

Data-Driven Robust Safety Verification for Markov Decision Processes[★]

Abhijit Mazumdar, Manuela L. Bujorianu, and Rafal Wisniewski

^{*} *Section of Automation & Control, Aalborg University, 9220 Aalborg East, Denmark (e-mail: abma, lmbu, raf@es.aau.dk)*

Abstract: In this paper, we propose a data-driven robust safety verification framework for stochastic dynamical systems modeled as Markov decision processes with time-varying and uncertain transition probabilities. Rather than assuming access to the exact nominal transition kernel, we consider the realistic setting where only samples from multiple system executions are available. These samples may correspond to different transition models inside an *ambiguity set* around the nominal transition kernel. Using these observations, we construct a unified ambiguity set that captures both inherent run-to-run variability in the transition dynamics and finite-sample statistical uncertainty. This ambiguity set is formalized through a Wasserstein-distance ball around a nominal empirical distribution and naturally induces an interval Markov decision process representation of the underlying system. Within this representation, we introduce a *robust safety function* that characterizes reach-avoid type probabilistic safety under all transition kernels consistent with the interval Markov decision process. We further derive high-confidence safety guarantees for the true, unknown time-varying system. A numerical example illustrates the applicability and effectiveness of the proposed approach.

Keywords: Probabilistic Safety, Data-Driven Robust Safety Verification, Interval Markov decision processes, Wasserstein Ambiguity Sets.

1. INTRODUCTION

Safety verification is vital to safety-critical systems, where unmodeled uncertainties and unpredictable variations can pose serious risks. Traditional approaches to probabilistic safety verification often assume that the system's behavior can be precisely characterized by known probability distributions. However, accurately identifying these probability distributions in practical scenarios is often challenging due to limited data, environmental variability, or complex dynamics. Consequently, any safety guarantees based on approximate or estimated probability models may become invalid if there is a mismatch between the assumed and actual distributions governing the system's transitions.

In stochastic optimization, distributionally robust optimization (DRO) has emerged as a powerful tool for providing reliable guarantees under model uncertainty. DRO frameworks account for this uncertainty by optimizing for the worst-case distribution within a specified ambiguity set which is a collection of probability distributions that captures possible variations around the nominal model. By considering the worst-case scenario within this set, DRO ensures that the safety guarantees remain robust, even when the true distribution deviates from the computed or assumed one. This approach allows safety-critical systems to operate with greater resilience to uncertainties in their underlying probabilistic models. There are many approaches used in DRO such as Wasserstein distance-based (Mohajerin Esfahani and Kuhn, 2018; Gao and Kleywegt, 2023; Yu et al., 2024), moment-based (Hao et al., 2021), Φ -divergence-based (Wu et al., 2024; Love and Bayraksan, 2014), etc.

Related Literature: The concept of safety that we consider in this work is the so-called *p*-safe. It has been developed in Wisniewski et al. (2020) and extensively studied in Wisniewski and Bujorianu (2021); Bujorianu et al. (2021b,a, 2020). A system is called to be *p*-safe if the system states do not visit the dangerous states before reaching the goal states with a probability more than a given threshold *p*. In Wisniewski and Bujorianu (2023), considering a Markov decision process (MDP), the safety func-

tion is reformulated by expected cost and a recursive expression is presented using dynamic programming problem.

In solving DRO optimization, the ambiguity set plays an important role. Wasserstein metric, which is a distance on the space of probability distributions, has been widely used to construct ambiguity set. However, use of Wasserstein distance makes the original problem an infinite-dimensional optimization over probability measures. By using Kantorovich duality (Mohajerin Esfahani and Kuhn, 2018; Kantorovich and Rubinshtein, 1958) resolves the infinite-dimension issue in the worst-case problem and represents the worse-case problem by a finite-dimensional convex optimization. In the context of an MDP, Iyengar (2005) introduces a distributionally robust Bellman equation based on which, a robust value iteration algorithm and a robust policy iteration algorithm are developed. Considering Wasserstein ambiguity set, Yang (2017) presents a method for finding the robust optimal policy. To carry out safety assessment, Yang (2018) uses moment-based ambiguity to define the uncertain distribution, enabling safety verification under partially known disturbance distributions. However, these works only consider either model ambiguity or ambiguity due to finite data samples, not both at the same time.

Our Contributions: In this paper, we study probabilistic safety for stochastic dynamical systems whose behavior may vary over time. We model the system as an *interval Markov decision process (IMDP)* with transition dynamics that are not fixed but can change slightly from one system execution to another due to disturbances, unmodeled effects, or shifts in operating conditions. Since the true transition dynamics are unknown, we rely on data collected from multiple runs, where each run provides one observation of the successor state. These samples are not required to come from the same underlying model, but we assume that the run-to-run variability remains within a bounded range. This leads to two sources of uncertainty in the data: *inherent variability in the system dynamics and statistical error from having only a finite number of observations*. We develop an approach that simultaneously accounts for both uncertainties and provides safety guarantees that remain valid under such model variation.

[★] This work has been supported by the Independent Research Fund Denmark (DFF) under Project SAFEmig (Project Number 3105-00173B).

Specifically, our goal is to compute the worst case probability of reaching unsafe states of the IMDP before visiting goal states. To do so, we formulate the problem as a distributionally robust sequential optimization. We use Wasserstein distance to construct the ambiguity set (Mohajerin Esfahani and Kuhn, 2018). To characterize distributionally robust safety, we introduce the robust safety function which is the worst case probability of reaching unsafe states before visiting goal states. We observe that the robust safety function is the solution of distributionally robust optimization with Wasserstein ambiguity set.

The following are our main contributions:

- i) In contrast to existing IMDP formulations that treat uncertainty as arising from either model variability or finite-sample statistical uncertainty, we introduce a *dual-source uncertainty model* that explicitly separates (a) inherent variability in the true transition dynamics and (b) statistical uncertainty induced by finite data. This decomposition enables a finer and more realistic characterization of uncertainty.
- ii) Considering the dual-source structure, we construct a *data-driven confidence region* for the transition kernel that jointly accounts for both model variability and sampling error. This yields high-confidence upper bounds on the reach-avoid safety probability. To the best of our knowledge, this constitutes the first high-confidence safety certification method for IMDPs.
- iii) Existing data-driven distributionally robust optimization (DRO) methods implicitly assume that all observed samples are drawn from a single, fixed underlying transition distribution. We relax this restrictive assumption by allowing observations to be generated by independent but *non-identically distributed* probabilities, each lying within the prescribed ambiguity set. This generalization enables safety analysis in environments with run-to-run variation and dynamic uncertainty.

The organization of the rest of the paper is as follows. In section 2, we introduce the MDP and various definitions. We introduce Wasserstein metric to describe the distance of two probability distributions and use Kantorovich's duality to reformulate it. Then, we formally define robust p -safety. We present the main results of the paper in Section 3. We provide an upper bound for the robust safety function for the true interval MDP in terms of the empirical robust safety function. In section 5, we demonstrate our main result using a numerical example. Finally, we present the concluding remark and our future work plan in section 6.

Notations: For any set S , we denote by $\Delta(S)$ the set of all probability measures on S . For a real number x , $|x|$ denotes its absolute value, whereas for a set S , $|S|$ denotes its cardinality. Given a probability measure μ over a discrete set X , the space $L^1(\mu)$ consists of all functions f satisfying $\sum_{x \in X} |f(x)|\mu(x) < \infty$. For a function $G : S \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, the expression $\{G(i)\}_{i \in S}$ represents a vector of dimension $|S|$ with components indexed by S . For real numbers r_1 and r_2 , the notation $[r_1, r_2]$ denotes the standard closed interval. For integers $k_1 < k_2$, the notation $[k_1 : k_2]$ denotes the set of integers in the interval $[k_1, k_2]$. For a vector $h \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the ℓ_1 -norm is written as $\|h\|_1$. For an event T in an experiment, $\mathbb{P}[T]$ denotes the probability that the event T occurs. The symbols \prod and \times denote Cartesian products of sets. Finally, the union of finitely many sets A_i , indexed by a finite set S , is denoted by $\bigcup_{i \in S} A_i$.

2. BACKGROUND AND PROBLEM FORMULATION

We consider a time-inhomogeneous Markov decision process (MDP) with a finite state space \mathcal{X} and a finite action space \mathcal{A} . The state space is partitioned into three disjoint subsets: the set of *goal* or *target* states E , the set of *forbidden* or *unsafe* states U , and the *living* set $H := \mathcal{X} \setminus (E \cup U)$. The goal states

are terminal, meaning that once the process enters the set, the evolution terminates.

A system trajectory is an element $\omega = (x_0, a_0, x_1, a_1, \dots)$ of the sample space $\Omega := (\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{A})^\infty$, equipped with the σ -algebra \mathcal{F} generated by the coordinate maps $X_t(\omega) = x_t$ and $A_t(\omega) = a_t$. Throughout, uppercase symbols X_t and A_t denote random variables, whereas lowercase symbols x_t and a_t denote their realizations. Suppose $\tau_S(t, x)$ denotes the first hitting time after t of a set S starting from state $X_t = x$.

Assumption 1. There exists an almost sure upper bound $T_{\max} < \infty$ on the hitting time $\tau := \tau_{E \cup U}(t, x)$ for all (t, x) .

We consider a time-varying policy $\pi := \{\pi_t\}_{t=0}^{T_{\max}-1}$, where each π_t assigns to every state $x \in \mathcal{X}$ a probability distribution over actions at time t , i.e., $\pi_t : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow \Delta(\mathcal{A})$. For a state $x \in H$ and action $a \in \mathcal{A}$, the transition to the next state $y \in \mathcal{X}$ at time $t+1$ occurs with probability $P_{t,x,a}(y)$. The transition kernel induced by the policy π is given by

$$P_{t,x}(y) := \sum_{a \in \mathcal{A}} \pi_t(a | x) P_{t,x,a}(y).$$

For all $x \in H$ and $k \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1]$, we define $\mathcal{P}_{k,x} := \{P_{k,x}(y)\}_{y \in \mathcal{X}}$ as the transition probability vector at time t from state x and $\mathcal{P}_k = [P_{k,x}(y)]_{x \in H, y \in \mathcal{X}}$ is the transition probability matrix at time $t = k$. We define $\mathcal{P}_t := \{\mathcal{P}_k\}_{k \in [t : T_{\max}-1]}$ is a set of transition probability matrices from time t until $T_{\max} - 1$.

If the transition probability \mathcal{P}_t is precisely known, then probabilistic safety can be characterized by defining the *safety function* as given in Wisniewski and Bujorianu (2023).

Definition 1. (Safety function). Consider a fixed policy π and a fixed transition probability \mathcal{P}_t . The safety function $S(x, t)$ for a state $X_t = x \in H$ is defined as the probability that any realization starting from a state $X_t = x$ hits the unsafe set U before hitting the goal set E following policy π , i.e.,

$$S(t, x) := \mathbb{P}_\pi[\tau_U(t, x) < \tau_E(t, x); \mathcal{P}_t | X_t = x].$$

For notational convenience, we write $\mathbb{P}_\pi[\cdot; \mathcal{P}_t]$ for the probability measure over system trajectories induced by the policy π and transition kernel \mathcal{P}_t , and $\mathbb{E}_\pi[\cdot; \mathcal{P}_t]$ for its associated expectation.

In this work, we assume that the exact transition probabilities are not known and it can vary over time and run. Instead, each $P_{t,x,a}(y)$ is assumed to lie within an interval or an ambiguity set, leading to an *interval MDP* representation. Specifically, the transition probability lies within the ambiguity set $[P_{t,x,a}^-(y), P_{t,x,a}^+(y)]$, and that the width of this ambiguity set is bounded by δ , i.e.,

$$P_{t,x,a}^-(y) \leq P_{t,x,a}(y) \leq P_{t,x,a}^+(y), \quad P_{t,x,a}^+(y) - P_{t,x,a}^-(y) \leq \delta.$$

Since we fix the policy, effectively, we have a Markov chain. Thus, in the rest of the paper, we consider a Markov chain with ambiguous transition probabilities. To construct the ambiguity set for the transition probability matrix \mathcal{P}_t , we define the 1-Wasserstein distance. For any two distribution $\mu, \nu \in \Delta(|\mathcal{X}|)$ defined $W(\mu, \nu)$ as given below:

$$W(\mu, \nu) := \left\{ \min_{\Gamma \in \Delta(\mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X})} \sum_{(y,z) \in \mathcal{X} \times \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(y, z) d(y, z) \right. \\ \left. \text{s.t. } \sum_{z \in \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(y, z) = \mu(y), \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \Gamma(y, z) = \nu(z) \right\},$$

where $d(x, y)$ is a distance metric. In this work, we consider $d(x, y)$ to be the *Hamming distance* between $x, y \in \mathcal{X}$ defined

as

$$d(x, y) := \begin{cases} 0, & x = y, \\ 1, & x \neq y. \end{cases}$$

Considering $d(x, y)$ as the Hamming distance, the 1-Wasserstein distance $W(\mu, \nu)$ becomes equivalent to the *total variation distance* $TV(\mu, \nu)$. The total variation distance $TV(\cdot)$ plays a crucial role in obtaining our final result.

The Wasserstein distance can be represented in a dual form using Kantorovich's duality as follows (Gao and Kleywegt, 2023):

$$W(\mu, \nu) = \sup_{f \in L^1(\mu), g \in L^1(\nu)} \left\{ \langle f, \mu \rangle + \langle g, \nu \rangle \mid s.t. f(z_1) + g(z_2) \leq d(z_1, z_2), \forall z_1, z_2 \in \mathcal{X} \right\}$$

where $\langle f, \mu \rangle := \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} f(y)\mu(y)$.

Then, we get the following expression for the Wasserstein distance $W(\mu, \nu)$:

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mu, \nu) &= \sup_{f \in L^1(\mu), g \in L^1(\nu)} \left\{ \langle f, \mu \rangle + \langle g, \nu \rangle \mid s.t. g(z_2) \leq \inf_{z_1} (d(z_1, z_2) - f(z_1)), \forall z_2 \in \mathcal{X} \right\} \\ &= \sup_{f \in L^1(\mu)} \langle f, \mu \rangle + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \inf_{z_1} (d(z_1, z_2) - f(z_1)) P_{t,x}(z_2) \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

Our main objective is to derive an upper bound on the safety function for the IMDP using only a finite number of data samples. Before doing so, we first assume access to the true nominal transition probability matrix \mathcal{P}_t together with a Wasserstein-type ambiguity set $\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)$. This ambiguity set is defined under the following rectangularity assumption (Iyengar, 2005; Liu et al., 2022). The rectangularity assumption is essential for deriving the recursive expression of the *robust safety function* introduced later.

We assume that the ambiguity set $\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_k)$ is defined as follows:

$$\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_k) := \{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k \mid \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}, \mathcal{P}_{k,x}) \leq \delta\},$$

Assumption 2. (Rectangularity assumption). For the family of transition probability matrices from time t to $T_{max} - 1$, we define the following ambiguity set:

$$\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t) := \cup_{k \in [t: T_{max}-1]} \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_k)$$

Similarly, for a distribution $\mathcal{P}_{k,x}$, $(k, x) \in [t : T_{max} - 1] \times H$, we define the following ambiguity set:

$$\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{k,x}) := \{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}) \mid W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}, \mathcal{P}_{k,x}) \leq \delta\}.$$

To characterize safety with ambiguous transition probability, we now introduce the distributionally robust safety function.

Definition 2. (Robust safety function). At time index t , consider a fixed policy π and a given nominal transition probability matrix \mathcal{P}_t with an ambiguity set $\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)$. For a state $X_t = x$, we define the distributionally robust safety function or simply robust safety function $S^R(t, x)$ as the worst-case probability that any realization starting from $X_t = x \in H$ visits the unsafe set U before visiting the goal set E , i.e.,

$$S^R(t, x) := \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)} \mathbb{P}_\pi [\tau_U(t, x) < \tau_E(t, x) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \mid X_t = x] \quad (2)$$

We consider the following notion of distributionally robust probabilistic safety, namely robust p -safety. This definition is inspired by the p -safety notion for standard MDPs introduced in Wisniewski and Bujorianu (2023).

Definition 3. (Robust p -safety). Suppose the policy π , robustness parameter δ and the safety parameter $p \in (0, 1)$ are fixed.

We call an MDP to be robust p -safe if $\max_{t \in [0: T_{max}-1], x \in H} S^R(t, x) \leq p$.

Our goal is to assess the robust p -safety of the IMDP for a given *evaluation policy* π by computing the robust safety function $S^R(t, x)$. The nominal transition probability matrix \mathcal{P} , the robustness parameter δ , and the safety threshold p are assumed to be known. The robust safety function, as defined in (2), is generally difficult to compute because it requires optimization over probability distributions. Our objective is to make this computation tractable by reformulating the problem as a finite-dimensional dual optimization problem. To achieve this, we employ the Kantorovich duality for the Wasserstein distance.

3. DISTRIBUTIONALLY ROBUST SAFETY VERIFICATION

In this section, we present derive various useful expressions for the robust safety function to evaluate robust p -safety.

Lemma 4. (Finite-horizon expression). For a state $X_t = x$ and time step $t \in [0 : T_{max} - 1]$, the robust safety function $S^R(t, x)$ can be expressed as:

$$S^R(t, x) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{k=t}^{\tau(t,x)+t-1} \kappa(X_k, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,X_k}) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \mid X_t = x \right], \quad (3)$$

where,

$$\kappa(x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}) := \sum_{y \in U} \tilde{P}_{k,x}(y).$$

Proof. Using Corollary 1 in Wisniewski and Bujorianu (2023) and Definition 2, we get the desired result. ■

We now show that the robust safety function S_π^R can also be computed recursively using dynamic programming.

Lemma 5. (Recursive expression). The robust safety function $S_\pi^R(t, x)$ is given by

$$S^R(t, x) = \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{t,x})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\kappa(x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) + S_\pi^R(t+1, y) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} \mid y \sim \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} \right].$$

Proof. From Lemma 4,

$$\begin{aligned} S^R(t, x) &= \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{k=t}^{\tau(t,x)+t-1} \kappa(X_k, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,X_k}) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \mid X_t = x \right] \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\kappa(x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) + \sum_{k=t+1}^{\tau(t+1, X_{t+1})+(t+1)-1} \kappa(X_k, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,X_k}) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \mid X_t = x \right] \\ &\stackrel{(b)}{=} \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{t,x})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\kappa(x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) + \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{t+1})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{k=t+1}^{\tau(t+1, X_{t+1})+(t+1)-1} \kappa(X_k, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,X_k}) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t+1} \mid X_{t+1} = y \right] \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \mid X_t = x \right] \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{t,x})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\kappa(x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) + S_\pi^R(t+1, y) \mid \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \mid y \sim \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} \right] \end{aligned}$$

The inner expectation in relation (a) is in view of Lemma 2 in Mazumdar et al. (2024). Relation (b) holds in view of the rectangularity structure of the ambiguity set $\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t)$. ■

We will also use the following expression for the robust safety function.

Lemma 6. The safety function $S^R(t, x)$ can be expressed as follows:

$$S^R(t, x) = \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{t,x})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y); \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t | X_t = x, y \sim \tilde{P}_{t,x} \right],$$

$$\text{where, } c(x, y) = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } y \in U \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Proof. We observe that

$$\mathbb{E}_\pi \left[c(x, y); \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t | X_t = x \right] = \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\kappa(x, \tilde{P}_{t,x}); \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t | X_t = x \right].$$

Thus, from Lemma 5, we get the desired result. ■

3.1 Convex program formulation of the robust safety function:

In the following lemma, we express the robust safety function as a finite-dimensional optimization problem. To this end, we make use of the Kantorovich duality result for Wasserstein distance computation.

Lemma 7. (Dual form of the robust safety function). The distributionally robust safety function is the solution of:

$$S^R(t, x) = \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \left[\lambda \delta + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \left(-\lambda d(l, y) + c(x, l) + S^R(t+1, l) \right) P_{t,x}(y) \right]. \quad (4)$$

Proof. From the definition, $S_\pi^R(x)$ is the solution of the above optimization problem

$$\begin{aligned} & S^R(t, x) \\ &= \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_{t,x})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y); \tilde{P}_{t,x} | y \sim \tilde{P}_{t,x} \right] \\ &= \begin{cases} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y); \tilde{P}_{t,x} | y \sim \tilde{P}_{t,x} \right] \\ \text{s.t. } W(\tilde{P}_{t,x}, \mathcal{P}_{t,x}) \leq \delta \end{cases} \\ &\stackrel{(a)}{=} \begin{cases} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y); \tilde{P}_{t,x} | y \sim \tilde{P}_{t,x} \right] \\ \text{s.t. } \sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{P}_{t,x}(z_1) \\ + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \inf_{z_1} (d(z_1, z_2) - f(z_1)) P_{t,x}(z_2) \leq \delta; \forall f \in L^1 \end{cases}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

In the above expression, equality (a) is due to (1). Using the standard duality in constrained optimization, we further get $\forall f \in L^1$:

$$\begin{aligned} & S^R(t, x) \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y) \right] \tilde{P}_{t,x}(y) \\ &\quad - \lambda \left(\sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{P}_{t,x}(z_1) + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{z_1} (d(z_1, z_2) - f(z_1)) P_{t,x}(z_2) - \delta \right) \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y) \right] \tilde{P}_{t,x}(y) \\ &\quad - \lambda \left(\sum_{z_1 \in \mathcal{X}} f(z_1) \tilde{P}_{t,x}(z_1) + \sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \min_{z_1} (d(z_1, z_2) - f(z_1)) P_{t,x}(z_2) - \delta \right) \quad (6) \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \sup_{\tilde{P}_{t,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X})} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[c(x, y) + S^R(t+1, y) - \lambda f(y) \right] \tilde{P}_{t,x}(y) \\ &\quad + \lambda \left(\sum_{z_2 \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{z_1} (-d(z_1, z_2) + f(z_1)) P_{t,x}(z_2) + \delta \right) \\ &\stackrel{a}{=} \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \left[\lambda \delta + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \max_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \left(-\lambda d(l, y) + c(x, l) + S^R(t+1, l) \right) P_{t,x}(y) \right] \end{aligned}$$

To get equality (a) in the above expression, we use the following analysis: since the expression is valid for all $f \in L^1$, we consider $f(l)$ such that $\lambda f(l) = -(c(x, l) + S_\pi^R(t+1, l))$ for all $y \in \mathcal{X}$. This choice of $f(y)$ helps us to avoid $\tilde{P}_{t,x}(y)$, thus eliminating the inner optimization.

4. DATA-DRIVEN ROBUST SAFETY FUNCTION

In this section, we present a data-driven approach to compute an upper bound on the robust safety function for the interval MDP. We assume that the true transition probabilities $P_{t,x}(\cdot)$ are not directly accessible for each state $x \in H$ and time $t \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1]$. Instead, for every pair (t, x) we observe N successor states

$$\{\xi_{t,x,1}, \xi_{t,x,2}, \dots, \xi_{t,x,N}\},$$

obtained by running the system N times. For each $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, the sample $\xi_{t,x,i}$ is generated according to a transition probability vector $\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i} := \{P_{t,x,i}(y)\}_{y \in \mathcal{X}}$, and we assume that these distributions are pairwise close in Wasserstein distance, i.e.,

$$W(\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}, \mathcal{P}_{t,x,j}) \leq \delta \quad \text{for all } i, j \in \{1, \dots, N\}.$$

Thus, the samples are independent but not identically distributed, and we cannot directly apply standard concentration inequalities for i.i.d. data that relate an empirical distribution to a single underlying “true” distribution.

To proceed, we define the empirical averaged distribution at (t, x) as

$$\hat{P}_{t,x}(y) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}\{\xi_{t,x,i} = y\}, \quad y \in \mathcal{X},$$

and the corresponding (unknown) averaged true distribution

$$\bar{P}_{t,x}(y) := \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N P_{t,x,i}(y), \quad y \in \mathcal{X}.$$

Suppose, $\forall (t, x) \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1] \times H$, $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x} := \{\hat{P}_{t,x}(y)\}_{y \in \mathcal{X}}$ and $\hat{P}_t := [\hat{P}_{t,x}(y)]_{x \in H, y \in \mathcal{X}}$ be the empirical transition probability matrix at time step $t \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1]$. We define the following family of empirical state-transition matrices from time $k \in [t : T_{\max} - 1]$ as $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t := \{\hat{P}_k\}_{k \in [t : T_{\max} - 1]}$.

Similar to ambiguity sets defined with the true nominal transition probabilities, empirical ambiguity sets are defined as follows. Ambiguity set around the empirical transition probability matrix is defined as:

$$\mathcal{D}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_k) := \{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_k \mid \sup_{x \in \mathcal{X}} W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}) \leq \delta + \rho\},$$

where, $\rho := \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{2} \varepsilon$, $\varepsilon := \sqrt{\frac{\ln(2|\mathcal{X}|/\beta)}{2N}}$, and $\beta \in (0, 1)$ is the confidence parameter.

For the family of empirical transition probability matrices for $k \in [t : T_{\max} - 1]$, we define the following ambiguity set:

$$\mathcal{D}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t) := \cup_{k \in [t : T_{\max} - 1]} \mathcal{D}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_k)$$

Similarly, for an empirical average distribution $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x} \forall (k, x) \in [t : T_{\max} - 1] \times H$ we define the following ambiguity set:

$$\mathcal{D}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}) := \left\{ \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x} \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}) \mid W(\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}) \leq \delta + \rho \right\}.$$

We now introduce the *empirical robust safety function* $\hat{S}^R(t, x)$ for each $(t, x) \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1] \times H$ as follows:

$$\hat{S}^R(t, x) := \sup_{\tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t \in \mathcal{D}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t)} \mathbb{E}_\pi \left[\sum_{k=t}^{\tau(t,x)+t-1} \kappa(X_k, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}); \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_t | X_t = x \right], \quad (7)$$

recall that

$$\kappa(x, \tilde{\mathcal{P}}_{k,x}) := \sum_{y \in U} \tilde{P}_{k,x}(y).$$

Using Lemma 7, we have the following dual form for the data-driven robust safety function $\hat{S}^R(t, x)$.

Lemma 8. (Empirical robust safety function). For each $(t, x) \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1] \times H$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{S}^R(t, x) \\ &= \inf_{\lambda \geq 0} \left\{ \lambda(\delta + \rho) + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left[\max_{l \in \mathcal{L}} (-\lambda d(y, l) + c(x, l) + \hat{S}^R(t+1, y)) \right] \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

As a corollary to the above result, we can further rewrite the robust safety function as a finite convex program, which is useful for computational aspects.

Corollary 9. (Convex-program formulation). We define epigraphical auxiliary variables $h_y \in \mathbb{R}$, $y \in \mathcal{X}$. Then the empirical robust safety function $\hat{S}^R(t, x)$ is the optimal value of the following convex program:

$$\begin{aligned} & \inf_{\lambda \geq 0, h_y} \left(\lambda(\delta + \rho) + \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} h_y \right) \\ & \text{s.t. } \max_{l \in \mathcal{L}} \left(-\lambda d(y, l) + c(x, l) + \hat{S}^R(t+1, y) \right) \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) \leq h_y; \quad \forall y \in \mathcal{X}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

We now present another important result, which provides a high-confidence upper bound on the true robust safety function for the original IMDP.

Theorem 10. (Upper bound of the robust safety function). Fix a time index $t \geq 0$, a state $x \in H$ and a confidence parameter $\beta \in (0, 1)$. With probability at least $(1 - \beta)$,

$$S^R(t, x) \leq \hat{S}^R(t, x).$$

Proof. Using Hoeffding's inequality, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ and for all $x \in H$, $t \in [0, T_{\max} - 1]$,

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left| \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) - \bar{P}_{t,x}(y) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \leq 2 \exp(-2N\varepsilon^2).$$

Using the definition of ε ,

$$2 \exp(-2N\varepsilon^2) = 2 \exp(-\ln(2|\mathcal{X}|/\beta)) = \frac{\beta}{|\mathcal{X}|}.$$

By a union bound over all $y \in \mathcal{X}$,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{P} \left(\max_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) - \bar{P}_{t,x}(y) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \mathbb{P} \left(\left| \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) - \bar{P}_{t,x}(y) \right| \geq \varepsilon \right) \\ & \leq \beta. \end{aligned}$$

Thus, with probability at least $(1 - \beta)$,

$$\max_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) - \bar{P}_{t,x}(y) \right| \leq \varepsilon.$$

On this event,

$$\|\hat{P}_{t,x} - \bar{P}_{t,x}\|_1 = \sum_{y \in \mathcal{X}} \left| \hat{P}_{t,x}(y) - \bar{P}_{t,x}(y) \right| \leq |\mathcal{X}| \varepsilon.$$

We can express the total variation distance by the following well-known result (Levin and Peres, 2009):

$$\text{TV}(\mu, \nu) = \frac{1}{2} \|\mu - \nu\|_1, \quad \forall \mu, \nu \in \Delta(\mathcal{X}).$$

Therefore, with probability at least $(1 - \beta)$,

$$W(\hat{P}_{t,x}, \bar{P}_{t,x}) = \text{TV}(\hat{P}_{t,x}, \bar{P}_{t,x}) = \frac{1}{2} \|\hat{P}_{t,x} - \bar{P}_{t,x}\|_1 \leq \frac{|\mathcal{X}|}{2} \varepsilon = \rho. \quad (9)$$

By assumption the pairwise distances between the true models are bounded:

$$W(\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}, \mathcal{P}_{t,x,j}) \leq \delta, \quad \forall i, j \leq N.$$

Since the Wasserstein distance is convex in each argument, we can bound the distance between each $\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}$ and the average model $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}$ as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} W(\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) &= W\left(\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}, \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \mathcal{P}_{t,x,j}\right) \\ &\leq \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N W(\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}, \mathcal{P}_{t,x,j}) \leq \delta. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Thus each $\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i}$ lies in the ball of radius δ around $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}$:

$$\mathcal{P}_{t,x,i} \in \mathcal{D}^\delta(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}).$$

By using relations (9),(10) and the triangle inequality of W , we have that any $\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}$ that satisfies $W(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) \leq \delta$ also satisfies

$$W(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) \leq W(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}, \bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) + W(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}, \hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) \leq \delta + \rho.$$

Therefore, $\forall (t, x) \in [0, T_{\max} - 1] \times H$,

$$\mathcal{D}^\delta(\bar{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}) \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{t,x}).$$

Hence, with probability at least $(1 - \beta)$,

$$\mathcal{D}^\delta(\mathcal{P}_t) \subseteq \hat{\mathcal{D}}^{\delta+\rho}(\hat{\mathcal{P}}_t), \quad \forall t \in [0, T_{\max} - 1].$$

Since taking the supremum over a larger set can only increase the value, from (3) and (7), we have the following result: with probability at least $1 - \beta$,

$$S^R(t, x) \leq \hat{S}^R(t, x). \quad \blacksquare$$

5. NUMERICAL EXAMPLE

We consider a finite MDP with $\mathcal{X} = \{1, \dots, 20\}$, partitioned into $H = \{1, \dots, 10\}$, $U = \{11, 12\}$, $E = \{13, \dots, 20\}$, where U and E are absorbing (terminal) sets. The action set is $\mathcal{A} = \{a_H, a_U, a_E\}$.

We consider that the process visits either the goal set E or the unsafe set U at time $t \leq T_{\max} = 10$ with probability 1. For the ease of demonstration, we consider the nominal transition probabilities $P_{t,x,a}$ of the IMDP to be time invariant. Further, we consider a policy π such that π_t is same for all $t \leq T_{\max} - 2$ and for $\pi_{T_{\max}-1}$ is chosen differently such that the process visits the target set E or the unsafe set U with at-most T_{\max} steps. For each $x \in H$, $a \in \mathcal{A}$, and $t \leq T_{\max} - 1$ the transition probabilities are: $P_{t,x,a_H}(y) = \frac{1}{|H|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in H\}$, $P_{t,x,a_U}(y) = \frac{1}{|U|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in U\}$, and $P_{t,x,a_E}(y) = \frac{1}{|E|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in E\}$. For $x \in U \cup E$, the process is absorbing: $P_{t,x,a}(y) = \mathbb{1}\{y = x\}$ for all $a \in \mathcal{A}$ and $t \leq T_{\max}$.

We evaluate the safety of the following randomized policy. For time steps $t \leq T_{\max} - 2$,

$$\pi_t(a_H | x) = 0.4, \quad \pi_t(a_U | x) = 0.3, \quad \pi_t(a_E | x) = 0.3, \quad x \in H.$$

At the last step $t = T_{\max} - 1$, we use

$$\pi_{T_{\max}-1}(a_H | x) = 0, \quad \pi_{T_{\max}-1}(a_U | x) = \pi_{T_{\max}-1}(a_E | x) = 0.5,$$

which forces transitions from H into $U \cup E$.

Thus, for the induced Markov chain satisfies, the nominal transition probabilities are as given below. For $x \in H$ and $t \leq T_{\max} - 2$,

$$P_{t,x}(y) = \frac{0.4}{|H|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in H\} + \frac{0.3}{|U|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in U\} + \frac{0.3}{|E|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in E\}.$$

For $x \in H$ and $t = T_{\max} - 1$, the transition probabilities are:

$$P_{t,x}(y) = \frac{0.5}{|U|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in U\} + \frac{0.5}{|E|} \mathbb{1}\{y \in E\}.$$

For computing the empirical robust safety function $\hat{S}^R(t, x)$, we assume that the true empirical transition probabilities of the induced Markov chain are not directly available. Instead, for each $\mathcal{P}_{x,a}$, we generate 100,000 transition samples. We use a confidence level of $\beta = 0.05$ and an ambiguity radius of $\delta = 0.2$ for the true transition probabilities. Based on these parameters, we first construct the empirical distributions $\hat{\mathcal{P}}_{x,a}$. Subsequently, we solve (8) independently for each $t \in [0 : T_{\max} - 1]$ and $x \in H$ to obtain the empirical robust safety function. The corresponding values of $\hat{S}^R(t, x)$ for a 4-state subset are listed below:

time t	$\hat{S}^R(t, 1)$	$\hat{S}^R(t, 2)$	$\hat{S}^R(t, 3)$	$\hat{S}^R(t, 4)$
0	0.9305	0.9274	0.9309	0.9312
1	0.9291	0.9286	0.9297	0.9278
2	0.9291	0.9299	0.9296	0.9293
3	0.9306	0.9288	0.9313	0.9292
4	0.9296	0.9291	0.9259	0.9284
5	0.9269	0.9259	0.9231	0.9247
6	0.9187	0.9170	0.9200	0.9191
7	0.9007	0.9012	0.9016	0.9018
8	0.8608	0.8600	0.8638	0.8593
9	0.7575	0.7607	0.7587	0.7553

Table 1. Empirical robust safety function $\hat{S}^R(t, x)$.

The empirical distributions obtained from the 100,000 generated samples are nearly identical to the true nominal transition probabilities. Suppose, however, that we naively treat these empirical distributions as if they were the true model, thereby ignoring the statistical uncertainty arising from the finite number of samples. In this case, we account only for model ambiguity using a radius of $\delta = 0.2$. The resulting robust safety function is shown below:

time t	$S^R(t, 1)$	$S^R(t, 2)$	$S^R(t, 3)$	$S^R(t, 4)$
0	0.8342	0.8313	0.8343	0.8348
1	0.8328	0.8321	0.8332	0.8317
2	0.8327	0.8334	0.8334	0.8331
3	0.8343	0.8326	0.8350	0.8330
4	0.8336	0.8333	0.8302	0.8322
5	0.8313	0.8305	0.8278	0.8293
6	0.8250	0.8231	0.8261	0.8253
7	0.8107	0.8111	0.8115	0.8115
8	0.7798	0.7790	0.7828	0.7784
9	0.6997	0.7029	0.7009	0.6975

Table 2. True robust safety function $S^R(t, x)$.

The true robust safety function $S^R(t, x)$ is as follows:

time t	$S^R(t, 1)$	$S^R(t, 2)$	$S^R(t, 3)$	$S^R(t, 4)$
0	0.8332	0.8332	0.8332	0.8332
1	0.8332	0.8332	0.8332	0.8332
2	0.8331	0.8331	0.8331	0.8331
3	0.8327	0.8327	0.8327	0.8327
4	0.8319	0.8319	0.8319	0.8319
5	0.8299	0.8299	0.8299	0.8299
6	0.8248	0.8248	0.8248	0.8248
7	0.8120	0.8120	0.8120	0.8120
8	0.7800	0.7800	0.7800	0.7800
9	0.7000	0.7000	0.7000	0.7000

Table 3. Robust safety function $S^R(t, x)$ with empirical average distribution.

Consequently, the robust safety function computed using only the empirical distribution can, in some cases, underestimate the true robust safety function. If the ambiguity arising from finite-sample uncertainty captured by ρ is ignored, it is possible that the true robust safety function exceeds the safety threshold p , while the empirically computed robust safety function remains below p . This discrepancy does not occur when both sources of uncertainty, δ and ρ , are incorporated in the computation of the empirical robust safety function, as illustrated in Table 1. The empirical robust safety function always serves as an high confidence upper-bound for the true robust safety function.

6. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We addressed the problem of distributionally robust safety verification for interval Markov Decision Processes (MDPs). Specifically, we studied the concept of robust probabilistic safety, termed robust p -safety, which generalizes probabilistic safety to MDPs with uncertain transition probabilities. We considered an ambiguity set that takes into account both model ambiguity and statistical (finite-sample) ambiguity. We provided a data-driven safety verification approach that estimates the probability of visiting unsafe states with an arbitrary high confidence. As future work, we will extend this framework to MDPs with larger state-action spaces and potentially continuous state spaces.

REFERENCES

- Bujorianu, M.L., Wisniewski, R., and Boulougouris, E. (2020). Stochastic safety for markov chains. *IEEE Control Systems Letters*, 5(2), 427–432.
- Bujorianu, M.L., Wisniewski, R., and Boulougouris, E. (2021a). p -safety and stability. *IFAC-PapersOnLine*, 54(9), 665–670.
- Bujorianu, M.L., Wisniewski, R., and Boulougouris, E. (2021b). Stochastic safety for random dynamical systems. In *2021 American Control Conference (ACC)*, 1340–1345. IEEE.
- Gao, R. and Kleywegt, A. (2023). Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with Wasserstein distance. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(2), 603–655.
- Hao, B., Cai, K., Fang, Y.P., Fadil, A., and Feng, D. (2021). A moment-based distributionally robust optimization model for air traffic flow management. In *2021 IEEE/AIAA 40th Digital Avionics Systems Conference (DASC)*, 1–7. IEEE.
- Iyengar, G.N. (2005). Robust dynamic programming. *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 30(2), 257–280.
- Kantorovich, L.V. and Rubinshtein, S. (1958). On a space of totally additive functions. *Vestnik of the St. Petersburg University: Mathematics*, 13(7), 52–59.
- Levin, D.A. and Peres, Y. (2009). *Markov chains and mixing times*. American Mathematical Society.
- Liu, Z., Bai, Q., Blanchet, J., Dong, P., Xu, W., Zhou, Z., and Zhou, Z. (2022). Distributionally robust q -learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 13623–13643. PMLR.
- Love, D. and Bayraksan, G. (2014). A classification of phi-divergences for data-driven stochastic optimization. In *IIE Annual Conference. Proceedings*, 2780. Institute of Industrial and Systems Engineers (IISE).
- Mazumdar, A., Wisniewski, R., and Bujorianu, M.L. (2024). Safe reinforcement learning for constrained Markov decision processes with stochastic stopping time. In *2024 IEEE 63rd Conference on Decision and Control (CDC)*, 1923–1928. IEEE.
- Mohajerin Esfahani, P. and Kuhn, D. (2018). Data-driven distributionally robust optimization using the Wasserstein metric: Performance guarantees and tractable reformulations. *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1), 115–166.
- Wisniewski, R., Bujorianu, M.L., and Sloth, C. (2020). p -safe analysis of stochastic hybrid processes. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 65(12), 5220–5235.
- Wisniewski, R. and Bujorianu, L.M. (2021). Safety of stochastic systems: An analytic and computational approach. *Automatica*, 133, 109839.

- Wisniewski, R. and Bujorianu, M.L. (2023). Probabilistic safety guarantees for Markov decision processes. *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*.
- Wu, J., Chen, J., Wu, J., Shi, W., Wang, X., and He, X. (2024). Understanding contrastive learning via distributionally robust optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.
- Yang, I. (2017). A convex optimization approach to distributionally robust Markov decision processes with Wasserstein distance. *IEEE control systems letters*, 1(1), 164–169.
- Yang, I. (2018). A dynamic game approach to distributionally robust safety specifications for stochastic systems. *Automatica*, 94, 94–101.
- Yu, Z., Dai, L., Xu, S., Gao, S., and Ho, C.P. (2024). Fast bellman updates for Wasserstein distributionally robust MDPs. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36.