

Assured Autonomy: How Operations Research Powers and Orchestrates Generative AI Systems*

Tinglong Dai[†] David Simchi-Levi[‡] Michelle Xiao Wu[§] Yao Xie[¶]

[†]Carey Business School, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21202; Data Science and AI Institute, Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland 21218, dai@jhu.edu

[‡]Institute for Data, Systems and Society, Operations Research Center, Department of Civil and Environmental Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, dslevi@mit.edu

[§]Purdue University, West Lafayette, Indiana 47907, michelle.xiao.wu@gmail.com

[¶]H. Milton Stewart School of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA 30332, yao.xie@isye.gatech.edu

Abstract. Generative artificial intelligence (GenAI) is shifting from conversational assistants toward agentic systems—autonomous decision-making systems that sense, decide, and act within operational workflows. This shift creates an autonomy paradox: as GenAI systems are granted greater operational autonomy, they should, by design, embody more formal structure, more explicit constraints, and stronger tail-risk discipline. We argue stochastic generative models can be fragile in operational domains unless paired with mechanisms that provide verifiable feasibility, robustness to distribution shift, and stress testing under high-consequence scenarios. To address this challenge, we develop a conceptual framework for assured autonomy grounded in operations research (OR), built on two complementary approaches. First, *flow-based generative models* frame generation as deterministic transport characterized by an ordinary differential equation, enabling auditability, constraint-aware generation, and connections to optimal transport, robust optimization, and sequential decision control. Second, *operational safety* is formulated through an adversarial robustness lens: decision rules are evaluated against worst-case perturbations within uncertainty or ambiguity sets, making unmodeled risks part of the design. This framework clarifies how increasing autonomy shifts OR’s role from solver to guardrail to system architect, with responsibility for control logic, incentive protocols, monitoring regimes, and safety boundaries. These elements define a research agenda for *assured autonomy* in safety-critical, reliability-sensitive operational domains.

Key words: Generative AI; autonomous agents; operations research; flow-based generative models

1. Introduction

Artificial intelligence (AI) is crossing a practical threshold: it is moving from advice to action. The question for many organizations is no longer whether generative AI (GenAI) can draft text or write code, but whether an agent can operate—place orders, route vehicles,

* Authors are listed alphabetically.

allocate clinical resources, balance power grids, coordinate multi-echelon logistics—under real constraints and real uncertainty. This shift from “chatbot” to “operator” exposes a paradox that should guide the next decade of Operations Research (OR): greater autonomy demands more structure. We call this the autonomy paradox, and it follows from a simple mechanism.

Autonomy delivers speed and scale, yet it also amplifies the cost of small errors, hidden constraint violations, and rare failures. In high-stakes settings, expected performance is a weak guide: low-probability regimes can dominate social cost, and “almost always safe” is not safe enough.

1.1. Operational Risk and the Case for OR

In the field, even highly engineered autonomous systems still exhibit edge cases that trigger recalls, investigations, and public concern. In December 2025, for example, a U.S. regulator disclosed a Waymo recall tied to a software issue that could cause vehicles to pass stopped school buses—a rare, high-consequence scenario (Khanna 2025). The lesson generalizes. When AI is embedded in operations, safety depends on engineered discipline: systems that are auditable and monitorable, respect hard constraints, and are stress-tested against tail events (Weick and Sutcliffe 2015).

At the same time, autonomy is advancing quickly under controlled conditions. A late-2025 lab study shows that multi-agent systems built from frontier generative models can manage the MIT Beer Distribution Game and reduce total costs relative to human teams (Long et al. 2025b). For the same setting, the GenAI Beer Game provides an interactive testbed that pairs a natural-language interface with an OR decision engine (Long et al. 2025a). Taken together, field failures and lab gains point to a single bottleneck: autonomy scales under decision regimes that remain feasible and stable when conditions drift and constraints bind in unanticipated ways.

These requirements define a design problem: build autonomous operators whose behavior stays feasible, monitorable, and stable under distribution shift and interaction. OR has spent decades developing the corresponding structure—explicit constraints and feasible-set reasoning, flow conservation and queueing stability, sequential decision control, and robust planning under uncertainty.

Forged during World War II to orchestrate complex military operations and emerging

technologies, OR was born in high-stakes settings and then carried into infrastructure, logistics, and service systems (Flagle 2002; Gass and Assad 2011). Rising autonomy renews that role. In low-autonomy settings, OR acts mainly as a solver. In medium-autonomy settings, it supplies guardrails—constraints, audits, and risk measures. In high-autonomy settings, OR becomes the architect of the operating regime: control logic, incentive protocols, monitoring rules, and safety boundaries within which fleets of agents act. Scaling autonomy responsibly requires this shift.

1.2. Assured Autonomy as an OR Problem

A defining feature of assured operational autonomy (“assured autonomy” for short) is that decisions are sequential, stateful, and coupled over time. Actions taken now reshape future feasibility, risk exposure, and information through delayed and nonlinear dynamics. This distinguishes operational autonomy from one-shot generative tasks and places OR’s tradition of sequential decision-making, control, and stability analysis at the center of the problem.¹ In such settings, the value of a generative model is not its static realism, but whether the closed-loop system it induces remains feasible, stable, and safe over long horizons.

The autonomy paradox implies two design commitments. First, the generative mechanism that drives actions must be constrainable and auditable—closer to an engineered dynamical system than a black-box sampler. This motivates deterministic, flow-based generators—continuous normalizing flows, flow matching, and probability-flow ordinary differential equation (ODE) formulations—that confine randomness to a source distribution while keeping the transformation dynamics deterministic and governed by an ODE. In these architectures, the flow (the ODE) is the engine of generation, while transformers provide representations, interfaces, and orchestration.

Second, operational safety should be built through adversarial design rather than post hoc filtering. Catastrophic failures in aviation, supply chains, power grids, or hospitals arise in tail regimes and under interaction; a natural abstraction is therefore game-theoretic. A controller chooses a policy to minimize cost while an adversary—representing nature, attackers, or distribution shift—chooses scenarios to maximize loss, linking assured performance to distributionally robust optimization and to one of OR’s historical roots: postwar game theory (Gass and Assad 2011; Shubik 2002).

¹ See, for example, Powell (2023) and Sutton and Barto (2018) for unification perspectives that emphasize closed-loop feasibility and stability rather than reward maximization.

Together, these commitments locate OR’s leverage. In modern GenAI, ideas matter when they remove binding bottlenecks. Operational settings expose bottlenecks that current generators often sidestep: feasibility by construction, explicit tail regimes that dominate social cost, and generation coupled to optimization so that “plausible” is defined by decision impact rather than surface similarity.

Assured autonomy is autonomy with guarantees: explicit invariants, tail-risk and shift stress tests, and auditable rules for monitoring, escalation, and deferral. It separates systems that look competent in routine settings from systems that remain safe and effective when conditions become novel, extreme, or adversarial. Our claim is that assured autonomy aligns with core OR principles—explicit constraints, worst-case reasoning, and accountable decision rules. Generative models do not produce operational autonomy on their own. Autonomy must be engineered with structure, constraints, and governance, and that redesign is an OR project.

This article is conceptual and design-oriented. Our aim is to specify what assured autonomy requires, diagnose why current GenAI paradigms fail under hard constraints and tail risk, and show how OR fills the gap. We synthesize recent work into an OR-powered integration stack—deterministic, transport-style generation; minimax stress testing; optimization and control; and continuous monitoring with fallback—that serves as both blueprint and research agenda. After diagnosing the limitations of current GenAI (Section 2), we present the technical core: flow-based generation (Section 3) and minimax safety design (Section 4). We then reframe OR’s evolving role (Section 5), illustrate the framework across supply chains, mobility, healthcare, and power grids (Section 6), and outline a research agenda (Section 7).

2. Why Current GenAI Is Insufficient for Assured Autonomy

GenAI has made rapid gains in producing fluent text and realistic media, and it can look compelling in controlled demonstrations. Operational autonomy, however, is judged by a different metric than plausibility. Most GenAI models are trained to generate high-probability continuations of observed patterns, whereas operations require actions that satisfy hard constraints, remain stable under feedback and delay, and perform acceptably under distribution shift—especially in rare, correlated regimes that dominate social cost. The failures are *structural*: imitation-based training does not, on its own, enforce feasibility, stability, or tail robustness. This mismatch becomes sharp along two dimensions—the degree of non-determinism in the decision engine and the safety-criticality of the domain. When both are

high, residual stochastic error is no longer a tolerable nuisance; it becomes a systematic source of tail risk. Writing about weapon control, Cummings argues “GenAI is simply too dangerous to include in safety-critical systems” (Cummings 2025). The broader point is not limited to weapons: when rare failure modes cannot be modeled, bounded, and monitored, delegating control to a stochastic generator increases exposure to catastrophic outcomes.

Why do these limitations persist? We begin by explaining how stochastic generation complicates certification in safety-critical settings, using LLMs and diffusion models as exemplars. We then distinguish semantic constraints from the structural constraints that define operational feasibility over time. Finally, we discuss tail risk, distribution shift, and accountability—the regimes in which average-case performance is least informative and post hoc diagnosis is essential.

2.1. Stochastic Generators and Safety-Critical Control

LLMs make the gap concrete. An LLM produces the most plausible continuation of a prompt given its training distribution and context. For drafting, summarizing, and brainstorming, this works well. For allocating scarce resources, scheduling tightly coupled activities, or enforcing safety rules that admit no exceptions, it becomes a liability. Correctness here means satisfying feasibility and safety conditions, not producing a reasonable narrative. Reflecting this concern, experts have argued GenAI should be prohibited “to control, direct, guide or govern any weapon” until hallucinations can be modeled and predicted, precisely because the technology as commonly deployed remains difficult to certify and bound in environments where failures can cost lives (Cummings 2025). Where the acceptable failure rate is effectively zero, plausibility does not substitute for assurance.

Diffusion models (Chen et al. 2024; Song et al. 2021; Song, Meng and Ermon 2021) illustrate a related structural misalignment. In their standard form, diffusion deliberately destroys structure by adding noise and then reconstructs it via a stochastic reverse-time process (Anderson 1982). This paradigm fits images and text, where intermediate states need not be meaningful. Operational systems are different: feasibility, conservation laws, stability conditions, and safety envelopes are invariants that should hold along an entire trajectory, not just at the endpoint. A generator that wanders stochastically and is “corrected” after the fact is hard to certify without additional architectural constraints, and it tends to underrepresent tails unless training and evaluation are explicitly redesigned to emphasize the rare regimes that dominate social cost.

2.2. Semantic Versus Structural Constraints

It is tempting to impose constraints on top of these models through prompting, penalty terms, or post hoc filtering. But this strategy is brittle: prompts are not enforceable constraints, and soft penalties are not hard feasibility. Even when an external checker is available, the generator becomes a proposal mechanism whose outputs must be governed by a separate decision regime. Recent work on constrained learning for diffusion models is therefore best read as both progress and diagnosis: Lagrangian-style training can yield meaningful satisfaction guarantees for certain constraint classes (Khalafi et al. 2025), yet the constraints emphasized in much of that literature are often semantic or preference-based rather than the conservation, capacity, integrality, and stability constraints that define OR problems.

A useful way to clarify the gap is to distinguish *semantic* from *structural* constraints. Semantic constraints regulate *what* is generated (attributes, labels, preferences, and fairness criteria). Structural constraints govern system feasibility as a dynamical object (e.g., flow conservation, capacity limits, integrality, stability, and feasibility over time) and should hold globally throughout execution. When structural constraints are violated, the result is not a lower-quality output but an infeasible or difficult-to-certify action. This is why assured autonomy cannot rest on semantic alignment alone when generative models are embedded in decision loops.

2.3. Tail Risk, Distribution Shift, and Accountability

The deeper problem is tail risk and distribution shift. Operational safety is rarely about being right on average. It is about not failing when the system is stressed: when demand surges, disruptions are correlated, sensors degrade, or strategic interaction produces congestion and cascades. Standard GenAI objectives do not target these regimes; they reward typical-case fidelity and tend to smooth away precisely the rare structures that robust planning should confront. OR frameworks, by contrast, have long emphasized tail events (Blanchet and Glynn 2008), asking which deviations matter and then encoding them through chance constraints, ambiguity sets, or worst-case objectives.

Operations also require accountability and diagnosis. High-reliability practice depends on learning from near misses and tracing failures back to their mechanisms (Weick and Sutcliffe 2015). Black-box generators make this difficult: when performance degrades, it is often unclear whether the cause is data drift, prompt drift, hidden constraint violations,




Figure 1 The OR-AI Integration Architecture for Assured Autonomy

or a failure mode absent from the training distribution. Without an auditable structure, governance becomes reactive and fragile.

Off-the-shelf GenAI is not built to enforce trajectory-level feasibility, to represent and control tail regimes that dominate social cost, or to support the accountability required in high-reliability operations. These gaps explain why current GenAI remains unreliable as an autonomous operator in safety-critical, constraint-driven settings. The next sections examine technical directions that target these failure modes, and Figure 1 summarizes the corresponding OR–AI integration architecture for assured autonomy.

3. Flow-Based Generative Models: Structured Evolution in Probability Space

We introduce flow-based generative models as a design pattern for auditable, constrainable generation—not as a claim that any particular method is empirically superior. Flow-based generative models construct complex distributions by transporting probability mass through a sequence of maps, from discrete normalizing flows to continuous-time formulations based on neural ODEs and related transport-based variants (Dinh, Sohl-Dickstein and Bengio 2017; Rezende and Mohamed 2015; Albergo, Boffi and Vanden-Eijnden 2023; Chen et al. 2018; Lipman et al. 2023; Geng et al. 2025; Song et al. 2023; Xu, Cheng and Xie 2023). The transport formulation is implementation-agnostic: in low-dimensional or structured settings, maps (or velocity fields) can be affine or piecewise-affine, triangular (Knothe–Rosenblatt), kernel-based, or computed via optimal transport solvers when geometry is explicit (Peyré and Cuturi 2019); neural parameterizations matter most when high-dimensional heterogeneity makes expressivity the bottleneck. Viewed through an OR lens, flow-based generation is

an iterative algorithm in probability space (Xie and Cheng 2025), which makes constraints and risk functionals natural to impose at the level of distributional evolution. Accordingly, we proceed in three steps: we first formalize continuous-time distributional dynamics; we then show how deterministic transport yields structure-by-construction and auditability (in contrast to stochastic sampling); and we close by explaining how this interface supports constraint- and tail-aware scenario generation for decision-making.

3.1. Continuous-Time Dynamics and Distributional Evolution

In the continuous-time setting, let $X_t \in \mathbb{R}^d$ denote the state of a system at time $t \in [0, T]$, with initial condition $X_0 \sim \rho_0 = P$, where P denotes the data or scenario distribution of interest. A flow-based model specifies a time-dependent velocity field $v_\phi(x, t) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^d$, parameterized by ϕ , and the system evolves according to the ordinary differential equation

$$\frac{dX_t}{dt} = v_\phi(X_t, t), \quad t \in [0, T]. \quad (1)$$

As particles evolve under this deterministic dynamics, the induced probability distribution evolves continuously over time. Let $\rho_t(x)$ denote the probability density of X_t . Its evolution is governed by the continuity equation

$$\partial_t \rho_t(x) + \nabla \cdot (\rho_t(x) v_\phi(x, t)) = 0, \quad (2)$$

which expresses conservation of probability mass along the flow.

Under mild regularity conditions, the dynamics in eq. (1) are deterministic and invertible, yielding an explicit transport between distributions. In practice, the velocity field v_ϕ is represented by a neural network—often using residual or time-incremental architectures—and learned via variational objectives in probability space or flow-matching formulations. While Gaussian reference distributions are common, the framework is not restricted to this choice: the terminal distribution Q may also represent structured or adversarial targets, such as least-favorable distributions arising in distributionally robust optimization (Xu et al. 2024).

Depending on context, the same transport admits two complementary interpretations. In generative use, one draws samples from a simple reference distribution Q and pushes them forward through the flow to obtain samples from a complex target distribution P . In analytical or decision-oriented settings, the flow may instead be used to push data or scenarios from reference measure P (e.g., observed from data) toward a worst-case distribution Q .




Figure 2 **Structural contrast between flow-based and diffusion-based generative models under constraints.** Red curves denote a constrained feasible region. Left: flow-based models transport samples deterministically from a reference distribution Q to a target distribution P , allowing constraints to be incorporated directly into the transformation. Right: diffusion-based models generate samples through iterative stochastic refinement, with randomness injected at each step and constraints typically enforced through guidance or correction mechanisms.

Both viewpoints rely on the same underlying transport structure and differ only in how the learned dynamics are traversed. This perspective connects to Wasserstein gradient-flow structure and JKO-type constructions (Ambrosio, Gigli and Savaré 2005; Cheng et al. 2024; Jordan, Kinderlehrer and Otto 1998), providing a variational view of training and stability closely aligned with OR’s optimization foundations.

From an OR perspective, eqs. (1) and (2) make a central duality explicit. Constraints can be imposed at the level of probability measures—for example, by requiring ρ_t to concentrate mass on a feasible set or to control tail risk—or at the level of individual sample paths, by designing the velocity field $v_\phi(\cdot, t)$ so that trajectories preserve invariants or remain within a feasible region. Once the velocity field is fixed, both particle paths and the induced distributional evolution are determined, providing a direct route to feasibility by construction.

Diffusion-based generators can also incorporate constraints; in practice, they are typically enforced through stochastic sampling with guidance, projection, or correction steps applied during generation. These mechanisms work well in many applications, but they make hard sample-wise certification and traceability less straightforward. Figure 2 illustrates this contrast: Deterministic-by-design transport makes auditability, replayability, and enforcement interfaces intrinsic; these features matter disproportionately in safety-critical operational loops.

3.2. Deterministic Transport and Structure-by-Construction

Modern flow-based generative modeling can be understood as learning transport maps between probability distributions. Rather than treating uncertainty as a static input, this perspective models system evolution as a structured transformation of distributions governed by invariants, feasibility conditions, and stability requirements. In OR, many constraints are not preferences but identities—such as flow conservation, capacity limits, nonnegativity, balance conditions, integrality, or temporal ordering—that should hold globally and often throughout execution. A transport-based view naturally accommodates these requirements: probability distributions evolve under dynamics that can, in principle, be designed to preserve structure by construction, rather than enforced post hoc through rejection, penalties, or repair. Generation thus becomes a controlled process governed by structure, rather than a black-box sampling procedure aimed primarily at reproducing observed data.

Diffusion and score-based models can also be interpreted within this transport framework, but they typically realize it through stochastic dynamics. In practice, diffusion models generate samples by simulating noisy reverse-time processes (Ho, Jain and Abbeel 2020; Song et al. 2021), and large language models similarly introduce randomness at each token generation step (Brown et al. 2020). Stochasticity enables diversity in creative domains. In operations, it becomes a liability: inconsistent outputs, intermittent feasibility violations, and failure modes that resist diagnosis. While diffusion models admit a deterministic sampling formulation via the probability-flow ordinary differential equation under idealized conditions (Song et al. 2021; Song, Meng and Ermon 2021), their predominant formulations and practical usage emphasize stochastic sampling, with determinism playing a secondary role rather than a primary design objective.

Flow-based generative models adopt a different architectural stance that aligns naturally with the transport-map view. Randomness is confined to the initial draw; conditional on this draw, generation proceeds through deterministic dynamics governed by an ordinary differential equation. This design enables exact traceability and replayability: an output can be traced back to a specific initial state, its atypicality under the known distribution quantified, and the trajectory replayed exactly for auditing and diagnosis. From an operational perspective, the deterministic transport map itself becomes the central object of assured autonomy, exposing the control surfaces required for feasibility enforcement, monitoring,

and governance. Recent developments such as flow matching, consistency models, and mean-flow formulations further decouple transport from density estimation, alleviating traditional computational concerns while preserving the determinism and controllability that make this paradigm well-suited for safety-critical decision-making (Geng et al. 2025; Lipman et al. 2023; Song et al. 2023).

Operational deployments rarely require training from scratch. A practical alternative is to start from a pretrained generative model (or a pretrained representation model) and adapt it to the operational domain via fine-tuning or lightweight updates—such as conditioning layers, adapters, or low-rank parameterizations (Hu et al. 2022)—using limited in-domain data and operational objectives. In the transport-map view, this corresponds to warm-starting the velocity field (or transport map) and then refining it to encode domain constraints, tail-sensitive regimes, and decision-coupled loss signals, reducing data and compute requirements while improving reliability. This adaptation stage is also where OR enters: constraint penalties, risk functionals, and decision-layer feedback can be imposed during fine-tuning rather than deferred to inference-time correction.

4. Game-Theoretic Safety and Robust Autonomy

Constrainability is not safety. A generator that faithfully reproduces the training distribution still fails when demand spikes, sensors degrade, or an adversary probes for weaknesses. Assured autonomy requires not just structure, but stress testing—systematic confrontation with futures that have not yet occurred. OR formalizes this as a game: the decision-maker chooses a policy; an adversary chooses the scenario that breaks it. Operational autonomy is, in the end, a confrontation with surprise. Models improve, sensors proliferate, and data pipelines thicken, yet the world continues to produce combinations of events that sit outside yesterday’s training distribution. Operationally, if an autonomous system is judged by what happens when things go wrong, then safety should be designed for those regimes, not appended as an afterthought. OR has a name for this stance. It is robustness, formalized as a game between a decision-maker and an adversary representing nature, strategic opponents, or a distribution shift. [Figure 3](#) previews this logic: the designer chooses a policy, an adversary selects a worst-case shift within a credible ambiguity set, and safety is the resulting equilibrium rather than a post-hoc patch.




Figure 3 Minimax Game-Theoretic Framework for AI Safety

A baseline coupling between generative models and decisions is given by the stochastic optimization problem

$$\min_{\theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P}[C(\theta, x)], \quad (3)$$

where θ denotes a decision or controller, x represents realized disturbances and inputs, $C(\theta, x)$ is the induced operational loss, and P is a nominal distribution learned or estimated from data. This formulation captures the classical “average-case” objective but leaves systems exposed to rare, correlated, or unmodeled regimes that dominate operational risk.

A canonical robust representation is the minimax formulation in the form of the distributionally robust optimization (DRO) (see, e.g., [Blanchet and Murthy 2019](#); [Gao and Kleywegt 2023](#); [Kuhn et al. 2019](#); [Selvi, Liu and Wiesemann 2025](#); [Shapiro 2017](#); [Wang, Gao and Xie 2025](#)):

$$\min_{\theta} \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P}[C(\theta, x)], \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{P} is an ambiguity set of distributions regarded as plausible. The designer chooses θ ; the adversary chooses P ; the resulting equilibrium trades off performance against vulnerability. Put differently, [eq. \(4\)](#) makes “what could go wrong?” operational: specify how the environment may shift, then optimize against the least favorable case.

In the GenAI setting, related minimax and worst-case formulations have emerged in recent work on high-dimensional problems ([Cheng et al. 2025](#); [Xu et al. 2024](#)). These developments reflect a growing recognition that flow-based generative models can represent and learn complex high-dimensional worst-case distributions, enabling direct sample (scenario) generation from such adversarial models.

4.1. Distribution-Level Constraints and Sample-Level Enforcement

An abstraction for *operational* constraint control is to distinguish between two classes of constraints. *Semantic constraints* regulate output attributes or preferences, while *structural constraints* govern the feasibility of the system as a dynamical object, such as flow conservation, capacity limits, integrality, or stability, and should hold globally throughout execution. In OR, such structural constraints are not preferences but non-negotiable identities.

For generative models used in decision-making, this distinction motivates imposing constraints directly on the *generated scenarios*, and hence on the induced scenario distribution. Let $x \in \mathcal{X}$ denote an operational scenario (e.g., demand trajectories, lead times, outages), drawn from a scenario distribution P , and let $h_k(x) \leq 0$ encode structural feasibility requirements. When generation is coupled to downstream decisions, a natural objective is

$$\mathcal{J}(P) = \min_{\theta \in \Theta} \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P}[C(\theta, x)],$$

which links constrained scenario generation directly to the minimax formulation in [eq. \(4\)](#).

As an illustration, a canonical formulation is to select (or learn) a distribution P within an admissible model class \mathcal{P} such that feasibility holds with high probability:

$$\max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}(P) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{P}_{x \sim P}(h_k(x) \leq 0) \geq 1 - \varepsilon_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (5)$$

More generally, feasibility can be enforced through risk-sensitive violation functionals,

$$\max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \mathcal{J}(P) \quad \text{s.t.} \quad \mathbb{E}_{x \sim P}[\psi_k(h_k(x))] \leq \delta_k, \quad k = 1, \dots, K, \quad (6)$$

where $\psi_k(\cdot)$ encodes tail-weighted or risk-sensitive penalties, such as hinge losses or CVaR-type functions. Introducing Lagrange multipliers yields a relaxation over *distribution-level* constraint violations,

$$\min_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \max_{\lambda_k \geq 0} -\mathcal{J}(P) + \sum_{k=1}^K \lambda_k (\mathbb{E}_{x \sim P}[\psi_k(h_k(x))] - \delta_k), \quad (7)$$

which highlights an OR-specific distinction: the constraints h_k represent *global structural feasibility*, not semantic attributes, and feasibility is enforced at the level of generated operational scenarios rather than individual model parameters.

Flow-based generators have a practical advantage here: distribution-level requirements can be realized at the level of individual samples. Because flow models implement generation as an explicit, deterministic transport map, constraints expressed pointwise in scenario

space—such as upper bounds, conservation laws, or state-dependent safety conditions—can be enforced, monitored, or penalized directly along generated trajectories. In this sense, constraints on the induced distribution can often be implemented by shaping the transport dynamics itself. This sample–distribution duality is particularly natural in OR settings, where feasibility is defined pointwise rather than abstractly over model parameters, and it aligns closely with the foundations of stochastic programming.

Comparable constraint control is also possible in diffusion-based generators, but it is more commonly implemented through stochastic dynamics with guidance, projection, or correction mechanisms applied during sampling. While effective in many settings, such approaches can make hard sample-wise guarantees and traceability more delicate. By contrast, the explicit transport structure of flow-based models makes constraint handling more transparent and directly compatible with OR formulations of feasibility and risk.

4.2. Minimax Stress Testing and Least-Favorable Distributions

Minimax stress testing treats reliability as performance against an adversary. The idea traces to von Neumann’s zero-sum games (von Neumann and Morgenstern 1944) and enters OR through robust optimization and robust control, which convert worst-case logic into tractable prescriptions under structured uncertainty (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski 2002). Distributionally robust optimization (DRO) sharpens the same stance by placing ambiguity directly on the data-generating process, often through moment sets, ϕ -divergences, or Wasserstein neighborhoods (Rahimian and Mehrotra 2019). This tradition is not a slogan. It provides a calibration problem: which stress classes are credible, and how much probability mass should represent misspecification?

Two implications are central for assured autonomy. First, robustness targets more than overt attacks. Operational disasters concentrate in rare, correlated, and cascading regimes that dominate social cost. High-reliability organizations institutionalize this stance through a sustained “preoccupation with failure” (Weick and Sutcliffe 2015). Grid operators formalize it with contingency standards; aviation relies on certification culture; hospitals operationalize it through escalation protocols. Across domains, expected performance is a weak standard. The operational standard is avoidance of catastrophic modes within defined stress classes.

Second, minimax reasoning becomes engineering only when the adversary is computable. As Figure 3 suggests, worst-case design requires a representation that can be searched, not merely invoked. Deterministic generators supply such a representation. When uncertainty is

modeled as a transport map or flow that pushes forward a reference measure into operational scenarios, the adversary in [eq. \(4\)](#) can be parameterized by that map. The problem becomes worst-case *generation*: the adversary explores a continuous family of distributions in \mathcal{P} rather than a small menu of hand-built stress tests. Recent work characterizing least-favorable distributions in Wasserstein space as pushforwards of transport maps provides this bridge ([Cheng et al. 2025](#)). In data-scarce regimes, the generator need only represent the ambiguity set with structure and control; fidelity to the true process is secondary. This yields decision-coupled stress testing: the generator searches for failures that are damaging to the deployed policy θ , rather than generic extremes.

4.3. Interaction, Governance, and Operational Escalation

Robust autonomy also has an interaction dimension. Many operational settings are not single-controller problems but systems of agents—vehicles negotiating right-of-way, inventory nodes coordinating replenishment, or software agents bidding in markets. In these environments, safety depends not only on worst-case uncertainty but also on incentives, equilibrium selection, and protocol design. OR’s game-theoretic toolkit is central: design communication and commitment rules that prevent deadlock, align local objectives with system goals, and restrict admissible behaviors to rule out pathological equilibria. The aim is to reduce the strategic degrees of freedom through which interaction can produce systemic harm.

Robustness without governance is incomplete. Deployment is not solving [eq. \(4\)](#) once; drift, nonstationarity, and updates make control ongoing. Assured autonomy therefore needs an explicit monitoring-and-deference policy: what is measured, what counts as “out of control,” and what action follows. Here OR’s sequential decision and monitoring traditions apply directly: escalation is itself a control policy, and fallback is a designed operating regime rather than an improvised human response.

5. From Solver to System Architect: The Evolving Role of OR in Assured Autonomy

OR began by solving well-posed decision problems. Humans supplied judgment and carried out the plan. With partial automation, OR shifted toward assurance: it checked feasibility, bounded actions, and audited recommendations from heuristics or learning systems. As operational autonomy rises, that separation no longer holds. OR must design the decision regime itself—the rules, constraints, monitoring triggers, escalation policies, and coordination protocols that govern how agents act and interact.

Table 1 Evolution of OR Roles with Increasing AI Autonomy.

<i>Level of autonomy</i>	<i>AI paradigm</i>	<i>Role of OR</i>
Decision support (human in charge)	Predictive analytics	Solver: provides optimal or near-optimal solutions
Human-in-the-loop automation	Stochastic generative AI	Guardrail: sets constraints, validates AI suggestions
Fully autonomous operations	Deterministic flow-based AI	Architect/legislator: designs system, rules, and objectives

Table 1 summarizes the change. In decision support, AI is mainly predictive and OR is prescriptive. Optimization turns forecasts and risk scores into plans, and a human manager decides. In partial autonomy, the stack becomes “propose-then-certify.” A learning component proposes an action; OR certifies it against hard constraints and risk limits, projects it onto the feasible set when needed, and triggers overrides or reversion to conservative policies when monitoring signals indicate elevated risk.

5.1. Designing Decision Regimes for Autonomous Operations

In fully autonomous settings—a dark factory, an autonomous supply chain, or a smart city where signals and vehicles negotiate flows in real time—the central OR task is constitutional. OR specifies the regime: admissible actions, objectives, inviolable constraints, information rights, and procedures for resolving conflicts. The object of design is no longer an instance. It is the system that produces instances and acts on them.

We already see this shift in power systems. Operators once used optimal power flow to recommend adjustments that humans executed. As renewables and fast-acting grid-edge devices proliferate, control becomes automated and the OR emphasis moves to rules and limits: reserve requirements, frequency-response obligations, and operating envelopes that maintain reliability. OR practitioners write the “grid code” autonomous controllers must satisfy.

A parallel shift appears in highly automated fulfillment. In robotized warehouses, managers do not route individual robots. OR defines the operating regime: zoning and staging policies, priority rules, congestion management, and conflict-resolution logic that prevents deadlock while preserving throughput. Optimization remains, but at a higher level: it shapes protocols rather than selecting each move.

OR fits this role because architecture is choice under constraints. Autonomous systems need rules that are efficient and robust, and that align local actions with system objectives.

Mechanism design offers a useful analogy: choose the rules so that decentralized behavior yields acceptable outcomes. In autonomy, the “players” are software modules. The designer decides what each module controls, what it observes, how conflicts are resolved, and what coupling prevents local goals from working at cross purposes.

5.2. Monitoring, Escalation, and Fallback

A second design task is fallback. Every autonomous system meets regimes outside its validated envelope. Assured autonomy requires explicit fallback rules: when monitoring signals indicate out-of-control behavior, the system contracts its action space, reverts to conservative policies, or defers to humans when available. Aviation provides the template: automation disengages when sensor inconsistencies exceed what the system can safely reconcile. The OR contribution is to define the triggers and to optimize fallback behavior so safety is preserved while residual performance is retained.

The legislator’s role also includes compliance. External requirements—regulation, safety standards, organizational policy—must be translated into executable constraints. In domains such as hiring or credit, fairness requirements are increasingly expressed as mathematical constraints that discipline learning and optimization. The same logic applies to high-stakes autonomy: compliance is achieved by design when constraints and auditability are built into the regime.

This elevation in OR’s role leads to meta-level optimization. The upper-level problem is to choose objectives, loss functions, information structures, and coordination protocols. The lower-level outcome is the behavior induced by learning and interaction. In effect, it is a bi-level problem: choose the rules so the resulting equilibrium is stable and aligned.

5.3. OR Inside the GenAI Stack: Inference and Resource Scheduling

The interaction between OR and GenAI is bidirectional. OR supplies structure and assurance when generative models enter operational loops, and OR also improves the GenAI stack itself. Inference scheduling, memory and compute allocation, and latency–throughput tradeoffs in LLM serving are queueing and scheduling problems. Recent work shows how OR models can guide online scheduling of LLM inference under memory constraints, improving efficiency and robustness (Ao et al. 2025). OR thus governs both the decision regime in the application and the computational substrate on which agentic AI runs.

5.4. Implications for OR Research and Practice

Supply chain autonomy provides a compact illustration. In Beer-Game testbeds, multi-agent GenAI systems can outperform human teams, yet performance and stability hinge on the regime—what information is shared, what constraints cap extreme actions, and how costs are defined (Long et al. 2025b; Simchi-Levi et al. 2025). The GenAI Beer Game makes the regime explicit by embedding generative agents in a structured operational system, enabling the study of auditability, constraint adherence, and failure modes beyond static benchmarks (Long et al. 2025a). As autonomy scales, OR moves up the ladder—from solving instances, to certifying actions, to designing the regime itself—and this shift calls for a broader toolkit that treats learning, adaptation, and multi-agent interaction as objects of design.

6. Applications Across Domains

The preceding sections argue operational autonomy scales only when it is *assured* by design. Assured autonomy is an architecture with three separable layers: (i) a representation layer that interprets messy inputs and interfaces with humans (often transformer-based); (ii) a generative engine that produces candidate states, trajectories, or scenarios under constraints that can be audited; and (iii) a decision-and-governance layer—optimization, robust control, and minimax stress testing—that keeps the agent within an admissible operating envelope as conditions shift or adversaries emerge. Using domain examples, this section illustrates what this architecture implies in practice, why the autonomy paradox binds most tightly, and how OR’s role evolves as autonomy increases (Table 2).

6.1. Supply Chains

Supply chains are a clean laboratory for the autonomy paradox: locally sensible actions, taken under delay and uncertainty, can generate globally unstable dynamics. The bullwhip effect formalizes this amplification and has been documented both analytically and experimentally in the Beer Distribution Game tradition (Lee, Padmanabhan and Whang 1997; Sterman 1989). As autonomy rises, the object of design shifts from average cost reduction to closed-loop stability: will a multi-agent system remain well behaved when information is inconsistent, conditions shift, or one agent makes a rare but extreme mistake?

Inventory planning is the canonical OR setting for sequential decision-making under uncertainty. Long before modern RL, dynamic programming and stochastic inventory theory produced practical policy classes—notably base-stock and (s, S) policies—that remain widely

Table 2 Assured Autonomy Across Domains: What Becomes Autonomous, What Should Never Be Violated, and Where OR Provides the “Assurance” Layer.

Domain	Operational autonomy	Invariants & tail risks	OR assurance mechanisms
Supply chains	Multi-agent replenishment, allocation, and routing over rolling horizons	Flow balance, capacity, lead times; cascades (bullwhip) under shocks and delays	Network optimization and robust control; constraint-preserving scenario generation; adversarial stress tests
Mobility & aviation	Real-time trajectory choice with interaction among many agents	Right-of-way and separation minima; rare sensor/comm failures; interaction tail events	Constrained optimal control and reachability; certified safety envelopes; worst-case interaction/weather generators
Healthcare operations	Workflow autonomy (documentation, triage, scheduling) and selective clinical support	“Never-miss” events; case-mix shift; propagation of errors through workflows	Queueing and resource allocation with safety constraints; statistical monitoring; explicit deferral and escalation rules
Power grids	Automated dispatch, reserve management, and remedial actions at machine speed	N-1 / N-1-1 security and stability; correlated outages; extreme weather	Security-constrained OPF/UC; contingency analysis; DRO/minimax over outage distributions; real-time monitoring

used and offer a transparent lens on service levels, stability, and tail-risk trade-offs (Porteus 2002; Zipkin 2000). In an assured-autonomy framing, these policies define admissible control structure, provide interpretable fallback modes, and anchor evaluation when learning-based components are introduced.

The interface layer is changing faster than the optimization layer. As LLMs reduce the transaction costs of specifying objectives, constraints, and “what-if” analyses, the limiting factor becomes the reliability of the optimization primitives underneath. Early deployments already use LLMs as a natural-language layer that translates planner intent into OR-based optimization and simulation workflows (Menache et al. 2025; Simchi-Levi et al. 2026), accelerating formulation and iteration rather than replacing solvers (Simchi-Levi et al. 2025). Autonomy reallocates OR effort toward admissible action spaces, invariants, and stress tests inside digital twins.

Recent evidence underscores both promise and limits. Multi-agent supply chains can be operated autonomously in simulation using frontier generative models (Long et al. 2025b). Yet the gains hinge less on “free reasoning” than on OR design choices: explicit objectives, information policies, and hard constraints that prevent destabilizing actions (e.g., budget caps or action bounds that block panic ordering). Autonomy arrives when the supply chain is treated as a controlled dynamical system with admissible inputs.

Flow-based generation and minimax safety make this operational. Supply chain uncertainty spans demand, lead times, yield, capacity, and disruptions, so generators should preserve inventory balance, nonnegativity, and capacity. A deterministic flow maps a simple latent source into constraint-consistent scenarios, making generation auditable and constraintable inside the decision loop. The minimax layer then enforces tail resilience via eq. (4): choose a policy θ against an adversarial distribution P over demand-and-disruption paths x with cost $C(\theta, x)$. What is new is not robustness but computable worst cases: in Wasserstein formulations, least-favorable distributions arise as transported measures, giving a continuous adversary and decision-coupled stress tests rather than a fixed scenario menu (Cheng et al. 2025; Xu et al. 2024).

Finally, monitoring must be designed in. The key signals are dynamical: rising upstream order variance, persistent inventory oscillations, and repeated constraint binding. Statistical process control is built for these patterns, except the “process” now includes autonomous agents whose behavior can drift with prompts, context windows, and upstream data feeds. A Six-Sigma-style approach makes this operational: control charts for decision stability (e.g., bullwhip proxies) and escalation rules that trigger conservative modes or human review when the system leaves control (Montgomery 2019). Because supply chains evolve on slower time scales (hours to weeks), adversarial stress tests can run continuously in a digital twin, enabling intervention before instability becomes catastrophic.

6.2. Mobility and Aviation

Transportation autonomy is often framed as a perception breakthrough. In practice, the binding constraints are coordination and regulation. The standard is compliance with bright-line safety rules in environments where other users behave strategically, unpredictably, or simply incorrectly. When an autonomous vehicle mishandles a stopped school bus, regulators treat it as a rule violation, not a marginal performance miss—hence recalls and scrutiny (Khanna 2025). When robotaxi programs stumble, enforcement turns on incident response, reporting, and verifiable risk controls (National Highway Traffic Safety Administration 2024).

These features sharpen the autonomy paradox. Mobility agents act in shared space. If the generative core is stochastic—for example, an iterative denoising procedure—it is hard to certify that separation, stopping, and right-of-way constraints hold along the entire trajectory, rather than only on average or after repair. Flow-based generation shifts the burden from

cleanup to design. When trajectories arise from deterministic dynamics with a constraint-aware vector field, feasibility can be made an invariant of the motion. This is OR at its comparative advantage: specify admissible dynamics instead of projecting infeasible samples back into the feasible set.

Aviation shows what assured autonomy looks like inside a mature safety regime. The U.S. National Airspace System already relies on decision support for time-based traffic management that schedules and meters flows through constrained airspace (Federal Aviation Administration 2024). The underlying logic is OR by construction: demand–capacity balancing, network constraints, and scheduling with separation requirements. In such a regime, generative or agentic components must remain subordinate to certified invariants. Transformers can help with intent inference, coordination messages, and explanations. The trajectory engine and the supervisory layer that guarantees separation must be auditable, stress-testable, and compatible with certification practice.

The minimax layer is equally concrete. The adversary is the coupled process that creates conflict: weather that restricts airspace, surveillance or communication degradation, and interaction patterns that produce dense encounters. An ambiguity set can bound plausible joint shifts in weather, demand, and sensing error. Transport-based generators offer a tractable representation of such shifts, and minimax optimization supplies the forcing function: a controller that remains safe against least-favorable distributions inside the ambiguity set supports a stronger safety case.

The key distinction from supply chains is timescale and certification. Mobility and aviation run at machine speed (milliseconds to minutes) under tight regulatory norms. Monitoring must therefore be continuous, fast, and action-guiding. In mobility, leading indicators include near-miss rates, envelope violations, and repeated rule conflicts; in aviation, they include loss-of-separation precursors and sustained overload in constrained sectors. Escalation should be explicit: tighten the admissible envelope, revert to conservative policies, or hand off when signals indicate loss of control.

6.3. Healthcare Operations

Healthcare is where the autonomy debate most often blurs categories. “Workflow autonomy”—drafting notes, coding visits, summarizing encounters—differs from “clinical autonomy,” where errors can harm patients. The early gains from GenAI reflect this: ambient scribes can reduce documentation burden and burnout (Dai, Kvedar and Polsky 2025),

while even documentation automation raises governance questions about consent and trust (Lawrence et al. 2025). The lesson is already visible at low stakes: deployment succeeds only with design, monitoring, and accountability.

Assurance becomes decisive when systems touch operations: emergency-department triage, inpatient bed assignment, and operating-room scheduling. Here the invariants are clinical and operational at once: avoid catastrophic misses, prevent unsafe delays, and preserve stability during surges. Tail risk dominates because capacity is finite. Small shifts in arrivals or acuity can push the system past a threshold where queues grow rapidly and errors propagate across units. In this setting, “AI checks AI” is a weak safeguard. A second model often shares the same data and blind spots, and it does not encode hospital constraints. Assurance belongs outside the language model: statistical monitoring for drift in calibration and case mix, coupled with OR decision logic that tightens admissible actions, triggers review, or reverts to conservative policies when signals indicate loss of control.

Flow-based generative models fit this assurance layer because they generate the right object: structured stress tests rather than text. Hospitals need plausible surge paths, correlated resource shortfalls, and patient-flow trajectories that respect capacity, conservation, and time ordering. Transport-based generators can be trained to produce such trajectories while preserving feasibility by construction. A minimax formulation then turns stress testing into a design principle: an adversary searches within an ambiguity set for arrival, acuity, and service-time distributions that strain the system most, and the decision maker chooses staffing, bed allocation, and triage thresholds that remain safe under least-favorable conditions. “Plan for rare disasters” becomes an operational requirement.

The domain implication is selective autonomy. Administrative work and low-risk allocations can be automated; high-risk decisions require hard boundaries. Those boundaries should take the form of formal deferral rules, triggered by monitoring statistics and calibrated to the cost of false reassurance. Assured autonomy in healthcare protects clinical attention for the cases where autonomy is least appropriate.

6.4. Power Grids

If any sector already lives under the logic of assured autonomy, it is the power grid. Operators do not optimize “on average.” They operate under explicit invariants: supply equals demand, flows respect thermal and voltage limits, and the system remains stable under credible contingencies. These requirements are codified in reliability standards that compel performance

under defined classes of adverse events, including sequential contingencies and stability constraints (North American Electric Reliability Corporation 2025). Regional planning turns this mandate into routine practice through contingency analysis and reinforcement rules; for example, N-1-1 studies apply a first contingency, allow prescribed corrective actions, and then impose a second contingency, with violations triggering upgrades (PJM Interconnection 2025). This is minimax reasoning embedded in institutions: plan for adverse regimes rather than typical days.

Agentic AI changes the surface of grid operations but not the governing principle. Forecasting, anomaly detection, and remedial-action recommendation can become more autonomous, increasing speed and complexity in a coupled cyber-physical system. The autonomy paradox follows: faster control demands a decision regime that is deterministic, certifiable, and constraint-preserving by construction. This is why flow-based generative modeling fits the grid. Power systems are organized around flows and dynamics; uncertain exogenous inputs—renewable ramps, weather-driven demand, correlated outages—can be represented as a deterministic transport map from a latent source to physically plausible scenario distributions that respect domain structure.

The minimax layer then becomes concrete. The adversary is nature and correlation: extreme weather, common-mode failures, and sequences of contingencies that push the system toward cascading collapse. An ambiguity set can encode plausible distribution shift, for instance via Wasserstein neighborhoods around empirical distributions of weather and renewable generation. The planner chooses reserves, dispatch, and corrective actions that perform well against least-favorable distributions, consistent with the reliability paradigm. Recent work on worst-case generation in Wasserstein space is relevant because it constructs least-favorable distributions as pushforwards of a transport map, rather than relying on a finite catalog of hand-crafted scenarios (Cheng et al. 2025).

The grid also clarifies a governance lesson: monitoring and fallback are part of the design. Power systems already have telemetry, alarms, and protection logic. Assured autonomy therefore means aligning AI components with that discipline. Recommendations should be filtered through security constraints; deviations detected using established stability and adequacy metrics; and fallback made explicit, from conservative redispatch to automated protection and, in extremis, controlled load shedding. The point is not to replace the reliability-first regime, but to make agentic AI compatible with it: transformers can improve interface and

explanation, while deterministic flows and explicit optimization preserve the invariants the grid cannot compromise.

Across the four domains, the lesson is the same. Autonomy fails when operations demand invariants, tail-risk discipline, and coordination that stochastic generation and after-the-fact checks do not supply. Assured autonomy rests on three choices: a deterministic, auditable generator; minimax stress tests that search for catastrophic regimes; and monitoring with clear escalation and fallback rules. The binding constraint differs by domain—delays and feedback in supply chains, certified interaction in mobility and aviation, workflow propagation in healthcare, and codified reliability under correlated contingencies in power grids. The agenda is to move assurance upstream: invariants in the model, worst cases in the loop, escalation in the system.

7. Research Agenda

Assured autonomy requires treating autonomous systems as engineered objects: feasible by construction, robust to distribution shift and tail events, and governable over their lifecycle. Four priorities follow: (i) feasibility by construction at the learning–optimization interface; (ii) minimax safety, worst-case generation, and verification; (iii) monitoring, handoffs, and lifecycle governance; and (iv) public goods that make progress cumulative.

7.1. Feasibility by Construction: Learning Meets Optimization

Autonomy collapses the traditional separation between learning and optimization: in many operational settings, the model is not merely an input to a solver; the solver is part of the model. The priority is making feasibility and invariants native to learning, not imposed afterward. One route embeds optimization primitives within learning pipelines via differentiable optimization layers, enabling end-to-end training with explicit constraints (Amos and Kolter 2017; Donti, Amos and Kolter 2017; Wilder, Dilkina and Tambe 2019). A second route develops sequential decision methods that maintain safety at each step, not only on average. Constrained Markov decision processes provide the right abstraction, with the frontier in scaling constraint satisfaction under function approximation and partial observability (Altman 1999; Garcia and Fernandez 2015). From an OR perspective, the key object is closed-loop behavior: does the learned policy preserve feasibility, stability, and conservation under the shifts and interactions that deployment induces? Progress is testable with operational metrics—constraint-violation rates, long-horizon stability, and stress-regime performance—rather than prediction error or episodic reward alone.

7.2. Minimax Safety, Worst-Case Generation, and Verification

Assured autonomy requires treating rare disasters as design inputs. This calls for objectives that optimize worst-case performance over credible ambiguity sets, connecting directly to robust optimization and DRO (Ben-Tal and Nemirovski 1998, 2002; Esfahani and Kuhn 2018; Rahimian and Mehrotra 2019). The minimax template provides a unifying lens: the decision-maker selects a policy while an adversary selects stressors or distributions that expose failure regimes. The challenge is tractability at scale. Recent work on worst-case generation over Wasserstein space suggests one path: represent least-favorable distributions as pushforwards of transport maps, yielding continuous and expressive worst-case generators (Cheng et al. 2025). Related developments linking flow-based learning to equilibrium computation in high-dimensional mean-field systems point to a broader bridge between transport, control, and multi-agent autonomy (Yu et al. 2025).

Verification is equally central. In mature safety domains, certification is an evidence regime. For autonomy, verification should answer concrete questions: can the system enter an unsafe state; can it violate a hard constraint; can plausible perturbations trigger cascading failure? Runtime assurance and safety-filtering ideas from control—including control barrier functions and shielding—offer one operational approach, enforcing hard constraints online while allowing learning-based components to operate within provably safe regions (Alshiekh et al. 2018; Ames et al. 2017). A growing literature in neural network verification and formal methods provides additional building blocks (Katz et al. 2017; Tjeng, Xiao and Tedrake 2019). OR has a comparative advantage in scaling verification because many tasks reduce to constrained counterexample search, where mixed-integer optimization and robust search are natural tools (Fischetti and Jo 2018). The practical objective is to move from informal assurances to certifiable safety envelopes with explicit assumptions and stress-tested scope.

7.3. Monitoring, Handoffs, and Lifecycle Governance

Even well-designed autonomous systems drift: data distributions change, incentives evolve, and correlated failures emerge only at scale. Assured autonomy therefore depends as much on governance as on algorithms. Monitoring should be treated as a control function that detects when the system leaves its specification and triggers predefined responses. A useful template is Statistical Process Control (SPC): continuous measurement of performance and violation metrics, calibrated alarms, and explicit escalation rules (Montgomery 2019; Shewhart 1931). At its core is a sequential detection problem—identifying change-points or distributional

shifts quickly after they occur (Xie et al. 2021)—with an emphasis on interpretability and operational relevance.

In operational settings, monitoring is inherently sequential because escalation and fallback decisions trade off detection delay against false alarms. Those choices determine when to tighten admissible actions, require human review, or revert to conservative policies, and they shape the system’s safety–performance profile over its lifecycle. This matches the high-reliability view that treats “preoccupation with failure” as a design principle, not a slogan (Weick and Sutcliffe 2015). The same lens sharpens human–AI collaboration. The key object is a handoff protocol: what triggers deferral, what information is transferred, and how the system learns from overrides without creating new failure modes. In OR terms, the handoff rule is a policy to be optimized subject to safety, workload, and delay constraints, especially when multiple autonomous agents and human actors share a workflow.

7.4. Benchmarks and Data Readiness

A final constraint is infrastructural. Progress needs benchmarks that are small enough to iterate on yet structured enough to capture operational reality. Vision and language advanced when shared datasets and protocols made progress legible (Deng et al. 2009); RL benefited from shared environments that standardized comparison (Brockman et al. 2016). Assured autonomy needs analogous testbeds for constraint-preserving generation, tail-aware stress testing, and decision quality under shift. The metrics should be operational—regret, stability, violation rates, and worst-case performance—not likelihood alone.

Digital twins for autonomous operations present a related opportunity. A useful twin is not a passive simulator; it is a structured stress-testing environment that generates rare events, distribution shifts, and worst-case scenarios under feasibility and performance constraints. Without that structure, twins reinforce average-case behavior rather than surfacing the failure modes that govern safety. Relatedly, the field faces a data-readiness gap. Operational datasets are abundant, but they are rarely curated to expose the objects that matter for assured autonomy: constraint sets, invariants, regime shifts, and rare-event structure. Building reusable datasets and testbeds is slow work, yet it is the basis for cumulative science and credible external validity. Institutional barriers are real as well: OR, statistics, ML, control, and human factors differ in training and norms of evidence. A field-level response requires venues and incentives that reward careful integration and reproducible evaluation, not only new architectures.

What ties these priorities together is a specific vision of autonomy: feasible by construction, hardened by minimax stress testing, governed by explicit monitoring and handoff rules, and accelerated by public benchmarks. Meeting that standard is the price of scaling autonomy responsibly, and it is also OR’s opportunity to shape what autonomy becomes.

8. Conclusion

Autonomous AI is leaving the lab and entering operations—warehouses, supply chains, clinics, mobility, and finance. The gains are real; the failures are fast and sticky. As autonomy rises, structure matters more. OR will shift from optimizing within a given workflow to designing the workflow itself.

This pattern echoes earlier waves of automation. Societies did not make high-energy machines acceptable by trusting average-case performance; they embedded control, standards, and contingency procedures in the surrounding system. Modern financial markets did not become resilient because trading algorithms became “smarter”; they became resilient because trading operated within risk limits, monitoring, and circuit breakers. Autonomy faces the same test. The relevant test is not whether a model can generate plausible outputs, but whether the operational system preserves nonnegotiable invariants, remains stable in tail regimes, and switches to a safe mode when conditions leave the validated envelope. Methodologically, this reframes autonomy as controlled evolution in probability space, with constraints and tail risk treated as explicit design requirements.

The practical implication is investing in models alone will disappoint. Value comes from redesigning the decision regime around the model: defining admissible actions, specifying escalation and deference rules, and institutionalizing stress testing and monitoring as operational processes. The managerial task is to decide *where* autonomy is appropriate, *how* it is bounded, and *when* it should yield to conservative policies or human judgment.

The research agenda is similarly concrete. Many central questions are not solved by scale: how to enforce feasibility throughout generation; how to search systematically for consequential failure regimes; how to verify safety properties without relying on model self-assessment; and how to coordinate multiple agents with aligned incentives and stable dynamics. These problems sit naturally in the OR toolkit, and they echo Herbert Simon’s argument that AI and OR are stronger together than apart (Simon 1987).

The autonomy paradox organizes this paper. Autonomy increases the value of rules that

can be audited and enforced. “Assured autonomy” treats constraints, tail regimes, and monitoring as design inputs, not afterthoughts. With that discipline, autonomy can scale; without it, autonomy imports unpriced risk. It is not a natural extension of current GenAI pipelines. It must be engineered—and OR provides the language and tools to do so.

Acknowledgments

The work of Y. Xie is partially supported by NSF DMS-2134037, CMMI-2112533, and the Coca-Cola Foundation.

References

Albergo, Michael S, Nicholas M Boffi, and Eric Vanden-Eijnden. 2023. “Stochastic interpolants: A unifying framework for flows and diffusions.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08797*.

Alshiekh, Mohammed, Roderick Bloem, Rüdiger Ehlers, Bettina Könighofer, Scott Niekum, and Ufuk Topcu. 2018. “Safe Reinforcement Learning via Shielding.” In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Second AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI-18)*. 2669–2678.

Altman, Eitan. 1999. *Constrained Markov Decision Processes*. Chapman and Hall/CRC.

Ambrosio, Luigi, Nicola Gigli, and Giuseppe Savaré. 2005. *Gradient Flows: In Metric Spaces and in the Space of Probability Measures*. Springer.

Ames, Aaron D., Xiangru Xu, Jessy W. Grizzle, and Paulo Tabuada. 2017. “Control Barrier Function Based Quadratic Programs for Safety Critical Systems.” *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control*, 62(8): 3861–3876.

Amos, Brandon, and J. Zico Kolter. 2017. “OptNet: Differentiable Optimization as a Layer in Neural Networks.” 136–145. Sydney, Australia.

Anderson, Brian DO. 1982. “Reverse-time diffusion equation models.” *Stochastic Processes and their Applications*, 12(3): 313–326.

Ao, Ruicheng, Gan Luo, David Simchi-Levi, and Xinshang Wang. 2025. “Optimizing LLM Inference: Fluid-Guided Online Scheduling with Memory Constraints.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.11320*.

Ben-Tal, Aharon, and Arkadi Nemirovski. 1998. “Robust Convex Optimization.” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 23(4): 769–805.

Ben-Tal, Aharon, and Arkadi Nemirovski. 2002. *Robust Optimization*. Princeton University Press.

Blanchet, Jose, and Karthyek Murthy. 2019. “Quantifying distributional model risk via optimal transport.” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 44(2): 565–600.

Blanchet, Jose, and Peter Glynn. 2008. “Efficient rare-event simulation for the maximum of heavy-tailed random walks.” *Annals of Applied Probability*, 18(4).

Brockman, Greg, Vicki Cheung, Ludwig Pettersson, Jonas Schneider, John Schulman, Jie Tang, and Wojciech Zaremba. 2016. “OpenAI Gym.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1606.01540*.

Brown, Tom B., Benjamin Mann, Nick Ryder, Melanie Subbiah, Jared Kaplan, Prafulla Dhariwal, Arvind Neelakantan, Pranav Shyam, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Sandhini

Agarwal, Ariel Herbert-Voss, Gretchen Krueger, Tom Henighan, Rewon Child, Aditya Ramesh, Daniel M. Ziegler, Jeffrey Wu, Clemens Winter, Christopher Hesse, Mark Chen, Eric Sigler, Mateusz Litwin, Scott Gray, Benjamin Chess, Jack Clark, Christopher Berner, Sam McCandlish, Alec Radford, Ilya Sutskever, and Dario Amodei. 2020. “Language models are few-shot learners.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 33: 1877–1901.

Cheng, Xiuyuan, Jianfeng Lu, Yixin Tan, and Yao Xie. 2024. “Convergence of flow-based generative models via proximal gradient descent in wasserstein space.” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, 70(11): 8087–8106.

Cheng, Xiuyuan, Yao Xie, Linglingzhi Zhu, and Yunqin Zhu. 2025. “Worst-case generation via minimax optimization in Wasserstein space.” *arXiv preprint*, arXiv:2512.08176.

Chen, Minshuo, Song Mei, Jianqing Fan, and Mengdi Wang. 2024. “Opportunities and challenges of diffusion models for generative AI.” *National Science Review*, 11(12): nwae348.

Chen, Ricky TQ, Yulia Rubanova, Jesse Bettencourt, and David K Duvenaud. 2018. “Neural ordinary differential equations.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 31.

Cummings, Mary. 2025. “Prohibiting Generative AI in Any Form of Weapon Control.” *NeurIPS 2025, San Diego, Poster*, Poster session: Fri, Dec 5, 2025.

Dai, Tinglong, Joseph C. Kvedar, and Daniel Polsky. 2025. “Policy Brief: Ambient AI Scribes and the Coding Arms Race.” *npj Digital Medicine*, 8(1).

Deng, Jia, Wei Dong, Richard Socher, Li-Jia Li, Kai Li, and Li Fei-Fei. 2009. “ImageNet: A Large-Scale Hierarchical Image Database.” 248–255.

Dinh, Laurent, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, and Samy Bengio. 2017. “Density Estimation Using Real NVP.” In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2017)*. Toulon, France.

Donti, Priya, Brandon Amos, and J. Zico Kolter. 2017. “Task-based End-to-End Model Learning in Stochastic Optimization.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.

Esfahani, Peyman Mohajerin, and Daniel Kuhn. 2018. “Data-Driven Distributionally Robust Optimization Using the Wasserstein Metric: Performance Guarantees and Tractable Reformulations.” *Mathematical Programming*, 171(1-2): 115–166.

Federal Aviation Administration. 2024. “NextGen.” *U.S. Federal Aviation Administration webpage*.

Fischetti, Matteo, and Jason Jo. 2018. “Deep Neural Networks and Mixed Integer Linear Optimization.” *Constraints*, 23(3): 296–309.

Flagle, Charles D. 2002. “Some Origins of Operations Research in the Health Services.” *Operations Research*, 50(1): 52–60.

Gao, Rui, and Anton Kleywegt. 2023. “Distributionally robust stochastic optimization with Wasserstein distance.” *Mathematics of Operations Research*, 48(2): 603–655.

Garcia, Javier, and Fernando Fernandez. 2015. “A Comprehensive Survey on Safe Reinforcement Learning.” *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 16: 1437–1480.

Gass, Saul I., and Arjang A. Assad. 2011. “History of Operations Research.” In *Transforming Research into Action. INFORMS TutORials in Operations Research*, Chapter 1, 1–14. Catonsville, MD:INFORMS.

Geng, Zhengyang, Mingyang Deng, Xingjian Bai, J Zico Kolter, and Kaiming He. 2025. “Mean flows for one-step generative modeling.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*.

Ho, Jonathan, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. 2020. “Denoising diffusion probabilistic models.” *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 33: 6840–6851.

Hu, Edward J., Yelong Shen, Phillip Wallis, Zeyuan Allen-Zhu, Yuanzhi Li, Shean Wang, Lu Wang, and Weizhu Chen. 2022. “LoRA: Low-Rank Adaptation of Large Language Models.” In *Proceedings of the 10th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2022)*.

Jordan, Richard, David Kinderlehrer, and Felix Otto. 1998. “The variational formulation of the Fokker–Planck equation.” *SIAM Journal on Mathematical Analysis*, 29(1): 1–17.

Katz, Guy, Clark W. Barrett, David L. Dill, Kyle Julian, and Mykel J. Kochenderfer. 2017. “Reluplex: An Efficient SMT Solver for Verifying Deep Neural Networks.” In *Computer Aided Verification – 29th International Conference, CAV 2017, Heidelberg, Germany, July 24–28, 2017, Proceedings, Part I*. Vol. 10426 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, , ed. Rupak Majumdar and Viktor Kuncak, 97–117. Heidelberg, Germany:Springer.

Khalafi, Shervin, Ignacio Hounie, Dongsheng Ding, and Alejandro Ribeiro. 2025. “Composition and Alignment of Diffusion Models Using Constrained Learning.” In *2nd Workshop on Models of Human Feedback for AI Alignment (MoFA), International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2025)*. Vancouver, Canada.

Khanna, Ruchika. 2025. “Waymo recalls, updates software for over 3000 vehicles, U.S. regulator says.” *Reuters*. News report.

Kuhn, Daniel, Peyman Mohajerin Esfahani, Viet Anh Nguyen, and Soroosh Shafieezadeh-Abadeh. 2019. “Wasserstein Distributionally Robust Optimization: Theory and Applications in Machine Learning.” In *Operations Research & Management Science in the Age of Analytics. INFORMS TutORials in Operations Research*, 130–166. INFORMS.

Lawrence, Katharine, Vasudev S. Kuram, Defne L. Levine, Sarah Sharif, Conner Polet, Kiran Malhotra, and Kellie Owens. 2025. “Informed Consent for Ambient Documentation Using Generative AI in Ambulatory Care.” *JAMA Network Open*, 8(7): e2522400.

Lee, Hau L., V. Padmanabhan, and Seungjin Whang. 1997. “Information Distortion in a Supply Chain: The Bullwhip Effect.” *Management Science*, 43(4): 546–558.

Lipman, Yaron, Ricky T. Q. Chen, Heli Ben-Hamu, Maximilian Nickel, and Matthew Le. 2023. “Flow Matching for Generative Modeling.” In *Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2023)*. Kigali, Rwanda:OpenReview.net. May 1–5, 2023.

Long, Carol, David Simchi-Levi, Andre P. Calmon, and Flavio P. Calmon. 2025a. “The GenAI Beer Game.” <https://infotheorylab.github.io/beer-game/>, Interactive testbed for generative AI in supply chain operations.

Long, Carol, David Simchi-Levi, Andre P. Calmon, and Flavio P. Calmon. 2025b. “When Supply Chains Become Autonomous.” *Harvard Business Review*. Online article.

Menache, Ishai, Jeevan Pathuri, David Simchi-Levi, and Tom Linton. 2025. “How Generative AI Improves Supply Chain Management.” *Harvard Business Review*, 104(1–2): 86–95.

Montgomery, Douglas C. 2019. *Introduction to Statistical Quality Control*. . 8th ed., Wiley.

National Highway Traffic Safety Administration. 2024. “Consent Order: Cruise; Standing General Order 2021-01 Reporting.” *Consent order*, In re: Cruise, LLC. Dated September 26, 2024; accessed December 13, 2025.

North American Electric Reliability Corporation. 2025. “TPL-001-5.1 — Transmission System Planning Performance Requirements.” *Reliability Standard*, Updated standard document.

Peyré, Gabriel, and Marco Cuturi. 2019. “Computational Optimal Transport with Applications to Data Sciences.” *Foundations and Trends® in Machine Learning*, 11(5–6): 355–607.

PJM Interconnection. 2025. “Manual 14B: PJM Region Transmission Planning Process.” *PJM Manual*, See Attachment G for N-1-1 criteria and procedures.

Porteus, Evan L. 2002. *Foundations of Stochastic Inventory Theory*. Stanford University Press.

Powell, Warren B. 2023. *Reinforcement Learning and Stochastic Optimization: A Unified Framework for Sequential Decisions*. John Wiley & Sons.

Rahimian, Hamed, and Sanjay Mehrotra. 2019. “Distributionally robust optimization: A review.” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1908.05659*.

Rezende, Danilo, and Shakir Mohamed. 2015. “Variational Inference with Normalizing Flows.” In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning (ICML 2015)*. Vol. 37 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, , ed. Francis Bach and David Blei, 1530–1538. Lille, France.

Selvi, Aras, Huikang Liu, and Wolfram Wiesemann. 2025. “Differential privacy via distributionally robust optimization.” *Operations Research*.

Shapiro, Alexander. 2017. “Distributionally robust stochastic programming.” *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 27(4): 2258–2275.

Shewhart, Walter A. 1931. *Economic Control of Quality of Manufactured Product*. D. Van Nostrand Company.

Shubik, Martin. 2002. “Game Theory and Operations Research: Some musings 50 years later.” *Operations Research*, 50(1): 192–196.

Simchi-Levi, David, Konstantina Mellou, Ishai Menache, and Jeevan Pathuri. 2026. “Large Language Models for Supply Chain Decisions.” In *AI in Supply Chains: Perspectives from Global Thought Leaders*. Vol. 27 of *Springer Series in Supply Chain Management*, , ed. Maxime C. Cohen and Tinglong Dai, 93–104. Springer.

Simchi-Levi, David, Tinglong Dai, Ishai Menache, and Michelle Xiao Wu. 2025. “Democratizing Optimization with Generative AI.” Johns Hopkins University Working Paper 5511218.

Simon, Herbert A. 1987. “Two heads are better than one: The collaboration between AI and OR.” *Interfaces*, 17(3): 8–15.

Song, Jiaming, Chenlin Meng, and Stefano Ermon. 2021. “Denoising Diffusion Implicit Models.” In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2021)*.

Song, Yang, Jascha Sohl-Dickstein, Diederik P. Kingma, Abhishek Kumar, Stefano Ermon, and Ben Poole. 2021. “Score-Based Generative Modeling through Stochastic Differential Equations.” In *Proceedings of the 9th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2021)*.

Song, Yang, Prafulla Dhariwal, Mark Chen, and Ilya Sutskever. 2023. “Consistency Models.” In *Proceedings of the 40th International Conference on Machine Learning*. Vol. 202 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, , ed. Andreas Krause, Emma Brunskill, Kyunghyun Cho, Barbara Engelhardt, Sivan Sabato and Jonathan Scarlett, 32211–32252. PMLR.

Sterman, John D. 1989. “Modeling Managerial Behavior: Misperceptions of Feedback in a Dynamic Decision Making Experiment.” *Management Science*, 35(3): 321–339.

Sutton, Richard S., and Andrew G. Barto. 2018. *Reinforcement Learning: An Introduction*. . 2nd ed., MIT Press.

Tjeng, Vincent, Kai Xiao, and Russ Tedrake. 2019. “Evaluating Robustness of Neural Networks with Mixed Integer Programming.” In *Proceedings of the 7th International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR 2019)*.

von Neumann, John, and Oskar Morgenstern. 1944. *Theory of Games and Economic Behavior*. Princeton University Press.

Wang, Jie, Rui Gao, and Yao Xie. 2025. “Sinkhorn distributionally robust optimization.” *Operations Research*.

Weick, Karl E., and Kathleen M. Sutcliffe. 2015. *Managing the Unexpected: Sustained Performance in a Complex World*. . 3rd ed., Hoboken, NJ:Wiley.

Wilder, Bryan, Bistra Dilkina, and Milind Tambe. 2019. “Melding the Data-Decisions Pipeline: Decision-Focused Learning for Combinatorial Optimization.” In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*. Vol. 33, 1658–1665. AAAI Press.

Xie, Liyan, Shaofeng Zou, Yao Xie, and Venugopal V Veeravalli. 2021. “Sequential (quickest) change detection: Classical results and new directions.” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 2(2): 494–514.

Xie, Yao, and Xiuyuan Cheng. 2025. “Flow-based generative models as iterative algorithms in probability space.” *IEEE Signal Processing Magazine, Special Issue on The Mathematics of Deep Learning*.

Xu, Chen, Jonghyeok Lee, Xiuyuan Cheng, and Yao Xie. 2024. “Flow-based distributionally robust optimization.” *IEEE Journal on Selected Areas in Information Theory*, 5: 62–77.

Xu, Chen, Xiuyuan Cheng, and Yao Xie. 2023. “Normalizing Flow Neural Networks by JKO Scheme.” In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*. Vol. 36, 47379–47405.

Yu, Jiajia, Junghwan Lee, Yao Xie, and Xiuyuan Cheng. 2025. “High-dimensional Mean-field Games by Particle-based Flow Matching.” *NeurIPS 2025 Workshop the Frontiers of Optimization, Sampling, and Games*.

Zipkin, Paul H. 2000. *Foundations of Inventory Management*. McGraw-Hill.