Convergence theory of Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming (a.k.a SDDP & co)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Journées SMAI-MODE



CERMICS

June 1st, 2022



École des Ponts ParisTech

Convergence of TFDP

#### **Motivations**

• An hydroelectric stock

 $\boldsymbol{s}_t = \boldsymbol{s}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{u}_t + \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ 

where, at time t:

- s<sub>t</sub> is the amount of water
- *u<sub>t</sub>* is the water turbined
- $\xi_t$  is the inflow
- $\boldsymbol{p}_t$  is the price



#### **Motivations**

• An hydroelectric stock

 $\boldsymbol{s}_t = \boldsymbol{s}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{u}_t + \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ 

where, at time t:

- *s*<sub>t</sub> is the amount of water
- *u<sub>t</sub>* is the water turbined
- $\xi_t$  is the inflow
- *p*<sub>t</sub> is the price

г *т* 



$$\begin{array}{ll}
\underset{(\boldsymbol{u}_{t})_{t=1:T}}{\text{Min}} & \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{t} -\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{K}(\boldsymbol{s}_{T})\right] \\
\text{s.t.} & \boldsymbol{s}_{0} = \boldsymbol{s}_{init} \\
\boldsymbol{s}_{t} = \boldsymbol{s}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} \\
\boldsymbol{0} \leq \boldsymbol{s}_{t} \leq \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_{t} \\
\boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{u}_{t}) \subset \boldsymbol{\sigma}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{1}, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}) & (\text{inform})
\end{array}$$

(initial stock) (dynamic) (state constraints) (information constraints)

-

#### Contents

#### 1 Dynamic Programming for Multistage Stochastic Problems

- 2 A framework for Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming
- 3 Convergence results
- 4 Discussion and extensions

# Introducing the value function

$$V_{t_0}(s) := \underset{(\boldsymbol{u}_t)_{t=t_0:T}}{\text{Min}} \qquad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=t_0}^T \boldsymbol{p}_t \boldsymbol{u}_t + \mathcal{K}(\boldsymbol{s}_T)\right]$$
  
s.t.  $\boldsymbol{s}_{t_0} = \boldsymbol{s}$  (Initial stock)  
 $\boldsymbol{s}_t = \boldsymbol{s}_{t-1} - \boldsymbol{u}_t + \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$  (dynamic)  
 $0 \le \boldsymbol{s}_t \le \bar{\boldsymbol{s}}_t$  (state constraints)  
 $\sigma(\boldsymbol{u}_t) \subset \sigma(\boldsymbol{\xi}_1, \dots, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)$  (information constraints)

- $V_{t_0}(s)$  is the optimal value of the problem starting at  $t_0$  with stock s
- $V_0(s_{init})$  is the value of the original problem

• 
$$\frac{dV_t(s)}{ds}$$
 is the marginal value of stock

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDP

< (日) →

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_t(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_t} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_t} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_t \boldsymbol{u}_t}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_t + \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

< 47 ►

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2 3

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\frac{\text{Algorithm} \quad 1: \quad \text{Discretized}}{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$\text{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{a}^{b} \int_{b}^{c} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \ \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)$$

$$V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\text{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})} \times V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2} \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{t}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \times \mathbf{N}_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\frac{\text{Algorithm} \quad 1: \quad \text{Discretized}}{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$for \ s \in S \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{U} \\ v \in \mathcal{U} \\ v \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi}) \hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\frac{\text{Algorithm} \quad 1: \quad \text{Discretized}}{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{a}^{b} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + v_{t+1}(s - u + \boldsymbol{\xi})} V_{t+1}(s - u + \boldsymbol{\xi})$$

$$V_{t}(s) += \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi}) \hat{v}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation



Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation



Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\begin{bmatrix} \text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \vdots \\ v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

1
2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{for } s \in S \text{ do} \\ \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \int_{0}^{1} \underbrace{\int_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}}}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} + V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{v}_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}} \right]$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \int_{0}^{1} \underbrace{\int_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}}}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} + V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{v}_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}} \quad \overrightarrow{v}_{t} = \hat{v}_{t} + \frac{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}{v_{t}}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \int_{0}^{1} \underbrace{\int_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}}}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} + V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{v}_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}} \quad \overrightarrow{v}_{t} = \hat{v}_{t} + \frac{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}{v_{t}}$$

1 2

5
Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \int_{0}^{1} \underbrace{\int_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}}}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{u} \in \mathcal{U}} + V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{\boldsymbol{v}_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{\boldsymbol{v}}} \quad \overrightarrow{v}_{t} = \hat{v}_{t} + \frac{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}{v_{t}}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2} \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{1} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U} \\ v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\begin{bmatrix} v = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u_{+} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\begin{bmatrix} v = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u_{+} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\frac{\text{Algorithm} \quad 1: \quad \text{Discretized}}{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$\text{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{a}^{b} \int_{b}^{c} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \ \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)$$

$$V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)$$

$$V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}_{1}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$\text{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$for s \in S \text{ do}$$

$$for s \in S \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{U} \\ v \in \mathcal{U} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation



Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\begin{bmatrix} v = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u_{+} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\begin{bmatrix} v = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u_{+} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t+1} \left[ \underbrace{\hat{v}_{t+1}(s - u + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t+1}(s - u + \boldsymbol{\xi})} \right]_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation



Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t+1} \left[ \underbrace{\hat{v}_{t+1}(s - u + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t+1}(s - u + \boldsymbol{\xi})} \right]_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation



Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\text{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{for s \in S \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{v \in \mathcal{U}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\begin{bmatrix} v = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u_{+} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_{t}} \left[ \min_{u_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-p_{t}u_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - u_{t} + \xi_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}$$

$$\overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
for  $s \in S$  do
$$\int_{\text{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}} \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} for \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \int_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}u + V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\xi_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

1

2

5

6

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}}_{v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{v_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2} \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{t}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5
Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \\ \begin{bmatrix} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2} \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{t}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \times \mathbf{N}_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2} \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \quad \text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{t}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi)}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4 \text{ 5}}_{6} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t = 1, 1 \leq 0, t \leq 1, t \leq 1$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4 \text{ s}}_{6} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}_{1} \overline{V_{T} \equiv K}; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$for s \in S \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{\substack{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do} \\ \mathbf{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \mathbf{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ \mathbf{for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do} \\ V_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}$$

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\text{for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\text{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{v_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1 2

5

< (F) >

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t = 1, 1 \to 0, t}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } t = 1, 1 \to 0, t}_{u \in \mathcal{U}}_{v \in$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4 \text{ 5}}_{6} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi}) \hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \overline{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}_{1} \overline{V_{T} \equiv K}; V_{t} \equiv 0$$

$$2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}$$

$$for s \in S \text{ do}$$

$$\int_{0}^{1} \int_{\substack{v \in \mathcal{U} \\ v \in \mathcal{U} \\ v \in \mathcal{U} \\ v_{t+1}(s - u + \xi) \\ v_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \xi)\hat{v}}$$

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{for } s \in S \text{ do} \\ \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \text{for } s \in S \text{ do} \\ \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\frac{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}{\text{Stochastic Dynamic Programming}}$$

$$V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0$$
2 for  $t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0$  do
3
4
5
6
$$\begin{bmatrix} v = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{bmatrix}$$

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{V_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{4 \text{ 5}}_{6} \left[ \begin{array}{c} \hat{v} = \min_{u \in \mathcal{U}} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + \\ V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi}) \\ V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v} \end{array} \right]$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t = \mathbf{m}_{t} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t = \mathbf{m}_{t} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1 2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t = \mathbf{m}_{t} - p_{t}\boldsymbol{u} + v_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u} + \boldsymbol{\xi})}_{V_{t}(s) + = \mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t} = \boldsymbol{\xi})\hat{v}}$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{2 \text{ for } t: T - 1 \rightarrow 0 \text{ do}}_{3} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \text{ for } s \in S \text{ do}_{4} \text{ for } \xi \in \Xi \text{ do}_{5} \text{ f$$

1

2

5

Under a crucial stagewise independence assumption (*i.e.*  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent random variables), we have the Dynamic Programming equation

$$V_{t}(s) = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{t}} \left[ \min_{\boldsymbol{u}_{t}} \left\{ \underbrace{-\boldsymbol{p}_{t}\boldsymbol{u}_{t}}_{\text{current cost}} + \underbrace{V_{t+1}(s - \boldsymbol{u}_{t} + \boldsymbol{\xi}_{t})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \right\} \right]$$

$$\overline{\text{Algorithm 1: Discretized}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{N}_{T} \equiv K; V_{t} \equiv 0}_{\mathbf{for } t: T - 1 \to 0 \text{ do}}_{1} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } s \in S \text{ do}}_{\mathbf{for } t = 1, 1 \to 0, t}_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \xrightarrow{\mathbf{for } t = 1, 1 \to 0, t}_{u \in \mathcal{U}}_{v \in$$

1 2

5

# From Dynamic Programming to SDDP

- DP is a flexible tool, hampered by the curses of dimensionality
- Numerical illustration (7 dams):
  - ► T = 52 weeks
  - $|S| = 100^7$  possible states
  - $|U| = 10^7$  possible controls
  - $|\xi_t| = 10 \ (10^{52} \text{ scenarios})$
- ➤ 2 days on today's fastest super-computer (3.10<sup>6</sup> years for 10 dams)
- ➡ Can be solved<sup>1</sup> in ≈ 1 minute (≈ 3 minutes for 10 dams)



<sup>1</sup>Approximately, depending on the problem and precision required...

Convergence of TFDP

# From Dynamic Programming to SDDP

- DP is a flexible tool, hampered by the curses of dimensionality
- Numerical illustration (7 dams):
  - ► T = 52 weeks
  - $|S| = 100^7$  possible states
  - $|U| = 10^7$  possible controls
  - $|\xi_t| = 10 \ (10^{52} \ \text{scenarios})$
- ➤ ≈ 2 days on today's fastest super-computer (3.10<sup>6</sup> years for 10 dams)
- Can be solved<sup>1</sup> in  $\approx$  1 minute ( $\approx$  3 minutes for 10 dams)



<sup>1</sup>Approximately, depending on the problem and precision required..

Convergence of TFDP

# From Dynamic Programming to SDDP

- DP is a flexible tool, hampered by the curses of dimensionality
- Numerical illustration (7 dams):
  - ► T = 52 weeks
  - $|S| = 100^7$  possible states
  - $|U| = 10^7$  possible controls
  - $|\xi_t| = 10 \ (10^{52} \text{ scenarios})$
- ➤ ≈ 2 days on today's fastest super-computer (3.10<sup>6</sup> years for 10 dams)
- ➤ Can be solved<sup>1</sup> in ≈ 1 minute (≈ 3 minutes for 10 dams)



<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>Approximately, depending on the problem and precision required...

How can we be so much faster ?

- Structural assumptions:
  - convexity
  - continuous state
  - duality tools
- Sampling instead of exhaustive computation
- Iteratively refining value function estimation at "the right places" only
- Stochastic Dual Dynamic Programming (SDDP) which
  - has been around for 30 years
  - is widely used in the energy community
  - has lots of extensions and variants
  - some convergence results, mainly asymptotic

How can we be so much faster ?

- Structural assumptions:
  - convexity
  - continuous state
  - duality tools
- Sampling instead of exhaustive computation
- Iteratively refining value function estimation at "the right places" only
- Stochastic Dual Dynamic Programming (SDDP) which
  - has been around for 30 years
  - is widely used in the energy community
  - has lots of extensions and variants
  - some convergence results, mainly asymptotic

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

< 67 ▶

 $x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

< 67 ▶

 $x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

< 67 ▶

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI
$x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



time

#### First forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

 $x_2$ 



#### First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

 $x_2$ 



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< /₽ → 7 / 30

 $x_2$ 



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< /₽ → 7 / 30

 $x_2$ 



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< /₽ → 7 / 30

 $x_2$ 



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

 $x_2$ 



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

 $x_2$ 0 0 time

First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< /⊒ → 7 / 30



First backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

< @ >



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

< 67 ▶



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

< 67 ▶



#### second forward pass : computing trajectory



second forward pass : computing trajectory



second forward pass : computing trajectory



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory



time

#### second forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< *合*⊅ → 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< /⊒ → 7 / 30



second backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI


third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



third forward pass : computing trajectory



third forward pass : computing trajectory



#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



third forward pass : computing trajectory



#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



time

#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFD



time

#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



time

#### third forward pass : computing trajectory

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDI



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< (F)



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30

< (F)



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

June 1st, 2022 7 / 30



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF



third backward pass : refining approximation (adding cuts)

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF





#### And so on...

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

#### Contents

#### Dynamic Programming for Multistage Stochastic Problems

#### 2 A framework for Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming

#### 3 Convergence results

4 Discussion and extensions

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDP

#### Problem setting

• The generic Multistage Stochastic Program considered reads

$$\min \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} \ell_t(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)\right]$$
(MSP)  
s.t.  $\boldsymbol{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}_t(\boldsymbol{x}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t) \quad \forall t$   
 $\sigma(\boldsymbol{x}_t) \subset \sigma(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\tau}\}_{\tau \in [t]}) \quad \forall t$ 

- Note that:
  - finite, discrete time
  - contraints are stagewise independent
  - cost could depend on  $x_{t-1}$  or  $u_t$  if needed
  - risk-neutral<sup>2</sup>

#### Problem setting

• The generic Multistage Stochastic Program considered reads

$$\min \quad \mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{t=1}^{T} \ell_t(\boldsymbol{x}_t, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)\right]$$
(MSP)  
s.t.  $\boldsymbol{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}_t(\boldsymbol{x}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t) \qquad \forall t$   
 $\sigma(\boldsymbol{x}_t) \subset \sigma(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_T\}_{T \in [t]}) \qquad \forall t$ 

- Note that:
  - finite, discrete time
  - contraints are stagewise independent
  - cost could depend on  $\boldsymbol{x}_{t-1}$  or  $\boldsymbol{u}_t$  if needed
  - risk-neutral<sup>2</sup>

#### Backward Bellman operators and Dynamic Programming Define the cost-to-go function

$$V_{t_0}(\mathbf{x}) = \min \qquad \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t=t_0+1}^{l} \ell_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)\Big]$$
  
s.t.  $\mathbf{x}_{t_0} = \mathbf{x}$   
 $\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t) \qquad \forall t > t_0$   
 $\sigma(\mathbf{x}_t) \subset \sigma(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\tau\}_{\tau \in [t]}) \qquad \forall t > t_0$ 

Assuming that  $(\xi_{ au})_{ au\in[T]}$  is stagewise independent, we have  $V_t=\mathcal{B}_t(V_{t+1})$ 

where the Backward Bellman operator  $\mathcal{B}_t$  is defined

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{t}(\tilde{V}) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^{n_{t}} \times \Xi_{t+1} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \\ (\mathbf{x}_{t}, \xi_{t+1}) & \mapsto \min_{\mathbf{x}_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X}_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t}, \xi_{t+1})} \underbrace{\ell_{t+1}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1}, \xi_{t+1})}_{\text{transition costs}} + \underbrace{\tilde{\mathcal{V}}(\mathbf{x}_{t+1})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \\ \mathcal{B}_{t}(\tilde{V}) : \mathbf{x}_{t} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{t}(\tilde{V})(\mathbf{x}_{t}, \xi_{t+1})] \end{cases}$$

#### Backward Bellman operators and Dynamic Programming Define the cost-to-go function

$$V_{t_0}(\mathbf{x}) = \min \qquad \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t=t_0+1}^{l} \ell_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)\Big]$$
  
s.t. 
$$\mathbf{x}_{t_0} = \mathbf{x}$$
  
$$\mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t) \qquad \forall t > t_0$$
  
$$\sigma(\mathbf{x}_t) \subset \sigma(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_\tau\}_{\tau \in [t]}) \qquad \forall t > t_0$$

Assuming that  $(\xi_{\tau})_{\tau \in [T]}$  is stagewise independent, we have  $V_t = \mathcal{B}_t(V_{t+1})$ 

where the Backward Bellman operator  $\mathcal{B}_t$  is defined

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{t}(\tilde{V}) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^{n_{t}} \times \Xi_{t+1} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \\ (x_{t}, \xi_{t+1}) \mapsto \min_{x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X}_{t+1}(x_{t}, \xi_{t+1})} \underbrace{\ell_{t+1}(x_{t+1}, \xi_{t+1})}_{\text{transition costs}} + \underbrace{\tilde{V}(x_{t+1})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \\ \mathcal{B}_{t}(\tilde{V}) : x_{t} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{t}(\tilde{V})(x_{t}, \xi_{t+1})] \end{cases}$$

< 47 →

#### Backward Bellman operators and Dynamic Programming Define the cost-to-go function

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{t_0}(\mathbf{x}) &= \min \qquad \mathbb{E}\Big[\sum_{t=t_0+1}^{t} \ell_t(\mathbf{x}_t, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t)\Big] \\ \text{s.t.} \qquad \mathbf{x}_{t_0} &= \mathbf{x} \\ \mathbf{x}_t \in \mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{x}_{t-1}, \boldsymbol{\xi}_t) \qquad \quad \forall t > t_0 \\ \sigma(\mathbf{x}_t) \subset \sigma(\{\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\tau}\}_{\tau \in [t]}) \qquad \quad \forall t > t_0 \end{split}$$

Assuming that  $(\xi_{\tau})_{\tau \in [T]}$  is stagewise independent, we have  $V_t = \mathcal{B}_t(V_{t+1})$ 

where the Backward Bellman operator  $\mathcal{B}_t$  is defined

$$\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{t}(\tilde{V}) := \begin{cases} \mathbb{R}^{n_{t}} \times \Xi_{t+1} \to \mathbb{R} \cup \{+\infty\} \\ (x_{t}, \xi_{t+1}) & \mapsto \min_{x_{t+1} \in \mathcal{X}_{t+1}(x_{t}, \xi_{t+1})} \underbrace{\ell_{t+1}(x_{t+1}, \xi_{t+1})}_{\text{transition costs}} + \underbrace{\tilde{V}(x_{t+1})}_{\text{cost-to-go}} \\ \mathcal{B}_{t}(\tilde{V}) : x_{t} \mapsto \mathbb{E}[\hat{\mathcal{B}}_{t}(\tilde{V})(x_{t}, \xi_{t+1})] \end{cases}$$

۱

< 47 →

We define the reachable sets

$$\begin{aligned} X_0^r &= \{x_0\} \\ X_t^r &= \bigcup_{x_{t-1} \in X_{t-1}^r} \bigcup_{\xi \in \Xi_t} \mathcal{X}_t(x_{t-1},\xi) \qquad \forall t \in [T]. \end{aligned}$$

➡ this is the set of state that one can attain starting from the initial point.

Cost-to-go induced policy and Forward Bellman operator

• Denote the set of  $\gamma$ -optimal solution of stage-t problem

$$\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}_{\gamma,t}(\tilde{V}): (\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \mapsto \gamma$$
 -  $\operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})} \ell_t(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \tilde{V}(\mathbf{y}).$ 

- We say that *F<sub>t</sub>* is a *γ*-forward Bellman operator of step *t*, if, for all function<sup>3</sup> *V*, *F<sub>t</sub>(V*) is a measurable selection of *X*<sup>#</sup><sub>γ,t</sub>(*V*).
- It means that the stage problem are solve with the same deterministic solver.
  - A given (collection of) forward operator (*F<sub>t</sub>*)<sub>t∈[T]</sub> define, for any (collection of) cost-to-go approximations (*Ṽ<sub>t</sub>*)<sub>t∈[T]</sub>, a policy.
  - A policy define, for any scenario (ξ<sub>t</sub>)<sub>t∈[T]</sub>, a trajectory and its associated cost.

<sup>3</sup>Lipschitz on  $X_t^r$ 

Cost-to-go induced policy and Forward Bellman operator

• Denote the set of  $\gamma$ -optimal solution of stage-t problem

$$\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}_{\gamma,t}(\tilde{V}): (\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \mapsto \gamma$$
 -  $\operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})} \ell_t(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \tilde{V}(\mathbf{y}).$ 

- We say that *F<sub>t</sub>* is a γ-forward Bellman operator of step *t*, if, for all function<sup>3</sup> *V*, *F<sub>t</sub>(V*) is a measurable selection of *X*<sup>#</sup><sub>γ,t</sub>(*V*).
- It means that the stage problem are solve with the same deterministic solver.
  - A given (collection of) forward operator (*F<sub>t</sub>*)<sub>t∈[T]</sub> define, for any (collection of) cost-to-go approximations (*Ṽ<sub>t</sub>*)<sub>t∈[T]</sub>, a policy.
  - A policy define, for any scenario (ξ<sub>t</sub>)<sub>t∈[T]</sub>, a trajectory and its associated cost.

<sup>3</sup>Lipschitz on  $X_t^r$ 

Cost-to-go induced policy and Forward Bellman operator

• Denote the set of  $\gamma$ -optimal solution of stage-t problem

$$\mathcal{X}^{\sharp}_{\gamma,t}(\tilde{V}): (\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) \mapsto \gamma$$
 -  $\operatorname*{arg\,min}_{\mathbf{y} \in \mathcal{X}_t(\mathbf{x}, \boldsymbol{\xi})} \ell_t(\mathbf{y}, \boldsymbol{\xi}) + \tilde{V}(\mathbf{y}).$ 

- We say that *F<sub>t</sub>* is a γ-forward Bellman operator of step *t*, if, for all function<sup>3</sup> *V*, *F<sub>t</sub>(V*) is a measurable selection of *X*<sup>#</sup><sub>γ,t</sub>(*V*).
- It means that the stage problem are solve with the same deterministic solver.
  - A given (collection of) forward operator (*F<sub>t</sub>*)<sub>t∈[T]</sub> define, for any (collection of) cost-to-go approximations (*Ṽ<sub>t</sub>*)<sub>t∈[T]</sub>, a policy.
  - A policy define, for any scenario (ξ<sub>t</sub>)<sub>t∈[T]</sub>, a trajectory and its associated cost.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup>Lipschitz on  $X_t^r$ 

# Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming algorithms

TFDP algorithms refine outer-approximations of the cost-to-go functions:

- using the current outer-approximation we compute a trajectory (forward phase)
- around the computed trajectory we refine the outer-approximations (backward phase)

A few comments:

- $\rightsquigarrow$  The forward phase depends on two elements:
  - the chosen forward operator  $\mathcal{F}_t$
  - the node-selection  $\xi_t^k$  method
- $\sim$  An inner cost-to-go approximation is sometimes computed and used in the node-selection process. It is required for the complexity analysis, but can be set to  $V_t$ .
- → Outer approximation are defined as maximum of elementary functions called cuts.

# Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming algorithms

TFDP algorithms refine outer-approximations of the cost-to-go functions:

- using the current outer-approximation we compute a trajectory (forward phase)
- around the computed trajectory we refine the outer-approximations (backward phase)

A few comments:

- $\rightsquigarrow$  The forward phase depends on two elements:
  - the chosen forward operator  $\mathcal{F}_t$
  - the node-selection  $\xi_t^k$  method
- $\sim$  An inner cost-to-go approximation is sometimes computed and used in the node-selection process. It is required for the complexity analysis, but can be set to  $V_t$ .
- $\rightsquigarrow$  Outer approximation are defined as maximum of elementary functions called cuts.

#### Cuts

Consider a function F that we approximate with a function  $f^k$ , called a cut, with respect to a point  $x^k$ .

We say that

These definitions are used to define the outer-approximations of  $V_t$ :

$$V_t^k := \max_{\kappa \le k} f_t^\kappa$$

where  $f_t^{\kappa}$  is a

- $L_t$ -Lipschitz on  $X_t^r$
- valid
- $\gamma$ -tight

```
cut of {\mathcal B}_t( {V}_{t+1}^\kappa)
```
# Cuts

Consider a function F that we approximate with a function  $f^k$ , called a cut, with respect to a point  $x^k$ .

We say that

• 
$$f^k$$
 is  $\underline{\gamma}_t$ -tight if  $f^k(x^k) \ge F(x^k) - \underline{\gamma}_t$   
•  $f^k$  is valid if  $f^k \le F$ 

These definitions are used to define the outer-approximations of  $V_t$ :

$$V_t^k := \max_{\kappa \le k} f_t^\kappa$$

where  $f_t^{\kappa}$  is a

- $L_t$ -Lipschitz on  $X_t^r$
- valid
- $\gamma$ -tight

cut of  $\mathcal{B}_t(\underline{V}_{t+1}^\kappa)$ 

# Example of cuts

- Affine Bender's cut
- Affine Lagrangian cuts
- Affine integer cuts



# Example of cuts

- Affine Bender's cut
- Affine Lagrangian cuts
- Affine integer cuts



V(x)

Step cuts

## Example of cuts

- Affine Bender's cut
- Affine Lagrangian cuts
- Affine integer cuts

Step cuts

#### Sipschitz-cuts



**Algorithm 2:** A general framework for TFDP algorithms

### Inner-approximation requirements

The inner approximation  $\overline{V}_t^k$ , not necessarily computed, shall satisfy the following properties:

$$\begin{array}{l} \bullet \quad \overline{V}_{t}^{k}(x_{t}^{k}) \leq \mathcal{B}_{t}(\overline{V}_{t+1}^{k})(x_{t}^{k}) + \bar{\gamma}_{t} \\ \bullet \quad \overline{V}_{t}^{k} \geq \mathcal{B}_{t}(\overline{V}_{t+1}^{k}) \\ \bullet \quad \overline{V}_{t}^{k} \leq \overline{V}_{t}^{k-1} \\ \bullet \quad \overline{V}_{t}^{k} \text{ is } \bar{L}_{t}\text{-l inschitz} \end{array}$$
(validity)

# Some TFDP algorithms

Algorithm's name	Node selection: Choice $\xi_t^k$	$\mathcal{F}_t$	$\underline{V}_t^k$	$\overline{V}_t^k$	Hypothesis	Complexity known
SDDP	Random sampling	Exact	Benders cuts	Vt	Convex	~
EDDP	Explorative	Exact	Benders cuts	Vt	Convex	~
APSDDP	Random sampling	Exact	Adaptive partition	Vt	Linear	×
SDDiP	Random sampling	Exact	Lagrangian or integer cuts	Vt	Mixed Integer Linear	×
MIDAS	Random sampling	Exact	Step cuts	Vt	Monotonic Mixed Integer	×
SLDP	Random sampling	Exact	Reverse norm cuts	Vt	Non-Convex	×
BDZ17	Problem child	Exact	Benders cuts	Epigraph as convex hull	Convex	×
BDZ18	Problem child	Exact	$Benders \times Epigraph$	$Hypograph \times Benders$	Convex-Concave	×
RDDP	Deterministic	Exact	Benders cuts	Epigraph as convex hull	Robust	*
ISDDP	Random sampling	Inexact	Inexact Lagrangian cuts	Vt	Convex	*
TDP	Problem child	Exact	Benders cuts	Min of quadratic	Convex	×
ZS19	Random or Problem	Regularized	Generalized conjugacy cuts	Norm cuts	Mixed Integer Convex	~
NDDP	Random or Problem	Regularized	Benders cuts	Norm cuts	Distributionally Robust	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>
DSDDP	Random sampling	Exact	Benders cuts	Fenchel transform	Linear	*

< @ >

### Contents

#### Dynamic Programming for Multistage Stochastic Problems

#### 2 A framework for Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming

#### 3 Convergence results

#### 4 Discussion and extensions

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

Independence of noises

 $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent exogeneous random variables, i.e. such that the law of  $\xi_t$  is independent of all decisions variables.

#### Independence of noises

 $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is a sequence of independent exogeneous random variables, i.e. such that the law of  $\xi_t$  is independent of all decisions variables.

#### Compatibility of constraints

We make the following assumptions, for all  $t \in [T]$ ,

- $\ell_t$  is a proper normal integrand;
- **2** for all  $x_t \in X_t^r$ , the random variable  $\ell_t(x_t, \xi_t)$  is integrable;

S for all  $x_{t-1} \in X_{t-1}^r$  and almost all  $\xi_t \in \Xi_{t-1}$ ,  $\mathcal{X}_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_t)$  is non-empty compact

imply relatively complete recourse

#### Lipschitz

- For  $t \in [T]$ , we assume that
  - $X_t^r$  has a diameter smaller than  $D_t < +\infty$ ;
  - **2** the expected cost-to-go function  $V_t$  is  $L_t$ -Lipschitz.

#### Lipschitz

- For  $t \in [T]$ , we assume that
  - $X_t^r$  has a diameter smaller than  $D_t < +\infty$ ;
  - **2** the expected cost-to-go function  $V_t$  is  $L_t$ -Lipschitz.

#### Existence of cuts

For every  $t \in [T]$  and  $k \in \mathbb{N}^*$ , there exists at least one  $\underline{L}_t$ -Lipschitz on  $X_t^r$ , valid and  $\underline{\gamma}$ -tight cut of  $\mathcal{B}_t(\underline{V}_{t+1}^k)$  at  $x_t^k$ .

➡ Usually guaranteed through recourse assumptions.

We study three node selection procedures:

- In andom node selection: the noise ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> used to obtain x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> in the forward pass is selected randomly, independently of other node selection.
- Problem-child node selection: we choose the ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> that lead to a x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> maximizing the current gap estimate.
- Sexplorative node selection: we choose the ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> that lead to a x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> as far as possible of the set of "good points".

We study three node selection procedures:

- I random node selection: the noise ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> used to obtain x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> in the forward pass is selected randomly, independently of other node selection.
- ➡ the most common, but hardest to study.
- Problem-child node selection: we choose the ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> that lead to a x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> maximizing the current gap estimate.
- Sexplorative node selection: we choose the ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> that lead to a x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> as far as possible of the set of "good points".

We study three node selection procedures:

- In andom node selection: the noise ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> used to obtain x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> in the forward pass is selected randomly, independently of other node selection.
- ➡ the most common, but hardest to study.
- Problem-child node selection: we choose the ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> that lead to a x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> maximizing the current gap estimate.
- some numerical advantages, and good theoretical guarantees.
- explorative node selection: we choose the \(\xi\_t^k\) that lead to a \(x\_t^k\) as far as possible of the set of "good points".

We study three node selection procedures:

- In andom node selection: the noise ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> used to obtain x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> in the forward pass is selected randomly, independently of other node selection.
- ➡ the most common, but hardest to study.
- Problem-child node selection: we choose the ξ<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> that lead to a x<sup>k</sup><sub>t</sub> maximizing the current gap estimate.
- some numerical advantages, and good theoretical guarantees.
- explorative node selection: we choose the \(\xi\_t^k\) that lead to a \(x\_t^k\) as far as possible of the set of "good points".

mainly theoretical.

## Effective iterations

Consider  $(\delta_t)_{t \in [T]} > 0$  and define

$$\begin{split} \varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}-1} &:= \underline{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}-1} + \bar{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}-1} \\ \varepsilon_t &:= \varepsilon_{t+1} + (\bar{L}_{t+1} + \underline{L}_{t+1})\delta_{t+1} + \gamma_{t+1}^F + \underline{\gamma}_t + \bar{\gamma}_t \quad \forall t \in [\mathcal{T}-2] \\ \varepsilon_0 &:= \varepsilon_1 + (\bar{L}_1 + \underline{L}_1)\delta_1 + \gamma_1^F \end{split}$$

• 
$$x_t^k$$
 is  $arepsilon_t$ -saturated, if  $\overline{V}_t^k(x_t^k) - \underline{V}_t^k(x_t^k) \leq arepsilon_t$ 

• 
$$x_t^k$$
 is  $\delta_t$ -distinguishable if  $||x_t^k - x_t^{\kappa}|| > \delta_t$   
 $\forall \kappa < k \mid x_t^{\kappa}$  is  $\varepsilon_t$ -saturated.

An effective iteration k ∈ N generates either a ε<sub>0</sub> first stage lower-bound, or a new ε<sub>t</sub>-saturated and δ<sub>t</sub>-distinguishable point for at least one t ∈ [T].

## Effective iterations

Consider  $(\delta_t)_{t \in [T]} > 0$  and define

$$\begin{split} \varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}-1} &:= \underline{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}-1} + \bar{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}-1} \\ \varepsilon_t &:= \varepsilon_{t+1} + (\bar{L}_{t+1} + \underline{L}_{t+1})\delta_{t+1} + \gamma_{t+1}^F + \underline{\gamma}_t + \bar{\gamma}_t \quad \forall t \in [\mathcal{T}-2] \\ \varepsilon_0 &:= \varepsilon_1 + (\bar{L}_1 + \underline{L}_1)\delta_1 + \gamma_1^F \end{split}$$

• 
$$x_t^k$$
 is  $\varepsilon_t$ -saturated, if  $\overline{V}_t^k(x_t^k) - \underline{V}_t^k(x_t^k) \le \varepsilon_t$ 

•  $x_t^k$  is  $\delta_t$ -distinguishable if  $||x_t^k - x_t^{\kappa}|| > \delta_t$  $\forall \kappa < k \mid x_t^{\kappa}$  is  $\varepsilon_t$ -saturated.

An effective iteration k ∈ N generates either a ε<sub>0</sub> first stage lower-bound, or a new ε<sub>t</sub>-saturated and δ<sub>t</sub>-distinguishable point for at least one t ∈ [T].

# Effective iterations

Consider  $(\delta_t)_{t \in [T]} > 0$  and define

$$\begin{split} \varepsilon_{\mathcal{T}-1} &:= \underline{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}-1} + \bar{\gamma}_{\mathcal{T}-1} \\ \varepsilon_t &:= \varepsilon_{t+1} + (\bar{L}_{t+1} + \underline{L}_{t+1})\delta_{t+1} + \gamma_{t+1}^F + \underline{\gamma}_t + \bar{\gamma}_t \quad \forall t \in [\mathcal{T}-2] \\ \varepsilon_0 &:= \varepsilon_1 + (\bar{L}_1 + \underline{L}_1)\delta_1 + \gamma_1^F \end{split}$$

- $x_t^k$  is  $\varepsilon_t$ -saturated, if  $\overline{V}_t^k(x_t^k) \underline{V}_t^k(x_t^k) \le \varepsilon_t$
- $x_t^k$  is  $\delta_t$ -distinguishable if  $||x_t^k x_t^{\kappa}|| > \delta_t$  $\forall \kappa < k \mid x_t^{\kappa}$  is  $\varepsilon_t$ -saturated.
- An effective iteration k ∈ N generates either a ε<sub>0</sub> first stage lower-bound, or a new ε<sub>t</sub>-saturated and δ<sub>t</sub>-distinguishable point for at least one t ∈ [T].

## Convergence results: by effective iterations

#### Theorem (bound on effective iterations number)

Assume that  $\delta_t \in [0, D_t]$  and  $\eta_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  are given and  $\varepsilon_t$  defined as above. Let

$$\overline{K} := \sum_{t=1}^{l-1} \left( \frac{D_t}{\delta_t} + 1 \right)^{n_t}$$

After at most  $\overline{K} + 1$  effective iterations we have a  $\varepsilon_1$ -lower bound:

$$\underline{V}_0^k(x_0) = \ell_1(x_1^k, \xi_1) + \underline{V}_1^k(x_1^k) \ge \operatorname{val}(MSP) - \varepsilon_1$$

# Convergence results: by effective iterations

#### Theorem (bound on effective iterations number)

Assume that  $\delta_t \in [0, D_t]$  and  $\eta_t \in \mathbb{R}_+$  are given and  $\varepsilon_t$  defined as above. Let

$$\overline{K} := \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \left( \frac{D_t}{\delta_t} + 1 \right)^{n_t}$$

After at most  $\overline{K} + 1$  effective iterations we have a  $\varepsilon_1$ -lower bound:

$$\underline{V}_0^k(x_0) = \ell_1(x_1^k, \xi_1) + \underline{V}_1^k(x_1^k) \geq \operatorname{val}(MSP) - \varepsilon_1$$

Further, there exists, among those  $\overline{K} + 1$  effective iteration, at least one such that  $x_1^k$  is an  $\varepsilon_0$ -solution to problem (MSP):

$$\ell_1(x_1^k,\xi_1) + V_1(x_1^k) \leq \operatorname{val}((MSP)) + \varepsilon_0$$

## Convergence result: deterministic node selection

#### Theorem

If the node selection is done by problem child method or explorative method then each iteration is effective.

# Convergence result: deterministic node selection

#### Theorem

If the node selection is done by problem child method or explorative method then each iteration is effective.

#### Theorem

Assume that each iteration is effective.  $\gamma_{\Sigma} := \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \underline{\gamma}_t + \overline{\gamma}_t + \gamma_t^F$   $n_t \leq n, \ D_t = D, \ \overline{L}_t = \underline{L}_t = L.$ 

Then, for every  $\varepsilon > \gamma_{\Sigma}$ , sufficiently small (e.g. such that  $\varepsilon \leq 2DL + \gamma_{\Sigma}$ ), TFDP finds an  $\varepsilon$ -first stage solution  $x_1^k$  within at most  $\bar{K}_{\varepsilon}$  iterations where

$$ar{\mathcal{K}}_arepsilon := \left(rac{2DL}{arepsilon - \gamma_{\Sigma}}
ight)^n (\mathcal{T}-1)^{n+1}$$

# Convergence result: random node selection

#### Lemma

Assume that we draw  $\xi_t^k \sim \boldsymbol{\xi}_t$ , and independently of all other  $\tilde{\xi}_{\tau}^{\kappa}$  as well as  $(\boldsymbol{\xi}_{\tau})_{\tau \in [\tau-1]}$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\text{Iteration } k \text{ is effective.} \left| A^{k-1} \right] \geq \prod_{t=1}^{k} \left( 1 - e^{\frac{-\tau_t}{D_t^2}} \right)$$

# Convergence result: random node selection

#### Lemma

Assume that we draw  $\xi_t^k \sim \xi_t$ , and independently of all other  $\tilde{\xi}_{\tau}^{\kappa}$  as well as  $(\xi_{\tau})_{\tau \in [\tau-1]}$ . Then,

$$\mathbb{P}\Big[\text{Iteration } k \text{ is effective.} \, \Big| \, A^{k-1} \Big] \geq \prod_{t=1}^{t} \left( 1 - e^{\frac{-2\eta_t^2}{D_t^2}} \right)$$

#### Theorem

Set  $\gamma_{\Sigma} := \sum_{t=1}^{T-1} \underline{\gamma}_t + \overline{\gamma}_t + \gamma_t^F$  and choose n, D, L such that, for all  $t \in [T-1], n_t \leq n, D_t = D, \overline{L}_t = \underline{L}_t = L$ . Then, for  $\varepsilon > \gamma_{\Sigma}$ , sufficiently small, the expected number of iterations of TFDP required to find an  $\varepsilon$ -first stage solution  $x_1^k$ , is bounded by  $(T-1)\left(\frac{4DL(T-1)}{\varepsilon-\gamma_{\Sigma}}\right)^{n+2(T-1)}$ .

### Contents

#### Dynamic Programming for Multistage Stochastic Problems

#### 2 A framework for Trajectory Following Dynamic Programming

#### 3 Convergence results

#### 4 Discussion and extensions

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

# The assumption we did not make

#### Finitely supported noise

The support of the random process  $(\xi_t)_{t \in [T]}$  is finite.

➡ To our knowledge all previous convergence results require this assumption.

Further this assumption is sometimes "abused", using the fact that each scenario  $(10^{52})$  is sampled an infinite number of time.

# Computing cuts: finitely supported case

Recall that

$${\mathcal B}_t( ilde V)(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}ig[\hat{{\mathcal B}}_t( ilde V)(\cdot,oldsymbol{\xi}_{t+1})ig]$$

## Thus, we can get cut for $\mathcal{B}(\tilde{V})$ as average of cuts for $\hat{\mathcal{B}}(\tilde{V})$

This is easily done with the finitely supported noise assumption.

More precisely, if  $\operatorname{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_t) = \{\xi^1, \dots, \xi^N\}$ , with  $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \xi^n) = \pi_n$ :

- for each  $n \in [N]$  compute a cut  $\hat{f}_n$  for  $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_t(\tilde{V})(\cdot, \xi^n)$  at x
- define  $f := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \pi_n \hat{f}_n$  as a cut for  $\mathcal{B}_t(\tilde{V})$  at x

# Computing cuts: finitely supported case

Recall that

$${\mathcal B}_t( ilde V)(\cdot) = \mathbb{E}ig[\hat{{\mathcal B}}_t( ilde V)(\cdot, {m \xi}_{t+1})ig]$$

Thus, we can get cut for  $\mathcal{B}( ilde{V})$  as average of cuts for  $\hat{\mathcal{B}}( ilde{V})$ 

➡ This is easily done with the finitely supported noise assumption.

More precisely, if  $\operatorname{supp}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_t) = \{\xi^1, \ldots, \xi^N\}$ , with  $\mathbb{P}(\boldsymbol{\xi}_t = \xi^n) = \pi_n$ :

• for each  $n \in [N]$  compute a cut  $\hat{f}_n$  for  $\hat{\mathcal{B}}_t(\tilde{V})(\cdot,\xi^n)$  at imes

• define 
$$f := \sum_{n=1}^{N} \pi_n \hat{f}_n$$
 as a cut for  $\mathcal{B}_t(\tilde{V})$  at  $\times$ 

Computing cuts: non-finitely supported case

If  $\xi_t$  is not finitely supported, computing a cut is harder. However, there are at least two cases:

- In the linear setting, using advanced polyhedral geometry tools (more on that in a few moments), we can compute exact cuts for some non-finitely supported noises.
- In the convex setting, using convexity (Jensen's and Edmunson-Madanski) inequalities, we can derive inexact cuts.

# Algorithm variations

Node selection Two main possibilities: random or problem-child. Other exists, like quasi-montercarlo, not covered by our results.

Forward operator Usually taken as an optimal solution, can also be the optimal solution of a regularized problem.

Multiple forward phases It is usual to simulate multiple trajectory in the forward phase before updating approximation to leverage parallelization.

Multicut Included in the framework with finitely supported assumption, unclear otherwise.

Cut selection To alleviate each iteration burden we sometimes use heuristics to drop cuts. This usually lose the convergence results and is not covered by our results.

Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDP

< 47 ►

## Setting extensions

We can adapt the results to other problem settings:

Minimax Can be seen as a two-player repeated stochastic game. The results can be adapted as long as we can compute inner and outer approximation and both reachable sets are of finite dimension and diameter.

Robust Special case of minimax problem.

Risk-averse Using nested coherent risk-measure formulation it is a special case of minimax. Results apply if the risk set can be described by a finite number of parameters, in particular if either

- we consider polyhedral coherent risk measures;
- or we consider mix of expectation and AVAR.

# Questions ?



Maël Forcier, Vincent Leclère

Convergence of TFDF

∢ 🗇 ।> 30 / 30