SDDP FOR MULTISTAGE STOCHASTIC LINEAR PROGRAMS BASED ON SPECTRAL RISK MEASURES

VINCENT GUIGUES AND WERNER RÖMISCH

ABSTRACT. We consider risk-averse formulations of multistage stochastic linear programs. For these formulations, based on convex combinations of spectral risk measures, risk-averse dynamic programming equations can be written. As a result, the Stochastic Dual Dynamic Programming (SDDP) algorithm can be used to obtain approximations of the corresponding risk-averse recourse functions. This allows us to define a risk-averse nonanticipative feasible policy for the stochastic linear program. Formulas for the cuts that approximate the recourse functions are given.

AMS subject classifications: 90C15, 91B30.

1. INTRODUCTION

Multistage stochastic programs play a central role when developing optimization models under stochastic uncertainty in engineering, transportation, finance and energy. Furthermore, since measuring, bounding or minimizing the risk of decisions becomes more and more important in applications, risk-averse formulations of such optimization models are needed and have to be solved. Several risk-averse model variants allow for a reformulation as a classical multistage model as in [6, 8] and the present paper. From a mathematical point of view multistage stochastic optimization methods represent infinite-dimensional models in spaces of random vectors satisfying certain moment conditions and contain high-dimensional integrals. Hence, their numerical solution is a challenging task. Each solution approach consists at least of two ingredients: (i) numerical integration methods for computing the expectation functionals and (ii) algorithms for solving the resulting finite-dimensional optimization models.

The favorite approach for (i) is to generate possible scenarios (i.e., realizations) of the random vector involved and to use them as 'grid points' for the numerical integration. Scenario generation can be done by Monte Carlo, Quasi-Monte Carlo or optimal quantization methods (see [5, 18] for overviews and [3, Part III] for further information). Scenarios for multistage stochastic programs have to be tree structured to model the increasing chain of σ-fields. Existing stability and convergence results like [11, 10], [12], and [21] provide approaches and conditions implying convergence of such schemes, in particular, for the deterministic first-stage solutions. Hence, they justify rolling horizon approaches based on repeated solving of multistage models, see [9] for instance.

The algorithms employed for (ii) depend on structural properties of the basic optimization model and on the inherent structure induced by the scenario tree approximation (see the survey [19] on decomposition methods).

Some algorithmic approaches incorporate the scenario generation method (i) as an algorithmic step of the solution method. Such approaches are, for example, stochastic decomposition methods for multistage models (see [20]), approximate dynamic programming (see [17]) and Stochastic Dual Dynamic Programming (SDDP) initiated in [13], revisited in [16, 22] and also studied in the present paper.

We consider risk-averse formulations of multistage stochastic linear programs of the form

$$
(1) \qquad \inf_{x_1,\ldots,x_T} d_1^\top x_1 + \theta_1 \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=2}^{T} d_t^\top x_t] + \sum_{t=2}^{T} \theta_t \rho_\phi(-\sum_{k=2}^{t} d_k^\top x_k)
$$
$$
C_t x_t = \xi_t - D_t x_{t-1}, \ x_t \geq 0, \ x_t \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-measurable}, \ t = 1, \ldots, T,
$$

where x_0 is given, parameters d_t, C_t, D_t are deterministic, $(\xi_t)_{t=1}^T$ is a stochastic process, $\mathcal{F}_t$ is the sigma-algebra $\mathcal{F}_t := \sigma(\xi_j, j \leq t)$, $(\theta_t)_{t=1}^T$ are nonnegative weights summing to one, and ρ_ϕ is a *spectral risk measure* [1] or *distortion risk measure* [14, 15] depending on a risk spectrum $\phi \in L_1([0,1])$. In the above formulation, we have assumed that the (one-period) spectral risk measure takes as argument a random income and that the trajectory of the process is known until the first stage. We assume *relatively complete recourse* for (1), which means that for any feasible sequence of decisions $(x_1, \ldots, x_t)$ to any t-stage scenario $(\xi_1, \xi_2, \ldots, \xi_t)$, there exists a sequence of feasible decisions $(x_{t+1}, \ldots, x_T)$ with probability one. A non-risk-averse model amounts to taking $\theta_1 = 1$ and $\theta_t = 0$ for $t = 2, \ldots, T$. A more general risk-averse formulation for multistage stochastic programs is considered in [8]. For these models, dynamic programming (DP) equations are written in [8] and an SDDP algorithm is detailed to obtain approximations of the corresponding recourse functions in the form of cuts. The main contribution of this paper is to provide analytic formulas for some cut coefficients, independent of the sampled scenarios and that can be useful for implementation. We also specialize the SDDP algorithm and especially the computation of the cuts for the particular risk-averse model (1).

We start by setting down some notation:

- e will denote a column vector of all ones;
- for $x, y \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the vector $x \circ y \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $(x \circ y)(i) = x(i)y(i)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$;
- for $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, the vector $x^+ \in \mathbb{R}^n$ is defined by $x^+(i) = \max(x(i), 0)$, $i = 1, \ldots, n$;
- the available history of the process at stage t is denoted by $\xi_{[t]} := (\xi_j, j \leq t)$;
- for vectors $x_1, \ldots, x_n$, the notation $x_{n_1:n_2}$ stands for the concatenation $(x_{n_1}, x_{n_1+1}, \ldots, x_{n_2})$ for $1 \leq n_1 \leq n_2 \leq n$;
- δ_{ij} is the Kronecker delta defined for i, j integers by $\delta_{ij} = 1$ if $i = j$ and 0 otherwise.

2. Risk-averse dynamic programming

Let $F_Z(x) = \mathbb{P}(Z \leq x)$ be the cumulative distribution function of an essentially bounded random variable Z and let $F_Z^{\leftarrow}(p) = \inf\{x : F_Z(x) \geq p\}$ be the generalized inverse of F_Z. Given a risk spectrum $\phi \in L_1([0,1])$ the spectral risk measure ρ_ϕ generated by ϕ is given by Acerbi [1]

$$
\rho_\phi(Z) = -\int_0^1 F_Z^{\leftarrow}(p)\phi(p)dp.
$$

Spectral risk measures have been used in various applications (portfolio selection Acerbi and Simonetti [2], insurance Cotter and Kevin [4]). The Conditional Value-at-Risk (CVaR) of level $0 < \varepsilon < 1$, denoted by $CVaR^\varepsilon$, is a particular spectral risk measure obtained taking $\phi(u) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon} 1_{0 \leq u < \varepsilon}$ (Acerbi [1]).

In what follows, we consider more generally a piecewise constant risk function $\phi(\cdot)$ with J jumps at $0 < p_1 < p_2 < \ldots < p_J < 1$. We set $\Delta\phi_k = \phi(p_k^+) - \phi(p_k^-) = \phi(p_k) - \phi(p_{k-1})$, for $k = 1, \ldots, J$, with $p_0 = 0$, and we assume that

$$
(i) \ \phi(\cdot) \text{ is positive}, \ (ii) \ \Delta\phi_k < 0, \ k = 1, \ldots, J, \ (iii) \int_0^1 \phi(u)du = 1.
$$

In this context, ρ_ϕ can be expressed as a linear combination of Conditional Value-at-Risk measures. With this choice of risk function ϕ, the spectral risk measure $\rho_\phi(Z)$ can be expressed as the optimal value of a linear program, Acerbi and Simonetti [2]:

$$(2) \qquad \rho_\phi(Z) = \inf_{w \in \mathbb{R}^J} \sum_{k=1}^{J} \Delta\phi_k[p_k w_k - \mathbb{E}\,[w_k - Z]^+] - \phi(1)\mathbb{E}[Z].$$

Using this formulation for ρ_ϕ, dynamic programming equations are written in [8] for risk-averse formulation (1). More precisely, problem (1) can be expressed as

$$(3) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\inf_{x_1, \, w_{2:T}} d_1^\top x_1 + \sum_{t=2}^{T} \theta_t c_1^\top w_t + \mathcal{Q}_2(x_1, \xi_{[1]}, z_1, w_2, \ldots, w_T), \\ &C_1 x_1 = \xi_1 - D_1 x_0, \ x_1 \geq 0, \ w_t \in \mathbb{R}^J, \ t = 2, \ldots, T, \end{aligned}$$

with $z_1 = 0$, vector $c_1 = \Delta\phi \circ p$, and where for $t = 2, \ldots, T$,

$$(4) \qquad \mathcal{Q}_t(x_{t-1}, \xi_{[t-1]}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}) = \mathbb{E}_{\xi_t | \xi_{[t-1]}} \left(\begin{array}{l} \inf_{x_t, z_t} f_t(z_t, w_t) + \mathcal{Q}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{[t]}, z_t, w_{t+1:T}) \\ z_t = z_{t-1} - d_t^\top x_t, \ C_t x_t = \xi_t - D_t x_{t-1}, \ x_t \geq 0 \end{array} \right)$$

with

$$(5) \qquad f_t(z_t, w_t) = -(\delta_{tT}\theta_1 + \phi(1)\theta_t)z_t - \theta_t \, \Delta\phi^\top(w_t - z_t e)^+,$$

and $\mathcal{Q}_{T+1} \equiv 0$. Function $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}$ represents at stage t a cost-to-go or recourse function which is risk-averse. As shown in the next section, it can be approximated by cutting planes by some polyhedral function $\mathfrak{Q}_{t+1}$. These approximate recourse functions are useful for defining a feasible approximate policy obtained solving

$$(6) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\inf_{x_t, z_t} f_t(z_t, w_t) + \mathfrak{Q}_{t+1}(x_t, \xi_{[t]}, z_t, w_{t+1:T}) \\ &C_t x_t = \xi_t - D_t x_{t-1}, \ x_t \geq 0, \ z_t = z_{t-1} - d_t^\top x_t, \end{aligned}$$

at stage $t = 2, \ldots, T$, knowing x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, first stage decision variables $w_{t:T}$, and ξ_t. First stage decision variables x_1 and $w_{2:T}$ are solution to (3) with $\mathcal{Q}_2$ replaced by the approximation $\mathfrak{Q}_2$.

3. Algorithmic issues

Dynamic programming equations (3)-(4) make possible the use of decomposition algorithms such as SDDP to obtain approximations of the corresponding recourse functions. When applied to DP equations (3)-(4), the convergence of this algorithm is proved in [8] under the following assumptions:

(A1) The supports of the distributions of $\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_T$, are discrete and finite.

(A2) Process (ξ_t) is interstage independent.

(A3) For $t = 1, \ldots, T$, for any feasible x_{t-1} and for any realization $\tilde{\xi}_t$ of ξ_t, the set

$$\{x_t \ : \ x_t \geq 0, \ C_t x_t = \tilde{\xi}_t - D_t x_{t-1}\}$$

is bounded and nonempty.

In the sequel, we assume that Assumptions (A1), (A2), and (A3) hold. In particular, we denote the realizations of ξ_t by $\xi_t^i, \ i = 1, \ldots, q_t < +\infty$ and set $p(t, i) = \mathbb{P}(\xi_t = \xi_t^i)$.

Since the supports of the distributions of the random vectors $\xi_2, \ldots, \xi_T$ are discrete and finite, optimization problem (1) is finite dimensional and the evolution of the uncertain parameters over the optimization period can be represented by a scenario tree having a finite number of scenarios that can happen in the future for $\xi_2, \ldots, \xi_T$. The root node of the scenario tree corresponds to the first time step with ξ_1 deterministic.

For a given stage t, to each node of the scenario tree corresponds an history $\xi_{[t]}$. The children nodes of a node at stage $t \geq 1$ are the nodes that can happen at stage $t + 1$ if we are at this node

at t. A sampled scenario $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_T)$ corresponds to a particular succession of nodes such that ξ_t is a possible value for the process at t and ξ_{t+1} is a child of ξ_t. A given node in the tree at stage t is identified with a scenario $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_t)$ going from the root node to this node.

In this context, the SDDP algorithm builds polyhedral lower bounding approximations $\mathfrak{Q}_t$ of $\mathcal{Q}_t$ for $t = 2, \ldots, T + 1$. Each iteration of this algorithm is made of a forward pass followed by a backward pass. Approximation $\mathfrak{Q}_t^i$ for $\mathcal{Q}_t$ available at the end of iteration i can be expressed as a maximum of cuts (hyperplanes lying below the recourse functions) built in the backward passes:

$$(7) \qquad \mathfrak{Q}_t^i(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}) = \max_{j=0,1,\ldots,iH} [-E_{t-1}^j x_{t-1} - Z_{t-1}^j z_{t-1} + \sum_{\tau=1}^{T-t+1} W_{t-1}^{j,\tau} w_{t+\tau-1} + e_{t-1}^j],$$

knowing that the algorithm starts taking for $\mathfrak{Q}_t^0$ a known lower bounding affine approximation of $\mathcal{Q}_t$ while $\mathfrak{Q}_{T+1}^i \equiv 0$. In the above expression, we have assumed that H cuts are built at each iteration. If the algorithm runs for K iterations, we end up with approximate recourse functions $\mathfrak{Q}_t = \mathfrak{Q}_t^K$, $t = 2, \ldots, T + 1$.

At iteration i, cuts for $\mathcal{Q}_t$, $t = 2, \ldots, T$, are built at some points $x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i$, $k = (i-1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$, computed in the forward pass replacing the recourse functions $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}$ by $\mathfrak{Q}_{t+1}^{i-1}$ (note that since variables $w_{2:T}$ are first stage decision variables, they just depend on the iteration).

More precisely, the cuts are computed for time step $T + 1$ down to time step 2. For time step $T + 1$, since $\mathfrak{Q}_{T+1}^i = \mathcal{Q}_{T+1} = 0$, the cuts for $\mathcal{Q}_{T+1}$ are obtained taking null vectors for E_T^k, Z_T^k, $W_T^{k,\tau}$, e_T^k for $k = (i-1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$. For $t = 2, \ldots, T$, using lower bounding approximation $\mathfrak{Q}_{t+1}^i$ of $\mathcal{Q}_{t+1}$, we can bound from below $\mathcal{Q}_t(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T})$ by $\mathbb{E}_{\xi_t}[Q_t^i(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t)]$ with $Q_t^i(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t)$ given as the optimal value of the following linear program:

$$(8) \qquad \begin{aligned} &\inf_{x_t, z_t, v_t, \tilde{\theta}_t} \quad -(\delta_{tT}\theta_1 + \phi(1)\theta_t)z_t - \theta_t \Delta\phi^\top v_t + \tilde{\theta}_t \\ &v_t \geq 0, \ v_t \geq w_t - z_t e, \ x_t \geq 0, \\ &z_t + d_t^\top x_t = z_{t-1} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (a) \\ &C_t x_t = \xi_t - D_t x_{t-1} \qquad\qquad\qquad\qquad (b) \\ &\overrightarrow{E}_t^i x_t + \overrightarrow{Z}_t^i z_t + \tilde{\theta}_t e \geq \sum_{\tau=1}^{T-t} \overrightarrow{W}_t^{i,\tau} w_{t+\tau} + \overrightarrow{e}_t^i \qquad (c) \end{aligned}$$

where $\overrightarrow{E}_t^i$ (resp. $\overrightarrow{Z}_t^i$, $\overrightarrow{W}_t^{i,\tau}$, and $\overrightarrow{e}_t^i$) is the matrix whose $(j+1)$th line is E_t^j (resp. Z_t^j, $W_t^{j,\tau}$, and e_t^j) for $j = 0, \ldots, iH$. In the backward pass of iteration i, the above problem is solved with $(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t)$ respectively replaced by $(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j)$ for $k = (i-1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$ and $j = 1, \ldots, q_t$. Let $\sigma_t^{k,j}, \tilde{\sigma}_t^{k,j}, \mu_t^{k,j}, \pi_t^{k,j}$, and $\rho_t^{k,j}$, be the (row vectors) optimal Lagrange multipliers respectively for the constraints $v_t \geq w_t^i - z_t e$, $v_t \geq 0$, (8)-(a), (8)-(b), and (8)-(c) for the problem defining $Q_t^i(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j)$ for $k = (i-1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$ and $j = 1, \ldots, q_t$. The following proposition provides the cuts computed for $\mathcal{Q}_t$, $t = 2, \ldots, T$, at iteration i:

Proposition 3.1. *[Optimality cuts] Let $\mathcal{Q}_t, t = 2, \ldots, T + 1$, be the risk-averse recourse functions given by (4). In the backward pass of iteration i of the SDDP algorithm, the following cuts are computed for these recourse functions. For $t = T + 1$, E_{t-1}^k, Z_{t-1}^k, $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$, and e_{t-1}^k are null for $k = (i-1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$. For $t = 2, \ldots, T$ and $k = (i-1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$, E_{t-1}^k is given by $\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\pi_t^{k,j} D_t$, and*

$$(9) \qquad Z_{t-1}^k = -\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\mu_t^{k,j}, \ \ W_{t-1}^{k,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\sigma_t^{k,j},$$

$$(10) \qquad W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\rho_t^{k,j} \overrightarrow{W}_t^{i,\tau-1}, \ \tau = 2, \ldots, T - t + 1.$$

Further, e_{t-1}^k is given by

$$\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j) \left[Q_t^i(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j) - \mu_t^{k,j} z_{t-1}^k - \sigma_t^{k,j} w_t^i - \sum_{\tau=1}^{T-t} \rho_t^{k,j} \overrightarrow{W}_t^{i,\tau} w_{t+\tau}^i + \pi_t^{k,j} D_t x_{t-1}^k \right].$$

Proof. Since a dual solution of the problem defining $Q_t^i(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j)$ is a subgradient of the value function for problem (8), we obtain that $Q_t^i(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t^j)$ is bounded from below by

$$Q_t^i(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j) + \mu_t^{k,j}(z_{t-1} - z_{t-1}^k) + \sigma_t^{k,j}(w_t - w_t^i)$$
$$+ \sum_{\tau=2}^{T-t+1} \rho_t^{k,j} \overrightarrow{W}_t^{i,\tau-1}(w_{t+\tau-1} - w_{t+\tau-1}^i) - \pi_t^{k,j} D_t(x_{t-1} - x_{t-1}^k).$$

Using the above lower bound and the fact that $Q_t(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T})$ is bounded from below by $\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j) Q_t^i(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t^j)$, we obtain the announced cuts. $\square$

The stopping criterion is discussed in [22] for a non-risk-averse model. The definition of a sound stopping criterion for the risk-averse model from [22] (based on a nested formulation of the problem defined in terms of conditional risk mappings) is a more delicate issue and still open for discussion. However, since problem (1) can be expressed as a non-risk-averse problem with modified objective, variables, and constraints, in our risk-averse context the stopping criterion is a simple adaptation of the stopping criterion for the non-risk-averse case.

More specifically, in the backward pass of iteration i, for the first time step, first stage problem (3) is solved replacing recourse function $\mathcal{Q}_2$ by $\mathfrak{Q}_2^i \leq \mathcal{Q}_2$. As a result, the optimal value of this problem gives a lower bound $z_{\inf}$ on the optimal value of (1).

In the forward pass of iteration i, we can compute the total cost $\mathcal{C}_k$ on each scenario $k = (i - 1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$:

$$(11) \qquad \mathcal{C}_k = d_1^\top x_1^k + \sum_{t=2}^{T} \theta_t c_1^\top w_t^i + \sum_{t=2}^{T} f_t(z_t^k, w_t^i).$$

If these H scenarios were representing all possible evolutions of $(\xi_1, \ldots, \xi_T)$, then

$$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \frac{1}{H} \sum_{k=(i-1)H+1}^{iH} \mathcal{C}_k$$

would be an upper bound on the optimal value of (1) (recall that the approximate policy is feasible and that the objective function of (1) can be written as an expectation). Since we only have a sample of all the possible scenarios, $\bar{\mathcal{C}}$ is an estimation of an upper bound on this optimal value. Introducing the empirical standard deviation $\bar{\sigma}$ of the sample $(\mathcal{C}_1, \ldots, \mathcal{C}_H)$:

$$\bar{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{H-1} \sum_{k=(i-1)H+1}^{iH} (\bar{\mathcal{C}} - \mathcal{C}_k)^2},$$

we can compute the $(1 - \alpha)$-confidence upper bound

$$(12) \qquad \bar{\mathcal{C}} + t_{1-\alpha,H-1} \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{H}}$$

on the approximate policy mean value where $t_{1-\alpha,H-1}$ is the $(1 - \alpha)$-quantile of the Student's t-distribution with $H - 1$ degrees of freedom. Since the optimal value of (1) is less than or equal to the approximate policy mean value, (12) gives an upper bound for the optimal value of (1) with confidence at least $1 - \alpha$. Consequently, we can stop the algorithm when $\bar{\mathcal{C}} + t_{1-\alpha,H-1} \frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{H}} - z_{\inf} \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\varepsilon > 0$.

Using the previous developments, the SDDP algorithm for solving (1) can be formulated as in Figure 1.

We now give for some particular choices of the first stage variables $w_{2:T}^1$, the exact expressions (independent of the sampled scenarios) of Z_{t-1}^k and $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$ for every $t = 2,\ldots,T$, $k = 1,\ldots,H$, and $\tau = 1,\ldots,T-t+1$. Though the first stage feasible set for (3) is not bounded, it can be easily shown that the optimal values of $w_{2:T}$ are bounded (see [8] for instance). As a result, well-chosen box constraints on $w_t, t = 2,\ldots,T$ can be added (at the first stage, and that do not modify the optimal value of (3)) without changing the cut calculations (since these latter are performed for stages $t = 2,\ldots,T$, where w_t are state variables).

Let us define for $t = 1,\ldots,T$, $x^t = (x_1,\ldots,x_t)$, $\xi^t = (\xi_1,\ldots,\xi_t)$, and let us introduce the set χ^t of admissible decisions up to time step t:

$$\chi^t = \{x^t : \exists \tilde{\xi}^t \text{ realization of } \xi^t \; : \; x_\tau \geq 0 \text{ and } C_\tau x_\tau = \tilde{\xi}_\tau - D_\tau x_{\tau-1}, \tau = 1,\ldots,t\}.$$

Since (A3) holds, the sets χ^t are compact and since $g^t(x^t) = \sum_{\tau=2}^t d_\tau^\top x_\tau$ is continuous, we can introduce the pairs $(C_t^u, C_t^\ell) \in \mathbb{R}^2$ defined by

$$C_t^u = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \max \; g^t(x^t) \\ x^t \in \chi^t, \end{array} \right. \qquad C_t^\ell = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \min \; g^t(x^t) \\ x^t \in \chi^t. \end{array} \right.$$

The objective of the forward pass is to build states where cuts are computed in the backward pass. At the first iteration, instead of building these states using the approximate recourse functions $\mathfrak{Q}_t^0$, we can choose arbitrary feasible states $x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_t^1, t = 2,\ldots,T$, (which is a simple task since relatively complete recourse holds). With this variant of the first iteration, we have iH cuts for $\mathfrak{Q}_t^i$ at the end of iteration i. If we choose first stage variables $w_{2:T}^1$ such that (i) $w_t^1 > -C_t^\ell e$ for $t = 2,\ldots,T$ (resp. such that (ii) $w_t^1 < -C_t^u e$ for $t = 2,\ldots,T$) then Z_{t-1}^k and $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$ for $k = 1,\ldots,H$, can be computed using Proposition 3.2-(i) (resp. Proposition 3.2-(ii)) which follows. For instance, if the costs are positive then item (i) is fulfilled with $w_t^1 = 0$ and item (ii) taking for each component of w_t^1 the opposite of a strict upper bound on the worst cost.

Proposition 3.2. *[Cuts calculation at the first iteration] Let us consider the risk-averse recourse functions $\mathcal{Q}_t$ given by (4). Valid cuts for $\mathcal{Q}_t$ are given by Proposition 3.1. Moreover, in the following two cases, we have closed-form expressions for Z_{t-1}^k and $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$ (independent of the sampled scenarios):*
(i) If for $t = 2,\ldots,T$, $w_t^1 > -C_t^\ell e$, then for $t = 2,\ldots,T$, $\mathcal{P}(t)$ holds where

$$\mathcal{P}(t) : \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall k = 1,\ldots,H, Z_{t-1}^k = \theta_1 + \phi(0)\sum_{\ell=t}^T \theta_\ell, \\ \forall k = 1,\ldots,H, W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} = -\theta_{t+\tau-1}\Delta\phi^\top, \; \tau = 1,\ldots,T-t+1. \end{array} \right.$$

(ii) If for $t = 2,\ldots,T$, $w_t^1 < -C_t^u e$, then for $t = 2,\ldots,T$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(t)$ holds where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(t) : \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \forall k = 1,\ldots,H, Z_{t-1}^k = \theta_1 + \phi(1)\sum_{\ell=t}^T \theta_\ell, \\ \forall k = 1,\ldots,H, W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} = 0, \; \tau = 1,\ldots,T-t+1. \end{array} \right.$$

Proof. Let us fix $t \in \{2,\ldots,T\}$, $k \in \{1,\ldots,H\}$, and $j \in \{1,\ldots,q_t\}$. We denote by $x_t, z_t, v_t, \tilde{\theta}_t$ an optimal solution to the problem defining $Q_t^1(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^1, \xi_t^j)$, i.e., problem (8) written for $i = 1$ and with $(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t)$ replaced by $(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j)$ (the dependence of the solution with respect to k, j is suppressed to alleviate notation).

Step 0: **INITIALIZATION.** Set $i = 1$ (iteration number) and select confidence levels $\alpha \in (1/2, 1)$ and $\varepsilon > 0$. Take null values for $E_{t-1}^0, Z_{t-1}^0, W_{t-1}^{0,\tau}, t = 2, \ldots, T + 1$. Take $e_T^0 = 0$ and for e_{t-1}^0 a lower bound on $\mathcal{Q}_t$ for $t = 2, \ldots, T$. Go to Step 1.

Step 1: **FORWARD PASS.**
Sample H scenarios $(\xi_1, \xi_2^k, \ldots, \xi_T^k), k = (i - 1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$.
Ct=0, Ct_Sq=0.
Solve the first stage problem

$$\inf_{x_1, w_{2:T}} d_1^\top x_1 + \sum_{t=2}^{T} \theta_t c_1^\top w_t + \mathfrak{Q}_2^{i-1}(x_1, z_1, w_2, \ldots, w_T),$$
$$C_1 x_1 = \xi_1 - D_1 x_0, \ x_1 \geq 0, \ w_t \in \mathbb{R}^J, \ t = 2, \ldots, T,$$

and store an optimal solution $(x_1^*, w_{2:T}^i)$.
For $k = (i - 1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$,
    Set $x_1^k = x_1^*$.
  For $t = 2, \ldots, T$,
    Solve
$$\inf_{x_t, z_t} f_t(z_t, w_t^i) + \mathfrak{Q}_{t+1}^{i-1}(x_t, z_t, w_{t+1:T}^i)$$
$$C_t x_t = \xi_t^k - D_t x_{t-1}^k, \ x_t \geq 0, \ z_t = z_{t-1}^k - d_t^\top x_t,$$

    and store an optimal solution (x_t^k, z_t^k).
  End For
  Compute $\mathcal{C}_k$ given by (11),
  Ct=Ct+$\mathcal{C}_k$, Ct_Sq=Ct_Sq+$\mathcal{C}_k^2$.
End For
$\bar{\mathcal{C}} = \frac{\text{Ct}}{H}$, $\bar{\sigma} = \sqrt{\frac{1}{H-1}(\text{Ct\_Sq} - H\bar{\mathcal{C}}^2)}$, $z_{\sup} = \bar{\mathcal{C}} + t_{1-\alpha, H-1}\frac{\bar{\sigma}}{\sqrt{H}}$. Go to Step 2.

Step 2: **BACKWARD PASS.**
For $t = T + 1$ down to 2,
  For $k = (i - 1)H + 1, \ldots, iH$,
    If $(t = T + 1)$ then set $E_{t-1}^k, Z_{t-1}^k, W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$, and e_{t-1}^k to 0.
    Else
      For $j = 1, \ldots, q_t$,
      Compute $Q_t^i(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j)$, i.e., solve (8) replacing
      $(x_{t-1}, z_{t-1}, w_{t:T}, \xi_t)$ by $(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^i, \xi_t^j)$ and
      store a dual solution.
      End For
      Build a cut for $\mathcal{Q}_t$, i.e., compute $E_{t-1}^k, Z_{t-1}^k, W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$, and e_{t-1}^k
      using the formulas from Proposition 3.1.
    End If
  End For
End For
Set $z_{\inf}$ to the optimal value of the first stage problem.
Go to Step 3.

Step 3: **STOPPING RULE.**
If $z_{\sup} - z_{\inf} \leq \varepsilon$ then stop.
Else $i \leftarrow i + 1$ and go to Step 1. **End If**

FIGURE 1. SDDP algorithm with relatively complete recourse for risk-averse inter-stage independent stochastic linear program (1).

The KKT conditions for this problem imply

$$(13) \qquad -\delta_{tT}\theta_1 - \phi(1)\theta_t - \mu_t^{k,j} - \sigma_t^{k,j}e - \rho_t^{k,j}\overrightarrow{Z}_t^1 = 0,$$

$$(14) \qquad -\theta_t\Delta\phi^\top - \tilde{\sigma}_t^{k,j} - \sigma_t^{k,j} = 0,$$

$$(15) \qquad \sigma_t^{k,j} \circ (-z_te + w_t^1 - v_t)^\top = 0,$$

$$(16) \qquad \tilde{\sigma}_t^{k,j} \circ v_t^\top = 0,$$

where for $t = T$ we have set $\rho_t^{k,j} = 0$. Next, since z_t can be written as $z_t = -g^t(x^t)$ for some $x^t \in \chi^t$, in case (i), we have $z_te \leq -C_t^\ell e < w_t^1$. Further $v_t = \max(0, w_t^1 - z_te) = w_t^1 - z_te > 0$. Using (14) and (16) we then get

$$(17) \qquad \tilde{\sigma}_t^{k,j} = 0 \text{ and } \sigma_t^{k,j} = -\theta_t\Delta\phi^\top.$$

Let us now first show (i) by backward induction on t. Plugging the value of $\sigma_T^{k,j}$ given in (17) into (13) we obtain

$$\mu_T^{k,j} = -\theta_1 - \phi(1)\theta_T + \theta_T e^\top\Delta\phi = -\theta_1 + \theta_T(-\phi(1) + \sum_{\ell=1}^J[\phi(p_\ell) - \phi(p_{\ell-1})]) = -\theta_1 - \theta_T\phi(0).$$

Using the above relation and (9) yields $Z_{T-1}^k = -\sum_{j=1}^{q_T} p(T,j)\mu_T^{k,j} = \theta_T\phi(0) + \theta_1$. Further, using once again (9), we obtain

$$(18) \qquad W_{T-1}^{k,1} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_T} p(T,j)\sigma_T^{k,j} = -\sum_{j=1}^{q_T} p(T,j)\theta_T\Delta\phi^\top = -\theta_T\Delta\phi^\top.$$

This shows $\mathcal{P}(T)$. Let us now assume that $\mathcal{P}(t+1)$ holds for some $t \in \{2, \ldots, T-1\}$ and let us show that $\mathcal{P}(t)$ holds. First notice that (18) still holds with T substituted with t, i.e., $W_{t-1}^{k,1} = -\theta_t\Delta\phi^\top$. Further, for $\tau = 2, \ldots, T-t+1$,

$$\begin{aligned} W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} &= \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\rho_t^{k,j}\overrightarrow{W}_t^{1,\tau-1}, & \text{from (10),} \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\rho_t^{k,j}\theta_{t+\tau-1}e\Delta\phi^\top, & \text{using } \mathcal{P}(t+1), \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\theta_{t+\tau-1}\Delta\phi^\top = -\theta_{t+\tau-1}\Delta\phi^\top, & \text{since } \rho_t^{k,j}e = 1. \end{aligned}$$

Also

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{t-1}^k &= -\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\mu_t^{k,j}, & \text{from (9),} \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)(-\phi(1)\theta_t + \theta_t\Delta\phi^\top e - \rho_t^{k,j}\overrightarrow{Z}_t^1), & \text{using (13) and (17),} \\ &= -\sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)(-\phi(0)\theta_t - \rho_t^{k,j}\overrightarrow{Z}_t^1), & \text{using the definition of } \Delta\phi, \\ &= \phi(0)\theta_t + \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)\rho_t^{k,j}(\theta_1 + \phi(0)\sum_{\ell=t+1}^T \theta_\ell)e, & \text{using } \mathcal{P}(t+1), \\ &= \theta_1 + \phi(0)\sum_{\ell=t}^T \theta_\ell & \text{since } \rho_t^{k,j}e = 1. \end{aligned}$$

We have thus shown $\mathcal{P}(t)$ which achieves the proof of (i).

Let us now assume that $w_t^1 < -C_t^u e$ for $t = 2, \ldots, T$ and let us show (ii). Let us fix $t \in \{2, \ldots, T\}$, $k \in \{1, \ldots, H\}$, and $j \in \{1, \ldots, q_t\}$. As before, we denote by $x_t, z_t, v_t, \tilde{\theta}_t$ an optimal solution to the problem defining $Q_t^1(x_{t-1}^k, z_{t-1}^k, w_{t:T}^1, \xi_t^j)$. In this case, $z_te \geq -C_t^u e > w_t^1$ and $v_t = \max(0, w_t^1 - z_te) = 0$. Using (14) and (15), we see that

$$(19) \qquad \tilde{\sigma}_t^{k,j} = -\theta_t\Delta\phi^\top \text{ and } \sigma_t^{k,j} = 0.$$

Using (9), we get $W_{t-1}^{k,1} = 0$. We show (ii) by backward induction. For $t = T$, plugging the value of $\sigma_T^{k,j}$ into (13) gives $\mu_T^{k,j} = -\theta_1 - \phi(1)\theta_T$, which, together with (9), gives $Z_{T-1}^k = \theta_1 + \phi(1)\theta_T$. We have already proved that $W_{T-1}^{k,1} = 0$ and thus $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(T)$ holds. Let us now assume that $\mathcal{P}(t+1)$

holds for some $t \in \{2, \ldots, T-1\}$ and let us show that $\mathcal{P}(t)$ holds. Since $\overrightarrow{W}_t^{1,\tau-1} = 0$, we obtain $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} = \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j) \rho_t^{k,j} \overrightarrow{W}_t^{1,\tau-1} = 0$ for $\tau = 2, \ldots, T-t+1$. Plugging $\sigma_t^{k,j} = 0$ into (13) and using (9) gives

$$
\begin{aligned}
Z_{t-1}^k &= \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)(\phi(1)\theta_t + \rho_t^{k,j} \overrightarrow{Z}_t^1), \\
&= \sum_{j=1}^{q_t} p(t,j)(\theta_1 + \phi(1) \sum_{\ell=t}^T \theta_\ell), \quad \text{using } \tilde{\mathcal{P}}(t+1) \text{ and } \rho_t^{k,j} e = 1, \\
&= \theta_1 + \phi(1) \sum_{\ell=t}^T \theta_\ell.
\end{aligned}
$$

This shows $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(t)$ and achieves the proof of (ii). $\square$

Proposition 3.2 can be used as a debugging tool to check the implementation of SDDP for risk-averse problem (1). More precisely, we can check that in cases (i) and (ii), implementing the formulas for Z_{t-1}^k and $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$ given in Proposition 3.1 will give the same results as implementing the formulas from Proposition 3.2.

At stage t, if instead of ρ_ϕ in (1) we use $CVaR^{\varepsilon_t}$, problem (1) becomes

$$
\begin{aligned}
(20) \quad & \inf_{x_1, \ldots, x_T} d_1^\top x_1 + \theta_1 \mathbb{E}[\sum_{t=2}^T d_t^\top x_t] + \sum_{t=2}^T \theta_t CVaR^{\varepsilon_t}(-\sum_{k=2}^t d_k^\top x_k) \\
& C_t x_t = \xi_t - D_t x_{t-1}, \; x_t \geq 0, \; x_t \text{ is } \mathcal{F}_t\text{-measurable}, \; t = 1, \ldots, T.
\end{aligned}
$$

For this model, we obtain a result analogous to Proposition 3.2:

Proposition 3.3. *Let us consider the risk-averse recourse functions $\mathcal{Q}_t$ for model* (20) *and their approximations $\mathfrak{Q}_t^i$ of form* (7), *obtained applying SDDP to the corresponding DP equations. In the following two cases, we obtain closed-form expressions for Z_{t-1}^k and $W_{t-1}^{k,\tau}$ (independent of the sampled scenarios):*
  (i) If for $t = 2, \ldots, T$, $w_t^1 > -C_t^\ell$, then for $t = 2, \ldots, T$, $\mathcal{P}(t)$ holds where

$$
\mathcal{P}(t) : \begin{cases} \forall k = 1, \ldots, H, Z_{t-1}^k = \theta_1 + \sum_{\ell=t}^T \frac{\theta_\ell}{\varepsilon_\ell}, \\ \forall k = 1, \ldots, H, W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} = \frac{\theta_{t+\tau-1}}{\varepsilon_{t+\tau-1}}, \; \tau = 1, \ldots, T-t+1. \end{cases}
$$

  (ii) If for $t = 2, \ldots, T$, $w_t^1 < -C_t^u$, then for $t = 2, \ldots, T$, $\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(t)$ holds where

$$
\tilde{\mathcal{P}}(t) : \; \forall k = 1, \ldots, H, Z_{t-1}^k = \theta_1, \; \text{and } W_{t-1}^{k,\tau} = 0, \; \tau = 1, \ldots, T-t+1.
$$

Proof. The proof is similar to the proof of Proposition 3.2. $\square$

Remark 3.4. *In the particular case when the CVaR levels $\varepsilon_t = \varepsilon \in (0,1)$ are the same at each time step, Proposition 3.3 is a particular case of Proposition 3.2 with $\phi(1) = 0, \phi(0) = \frac{1}{\varepsilon}$, and $\Delta \phi = -1/\varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$.*

Numerical simulations for a real-life application modeled as (20) are reported in [7].

When Assumption (A1) does not hold, as stated in [22], a feasible nonanticipative policy can still be proposed using approximate recourse functions $\mathfrak{Q}_t$ obtained applying SDDP on a *Sample Average Approximation* (SAA) of the original problem (1).

References

[1] C. Acerbi. Spectral measures of risk: a coherent representation of subjective risk aversion. *J. of Banking and Finance*, 7:1505–1518, 2002.

[2] C. Acerbi and P. Simonetti. Portfolio optimization with spectral measures of risk. *Abaxbank internal report.* Available at http://www.gloriamundi.org/, 2002.

[3] M. Bertocchi, G. Consigli, and M. A. H. Dempster, editors. *Stochastic Optimization Methods in Finance and Energy.* Springer, New York, 2011.

[4] J. Cotter and K. Dowd. Extreme spectral risk measures: An application to futures clearinghouse variation margin requirements. *Journal of Banking and Finance*, 30:3469–3485, 2006.

[5] J. Dupačová, G. Consigli, and S. W. Wallace. Scenarios for multistage stochastic programs. *Annals of Operations Research*, 100:25–53, 2000.

[6] A. Eichhorn and W. Römisch. Polyhedral risk measures in stochastic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 16:69–95, 2005.

[7] V. Guigues. SDDP for some interstage dependent risk-averse problems and application to hydro-thermal planning. *Submitted to Computational Optimization and Applications*, 2011.

[8] V. Guigues and W. Römisch. Sampling-based decomposition methods for multistage stochastic programs based on extended polyhedral risk measures. *SIAM Journal on Optimization, to appear*.

[9] V. Guigues and C. Sagastizábal. The value of rolling horizon policies for risk-averse hydro-thermal planning. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 217:129–140, 2012.

[10] H. Heitsch and W. Römisch. Scenario tree modeling for multistage stochastic programs. *Mathematical Programming*, 118:371–406, 2009.

[11] H. Heitsch, W. Römisch, and C. Strugarek. Stability of multistage stochastic programs. *SIAM Journal on Optimization*, 17:511–525, 2006.

[12] T. Pennanen. Epi-convergent discretizations of multistage stochastic programs via integration quadratures. *Mathematical Programming*, 116:461–479, 2009.

[13] M.V.F. Pereira and L.M.V.G Pinto. Multi-stage stochastic optimization applied to energy planning. *Mathematical Programming*, 52:359–375, 1991.

[14] G. Ch. Pflug. On distortion functionals. *Statistics and Decisions*, 24:45–60, 2006.

[15] G. Ch. Pflug and W. Römisch. *Modeling, Measuring, and Managing Risk*. World Scientific, Singapore, 2007.

[16] A. B. Philpott and Z. Guan. On the convergence of stochastic dual dynamic programming and related methods. *Operations Research Letters*, 36:450–455, 2008.

[17] W.B. Powell. *Approximate Dynamic Programming - Solving the curses of dimensionality*. Wiley, 2nd edition, Hoboken, New Jersey, 2011.

[18] W. Römisch. Scenario generation. In J. J. Cochran, editor, *Encyclopedia of Operations Research and Management Science*. Wiley, 2010.

[19] A. Ruszczyński. Decomposition methods. In *Stochastic Programming*, Handbooks in Operations Research and Management Science, chapter 3, pages 141–211. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 2003.

[20] S. Sen and Zhihong Zhou. Multistage stochastic decomposition: A bridge between stochastic programming and approximate dynamic programming. *SIAM Journal on Optimization, to appear*.

[21] A. Shapiro. Inference of statistical bounds for multistage stochastic programming problems. *Mathematical Methods of Operations Research*, 58:57–68, 2003.

[22] A. Shapiro. Analysis of stochastic dual dynamic programming method. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 209:63–72, 2011.

VINCENT GUIGUES: IMPA, INSTITUTO DE MATEMÁTICA PURA E APLICADA, 110 ESTRADA DONA CASTORINA, JARDIM BOTANICO, RIO DE JANEIRO, BRAZIL, `vguigues@impa.br` AND WERNER RÖMISCH: HUMBOLDT-UNIVERSITY BERLIN, INSTITUTE OF MATHEMATICS, 10099 BERLIN, GERMANY, `romisch@math.hu-berlin.de`