

# Incentivizing Secure Software Development: The Role of Liability (Waiver) and Audit

Ziyuan Huang, Gergely Biczók, Mingyan Liu \*

December 2023

## Abstract

Misaligned incentives in secure software development have long been the focus of research in the economics of security. Product liability, a powerful legal framework in other industries, has been largely ineffective for software products until recent times. However, the rapid regulatory responses to recent global cyberattacks by both the United States and the European Union, together with the (relative) success of the General Data Protection Regulation in defining both duty and standard of care for software vendors, may just enable regulators to use liability to re-align incentives for the benefit of the digital society. Specifically, the recently proposed United States National Cybersecurity Strategy shifts responsibility for cyber incidents back to software vendors. In doing so, the strategy also puts forward the concept of the liability waiver: if a software company voluntarily undergoes and passes an IT security audit, its liability is waived.

In this paper, we analyze this audit scenario from the aspect of the software vendor. We propose a mechanism where a software vendor should first undergo a repeated auditing process in each stage of which the vendor decides whether to quit early or stay with additional security investment. We show that the optimal strategy for an opt-in vendor is to never quit; and exert cumulative investments in either “one-and-done” or “incremental” manner. We relate the audit mechanism to a liability waiver insurance policy and revealed its effect on reshaping the vendor’s risk perception. We also discuss influence of audit quality on the vendor’s incentives and pinpoint that a desirable audit rule should be highly accurate and less strict.

## 1 Introduction

Making software products more secure is arguably one of the most important elements in securing our overall computer and information network ecosystem. It has also been one of the most challenging due in no small part to a sequence of misaligned incentives. For one, security features in a software product can be hard to monetize (even when they are noticeable), and thus, spending resources to improve the security in software production may not lead to immediate or substantial returns on investment. This is exacerbated by the fact that software markets usually reward first-movers that release new functional features as quickly as possible, resulting in little to no security testing; hence the mantra: “we’ll ship it on Tuesday and get it right by version 3” [1]. Secondly, while vulnerabilities in software products can lead to substantial costs to a vendor (incurred in developing patches, for instance), there is significant uncertainty on whether certain costs will materialize because a large number of vulnerabilities are never discovered or publicly disclosed, and even among those discovered, a majority of them are never exploited. Rather than fixing the vulnerabilities, they are often rolled up in the development of newer versions of the software. This means there is less motivation on the vendor’s part to try to minimize vulnerabilities a priori. Perhaps most importantly, a software vendor’s exposure to potential security risk is limited by the fact that the vast majority of the

---

\*Ziyuan Huang and Mingyan Liu are with the Electrical and Computer Engineering Department, University of Michigan, 1301 Beal Avenue, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA; e-mail: {ziyuanh, mingyan}@umich.edu; Gergely Biczók is with the CrySyS Lab, Department of Networked Systems and Services, Budapest University of Technology and Economics, 1111 Budapest, Műegyetem rkp. 3, Hungary; e-mail: biczok@crysys.hu.

cost incurred in a security incident is borne by the consumer/user/buyer of the software, not the producer, instantiating a lax approach to risk mitigation owing to moral hazard [1].

Modern liability frameworks, emerging from early 20th-century case law, aim at establishing legal obligations for individuals and organizations to assume responsibility for their actions, particularly when such actions result in harm or damage to others. Liability encompasses various legal principles and frameworks that determine when (duty of care) and to what extent (standard of care) one party may be held accountable for the consequences of their behavior. Historically, software companies frequently avoided product liability using a combination of legal gray zones and disclaimers, capitalizing on the broad interpretation of acceptable user risk. However, the General European Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) leveled the playing field by defining both duty and standard of care, leading to substantial fines for mishandling personal data and prompting a reassessment of cybersecurity investments. In addition, recent global cyberattacks triggered rapid regulatory responses in the US and the EU, mandating secure software development, compliance, and supply chain security to overcome information asymmetry and lack of expertise for end-users, re-assigning liability back to software vendors. At the same time, the insurance sector is grappling with the insurability of cyber risks, particularly in critical infrastructure, following severe cybersecurity incidents and ongoing armed conflicts. The insurance industry is scrambling to establish baseline scenarios for industrial control systems, as the potential for systemic cyber risks and catastrophic losses may shift responsibility to governments as insurers of last resort. This motivated a series of national security policy directives that aim to allow liability claims against insecure software products produced by software vendors. Specifically, the United States National Cybersecurity Strategy, released in April 2023, has introduced a liability waiver mechanism tied to government-mandated security audits, serving as a financial incentive for software companies to improve their product security practices.

In this work, we examine what happens if a (government) agency offers optional (and free) product security audit and, for those who pass the audit, waives their liability associated with software security. This is formulated as a discrete-time optimal stopping problem, where a software vendor can choose not to be audited and bear any potential liability that may occur or to be audited. The audit is assumed to be informative but not perfect, with some randomness to it, i.e., the outcome contains both false positive and false negative results. Once a vendor opts to be audited, then it has to either pass the audit at some time or it can quit the market entirely; in other words, a product that has failed an audit is not allowed to release to the market. The decisions facing the vendor, beyond the initial choice of whether to enter into the audit process at all, include how much security investment (or effort) to make initially in order to pass the audit and how much more to make subsequently, following each failed audit, and when is a good time to quit if at all.

Our goal is to understand: (1) from the vendor’s perspective, under what condition should it subject itself to the audit, and what is the optimal sequence of security investment; (2) from the auditor’s perspective, how to maximally incentivize vendors to opt in.

Our main findings are as follows:

- Our results show that under an optimal policy for the vendor, once it opts into the audit mechanism, it will never quit; it will continue to either improve or hope that it will eventually pass the audit.
- The optimal policy is in general non-unique, but enjoy some very interesting properties. An optimal policy falls into two broad categories: the “one-and-done” types and the “incremental” types.

Under the first type, the vendor invests in one installment at the beginning of the process an amount from a well defined optimal set, prior to the initial audit, and then waits to pass the audit, repeating over and over till it succeeds. For some problem instances, this initial investment could be quite low (in which case the vendor simply waits for luck to carry it through the audit).

Under the second type, the vendor invests multiple times, with each amount from the same optimal set but the timing of these investments can be arbitrary.

- Under either type of strategy, given the probabilistic nature of the audit outcome, an audit could clear a product with very low security investment for market entry, which is undesirable from a social welfare standpoint. The auditor can mitigate this by making the audit more accurate (lower noise) but easier (lower threshold for passing).

- We show how this audit mechanism can be related to a liability waiver insurance policy, and how it reshapes the vendor’s risk perception.
- We show how the audit quality (accuracy and hardness) influences the vendor’s participation incentive, and how to adjust these parameters to increase participation.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. In Section 2 we review related literature. Section 3 presents an optimal stopping time model to capture the decision making process of a vendor and some key properties of this problem. Section 4 fully characterizes the vendor’s optimal strategy if it decides to participate in the audit mechanism. Section 5 examines how the audit parameters influences the participation incentive of a vendor. Section 6 concludes the paper and presents a number of extensions and future directions.

## 2 Background and Related Work

### 2.1 Software liability

To understand the state of affairs in the ever-changing software liability regulation, we provide a brief overview. The legal interpretation of liability already appeared in Roman Law, but the modern *framework of product liability* first emerged in [2] in relation to a faulty automobile wheel causing injuries to the driver. The ruling cited the reasonable basis for the automobile manufacturer to know product risks and to make extra effort to ensure the safety of anyone coming into contact with the car, even if the wheel was produced by another company. The next milestone case [3] established *duty of care* with respect to a person consuming spoiled ginger beer produced by a bottler and contracting severe gastroenteritis. The bottler had to pay restitution owing to his negligence. Finally, *standard of care* was put forward in [4] in a complicated multi-party liability case among the US government, a railroad company, and two boating companies, where the mooring lines of a barge carrying flour belonging to the government were disconnected by another barge, causing damage to other ships and eventually sinking. Liability was shared among the companies; specifically, the boating company operating the barge that cut the lines failed to look after the safety and security of other barges contacted. Interestingly, the judge based his ruling on *inadequate risk management*: the burden of precautions taken by the company was smaller than the likelihood, and the impact of the incident multiplied together.

Although there were a number of liability cases against software companies in the last decades, companies often managed to escape fines using nuances of contract law, and limitations of liability and disclaimers in end-user license agreements (EULA). In fact, the flexible interpretation of acceptable risk taken by the user of a software product made this a gray area. This has changed dramatically with the emergence of the European General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) and its penalty system for organizations mismanaging the personal data of their users. The GDPR has defined both the duty and standard of care, data protection agencies collected billions of Euros in fines, and the cost-benefit assessment of cybersecurity-related investments has changed for the better, at least for the safekeeping of personal data. Concurrently, governments around the world have become increasingly worried about the changing landscape of cyberattacks which showed a shift from accessing/exposing user data towards damaging and controlling critical infrastructure integrated across governmental institutions and private organizations. The 2017 NotPetya ransomware and the 2021 SolarWinds attacks stand out as having far-reaching implications for national security, letting malicious attackers breach and potentially take over control of systems of critical importance (governmental organizations, financial institutes, logistics companies, etc.) in the Ukraine, in the United States, and across the globe. These incidents made governments prioritize the cyber-hardening of their national infrastructure and, specifically, focus on software supply chain security. Accordingly, both the United States (via the 2021 Executive Order on Improving the Nation’s Cybersecurity [5]) and the European Union (via the 2022 Cyber Resilience Act [6]) acted swiftly and put forward regulations mandating secure software development, standardized product cybersecurity compliance, and a secure software supply chain [7], and also reducing the information asymmetry pertaining to non-expert end-users of software products. Software liability also factors in the end-users’ technical (not having the expertise to assess product security) and legal inability (EULA prohibiting the inspection of software code) to evaluate software products they use. In fact, reflecting liability back to software companies is indeed a sensible solution.

Another intriguing aspect of software liability comes from cyber-insurance. The devastating cybersecurity incidents and the ongoing multi-modal armed conflicts affecting critical infrastructure raised alarms in the insurance industry regarding the insurability of cyber risks [8], potentially inhibiting the market that experienced real growth in recent years after decades of underdevelopment. In fact, insurers and re-insurers, together with academics and cybersecurity experts, are trying to establish baseline scenarios in the industrial control system domain [9]. Indeed, if the cyber risk is systemic and catastrophic losses are expected in the critical infrastructure sector, the insurance industry will lose its interest to underwrite new policies. In that case, governments would shoulder the responsibility to be insurers of last resort, similar to instances of frequent natural disasters [10]. Supposing this happens, the increased scrutiny for software product security laid down in recent regulations is even more sensible. Even so, a potential insurer role would also be a financial and administrative burden for the government, especially taking into account tangled software supply chains. On the other hand, supply chain security solutions and best practices are available; if a company decides to invest money and effort, a much-improved level of security is within reach. Recognizing this, the current United States National Cybersecurity Strategy ([11], released in April 2023) explicitly introduced a liability waiver mechanism designed to reward software companies willing to undergo and pass a government-mandated product security audit. Such a waiver mechanism could just be the missing financial incentive for software companies to change their usual ways regarding secure products.

## 2.2 IT Security Audits

Security audits and related incentive challenges have long been the focus of the ICT industry, regulators, and researchers. Often perceived as an enabler of effective cyber-insurance contracts and incentivizing self-protection, audits with post-audit certification are heralded as a potentially effective mechanism for achieving the desired level of security between multiple interacting stakeholders [12, 13]. In the early phase of cyber-insurance (1997-2006), the lack of historical data and rudimentary cyber risk modeling resulted in ineffective actuarial models [14]. Yet, many of them attempted to link security levels to pricing using security audits, thereby reducing the information asymmetry between prospective clients and insurers [15]. Some insurer carriers (e.g., Hiscox) and brokers (e.g., InsureTrust) performed the security audits themselves before determining premiums, others outsourced audits to external parties and offered discounts upon successful certification (e.g., AIG). These audits were reported to be rigorous, lengthy, and expensive, yet their effectiveness could vary [14].

Providing a clear rationale for carefully designed audit processes, Böhme finds that security audits connected to cyber-insurance contracts should be tailored to the situation at hand and that their design space is vast, spanning voluntary, mandatory, unilateral, and bilateral audits with complex technical, managerial, and policy implications [16]. Focusing on a single profit-maximizing cyber insurer, Khalili et al. explore the role of an initial quantitative security audit in cyber-insurance contract design [17]. Authors show that a market exists for a single risk-averse client and that the client’s self-protection effort inside the contract increases with the quality of pre-screening, i.e., it can mitigate moral hazard. Nevertheless, even with perfect pre-screening, the effort level is still lower than without insurance. On the other hand, when introducing multiple, interdependent clients, proper pre-screening enables both optimal profits for the insurer and an improved level of security across clients. In fact, security interdependence and the resulting underinvestment create a potential for extra profits for the insurer. Consequently, security pre-screening then enables the insurer to realize these profits by designing insurance contracts that incentivize clients to increase the level of self-protection and, under some conditions, also improve the state of network security. In some cyber-insurance constructions, the cybersecurity posture of companies is self-reported. Therefore, a key problem for insurers is to design a post-incident claims auditing strategy (including punishment for non-compliance) to deter policyholders from misrepresenting their security levels to gain a premium discount [18]. Panda et al. demonstrate that the intuitive approach to this problem is less efficient than computing optimal audit parameters from elaborate game-theoretical models.

Interestingly, the management literature investigates IT security audits from a slightly different angle. Gordon et al. find that security audits, as a specific form of management accounting control, can reduce cybersecurity risks and create a healthy balance in responsibility across various internal functions if accompanied by adequate intra-organizational incentives [19]. Adding to this, Steinbart et al. underline the importance of a proper working relationship between the information security and internal audit functions

(IAF) within a company[20]. As IAF is responsible for overseeing and improving risk management and legal compliance, a good relationship results in more effective security investments, improved cybersecurity posture, and streamlined incident response. Posing a different research question, Herath and Herath develop a performance evaluation decision model for whether or not to conduct an IT security audit proving legal compliance [21]. In fact, the answer is far from trivial, as voluntary security audits carry various costs and delicate timing issues and depend on the proper design of managerial incentives.

Another phenomenon emerging in the accounting literature is the impact of cyber risk on external business audits [22, 23]. External auditors are responsible for i) evaluating the client’s losses, claims, and liabilities related to cyber incidents, ii) detecting potential deficiencies in (shared) internal controls (signaled by security incidents), and iii) testing and monitoring access control implemented by the client and integrating cyber threats into their audit risk model. Specifically, Rosati et al. find that breached clients are charged higher audit fees, and these higher fees affect the whole industry [22]. Nevertheless, external auditors do not revise their audit risk assessment post-breach, meaning that cyber risk has already been part of their model and that higher audit fees are temporary. In a related study, Rosati et al. find that, contrary to intuition, cyber incidents do not result in decreased financial audit quality, as external auditors increase their audit and testing efforts owing to the acknowledgment and integration of cyber risks [23].

In this work, inspired by the recently released United States National Cybersecurity Strategy [11], we focus on the audit process of a software vendor, potentially resulting in waived liability with respect to the vendor’s software products. We concentrate on a single vendor and investigate the utility and temporal dynamics of the audit process ([21]), while also analyzing the impact of different risk appetites ([17] and audit quality ([17, 23])).

### 3 An Optimal Stopping Problem: Model and Preliminaries

The basic problem consists of a neutral auditor with a pre-determined, publicly known audit rule and a utility-maximizing software vendor (also occasionally referred to interchangeably as the software developer or producers) responding optimally to the audit rule. The process plays out in discrete time and potentially over multiple periods, as the vendor may need to be audited repeatedly in order to pass. This section first describes the sequential decision problem and related assumptions in Section 3.1 and then briefly introduced the methodology used to solve the problem, i.e., the discounted-reward Markov Decision Process (MDP) formulated as an optimal stopping problem, in Section 3.2.

#### 3.1 Problem Description

Consider the scenario where a software liability waiver policy exists, which allows a software vendor to enter the market with zero liability provided it clears an auditing requirement. Further assume that the initial decision of whether to be audited is voluntary; however, once a vendor decides to go through the auditing process, then it either has to pass the audit or quit the market entirely. The rationale for the latter assumption is that a product with known defects/vulnerabilities should not be allowed to enter the market. In other words, a vendor can decide to “opt out”, whereby it bears the cost of potential liability entirely on its own but does not need the auditor’s clearance to put its software on the market; or it can decide to “opt in”, whereby it subject itself to the audit and may have to try multiple times to pass. In either case the vendor can also choose to quit the market at any time.

The vendor is utility maximizing and potentially risk averse, optimizing over its (successive) security investment/effort levels, whereas the auditor is not. We shall assume that the audit service is free but not perfect in its accuracy, i.e., the audit outcome may contain both false positives and false negatives. Each audit in the auditing process is independent of the others. The availability of such an audit service may be viewed as a type of mechanism. The central questions we seek to answer include whether there is incentive for a vendor to participate in such a mechanism, and whether it can induce better/higher security effort from the vendor in its software production.

## The Software Vendor

From the vendor's point of view, the process can be modeled as an infinite-horizon dynamical system in discrete time. At the initial stage  $t = 0$ , the vendor decides whether to participate in the audit. If not, the process terminates immediately and the vendor's optimal action is to choose some  $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$  at  $t = 0^+$  that maximizes the following *expected* opt-out utility which is materialized at time  $t = 1$  when the product is put on the market:

$$U^{\text{out}}(x) := R - C_X(x) - C_L(x), \quad (1)$$

where  $R$  denotes the total revenue from selling the product, and  $C_X(x)$  and  $C_L(x)$  represent the expected cost of security investment/effort in the production and the potential liability loss. For simplicity, we will only treat the liability loss as a random variable and use  $C_L(x)$  to denote its expectation; the other two terms are treated as deterministic. This does not significantly alter our analysis or main findings. The potential risk aversion of the vendor is modeled through the function  $C_L(x)$  and discussed shortly. The assumption that the revenue  $R$  is independent of the security investment  $x$  is also a simplification, although reasonably justified in practice since enhanced security features in a (software) product is often hard to monetize. Removing both assumptions is a possible direction of extension.

If the vendor decides to participate in the audit, it then must determine and commit to a security investment  $x_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$  at time  $t = 0^+$ . The value  $x_0$  is private information of the vendor; however, since its utility function is assumed public knowledge, the vendor's optimal strategy, including the value  $x_0$ , is ultimately known to the auditor/mechanism (i.e., the latter can simply follow the same computation). The effort  $x_0$  goes into the software development over the first time step, with product completed, incurring an instantaneous cost of  $c_0 = C_X(x_0)$ , and submitted for audit at time  $t = 1^-$ . The audit outcome is revealed at time  $t = 1$ . Let the audit outcome at time  $t$  be denoted as  $s_t \in \{0, 1\}$ . If the audit outcome is positive/successful, i.e.,  $s_1 = 1$ , the process terminates: the vendor is granted market entry, earning a reward  $r_1$  equaling to the revenue  $R$  at time  $t = 1^+$ . This is also considered the terminal reward for passing the audit with discounting applied through the utility function given shortly below.

If the audit outcome at  $t = 1$  is negative/fail, i.e.,  $s_t = 0$ , then the vendor is temporarily denied market entry. It can either choose to quit the process (exit the market) at time  $t = 1^+$ , thereby receiving zero revenue but incurring no further cost, or opt for re-auditing. In the latter case, the vendor must decide a new (cumulative) effort level  $x_1 \in [x_0, \infty)$  at time  $t = 1^+$ , thereby committing to an *additional* security investment of  $x_1 - x_0$  over the next time step. This incurs an instantaneous cost of  $c_1 = C_X(x_1) - C_X(x_0)$  at time  $t = 2^-$ . The process then proceeds to stage  $t = 2$  and repeats indefinitely until the vendor either successfully passes the audit or decides to quit. For any non-terminal stage, we assume it generates a reward of  $r_t = 0$ . Let  $q_t$  denote the binary quitting decision with  $q_t = 1$  indicates a quit. The sequencing of actions and decisions is illustrated in Figure 1, assuming the process has not stopped until time  $t + 1$ .




Figure 1: Timeline of the decision process.

Formally, define  $\underline{x} := \{x_t\}_{t=0}^\infty$  as the increasing sequence of total (accumulated) security investments decided by the vendor at each time  $t^+$ . Let  $\tau_s \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  denote the quitting time and  $\tau_a \in \{1, 2, \dots\}$  the time at which the vendor first passes the audit; both are in general random (stopping) times of the processes  $\{q_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  and  $\{s_t\}_{t \geq 0}$  respectively. The vendor's utility when opting in the policy can be written as follows,

given the vendor's decision on  $\underline{x}$  and  $\tau_s$  :

$$\begin{aligned}
U^{\text{in}}(\underline{x}, \tau_s) &= \mathbb{E}_{\tau_a} \left[ \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_a \wedge \tau_s} \alpha^{t-1} r_t - \sum_{t=0}^{\tau_a \wedge \tau_s - 1} \alpha^t c_t \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tau_a} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\tau_a \wedge \tau_s - 1} \alpha^t (r_{t+1} - c_t) \right] \\
&= \mathbb{E}_{\tau_a} \left[ -C_X(x_0) - \sum_{t=1}^{\tau_a \wedge \tau_s - 1} \alpha^t (C_X(x_t) - C_X(x_{t-1})) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \alpha^{\tau_a - 1} R \mathbf{1}_{[0, \tau_s]}(\tau_a) \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where  $\mathbf{1}_A(x)$  is the indicator function that returns 1 when the  $x \in A$  and 0 otherwise and  $\tau_a \wedge \tau_s := \min\{\tau_a, \tau_s\}$ . Also, notice that  $r_{\tau_a} = R$  and  $r_{\tau_s} = 0$ . The vendor's goal, if it decides to opt in, is to maximize its opt-in utility in Eqn (2). Denote the maximum utility by  $U^{\text{in},*} := \max_{\underline{x}, \tau_s} U^{\text{in}}(\underline{x}, \tau_s)$ .

### The Auditor

The auditor is modeled as a neutral (without its own utility function) party defined by the quality of its audit: the sequence of functions  $\underline{q}(\underline{x}) := \{p_t(x_{t-1})\}_{t=1}^\infty$ , where  $p_t(x_{t-1})$  is the probability of the software product passing audit at time  $t$  given cumulative security effort of  $x_{t-1}$ .

A security audit for software in practice is a complex task. For tractability, we will model this as an estimation process, whereby the auditor predetermines a threshold  $\delta$  and estimates whether the vendor's security effort exceeds it. It follows that the estimate at stage  $t$  can be represented as a random variable  $Y_t := x_{t-1} + W_t$  where  $W_t \sim \mathcal{N}(0, \sigma_t^2)$ . Thus the probability of passing the audit is  $p_t(x_{t-1}) = \mathbb{P}(Y_t \geq \delta) = \mathbb{P}(W_t \geq \delta - x_{t-1}) = Q\left(\frac{\delta - x_{t-1}}{\sigma_t}\right)$  where  $Q(z) := \mathbb{P}(Z \geq z | Z \sim \mathcal{N}(0, 1)) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \text{erf}\left(\frac{z}{\sqrt{2}}\right)\right)$ .

The audit is only *meaningful* or *informative* if it is correct more than 50% of the time. In the threshold model described above, if  $x_{t-1} \geq \delta$ , then  $p_t(x_{t-1}) \geq Q(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ ; if  $x_{t-1} < \delta$ , then  $p_t(x_{t-1}) < Q(0) = \frac{1}{2}$ . Thus, this threshold audit model is indeed informative for any parameterization  $(\sigma_t)_{t \geq 1}$ .

**Assumption 3.1.** *The audit process is static (or time-invariant), given by  $p_t(x) = p(x)$  for all  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  and some fixed function  $p(\cdot)$ .*

Applying the above assumption in the threshold audit yields  $\sigma_t = \sigma$  for all  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  and some fixed  $\sigma > 0$ .

### Specific Functions Used in the Analysis

To fully define the vendor's utility function we now impose some properties on the liability loss  $C_L(x)$  and investment cost  $C_X(x)$ .

We will begin by assuming that the actual liability loss (in dollar amount), denoted by  $Z_x$ , follows a normal distribution truncated to  $[0, \infty)$ , which is a normal distribution with mean  $\mu_Z(x)$  and variance  $\sigma_Z^2(x)$  conditioned on the random variable being non-negative. Assume  $\mu_Z(x)$  and  $\sigma_Z^2(x)$  are both positive and decreasing in  $x$ , i.e., higher effort reduces the expected loss and the uncertainty in the loss. The density function of  $Z_x$  is

$$f(z; x) = \frac{1}{\sigma_Z(x)} \frac{\varphi\left(\frac{x - \mu_Z(x)}{\sigma_Z(x)}\right)}{1 - \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu_Z(x)}{\sigma_Z(x)}\right)},$$

where  $\varphi(\cdot)$  and  $\Phi(\cdot)$  are respectively the probability density and cumulative distribution functions of the standard normal distribution. [24] shows that truncated normal is the maximum entropy distribution on  $[0, \infty)$  provided the knowledge of first and second moments subjected to the condition  $\mu_2 < 2\mu_1^2$  where  $\mu_k$  is the  $k$ -th moment. We argue that representing the liability loss with known mean and variance with truncated normal distributions is a suitable choice by the principle of maximum entropy. It states that the

maximum entropy distribution is the least informative, therefore the best, distribution that represents the current system with given prior knowledge of moments [25].

To capture the vendor's risk aversion, we will model the liability cost that enters into the vendor's utility function as  $C_L(x) := \mathbb{E} \exp(\gamma Z_x)$ , where  $\gamma > 0$  represents the vendor's risk attitude. An interesting observation on the Gaussian assumption is that the *perceived* risk after the transformation through risk aversion, i.e.,  $\exp(\gamma Z_x)$ , actually follows a log-normal distribution, which belongs to the heavy-tailed distribution family<sup>1</sup>. By the property of normal distribution, we can write  $C_L(\gamma, x)$  as

$$C_L(\gamma, x) = \exp \left( \gamma \mu_Z(x) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \sigma_Z^2(x) \left[ \frac{1 - \Phi \left( -\frac{\mu_Z(x)}{\sigma_Z(x)} - \gamma \sigma_Z(x) \right)}{1 - \Phi \left( -\frac{\mu_Z(x)}{\sigma_Z(x)} \right)} \right] \right). \quad (3)$$

For the effort cost  $C_X(x)$ , we will assume it can be decomposed into two component costs:  $C_X(x) = C_P(x) + C_S(x)$ . Here  $C_P(x) > 0$  represents the cost of software development and is strictly decreasing in  $x$  with diminishing marginal; this reflects the observations that higher security investments, such as developer training, may shorten the development cycle. On the other hand,  $C_S(x) > 0$  represents the pure cost of security investment and is strictly increasing in  $x$ . When put together, we develop the following assumption.

**Assumption 3.2.**  $C_X(x)$  is first decreasing and then increasing (unboundedly), resulting in a unique global maximum.

This shape is critical to our subsequent analysis. Intuitively, this means that while security investment can help lower the development cost to some extent, its own cost ultimately overtakes that of development.

As long as the above assumption is satisfied, it is less important what precise forms these costs take. Subsequently, we will sometimes work with the following functional forms of  $C_P(x)$  and  $C_S(x)$  (with positive constants  $b, c$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} C_P(x) &= \exp(-bx), \\ C_S(x) &= c \cdot x. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

## 3.2 Preliminaries

In light of Figure 1, the vendor's decision process can be reformulated as a discounted-reward Markov decision process (MDP) as follows. Let  $e_t \in \{0, 1\}$  denote the *continuation status* of the process:  $e_t = 1$  if the process has terminated by time  $t$  (inclusive), and  $e_t = 0$  if the process proceeds into  $t^+$ . Define states  $z_t := (e_t, x_{t-1}) \in \mathcal{Z} := \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  for  $t = 1, 2, \dots$  where  $x_{t-1}$  is the cumulative security investment over the first  $t-1$  steps. Given the current state  $z_t$ , the vendor chooses an action  $u_t := (q_t, a_t) \in \mathcal{U} := \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  where  $q_t = 1$  when the vendor decides to quit at this stage and  $a_t$  represents the vendor's additional investment in case of continuation.

Define an alternative instantaneous reward function  $\rho(z_t, u_t)$  as follows:

$$\rho(z_t, u_t) = [p(x_{t-1} + a_t)R - (C_X(x_{t-1} + a_t) - C_X(x_{t-1}))] \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(e_t) \mathbf{1}_{\{0\}}(q_t). \quad (5)$$

Intuitively, this is the expected payoff (reward minus cost) that the vendor earns at time  $t$ . It is zero when either the process has stopped ( $e_t = 0$ ) or the vendor decides to quit ( $q_t = 1$ ) at time  $t$ .

The state at time  $t+1$  can be updated using the tuple  $(z_t, u_t)$  as follows:

$$x_t = x_{t-1} + a_t \quad \text{and} \quad e_{t+1} = \begin{cases} w_t & e_t = 0 \text{ and } q_t = 0 \\ 1 & e_t = 1 \text{ or } q_t = 1 \end{cases}$$

where  $w_t \sim \text{Bernoulli}(p(x_{t-1} + a_t))$ . This system is a valid MDP by construction.

Let  $\pi := \{u_t\}_{t=1}^\infty$  denote an arbitrary policy. Define the *expected total discounted reward* with initial state  $z$  under policy  $\pi$  as

$$V^\pi(z) = \mathbb{E}_{\tau_a} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\tau_a \wedge \tau_s^\pi - 1} \alpha^t \rho(z_t^\pi, u_t^\pi) \middle| z_0^\pi = z \right] = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \alpha^t \rho(z_t^\pi, u_t^\pi) \middle| z_0^\pi = z \right], \quad (6)$$

<sup>1</sup>It is worth noticing that the cyber loss itself, i.e.,  $Z_x$ , is usually directly seen modeled as heavy-tailed. Mathematically, our assumption of Normally distributed loss filtered through a risk-averse utility function achieves a similar effect.



where the superscript  $\pi$  emphasizes the dependence of relevant variables on the policy  $\pi$ . The second equality holds because by definition,  $\rho(z_t^\pi, u_t^\pi) = 0$  if the process has stopped before time  $t$ , i.e.,  $e_t = 1$ . The goal of the MDP is to find the optimal policy  $\pi$  that maximizes the objective in Eq. (6). Denote the *optimal reward function* as  $V^*(z) := \max_\pi V^\pi(z)$  and the optimal policy as  $\pi^*(z) \in \arg \max_\pi V^\pi(z)$ .

It suffices to limit our attention to non-terminal states because  $V^*(1, x) \equiv 0$  by Eqn (5) and (6). With a slight abuse of notation, we will denote  $V^*(x) := V^*(0, x)$ . Additionally, without loss of generality, we will only consider stationary policies, i.e., state-dependent and time-invariant, that depend on the state  $z_t$  only through  $x_{t-1}$ . In other words, there exists a function  $g : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathcal{U}$  s.t.  $u_t = g(x_{t-1})$  for every  $t \geq 0$ .

Using the notation above, we can express the vendor's optimal opt-in utility as follows:

$$U^{\text{in},*} = -C_X(0) + V^*(0). \quad (7)$$

The methodology used to compute  $V^*$  is the Bellman equation. By an extension of Theorem 2.2 in [26] (see Appendix A),  $V^*$  is the unique solution to the following fixed-point (Bellman) equation,

$$V^*(x) = \max_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \rho(e = 0, x, u) + \alpha \mathbb{E} \left[ V^*(z') \middle| e = 0, x, u \right], \quad \forall x \geq 0, \quad (8)$$

where  $z'$  represents the next state.

## 4 The Optimal Opt-In Policy

We now characterize the optimal strategy of the vendor if it initially decides to opt into the audit mechanism. We begin by determining when it is optimal to quit and then derive its optimal investments using the Bellman equation.

### 4.1 Optimal Quitting Time

We expand  $V^*(x)$  as follows

$$V^*(x) = \max \left\{ 0, \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + C_X(x) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))V^*(y) \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where the first term in the  $\max$  operator is the maximum reward-to-go for quitting, i.e.,  $q = 1$ , and the second term that for continuation. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} V^*(x) &\geq \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + C_X(x) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))V^*(y) \\ &\geq p(x)R + \alpha(1 - p(x))V^*(x), \quad \forall x \geq 0, \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$V^*(x) \geq \frac{p(x)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x)} > 0, \quad \forall x \geq 0.$$

This directly leads to the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.1.** *Once opted in, the vendor will never quit the audit process in an optimal strategy.*

### 4.2 Optimal Continuation Investment

Given that an opt-in vendor will never quit, we can remove the  $\max$  operator in Eq. (9) and express  $V^*(x)$  more concisely as

$$V^*(x) = \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + C_X(x) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))V^*(y), \quad \forall x \geq 0.$$

Define  $W(x) := V^*(x) - C_X(x)$ . The above equation is equivalent to

$$W(x) = \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))V^*(y), \quad \forall x \geq 0. \quad (10)$$

The optimal additional investment given the accumulated investments  $x$  can also be computed using

$$a^*(x) \in -x + \arg \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))V^*(y). \quad (11)$$

**Lemma 4.2.**  *$W$  is decreasing in  $x$ .<sup>2</sup>*

The monotonicity of  $W$  has a very interesting implication on the vendor's behavior. Suppose the cumulative investments up to  $t$  is  $x_{t-1}$  and the vendor chooses an  $a_t^*$  optimally according to Eq. (11), resulting in a new cumulative investment  $x_t = x_{t-1} + a_t^*$ . If the vendor fails the audit at this level, its optimal additional investment now becomes zero because the maximum in Eqn (10) is already obtained with  $x_t$  over  $[x_t, \infty)$  by the monotonicity of  $W$ . Therefore, one of the vendor's optimal strategy given any cumulative investment (sunk cost) is to immediately invest at the optimal additional level and wait indefinitely until it passes the audit.

**Lemma 4.3.** *The function  $W$  can be expressed as*

$$W(x) = \max_{y \geq x} G(y), \quad \forall x \geq 0, \quad (12)$$

where

$$G(y) := -C_X(y) + \frac{p(y)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(y)}, \quad (13)$$

and the optimal additional investment, given cumulative investment  $x$ , is

$$a^*(x) \in -x + \arg \max_{y \geq x} G(y). \quad (14)$$

Comparing the maximum opt-in utility value in Eq. (7) and the definition of  $W$  in Eq. (10), we see that  $U^{\text{in},*} = W(0)$ . Therefore, we can directly calculate the opt-in optimal (sequential) security investments behavior by evaluating the function  $G(x)$ .

**Theorem 4.4.** *If the vendor opts in, its optimal strategy has to satisfy the following properties:*

- (1) *it will never quit;*
- (2) *it is given by any non-decreasing sequence of cumulative investments  $\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0}$ , where  $x_t \in \mathcal{G} := \arg \max_{x \geq 0} G(x)$ ;*
- (3) *the optimal opt-in utility is given by  $\max_{x \geq 0} G(x)$ .*

Theorem 4.4-(2) says that the optimal opt-in strategy is in general not unique, but these all fall into two broad categories. The first class is such the vendor invests any amount  $x \in \mathcal{G}$  at stage 0 followed by nothing else in subsequent stages, essentially waiting for the audit to eventually return a positive outcome (which is guaranteed to occur with high probability given our assumptions on the audit process). This class of strategies/vendors is the “patient” type, deciding on a total expenditure and then waiting it out. In particular, those that invest in the smallest amount (the smallest  $x$  in  $\mathcal{G}$ ) are foregoing revenue (due to the long expected time to passing audit, by the time there is revenue it is severely discounted) in exchange for a small initial security investment.

The other class of optimal strategies involves investing at two or more different times, each time reaching some cumulative amount  $x \in \mathcal{G}$ . When these investments are made is arbitrary, provided the first must occur at time 0. This type of strategies/vendors are more impatient and/or opportunistic: they invest some small amount initially, hoping to pass audit on good luck; when that doesn't happen for some time, they decide to up their game and invest more and hope to pass audit this time, and so on.

It is important to emphasize that both types of strategies yield the same opt-in utility under our model; they essentially reflect different tradeoffs between willingness to invest vs. willingness to wait for return on investment.

---

<sup>2</sup>All proofs can be found in Appendix B.

Those who invest the largest amount  $x \in \mathcal{G}$  at time 0 necessarily belong to the first type, as there is no more feasible action left given the non-decreasing nature of the sequence. These are the “ideal” or most “desirable” vendors from a public interest or social welfare perspective – they invest the maximum amount in one go thereby resulting in the highest quality product. In the next section we will discuss what configurations on the auditing process can help lead to this type of strategy.

The next example shows more concretely the property of the optimal strategies given in Theorem 4.4-(2) and discussed above.

**Example 1** (Property of the Optimal Sequence of Cumulative Investments)

Suppose the set  $\mathcal{G}$  in Theorem 4.4 contains exactly 3 values  $\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2$ , and  $\tilde{x}_3$ , where  $\tilde{x}_1 < \tilde{x}_2 < \tilde{x}_3$ ; i.e.,  $G(x)$  has three maximizers. By Theorem 4.4-(2), every optimal investment sequence should start with  $x_0 \in \{\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_3\}$ . This means the initial action  $a_0^* \in \{\tilde{x}_1, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_3\}$  as  $x_0 = x_{-1} + a_0^* = a_0^*$  by our definition.

If an optimal strategy starts with  $x_0 = \tilde{x}_3$ , then all subsequent cumulative investments remain at  $\tilde{x}_3$ , i.e., no additional investment in the future. In this case, the optimal cumulative investment sequence and the optimal action sequence are respectively,

$$\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0} = \{\tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_3, \dots\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{a_t^*\}_{t \geq 0} = \{\tilde{x}_3, 0, 0, 0, \dots\}.$$

As  $\tilde{x}_3$  is the largest element in  $\mathcal{G}$ ,  $\{\tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_3, \dots\}$  is the unique non-decreasing sequence of cumulative investments in  $\mathcal{G}$  given  $x_0 = \tilde{x}_3$ .

If an optimal strategy starts with  $x_0 = \tilde{x}_2$ , then this can lead to either type of optimal sequences. Under the first type, the vendor invests nothing more beyond the initial amount, i.e.,

$$\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0} = \{\tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_2, \dots\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{a_t^*\}_{t \geq 0} = \{\tilde{x}_2, 0, 0, 0, \dots\}.$$

Under the second type, the vendor invests an additional  $\tilde{x}_3 - \tilde{x}_2$  at some arbitrary future time  $\geq 1$ , i.e.,

$$\{x_t\}_{t \geq 0} = \{\tilde{x}_2, \dots, \tilde{x}_2, \tilde{x}_3, \tilde{x}_3, \dots\} \quad \text{and} \quad \{a_t^*\}_{t \geq 0} = \{\tilde{x}_2, 0, \dots, \tilde{x}_3 - \tilde{x}_2, 0, \dots\}.$$

Interestingly, the exact time at which the additional investment  $\tilde{x}_3 - \tilde{x}_2$  is made has no impact on the strategy's optimality.

Similarly, if the optimal strategy starts with  $x_0 = \tilde{x}_1$ , then the vendor could either invest nothing more, or increase its cumulative investment to  $\tilde{x}_2$  (or  $\tilde{x}_3$ ) at some arbitrary time in the future but nothing more, or increase to  $\tilde{x}_2$  at some time, followed by another increase to  $\tilde{x}_3$  some time later.

**Example 2** (Using  $C_X(x)$  given in Eq. (4))

Let  $p(x)$  denote the static threshold audit mechanism introduced in Section 3 and given in Assumption 3.1, and consider the  $C_X(x)$  in (4). It can be shown that  $G(x)$  has at most two local maximum, i.e.,  $\mathcal{G}$  contains either one or two numbers (see Appendix C for details). This is illustrated in Figure 2, with the two local maximum denoted low and high, respectively, as  $x_L$  and  $x_H$ . If  $G(x_L) \neq G(x_H)$ , then there is a single global maximum and the optimal investment strategy is unique: investing at the global maximum level at time 0 nothing else thereafter.

If  $x_L = x_H$ , then the vendor has two equally optimal options at the initial stage: being conservative and choosing  $x_H$ , which is more likely to secure an early pass, or being opportunistic and choosing  $x_L$ , hoping for a lucky pass. In the latter case, the vendor has the option to increase its investments to  $x_H$  at a later time.

### 4.3 Equivalence to Liability Insurance

Define the following function:

$$C_A(x; p) = \frac{(1 - \alpha)(1 - p(x))}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x)} R. \quad (15)$$

We can then re-write the utility function as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U^{\text{in}}(x) &= G(x) = -C_X(x) + \frac{p(x)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x)} \\ &= R - C_X(x) - \frac{(1 - \alpha)(1 - p(x))R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x)} \\ &= R - C_X(x) - C_A(x; p), \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$




Figure 2: Shape of  $G(x)$  with  $C_X(x)$  given by Eq. (4). Parameters used:  $b = c = 1$ ,  $R = 26$ ,  $\alpha = 0.08$ ,  $\delta = 9.13$ , and  $\sigma = 10$ . There are two local maximum in the figure  $x_L$  and  $x_H$  with  $x_L < x_H$ ; in this example both attain the same global maximum.

with the optimal opt-in strategy obtained by maximizing  $U^{\text{in}}(x)$  over  $[0, \infty)$ . Comparing the above expression to the opt-out utility function given in Eq. (1), we see the two only differ in their last terms: liability loss  $C_L(x)$  in Eq. (1) and  $C_A(x; p)$  in Eq. (16). This comparison provides an alternative interpretation of the optimal opt-in strategy. It suggests that the audit mechanism is equivalent to a “waiver-for-fee” mechanism, i.e., offering the vendor complete liability waiver in exchange for a one-time fee of  $C_A(x; p)$ . This is nothing but an insurance policy with premium discrimination. Viewed through the insurance lens,  $C_A(x; p)$  is functionally equivalent to the premium charged by the insurance provider; it is assessed not only based on the security effort of the vendor, but also on the market value of the product. The insurance provider may or may not perform an audit as long as it has a way of determining  $p(x)$ .

We will refer to  $C_A(x; p)$  as the waiver cost or audit cost. Remarkably,  $C_A(x; p)$  is always bounded above by  $R$  while  $C_L(x)$  could be unbounded for sufficiently small  $x$ . Thus this comparison to insurance merely serves as an alternative interpretation of the audit mechanism, but does not address whether such an insurance provider would indeed exist and makes profit. This is a crucial difference between a profit-maximizing insurer and a profit-neutral auditor modeled in this paper; a more comprehensive comparison will be an interesting direction of future study.

#### 4.4 Risk Perception under the Audit Mechanism

The shape of this function  $C_A(x; p)$  reveals quite a few interesting properties. Firstly, this function is decreasing in  $x$  with diminishing margins, similar to the liability loss function  $C_L(\gamma, x)$ . When the vendor decides to opt in, this waiver cost essentially replaces the liability loss and thus represents the “risk” now perceived by the vendor.

A few examples of this function with  $p(x)$  being the threshold form defined in Section 3 are depicted in Fig. 3. We observe that  $C_A(x; p)$  is first concave and then convex as  $x$  increases. This suggests that under the audit mechanism, the vendor’s risk attitude transitions from risk seeking to risk aversion; the former dominates at lower investment levels, while the latter at higher investment levels. Notice that  $C_A(x; p)$  is presented as loss so that the risk-averse (resp. risk-seeking) region corresponds to the concave (resp. convex) region of  $-C_A(x; p)$ . This is in contrast to  $-C_L(x)$  which is purely concave, indicating risk-aversion under all security investments.




Figure 3: Auditing cost function  $C_A(x; p)$  with threshold audit example evaluated at different noise level  $\sigma$ , taking the threshold fixed as  $\delta = 3$ .

## 5 Impact of the Audit Quality

Although we do not explicitly model the auditor as a strategic agent, the vendor's strategy, and moreover, its choice of participation, is indeed influenced by the audit threshold  $\delta$  and audit noise  $\sigma$ , under the threshold audit rule introduced in Section 3. In this section we first examine how these audit parameters impact the vendor's strategy when it opts in, and then how they impact the vendor's decision to opt in vs. stay out.

### 5.1 On the Vendor's Optimal Opt-In Strategy

Results and discussion in Section 4.2 suggest there can potentially be many optimal strategies for an opt-in vendor, some starting at very low investment levels depending on the solution set to  $G(x)$ . While these are equally optimal by the definition of our model, the auditor may favor earlier and higher investments. Below we show that different choices of  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$  can reshape  $G(x)$  so as to induce more desired opt-in strategies.

Figure 4a and 4b depict the shape of  $G(x)$  under different values of  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$  respectively, while keeping the other fixed. The global maximum solutions of each curve correspond to the optimal opt-in investments in that specific parameter setup. The main observations are summarized as follows:

1. From Figure 4a, we see when two local maximas exist in  $G(x)$ , a high threshold (more difficult audit) leads the low solution  $x_L$  to dominate (it becomes the global maxima), whereas a low threshold (an easier audit) leads the high solution  $x_H$  to dominate (it becomes the global maxima). (In the region above the boundary (dashed black horizontal line), the audit threshold is small and  $x_H$  induces higher utility than  $x_L$ ; in the region below the boundary, the audit threshold is large and  $x_L$  results in higher utility.) Also, a smaller threshold always induces higher vendor's utility, regardless of the investment.
2. The above observation suggests that a high threshold  $\delta$  can encourage low investment as an optimal strategy. This seems counter intuitive, but the reason is that a difficult audit poses a risk of failing the audit even at decent effort levels, so the vendor invests less and instead relies on waiting for a positive audit outcome to materialize when luck strikes. At the same time, a low threshold reduces the need to gamble on the outcome of the audit and encourages the vendor to invest at the optimal (high) level from the start, aimed at ensuring a speedy pass.
3. From Figure 4b we see that the shape of the  $G(x)$  function is even more sensitive to the audit noise: a low noise (blue curve) drives  $x_H$  to become the global maxima (thus high investment as an optimal

strategy) and a high noise (yellow curve) drives  $x_L$  to be the global maxima (thus low investment as an optimal strategy).

In short, the above observations suggest that an accurate (low noise) but not overly strict/difficult audit (so it is possible to pass) is the best choice: it minimizes opportunistic behavior and reliance on chance and encourages higher levels of effort earlier on in the process.




Figure 4: Different curves of the opt-in objective  $G(x)$  under different audit parameters  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$ . (a) and (b) respectively show the influence of  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$ .

## 5.2 On the Vendor's Choice of Participation

Clearly, the vendor only has an incentive to participate in the audit mechanism if  $U^{in,*} \geq U^{out,*}$ , assuming ties are broken in favor of participation. To highlight the vendor's opt-out utility's dependency on its risk attitudes, we will write  $U^{out,*}(\gamma)$  instead of  $U^{out,*}$  with liability loss taking the form given in Eq. (3). The following results follow immediately.

**Theorem 5.1.** *There exists  $\bar{\gamma} \in [0, \infty]$  such that for  $\gamma \geq \bar{\gamma}$ ,  $U^{out,*}(\gamma) \leq U^{in,*}$  and the vendor has an incentive to participate in the audit mechanism; for  $\gamma < \bar{\gamma}$ ,  $U^{out,*}(\gamma) > U^{in,*}$  and the vendor prefers to stay outside. Specifically, when  $\bar{\gamma} = \infty$ , the vendor never participates; and when  $\bar{\gamma} = 0$ , the vendor always participates.*

The value  $\bar{\gamma}$  is the boundary risk attitude at which the vendor is indifferent between getting the waiver/audit or not. Above this level the vendor is relatively risk averse and therefore interested in participating and transferring its risk to the auditor. Below this level the vendor is relatively risk seeking and does not have an incentive to participate.

As  $\bar{\gamma}$  is nonnegative, participation is increased with a lower  $\bar{\gamma}$ . Below we show how the auditor can lower this value by adjusting its auditing threshold and noise.

We will write the maximum opt-in utility as  $U^{in,*}(\delta, \sigma)$  to emphasize its dependence on the auditing parameters. For each pair of  $(\delta, \sigma)$ , we can calculate  $\bar{\gamma}$  by solving the equation  $U^{out,*}(\bar{\gamma}) = U^{in,*}(\delta, \sigma)$  for  $\bar{\gamma}$ . We will similarly write it as  $\bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sigma)$ . Define the *coverage* of an audit mechanism with a fixed threshold  $\delta$  as  $\bar{\gamma}_\delta := \inf_{\sigma \geq 0} \bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sigma)$ . Similarly, define the coverage associated with a fixed accuracy  $\sigma$  as  $\bar{\gamma}_\sigma := \inf_{\delta \geq 0} \bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sigma)$ . The coverage of the audit mechanism where both  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$  are free variables is denoted simply as  $\bar{\gamma}_0$ .

**Theorem 5.2.** (1)  $\bar{\gamma}_0 = 0$ , i.e., there exists an audit mechanism (a pair of audit parameters) that can ensure full coverage (of all vendor types).

(2) For fixed  $\sigma$  and  $\delta_1 \leq \delta_2$ ,  $\bar{\gamma}(\delta_1, \sigma) \leq \bar{\gamma}(\delta_2, \sigma)$  and  $\bar{\gamma}_\sigma = \bar{\gamma}(0, \sigma)$ . This means that  $\bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sigma)$  increases in the audit threshold  $\delta$  and the maximum coverage is reached when the threshold is zero. However, this

maximum is practically undesirable since a zero threshold means a non-investing vendor, which should not be waived.

- (3)  $\bar{\gamma}_{\sigma_1} \leq \bar{\gamma}_{\sigma_2}$  for every  $\sigma_1 \leq \sigma_2$ . This implies higher accuracy increases the coverage by attracting less risk-averse vendors.

Figure 5 shows some numerical results highlighting the above result.




Figure 5: Contour plot of  $\bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sigma)$  against various values of  $\delta$  and  $\sigma$ . The red dotted line signifies the zero boundary  $\bar{\gamma}(\delta, \sigma) = 0$ .

We make a similar observation that in terms of maximizing the mechanism's coverage or participation, it is once again best to have a high accurate audit but not a very strict/difficult one.

## 6 Discussion and Conclusion

In this work, we explored the liability waiver mechanism enabled by security investment auditing and its feasibility to incentivize beneficial software security practices. We formulated the mechanism as a stopping-time problem and fully characterized the properties of an optimal strategy. Most interesting of these is the result that there can be many equally optimal strategies, in the form of a sequence of security investments over time, that reflect very different attitudes and tradeoffs on the part of the vendor, from low investments/slow return to high investment and rapid return. We further showed how such an audit mechanism relates to liability insurance and how the audit parameters (accuracy and difficulty) impact the vendor's optimal strategy once it opts in. We also examined how the audit parameters affect the vendor's participation incentive. We showed that the threshold audit mechanism could incentivize participation while inducing high security investment at the same time. Our general conclusion is that an accurate (low noise) but not very strict (difficult) audit can increase participation while incentivizing higher security investment.

There are a number of very interesting future directions to pursue. As mentioned earlier, a more comprehensive and quantitative comparison with liability insurance is of great interest and value.

Secondly, our present model assumes independent and identical audit processes being used repeatedly. This resulted in some less desirable behavior of the vendor, such as repeating the audit till it passed without making any real change/improvement. A worthwhile extension is to make successive audits a function of the history, e.g., with each failure, the audit may become more strict (increasing threshold) or more/less accurate (lower/higher noise), and so on.

Our result suggests that voluntary participation over all risk-averse vendors cannot be guaranteed simultaneously with high security investments. Thus, a trade-off is unavoidable if the auditor is strategic and tasked to maximize customers' benefits. This might suggest a constrained optimization problem that intends to maximize the worst-case coverage capacity while keeping all participants incentive compatible and their security investment no less than some pre-determined value. Any solution to this problem, if it exists, should be the maximum-coverage liability waiver mechanism in which the induced security investments are no worse than some pre-defined baseline. Based on the new mechanism, a proper "optimality" of the trade-off can be defined and discussed from the perspective of a strategic auditor.

## References

- [1] R. J. Anderson, "Why information security is hard-an economic perspective," in *17th Annual Computer Security Applications Conference (ACSAC 2001), 11-14 December 2001, New Orleans, Louisiana, USA*, IEEE Computer Society, 2001, pp. 358–365. DOI: 10.1109/ACSAC.2001.991552. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1109/ACSAC.2001.991552>.
- [2] *MacPherson v Buick Motor Co.* 1916. [Online]. Available: <https://casetext.com/case/macpherson-v-buick-motor-co-2>.
- [3] *Donoghue v Stevenson*, 1932. [Online]. Available: <https://www.bailii.org/uk/cases/UKHL/1932/100.html>.
- [4] *United States v. Carroll Towing Co.* 1947. [Online]. Available: <https://casetext.com/case/united-states-v-carroll-towing-co-2/>.
- [5] White House, *Executive Order on Improving the Nation's Cybersecurity*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/briefing-room/presidential-actions/2021/05/12/executive-order-on-improving-the-nations-cybersecurity/>.
- [6] P. G. Chiara, "The cyber resilience act: The eu commission's proposal for a horizontal regulation on cybersecurity for products with digital elements: An introduction," *International Cybersecurity Law Review*, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 255–272, 2022.
- [7] Sonatype, *The global regulatory landscape for the software supply chain in 2023*, 2023.
- [8] World Economic Forum, *The global risks report 2023, 18th edition*, 2023.
- [9] S. Dejung, M. Liu, A. Lüder, and E. Weippl, "Managing Industrial Control Systems Security Risks for Cyber Insurance (Dagstuhl Seminar 21451)," *Dagstuhl Reports*, vol. 11, no. 10, S. Dejung, M. Liu, A. Lüder, and E. Weippl, Eds., pp. 36–56, 2022, ISSN: 2192-5283. DOI: 10.4230/DagRep.11.10.36. [Online]. Available: <https://drops.dagstuhl.de/entities/document/10.4230/DagRep.11.10.36>.
- [10] J. D. Cummins *et al.*, "Should the government provide insurance for catastrophes," *Federal Reserve Bank of St. Louis Review*, vol. 88, no. 4, pp. 337–379, 2006.
- [11] White House, "National cybersecurity strategy," *White House, Washington, DC*, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://www.whitehouse.gov/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/National-Cybersecurity-Strategy-2023.pdf>.
- [12] M. Lelarge and J. Bolot, "Economic incentives to increase security in the internet: The case for insurance," in *IEEE INFOCOM 2009*, IEEE, 2009, pp. 1494–1502.
- [13] M. Liu, *Embracing Risk Cyber Insurance as an Incentive Mechanism for Cybersecurity*. Springer.
- [14] D. W. Woods and J. Wolff, "A history of cyber risk transfer," *Available at SSRN 4493171*, 2023.
- [15] R. Böhme, G. Schwartz, *et al.*, "Modeling cyber-insurance: Towards a unifying framework.," in *WEIS*, 2010.
- [16] R. Böhme, "Security audits revisited," in *International conference on financial cryptography and data security*, Springer, 2012, pp. 129–147.



- [17] M. M. Khalili, P. Naghizadeh, and M. Liu, “Designing Cyber Insurance Policies: The Role of Pre-Screening and Security Interdependence,” *IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security*, vol. 13, no. 9, pp. 2226–2239, Sep. 2018, Conference Name: IEEE Transactions on Information Forensics and Security, ISSN: 1556-6021. DOI: 10.1109/TIFS.2018.2812205.
- [18] S. Panda, D. W. Woods, A. Laszka, A. Fielder, and E. Panaousis, “Post-incident audits on cyber insurance discounts,” *Computers & Security*, vol. 87, p. 101593, 2019.
- [19] L. A. Gordon, M. P. Loeb, T. Sohail, C.-Y. Tseng, and L. Zhou, “Cybersecurity, capital allocations and management control systems,” *European Accounting Review*, vol. 17, no. 2, pp. 215–241, 2008.
- [20] P. J. Steinbart, R. L. Raschke, G. Gal, and W. N. Dilla, “The influence of a good relationship between the internal audit and information security functions on information security outcomes,” *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, vol. 71, pp. 15–29, 2018.
- [21] H. S. Herath and T. C. Herath, “It security auditing: A performance evaluation decision model,” *Decision Support Systems*, vol. 57, pp. 54–63, 2014.
- [22] P. Rosati, F. Gogolin, and T. Lynn, “Audit firm assessments of cyber-security risk: Evidence from audit fees and sec comment letters,” *The International Journal of Accounting*, vol. 54, no. 03, p. 1950013, 2019.
- [23] P. Rosati, F. Gogolin, and T. Lynn, “Cyber-security incidents and audit quality,” *European Accounting Review*, vol. 31, no. 3, pp. 701–728, 2022.
- [24] D. Dowson and A. Wragg, “Maximum-entropy distributions having prescribed first and second moments (corresp.),” *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory*, vol. 19, no. 5, pp. 689–693, Sep. 1973, ISSN: 0018-9448. DOI: 10.1109/TIT.1973.1055060. [Online]. Available: <http://ieeexplore.ieee.org/document/1055060/> (visited on 12/09/2023).
- [25] E. T. Jaynes, “Information theory and statistical mechanics,” *Phys. Rev.*, vol. 106, pp. 620–630, 4 May 1957. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRev.106.620. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRev.106.620>.
- [26] O. Hernández-Lerma, *Adaptive Markov Control Processes* (Applied Mathematical Sciences), en, F. John, J. E. Marsden, and L. Sirovich, Eds. New York, NY: Springer, 1989, vol. 79, ISBN: 978-1-4612-6454-5 978-1-4419-8714-3. DOI: 10.1007/978-1-4419-8714-3. [Online]. Available: <http://link.springer.com/10.1007/978-1-4419-8714-3> (visited on 12/02/2023).

# Appendices

## A Bellman Equation with Unbounded Rewards

We prove the Bellman equation theorem when the rewards are unbounded and take specific forms in (5) and (4). The idea is to modify the function sup-norm used in Theorem 2.2 in [26] so that it remains bounded for linearly increasing functions such as (4).

Define the weighted norm

$$\|V\|_w = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{|V(z)|}{w(z)}, \quad V \in \mathcal{B} \quad (17)$$

where  $w(z)$  is the (positive) weight function defined as follows

$$w(z) = w(f, s, x) := 1 + \left( \frac{1}{1 + s + x} \right) \mathbf{1}\{f = 0\}, \quad z \in \mathcal{Z},$$

with  $\mathbf{1}\{f = 0\}$  being the indicator function that returns 1 when  $f = 0$  and zero otherwise. It is easy to verify that  $\|\cdot\|_w$  is a valid norm. Let  $\mathcal{B}$  be the set of real-valued bounded functions with norm  $\|\cdot\|_w$  on the state space  $\mathcal{Z} := \{0, 1\}^2 \times \mathbb{R}_+$ . In fact, the space  $(\mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|_w)$  is a Banach space as shown by the lemma below.

**Lemma A.1.**  *$(\mathcal{B}, \|\cdot\|_w)$  is a Banach space provided that  $\|\cdot\|_w$  is a valid norm.*

*Proof.* Let  $\{V_n\}_{n \geq 0} \subseteq \mathcal{B}$  be a Cauchy sequence with norm  $\|\cdot\|_w$ . Define  $\bar{V} := \limsup_{n \rightarrow \infty} V_n$  pointwise. Then, there exists a subsequence  $\{V_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 0}$  such that  $\bar{V} = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} V_{n_k}$  pointwise. Fix arbitrary  $\varepsilon > 0$ , the Cauchy-ness of  $\{V_{n_k}\}_{k \geq 0}$  implies the existence of  $K > 0$  such that

$$\frac{|V_{n_k}(z) - V_{n_l}(z)|}{w(z)} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}, \forall k, l \geq K.$$

By sending  $l$  to  $\infty$  and the pointwise convergence, we obtain

$$\frac{|V_{n_k}(z) - \bar{V}(z)|}{w(z)} < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}, \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z}, \forall k \geq K,$$

which implies

$$\|V_{n_k} - \bar{V}\|_w < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} \quad \forall k \geq K$$

Besides, the Cauchy-ness of  $\{V_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  also implies the existence of  $N > 0$  such that  $\|V_n - V_m\|_w < \frac{\varepsilon}{2}$  for every  $n, m \geq N$ . Therefore, letting  $M := \max\{N, n_K\}$  and choosing  $k$  such that  $n_k > M$ , we have

$$\|V_n - \bar{V}\|_w \leq \|V_n - V_{n_k}\|_w + \|V_{n_k} - \bar{V}\|_w \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \frac{\varepsilon}{2} = \varepsilon, \quad \forall n \geq M.$$

Thus, the Cauchy sequence  $\{V_n\}_{n \geq 0}$  has a limit  $\bar{V}$ . Choosing any  $n > M$  and by the triangle inequality, we obtain

$$\|\bar{V}\|_w \leq \|\bar{V} - V_n\|_w + \|V_n\|_w < \frac{\varepsilon}{2} + \|V_n\|_w < \infty.$$

So, the limit  $\bar{V}$  is also in  $\mathcal{B}$ . ■

Define the dynamic programming operator for any function in  $\mathcal{B}$  as

$$TV(z) := \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} r(z, u) + \alpha \int V(z') Q(dz'|z, u), \quad \forall z \in \mathcal{Z},$$

where  $\mathcal{U} := \{0, 1\} \times \mathbb{R}_+$  is the action space and  $Q(z'|z, u)$  is the probability density of the next state represented by  $z'$  given the current state-action pair  $(z, u)$ . Notice the Bellman equation is the same as  $V = TV$ .

The theory of discounted-reward MDP requires the following claims [26]:

- (a) The Bellman equation  $V = TV$  has a unique solution  $V^*$ .
- (b)  $V^*$  equals the maximum objective, i.e.,  $V^* = \sup_g \mathbb{E}\{\sum_t r(z_t^g, u_t^g)\}$

Furthermore, if  $g^*(z) := \arg \sup_u r(z, u) + \alpha \int V(z') Q(z'|z, u)$  exists for every  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ , then  $g^*$  is the optimal stationary policy of the MDP.

To show (a), it is sufficient to prove that  $T$  is a contraction mapping and the existence and unique will follow by Banach fixed-point theorem. We construct this notion in Lemma A.2 and A.3.

**Lemma A.2** (self-mapping). *Suppose  $r$  is bounded above by  $M$ , which includes our specialization in (5) and (4). Then, for any  $V \in \mathcal{B}$ , we have  $TV \in \mathcal{B}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $V \in \mathcal{B}$  with upperbound  $\|V\|_w \leq B$ . Given any  $z = (f, s, x) \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} TV(z) &\leq \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \{r(z, u)\} + \alpha \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \int V(z') Q(dz'|z, u) \\ &\leq M + \alpha B \cdot \sup_{u \in \mathcal{U}} \int w(z') Q(dz'|z, u) \leq M + 2\alpha B. \end{aligned}$$

The lowerbound is obtained by plugging in arbitrary action  $u \in \mathcal{U}$ , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} TV(z) &\geq r(z, (1, 0)) + \alpha \int V(z') Q(z'|z, (1, 0)) \\ &\geq \alpha V(1, s, x). \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the weighted norm of  $TV$  is

$$\|TV\|_w = \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \frac{|TV(z)|}{w(z)} \leq \sup_{z \in \mathcal{Z}} \max \left\{ \frac{M + 2\alpha B}{w(z)}, \alpha \left| \frac{V(1, s, x)}{w(z)} \right| \right\}.$$

The first term in the curly bracket is bounded for all  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$  since  $w(\cdot) \geq 1$ . The second term is also bounded because for arbitrary  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\left| \frac{V(1, s, x)}{w(z)} \right| = \left| \frac{V(1, s, x)}{w(1, s, x)} \right| \frac{w(1, s, x)}{w(z)} \leq \frac{B}{w(z)} \leq B.$$

Therefore,  $\|TV\|_w < \infty$  and consequently  $TV \in \mathcal{B}$ . ■

**Lemma A.3** (contraction).  *$T$  is a contraction mappings over  $\mathcal{B}$ .*

*Proof.* Define the operator  $H$  over  $\mathcal{B}$  as

$$HV(z, u) = r(z, u) + \alpha \int V(z') Q(dz'|z, u), \quad V \in \mathcal{B}.$$

Let  $V_1, V_2 \in \mathcal{B}$ . Then, it follows that, for any  $z \in \mathcal{Z}$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} TV_1(z) - TV_2(z) &= \sup_u \{HV_1(z, u)\} - \sup_{u'} \{HV_2(z, u')\} \\ &= \sup_u \left\{ HV_1(z, u) - \sup_{u'} \{HV_2(z, u')\} \right\} \\ &\leq \sup_u \{HV_1(z, u) - HV_2(z, u)\} \\ &= \alpha \sup_u \int (V_1(z') - V_2(z')) Q(dz'|z, u). \end{aligned}$$

Similarly, one can also prove by operating on the other term that

$$TV_1(z) - TV_2(z) \geq \alpha \sup_u \int (V_2(z') - V_1(z')) Q(dz'|z, u).$$

Thus, we can derive an upperbound of the weighted absolute difference

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|TV_1(z) - TV_2(z)|}{w(z)} &\leq \alpha \sup_u \int \frac{|V_1(z') - V_2(z')|}{w(z)} Q(dz'|z, u) \\ &\leq \alpha \|V_1 - V_2\|_w \sup_u \int \frac{w(z')}{w(z)} Q(dz'|z, u). \end{aligned}$$

Define  $\Gamma(z, u) := \int \frac{w(z')}{w(z)} Q(dz'|z, u)$ . Let's denote the entries of  $z$  as  $z = (f, s, x)$ . (1) When  $f = 1$ , then  $z' = z \implies \Gamma(z, u) = w(z)/w(z) = 1$ . (2) When  $f = 0$  and  $s = 1$ , we have  $z' = (1, 1, x) \implies \Gamma(z, u) = w(1, 1, x)/w(0, 1, x) \leq 1$ . (3) When  $f = 0$  and  $s = 0$ , we obtain  $\Gamma(z, u) = \frac{w(0, 0, x+u)}{w(0, 0, x)}(1 - p(x+u)) + \frac{w(0, 1, x+u)}{w(0, 0, x)}p(x+u) \leq 1$  as  $w(0, s, x)$  decreases in either  $s$  or  $x$  and  $0 \leq p(\cdot) \leq 1$ .

Therefore, we conclude

$$\|TV_1 - TV_2\|_w \leq \alpha \|V_1 - V_2\|_w,$$

and that  $T$  is a contraction mapping in  $\mathcal{B}$  for any  $0 < \alpha < 1$ . ■

**Theorem A.4.** *The Bellman equation  $V = TV$  has a unique solution in  $\mathcal{B}$ .*

*Proof.* This result follows readily from Lemma A.2 and A.3 combined with Banach fixed-point theorem. ■

Theorem A.4 justifies claim (a) above. Claim (b) follows the standard arguments independent of the unbounded-reward assumption so that we omit it here.

## B Proof of Results

### B.1 Lemma 4.2

*Proof.* Define the set  $\mathcal{B}(x) := \{-C_X(y) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))V^*(y) : y \geq x\}$ . Notice that  $W(x) = \max \mathcal{B}(x)$ . Let  $x_1, x_2 \geq 0$  and  $x_1 \leq x_2$ . Then,  $\mathcal{B}(x_1) \supseteq \mathcal{B}(x_2)$ , which implies  $W(x_1) \geq W(x_2)$ . ■

### B.2 Lemma 4.3

*Proof.* (i) According to Eq. (10),  $W$  can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) &= \max_{y \geq x} -(1 - \alpha + \alpha p(y))C_x(y) + p(y)R + \alpha(1 - p(y))W(y) \\ &\geq -(1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x))C_x(x) + p(x)R + \alpha(1 - p(x))W(x), \end{aligned}$$

which implies

$$W(x) \geq -C_X(x) + \frac{p(x)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x)},$$

as  $1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x) > 0$  for every  $x > 0$ . For any  $x \geq 0$ , by Lemma 4.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} W(x) &\geq W(y) \geq -C_X(y) + \frac{p(y)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(y)}, \quad \forall y \geq x \\ \implies W(x) &\geq \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + \frac{p(y)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(y)}. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

To show the reverse direction, define the function over which  $W(x)$  takes supremum as

$$g(x) := -(1 - \alpha + \alpha p(x))C_x(x) + p(x)R + \alpha(1 - p(x))W(x)$$

and the quantity

$$\bar{y}_x := \max \mathcal{D}(x) := \max\{y \geq x : g(y) = W(x)\}. \tag{19}$$

By monotonicity of  $W$ , it follows that  $W(x) = W(\bar{y}_x) = g(\bar{y}_x)$ . The latter equality can be reorganized to obtain

$$W(\bar{y}_x) = -C_X(\bar{y}_x) + \frac{p(\bar{y}_x)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(\bar{y}_x)} = G(\bar{y}_x),$$

where the second equality is from the definition of  $G(x)$ , which further implies  $W(x) = G(\bar{y}_x)$ . Since  $\bar{y}_x \in [x, \infty)$ , we also have

$$W(x) \leq \max_{y \geq x} G(y) = \max_{y \geq x} -C_X(y) + \frac{p(y)R}{1 - \alpha + \alpha p(y)}.$$

Together with Eq. (18), we conclude that  $W(x) = \max_{y \geq x} G(y)$ .

(ii) To show the optimal investment, define the set

$$\mathcal{G}(x) := \arg \max_{y \geq x} G(y).$$

Let  $y_x^* := a^* + x$ . Then,  $y_x^*$  is optimal if and only if  $y_x^* \in \mathcal{D}(x)$  with  $\mathcal{D}(x)$  defined in Eq. (19). We obtain from the above discussion

$$G(y_x^*) = W(y_x^*) = W(x) = \max_{y \geq x} G(y) \implies y_x^* \in \mathcal{G}(x),$$

Now let  $y'_x \in \mathcal{G}(x)$ . Then, by our results in (i),  $W(x) = G(y'_x)$ . By monotonicity of  $W$  and that  $y'_x \geq x$ , we further obtain  $W(x) = W(y'_x) = G(y'_x)$ . Transforming the latter equality by multiplying both sides with  $1 - \alpha + \alpha p(y'_x)$  and rearranging terms yield  $W(x) = W(y'_x) = g(y'_x)$ . This implies  $y'_x \in \mathcal{D}(x)$ . Therefore,  $\mathcal{D}(x) = \mathcal{G}(x)$ , i.e., any investment obtained by maximizing  $G$  is optimal and any optimal investment must maximize  $G$ . ■

### B.3 Theorem 5.1

*Proof.* It is sufficient to show that  $U^{\text{out},*}(\gamma)$  is monotonically decreasing in the risk attitude  $\gamma$ .

We first show that  $C_L(\gamma, x)$  given in Eq. (3) is increasing in  $\gamma$ . Then, the lemma follows directly from the fact that any pair of functions  $f, g$  defined on the same domain s.t.  $f \leq g$  point-wise satisfy  $\sup_x f(x) \leq \sup_x g(x)$ .

It is sufficient to show the function

$$g(\gamma) = \gamma \mu_Z(x) + \frac{1}{2} \gamma^2 \sigma_Z^2(x) \left[ \frac{1 - \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu_Z(x)}{\sigma_Z(x)} - \gamma \sigma_Z(x)\right)}{1 - \Phi\left(-\frac{\mu_Z(x)}{\sigma_Z(x)}\right)} \right]$$

is monotonicity increasing for each fixed  $x \geq 0$  on the interval  $[0, \infty)$ . This is true since the first term is a linear function in  $\gamma$  with a positive coefficient and the second term is the product of two positive increasing functions. ■

## C Local Maximums of $G(x)$


*Proof.* (sketch) To avoid long equations, we sketch the key steps used in this proof. Let's first take the first-order derivative of  $G(x)$  given as follows:

$$G'(x) = -c + b \exp(-bx) + \frac{R(1-\alpha)p'(x)}{(1-\alpha + \alpha p(x))^2}.$$

Any critical point of  $G(x)$  is given by zeroing the above equation, which is equivalent to

$$c - b \exp(-bx) = \frac{R(1-\alpha)p'(x)}{(1-\alpha + \alpha p(x))^2}.$$

The left-hand side is monotonically increasing in  $x$  with diminishing derivative. If the right-hand side is first increasing and then decreasing, then we are able to conclude that there are at most three critical points in the function  $G(x)$ , as illustrated in the figure below. Since the function  $G(x)$  is continuous with at most 3



critical points, the number of its local maximum is at most 2, which can be easily seen by contradiction.

To characterize the shape of the right hand side, let's take the derivative of the right hand side and obtain

$$\text{LHS}' = \frac{R(1-\alpha)}{\sigma} \times \frac{p'(x) \left( \frac{\delta-x}{\sigma} (1-\alpha + \alpha p(x)) - 2\alpha \sigma p'(x) \right)}{(1-\alpha + \alpha p(x))^3}.$$

The sign of this derivative is solely determined by the term

$$H(x) := \frac{\delta-x}{\sigma} (1-\alpha + \alpha p(x)) - 2\alpha \sigma p'(x).$$

Define the function

$$h(x) = x(1 - \alpha \Phi(x)) - 2\alpha \varphi(x),$$

where  $\Phi(\cdot)$  and  $\varphi(\cdot)$  are respectively the CDF and PDF of the standard normal distribution. Due to the definition of  $p(x)$  and the property of standard normal distribution that  $\varphi'(x) = -x\varphi(x)$ , we have the following relation  $H(x) = h\left(\frac{\delta-x}{\sigma}\right)$ . Then, it is sufficient to prove that  $h(x)$  is increasing in  $x$ . This can be done by taking two consecutive derivatives of  $h$  and using the fact  $xf(x) \rightarrow 0$  as  $x \rightarrow \infty$ . ■