



PONTRYAGIN PRINCIPLE AND ENVELOPE THEOREM

JOËL BLOT*, HASAN YILMAZ

Laboratoire SAMM EA 4543, Université Paris 1 Panthéon-Sorbonne, centre P.M.F., 90 rue de Tolbiac, 75634 Paris cedex 13, France

Dedicated to the memory of Professor Jack Warga on the occasion of his 100th birthday

Abstract. We provide an improvement to the maximum principle of Pontryagin for Optimal Control problems. We establish differentiability properties of the value function for these problems with assumptions that are as low as possible. Notably, we lighten the assumptions by using Gâteaux and Hadamard differentials.

Keywords. Envelope theorem; Pontryagin maximum principle, Piecewise continuous functions.

1. INTRODUCTION

The paper provides envelope theorems for parameterized problems of Optimal Control (problem of Bolza) as

$$(\mathcal{B}, \pi) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Maximize} \quad \int_0^T f^0(t, x(t), u(t), \pi) dt + g^0(x(T), \pi) \\ \text{subject to} \quad x \in PC^1([0, T], \Omega), u \in NPC_R^0([0, T], U), \\ \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \underline{dx}(t) = f(t, x(t), u(t), \pi), x(0) = \xi_0, \\ \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, g^i(x(T), \pi) \geq 0, \\ \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, q\}, h^j(x(T), \pi) = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

For all parameters π , $V[\pi]$ is the value of the problem (\mathcal{B}, π) . We establish properties of the value function $[\pi \mapsto V[\pi]]$ in terms of Gâteaux variation, Gâteaux differentiability, and Fréchet continuous differentiability. We try to establish such results using assumptions as low as possible. Envelope theorems for static optimization and Calculus of Variations can be found in [4] where references on economic motivations are cited.

*Corresponding author.

E-mail address: blot@univ-paris1.fr (J. Blot), yilmaz.research@gmail.com (H. Yilmaz).

Received: June 27, 2022; Accepted: September 14, 2022.

In the literature about optimal control in a continuous time framework, concerning the Pontryagin principle, there exist two different choices of formalism. In the first one, the state functions are piecewise continuously differentiable and the control functions are piecewise continuous. In the second choice, the state functions are absolutely continuous and the control functions are measurable and essentially bounded. Our works belong to the first choice of formalism.

In this paper, in the continuous time framework, we start by establishing new Pontryagin principles for the problems of Bolza and Mayer without parameter. In the continuous-time framework, some results on the Pontryagin principle for Optimal Control problems can be found in L.S. Pontryagin, V.G. Boltyanskii, R.V. Gamkrelidze, and E.F. Mishchenko in [12], V. Alexeev, V.M. Tikhomirov, and S.V. Fomine in [1], A. Ioffe and V.M. Tikhomirov in [9], P. Michel in [11], and J. Blot and H. Yilmaz in [3]. Notice that, in [3], the authors generalize the proof of the Pontryagin principle in [11] with infinite dimensional state space. In this paper, we improve the Pontryagin principle of [3] in the following way. Firstly, the control space is a Hausdorff topological space instead of a metric space. Next, for the functions which define the final constraints, we replace the assumptions of Fréchet differentiability at a point by the assumptions of Hadamard differentiability at a point. Moreover, for the vector field and the integrand of the criterion, we lighten assumptions of Fréchet differentiability by using assumptions of the Gâteaux differentiability. Besides, we provide, on the one hand, qualification conditions to obtain the multiplier associated to the criterion equal to 1 and, on the other hand, another qualification conditions to obtain the uniqueness of the multiplier and the adjoint function when the multiplier associated to the criterion equal to 1. Furthermore, these qualification conditions are very useful to treat the question of the envelope theorems. Notice that we provide conditions on the Gâteaux differentials to obtain Lipschitz conditions, we provide a new result on the differentiability of nonlinear functionals. Moreover, we do not do assumptions on the regularity of the multipliers and the adjoint function with respect to the parameter (as it is often the case in the literature).

We summarize the content of this paper as follows. In Section 2, we establish Pontryagin principles for the Optimal Control. In a first subsection, we state a Pontryagin principle for the problem of Bolza, and we provide new qualification conditions. In a second subsection, we state a Pontryagin principle for the problem of Mayer, and we give qualification conditions. In a third subsection, we prove the results on the problem of Mayer; in order to do that we use a new multiplier rule which is an improvement of a multiplier rule in [2]. In the last subsection, in order to prove the Pontryagin principle of the problem of Bolza, we transform the problem of Bolza into a problem of Mayer. In Section 3, we establish envelope theorems for parameterized problems of optimal control. In the first subsection, we state envelope theorems. In the second subsection, we prove the first envelope theorem. In order to do that, we provide new results on the differentiability of nonlinear integral functionals and we use the new Pontryagin principles and qualification conditions for the problems of Bolza without parameter. In the third subsection, by using the first envelope theorem, we prove that the value function is Gâteaux differentiable at a point. In the last subsection, we prove the last envelope theorem by using the second envelope theorem.

2. STATEMENTS OF THE PONTYAGIN PRINCIPLES

2.1. Pontryagin principle for the problem of Bolza. E is a real Banach space, Ω is a non-empty subset of E , U is a Hausdorff topological space, $f : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \rightarrow E$, $f^0 : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $g^\alpha : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($0 \leq \alpha \leq m$), and $h^\beta : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($1 \leq \beta \leq q$) are functions when $(m, q) \in \mathbb{N}_* \times \mathbb{N}_*$, where $\mathbb{N}_* = \mathbb{N} \setminus \{0\}$.

When X is a Hausdorff topological space, $PC^0([0, T], X)$ denotes the space of the *piecewise continuous functions* from $[0, T]$ into X . As in [3], we specify that $x \in PC^0([0, T], X)$ when x is continuous on $[0, T]$ or when there exists a subdivision of $[0, T]$, $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_k < \tau_{k+1} = T$ such that x is continuous at t when $t \notin \{\tau_i : 0 \leq i \leq k+1\}$ and the right-hand limit $x(\tau_i+)$ exists in X and when $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and the left hand limit $x(\tau_i-)$ exists in X when $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$. We define $NPC_R^0([0, T], X)$ as the set of the $x \in PC^0([0, T], X)$ which are right-continuous on $[0, T[$ and left-continuous at T . An element of $NPC_R^0([0, T], X)$ is called a *normalized piecewise continuous function*, cf. [3]. When X is a real normed vector space, \mathfrak{D} is a non-empty open subset of X and Y is a Hausdorff topological space. A mapping $\mathfrak{g} : [0, T] \times \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow Y$ is *piecewise continuous with a parameter* on $[0, T] \times \mathfrak{D}$ when there exists a subdivision of $[0, T]$, $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_k < \tau_{k+1} = T$ such that, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, k-1\}$, \mathfrak{g} is continuous on $[\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}[\times \mathfrak{D}$, \mathfrak{g} is continuous on $[\tau_k, \tau_{k+1}] \times \mathfrak{D}$, and for all $i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$, for all $x \in \mathfrak{D}$, $\lim_{t \rightarrow \tau_i-, z \rightarrow x} \mathfrak{g}(t, z)$ exists in Y . The space of all the piecewise continuous functions with a parameter is denoted by $PCP^0([0, T] \times \mathfrak{D}, Y)$. When X is included into a real normed vector space, $PC^1([0, T], X)$ denotes the space of the piecewise continuously differentiable functions from $[0, T]$ into X . We specify that $x \in PC^1([0, T], X)$ when x is continuously differentiable on $[0, T]$ or when x is continuous on $[0, T]$ and there exists a subdivision, $0 = \tau_0 < \tau_1 < \dots < \tau_k < \tau_{k+1} = T$ such that x is continuously differentiable at t if $t \notin \{\tau_i : 0 \leq i \leq k+1\}$ the right derivative $x'_R(\tau_i) = x'(\tau_i+)$ exists when $i \in \{0, \dots, k\}$, the left derivative $x'_L(\tau_i) = x'(\tau_i-)$ exists when $i \in \{1, \dots, k+1\}$, cf. [3]. As in [3], we consider the *extended derivative* of $x \in PC^1([0, T], X)$ as follows:

$$\underline{dx}(t) := \begin{cases} x'(t) & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \setminus \{\tau_i : i \in \{0, \dots, k+1\}\}, \\ x'_R(t) & \text{if } t = \tau_i, i \in \{0, \dots, k\}, \\ x'_L(t) & \text{if } t = T. \end{cases} \quad (2.1)$$

Note that if $x \in PC^1([0, T], X)$, then $\underline{dx} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], X)$. Moreover, \underline{d} is a continuous linear operator from $PC^1([0, T], X)$ into $NPC_R^0([0, T], X)$. When X is included in a Banach space, the following relation holds:

$$\text{for all } s < t \text{ in } [0, T], x(t) - x(s) = \int_s^t \underline{dx}(r) dr,$$

where the integral is taken in the sense of Riemann as exposed in [5]. We refer to [3] for the details about these function spaces. When X is a real normed vector space, \mathfrak{D} is a non-empty open subset of X , $x \in \mathfrak{D}$, $v \in X$, and Y is a real normed vector space, when $\mathfrak{f} : \mathfrak{D} \rightarrow Y$ is a mapping, when it exists $D_G^+ \mathfrak{f}(x; v)$ denotes the right-directional derivative (also called the right Gâteaux variation) of \mathfrak{f} at x in the direction v cf. [4] (Subsection 2.1). When it exists, $D_G \mathfrak{f}(x)$ (respectively $D_H \mathfrak{f}(x)$, respectively $D_F \mathfrak{f}(x)$) denotes the Gâteaux (respectively Hadamard, respectively Fréchet) differential of \mathfrak{f} at x . Moreover, when X is a finite product of n real normed spaces, $X := \prod_{i=1}^n X_i$, if $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$, $D_{G,i} \mathfrak{f}(x)$ (respectively $D_{H,i} \mathfrak{f}(x)$, respectively $D_{F,i} \mathfrak{f}(x)$) denotes the partial Gâteaux (respectively Hadamard, respectively Fréchet) differential of \mathfrak{f} at x with respect

to the i -th vector variable. If $1 \leq i_1 \leq i_2 \leq i_3 \leq n$, $D_{H,(i_1,i_2,i_3)}\mathbf{f}(x)$ denotes the Hadamard differential of the mapping $[(\mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \mathbf{x}_{i_3}) \mapsto \mathbf{f}(x_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_1}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_2}, \dots, \mathbf{x}_{i_3}, \dots, x_n)]$ at the point $(x_{i_1}, x_{i_2}, x_{i_3})$.

We formulate the problem of Bolza:

$$(\mathcal{B}) \begin{cases} \text{Maximize} & J(x, u) := \int_0^T f^0(t, x(t), u(t)) dt + g^0(x(T)) \\ \text{subject to} & x \in PC^1([0, T], \Omega), u \in NPC_R^0([0, T], U), \\ & \forall t \in [0, T], \dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t), u(t)), x(0) = \xi_0, \\ & \forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, g^\alpha(x(T)) \geq 0, \\ & \forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, h^\beta(x(T)) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Generally the controlled dynamical system which is present in (\mathcal{B}) is formulated as follows: $x'(t) = f(t, x(t), u(t))$ when $x'(t)$ exists. In [3], we explain why the present formulation is equivalent.

If $f^0 = 0$, (\mathcal{B}) is called a problem of Mayer and it is denoted by (\mathcal{M}) . When (x, u) is an admissible process for (\mathcal{B}) or (\mathcal{M}) , we consider the following condition of qualification, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$.

$$(QC, i) \begin{cases} \text{If } (c_\alpha)_{i \leq \alpha \leq m} \in \mathbb{R}_+^{1-i+m}, (d_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q} \in \mathbb{R}^q \text{ satisfy} \\ (\forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, c_\alpha g^\alpha(x(T)) = 0), \text{ and} \\ \sum_{\alpha=i}^m c_\alpha D_G g^\alpha(x(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q d_\beta D_G h^\beta(x(T)) = 0, \text{ then} \\ (\forall \alpha \in \{i, \dots, m\}, c_\alpha = 0) \text{ and } (\forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, d_\beta = 0). \end{cases}$$

When $i = 0$, this condition is due to Michel [11].

Now we formulate the assumptions for our theorems. Let (x_0, u_0) be an admissible process of (\mathcal{B}) or (\mathcal{M}) .

Conditions on the integrand of the criterion.

(A11) $f^0 \in C^0([0, T] \times \Omega \times U, \mathbb{R})$, for all $(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, $D_{G,2}f^0(t, \xi, \zeta)$ exists, for all $(t, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times U$, $D_{F,2}f^0(t, x_0(t), \zeta)$ exists and $[(t, \zeta) \mapsto D_{F,2}f^0(t, x_0(t), \zeta)] \in C^0([0, T] \times U, E^*)$.

(A12) For all non-empty compact $K \subset \Omega$, for all non-empty compact $M \subset U$, $\sup_{(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times K \times M} \|D_{G,2}f^0(t, \xi, \zeta)\| < +\infty$,

where C^0 means the continuity and E^* denotes the topological dual space of E .

Conditions on the vector field.

(A11) $f \in C^0([0, T] \times \Omega \times U, E)$, for all $(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, $D_{G,2}f(t, \xi, \zeta)$ exists, for all $(t, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times U$, $D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), \zeta)$ exists and $[(t, \zeta) \mapsto D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), \zeta)] \in C^0([0, T] \times U, \mathcal{L}(E, E))$.

(A12) For all non-empty compact $K \subset \Omega$, for all non-empty compact $M \subset U$, $\sup_{(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times K \times M} \|D_{G,2}f(t, \xi, \zeta)\| < +\infty$,

where $\mathcal{L}(E, E)$ denotes the space of bounded linear mappings from E into E .

Conditions on terminal constraints functions and on terminal part of the criterion.

(AT1) For all $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, g^α is Hadamard differentiable at $x_0(T)$.

(AT2) For all $\beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, h^β is continuous on a neighborhood of $x_0(T)$ and Hadamard differentiable at $x_0(T)$.

(AI1) and (AI2) are an improvement of condition (A3) of [3], (AV1) and (AV2) are an improvement of condition (A4) of [3], (AT1) is an improvement of condition (A1) of [3], and (AT2) is an improvement of condition (A2) of [3].

The Hamiltonian of (\mathcal{B}) is the function $\mathcal{H}_B : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times E^* \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\mathcal{H}_B(t, \xi, \zeta, p, \lambda) := \lambda f^0(t, \xi, \zeta) + p \cdot f(t, \xi, \zeta)$ when $(t, \xi, \zeta, p, \lambda) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times E^* \times \mathbb{R}$.

Theorem 2.1. (*Pontryagin Principle for the problem of Bolza*)

When (x_0, u_0) is a solution of (\mathcal{B}) , under (AI1), (AI2), (AV1), (AV2), (AT1) and (AT2), there exist multipliers $(\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m} \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m}$, $(\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and an adjoint function $p \in PC^1([0, T], E^*)$ which satisfy the following conditions.

- (NN) $((\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q})$ is non zero.
- (Si) For all $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_\alpha \geq 0$.
- (Sl) For all $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_\alpha g^\alpha(x_0(T)) = 0$.
- (TC) $\sum_{\alpha=0}^m \lambda_\alpha D_H g^\alpha(x_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q \mu_\beta D_H h^\beta(x_0(T)) = p(T)$.
- (AE.B) $\underline{d}p(t) = -D_{F,2}\mathcal{H}_B(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t), \lambda_0)$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.
- (MP.B) For all $t \in [0, T]$, for all $\zeta \in U$,
 $\mathcal{H}_B(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t), \lambda_0) \geq \mathcal{H}_B(t, x_0(t), \zeta, p(t), \lambda_0)$.
- (CH.B) $\mathcal{H}_B := [t \mapsto \mathcal{H}_B(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t), \lambda_0)] \in C^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$,

(NN) means non nullity, (Si) means sign, (Sl) means slackness, (TC) means transversality condition, (AE.B) means adjoint equation, (MP.B) means maximum principle and (CH.B) means continuity of the Hamiltonian.

Corollary 2.2. *In this setting and under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, if, in addition, we assume that, for all $(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, the partial derivatives with respect to the first variable $\partial_1 f^0(t, \xi, \zeta)$ and $\partial_1 f(t, \xi, \zeta)$ exist and $\partial_1 f^0$ and $\partial_1 f$ are continuous on $[0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, then $\mathcal{H}_B \in PC^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\underline{d}\mathcal{H}_B(t) = \partial_1 \mathcal{H}_B(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t), \lambda_0)$.*

We introduce other conditions.

(AV3) U is a subset of real normed vector space Y , there exists $\hat{t} \in [0, T]$ s.t. U is a neighborhood of $u_0(\hat{t})$ in Y , $D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}))$ exists and it is surjective

and

- (LI) U is a subset of a real normed vector space Y s.t. U is a neighborhood of $u_0(T)$ in Y , $D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T))$ exists and
 $((D_H g^\alpha(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)))_{1 \leq \alpha \leq m},$
 $(D_H h^\beta(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)))_{1 \leq \beta \leq q})$ is free.

Corollary 2.3. *In this setting and under the assumptions of Theorem 2.1, the following assertions hold.*

- (i) Under (QC, 1) for $(x, u) = (x_0, u_0)$, we have for all $t \in [0, T]$, $(\lambda_0, p(t)) \neq 0$.
- (ii) Under (QC, 1) for $(x, u) = (x_0, u_0)$ and (AV3), we can choose $\lambda_0 = 1$.
- (iii) Under (LI), we can choose $\lambda_0 = 1$.
- (iv) Under (LI), if, in addition, we assume that $D_{G,3}f^0(T, x_0(T), u_0(T))$ exists, then
 $((\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m} \times \mathbb{R}^q \times PC^1([0, T], E^*)$ with $\lambda_0 = 1$, which satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 2.1, are unique.

2.2. Pontryagin principles for the problem of Mayer. The Hamiltonian of (\mathcal{M}) is the function $\mathcal{H}_M : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times E^* \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\mathcal{H}_M(t, \xi, \zeta, p) := p \cdot f(t, \xi, \zeta)$ when $(t, \xi, \zeta, p) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times E^*$.

Theorem 2.4. (*Pontryagin Principle for the problem of Mayer*)

When (x_0, u_0) is a solution of (\mathcal{M}) , under (AV1), (AV2), (AT1) and (AT2), there exist multipliers $(\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m} \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m}$, $(\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ and an adjoint function $p \in PC^1([0, T], E^*)$ which satisfy the following conditions.

- (NN) $((\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q})$ is non zero.
- (Si) For all $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_\alpha \geq 0$.
- (Sl) For all $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_\alpha g^\alpha(x_0(T)) = 0$.
- (TC) $\sum_{\alpha=0}^m \lambda_\alpha D_H g^\alpha(x_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q \mu_\beta D_H h^\beta(x_0(T)) = p(T)$.
- (AE.M) $\underline{d}p(t) = -D_{F,2} \mathcal{H}_M(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t))$ for all $t \in [0, T]$.
- (MP.M) For all $t \in [0, T]$, for all $\zeta \in U$,
 $\mathcal{H}_M(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t)) \geq \mathcal{H}_M(t, x_0(t), \zeta, p(t))$.
- (CH.M) $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_M := [t \mapsto \mathcal{H}_M(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t))] \in C^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$.

Corollary 2.5. In this setting and under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, if in addition we assume that, for all $(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, the partial derivatives with respect to the first variable $\partial_1 f(t, \xi, \zeta)$ exist and $\partial_1 f$ are continuous on $[0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, then $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_M \in PC^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\underline{d}\bar{\mathcal{H}}_M(t) = \partial_1 \mathcal{H}_M(t, x_0(t), u_0(t), p(t))$.

Corollary 2.6. In this setting and under the assumptions of Theorem 2.4, the following assertions hold.

- (i) Under (QC, 1) for $(x, u) = (x_0, u_0)$, we have for all $t \in [0, T]$, $(\lambda_0, p(t)) \neq 0$.
- (ii) Under (QC, 0) for $(x, u) = (x_0, u_0)$, we have for all $t \in [0, T]$, $p(t) \neq 0$.
- (iii) Under (QC, 1) for $(x, u) = (x_0, u_0)$ and (AV3), we can choose $\lambda_0 = 1$.
- (iv) Under (LI), the $((\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}, p) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m} \times \mathbb{R}^q \times PC^1([0, T], E^*)$ with $\lambda_0 = 1$, which satisfies the conclusions of Theorem 2.4, are unique.

2.3. Proofs of results for the problem of Mayer. We consider

$S := ((t_i, v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ where $t_i \in [0, T]$ satisfying $0 < t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_N < T$, where $v_i \in U$ and where $N \in \mathbb{N}_*$. We denote by \mathbb{S} the set of such S .

When $S \in \mathbb{S}$ and $a = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we define the following objects: $J(i) = J(i, S) := \{j \in \{1, \dots, i-1\} : t_j = t_i\}$, $b_i(a) = b_i(a, S) := 0$ if $J(i) = \emptyset$ and $b_i(a) = b_i(a, S) = \sum_{j \in J(i)} a_j$ if $J(i) \neq \emptyset$. We also define $I_i(a) = I_i(a, S) := [t_i + b_i(a), t_i + b_i(a) + a_i[$. We define $\delta(S) = \min\{t_{i+1} - t_i : i \in \{1, \dots, N-1\}, t_i < t_{i+1}\}$ and $\|a\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^N |a_i| = \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \leq \delta(S)$. When $a \in B_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we have $I_i(a) \subset [0, T]$ and $I_i(a) \cap I_j(a) = \emptyset$ when $i \neq j$ and we can define the needlelike variation of u_0 :

$$u_a(t) = u_a(t, S) := \begin{cases} v_i & \text{if } t \in I_i(a), 1 \leq i \leq N, \\ u_0(t) & \text{if } t \in [0, T] \setminus \cup_{1 \leq i \leq N} I_i(a). \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$

It is easy to verify that

$$u_a = u_a(\cdot, S) \in NPC_R^0([0, T], U). \quad (2.3)$$

We associate to the control function u_a the non extendable solution x_a of the Cauchy problem on $[0, T]$.

$$\underline{d}x_a(t) = f(t, x_a(t), u_a(t)), \quad x_a(0) = \xi_0. \quad (2.4)$$

In the sequel of this subsection, we arbitrarily fix a list $S = ((t_i, v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ in \mathbb{S} .

Lemma 2.7. *Let X be a metric space, Y be a non empty set, Z be a real normed vector space and $\phi : X \times Y \rightarrow Z$ be a mapping. We assume that: for all non-empty compact subset K of X , we have $\sup_{(x,y) \in K \times Y} \|\phi(x,y)\| < +\infty$. Then, for all non-empty compact subset K of X , there exists $\rho > 0$ s.t. $\sup_{(x,y) \in V(K,\rho) \times Y} \|\phi(x,y)\| < +\infty$, where $V(K,\rho) := \{z \in X : d(z,K) := \inf_{k \in K} d(z,k) < \rho\}$.*

Proof. We proceed by contradiction, we assume that there exists a non-empty compact subset $K \subset X$ s.t. $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \forall \gamma \in \mathbb{R}_+ \exists (x^\varepsilon, y^\varepsilon) \in V(K, \varepsilon) \times Y, \|\phi(x^\varepsilon, y^\varepsilon)\| > \gamma$. Therefore taking $\varepsilon = \frac{1}{n}, \gamma = n$ with $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, we obtain $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_*, \exists (x_n, y_n) \in V(K, \frac{1}{n}) \times Y, \|\phi(x_n, y_n)\| > n$. Hence, for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_*$, $\exists u_n \in K$ s.t. $d(x_n, u_n) = d(x_n, K) < \frac{1}{n}$. Since K is a compact, there exists $\psi : \mathbb{N}_* \rightarrow \mathbb{N}_*$ strictly increasing and $z \in K$ s.t. $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} u_{\psi(n)} = z$. Hence, we have also $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} x_{\psi(n)} = z$. Since $K_0 := \{x_{\psi(n)} : n \in \mathbb{N}_*\} \cup \{z\}$ is compact, there exists $\gamma_0 \in \mathbb{R}_+$ s.t., $\forall n \in \mathbb{N}_*, \|\phi(x_{\psi(n)}, y_{\psi(n)})\| \leq \sup_{(x,y) \in K_0 \times Y} \|\phi(x,y)\| \leq \gamma_0 < +\infty$. Besides, we have also for all $n \in \mathbb{N}_*, \psi(n) < \|\phi(x_{\psi(n)}, y_{\psi(n)})\| \leq \gamma_0$. Since $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \psi(n) = +\infty$, we obtain the contradiction $+\infty \leq \gamma_0 < +\infty$. \square

Lemma 2.8. *Let X and Z be two real normed vector spaces, Y be a non-empty set, \mathbb{G} be a non-empty open subset of X , and $\phi : \mathbb{G} \times Y \rightarrow Z$ be a mapping. We assume that the two following conditions are fulfilled.*

- (a) $\forall (x,y) \in \mathbb{G} \times Y, D_{G,1}\phi(x,y)$ exists.
- (b) $\forall K \subset \mathbb{G}, K$ non-empty compact set, $\sup_{(x,y) \in K \times Y} \|D_{G,1}\phi(x,y)\| < +\infty$.

For each non-empty compact subset $K \subset \mathbb{G}$, there exist $\eta > 0, \kappa > 0$ s.t. for all $x \in K$, for all $x_1, x_2 \in \bar{B}(x, \eta)$, for all $y \in Y, \|\phi(x_1, y) - \phi(x_2, y)\| \leq \kappa \|x_1 - x_2\|$.

Proof. Let $K \subset \mathbb{G}, K$ non-empty, and compact. From Lemma 2.7, there exists $\rho > 0$ s.t. $\kappa := \sup_{(x,y) \in V(K,\rho) \times Y} \|D_{G,1}\phi(x,y)\| < +\infty$. We set $\eta := \frac{\rho}{2}$. Let $x \in K$ and $x_1, x_2 \in \bar{B}(x, \eta)$. Since the balls are convex, we have $[x_1, x_2] \subset \bar{B}(x, \eta) \subset V(K, \rho)$. Using the mean value inequality ([1], Subsection 2.2.3, p. 143), we obtain, for all $y \in Y, \|\phi(x_1, y) - \phi(x_2, y)\| \leq \sup_{\xi \in [x_1, x_2]} \|D_{G,1}\phi(\xi, y)\| \|x_1 - x_2\| \leq \kappa \|x_1 - x_2\|$. \square

Remark 2.9. Noting that we do not use a condition of continuity on ϕ in Lemma 2.7, we replace it by a condition of boundedness on the compact subsets. It is similar in Lemma 2.8 for $D_{G,1}\phi$ instead of ϕ . These lemmas permit us to replace the condition of partial differentiable continuity in (A3) and (A4) of [3] by the conditions (AI2) and (AV2).

Lemma 2.10. *Let X and Y be metric spaces and $\phi \in C^0([0, T] \times X, Y)$. The Nemytskii operator $N_\phi : PC^0([0, T], X) \rightarrow PC^0([0, T], Y)$, defined by $N_\phi(z) := [t \mapsto \phi(t, z(t))]$ when $z \in PC^0([0, T], X)$, is well defined and continuous. Moreover, $N_\phi(NPC_R^0([0, T], X)) \subset NPC_R^0([0, T], Y)$.*

Proof. Let $z \in PC^0([0, T], X)$; we set $w(t) := \phi(t, z(t))$ when $t \in [0, T]$. Since ϕ is continuous, we have, for all $t \in [0, T], w(t+) = \phi(t, z(t+))$ and, for all $t \in]0, T], w(t-) = \phi(t, z(t-))$. Since the set of discontinuity points of z , $\text{discont}(z)$, is finite, $\text{discont}(w)$ is necessarily finite, and so $w \in PC^0([0, T], Y)$. We denote by $\mathcal{G}(z)$ the graph of z . Since $z \in PC^0([0, T], X)$, $cl(\mathcal{G}(z))$ is compact and then, we can use the Heine-Schwartz lemma ([13] p. 355, note (**)) and assert that: $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon > 0, \forall (t, s) \in [0, T], \forall \xi \in X, |t - s| + d(z(t), \xi) \leq \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon \Rightarrow d(\phi(t, z(t)), \phi(s, \xi)) \leq \varepsilon$. Hence, $\forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon > 0, \forall t \in [0, T], \forall \xi \in X, d(z(t), \xi) \leq \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon \Rightarrow$

$d(\phi(t, z(t)), \phi(t, \xi)) \leq \varepsilon$. Let $\varepsilon > 0$. If $z_1 \in PC^0([0, T], X)$ satisfies $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} d(z(t), z_1(t)) \leq \vartheta_\varepsilon$, then $\sup_{0 \leq t \leq T} d(\phi(t, z(t)), \phi(t, z_1(t))) \leq \varepsilon$. The continuity of N_ϕ at z is proven. Therefore, N_ϕ is well defined and continuous. Moreover, when $z \in NPC_R^0([0, T], X)$, since z is right-continuous on $[0, T[$ and ϕ is continuous, we have also $N_\phi(z) \in NPC_R^0([0, T], Y)$. \square

Lemma 2.11. *Let $0 = s_0 < s_1 < \dots < s_n < s_{n+1} = T$, and, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, $\mathbf{h}_i \in PC^0([0, T], E)$. We consider $\mathbf{h} : [0, T] \rightarrow E$ defined by $\mathbf{h}(t) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} 1_{[s_i, s_{i+1}[}(t) \mathbf{h}_i(t) + 1_{[s_n, T]}(t) \mathbf{h}_n(t)$ when $t \in [0, T]$. We have $\mathbf{h} \in PC^0([0, T], E)$.*

Proof. Note that $\text{discont}(\mathbf{h}) \subset \{s_i : 0 \leq i \leq n+1\} \cup \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq n} \text{discont}(\mathbf{h}_i)$. Hence, $\text{discont}(\mathbf{h})$ is finite. When $t \in [0, T[$, we have $\mathbf{h}(t+) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} 1_{[s_i, s_{i+1}[}(t+) \mathbf{h}_i(t+) + 1_{[s_n, T]}(t+) \mathbf{h}_n(t+)$ and, when $t \in]0, T]$, $\mathbf{h}(t-) = \sum_{0 \leq i \leq n-1} 1_{[s_i, s_{i+1}[}(t-) \mathbf{h}_i(t-) + 1_{[s_n, T]}(t-) \mathbf{h}_n(t-)$. This proves $\mathbf{h} \in PC^0([0, T], E)$. \square

Now, we consider the linearization of the evolution equation

$$\underline{dy}(t) = D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \cdot y(t). \quad (2.5)$$

We denote by $R(\cdot, \cdot)$ the resolvent of (2.5). We know that, for all $(t, s) \in [0, T]^2$, $R(t, \cdot) \in PC^1([0, T], \mathcal{L}(E, E))$ and $R(\cdot, s) \in PC^1([0, T], \mathcal{L}(E, E))$. For all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we also consider the following Cauchy problem on an inhomogeneous ODE:

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \underline{dz}_a(t) &= D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \cdot z_a(t) + f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \\ z(0) &= 0. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.6)$$

We denote by z_a the non extendable solution of (2.6). Since (2.6) is an inhomogeneous linear ODE, z_a is defined on all over $[0, T]$.

Lemma 2.12. *We consider the linear mapping $\mathfrak{L} : \mathbb{R}^N \rightarrow E$, defined by $\mathfrak{L} \cdot a := \sum_{i=1}^N a_i R(T, t_i) \cdot [f(t_i, x_0(t_i), v_i) - f(t_i, x_0(t_i), u_0(t_i))]$ when $a = (a_1, \dots, a_N) \in \mathbb{R}^N$. There exists $\rho_1 : \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N \rightarrow E$ s.t. $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \rho_1(a) = 0$ and, for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $z_a(T) = z_0(T) + \mathfrak{L} \cdot a + \|a\|_1 \rho_1(a)$.*

Proof. For all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, the second member of (2.6) is Δ_a , defined by $\Delta_a(t) := 0$ when $t \notin \bigcup_{1 \leq i \leq N} I_i(a)$ and $\Delta_a(t) := f(t, x_0(t), v_i) - f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t))$ when $t \in I_i(a)$ ($1 \leq i \leq N$). Using Lemma 2.10 and 2.11, we see that $\Delta_a \in PC^0([0, T], E)$. Since $R(t, \cdot)$ is continuous, $R(t, \cdot) \cdot \Delta_a \in PC^0([0, T], E)$, hence it is Riemann integrable. Using the Variation of Constants formula, we can write $z_a(t) = z_a(0) + \int_0^t R(t, s) \cdot \Delta_a(s) ds$. Note that $z_0 = 0$ since the second member of (2.6) is zero and the initial value is zero. Hence, we have, for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$,

$$\begin{aligned} z_a(T) - z_0(T) - \mathfrak{L} \cdot a &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{I_i(a)} R(T, s) \cdot \Delta_a(s) ds - \sum_{i=1}^N a_i R(T, t_i) \cdot \Delta_a(t_i) \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{I_i(a)} (R(T, s) \cdot \Delta_a(s) - R(T, t_i) \cdot \Delta_a(t_i)) ds. \end{aligned}$$

We set, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, N\}$, $\phi_i(a) := 0$ if $a_i = 0$ and

$$\phi_i(a) := \frac{1}{a_i} \int_{t_i+b_i}^{t_i+b_i+a_i} [R(T, s) \cdot \Delta(s, a) - R(T, t_i) \cdot \Delta(t_i)] ds. \quad (2.7)$$

if $a_i \neq 0$. Hence, we obtain the following relation

$$z_a(T) = z_0(T) + \mathfrak{L} \cdot a + \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} a_i \phi_i(a). \quad (2.8)$$

We introduce the mappings, $\psi_i : [0, 1] \times (\bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N) \rightarrow E$, ($1 \leq i \leq N$), defined by

$$\psi_i(\theta, a) := R(T, t_i + b_i + \theta a_i) \cdot \Delta_a(t_i + b_i + \theta a_i, a) - R(T, t_i) \cdot \Delta_a(t_i). \quad (2.9)$$

Note that $\psi_i(\cdot, a) \in PC^0([0, 1], E)$ and so it is Riemann integrable and using a change of variable, we obtain $\phi_i(a) := \int_0^1 \psi_i(\theta, a) d\theta$ ($1 \leq i \leq N$). Since x_0 and $R(T, \cdot)$ are continuous, since u_0 is right-continuous, we have $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} x_0(t_i + b_i + \theta a_i) = x_0(t_i)$, $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} u_0(t_i + b_i + \theta a_i) = u_0(t_i)$, $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} R(T, t_i + b_i + \theta a_i) = R(T, t_i)$, and then we obtain $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \psi_i(\theta, a) = 0$ for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and also

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\psi_i(\theta, a)\| = 0 \text{ for all } \theta \in [0, 1]. \quad (2.10)$$

Since $\Delta_a \in PC^0([0, T], E)$ and since a is not present in the formula of Δ_a , we see that

$$\exists c_1 \in \mathbb{R}_+, \forall a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall t \in [0, T], \|\Delta_a(t)\| \leq c_1. \quad (2.11)$$

Consequently, we obtain, for all $\theta \in [0, 1]$ and for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$,

$$\|\psi_i(\theta, a)\| \leq 2 \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \|R(T, s)\| \|\Delta_a(s)\| \leq 2 \|R(T, \cdot)\|_\infty c_1. \quad (2.12)$$

Since $\|\psi_i(\cdot, a)\| \in PC^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, it is Riemann integrable and also Borel integrable on $[0, 1]$, and since the constants are Riemann integrable on $[0, 1]$, with (2.10) and (2.12) we can use the theorem of the Dominated Convergence of Lebesgue to obtain

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \int_0^1 \|\psi_i(\theta, a)\| d\theta = \int_0^1 \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\psi_i(\theta, a)\| d\theta = 0.$$

Since, for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\|\phi_i(a)\| \leq \int_0^1 \|\psi_i(\theta, a)\| d\theta$, we obtain $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\phi_i(a)\| = 0$, i.e. $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \phi_i(a) = 0$. Setting, for all $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \cap \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S))$, $\rho_1(a) := 0$ when $a = 0$ and $\rho_1(a) := \frac{1}{\|a\|_1} \sum_{i=1}^N a_i \phi_i(a)$ when $a \neq 0$, we see that $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \rho_1(a) = 0$, and we have proven the lemma. \square

Lemma 2.13. *There exists $k \in \mathbb{R}_{+*}$, for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we have*

$$\int_0^T \|f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t))\| dt \leq k \|a\|_1.$$

Proof. We set $k := c_1$ provided by (2.11). Let $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^N \cap \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S))$. Using the Chasles relation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \int_0^T \|f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t))\| dt &= \int_0^T \|\Delta_a(t)\| dt \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^N \int_{t_i+b_i}^{t_i+b_i+a_i} \|\Delta_a(t)\| dt \leq c_1 \sum_{i=1}^N a_i = k \|a\|_1. \end{aligned}$$

\square

The discontinuity points of u_0 are denoted by τ_j ($0 \leq j \leq k+1$). We consider the set $M := (\bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq k} cl(u_0([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}])) \cup \{v_i : 1 \leq i \leq N\}$, which is compact as a finite union of compacts.

Lemma 2.14. *There exist $L \in \mathbb{R}_{+*}$ and $r \in \mathbb{R}_{+*}$ such that, $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $\forall \xi, \xi_1 \in \bar{B}(x_0(t), r)$, $\forall \zeta \in M$, $\|f(t, \xi, \zeta) - f(t, \xi_1, \zeta)\| \leq L\|\xi - \xi_1\|$.*

Proof. We set $K := x_0([0, T])$, which is compact and non-empty. Using (Av1) and (Av2), we can apply Lemma 2.8 to the mapping $\phi(\xi, (t, \zeta)) := f(t, \xi, \zeta)$ with $Y := [0, T] \times M$ to obtain the result. \square

Setting $r_1 := re^{-L.T}$, we consider the set $\mathcal{X} := \bar{B}(x_0, r_1) \subset C^0([0, T], \Omega) \subset C^0([0, T], E)$. This last vector space is endowed with the norm of Bielecki $\|\varphi\|_b := \sup_{t \in [0, T]}(e^{-Lt}\|\varphi(t)\|)$ for which it is a Banach space (see [7], p.56). When $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, \delta(S)) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we consider the operator $\Phi_a : \mathcal{X} \rightarrow C^0([0, T], E)$ defined by

$$\Phi_a(x) := [t \mapsto \xi_0 + \int_0^t f(s, x(s), u_a(s))ds]. \quad (2.13)$$

This operator was used in [3].

Lemma 2.15. *The following assertions hold.*

- (i) *There exists $r_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{+*}$ s.t. for all $a \in \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\|a\|_1 \leq r_2 \Rightarrow \Phi_a(\mathcal{X}) \subset \mathcal{X}$.*
- (ii) *For all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, for all $x, z \in \mathcal{X}$, $\|\Phi_a(x) - \Phi_a(z)\|_b \leq (1 - e^{-L.T})\|x - z\|_b$.*
- (iii) *For all $x \in \mathcal{X}$, the mapping $[a \mapsto \Phi_a(x)]$ is continuous from $\bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$ into \mathcal{X} .*

Proof. Using Lemma 2.13 instead of Lemma 4.1 in [3] and Lemma 2.14 instead of Lemma 4.2, the proof of (i) is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.3 of [3], the proof of (ii) is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.4 of [3], and the proof of (iii) is similar to the proof of Lemma 4.5 of [3] \square

Lemma 2.16. *The following assertions hold.*

- (i) *For all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, there exists a solution x_a of the Cauchy problem (2.4) which is defined on $[0, T]$ all over.*
- (ii) *The mapping $[a \mapsto x_a]$, from $\bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$ into \mathcal{X} , is continuous.*
- (iii) *There exists $k_1 \in \mathbb{R}_{+*}$ such that, $\forall a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $\|x(t, a) - x_0(t)\| \leq k_1\|a\|_1$.*

Proof. For (i) and (ii), the proof is similar to the proof of the Proposition 4.1 in [3], and the only difference is to use the Lemma 2.15 of the present paper instead of Lemmas 4.3, 4.4, 4.5 of [3].

For (iii), we set $k_1 = ke^{L.T}$. Let $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Since x_a is a fixed point of Φ_a and x_0 is a fixed point of Φ_0 , for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have $x_a(t) - x_0(t) = \xi_0 + \int_0^t f(s, x_a(s), u_a(s))ds - \xi_0 - \int_0^t f(s, x_0(s), u_0(s))ds$, which implies

$$\begin{aligned} \|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| &\leq \int_0^t \|f(s, x_a(s), u_a(s)) - f(s, x_0(s), u_0(s))\|ds \\ &\leq \int_0^t \|f(s, x_a(s), u_a(s)) - f(s, x_0(s), u_a(s))\|ds \\ &\quad + \int_0^t \|f(s, x_0(s), u_a(s)) - f(s, x_0(s), u_0(s))\|ds. \end{aligned}$$

Using Lemma 2.13 and 2.14, we have $\|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| \leq \int_0^t (L\|x_a(s) - x_0(s)\|)ds + k\|a\|_1$. Consequently, using the lemma of Gronwall ([8], p.24), we obtain, $\forall t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| \leq k\|a\|_1 e^{\int_0^T Lds} = k_1\|a\|_1,$$

and so (iii) is proven. \square

Lemma 2.17. *There exists $\rho : \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N \rightarrow E$ s.t. $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \rho(a) = 0$ and s.t. for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $x_a(T) = x_0(T) + \mathfrak{L} \cdot a + \|a\|_1 \rho(a)$, where \mathfrak{L} is provided by Lemma 2.12.*

Proof. We arbitrarily fix $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, and we introduce, $\forall t \in [0, T]$,

$$y_a(t) = (x_a(t) - z_a(t)) - (x_0(t) - z_0(t)) = x_a(t) - z_a(t) - x_0(t). \quad (2.14)$$

and

$$\gamma_a(t) := \underline{d}y_a(t) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \cdot y_a(t). \quad (2.15)$$

Doing a straightforward calculation, we obtain

$$\underline{d}y_a(t) = f(t, x_a(t), u_a(t)) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \cdot z_a(t) - f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)).$$

Consequently, $\forall t \in [0, T]$,

$$\gamma_a(t) := f(t, x_a(t), u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \cdot (x_a(t) - x_0(t)). \quad (2.16)$$

For all $t \in [0, T]$, we define $\varepsilon_a^1(t) := 0$ if $x_a(t) = x_0(t)$, and $\varepsilon_a^1(t) := \frac{1}{\|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\|} (f(t, x_a(t), u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t)) \cdot (x_a(t) - x_0(t)))$ if $x_a(t) \neq x_0(t)$. We also define $\varepsilon_a^2(t) = D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_0(t))$. Doing a straightforward calculation, we obtain

$$\gamma_a(t) = \|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| \varepsilon_a^1(t) + \varepsilon_a^2(t) \cdot (x_a(t) - x_0(t)). \quad (2.17)$$

Now, we study the properties of ε_a^1 . Let $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$. Let $t_0 \in [0, T]$ s.t. $x_a(t_0) = x_0(t_0)$. Since x_a and x_0 are continuous, there exists $\nu > 0$ s.t. $x_a(t) \neq x_0(t)$ when $t \in]t_0 - \nu, t_0 + \nu[$. Using the continuity of x_a and x_0 , the piecewise continuity of u_a and u_0 , the continuity of f , Lemma 2.10 and (Av1), we obtain that $\varepsilon_a^1(t_0+)$ and $\varepsilon_a^1(t_0-)$ exist in E . When $x_a(t_0) \neq x_0(t_0)$, from the existence of $D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t))$, we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \forall \varepsilon > 0, \exists \mathfrak{d}_{\varepsilon, a} > 0, \forall \xi \in E, \|\xi - x_0(t)\| \leq \mathfrak{d}_{\varepsilon, a} \Rightarrow \\ \|f(t, \xi, u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) \\ - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) \cdot (\xi - x_0(t))\| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi - x_0(t)\|. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (2.18)$$

Since $\lim_{t \rightarrow t_0} (x_a(t) - x_0(t)) = x_a(t_0) - x_0(t_0) = 0$, when we fix $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{b}_{\varepsilon, a} > 0$ s.t.

$$t_0 < t < t_0 + \mathfrak{b}_{\varepsilon, a} \Rightarrow \|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| \leq \mathfrak{d}_{\varepsilon, a}$$

\Rightarrow

$$\|f(t, x_a(t), u_a(t)) - f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), u_a(t)) \cdot (x_a(t) - x_0(t))\| \leq \varepsilon \|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\|$$

thanks to (2.18). Therefore $\|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| \leq \varepsilon$ if $x_a(t) \neq x_0(t)$ or if $x_a(t) = x_0(t)$. Hence, we have proven that $\|\varepsilon_a^1(t_0+)\| = 0$. Similarly, we obtain $\|\varepsilon_a^1(t_0-)\| = 0$. Consequently, we have proven

$$\|\varepsilon_a^1\| \in \text{Reg}([0, T], \mathbb{R}), \quad (2.19)$$

where $\text{Reg}([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ denotes the space of the regulated functions from $[0, T]$ into \mathbb{R} cf. [5] (Chapter 7, Section 6). Hence, $\|\varepsilon_a^1\|$ is Riemann integrable on $[0, T]$ and also Borel integrable on $[0, T]$. From (Av2), we know that $L_1 := \sup_{\zeta \in M} \|D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), \zeta)\| < +\infty$. Using Lemma 2.14, we obtain $\|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| \leq \max\{0, L\} + L_1 =: L_2$, and so

$$\exists L_2 \in \mathbb{R}_{+*}, \forall a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N, \forall t \in [0, T], \|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| \leq L_2. \quad (2.20)$$

We introduce the mapping $\Theta : \Omega \times [0, T] \times U \rightarrow E$ defined by

$$\Theta(\xi, t, \zeta) := \frac{1}{\|\xi - x_0(t)\|} (f(t, \xi, \zeta) - f(t, x_0(t), \zeta) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), \zeta) \cdot (\xi - x_0(t)))$$

when $\xi \neq x_0(t)$ and $\Theta(\xi, t, \zeta) = 0$ when $\xi = x_0(t)$. We fix $(t, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times U$. From (AV1), for all $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists $\mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon > 0$ s.t.

$$\|\xi - x_0(t)\| \leq \mathfrak{d}_\varepsilon \Rightarrow \|f(t, \xi, \zeta) - f(t, x_0(t), \zeta) - D_{F,2}f(t, x_0(t), \zeta) \cdot (\xi - x_0(t))\| \leq \varepsilon \|\xi - x_0(t)\|,$$

which implies

$$\forall (t, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times U, \lim_{\xi \rightarrow x_0(t)} \Theta(\xi, t, \zeta) = 0. \quad (2.21)$$

Fix $t \in [0, T]$. For all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \|\varepsilon_1(t, a)\| &= \|\Theta(x_a(t), t, u_a(t))\| = \|1_{[0, t_1[}(t) \Theta(x_a(t), t, u_0(t)) + \\ &\quad \sum_{i=1}^N 1_{I_i(a)}(t) \Theta(x_a(t), t, v_i) + \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} 1_{[t_i+b_i(a)+a_i, t_{i+1}+b_{i+1}(a)]}(t) \Theta(x_a(t), t, u_0(t)) \\ &\quad + 1_{[t_N+b_N(a)+a_N, T]}(t) \Theta(x_a(t), t, u_0(t))\|. \\ &\leq (N+1) \|\Theta(x_a(t), t, u_0(t))\| + \sum_{i=1}^N \|\Theta(x_a(t), t, v_i)\|. \end{aligned}$$

Using (2.21), we obtain

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| = 0. \quad (2.22)$$

From (2.19), (2.20), (2.22), and the Dominated Convergence Theorem of Lebesgue, since the constants are Lebesgue integrable, we obtain

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| dt = \int_0^T \lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| dt = 0. \quad (2.23)$$

Using (AV1) and Lemma 2.10, we see that ε_a^2 is a difference of two piecewise continuous functions on $[0, T]$. Consequently, we have

$$\text{for all } a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_2) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N, \|\varepsilon_a^2\| \in PC^0([0, T], \mathbb{R}). \quad (2.24)$$

Thus $\|\varepsilon_a^2\|$ is Riemann integrable and Lebesgue integrable on $[0, T]$. Besides, we have also $\int_0^T \|\varepsilon_a^2(t)\| dt \leq \sum_{1 \leq i \leq N} \int_{t_i+b_i}^{t_i+b_i+a_i} (2L_1) dt = 2L_1 \|a\|_1$, and so we obtain

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \int_0^T \|\varepsilon_a^2(t)\| dt = 0. \quad (2.25)$$

From (2.17), (2.23), and (2.25), we have $\|\gamma_a(t)\| \leq \|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| \|\varepsilon_1(t, a)\| + \|\varepsilon_2(t, a)\| \|x_a(t) - x_0(t)\| \leq k_1 \|a\|_1 (\|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| + \|\varepsilon_a^2(t)\|) \Rightarrow \int_0^T \|\gamma_a(t)\| dt \leq k_1 \|a\|_1 (\int_0^T \|\varepsilon_a^1(t)\| dt + \int_0^T \|\varepsilon_a^2(t)\| dt)$. Consequently, using (2.23) and (2.25), we have

$$\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \left(\frac{1}{\|a\|} \int_0^T \|\gamma_a(t)\| dt \right) = 0. \quad (2.26)$$

From (2.15) and the formula of the Variation of Constants, we obtain $y_a(T) = \int_0^T R(T, s) \cdot \gamma_a(s) ds$. We introduce $\varpi(a) := 0$ when $a = 0$ and $\varpi(a) := \frac{1}{\|a\|} \int_0^T R(T, s) \cdot \gamma_a(s) ds$ when $a \neq 0$; hence we have $y_a(T) = \|a\|_1 \varpi(a)$. Since $R(T, \cdot)$ is piecewise continuous, it is bounded. We set $\mathfrak{q} := \sup_{0 \leq s \leq T} \|R(T, s)\|$. We have $\|\varpi(a)\| \leq \mathfrak{q} \cdot \frac{1}{\|a\|} \int_0^T \|\gamma_a(s)\| ds$ when $a \neq 0$, and using (2.26), we obtain $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \|\varpi(a)\| = 0$, i.e. $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \varpi(a) = 0$. Using (2.14) and Lemma 2.12, we

obtain that $x_a(T) = x_0(T) + z_a(T) + y_a(T) = x_0(T) + \mathcal{L} \cdot a + \|a\|_1(\rho_1(a) + \varpi(a))$. Setting $\rho(a) := \rho_1(a) + \varpi(a)$, we have $\lim_{a \rightarrow 0} \rho(a) = 0$. The lemma is proven. \square

Lemma 2.18. *Let $S = ((t_i, v_i))_{1 \leq i \leq N} \in \mathbb{S}$. There exist $(\lambda_\alpha^S)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m} \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m}$ and $(\mu_\beta^S)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q} \in \mathbb{R}^q$ which satisfy the following conditions.*

- (a) $(\lambda_\alpha^S)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}$ and $(\mu_\beta^S)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}$ are not simultaneously equal to zero.
- (b) $\forall \alpha \in \{0, \dots, m\}, \quad \lambda_\alpha^S \geq 0.$
- (c) $\forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad \lambda_\alpha^S g^\alpha(x_0(T)) = 0.$
- (d) $\forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, p(t_i)[f(t_i, x_0(t_i), v_i) - f(t_i, x_0(t_i), u_0(t_i))] \leq 0$, where $p(t) := (\sum_{\alpha=0}^m \lambda_\alpha^S D_H g^\alpha(x_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q \mu_\beta^S D_H h^\beta(x_0(T)))R(T, t)$, $R(t, s)$ being defined just before Lemma 2.12.

Proof. Using Lemma 2.17, the Proposition 4.2 of [3] ensures the existence of $r_3 \in]0, r_2]$ and a function $\tilde{x} \in C^0(\bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_3), \Omega)$ which is Fréchet differentiable at $a = 0$ and which satisfies, for all $a \in \bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_3) \cap \mathbb{R}_+^N$, $\tilde{x}(a) = x_a(T)$, and $D_F \tilde{x}(0) = \mathcal{L} \cdot a$. Since (x_0, u_0) is a solution of (\mathcal{M}) , $a = 0$ is a solution of the following finite-dimensional optimization problem

$$(\mathcal{F}_S^1) := \begin{cases} \text{Maximize} & g^0(\tilde{x}(a)) \\ \text{subject to} & a \in B(0, r_3) \\ & \forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad g^\alpha(\tilde{x}(a)) \geq 0 \\ & \forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, \quad h^\beta(\tilde{x}(a)) = 0 \\ & \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N\}, \quad b_i^* a \geq 0 \end{cases}$$

where $(b_i^*)_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ is the dual basis of the canonical basis of \mathbb{R}^N . Since \tilde{x} is Fréchet differentiable at 0, we have from (AT1) and (AT2) that $g^\alpha \circ \tilde{x}$ when $\alpha \in \{0, \dots, m\}$ and $h^\beta \circ \tilde{x}$ when $\beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}$ are Hadamard differentiable at 0. Moreover, since $\tilde{x} \in C^0(\bar{B}_{\|\cdot\|_1}(0, r_3), \Omega)$, by using (AT2), for all $\beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $h^\beta \circ \tilde{x}$ is continuous on a neighborhood of 0. Hence we can use the Multiplier rule of [14] (Theorem 2.2) to obtain our result. \square

With respect to Lemma 5.1 of [3], in Lemma 2.18, the Hadamard differentiability replaces the Fréchet differentiability. To finish the proof of Theorem 2.4, we exactly proceed as in Subsection 5.2 of [3]. We just recall the schedule of the reasoning. For all $S \in \mathbb{S}$, we consider $K(S)$, which is the set of the $((\lambda_\alpha)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_\beta)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m+q}$ which satisfy the conclusions (a,b,c,d) of Lemma 2.18 and $\sum_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m} |\lambda_\alpha| + \sum_{1 \leq \beta \leq q} |\mu_\beta| = 1$. $\Sigma(0, 1)$ being the unit sphere of \mathbb{R}^{1+m+q} , $K(S)$ is a non-empty closed subset of $\Sigma(0, 1)$. Since $\Sigma(0, 1)$, $(K(S))_{S \in \mathbb{S}}$ possesses the finite intersection property ([10], p.31) and consequently we have $\bigcap_{S \in \mathbb{S}} K(S) \neq \emptyset$. An element of this intersection is convenient for the conclusions (NN), (Si), (S ℓ), (AE.M), and (MP.M) of Theorem 2.4. The conclusions (CH.M) is proven by Lemma 5.2 of [3]. The proof of Corollary 2.5 is similar to the proof of Part (II) of Theorem 2.2 in [3] which is given in Subsection 5.3 in [3]. To prove assertion (i) of Corollary 2.6, we proceed by contradiction. We assume the existence of $s \in [0, T]$ s.t. $(\lambda_0, p(s)) = (0, 0)$. Since $p(s) = 0$, we have $p(T) = 0$ since (AE.M) is linear homogeneous. From (TC), we have $\sum_{\alpha=1}^m \lambda_\alpha D_H g^\alpha(x_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q \mu_\beta D_H h^\beta(x_0(T)) = 0$. Hence using (TC), (Si), (S ℓ), (QC, 1) implies that $(\forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \lambda_\alpha = 0)$ and $(\forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, \mu_\beta = 0)$. Moreover, since $\lambda_0 = 0$, we obtain a contradiction with (NN). The proof of assertion (ii) of Corollary 2.6 is similar to the proof of Part (III) of Theorem 2.2 in [3].

To prove assertion (iii) of Corollary 2.6, we proceed by contradiction. We assume that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Since $D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}))$ exists, $D_{G,3}H_M(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}), p(\hat{t}))$ exists and $D_{G,3}H_M(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}), p(\hat{t})) = p(\hat{t}) \circ D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}))$. Therefore, by using (MP.M), we have $p(\hat{t}) \circ D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t})) = 0$. Since $D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}))$ is surjective, we have $p(\hat{t}) = 0$. Hence, $(\lambda_0, p(\hat{t})) = 0$ that is a contradiction with the assertion (i). We have proven that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$, and it suffices to divide all the multipliers and p by λ_0 to obtain the assertion (iii).

To prove the assertion (iv) of Corollary 2.6, we begin to prove that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. To do that, we proceed by contradiction, we assume that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Since $D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T))$ exists, $D_{G,3}H_M(T, x_0(T), u_0(T), p(T))$ exists and we have $D_{G,3}H_M(T, x_0(T), u_0(T), p(T)) = p(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T))$. From (MP.M), we obtain $p(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0$. From (TC), we obtain

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^m \lambda_{\alpha} D_H g^{\alpha}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q \mu_{\beta} D_H h^{\beta}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = p(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0.$$

By using (LI), we obtain $((\lambda_{\alpha})_{1 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta})_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}) = 0$, which is a contradiction with (NN). Hence, we have proven that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. Dividing $\lambda_{\alpha}, \mu_{\beta}, p$ by λ_0 , we normalize all these terms, and we have $\lambda_0 = 1$. To prove the uniqueness, let $((\lambda_{\alpha}^1)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta}^1)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}, p^1) \in \mathbb{R}^{1+m+q} \times PC^1([0, T], E^*)$ which satisfy the conclusions of the Theorem 2.4 are verified with $\lambda_0^1 = 1$. From (MP.M), we have, $p^1(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0$. Thus

$$(p(T) - p^1(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0.$$

From (TC), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\alpha=1}^m (\lambda_{\alpha} - \lambda_{\alpha}^1) D_H g^{\alpha}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) \\ & + \sum_{\beta=1}^q (\mu_{\beta} - \mu_{\beta}^1) D_H h^{\beta}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

Hence, using (LI), $(\lambda_{\alpha})_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m} = (\lambda_{\alpha}^1)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}$ and $(\mu_{\beta})_{1 \leq \beta \leq q} = (\mu_{\beta}^1)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}$. Consequently, using (TC), we obtain $p(T) = p^1(T)$. Using the uniqueness of the solution of a Cauchy problem on (AE.M), we obtain $p = p^1$. Corollary 2.6 is proven.

2.4. Proof of the results of the problem of Bolza. As in [3], we transform the problem of Bolza into a problem of Mayer to deduce Theorem 2.1 from Theorem 2.4. That is why, we introduce an additional state variable denoted by σ . We set $\mathfrak{X} := (\sigma, \xi) \in \mathbb{R} \times \Omega$ as a new state variable; we set $F(t, (\sigma, \xi), \zeta) := (f^0(t, \xi, \zeta), f(t, \xi, \zeta))$ as the new vectorfield; we set $G^0(\sigma, \xi) := \sigma + g^0(\xi)$, $G^{\alpha}(\sigma, \xi) := g^{\alpha}(\xi)$ when $\alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, and we set $H^{\beta}(\sigma, \xi) := h^{\beta}(\xi)$ when $\beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}$. We formulate the new following problem of Mayer:

$$(\mathcal{MB}) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Maximize } G^0(\mathfrak{X}(T)) \\ \text{subject to } \mathfrak{X} \in PC^1([0, T], \mathbb{R} \times \Omega), u \in NPC_R^0([0, T], U) \\ \underline{d}\mathfrak{X}(t) = F(t, \mathfrak{X}(t), u(t)), \mathfrak{X}(0) = (0, \xi_0) \\ \forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, G^{\alpha}(\mathfrak{X}(T)) \geq 0 \\ \forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, H^{\beta}(\mathfrak{X}(T)) = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

Proceeding as in the section 6 of [3], the proofs of Theorem 2.1, of Corollary 2.2 and of assertion (i) of Corollary 2.3 are similar to the proof of Theorem 2.1, Part (I), Part (II), and Part (III) of [3].

Proof of assertion (ii) of Corollary 2.3.

First we want to prove that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. To do that, we proceed by contradiction, we assume that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Using (MP.B), we obtain $p(\hat{t}) \circ D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t})) = 0$. Since $D_{G,3}f(\hat{t}, x_0(\hat{t}), u_0(\hat{t}))$ is onto, we have necessarily $p(\hat{t}) = 0$. Since we have assumed (QC,1), $(\lambda_0, p(\hat{t})) = (0, 0)$ provides a contradiction after assertion (i) of Corollary 2.3. Hence we have proven that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. To conclude it suffices to divide $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_m, \mu_1, \dots, \mu_q$ and p by λ_0 .

Proof of assertion (iii) of Corollary 2.3.

First we want to prove that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. To do that, we proceed by contradiction, we assume that $\lambda_0 = 0$. Using (MP.B), we obtain $p(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0$. That is why, using (TC), we obtain $\sum_{\alpha=1}^m \lambda_{\alpha} D_H g^{\alpha}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q \mu_{\beta} D_H h^{\beta}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = p(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0$. It follows from (LI) that $(\forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \lambda_{\alpha} = 0)$ and $(\forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, \mu_{\beta} = 0)$; hence we have $((\lambda_{\alpha})_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta})_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}) = (0, 0)$; which contradicts (NN). We have proven that $\lambda_0 \neq 0$. We conclude as in the proof of (ii).

Proof of assertion (iv) of Corollary 2.3.

From assertion (iii), we know that there exists $((\lambda_{\alpha})_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta})_{1 \leq \beta \leq q})$ with $\lambda_0 = 1$, and p which satisfy the conclusions of Theorem 2.1. Let $((\lambda_{\alpha}^1)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta}^1)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q})$ with $\lambda_0^1 = 1$, and p^1 which satisfy the conclusions of Theorem 2.1. Using (MP.B), we have

$$p^1(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) + D_{G,3}f^0(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0$$

and

$$p(T) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) + D_{G,3}f^0(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0.$$

Using twice (TC), we obtain $\sum_{\alpha=1}^m (\lambda_{\alpha} - \lambda_{\alpha}^1) D_H g^{\alpha}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) + \sum_{\beta=1}^q (\mu_{\beta} - \mu_{\beta}^1) D_H h^{\beta}(x_0(T)) \circ D_{G,3}f(T, x_0(T), u_0(T)) = 0$. The linear independence provided by (LI) implies $(\forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \lambda_{\alpha} - \lambda_{\alpha}^1 = 0)$ and $(\forall \beta \in \{1, \dots, q\}, \mu_{\beta} - \mu_{\beta}^1 = 0)$. Consequently, we have $((\lambda_{\alpha})_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta})_{1 \leq \beta \leq q}) = ((\lambda_{\alpha}^1)_{0 \leq \alpha \leq m}, (\mu_{\beta}^1)_{1 \leq \beta \leq q})$. Using twice (TC), we obtain $p(T) = p^1(T)$. Using (AE.B) and the uniqueness of the solution of a Cauchy problem, we obtain $p = p^1$. We have proven the uniqueness.

3. ENVELOPE THEOREMS

X is a Banach space, Y and Z are real normed spaces, Ω is a non-empty open subset of X , and U is a non-empty open subset of Y , $f^0 : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, $f : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times Z \rightarrow X$, $g^i : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($0 \leq i \leq m$) and $h^j : \Omega \times Z \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ ($1 \leq j \leq q$) are mappings. Let $\xi_0 \in \Omega$, for all $\pi \in Z$, we consider the following problem of Bolza.

$$(\mathcal{B}, \pi) \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{Maximize} \quad \int_0^T f^0(t, x(t), u(t), \pi) dt + g^0(x(T), \pi) \\ \text{subject to} \quad x \in PC^1([0, T], \Omega), u \in NPC_R^0([0, T], U) \\ \quad \forall t \in [0, T], \quad \dot{x}(t) = f(t, x(t), u(t), \pi), \quad x(0) = \xi_0 \\ \quad \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \quad g^i(x(T), \pi) \geq 0 \\ \quad \forall j \in \{1, \dots, q\}, \quad h^j(x(T), \pi) = 0. \end{array} \right.$$

The Hamiltonian of Pontryagin of this problem of Bolza is $\mathcal{H}_\pi : [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times X^* \times \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $\mathcal{H}_\pi(t, \xi, \zeta, p, \lambda) := p \cdot f(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi) + \lambda f^0(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)$ when $t \in [0, T]$, $\xi \in \Omega$, $\zeta \in U$, $p \in X^*$ and $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$. For each $\pi \in Z$, we denote by $V[\pi]$ the value of (\mathcal{B}, π) .

3.1. Main results. We fix $\pi_0 \in Z$ and we consider the following list of conditions.

Conditions on the solutions.

- (SO) There exists an open neighborhood P of π_0 in Z s.t., $\forall \pi \in P$, there exists $(x[\pi], u[\pi]) \in PC^1([0, T], \Omega) \times NPC_R^0([0, T], U)$, a solution of (\mathcal{B}, π) . There exists $\delta\pi \in Z$ s.t. $D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ and $D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ exist.

Conditions on the integrand of the criterion.

- (IC1) $f^0 \in C^0([0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times P, \mathbb{R})$, and, $\forall (t, \xi, \zeta, \pi) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times P$, $D_{G,2}f^0(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)$ exists. Moreover, for all $\pi \in P$, for all non-empty compact K s.t. $K \subset \Omega \times U$, $\sup_{(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times K} \|D_{G,2}f^0(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)\| < +\infty$.
- (IC2) For all $t \in [0, T]$, $D_{H,(2,3,4)}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0)$ exists. Moreover, for all $\pi \in P$, $D_{H,3}f^0(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi)$ exists, and the function $[\pi \mapsto D_{H,3}f^0(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi)] \in C^0(P, Y^*)$.
- (IC3) There exists $\kappa \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), m_1; \mathbb{R}_+)$, there exists $\rho > 0$ s.t., $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $\forall (\xi_1, \zeta_1, \pi_1), (\xi_2, \zeta_2, \pi_2) \in B_{\|\cdot\|_1}((x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0), \rho)$, $|f^0(t, \xi_1, \zeta_1, \pi_1) - f^0(t, \xi_2, \zeta_2, \pi_2)| \leq \kappa(t) \|(\xi_1, \zeta_1, \pi_1) - (\xi_2, \zeta_2, \pi_2)\|$.
- (IC4) For all $(t, \zeta, \pi) \in [0, T] \times U \times P$, $D_{F,2}f^0(t, x[\pi](t), \zeta, \pi)$ exists and, $\forall \pi \in P$, $[(t, \zeta) \mapsto D_{F,2}f^0(t, x[\pi](t), \zeta, \pi)] \in C^0([0, T] \times U, X^*)$,

where $\mathcal{B}([0, T])$ is the Borel tribe on $[0, T]$ and m_1 is the canonical Borel measure on $[0, T]$.

Notice that (IC1) concerns the continuity and the partial Gâteaux differentiability; (IC2) concerns the Hadamard differentiability, (IC3) concerns a partial Lipschitz condition, and (IC4) concerns the partial Fréchet differentiability. if, $x \in C^0(P, C^0([0, T], \Omega))$ and, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $f^0(t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ is Fréchet differentiable on $\Omega \times U \times P$, and if $D_{F,(2,3,4)}f^0$ is continuous on $[0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times P$ then (IC1)-(IC4) are fulfilled. In our approach we want to weaken the conditions on f^0 .

Conditions on the vector field.

- (V1) For all $\pi \in P$, $[(t, \xi, \zeta) \mapsto f(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)] \in C^0([0, T] \times \Omega \times U, X)$, and, for all $(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi) \in [0, T] \times \Omega \times U \times P$, $D_{G,2}f(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)$ exists. Moreover, for all $\pi \in P$, for all non-empty compact K s.t. $K \subset \Omega \times U$, $\sup_{(t, \xi, \zeta) \in [0, T] \times K} \|D_{G,2}f(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)\| < +\infty$.
- (V2) For all $t \in [0, T]$, $D_{H,(2,3,4)}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0)$ exist and, for all $\pi \in P$, $D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi)$ exists.
- (V3) For all $(t, \zeta, \pi) \in [0, T] \times U \times P$, $D_{F,2}f(t, x[\pi](t), \zeta, \pi)$ exists and, $\forall \pi \in P$, $[(t, \zeta) \mapsto D_{F,2}f(t, x[\pi](t), \zeta, \pi)] \in C^0([0, T] \times U, \mathcal{L}(X, X))$.

We can do a comment on (V1)-(V3) which is similar to the comment on (IC1)-(IC4) which is given just after (IC4).

Conditions on the terminal constraints functions and the terminal function of the criterion.

- (CT1) For all $\phi \in \{g^i : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{h^j : 1 \leq j \leq q\}$, $D_H\phi(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0)$ exists and, $\forall \pi \in P$, $D_{H,1}\phi(x[\pi](T), \pi)$ exists.
- (CT2) For all $\pi \in P$, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $h^j(\cdot, \pi)$ is continuous on a neighborhood of $x[\pi](T)$.

Conditions on the terminal constraints functions, the terminal function of the criterion and the vector field.

- (CVT1) $(D_{H,1}g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \circ D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi_0](T), u[\pi_0](T), \pi_0),$
 $D_{H,1}h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \circ D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi_0](T), u[\pi_0](T), \pi_0))_{1 \leq i \leq m, 1 \leq j \leq q}$ is free.
- (CVT2) For all $\phi \in \{g^i : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{h^j : 1 \leq j \leq q\}$,
 $[\pi \mapsto D_{H,1}\phi(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi)]$ belongs to
 $C^0(P, Y^*)$.

Conditions on the control space

(ESP) There exists $(\cdot | \cdot)$ an inner product on Y^* s.t. $(\cdot | \cdot) \in C^0((Y^*, \|\cdot\|_{Y^*})^2, \mathbb{R})$.

Theorem 3.1. *Under (SO), (IC1), (IC2), (IC3), (IC4), (V1), (V2), (V3), (CT1), (CT2), (CVT1), (CVT2) and (ESP), $D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ exists and*

$$\begin{aligned} D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi] &= D_{H,2}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,2}g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi_0] D_{H,2}h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t) \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t), \text{ where } (\lambda_i[\pi_0])_{0 \leq i \leq m}, \text{ with } \lambda_0[\pi_0] = \\ &1, (\mu_j[\pi_0])_{1 \leq j \leq q} \text{ (respectively } p[\pi_0]) \text{ are the unique multipliers (respectively the unique adjoint} \\ &\text{function) of the Pontryagin Theorem applied to the solution } (x[\pi_0], u[\pi_0]) \text{ of } (\mathcal{B}, \pi_0). \end{aligned}$$

In order to provide a result on the Gâteaux differentiability of V at π_0 , we introduce the following strengthened conditions.

- (SO-bis) For all $\delta\pi \in Z$, $D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ and $D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ exists.
- (V4) There exists $\underline{c} \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathbf{m}_1; \mathbb{R}_+)$ s.t.
 $\forall t \in [0, T], \|D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0)\| \leq \underline{c}(t)$.

Corollary 3.2. *Under the assumptions of Theorem 3.1, assuming in addition (SO-bis) and (V4), V is Gâteaux differentiable at π_0 and the formula of $D_GV[\pi_0]$ is given by the formula of Theorem 3.1.*

In order to provide a result on the continuous Fréchet differentiability of V , we introduce the following strengthened conditions

- (SO-ter) The functions $[\pi \mapsto x[\pi]]$ and $[\pi \mapsto u[\pi]]$ are continuous at π_0 and, for all $\pi \in P$, for all $\delta\pi \in Z$, $D_G^+x[\pi; \delta\pi]$ and $D_G^+u[\pi; \delta\pi]$ exist.
- (IC5) For all $\pi \in P$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $D_{H,(2,3,4)}f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$ and, for all $t \in [0, T]$,
 $[\pi \mapsto D_{H,(2,4)}f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)] \in C^0(P, (X \times Z)^*)$.
- (IC6) For all $\pi \in P$, $[t \mapsto D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)]$ belongs to
 $\mathcal{L}^0([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), (Z^*, \mathcal{B}(Z^*)))$.
- (V5) For all $\pi \in P$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $D_{H,(2,3,4)}f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$ exist and for all $t \in [0, T]$,
 $[\pi \mapsto D_{H,(2,4)}f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)] \in C^0(P, \mathcal{L}(X \times Z, X))$.
- (V6) For all $\pi \in P$, $[t \mapsto D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)]$ belongs to
 $\mathcal{L}^0([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), (\mathcal{L}(Z, X), \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{L}(Z, X))))$ and there exists
 $c \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathbf{m}_1; \mathbb{R}_+)$ s.t. $\forall t \in [0, T], \forall \pi \in P$,
 $\|D_{H,(2,4)}f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)\| \leq c(t)$.
- (CT3) For all $\phi \in \{g^i : 0 \leq i \leq m\} \cup \{h^j : 1 \leq j \leq q\}$, for all $\pi \in P$, ϕ is Hadamard differentiable
at $(x[\pi](T), \pi)$ and, $[\pi \mapsto D_H\phi(x[\pi](T), \pi)] \in C^0(P, (X \times Z)^*)$.

\mathcal{L}^0 denotes the space of all measurable functions.

Corollary 3.3. *Under the assumptions of Corollary 3.2, if, in addition (SO-ter), (IC5), (IC6), (V5), (V6) and (CT3) are fulfilled, then V is continuously Fréchet differentiable on \mathfrak{W} which is an open neighborhood of π_0 and for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, for all $\delta\pi \in Z$,*

$$\begin{aligned} D_F V[\pi] \cdot \delta\pi &= D_{H,2} g^0(x[\pi](T), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi] D_{H,2} h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4} f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t) \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi](t) \cdot D_{H,4} f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t), \text{ where } (\lambda_i[\pi])_{0 \leq i \leq m}, \text{ with} \\ \lambda_0[\pi] &= 1, (\mu_j[\pi])_{1 \leq j \leq q} \text{ (respectively } p[\pi]) \text{ are the unique multipliers (respectively the unique} \\ &\text{adjoint function) of the Pontryagin Theorem applied to the solution } (x[\pi], u[\pi]) \text{ of } (\mathcal{B}, \pi). \end{aligned}$$

3.2. Proof of Theorem 3.1. We begin to establish a generalization of Lemma 5.2 in [4].

Lemma 3.4. *Let E be a real normed vector space, G be a non-empty open subset of E , $\mathfrak{f} : [0, T] \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ be a function and $\mathfrak{x}_0 \in NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$. We consider the following conditions:*

- (i) $\mathfrak{f} \in PCP^0([0, T] \times G, \mathbb{R})$.
- (ii) *There exists $\rho_1 > 0$ and there exists $\zeta \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathbf{m}_1; \mathbb{R}_+)$ s.t., $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $\forall u_1, u_2 \in B(\mathfrak{x}_0(t), \rho_1)$, $|\mathfrak{f}(t, u_1) - \mathfrak{f}(t, u_2)| \leq \zeta(t) \|u_1 - u_2\|$.*
- (iii) *For all $t \in [0, T]$, $D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t))$ exists.*

We consider the functional $F : NPC_R^0([0, T], G) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by,

for all $\mathfrak{x} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$, $F(\mathfrak{x}) := \int_0^T \mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}(t)) \, dt$. The following assertions hold.

- (a) $NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$ is open in $NPC_R^0([0, T], E)$.
- (b) *Under (i)-(ii), F is well defined and Lipschitzian on $B_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(\mathfrak{x}_0, \rho_1)$.*
- (c) *Under (i)-(iii), F is Hadamard differentiable at \mathfrak{x}_0 and for all $\mathfrak{h} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], E)$, $[t \mapsto D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t)] \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathbf{m}_1; \mathbb{R})$ and for all $\mathfrak{h} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], E)$, $D_H F(\mathfrak{x}_0) \cdot \mathfrak{h} = \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t) \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t)$.*

Proof. (a) Let $\mathfrak{x} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$; we have the closure $cl(\mathfrak{x}([0, T])) \subset G$. If $(\tau_i)_{0 \leq i \leq n+1}$ is the list of discontinuity points of \mathfrak{x} , when $i \in \{0, \dots, n\}$, we define $\mathfrak{x}_i : [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}] \rightarrow G$ by setting $\mathfrak{x}_i(t) := \mathfrak{x}(t)$ if $t \in [\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}[$ and $\mathfrak{x}_i(\tau_{i+1}) := \mathfrak{x}(\tau_{i+1}-)$. Hence, we have $\mathfrak{x}_i \in C^0([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}], G)$, and then $\mathfrak{x}_i([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}])$ is compact and moreover we have $cl(\mathfrak{x}([0, T])) := \bigcup_{0 \leq i \leq n} \mathfrak{x}_i([\tau_i, \tau_{i+1}])$ which is compact as a finite union of compacts.

Using the continuity of the function $[u \mapsto d(u, E \setminus G) := \inf\{\|u - v\| : v \in E \setminus G\}]$, the closedness of $E \setminus G$ and the Optimization theorem of Weierstrass setting $\alpha := \inf\{d(u, E \setminus G) : u \in cl(\mathfrak{x}([0, T]))\}$, we have $\alpha > 0$, and then we easily verify that $B_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(\mathfrak{x}, \frac{\alpha}{2}) \subset NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$; and so (a) is proven.

(b) When $\mathfrak{x} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$, we see that $[t \mapsto \mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}(t))]$ is regulated and consequently, it is Riemann integrable on $[0, T]$ cf. ([5], p. 168) hence $F(\mathfrak{x})$ is well defined. (ii) implies that F is Lipschitzian on $B_{\|\cdot\|_\infty}(\mathfrak{x}, \rho_1)$; and so (b) is proven.

(c) Let $\mathfrak{h} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], E)$, $\mathfrak{h} \neq 0$. We set $\theta^0 := \frac{1}{\|\mathfrak{h}\|_\infty} \min\{\rho, \frac{\alpha}{2}\} > 0$. Let $(\theta_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}} \in]0, \theta^0[^\mathbb{N}$ s.t. $\lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \theta_n = 0$.

Since the Hadamard differentiability implies the Gâteaux differentiability, from (iii), for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have $D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t) = D_{G,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \Psi_n(t)$.

where $\Psi_n(t) := \frac{1}{\theta_n} (\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t) + \theta_n \mathfrak{h}(t)) - \mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)))$.

Since $[t \mapsto \mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t) + \theta_n \mathfrak{h}(t))]$ and $[t \mapsto \mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t))]$ are regulated, they are uniform (therefore pointwise) limits of sequences of step functions, hence they are Borel functions, and then Ψ_n is a Borel function as a pointwise limit of a sequence of Borel functions. Hence $[t \mapsto D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t)]$ is a Borel functions. Using (ii), we see that that $\|\Psi_n(t)\| \leq \zeta(t)\|\mathfrak{h}\|_\infty$ for all $t \in [0, T]$ and for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$. Since $\zeta\|\mathfrak{h}\|_\infty \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathfrak{m}_1; \mathbb{R}_+)$ we can use the Dominated Convergence Theorem of Lebesgue to assert that $[t \mapsto D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t)] \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathfrak{m}_1; \mathbb{R})$ and also that

$$\int_{[0,T]} D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \int_{[0,T]} \Psi_n(t) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) = \lim_{n \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{\theta_n} (F(\mathfrak{x}_0 + \theta_n \mathfrak{h}) - F(\mathfrak{x}_0));$$

hence $D_G^+ F(\mathfrak{x}_0; \mathfrak{h})$ exists and we have

$$D_G^+ F(\mathfrak{x}_0; \mathfrak{h}) = \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,2}\mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}_0(t)) \cdot \mathfrak{h}(t) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t). \quad (3.1)$$

Using the linearity of the integral and of the Hadamard differential, we obtain that $D_G^+ F(\mathfrak{x}_0; \cdot)$ is linear, and since $|D_G^+ F(\mathfrak{x}_0; \mathfrak{h})| \leq \|\zeta\|_{L^1} \|\mathfrak{h}\|_\infty$ for all $\mathfrak{h} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], E)$, we obtain that $D_G^+ F(\mathfrak{x}_0; \cdot)$ is continuous and consequently F is Gâteaux differentiable at \mathfrak{x}_0 . Under (a), since F is Lipschitzian on a ball centered at \mathfrak{x}_0 , using ([6], p.259), we obtain that $D_H F(\mathfrak{x}_0)$ exists and the formula of $D_H F(\mathfrak{x}_0) \cdot \mathfrak{h}$ is given by $D_G^+ F(\mathfrak{x}_0; \mathfrak{h})$ and (3.1). \square

We are able now to prove Theorem 3.1.

1st step: existence of $D_G^+ V(\pi_0)$. We consider $E := X \times Y \times Z$, $G := \Omega \times U \times P$ which is open in E , $\mathfrak{f} : [0, T] \times G \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ the function defined by $\mathfrak{f}(t, (\xi, \zeta, \pi)) := f^0(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)$, $\mathfrak{x}[\pi](t) = (x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$ and when $\mathfrak{x} \in NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$, we consider the function $F(\mathfrak{x}) := \int_0^T \mathfrak{f}(t, \mathfrak{x}(t)) dt$ as in Lemma 3.4. We want to use Lemma 3.4 with $\mathfrak{x}_0 = \mathfrak{x}[\pi_0] \in NPC_R^0([0, T], G)$. From (IC1), (IC2) and (IC3), the assumptions (i)-(iii) of Lemma 3.4 are fulfilled, therefore we obtain that, for all $v \in NPC_R^0([0, T], X \times Y \times Z)$,

$$[t \mapsto D_{H,(2,3,4)} f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot v(t)] \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathfrak{m}_1; \mathbb{R}), \quad (3.2)$$

and F is Hadamard differentiable at $\mathfrak{x}[\pi_0]$. Next, after (SO), $D_G^+ \mathfrak{x}[\pi_0; \delta \pi]$ exists and for all $t \in [0, T]$, $D_G^+ \mathfrak{x}[\pi_0; \delta \pi](t) := (D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta \pi](t), D_G^+ u[\pi_0; \delta \pi](t), \delta \pi)$.

From (SO), we have also, for all $\pi \in P$, $V[\pi] = F(\mathfrak{x}[\pi]) + g^0(x[\pi](T), \pi)$. Therefore, using ([6], (4.2.5) p.263), we have $D_G^+ V[\pi_0; \delta \pi] = D_H F(\mathfrak{x}[\pi_0]) \cdot D_G^+ \mathfrak{x}[\pi_0; \delta \pi] + D_H g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot (D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta \pi](T), \delta \pi)$.

2st step: a first formulation of $D_G^+ V(\pi_0)$. Using the formula of Lemma 3.4 for F with $\mathfrak{x}_0 = \mathfrak{x}[\pi_0]$ and the partial differentials in the previous formula, we obtain

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & D_G^+ V[\pi_0; \delta \pi] \\ &= \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,2} f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta \pi](t) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,3} f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ u[\pi_0; \delta \pi](t) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4} f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta \pi d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) \\ &+ D_{H,1} g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta \pi](T) + D_{H,2} g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta \pi. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.3)$$

At this time, we see that the second and last terms of (3.3) are present in the formula of Theorem 3.1. We ought to transform the other terms.

3st step: the existence of multipliers and the adjoint function of the Pontryagin Theorem.

Thanks to (CVT1) and (CVT2), by using Lemma 4.1 in [4], there exists Q , an open neighborhood of π_0 , $Q \subset P$, s.t.

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\forall \pi \in Q, ((D_{H,1}g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi))_{1 \leq i \leq m}, \\ &(D_{H,1}h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi))_{1 \leq j \leq q}) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.4)$$

is free.

Setting, $\forall (\pi, t, \xi, \zeta) \in Q \times [0, T] \times \Omega \times U$, $f_\pi^0(t, \xi, \zeta) = f^0(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)$, $f_\pi(t, \xi, \zeta) = f(t, \xi, \zeta, \pi)$, $g_\pi^i(\xi) := g^i(\xi, \pi)$ ($0 \leq i \leq m$), $h_\pi^j(\xi) := h^j(\xi, \pi)$ ($1 \leq j \leq q$), we see that (\mathcal{B}, π) is a special case of the problem of (\mathcal{B}) of Section 2 of this paper. For all $\pi \in Q$, note that (SO) implies that $(x[\pi], u[\pi])$ is a solution of (\mathcal{B}, π) , (IC1) and (IC4) imply that (AI1) is fulfilled, (IC1) implies that (AI2) is fulfilled, (V1) and (V3) imply that (Av1) is fulfilled, (V1) implies that (Av2) is fulfilled, (CT1) implies that (AT1) is fulfilled, (CT2) implies that (AT2) is fulfilled, (CT2) implies that (AT2) is fulfilled. Hence, the assumptions of Theorem 2.1 are fulfilled. Moreover, note that (3.4) and (V2) implies that (LI) is fulfilled, and using (IC2), the assumptions of Corollary 2.3, (iv), hold.

Hence, we obtain the existence and the uniqueness of $((\lambda_i[\pi])_{0 \leq i \leq m}, (\mu_j[\pi])_{1 \leq j \leq q})$, $p[\pi] \in \mathbb{R}^{k+1} \times \mathbb{R}^l \times PC^1([0, T], X^*)$ with $\lambda_0[\pi] = 1$ s.t. the following conditions are fulfilled.

- (Si) For all $\pi \in Q$, for all $i \in \{0, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_i[\pi] \geq 0$.
- (Sl) For all $\pi \in Q$, for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_i[\pi]g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) = 0$.
- (TC) For all $\pi \in Q$,

$$D_{H,1}g^0(x[\pi](T), \pi) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi]D_{H,1}g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) + \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi]D_{H,1}h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) = p[\pi](T).$$
- (AE) For all $\pi \in Q$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\underline{d}p[\pi](t) = -p[\pi](t) \circ D_{F,2}f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) - D_{F,2}f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$.
- (MP) For all $\pi \in Q$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, for all $\zeta \in U$,

$$\mathcal{H}_\pi(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), p[\pi](t), 1) \geq \mathcal{H}_\pi(t, x[\pi](t), \zeta, p[\pi](t), 1).$$

4th step: the transformation of the partial differentials of f^0 with respect to the state variable and the control variable. For all $t \in [0, T]$, for all real normed space \mathfrak{Y} , we consider the evaluation operator $ev_t^\mathfrak{Y} : NPC_R^0([0, T], \mathfrak{Y}) \rightarrow \mathfrak{Y}$ defined by $ev_t^\mathfrak{Y}(\varphi) := \varphi(t)$ when $\varphi \in NPC_R^0([0, T], \mathfrak{Y})$. Note that $ev_t^\mathfrak{Y} \in \mathcal{L}(NPC_R^0([0, T], \mathfrak{Y}), \mathfrak{Y})$. We can rewrite the evolution equation of (\mathcal{B}, π) in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} &\forall \pi \in P, \forall t \in [0, T], (ev_t^X \circ \underline{d} \circ x)[\pi] = f(t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \circ (ev_t^X(x)[\cdot], ev_t^Y(u)[\cdot], id_Z)[\pi]. \text{ Using ([6], p.253),} \\ &\text{we obtain } D_G^+(ev_t^X \circ \underline{d} \circ x)[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = D_H(ev_t^X \circ \underline{d})(x([\pi_0]) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]) \\ &= (ev_t^X \circ \underline{d}) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = ev_t^X(\underline{d}(D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi])) \\ &= \underline{d}(D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi])(t) \text{ i.e. we have the following inversion of the two notions of differentiation } \underline{d} \text{ and } D_G^+. \end{aligned}$$

$$D_G^+(\underline{d}x(t))[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = \underline{d}(D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi])(t). \quad (3.5)$$

From (V2), we also have $D_G^+(f(t, \cdot, \cdot, \cdot) \circ (ev_t^X(x)[\cdot], ev_t^Y(u)[\cdot], id_Z))[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = D_{H,(2,3,4)}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot (D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), \delta\pi)$. Therefore, we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\underline{d}[D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]](t) = D_{H,(2,3,4)}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot (D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), \delta\pi)$. From (MP), (V2) and (IC2), we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $p[\pi_0](t) \circ D_{H,3}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) + D_{H,3}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) = 0$.

Consequently, for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& D_{H,(2,3)}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot (D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t)) \\
&= -\underline{d}[p[\pi_0]](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) - \\
& p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,2}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) - \\
& p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,3}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) \\
&= -\underline{d}[p[\pi_0]](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) - p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,(2,3,4)}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \\
& (D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t), \delta\pi) \\
&+ p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\
&= -\underline{d}[p[\pi_0]](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) - p[\pi_0](t) \cdot \underline{d}[D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]](t) + \\
& p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
& D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = \\
& \int_{[0,T]} -\underline{d}[p[\pi_0]](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) - p[\pi_0](t) \cdot \underline{d}[D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]](t) dm_1(t) \\
& + \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi dm_1(t) \\
& + \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi dm_1(t) \\
& + D_{H,1}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) + D_{H,2}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi.
\end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.6)$$

We consider the function $\psi : [0, T] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by, for all $t \in [0, T]$,
 $\psi(t) = p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t)$. Since $\psi \in PC^1([0, T], X^*)$ and $D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi] \in PC^1([0, T], X)$,
we have $\psi \in PC^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and, for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have $\underline{d}p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) + p[\pi_0](t) \cdot \underline{d}[D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]](t)$. i.e. $\underline{d}\psi(t) = \underline{d}p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](t) + p[\pi_0](t) \cdot \underline{d}[D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]](t)$. Since $\psi \in PC^1([0, T], \mathbb{R})$, we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\psi(T) - \psi(0) = \int_0^T \underline{d}\psi(t) dt$.

Moreover, we have $D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](0) = 0$.

Therefore $-\int_0^T \underline{d}\psi(t) dt = -\psi(T) + \psi(0) = -p[\pi_0](T) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T)$.

Therefore, we obtain

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
& D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = -p[\pi_0](T) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) \\
& + \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi dm_1(t) \\
& + \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi dm_1(t) \\
& + D_{H,1}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) \\
& + D_{H,2}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi.
\end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.7)$$

5th step: the transformation of the first and the second to last terms of (3.7). From (TC), we obtain

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
& D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = -\sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,1}g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi_0] D_{H,1}h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) \\
& + \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi dm_1(t) \\
& + \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi dm_1(t) \\
& + D_{H,2}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi.
\end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.8)$$

Besides, by using (MP) and (V2), we have, for all $\pi \in Q$,

$p[\pi](T) \circ D_{H,3}f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) + D_{H,3}f^0(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) = 0$. Consequently,

by using (TC), we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \forall \pi \in Q, \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i [\pi] D_{H,1} g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3} f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j [\pi] D_{H,1} h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3} f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) \\ & = -D_{H,1} g^0(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3} f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) \\ & - D_{H,3} f^0(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.9)$$

In the following lemma, we establish the continuity of the multipliers with respect to π .

Lemma 3.5. *For all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_i \in C^0(Q, \mathbb{R}_+)$, and, for all $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $\mu_j \in C^0(Q, \mathbb{R})$.*

Proof. First, for all $\pi \in Q$, we set $F_\pi := \text{span}\{e_i[\pi] : 1 \leq i \leq m+q\}$ and $F := \bigcup_{\pi \in Q} (F_\pi \times \{\pi\})$ where for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $e_i[\pi] = D_{H,1} g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3} f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi)$ and for all $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$,

$e_{m+j}[\pi] = D_{H,1} h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3} f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi)$. For all $(\mathbf{x}, \pi) \in F$, we denote by $\mathbf{x}_\alpha(x, \pi)$ the α -th coordinate of \mathbf{x} in the basis $(e_j[\pi])_{1 \leq j \leq m+q}$.

From (IC2), (V2), (CVT2), (ESP) and (3.4), by using Lemma 4.3 in [4], with $\mathbb{E} = Y^*$, $\mathbb{W} = Z, W = Q$, we obtain that, $\forall \alpha \in \{1, \dots, m+q\}$, \mathbf{x}_α is continuous on $\bigcup_{\pi \in Q} (F_\pi \times \{\pi\})$.

Consequently, since (3.9), we have, for all $\pi \in Q$,

$$\mathbf{x}[\pi] := -D_{H,1} g^0(x[\pi](T), \pi) \circ D_{H,3} f(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) - D_{H,3} f^0(T, x[\pi](T), u[\pi](T), \pi) \in F_\pi.$$

Hence, we have for all $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, $\lambda_i = \mathbf{x}_i \circ (\mathbf{x}, \text{id}_Q) \in C^0(Q, \mathbb{R})$, and

for all $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$, $\mu_j = \mathbf{x}_{m+j} \circ (\mathbf{x}, \text{id}_Q) \in C^0(Q, \mathbb{R})$. \square

Let $i \in \{1, \dots, m\}$; if $\lambda_i[\pi_0] > 0$, using Lemma 3.5, there exists a neighborhood N of π_0 in Q s.t., for all $\pi \in N$, $\lambda_i[\pi] > 0$. Consequently, by using (S ℓ), we obtain that, for all $\pi \in N$, $g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) = 0$. From (SO) and (CT1), we have $D_{H,1} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) + D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi = 0$. Hence we have

$$\lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi = -\lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,1} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T).$$

Moreover, if $\lambda_i[\pi_0] = 0$, then we also have $\lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi = -\lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,1} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T)$. Hence, we obtain

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \forall i \in \{1, \dots, m\}, \lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ & = -\lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,1} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.10)$$

Let $j \in \{1, \dots, q\}$; remark that for all $\pi \in Q$, $h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) = 0$.

From (SO) and (CT1), we have

$D_{H,1} h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T) + D_{H,2} h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi = 0$. Consequently, we obtain

$$\mu_j[\pi_0] D_{H,2} h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi = -\mu_j[\pi_0] D_{H,1} h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot D_G^+ x[\pi_0; \delta\pi](T). \quad (3.11)$$

From (3.8), (3.10) and (3.11), we have

$$\begin{aligned} D_G^+ V[\pi_0; \delta\pi] &= D_{H,2} g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi_0] D_{H,2} h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4} f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t) \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4} f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \, d\mathbf{m}_1(t). \end{aligned}$$

3.3. Proof of Corollary 3.2. For all $\delta\pi \in Z$, from (SO-bis), $D_G^+x[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ and $D_G^+u[\pi_0; \delta\pi]$ exist.

Consequently, the assumptions of Theorem 3.1 are fulfilled for every direction $\delta\pi \in Z$. Therefore, using Theorem 3.1, we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\forall \delta\pi \in Z, \\ &D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi] = D_{H,2}g^0(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi_0] D_{H,2}g^i(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi_0] D_{H,2}h^j(x[\pi_0](T), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi d\mathbf{m}_1(t) \\ &+ \int_{[0,T]} p(\pi_0)(t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi d\mathbf{m}_1(t). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.12)$$

Moreover, we have

$$\forall t \in [0, T], \|D_{H,(2,3,4)}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0)\| \leq \kappa(t). \quad (3.13)$$

Since (3.13), using the linearity property of the Borel integral, we have

$$[\delta\pi \mapsto \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4}f^0(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi d\mathbf{m}_1(t)] \in Z^*.$$

Besides, from (V4), we have for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\|p[\pi_0](t) \circ D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0)\| \\ &\leq \|p[\pi_0](t)\| \|D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0)\| \leq \|p[\pi_0]\|_{\infty} \kappa(t). \end{aligned}$$

Consequently, using the linearity property of the Borel integral, we have

$$[\delta\pi \mapsto \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi_0](t) \cdot D_{H,4}f(t, x[\pi_0](t), u[\pi_0](t), \pi_0) \cdot \delta\pi d\mathbf{m}_1(t)] \in Z^*.$$

Therefore, we have $[\delta\pi \mapsto D_G^+V[\pi_0; \delta\pi]] \in Z^*$. Therefore V is Gâteaux-differentiable at π_0 .

3.4. Proof of Corollary 3.3. Note that, by using (SO-ter), the function $\mathfrak{x} : P \rightarrow NPC_R^0([0, T], \Omega \times U \times P)$, defined by, for all $\pi \in P$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\mathfrak{x}[\pi](t) = (x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$ is continuous at π_0 .

Therefore, we have

$$\exists \bar{r} > 0 \text{ s.t. } \forall \pi \in B(\pi_0, \bar{r}), \|\mathfrak{x}[\pi] - \mathfrak{x}[\pi_0]\|_{\infty} < \frac{\rho}{2}. \quad (3.14)$$

We set $\alpha := \min\{\bar{r}, \frac{\rho}{2}\}$. Note that, we also have

$$\forall \pi \in B(\pi_0, \alpha), \forall t \in [0, T], B_{\|\cdot\|_1}(\mathfrak{x}[\pi](t), \alpha) \subset B_{\|\cdot\|_1}(\mathfrak{x}[\pi_0](t), \rho). \quad (3.15)$$

From (IC3), by using (3.15), we have

$$\left. \begin{aligned} &\forall \pi \in B(\pi_0, \alpha), \forall t \in [0, T], \forall (\xi_1, \zeta_1, \pi_1), (\xi_2, \zeta_2, \pi_2) \in B_{\|\cdot\|_1}(z(\pi)(t), \alpha), \\ &|f^0(t, \xi_1, \zeta_1, \pi_1) - f^0(t, \xi_2, \zeta_2, \pi_2)| \leq \kappa(t) \|(\xi_1, \zeta_1, \pi_1) - (\xi_2, \zeta_2, \pi_2)\|_1. \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.16)$$

We set $\mathfrak{W} := B(\pi_0, \alpha) \cap Q \subset P$. Let $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$. Note that \mathfrak{W} is an open neighborhood of π in Q and, for all $\bar{\pi} \in \mathfrak{W}$, $(x[\bar{\pi}], u[\bar{\pi}])$ is a solution of $(\mathcal{B}, \bar{\pi})$, consequently (SO) is fulfilled $\pi_0 = \pi$. π_0 is not present in the conditions (IC1), (IC4), (V1), (V3), (CT2) and (CVT2), that is why using our assumptions these conditions are already verified.

Using our additional assumptions, the conditions (SO-bis), (IC2), (IC3), (V2), (V4) and (CT1) are fulfilled with $\pi_0 = \pi$.

Besides, the assertions (3.16) implies that (IC3) is fulfilled with $\pi_0 = \pi$, and the assertion (3.4) implies that (CVT1) with $\pi_0 = \pi$. Hence, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, the assumptions of Corollary 3.2 are

fulfilled with $\pi_0 = \pi$. Therefore, we can use the Theorem 3.1 and we obtain that V is Gâteaux differentiable for every $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$ and

$$\left. \begin{aligned} & \forall \pi \in \mathfrak{W}, \forall \delta \pi \in Z \\ & D_G V[\pi] \cdot \delta \pi = D_{H,2} g^0(x[\pi](T), \pi) \cdot \delta \pi + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) \cdot \delta \pi \\ & + \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j(\pi) D_{H,2} h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) \cdot \delta \pi \\ & + \int_{[0,T]} D_{H,4} f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) \cdot \delta \pi \, d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) \\ & + \int_{[0,T]} p[\pi](t) \cdot D_{H,4} f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) \cdot \delta \pi \, d\mathfrak{m}_1(t). \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (3.17)$$

Besides, by using (3.16) and (IC5), we have

$$\forall \pi \in B(\pi_0, \alpha), \forall t \in [0, T], \|D_{H,(2,3,4)} f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)\| \leq \kappa(t). \quad (3.18)$$

For all $i \in \{2, 4\}$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, we set

$\mathfrak{f}_i(t, \pi) = D_{H,i} f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$ and $\mathfrak{f}_i^0(t, \pi) = D_{H,i} f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi)$. In the following lemma, we prove that the adjoint function is continuous with respect to the parameter π .

Lemma 3.6. $[\pi \mapsto p[\pi]] \in C^0(\mathfrak{W}, (PC^1([0, T], X^*), \|\cdot\|_\infty))$.

Proof. From (TC), (CT3) and Lemma 3.5, we have

$$[\pi \mapsto p[\pi](T)] \in C^0(Q, X^*). \quad (3.19)$$

Let $\hat{\pi} \in \mathfrak{W}$. We consider the functions $\varphi_1 : [0, T] \times \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $(t, \pi) \in [0, T] \times \mathfrak{W}$, $\varphi_1(t, \pi) := \|\mathfrak{f}_2(t, \pi) - \mathfrak{f}_2(t, \hat{\pi})\|$, and $\varphi_1^0 : [0, T] \times \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by, for all $(t, \pi) \in [0, T] \times \mathfrak{W}$, $\varphi_1^0(t, \pi) := \|\mathfrak{f}_2^0(t, \pi) - \mathfrak{f}_2^0(t, \hat{\pi})\|$. Note that using (IC4) and Lemma 2.10, we have for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\varphi_1^0(\cdot, \pi) \in NPC_R^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$. Besides, using (3.18), we have for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\varphi_1^0(t, \pi) \leq 2\kappa(t)$. Next, using (IC5), we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \varphi_1^0(t, \pi) = \varphi_1^0(t, \hat{\pi}) = 0$.

Therefore, using the Dominated Convergence Theorem of Lebesgue, the functional $\psi_1^0 : \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\psi_1^0(\pi) := \int_0^T \varphi_1^0(t, \pi) \, dt$, is continuous at $\hat{\pi}$ i.e.

$$\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \psi_1^0(\pi) = \psi_1^0(\hat{\pi}) = 0. \quad (3.20)$$

Using (V3) and Lemma 2.10, we have, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\varphi_1(\cdot, \pi) \in NPC_R^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$.

From (V6) we have, $\forall \pi \in \mathfrak{W}, \forall t \in [0, T], \varphi_1(t, \pi) \leq 2c(t)$.

Besides, using (V5), we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \varphi_1(t, \pi) = \varphi_1(t, \hat{\pi}) = 0$.

Consequently, using the Dominated Convergence Theorem of Lebesgue, the functional $\psi_1 : \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\psi_1(\pi) := \int_0^T \varphi_1(t, \pi) \, dt$, is continuous at $\hat{\pi}$ i.e.

$$\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \psi_1(\pi) = \psi_1(\hat{\pi}) = 0. \quad (3.21)$$

For all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, for all $t \in [0, T]$, we have the following inequalities:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \|p[\pi](t) - p[\hat{\pi}](t)\| = \|p[\pi](T) + \int_T^t [-p[\pi](s) \circ f_2(s, \pi) - f_2^0(s, \pi)] ds - \\
& (p[\hat{\pi}](T) + \int_T^t [-p[\hat{\pi}](s) \circ f_2(s, \hat{\pi}) - f_2^0(s, \hat{\pi})] ds)\| \\
& \leq \|p[\pi](T) - p[\hat{\pi}](T)\| + \int_t^T \|p[\pi](s) \circ f_2(s, \pi) - p[\hat{\pi}](s) \circ f_2(s, \hat{\pi})\| ds \\
& + \int_t^T \|f_2^0(s, \pi) - f_2^0(s, \hat{\pi})\| ds \\
& \leq \|p[\pi](T) - p[\hat{\pi}](T)\| + \int_t^T \|p[\pi](s) \circ f_2(s, \pi) - p[\hat{\pi}](s) \circ f_2(s, \pi) + \\
& p[\hat{\pi}](s) \circ f_2(s, \pi) - p[\hat{\pi}](s) \circ f_2(s, \hat{\pi})\| ds + \int_t^T \|f_2^0(s, \pi) - f_2^0(s, \hat{\pi})\| ds \\
& \leq \|p[\pi](T) - p[\hat{\pi}](T)\| + \int_t^T \|p[\pi](s) - p[\hat{\pi}](s)\| \|f_2(s, \pi)\| ds \\
& + \int_t^T \|p[\hat{\pi}](s)\| \|f_2(s, \pi) - f_2(s, \hat{\pi})\| ds + \psi_1^0(\pi) \\
& \leq \|p[\pi](T) - p[\hat{\pi}](T)\| + \int_{[t, T]} \|p[\pi](s) - p[\hat{\pi}](s)\| c(s) d\mathbf{m}_1(s) + \|p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \psi_1(\pi) \\
& + \psi_1^0(\pi).
\end{aligned}$$

Since $[s \mapsto \|p[\pi](s) - p[\hat{\pi}](s)\|] \in C^0([0, T], \mathbb{R})$ and $c \in \mathcal{L}^1([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), \mathbf{m}_1; \mathbb{R}_+)$, by using the lemma of Gronwall ([1], p.183), we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$,

$$\|p[\pi](t) - p[\hat{\pi}](t)\| \leq [\|p[\pi](T) - p[\hat{\pi}](T)\| + \|p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \psi_1(\pi) + \psi_1^0(\pi)] \exp(\int_{[t, T]} c(s) d\mathbf{m}_1(s)).$$

Therefore, we have

$$\|p[\pi] - p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \leq [\|p[\pi](T) - p[\hat{\pi}](T)\| + \|p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \psi_1(\pi) + \psi_1^0(\pi)] \exp(\int_{[0, T]} c(s) d\mathbf{m}_1(s)). \quad (3.22)$$

Hence, using (3.19), (3.20) and (3.21), we have $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \|p[\pi] - p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty = 0$.

Consequently, we have $[\pi \mapsto p[\pi]] \in C^0(\mathfrak{W}, (PC^1([0, T], X^*), \|\cdot\|_\infty))$. \square

Next, we consider the function $\Psi_2 : \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow Z^*$, defined by, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, for all $\delta\pi \in Z$,

$$\Psi_2(\pi) \cdot \delta\pi := \int_{[0, T]} D_{H,4} f^0(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi d\mathbf{m}_1(t).$$

Lemma 3.7. $\Psi_2 \in C^0(\mathfrak{W}, Z^*)$.

Proof. Let $\hat{\pi} \in \mathfrak{W}$. We consider the fonction $\varphi_2^0 : [0, T] \times \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ defined by $\varphi_2^0(t, \pi) := \|f_4^0(t, \pi) - f_4^0(t, \hat{\pi})\|$.

Using (IC6), we have, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\varphi_2^0(\cdot, \pi) \in \mathcal{L}^0([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})))$. Next, using (3.18), we have, $\forall \pi \in \mathfrak{W}, \forall t \in [0, T], \varphi_2^0(t, \pi) \leq 2\kappa(t)$. Besides, from (IC5), we have, for all $t \in [0, T], \lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \varphi_2^0(t, \pi) = \varphi_2^0(t, \hat{\pi}) = 0$. Hence, using the Dominated Convergence Theorem of

Lebesgue, the functional $\psi_2^0 : \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by, $\psi_2^0(\pi) := \int_{[0, T]} \varphi_2^0(t, \pi) d\mathbf{m}_1(t)$ is continuous at $\hat{\pi}$ i.e.

$$\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \psi_2^0(\pi) = \psi_2^0(\hat{\pi}) = 0. \quad (3.23)$$

For all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, we have $\|\Psi_2(\pi) - \Psi_2(\hat{\pi})\| \leq \psi_2^0(\pi)$.

Consequently, using (3.23), we have $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \|\Psi_2(\pi) - \Psi_2(\hat{\pi})\| = 0$. Hence, we have proven the lemma. \square

Now, we consider, the function $\Psi_3 : \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow Z^*$, defined by, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, for all $\delta\pi \in Z$, $\Psi_3(\pi) \cdot \delta\pi := \int_{[0, T]} p[\pi](t) \cdot D_{H,4} f(t, x[\pi](t), u[\pi](t), \pi) \cdot \delta\pi d\mathbf{m}_1(t)$.

Lemma 3.8. $\Psi_3 \in C^0(\mathfrak{W}, Z^*)$.

Proof. Let $\hat{\pi} \in \mathfrak{W}$. We consider the function $\varphi_2 : [0, T] \times \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $\varphi_2(t, \pi) := \|\mathfrak{f}_4(t, \pi) - \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \hat{\pi})\|$.

From (V6), we have, for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\varphi_2(\cdot, \pi) \in \mathcal{L}^0([0, T], \mathcal{B}([0, T]), (\mathbb{R}, \mathcal{B}(\mathbb{R})))$. Moreover, using (V6), we also have, $\forall \pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\forall t \in [0, T]$, $\varphi_2(t, \pi) \leq 2c(t)$. Besides, from (V5), we have, for all $t \in [0, T]$, $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \varphi_2(t, \pi) = \varphi_2(t, \hat{\pi}) = 0$. Hence, using the Dominated Convergence Theorem of Lebesgue the functional $\psi_2 : \mathfrak{W} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, defined by $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, $\psi_2(\pi) := \int_{[0, T]} \varphi_2(t, \pi) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t)$, is continuous at $\hat{\pi}$ i.e.

$$\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \psi_2(\pi) = \psi_2(\hat{\pi}) = 0. \quad (3.24)$$

For all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, we have $\|p[\pi](t) \circ \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \pi) - p[\hat{\pi}](t) \circ \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \hat{\pi})\|$
 $= \|p[\pi](t) \circ \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \pi) - p[\hat{\pi}](t) \circ \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \pi) + p[\hat{\pi}](t) \circ \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \pi) - p[\hat{\pi}](t) \circ \mathfrak{f}_4(t, \hat{\pi})\|$
 $\leq \|p[\pi] - p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty c(t) + \|p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \varphi_2(t, \pi).$

Consequently, we obtain

$$\|\Psi_3(\pi) - \Psi_3(\hat{\pi})\| \leq \|p[\pi] - p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \int_{[0, T]} c(t) d\mathfrak{m}_1(t) + \|p[\hat{\pi}]\|_\infty \psi_2(\pi).$$

Consequently, using Lemma 3.6 and (3.24), we obtain $\lim_{\pi \rightarrow \hat{\pi}} \|\Psi_3(\pi) - \Psi_3(\hat{\pi})\| = 0$. Therefore, we have proven this lemma. \square

From (3.17), remark that

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \forall \pi \in \mathfrak{W}, \\ D_G V[\pi] &= D_{H,2} g_0(x[\pi](T), \pi) + \sum_{i=1}^m \lambda_i[\pi] D_{H,2} g^i(x[\pi](T), \pi) \\ &\quad + \sum_{j=1}^q \mu_j[\pi] D_{H,2} h^j(x[\pi](T), \pi) + \Psi_2(\pi) + \Psi_3(\pi). \end{aligned} \right\}$$

Consequently, using (CT3) and Lemmas 3.5, 3.7 and 3.8, we obtain that, $D_G V \in C^0(\mathfrak{W}, Z^*)$. Therefore, using Corollary 2, p. 144 in [1], we obtain that V is Fréchet differentiable on \mathfrak{W} and $D_F V[\pi] = D_G V[\pi]$ for all $\pi \in \mathfrak{W}$, and therefore $D_F V \in C^0(\mathfrak{W}, Z^*)$.

Acknowledgements

The authors thank an anonymous referee who helped us to improve the presentation of the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] V.M. Alexeev, V.M. Tikhomirov, S.V. Fomine, *Commande optimale*, french edition, MIR, Moscow, 1982.
- [2] J. Blot, On the multiplier rules, *Optimization* 65 (2016) 947-955.
- [3] J. Blot, H. Yilmaz, A generalization of Michel's result on the Pontryagin Maximum Principle, *J. Optim. Theory Appl.* 183 (2019) 792-812.
- [4] J. Blot, H. Yilmaz, Envelope theorems for static optimization and calculus of variations, *J. Math. Anal. Appl.* 509 (2022) 125966.
- [5] J. Dieudonné, *Éléments d'analyse*, tome 1: fondements de l'analyse moderne, french edition, Gauthier-Villars, Paris, 1969.
- [6] T.M. Flett, *Differential Analysis*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1980.
- [7] A. Granas, J. Dugundji, *Fixed Point Theory*, Springer, New York Inc., New-York, 2003.
- [8] P. Hartman, *Ordinary Differential Equations*, second edition, SIAM, Boston, 1982.
- [9] A.D. Ioffe, V.M. Tikhomirov, *Theory of Extremal Problems*, english edition, North-Holland Pub. Co., Amsterdam, 1979.
- [10] S. Lang, *Real and Functional Analysis*, third edition, Springer-Verlang New York, Inc., New-York, 1993.
- [11] P. Michel, Une démonstration élémentaire du principe du maximum de Pontryaguine, *Bulletin de Mathématiques Économiques* N°14 (1977).

- [12] L.S. Pontryagin, V.G. Boltyanskii, R.V. Gamkrelidze, E.F. Mishchenko, *Théorie mathématique des processus optimaux*, french edition, MIR, Moscow, 1974.
- [13] L. Schwartz, *Cours d'analyse*; tome 1, Hermann, Paris, 1967.
- [14] H. Yilmaz, A generalization of multiplier rules for infinite-dimensional optimization problems, *Optimization* 70 (2021) 1825-1835.