

# A Taxonomy for Evaluating Generalist Robot Policies

Jensen Gao<sup>\*1</sup>, Suneel Belkhale<sup>\*1</sup>, Sudeep Dasari<sup>2</sup>, Ashwin Balakrishna<sup>2</sup>, Dhruv Shah<sup>2</sup>, Dorsa Sadigh<sup>1,2</sup>  
<sup>1</sup>Stanford University, <sup>2</sup>Google DeepMind

*Abstract*—Machine learning for robotics promises to unlock generalization to novel tasks and environments. Guided by this promise, many recent works have focused on scaling up robot data collection and developing larger, more expressive policies to achieve this. But how do we measure progress towards this goal of policy generalization in practice? Evaluating and quantifying generalization is the Wild West of modern robotics, with each work proposing and measuring different types of generalization in their own, often difficult to reproduce, settings. In this work, our goal is (1) to outline the forms of generalization we believe are important in robot manipulation in a comprehensive and fine-grained manner, and (2) to provide reproducible guidelines for measuring these notions of generalization. We first propose  $\star$ -Gen, a taxonomy of generalization for robot manipulation structured around visual, semantic, and behavioral generalization. We discuss how our taxonomy encompasses most prior notions of generalization in robotics. Next, we instantiate  $\star$ -Gen with a concrete real-world benchmark based on the widely-used Bridge V2 dataset. We evaluate a variety of state-of-the-art models on this benchmark to demonstrate the utility of our taxonomy in practice. Our taxonomy of generalization can yield many interesting insights into existing models: for example, we observe that current vision-language-action models struggle with various types of semantic generalization, despite the promise of pre-training on internet-scale language datasets. We believe  $\star$ -Gen and our guidelines can improve the dissemination and evaluation of progress towards generalization in robotics, which we hope will guide model design and future data collection efforts. We provide videos and demos at our website [stargen-taxonomy.github.io](https://stargen-taxonomy.github.io).

## I. INTRODUCTION

Learning-based robotics often comes with the promise of generalization. As an example, an ambitious goal is to train a policy on diverse household data so it can enter a new home and fold laundry. This vision has led to many recent works that train robot policies on diverse datasets via imitation learning [1–13] with the hope of broad generalization. For example, if a robot encounters an unseen item of clothing in a new home, it should infer how to fold it using its extensive prior experience. However, in contrast to other domains like language and vision, we have yet to reach a point in robotics where policies can reliably generalize in this manner.

In pursuit of reliable and broad generalization, recent work has focused on scaling up data collection [2–4, 14–20] and developing more expressive models [3, 7–13], following the successes of other machine learning fields. Although these advances have led to more capable policies that certainly generalize to some novel scenarios, it is often unclear from existing evaluations how generalist these policies truly are.

While prior work on learning generalist policies demonstrate various forms of generalization, such as visual robust-

ness to distractor objects, or understanding novel language instructions, there often lacks consistency and exhaustiveness in the evaluations considered. Each work proposes their own forms of generalization and evaluation conditions for measuring them, usually with little transparency into how they were decided upon. As a result, it has become difficult to measure progress toward the real-world deployability of these policies. Despite promising results reported in the literature, real-world deployment of generalist policies has remained largely elusive.

To work towards more comprehensive and systematic evaluations that better capture progress towards deployability, in this work we develop a taxonomy of generalization to guide policy evaluation efforts. To ground our taxonomy, we observe that policies require generalization when there are *perturbations* to the policy’s *inputs* or required *outputs*. Thus, our insight is to structure our taxonomy around each input and output modality of a given policy, to more comprehensively consider the various perturbations a policy may need to generalize to.

To this end, we propose  $\star$ -Gen (STAR-Gen) – a Systematic Taxonomy of the Axes of Robot Generalization.  $\star$ -Gen is built around the input and output modalities of visuo-lingual control policies, which have three such modalities: vision, language, and actions. Therefore, we categorize perturbations as **visual** (changes to visual inputs), **semantic** (changes in language inputs), and **behavioral** (changes to action outputs). For each combination of these labels (e.g., **visual** only, or **visual + behavioral**), we provide more granular generalization *axes* to guide evaluation. For instance, we include *Object Properties* as an axis for the category **semantic**, which involves generalizing from the language instruction “put carrot on plate” to “put the orange object on the plate” for the same underlying behavior.

To demonstrate the utility of our taxonomy in practice, we present a real-world case study of designing a generalization benchmark, BridgeV2- $\star$ , based on the popular Bridge V2 dataset [17]. We outline all design choices of our benchmark based on our proposed taxonomy. We then evaluate several state-of-the-art open-source manipulation policies, such as OpenVLA [10], MiniVLA [21], and a re-implementation of  $\pi_0$  [13, 22] on this benchmark. BridgeV2- $\star$  not only provides a more detailed, granular view of the generalization capabilities of current models, but also offers a blueprint for designing generalization benchmarks based on any given training dataset.

Our evaluations – consisting of 1600+ robot trials across 13 axes of generalization – generate several insights into these state-of-the-art models. For example, we find that larger cross-embodiment robot datasets can improve several axes of generalization, but offer limited benefits along axes that existing models struggle with the most. In addition, we find

\*Equal contribution.




Fig. 1: Visualization of  $\star$ -Gen applied to the example base task “put carrot on plate”.  $\star$ -Gen is structured around perturbations to the three modalities of visuo-lingual policies (**visual**, **semantic**, **behavioral**), with consideration for each possible combination of each modality. We refer to these combinations as *categories*. For each category (colored sectors), we group different perturbations of that category into *axes* of generalization (light colored boxes). We provide some example perturbations.

that co-training policies with general vision-language data can improve many axes, but has a surprisingly mixed effect on **semantic** axes. We also find that using an improved action tokenization scheme can broadly improve many axes.

In summary, we present  $\star$ -Gen, a taxonomy of generalization structured around the three modalities – vision, language, and actions – that span the space of generalization for visuo-lingual policies. We perform a case study of instantiating  $\star$ -Gen as a real-world benchmark, BridgeV2- $\star$ . BridgeV2- $\star$  consisted of 1600+ evaluations across 13 axes, and led to new findings on state-of-the-art generalist models, and the impact of various model design decisions. We hope  $\star$ -Gen provides guidance for training models and evaluating for generalization, to help advance progress for generalist robot policies.

## II. RELATED WORK

To achieve broad generalization in robotics, much prior work has focused on scaling up real world data collection. These efforts typically aim to capture diversity in both environmental conditions and task behavior to achieve such generalization [14–19]. Building on these efforts, Open X-Embodiment consolidates a wide variety of robot datasets to support training unified models across multiple datasets [5].

While these datasets are usually collected with diversity in mind, it is often unclear what forms of diversity matter, or how this diversity should be achieved. Recent works have investigated data collection strategies to identify best practices

for generating diverse robot data [23, 24]. However, while these works consider various notions of diversity during data collection and corresponding axes of generalization during evaluation, these axes are neither exhaustive nor standardized.

Nevertheless, recent works have attempted to leverage these datasets for learning generalist robot policies. These works involve training large-scale, visuo-lingual policies on this data, with the goal of generalizing to a wide variety of scenarios [2–5, 7–13]. However, each of these works design their own evaluations that only focus on a relatively narrow selection of generalization. This makes it challenging to determine how different models make progress towards a wide range of different forms of generalization.

A compelling alternative is to benchmark performance and generalization in simulation. There has been extensive work in simulated robotic manipulation platforms that support task and scene diversity [25–31]. However, these largely do not come with pre-defined benchmarks that measure precise notions of generalization. Some works in simulation have benchmarked distribution shifts in a more fine-grained manner [32–36]. However, similar to real-world policy evaluation efforts, the generalization axes considered in each work are often inconsistent across works, with each work defining their own forms of generalization that are often limited in scope.

To address these limitations in prior data collection and policy evaluation efforts, we propose  $\star$ -Gen, a taxonomy of

meaningful axes of generalization in robotics.  $\star$ -Gen covers a superset of the axes considered in prior works, and can be instantiated for both simulated and real-world environments. By carefully defining and more exhaustively delineating various notions of generalization, we hope this taxonomy can be useful for collecting better datasets that make more progress towards generalization, and developing better benchmarks that more accurately assess this progress.

### III. WHAT IS GENERALIZATION?

In this section, we outline our preliminaries, provide a formal definition of generalization when evaluating robot policies, and list additional assumptions, which we will use later in Section IV-A to design our taxonomy  $\star$ -Gen.

#### A. Preliminaries

We first define several foundational concepts that we will later use to define generalization:

**Environment.** We define an environment as the tuple  $E = (\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{O}, \mathcal{A}, \mathcal{L}, f_o, f_t)$ , where  $\mathcal{S}$  is the state space,  $\mathcal{O}$  is the observation space derived from  $\mathcal{S}$  through observation function  $f_o : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{O}$ ,  $\mathcal{A}$  is the action space, and  $f_t : \mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}$  is the transition function. We assume  $\mathcal{O}$  consists of third-person images of a scene, and  $\mathcal{A}$  consists of robot actions.

**Task.** Given an environment  $E$ , we define a task space  $T$ . A task  $\tau \in T$  is defined as  $\tau = (p_\tau(s_0), l_\tau, R_\tau)$ , where  $p_\tau(s_0)$  is an initial state distribution for  $E$ ,  $l_\tau \in \mathcal{L}$  is a language instruction that specifies the task, and  $R_\tau : (\mathcal{S} \times \mathcal{A})^* \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is a success function that maps a sequence of states and actions to a binary success indicator. This also defines an initial observation distribution  $p_\tau(o_0)$  induced by  $f_o$ .

**Policy.** A policy  $\pi(a | o^n, l)$  takes in  $n \geq 1$  observations, a language instruction, and outputs an action distribution.

**Expert Policy.** We define the expert policy as  $\pi_E(a | o^n, l)$ , which produces successful episodes (where success is defined by  $R_\tau$ ) for a given task  $\tau$ .

#### B. Defining Generalization for Visuo-Lingual Policies

Generalization is often defined in prior work as measuring the performance of a policy  $\pi$  on some task  $\tau'$  that lies outside some source distribution of tasks (i.e., in some target distribution). Having a source distribution implies the policy  $\pi$  learns from data, such as expert demonstrations in imitation learning (IL), or online samples in reinforcement learning (RL). In this work, we focus on the IL setting and use the terms source distribution and training distribution interchangeably, although our formalism is extendable to any setting with a source distribution and target distribution to generalize to.

However, for policies to be deployable in diverse settings, there is an immense space of potential tasks  $\tau'$  that should be considered (i.e., the target distribution is vast). Furthermore, it can be challenging to define the training distribution for large datasets, making it difficult to characterize how a task captures generalization from the training distribution. Rather

than attempting to define evaluation tasks as representing generalization relative to the entire training distribution of a policy, as is often the case in prior work, we define generalization more precisely as *perturbations* to some base task as follows:

**Base Task.** A base task  $\tau_B$  is a task where an end application desires for a policy to be able to perform the task and perturbations of it. For example, a base task for a cooking robot could be a specific instance of chopping an onion, and it would be desirable for the robot to be robust to different variations of it. Using base tasks allows us to more precisely understand how *changes* to a task affect our policy.

**Perturbations.** We define a perturbation function as a transformation  $P : T \rightarrow T$ , that applies a task delta to a base task  $\tau$  to produce a new task  $\tau_P$ . We categorize perturbations induced by a perturbation function based on how the inputs and outputs of a policy  $\pi(a | o^n, l)$  are impacted as follows:

- **Visual:**  $\tau_P$  is a visual perturbation of  $\tau$  if  $p_\tau(o_0) \neq p_{\tau_P}(o_0)$ , i.e., the initial distribution of image observations has changed (e.g., the *Viewpoint* change in the top Fig. 1).
- **Semantic:**  $\tau_P$  is a semantic perturbation of  $\tau$  if  $l_\tau \neq l_{\tau_P}$ , i.e., the language instruction has changed (e.g., the left side of Fig. 1).
- **Behavioral:**  $\tau_P$  is a behavioral perturbation of  $\tau$  if the expert policy  $\pi_E$  changes its action distribution for the task, i.e., the required optimal behavior changes (e.g., morphing a carrot to a smaller one on the right of Fig. 1).

Note that this categorization is not mutually exclusive, meaning a perturbation can fall under one or more of the above categories. For example, the behavior of the expert policy often changes with the initial state distribution or the instruction, so **behavioral** perturbations are often also **visual** or **semantic**.

We also note that because a perturbation captures how a base task changes, the same perturbed task  $\tau_P$  could be associated with multiple different categorizations, depending on the base task. For example, if the base task is “pick up carrot” with a carrot and apple in the scene, and the task is perturbed to “pick up the orange object”, then this is **semantic** only, because the required behavior does not change. However, if the base task is instead “pick up apple”, then “pick up the orange object” would be a **semantic + behavioral** perturbation, because the task now involves picking up a new object.

This categorization can be extended to additional modalities if the policy relies on them, e.g., if the policy uses tactile information or sound [37], we can further categorize perturbations based on changes to these modalities.

**Factors.** We define a factor as a human-interpretable, fine-grained grouping of perturbations, where all perturbations in a factor affect a task in a common way. For example, the lighting in a scene for a base task could be changed in multiple ways (e.g., varying intensities), each of which would be a different perturbation. We can then group all such perturbations under the factor “Lighting”. Factors can be categorized as one or more of **visual**, **semantic**, and **behavioral**, based on the categorization of their constituent perturbations.

**Axes.** We define an axis of generalization as a grouping of factors that share a common set of applicable modalities. Axes are designed (subjectively) by humans to group correlated factors together. For example, our taxonomy defines *Image Augmentations* as an axis consisting of **visual** factors that can be varied using simple and common image transforms, such as “Lighting” or “Image Blur”.

Based on our formalism, generalization can be defined at multiple granularities. First, we define *generalization to a factor* as the robustness of a policy to perturbations defined by that factor. Then, we define *generalization to an axis* as robustness to factors within that axis. Finally, we define *generalization to a category* as robustness to the axes within that category, where categories are defined by the set of modalities (**visual**, **semantic**, **behavioral**) that are perturbed.

### C. Assumptions

We provide more assumptions we make to narrow down the scope of generalization we consider, along with our rationale.

**Manipulation Tasks.** While there exists many classes of robotics tasks where one could study generalization, we build our taxonomy in for robot manipulation tasks. While other domains are of course important, manipulation presents many unique and elusive forms of generalization worth investigating.

**Atomic Perturbations.** We focus on perturbations that are *atomic*, which we loosely define as meaning they can be achieved by a single change to a task. For example, “pick up plate” → “push the cup” is not *atomic* because this requires two changes to the task: changing “plate” to “cup”, and changing “pick” to “push”. We do this to study generalization in a more fine-grained manner while not limiting comprehensiveness, because more complex perturbations can be achieved using a composition of atomic perturbations in our taxonomy.

**Short-Horizon Tasks.** Many works study long-horizon manipulation tasks, which consist of sequencing many shorter tasks together. There are many interesting types of generalization specific to the long-horizon setting, such as reordering tasks in a sequence, or perturbing one or multiple tasks in the sequence. In this work, we focus on short-horizon tasks as a starting point. We hope that by establishing a taxonomy for generalization at the this level, this taxonomy can be readily extended in the future to longer horizons.

## IV. AXES OF GENERALIZATION

Our goal is to present a broad taxonomy of generalization that can guide future evaluations of robot policies. First, in Section IV-A, we outline  $\star$ -Gen, our taxonomy. Next, in Section IV-B, we reframe prior work through the lens of  $\star$ -Gen, illustrating how it not only encompasses prior efforts, but also provides a comprehensive framing for evaluating policies.

### A. $\star$ -Gen: A Taxonomy of Generalization

We structure our taxonomy  $\star$ -Gen around the three modalities visuo-lingual manipulation policies use to interact with the world: **visual** (image inputs), **semantic** (language task inputs), and **behavioral** (action outputs).

As defined in Section III, all perturbations to a base task affect visuo-lingual policies through combinations of these three modalities. Therefore, we can categorize perturbations (and thus factors and axes) into seven distinct *categories* based on the combination of modalities they modify.

**Visual:** Factors and axes in this category modulate image inputs for the initial state, but do not affect the required behavior in the base task or the language instruction. Example factors include lighting, camera pose, and distractor objects (see the green sector of Fig. 1).

**Semantic:** Semantic factors and axes modulate the language instruction without changing the initial image or the required behavior. Example factors include replacing verbs with synonyms, and changing the instruction to use spatial relationships such as “in the \_\_\_” (see the orange sector of Fig. 1).

**Behavioral:** Behavioral factors and axes only affect required behavior without affecting policy inputs. Therefore, all isolated behavioral factors are necessarily *unobserved* from single observations. Example factors include changes to object mass or friction (see the blue sector of Fig. 1). These factors are often challenging for policies due to their unobservability.

**Visual + Behavioral:** These factors and axes affect the initial image and required behavior, without changing the language instruction. As we show in Section IV-B, many factors that prior work consider as “behavior” generalization fall into this category [3, 10]. Example factors include manipulated object poses and surface/table heights (see the cyan sector of Fig. 1).

**Semantic + Behavioral:** These factors and axes affect the language instruction and required behavior, without affecting the initial image. Example factors include changing the speed of a behavior (“quickly” vs. “slowly”) in language, or specifying prepositional phrases like “into” or “in front of” that change the required behavior (see the purple sector of Fig. 1).

**Visual + Semantic:** These factors and axes affect the initial image and language instruction, without requiring change to behavior. An example of this would be if the base instruction is “pick up the purple cup” and the cup changes color to blue, which changes the instruction to “pick up the blue cup”. This is still an *atomic* perturbation, but since the color was specified in the original instruction, the instruction must also be changed. Had the initial instruction been “pick up the cup” and the cup was already blue, then “pick up the blue cup” would be a **semantic** perturbation. See the brown sector of Fig. 1.

**Visual + Semantic + Behavioral:** This category of factors and axes affect all three modalities at once. An example is going from “pick up the carrot” to “pick up the zucchini” – this single perturbation affects the initial image, the language, and the behavior required to pick up the new object.

Within each of these high level *categories* of generalization, there are many potential *axes*. We list the axes we define in  $\star$ -Gen in Table I. For each axis, we provide a description and list some example factors that fall under it. Importantly, not all base tasks will have meaningful instantiations of each axis in practice, which we will discuss more in Section VI.

TABLE I: ★-Gen: Axes of Generalization

Axis	Name	Description	Example Factors
<b>Visual</b>			
<b>Image Augmentations</b>	V-AUG	Realistic generic augmentations in image space.	lighting, image blur, image contrast
<b>Visual Scene</b>	V-SC	Visual changes to scene elements that do not affect behavior.	surface color, distractor object appearance, distractor object placement, textures
<b>Visual Task Object</b>	V-OBJ	Visual changes to task-relevant objects that do not affect behavior.	manipulated object color, other object color (e.g., container an object is placed in)
<b>Viewpoint</b>	V-VIEW	Changes to camera viewpoints.	camera pose, partial occlusion
<b>Semantic</b>			
<b>Object Properties</b>	S-PROP	Changes to instruction that require additional knowledge about physical properties of a task-relevant object.	referencing objects based on color, mass, size
<b>Language Rephrase</b>	S-LANG	Simple rephrasing of the instruction that does not affect underlying behavior.	verb synonyms, removing articles (e.g., "pick up the carrot" → "pick up carrot")
<b>Multi-Object Referencing</b>	S-MO	Changes to instruction that involve references to spatial relationships between multiple objects when defining a task, without changing behavior.	understanding to be "left" or "right" of an object, to be "in" an object (e.g., "pick up carrot" → "pick up object in sink")
<b>Human Affordances</b>	S-AFF	Changes to instruction that require knowledge of human affordances, or how humans interact with an object.	understanding human comfort, object use cases (e.g., "hand me something I can use to clean up this mess")
<b>Internet Knowledge</b>	S-INT	Changes to instruction that require external knowledge that can be found on the internet.	famous nouns (e.g., celebrities), properties of common objects (e.g., color of a basketball)
<b>Behavioral</b>			
<b>Hidden Object</b>	B-HOBJ	Unobserved changes to task-relevant objects that affect behavior.	task-relevant object mass, friction, fragility
<b>Hidden Scene</b>	B-HSC	Unobserved changes to scene elements that affect behavior.	surface friction, temperature
<b>Visual + Behavioral</b>			
<b>Object Poses</b>	VB-POSE	Changes to task-relevant object poses in the scene.	manipulated object pose, other object pose
<b>Interacting Scene</b>	VB-ISC	Changes to scene elements that affect behavior.	clutter, surface height
<b>Morphed Objects</b>	VB-MOBJ	Changes to task-relevant objects that affect their geometry.	manipulated object size, shape
<b>Robot Embodiment</b>	VB-ROB	Changes to the robot embodiment that affect behavior.	new robot arm, new gripper or hand
<b>Symmetry</b>	VB-SYM	Specific to bimanual embodiments, symmetry captures changes that require the robot to mirror behavior across arms.	using different arm to perform same absolute motion, to perform flipped absolute motion
<b>Semantic + Behavioral</b>			
<b>Motion Adverbs</b>	SB-ADV	Changes to instruction involving motion descriptors that affect behavior.	speed (e.g., "quickly" or "slowly")
<b>Spatial Multi-Object</b>	SB-SMO	Changes to instruction that involve references to spatial relationships between multiple objects when defining a task, that affect behavior.	changing spatial references relative to the same object (e.g., "pick object left of the sink" → "pick object right of the sink")
<b>Noun Grounding</b>	SB-NOUN	Replacing nouns with other nouns already in the scene.	other manipulated object (e.g., "pick carrot" → "pick knife" when both are in the scene)
<b>Action Verbs</b>	SB-VRB	Changes to action verbs that require new behavior.	new action to perform on task-relevant object (e.g., "pick bottle" → "rotate bottle")
<b>Visual + Semantic</b>			
<b>New Object Property</b>	VS-PROP	Changes to task-relevant object properties that affect object appearance and language instruction, but not behavior.	new object color when base language instruction refers to the object color
<b>Visual + Semantic + Behavioral</b>			
<b>New Object</b>	VS-NOBJ	Changes to task-relevant objects to new objects with different visual appearances, semantic descriptions, and physical characteristics.	new manipulated object (e.g., carrot → zucchini)

In Fig. 1, we show example tasks for several axes, for the base task of "put carrot on plate". For example, an instantiation of *Visual Scene* (V-SC) for this task could be the introduction of a distracting object such as corn into the corner of the sink, which does not affect the desired behavior of the robot (picking up the carrot and placing it on the plate).

**Compositionality.** The axes and factors in ★-Gen are defined for *atomic* perturbations. We can *compose* these to obtain more complex notions of generalization, provided this is meaningful. For example, we can compose a perturbation for the *visual* axis *Viewpoint* with a perturbation for the *semantic* axis *Object Properties*, to create a compositional perturbation.

		Visual				Semantic					B	VB			SB		VSB	
		AUG	SC	OBJ	VIEW	PROP	LANG	MO	AFF	INT	HOBJ	POSE	ISC	MOBJ	ROB	SMO	NOUN	NOBJ
Simulation Data	FactorWorld [34]	✓	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓				
	KitchenShift [32]	✓		✓	✓							✓		✓	✓			
	Colosseum [35]	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓			✓				
	Eff-Comp [23]		✓		✓							✓						
	CALVIN [33]		✓	✓		✓	✓					✓	✓	✓				
	VLABench [38]					✓	✓	✓	✓	✓						✓		
Real Data	Scaling [24]			✓								✓	✓	✓				
	BridgeV2 [17]	✓	✓	✓							✓	✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
	DROID [19]		✓	✓	✓									✓	✓			
Policy	BC-Z [1]		✓									✓		✓	✓			✓
	RT-Series [2, 3]		✓			✓		✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
	MT-ACT [4]	✓	✓									✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
	$\pi_0$ [13]		✓	✓								✓	✓	✓	✓			✓
	OpenVLA [10]		✓			✓	✓	✓		✓		✓		✓	✓		✓	✓
	BridgeV2-★		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

TABLE II: We present existing generalization benchmarks or datasets (top rows) or policy learning works that report generalization (bottom rows) through the lens of our taxonomy  $\star$ -Gen, including our benchmark presented in Section VI, BridgeV2-★. Columns are different axes of generalization in our taxonomy (a subset of 17/22 axes in Table I). We abbreviate combinations of modalities by their first letter, e.g., “VB” above maps to **visual + behavioral**. A checkmark indicates a given axis is considered in the benchmark. Besides compositional (e.g., in [23]) and long horizon (e.g., in [33, 38]), generalization, the checkmarks in this table fully encompass the scope of evaluation for each prior work. Our instantiated benchmark BridgeV2-★ covers more axes than any prior work, although is not complete due to practical limitations discussed in Section VI.

### B. Prior Notions of Generalization

In Table II we list prior works (both benchmarks and policy learning efforts) that measure generalization along with the axes of  $\star$ -Gen they consider. For conciseness, we leave out axes that were not present in any of these works. A checkmark indicates that an axis is considered by a benchmark, although we note that different works that have a checkmark for a given axis may cover them to different levels of comprehensiveness.

We find in Table II that only a subset of our axes are measured in each prior work. We do not include compositional or long-horizon forms of generalization in this analysis, but these are also sparsely represented in prior work. We find that most dataset and benchmarking works (top rows of Table II) focus evaluation effort on **visual** related axes, while **semantic** axes are less explored by most of them. Policy learning works (bottom rows of Table II) focus less on **visual**, and do more rigorous evaluation of certain **visual + behavioral** axes. **Semantic** also tends to be under-evaluated in these works.

Thus, we find  $\star$ -Gen to be a superset of prior attempts to measure generalization. While not observable in Table II, we find that prior works are also generally not as fine-grained as our taxonomy in their categorization of generalization – for example RT-2 [3] simply groups many of our **visual + behavior** axes under the blanket category “Behavior Generalization”.

## V. FREQUENTLY ASKED QUESTIONS

Having defined the axes of generalization in  $\star$ -Gen and compared it to prior work in Section IV-B, readers might

have questions about our taxonomy and its assumptions. In this section, we provide answers to several possible questions.

*Q: Is  $\star$ -Gen meant to be comprehensive?*

A: The axes presented in  $\star$ -Gen are meant as a starting point for the field, and although we did our best to make this list comprehensive, there could certainly exist other meaningful axes. In contrast, we consider the *categories* in  $\star$ -Gen (e.g., **visual + behavioral**) to be exhaustive for the policies we consider, since they are built from the seven unique combinations of our policy modalities.

*Q: Are the axes and factors in  $\star$ -Gen subjective?*

A: Yes, the axes and factors in  $\star$ -Gen are human-specified in a subjective manner, so there are certainly other ways to group perturbations into factors, and factors into axes. However, our goal is not to design an objective way to categorize generalization, as this is an inherently subjective process. Instead, we aim to provide greater structure and comprehensiveness when categorizing generalization using human interpretable concepts, like “task-relevant objects” and “verbs”.

*Q: What is the purpose of defining a taxonomy if it is inherently subjective?*

A: As we will see in Section VI, our taxonomy give us the vernacular to discuss more fine-grained types of generalization. We intend this taxonomy to be a starting point for practitioners to gain greater insights about their models, and recognize the potential for reshaping our taxonomy as our understanding of how to effectively evaluate generalization grows.

*Q: Is each axis equally important for generalization?*

A: Whether or not an axis is “important” is very subjective, and depends on specific applications. Instead, we categorize different types of generalization more systematically to aid researchers and practitioners in evaluating their robot policies based on the needs of their downstream applications.

*Q: Can you quantify how much different perturbations affect a base task?*

A: It would be interesting to consider the “edit distance” that a perturbation induces from a base task, to quantify how much generalization is required. However, we do not consider this in  $\star$ -Gen, due to the challenging nature of defining such distances. Some options for this could include image or text embeddings for **visual** or **semantic** perturbations, dynamic time warping [39] for **behavioral**, or using multi-modal foundation models. Future work can investigate correlating such metrics with empirical generalization.

## VI. CASE STUDY: EVALUATING GENERALIZATION FOR REAL-WORLD ROBOT MANIPULATION

$\star$ -Gen provides a broad framework for generalization in robot manipulation, but how should practitioners use this framework to evaluate policies? In this section, we walk through a case study on instantiating a useful, real-world benchmark from  $\star$ -Gen. We develop this benchmark, which we call BridgeV2- $\star$ , based on the widely used Bridge V2 dataset [17]. We evaluate several state-of-the-art models, including OpenVLA [10] and a reimplementation of  $\pi_0$  [13, 22]. In Section VI-A, we outline our desiderata for this benchmark and our guiding principles for how generalization tasks were chosen from our taxonomy. Then in Section VI-B, we provide our exact instantiation of the benchmark, including the data and specific tasks used for each category and axis of generalization. Finally, in Section VI-C, we report our results on this benchmark for several models and variations. Our granular taxonomy of generalization empowers us to make several interesting insights about these different models.

### A. Benchmark Desiderata

There is a vast set of factors and axes within our taxonomy, especially if we consider combinatorial choices of multiple axes. Thus, an immediate practical concern in designing a benchmark is how to budget effort toward different evaluation settings. We strike the following balance in our benchmark:

- *Base Tasks:* We choose four base tasks that do not deviate significantly from the support of the pre-training dataset (i.e., tasks that involve scenes and objects classes found in the dataset). We choose tasks that have practical instantiations of as many axes as possible.
- *Categories:* We aim to evaluate categories that are both relevant to and allowed by the base tasks and the pre-training data distribution (i.e., Bridge V2).
- *Axes:* We prioritize axes within each category that are instantiable for the base tasks.
- *Factors:* We evaluate one or two factors per axis.

While the number of base tasks, axes, and factors can be scaled up arbitrarily, we found these specifications to strike a balance between providing utility and practical evaluation time.

### B. Instantiating $\star$ -Gen on Bridge V2

Based on the above desiderata, we now discuss our choices for base tasks, axes, and models in this case study.

**Dataset.** We chose Bridge V2 [17] as our pre-training dataset and platform, since prior work has shown meaningful generalization from training on it [7, 10, 17], and training environments from Bridge V2 have previously been reproduced for evaluation in other locations [7, 10, 40, 41].

**Choosing Base Tasks.** We consider the following base tasks in our evaluation. Illustrations of these task setups are shown in Table V and Table VI in Appendix A-I.

- 1) Put carrot on plate.
- 2) Put knife on plate.
- 3) Flip pot upright.
- 4) Put plate in sink.

We choose these base tasks based on the support of the pre-training data. In particular, our tasks are instantiated in a replication of a sink environment that was used in Bridge V2, and was also used to evaluate generalization in prior work [10]. We do this to promote generalization induced by the pre-training dataset, as otherwise it is less likely that policies would observe any significant degree of generalization.

We choose these specific tasks to cover different levels of alignment with the original tasks from Bridge V2 for this sink environment. We provide greater discussion of this in Appendix A-A. These tasks were also chosen because they allow for a wide range of perturbations from  $\star$ -Gen.

**Axes in BridgeV2- $\star$ .** In Table III we list all axes and factors we evaluate (also shown in the BridgeV2- $\star$  row of Table II).

	Axis	Abbreviation	Factors
Visual	Visual Scene	V-SC	distractors, surface color
	Visual Task Object	V-OBJ	other object color
	Viewpoint	V-VIEW	camera pose
Semantic	Object Properties	S-PROP	referencing color
	Language Rephrase	S-LANG	changing verbs
	Multi-Object Referencing	S-MO	understanding “in” and “on”
	Internet Knowledge	S-INT	common obj properties, typos
VB	Object Poses	VB-POSE	manipulated object pose
	Interacting Scene	VB-ISC	surface height
	Morphed Objects	VB-MOBJ	manipulated object size, shape
SB	Spatial Multi-Object	SB-SMO	understanding “in”
	Action Verbs	SB-VRB	new action on object
VSB	New Object	VSB-NOBJ	new manipulated object

TABLE III: The axes from  $\star$ -Gen evaluated in BridgeV2- $\star$

These axes span 5/7 of the categories and 13/22 axes in  $\star$ -Gen. A list of exact tasks is provided in Appendix A-I. **Behavioral** axes were difficult to instantiate because most perturbations

that do not alter visuals or language also do not affect behavior, especially for our base tasks. For example, changing the weight of the carrot does not meaningfully change required behavior. Similarly, instantiating our sole axis for **visual + semantic** (*New Object Property*) was infeasible, as our base tasks do not refer to object properties. We encourage future work to consider a wider variety of base tasks (and associated pre-training datasets) that support assessing more of our axes.

**Candidate Policies.** We focus our evaluation on state-of-the-art open-source imitation learning policies that have shown meaningful generalization in the literature. Hence, we analyze three vision-language-action (VLA) models based on large pre-trained foundation models and fine-tuned on robot data.

- 1) OpenVLA [10]: Open-source VLA with 7B parameters based on a Prismatic-Llama backbone [42].
- 2) MiniVLA [21]: Open-source VLA with 1B parameters and vector quantized tokenization with action chunking, based on a Prismatic-Qwen backbone [42, 43].
- 3)  $\pi_0$  [13, 22]: Third-party re-implementation of a 3B parameter VLA using flow-based action chunking, based on a PaliGemma backbone [44].

**Evaluation Procedure.** To evaluate our models, we adopt a co-fine-tuning strategy. First, we start from a version of each model that is pre-trained only on Bridge V2. Then, we collect a small number of base task demonstrations from our evaluation environment, and then co-fine-tune on Bridge V2 and this data. We do this for the following reasons:

- 1) Including in-domain data allows us to clearly define what it means to be “in-distribution”, and how different evaluation conditions deviate from this, without needing to replicate the exact environment and tasks present in the prior data, which can be challenging. Having a precise notion of “in-distribution” is important, as otherwise it is ambiguous how to designate any given evaluation condition as some form of generalization.
- 2) Collecting new data is needed to have greater flexibility when choosing base tasks, such that we can choose tasks where many axes of generalization can be applied, or tasks that are required for a given application.
- 3) It is realistic in many scenarios to require in-domain data to perform a given task effectively, so this procedure represents a realistic use case for generalist policies.

We denote co-fine-tuned models with (FT), while models without this designation are evaluated zero-shot without in-domain data. In Appendix A-G, we compare models with and without co-fine-tuning to further motivate this procedure.

We generate perturbations of our base tasks to evaluate for generalization. We measure generalization with respect to these base tasks, **not** the pre-training data. We describe our rationale for this more thoroughly in Appendix A-B. For each task (base tasks and their perturbations), we minimize randomness in the initial conditions (e.g., we attempt to limit variation in object poses across demonstrations and evaluations). When constructing perturbed tasks, we only modify the initial conditions of the base task in the manner specified by a given




Fig. 2: BridgeV2-★ main results. We report aggregated success rates for each model and axis, including in-distribution (ID).

factor, so that success rates only reflect generalization to the specified perturbation, and not other inadvertent changes [45].

### C. Main Results

In Fig. 2, we report our main results on our BridgeV2-★ benchmark, which consists of in-distribution base task performance, and 55 task variations that span 13 of our axes, for a total of **885 real-world evaluations**. We find that existing generalist policies tend to struggle on most of our considered axes. In particular, **semantic** generalization is weak across all models, despite them leveraging large language model backbones trained on internet-scale data. This has interesting implications: e.g., rather than relying solely on improvements in language modeling to improve **semantic** generalization, perhaps other mechanisms are needed, such as improving language annotations in robot datasets [46].

Each model tends to have similar strengths and weaknesses across our different axes. However, there are some notable differences between each model that the fine-grained nature of our benchmark helps reveal. For example, OpenVLA is noticeably worse at **visual** generalization than the other models, while MiniVLA struggles more with forms of **visual + behavioral** generalization. OpenVLA performs the best at understanding object properties which could be due to it having the largest language model backbone, but it still struggles with other forms of **semantic** generalization.  $\pi_0$  generally performs the best across all axes, possibly due to a more capable VLM backbone (PaliGemma), and/or better architecture design (flow-based action chunking). However, like the other models,  $\pi_0$  still generally struggles in terms of absolute performance for most axes. We provide detailed results for each evaluation condition in the Appendix A-J.



Fig. 3: We investigate different VLA design decisions to assess their impact on generalization. We report success rates across all trials for each model and axis. (a) Scaling robot dataset size and diversity can improve multiple axes of generalization. (b) Using a larger LLM backbone can improve **semantic** generalization, but only to a limited extent. (c) VQA co-training can improve some axes, but has a mixed effect on **semantic** axes. (d) Vector quantized action chunking can improve multiple axes.

#### D. Investigating VLA Design Decisions

To better understand how the design space of VLA policies affects generalization, we experiment with several VLA design decisions. We report findings from **390 additional evaluations** for two base tasks (“put carrot” and “put knife”) in Figure 3.

**Scaling Robot Data.** In Fig. 3(a) we compare our Bridge-only version of OpenVLA with a version that instead uses a mixture of data from OXE [5] for pre-training and co-fine-tuning. It is important to note that OXE is a significantly larger dataset that contains Bridge V2, along with data from over 20 other robot

embodiments. Consistent with prior work [5, 10], we find that larger and more diverse robot datasets can significantly improve overall generalization. However, we observe that while generalization improves along several axes (especially some **semantic** and **visual** axes), those that the Bridge-only model struggled with the most (e.g., *Viewpoint*, *Morphed Objects*, *Multi-Object Referencing*) do not improve significantly. This indicates that further efforts are needed to address the most significant deficiencies in current generalist policies.

**Scaling LLM Backbones.** In Fig. 3(b) we compare VLA

	OpenVLA (OXE)	OpenVLA (OXE, FT)	OpenVLA (Bridge, FT)	OpenVLA (Bridge, VQA, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, -VQ, FT)	$\pi_0$ Reimplement (Bridge, FT)
<b>Semantic</b> (S-PROP + S-LANG)	6/10	8/10	4/10	0/10	4/10	2/10	1/10
<b>Visual</b> (V-SC + V-OBJ)	3/10	6/10	5/10	6/10	8/10	5/10	7/10
<b>Visual + Behavioral</b> (VB-POSE + VB-ISC)	5/10	6/10	3/10	7/10	5/10	6/10	8/10
Overall	14/30	20/30	12/30	13/30	17/30	13/30	16/30

TABLE IV: Compositional results for two axes from each of **semantic**, **visual**, and **visual + behavioral**.

policies that share the same architecture and differ only in the large language model (LLM) backbone. Specifically, we compare OpenVLA (Bridge, FT), using Llama 2 7B [47], and MiniVLA (Bridge, -VQ, FT), using Qwen2.5 0.5B [43]. Note that this version of MiniVLA does not use vector quantized action chunking (designated as -VQ), and the only major difference between these two models is their LLM backbone. We find that the larger LLM backbone does improve **semantic** generalization, which makes intuitive sense. However, there still remain large deficiencies in terms of absolute performance for these axes, and there is much less effect on the others, suggesting that scaling LLMs only has limited benefits.

**VQA Co-training.** In Fig. 3(c), we investigate co-training with general visual-question answering (VQA) data, which has been suggested in prior work to improve VLA generalization [3]. We find that VQA co-training does generally help, but surprisingly has a mixed effect for **semantic** axes, improving 3 of them (*Language Rephrase*, *Multi-Object Referencing*, *Internet Knowledge*), but hurting another (*Object Properties*). This could indicate room for improvement when co-training VLAs, such as by using targeted VQA data for inducing various forms of policy generalization, rather than general VQA data.

**Vector Quantized Action Chunking.** In Fig. 3(d), we investigate the effect of removing vector quantized action chunking (-VQ) from MiniVLA [21], and instead using the binning-based tokenization from OpenVLA. We find that for nearly all axes (except *Interacting Scene*), this change hurts generalization. This is perhaps because action chunking helps the policy resolve action uncertainty and multi-modality by committing to certain action sequences, as hypothesized in prior work [48].

**Compositionality.** As mentioned in Section IV-A, we can compose the axes in  $\star$ -Gen to form new types of generalization. While our primary focus in this work is studying single axes at a time, we provide some example compositional results in Table IV, which consists of **210 additional evaluations**. We once again see that training on the larger OXE mixture seems to improve many **semantic** axes, specifically the composition of referring to object properties in language and rephrasing language instructions (S-PROP + S-LANG), possibly due to a larger variety of language instructions in the training data. Furthermore, some models are fairly robust to combinations of distractors and object colors (V-SC + V-OBJ), with MiniVLA and  $\pi_0$  being the most performant, similarly as in the main results. Some models are also surprisingly robust to the

composition of different object poses and scene factors (VB-POSE + VB-ISC), with  $\pi_0$  performing the best in this setting.

## VII. DISCUSSION

We present  $\star$ -Gen, a taxonomy of generalization for robot manipulation. We hope this taxonomy can help improve the comprehensiveness and preciseness of generalization benchmark design as generalist robot policies improve in capabilities. Our taxonomy not only thoroughly considers the space of visuo-lingual policy generalization, but is also straightforward to instantiate in practice. We demonstrate the considerations and design process for an instantiation of the  $\star$ -Gen benchmark on the popular Bridge V2 Dataset and evaluate state-of-the-art VLA models along 13 axes of different combinations of **visual**, **semantic**, and **behavioral** generalization. Our analysis leads to key insights about generalist policy design choices:

- 1) Larger LLMs can help generalization to a limited extent, primarily for **semantic** axes.
- 2) Larger, cross embodiment datasets can help with many generalization axes, but do not significantly improve the largest deficiencies in existing models.
- 3) Vector quantized action chunking improves generalization over binning-based tokenization without chunking.
- 4) Co-training on VQA datasets can help with overall generalization, but only to a limited extent, and with surprisingly mixed results for **semantic** axes.

**Limitations and Future Work.** Due to constraints imposed by real-world evaluation time (1600+ trials), we only evaluate a subset of factors and their compositions that we believe most effectively demonstrate the benefits of  $\star$ -Gen. We hope that future work can build more benchmarks based our taxonomy, such as by considering datasets that support more complex behavior and diverse settings like DROID [19]. Also, we still design our evaluation conditions in BridgeV2- $\star$  using human oversight, leaving room for possible bias. We believe future work can instead automate benchmark design using generative models, which we provide a preliminary demonstration of on our website, and describe in more detail in Appendix B.

While we consider  $\star$ -Gen to be a strong starting point, we believe that future work can revise and expand our taxonomy based on the needs of robotics practitioners. Also, while we show that  $\star$ -Gen can help prove insights about current generalist policies and their design decisions, we also hope that  $\star$ -Gen can help inform data collection efforts to achieve the forms of generalization considered in our taxonomy.

## REFERENCES

- [1] E. Jang, A. Irpan, M. Khansari, D. Kappler, F. Ebert, C. Lynch, S. Levine, and C. Finn, “Bc-z: Zero-shot task generalization with robotic imitation learning,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2022, pp. 991–1002.
- [2] A. Brohan, N. Brown, J. Carbajal, Y. Chebotar, J. Dabis, C. Finn, K. Gopalakrishnan, K. Hausman, A. Herzog, J. Hsu *et al.*, “Rt-1: Robotics transformer for real-world control at scale,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.06817*, 2022.
- [3] A. Brohan, N. Brown, J. Carbajal, Y. Chebotar, X. Chen, K. Choromanski, T. Ding, D. Driess, A. Dubey, C. Finn *et al.*, “Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.15818*, 2023.
- [4] H. Bharadhwaj, J. Vakil, M. Sharma, A. Gupta, S. Tuliani, and V. Kumar, “Roboagent: Generalization and efficiency in robot manipulation via semantic augmentations and action chunking,” 2023.
- [5] A. O’Neill, A. Rehman, A. Gupta, A. Maddukuri, A. Gupta, A. Padalkar, A. Lee, A. Pooley, A. Gupta, A. Mandlekar *et al.*, “Open x-embodiment: Robotic learning datasets and rt-x models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.08864*, 2023.
- [6] N. M. M. Shafiullah, A. Rai, H. Etukuru, Y. Liu, I. Misra, S. Chintala, and L. Pinto, “On bringing robots home,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.16098*, 2023.
- [7] O. M. Team, D. Ghosh, H. Walke, K. Pertsch, K. Black, O. Mees, S. Dasari, J. Hejna, T. Kreiman, C. Xu *et al.*, “Octo: An open-source generalist robot policy,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.12213*, 2024.
- [8] R. Doshi, H. Walke, O. Mees, S. Dasari, and S. Levine, “Scaling cross-embodied learning: One policy for manipulation, navigation, locomotion and aviation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.11812*, 2024.
- [9] D. Niu, Y. Sharma, G. Biamby, J. Quenum, Y. Bai, B. Shi, T. Darrell, and R. Herzig, “Llarva: Vision-action instruction tuning enhances robot learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.11815*, 2024.
- [10] M. Kim, K. Pertsch, S. Karamcheti, T. Xiao, A. Balakrishna, S. Nair, R. Rafailov, E. Foster, G. Lam, P. Sanketi, Q. Vuong, T. Kollar, B. Burchfiel, R. Tedrake, D. Sadigh, S. Levine, P. Liang, and C. Finn, “Openvla: An open-source vision-language-action model,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09246*, 2024.
- [11] L. Wang, X. Chen, J. Zhao, and K. He, “Scaling proprioceptive-visual learning with heterogeneous pre-trained transformers,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.20537*, 2024.
- [12] S. Liu, L. Wu, B. Li, H. Tan, H. Chen, Z. Wang, K. Xu, H. Su, and J. Zhu, “Rdt-1b: a diffusion foundation model for bimanual manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.07864*, 2024.
- [13] K. Black, N. Brown, D. Driess, A. Esmail, M. Equi, C. Finn, N. Fusai, L. Groom, K. Hausman, B. Ichter *et al.*, “ $\pi_0$ : A vision-language-action flow model for general robot control,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.24164*, 2024.
- [14] A. Mandlekar, Y. Zhu, A. Garg, J. Booher, M. Spero, A. Tung, J. Gao, J. Emmons, A. Gupta, E. Orbay *et al.*, “Roboturk: A crowdsourcing platform for robotic skill learning through imitation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2018, pp. 879–893.
- [15] S. Dasari, F. Ebert, S. Tian, S. Nair, B. Bucher, K. Schmeckpeper, S. Singh, S. Levine, and C. Finn, “Robonet: Large-scale multi-robot learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:1910.11215*, 2019.
- [16] F. Ebert, Y. Yang, K. Schmeckpeper, B. Bucher, G. Georgakis, K. Daniilidis, C. Finn, and S. Levine, “Bridge data: Boosting generalization of robotic skills with cross-domain datasets,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2109.13396*, 2021.
- [17] H. R. Walke, K. Black, T. Z. Zhao, Q. Vuong, C. Zheng, P. Hansen-Estruch, A. W. He, V. Myers, M. J. Kim, M. Du *et al.*, “Bridgedata v2: A dataset for robot learning at scale,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 1723–1736.
- [18] H.-S. Fang, H. Fang, Z. Tang, J. Liu, J. Wang, H. Zhu, and C. Lu, “Rh20t: A robotic dataset for learning diverse skills in one-shot,” in *RSS 2023 Workshop on Learning for Task and Motion Planning*, 2023.
- [19] A. Khazatsky, K. Pertsch, S. Nair, A. Balakrishna, S. Dasari, S. Karamcheti, S. Nasiriany, M. K. Srirama, L. Y. Chen, K. Ellis *et al.*, “Droid: A large-scale in-the-wild robot manipulation dataset,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2403.12945*, 2024.
- [20] S. Mirchandani, D. D. Yuan, K. Burns, M. S. Islam, T. Z. Zhao, C. Finn, and D. Sadigh, “Robocrowd: Scaling robot data collection through crowdsourcing,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.01915*, 2024.
- [21] S. Belkhale and D. Sadigh, “Minivla: A better vla with a smaller footprint,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/Stanford-ILIAD/openvla-mini>
- [22] A. Ren, “Open pi-zero,” 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://github.com/allenzren/open-pi-zero>
- [23] J. Gao, A. Xie, T. Xiao, C. Finn, and D. Sadigh, “Efficient data collection for robotic manipulation via compositional generalization,” in *Proceedings of Robotics: Science and Systems (RSS)*, 2024.
- [24] F. Lin, Y. Hu, P. Sheng, C. Wen, J. You, and Y. Gao, “Data scaling laws in imitation learning for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.18647*, 2024.
- [25] S. James, Z. Ma, D. R. Arrojo, and A. J. Davison, “Rlbench: The robot learning benchmark & learning environment,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 3019–3026, 2020.
- [26] T. Mu, Z. Ling, F. Xiang, D. Yang, X. Li, S. Tao, Z. Huang, Z. Jia, and H. Su, “Maniskill: Generalizable manipulation skill benchmark with large-scale demonstrations,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14483*, 2021.
- [27] C. Li, F. Xia, R. Martín-Martín, M. Lingelbach, S. Srivas-

- tava, B. Shen, K. Vainio, C. Gokmen, G. Dharan, T. Jain *et al.*, “igibson 2.0: Object-centric simulation for robot learning of everyday household tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03272*, 2021.
- [28] A. Szot, A. Clegg, E. Undersander, E. Wijmans, Y. Zhao, J. Turner, N. Maestre, M. Mukadam, D. S. Chaplot, O. Maksymets *et al.*, “Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat,” *Advances in neural information processing systems*, vol. 34, pp. 251–266, 2021.
- [29] K. Ehsani, W. Han, A. Herrasti, E. VanderBilt, L. Weihs, E. Kolve, A. Kembhavi, and R. Mottaghi, “Manipulathor: A framework for visual object manipulation,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, 2021, pp. 4497–4506.
- [30] C. Li, R. Zhang, J. Wong, C. Gokmen, S. Srivastava, R. Martín-Martín, C. Wang, G. Levine, M. Lingelbach, J. Sun *et al.*, “Behavior-1k: A benchmark for embodied ai with 1,000 everyday activities and realistic simulation,” in *Conference on Robot Learning*. PMLR, 2023, pp. 80–93.
- [31] S. Nasiriany, A. Maddukuri, L. Zhang, A. Parikh, A. Lo, A. Joshi, A. Mandlikar, and Y. Zhu, “Robocasa: Large-scale simulation of everyday tasks for generalist robots,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.02523*, 2024.
- [32] E. Xing, A. Gupta, S. Powers, and V. Dean, “Kitchen-shift: Evaluating zero-shot generalization of imitation-based policy learning under domain shifts,” in *NeurIPS 2021 Workshop on Distribution Shifts: Connecting Methods and Applications*, 2021.
- [33] O. Mees, L. Hermann, E. Rosete-Beas, and W. Burgard, “Calvin: A benchmark for language-conditioned policy learning for long-horizon robot manipulation tasks,” *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, vol. 7, no. 3, pp. 7327–7334, 2022.
- [34] A. Xie, L. Lee, T. Xiao, and C. Finn, “Decomposing the generalization gap in imitation learning for visual robotic manipulation,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 3153–3160.
- [35] W. Pumacay, I. Singh, J. Duan, R. Krishna, J. Thomason, and D. Fox, “The colosseum: A benchmark for evaluating generalization for robotic manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.08191*, 2024.
- [36] X. Li, K. Hsu, J. Gu, K. Pertsch, O. Mees, H. R. Walke, C. Fu, I. Lunawat, I. Sieh, S. Kirmani *et al.*, “Evaluating real-world robot manipulation policies in simulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.05941*, 2024.
- [37] M. A. Lee, Y. Zhu, K. P. Srinivasan, P. Shah, S. Savarese, L. Fei-Fei, A. Garg, and J. Bohg, “Making sense of vision and touch: Self-supervised learning of multimodal representations for contact-rich tasks,” *International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, 2018.
- [38] S. Zhang, Z. Xu, P. Liu, X. Yu, Y. Li, Q. Gao, Z. Fei, Z. Yin, Z. Wu, Y.-G. Jiang *et al.*, “Vlabench: A large-scale benchmark for language-conditioned robotics manipulation with long-horizon reasoning tasks,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.18194*, 2024.
- [39] M. Müller, “Dynamic time warping,” *Information retrieval for music and motion*, pp. 69–84, 2007.
- [40] J. Yang, M. S. Mark, B. Vu, A. Sharma, J. Bohg, and C. Finn, “Robot fine-tuning made easy: Pre-training rewards and policies for autonomous real-world reinforcement learning,” in *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*. IEEE, 2024, pp. 4804–4811.
- [41] J. Hejna, C. Bhateja, Y. Jian, K. Pertsch, and D. Sadigh, “Re-mix: Optimizing data mixtures for large scale imitation learning,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.14037*, 2024.
- [42] S. Karamcheti, S. Nair, A. Balakrishna, P. Liang, T. Kollar, and D. Sadigh, “Prismatic vlms: Investigating the design space of visually-conditioned language models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.07865*, 2024.
- [43] A. Yang, B. Yang, B. Zhang, B. Hui, B. Zheng, B. Yu, C. Li, D. Liu, F. Huang, H. Wei *et al.*, “Qwen2. 5 technical report,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.15115*, 2024.
- [44] L. Beyer, A. Steiner, A. S. Pinto, A. Kolesnikov, X. Wang, D. Salz, M. Neumann, I. Alabdulmohsin, M. Tschannen, E. Bugliarello *et al.*, “Paligemma: A versatile 3b vlm for transfer,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07726*, 2024.
- [45] H. Kress-Gazit, K. Hashimoto, N. Kuppaswamy, P. Shah, P. Horgan, G. Richardson, S. Feng, and B. Burchfiel, “Robot learning as an empirical science: Best practices for policy evaluation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.09491*, 2024.
- [46] L. Smith, A. Irpan, M. G. Arenas, S. Kirmani, D. Kalashnikov, D. Shah, and T. Xiao, “Steer: Flexible robotic manipulation via dense language grounding,” 2024.
- [47] H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, P. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale *et al.*, “Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.09288*, 2023.
- [48] T. Z. Zhao, V. Kumar, S. Levine, and C. Finn, “Learning fine-grained bimanual manipulation with low-cost hardware,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.13705*, 2023.
- [49] H. Liu, C. Li, Y. Li, and Y. J. Lee, “Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning,” in *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024, pp. 26 296–26 306.
- [50] N. Ravi, V. Gabeur, Y.-T. Hu, R. Hu, C. Ryali, T. Ma, H. Khedr, R. Rädle, C. Rolland, L. Gustafson, E. Mintun, J. Pan, K. V. Alwala, N. Carion, C.-Y. Wu, R. Girshick, P. Dollár, and C. Feichtenhofer, “Sam 2: Segment anything in images and videos,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.00714*, 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.00714>

### A. Base Tasks

We consider the following four base tasks in our evaluation for BridgeV2-★:

- 1) Put carrot on plate.
- 2) Put knife on plate.
- 3) Flip pot upright.
- 4) Put plate in sink.

Each task is instantiated in a replication of a sink environment that was used in Bridge V2, and was also used to evaluate generalization in prior work [10]. We tuned the environment conditions such that the publicly released OpenVLA 7B model trained on OXE was able to achieve reasonable zero-shot performance on the “put carrot” and “put knife” tasks, in order to increase the likelihood of transfer from the pre-training data for generalization. However, there are inevitably some minor differences from this environment and what was used to collect data in Bridge V2, such as in camera pose or lighting. While we could have chosen base tasks in an environment that deviates more from the pre-training data, this would have likely led to much weaker forms of generalization in our evaluation, which would make our results less informative. We leave investigation of this to future work.

The base tasks “put carrot” and “put knife” are both instantiated from the same initial configuration. “flip pot” and “put plate” are also both instantiated from the same initial configuration. We do this to increase the difficulty and realism for **semantic** generalization, because having multiple tasks from the same initial configuration makes it so that policies must understand the language instruction to know which of the tasks to perform. Therefore, the policy cannot simply ignore the language instruction and memorize which task based on the visual appearance of the scene.

Each base task varies in the degree from which they deviate from the support of the demonstrations found in Bridge V2 for this sink environment, which we describe in more detail:

- 1) **Put carrot on plate:** This language instruction is found in Bridge V2 demonstrations for our sink environment. The carrot is different from the one used in these demonstrations, but is of similar appearance and geometry. The plate is also different, with a different color, but similar geometry. The initial pose of the carrot and plate are significantly different than in any of these demonstrations, but similar poses for other task-relevant objects are found in other demonstrations for this environment for similar tasks (e.g., “put knife on cutting board”). We find that the official OpenVLA 7B model is able to somewhat reliably perform this task zero-shot.
- 2) **Put knife on plate:** This language instruction is not found in Bridge V2 demonstrations for our sink environment, but demonstrations with similar instructions are (e.g., “put carrot on plate”, “put knife on cutting board”). The knife is different from the one used in these demonstrations, but is of similar appearance and

geometry. The plate is also different, with a different color, but similar geometry. Similar initial poses for task-relevant objects are found in demonstrations for the task “put knife on cutting board” in this sink environment. We find that the official OpenVLA 7B model is able to somewhat reliably perform this task zero-shot.

- 3) **Flip pot upright:** This language instruction is found in Bridge V2 demonstrations for our sink environment. The pot used is significantly different from the one used in these demonstrations (e.g., it is plastic instead of metal, and has different geometry). The initial pose of the pot is also somewhat different than in these demonstrations. We find that the official OpenVLA 7B model is able to rarely perform perform this task zero-shot.
- 4) **Put plate in sink:** This language instruction is not found in Bridge V2 demonstrations for our sink environment. However, there is a somewhat similar language instruction in Bridge V2 for a slightly different sink environment (“put cup from anywhere into sink”). The initial pose, appearance, and geometry of the plate is significantly different than in any task demonstrations for our sink environment. We find that the official OpenVLA 7B model is unable to perform this task zero-shot, and exhibits largely meaningless behavior.

### B. Defining Generalization

In our work, we measure generalization with respect to the in-domain base tasks we consider, **not** with respect to the pre-training data a policy was exposed to. This differs from much prior work that evaluate generalist robot policies, that often construct environments and tasks that are deemed as representing generalization conditions with respect to the pre-training data. While some of these conditions certainly do capture this, we argue that this is a less precise way of assessing generalization, compared to using base tasks. This is because it is often unclear which components of a given evaluation task are considered “seen” and “unseen” with respect to pre-training data, especially as these datasets grow larger and become more difficult to analyze.

For example, a given evaluation task might be considered generalization because it is similar to a task found in the pre-training dataset for a sink environment, but is in a different, unseen sink. However, it can be difficult to precisely quantify in what ways this new sink is different from the one in the pre-training data, because there are many ways it can differ (e.g., the visual appearance of the scene, the geometry of the sink, the camera view). Furthermore, it is possible that some elements of the new task are found in other tasks or scenes (e.g., an object involved in the new task could be unseen in the training sink environment, but not in other environments), and this should also be accounted for in order to make precise claims about generalization (e.g., whether the generalization is compositional, or completely out-of-distribution).

More generally speaking, to be rigorous when making claims about generalization with respect to pre-training data, one should account for *all* tasks in the pre-training data,

and consider how a given evaluation task differs from all these tasks for all relevant factors. However, this is largely impractical, due to the size and diversity of current datasets, the difficulty of systematically comparing factors across tasks at scale, and a general lack of detailed annotations in these datasets to support this kind of analysis.

Instead, we argue that is simpler, and possibly more useful, to measure generalization with respect to base tasks. In this way, we only have to consider generalization from a small set of conditions that are controllable, such that we can make precise perturbations from them, and therefore make more precise claims about generalization.

While we no longer make claims about generalization from pre-training data, we argue this is not what is most critical for measuring progress towards deployability. Instead, what matters most is performance when faced with conditions that are reflective of real-world deployment. Therefore, when evaluating for generalization, if perturbations to a base task are chosen in way that reflects these conditions (as informed by our taxonomy), then the evaluation should capture progress towards deployability. However, to avoid possible bias, these perturbations should be chosen without considering the specific conditions found in the pre-training data.

### C. Evaluation Procedure Details

We perform our evaluations by executing each policy until either the policy succeeds as deemed by a human evaluator, it reaches a dangerous or irrecoverable state, or terminates after 100 timesteps. For tasks that involve placing an object on another object or surface, we consider success to be if the object is on top of the other object/surface in a stable configuration, and the object is not grasped by the robot. For tasks that involve placing an object on a plate, the plate must also not be knocked over from its initial position. For tasks that involve flipping a container upright, the base of the container must make contact with the base of the sink, the container must be in a stable configuration, and the container must not be grasped by the robot.

We aim to minimize differences between our evaluation conditions and in-domain training data, beyond the differences introduced by a specified perturbation. To do this, we periodically check the image difference between live observations and the base task demonstration data, and adjust the environment to minimize this when the difference is significant.

### D. Co-fine-tuning vs. Fine-tuning

For our evaluations, we incorporate in-domain data into each model by co-fine-tuning with the model’s pre-training data. We do this to help preserve each model’s original capabilities, to promote generalization and fair comparison of each model. However, this procedure may become impractical as robot pre-training datasets become larger in size, or if they are not openly available. One could also consider evaluating these models by only fine-tuning on in-domain data, without any pre-training data. However, this should be done carefully to avoid catastrophic forgetting. We leave exploration of best

practices for fine-tuning generalist policies, and comparing the generalization of such fine-tuned policies, to future work.

### E. In-Domain Data

We collect demonstrations for our in-domain data using a Meta Quest VR headset. For consistency, we collect all our data using a single experienced human teleoperator. For the “put carrot” and “put knife” base tasks, we collect 10 demonstrations per base task. For the “put pot” and “put plate” base tasks, we collect 50 demonstrations per base task, because we found that more demonstrations were needed for satisfactory in-distribution performance of models.

### F. Model Details

**General Training Details.** Unless otherwise stated, for all co-fine-tuned models (designated with FT), we co-fine-tune for 5K gradient steps (which we found was sufficient for convergence of most models) with a batch size of 256 and a learning rate of  $1e - 6$ . We adopt a smaller learning rate than what was used during pre-training because we found higher learning rates tend to degrade training metrics on the pre-training dataset. We use the Adam optimizer for all training. When co-fine-tuning, we normalize the in-domain dataset using the dataset statistics from Bridge V2.

For each model type, we co-fine-tune two separate models: one for the “put carrot” and “put knife” base tasks, and another for the “flip pot” and “put plate” base tasks. We do this because we had already trained and partially evaluated models co-fine-tuned only on “put carrot” and “put knife” before expanding our base task selection to include the others. However, it would also be fine to co-fine-tune models on all base tasks together. When co-fine-tuning models for the “put carrot” and “put knife” base tasks, we upsample the in-domain data by 100x relative to the pre-training data. For the “flip pot” and “put plate” base tasks, we upsample the in-domain data by 50x.

We describe the specific training details of each model we consider in our experiments below:

**OpenVLA (OXE).** We use the publicly released OpenVLA 7B model trained on a mixture of data from OXE [10].

**OpenVLA (OXE, FT).** We co-fine-tune OpenVLA (OXE) on a combination of the same OXE mixture used to originally train the model (except DROID [19]), as well as the in-domain data for a given set of base tasks.

**OpenVLA (Bridge, FT).** We first pre-train a version of OpenVLA 7B on Bridge V2 for 200K gradient steps with a batch size of 256. We then co-fine-tune this model with Bridge V2.

**OpenVLA (Bridge, Rand Init, FT).** We first pre-train a version of OpenVLA 7B on Bridge V2, except we initialize the model from random weights, rather than a pre-trained vision-language model. We pre-train for 200K gradient steps with a batch size of 256. We then co-fine-tune this model with Bridge V2.

**OpenVLA (Bridge, VQA, FT).** We first pre-train a version of OpenVLA 7B on Bridge V2 and the VQA dataset used for training LLaVA-1.5 ([49]). This is a subset of the dataset used for training the base Prism-7B used for initializing OpenVLA [42]. We set of 20% of our pre-training mixture to consist of VQA data. We pre-train for 200K gradient steps with a batch size of 256. We then co-fine-tune this model with Bridge V2, again using 20% VQA data.

**MiniVLA (Bridge, FT).** We start from the publicly released MiniVLA model trained on Bridge V2 [21], and then co-fine-tune this model with Bridge V2. We increase the amount of gradient steps during co-fine-tuning from 5K to 10K, which was necessary for convergence. During inference, we only execute the first action from each predicted action chunk.

**MiniVLA (Bridge, No VQ, FT).** We first pre-train a version of MiniVLA that uses the binning-based tokenizer from OpenVLA rather than the vector quantized action chunking tokenizer used in MiniVLA. We pre-train on Bridge V2 for 300K gradient steps with a batch size of 256 and learning rate of  $2e - 5$ , and then co-fine-tune this model with Bridge V2.

**$\pi_0$  (Bridge, FT).** We use the  $\pi_0$  re-implementation from <https://github.com/allenzren/open-pi-zero> [22]. We start from the publicly released checkpoint pre-trained on Bridge V2 using beta timestep sampling, and then co-fine-tune this model with Bridge V2. We co-fine-tune for 80K training steps and a learning rate of  $1e - 5$ , with a linear warmup of 200 steps. We found it was necessary to increase in-domain upsampling rate to 1000x relative to Bridge V2 for “put carrot” and “put knife”, and 500x for “flip pot” and “put plate”, in order to fit the in-domain data in a reasonable amount of training time. During inference, we only execute the first action from each predicted action chunk.

Unlike all other models, this model was pre-trained using image augmentation (random crop, lighting, and color). During co-fine-tuning, we remove image augmentation to increase training speed. Furthermore, this model only uses trajectories from Bridge V2 that have language annotations.

### G. Impact of In-Domain Data

To motivate our choice to assess generalization by comparing models co-fine-tuned on in-domain base task data, in Fig. 4 we compare the publicly released OpenVLA 7B model zero-shot, and the same model co-fine-tuned with in-domain data, for the “put carrot” and “put knife” tasks. We find that co-fine-tuning significantly improves both in-distribution base task performance and multiple axes of generalization. This highlights the importance of co-fine-tuning on base task data in order to properly define base tasks as in-distribution. Otherwise, it is likely there will be some significant distribution shift between the pre-training data and the chosen base tasks for evaluation. As a result, performance in general will suffer, making evaluation of generalization more challenging.

### H. Random Initialization

In addition to our reported results, we additionally attempted to evaluate OpenVLA (Bridge, Rand Init, FT), a model with




Fig. 4: We find that co-fine-tuning on in-domain data for our base tasks significantly improves both in-distribution performance of OpenVLA on our base tasks, as well as generalization for many of our axes.

the same architecture as OpenVLA, but trained from randomly initialized weights, rather than pre-trained VLM weights. Although training metrics on Bridge V2 and our in-domain data did converge, we found that the model failed completely to succeed at our in-distribution base tasks. Therefore, we did not consider this model in our evaluations.

### I. Evaluation Conditions

We detail every generalization condition we consider in our evaluation, including scene images, names for each evaluation condition, axes, language instructions, and additional notes. We provide this information for the main evaluations based on the “put carrot” and “put knife” tasks in Table V, for the “flip pot” and “put plate” tasks in Table VI, and for the compositional evaluations in Table VII.

**Implementation Details.** For the generalization conditions that involve recoloring the sink (Carrot Red Sink, Knife Red Sink, Pot Green Sink, Plate Green Sink), we do not physically change the sink color. Instead, we preprocess each image frame given to the policy using SAM 2.1 Large [50] to segment the sink, and then recoloring these pixels to the desired color.

For the generalization conditions that make the sink table shorter relative to the robot (Carrot Shorter Table, Knife Shorter Table, Pot Shorter Table, Plate Shorter Table), rather than lowering the sink table, we raise the table that the robot is mounted on, which achieves the same effect.

Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Carrot Base	In-distribution	put carrot on plate	N/A
	Knife Base	In-distribution	put knife on plate	N/A
	Carrot Color	S-PROP	put the orange object on the plate	refers to carrot by color
	Knife Color	S-PROP	put the gray and green object on the plate	refers to knife by color
	Carrot Lift/Place	S-LANG	lift carrot and place on plate	replaced verb “put” using “lift” and “place”
	Knife Lift/Place	S-LANG	lift knife and place on plate	replaced verb “put” using “lift” and “place”
	Carrot Counter	S-MO	put the object that is on the counter on the plate	refers to carrot by location (on counter)
	Knife Sink	S-MO	put the object that is in the sink on the plate	refers to knife by location (in sink)
	Carrot Basketball	S-INT	put the object that is the same color as a basketball on the plate	refers to carrot by color of a basketball (orange)
	Knife Typo	S-INT	put knif on plate	“knife” misspelled as “knif”
	Carrot in Sink	SB-SMO	put carrot in sink	goal for carrot is sink instead of plate
	Rotate Knife	SB-VRB	rotate knife clockwise	rotate knife instead of put on plate
	Carrot Distractors	V-SC	put carrot on plate	distractor objects (corn, salt shaker)
	Knife Distractors	V-SC	put knife on plate	distractor objects (corn, salt shaker)
	Carrot Red Sink	V-SC	put carrot on plate	red sink
	Knife Red Sink	V-SC	put knife on plate	red sink
	Carrot Orange Plate	V-OBJ	put carrot on plate	orange plate
	Knife Orange Plate	V-OBJ	put knife on plate	orange plate
	Carrot Camera	V-VIEW	put carrot on plate	new camera view
	Knife Camera	V-VIEW	put knife on plate	new camera view

TABLE V: Generalization conditions for “put carrot” and “put knife”.


Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Carrot Farther	VB-POSE	put carrot on plate	carrot slightly farther from robot
	Carrot Start Sink	VB-POSE	put carrot on plate	carrot start in sink, oriented vertically
	Knife Raised	VB-POSE	put knife on plate	knife raised by placing it on a block
	Knife Right	VB-POSE	put knife on plate	knife moved to the right
	Carrot Shorter Table	VB-ISC	put carrot on plate	shorter sink table
	Knife Shorter Table	VB-ISC	put knife on plate	shorter sink table
	Baby Carrot	VB-MOBJ	put carrot on plate	real baby carrot
	Small Knife	VB-MOBJ	put knife on plate	smaller knife

TABLE V: Generalization conditions for “put carrot” and “put knife”.

Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Ball	VS-B-NOBJ	put ball on plate	carrot replaced with ball
	Pizza	VS-B-NOBJ	put pizza on plate	knife replaced with pizza

TABLE V: Generalization conditions for “put carrot” and “put knife”.

Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Pot Base	In-distribution	flip pot upright which is in sink	N/A
	Plate Base	In-distribution	put plate in sink	N/A
	Pot Color	S-PROP	flip the gray object upright which is in sink	refers to pot by color
	Plate Color	S-PROP	put the pink object in the sink	refers to plate by color
	Pot Lift/Place	S-LANG	lift pot upright and place in sink	replaced verb “flip” using “lift” and “place”
	Plate Lift/Place	S-LANG	lift plate and place in sink	replaced verb “put” using “lift” and “place”
	Pot Sink	S-MO	flip the object that is in the sink upright	refers to pot by location (in sink)
	Plate Drying Rack	S-MO	put the object that is in the drying rack in the sink	refers to plate by location (in drying rack)
	Pot Boiling	S-INT	flip the object that can be used for boiling water upright	refers to pot by ability to boil water
	Plate Typo	S-INT	put plait on plate	“plate” misspelled as “plait”
	Plate to Counter	SB-SMO	put plate on counter	goal for plate is counter instead of sink
	Pot to Left	SB-VRB	move pot to the left side of the sink	move pot left instead of flip upright
	Pot Distractors	V-SC	flip pot upright which is in sink	distractor objects (eggplant, fork, cheese)
	Plate Distractors	V-SC	put plate in sink	distractor objects (eggplant, fork, cheese)
	Pot Green Sink	V-SC	flip pot upright which is in sink	green sink
	Knife Green Sink	V-SC	put plate in sink	green sink
	Gray Plate	V-OBJ	put plate in sink	gray plate
	Pot Camera	V-VIEW	flip pot upright which is in sink	new camera view
	Plate Camera	V-VIEW	put plate in sink	new camera view

TABLE VI: Generalization conditions for “flip pot” and “put plate”.

Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Pot Left	VB-POSE	flip pot upright which is in sink	pot moved to left
	Pot Angled	VB-POSE	flip pot upright which is in sink	pot rotated and angled to the right
	Plate Closer	VB-POSE	put plate in sink	plate slightly closer to robot
	Plate Counter	VB-POSE	put plate in sink	plate flat on counter
	Pot Shorter Table	VB-ISC	flip pot upright which is in sink	shorter sink table
	Plate Shorter Table	VB-ISC	put plate in sink	shorter sink table
	Thin Pot	VB-MOBY	flip pot upright which is in sink	thinner and taller metal pot
	Red Bowl	VB-MOBY	put plate in sink	plate replaced with red bowl

TABLE VI: Generalization conditions for “flip pot” and “put plate”.

Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Cup	VSB-NOBJ	flip cup upright which is in sink	pot replaced with cup
	Spoon	VSB-NOBJ	flip pot upright which is in sink	plate replaced with spoon

TABLE VI: Generalization conditions for “flip pot” and “put plate”.

Scene Image	Condition Name	Axis	Language Instruction	Notes
	Carrot Color + Lift/Place	S-PROP + S-LANG	lift the orange object and place on plate	refers to carrot by color and replaced verb “put” using “lift” and “place”
	Knife Color + Lift/Place	S-PROP + S-LANG	lift the gray and green object and place on plate	refers to knife by color and replaced verb “put” using “lift” and “place”
	Carrot Distractors + Orange Plate	V-SC + V-OBJ	put carrot on plate	distractor objects (corn, salt shaker) and orange plate
	Knife Distractors + Orange Plate	V-SC + V-OBJ	put knife on plate	distractor objects (corn, salt shaker) and orange plate
	Carrot Farther + Shorter Table	VB-POSE + VB-ISC	put carrot on plate	carrot slightly farther from robot and shorter sink table
	Knife Right + Shorter Table	VB-POSE + VB-ISC	put knife on plate	knife moved to right and shorter sink table

TABLE VII: Generalization conditions for compositional experiments.

Condition Name	OpenVLA (OXE)	OpenVLA (OXE, FT)	OpenVLA (Bridge, FT)	OpenVLA (Bridge, VQA, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, FT, -VQ)	$\pi_0$ Reimplment (Bridge, FT)
Carrot Base	3/5	5/5	3/5	4/5	5/5	4/5	4/5
Knife Base	2/5	3/5	5/5	5/5	5/5	4/5	5/5
Carrot Color	2/5	4/5	4/5	2/5	2/5	2/5	2/5
Knife Color	2/5	3/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5
Carrot Lift/Place	3/5	5/5	2/5	4/5	5/5	3/5	5/5
Knife Lift/Place	2/5	4/5	4/5	3/5	4/5	1/5	5/5
Carrot Counter	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5
Knife Sink	1/5	2/5	1/5	3/5	0/5	0/5	3/5
Carrot Basketball	0/5	0/5	0/5	1/5	0/5	0/5	0/5
Knife Typo	1/5	4/5	4/5	4/5	1/5	1/5	4/5
Carrot in Sink	–	–	5/5	–	5/5	–	3/5
Rotate Knife	–	–	1/5	–	0/5	–	0/5
Carrot Distractors	3/5	5/5	3/5	3/5	3/5	2/5	4/5
Knife Distractors	1/5	3/5	2/5	3/5	5/5	3/5	4/5
Carrot Red Sink	3/5	3/5	1/5	3/5	3/5	1/5	5/5
Knife Red Sink	1/5	3/5	2/5	2/5	3/5	4/5	2/5
Carrot Orange Plate	2/5	3/5	2/5	3/5	4/5	0/5	3/5
Knife Orange Plate	4/5	4/5	2/5	4/5	5/5	5/5	5/5
Carrot Camera	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	1/5	0/5	0/5
Knife Camera	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	1/5	0/5	5/5
Carrot Farther	2/5	3/5	2/5	4/5	3/5	3/5	2/5
Carrot Start Sink	3/5	3/5	3/5	2/5	5/5	3/5	5/5
Knife Raised	0/5	2/5	3/5	4/5	4/5	3/5	1/5
Knife Right	2/5	3/5	3/5	5/5	4/5	2/5	5/5
Carrot Shorter Table	2/5	5/5	2/5	4/5	3/5	4/5	5/5
Knife Shorter Table	0/5	3/5	3/5	3/5	2/5	2/5	5/5
Baby Carrot	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	1/5	0/5	1/5
Small Knife	0/5	0/5	1/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5
Ball	–	–	0/5	–	3/5	–	1/5
Pizza	–	–	1/5	–	0/5	–	0/5

TABLE VIII: Detailed generalization results for “put carrot” and “put knife”.

### J. Evaluation Results

We provide individual success rates for all generalization conditions listed in Appendix A-I. We provide this for the main evaluations based on the “put carrot” and “put knife” tasks in Table VIII, for the “flip pot” and “put plate” tasks in Table IX, and for the compositional evaluations in Table X.

Condition Name	OpenVLA (Bridge, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, FT)	$\pi_0$ Reimplment (Bridge, FT)
Pot Base	3/5	5/5	5/5
Plate Base	3/5	4/5	4/5
Pot Color	4/5	1/5	1/5
Plate Color	0/5	0/5	0/5
Pot Lift/Place	0/5	2/5	1/5
Plate Lift/Place	0/5	0/5	0/5
Pot Sink	1/5	1/5	5/5
Plate Drying Rack	0/5	0/5	0/5
Pot Boiling	0/5	0/5	0/5
Plate Typo	0/5	0/5	0/5
Plate to Counter	0/5	0/5	0/5
Pot to Left	0/5	2/5	0/5
Pot Distractors	3/5	4/5	5/5
Plate Distractors	3/5	1/5	0/5
Pot Green Sink	3/5	3/5	4/5
Plate Green Sink	2/5	1/5	3/5
Gray Plate	4/5	3/5	3/5
Pot Camera	0/5	1/5	0/5
Plate Camera	0/5	0/5	0/5
Pot Left	3/5	0/5	0/5
Pot Angled	3/5	3/5	5/5
Plate Closer	0/5	3/5	4/5
Plate Counter	2/5	0/5	0/5
Pot Shorter Table	5/5	2/5	5/5
Plate Shorter Table	3/5	0/5	2/5
Thin Pot	3/5	0/5	1/5
Red Bowl	0/5	2/5	5/5
Cup	3/5	0/5	3/5
Spoon	0/5	0/5	0/5

TABLE IX: Detailed generalization results for “flip pot” and “put plate”.

Condition Name	OpenVLA (OXE)	OpenVLA (OXE, FT)	OpenVLA (Bridge, FT)	OpenVLA (Bridge, VQA, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, FT)	MiniVLA (Bridge, FT, No VQ)	$\pi_0$ Reimplment (Bridge, FT)
Carrot Color + Lift/Place	3/5	4/5	4/5	0/5	4/5	2/5	1/5
Knife Color + Lift/Place	3/5	4/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5	0/5
Carrot Distractors + Orange Plate	1/5	4/5	2/5	3/5	3/5	0/5	3/5
Knife Distractors + Orange Plate	2/5	2/5	3/5	3/5	5/5	5/5	4/5
Carrot Farther + Shorter Table	3/5	3/5	3/5	3/5	2/5	3/5	3/5
Knife Right + Shorter Table	2/5	3/5	0/5	4/5	3/5	3/5	5/5

TABLE X: Detailed results for our compositional evaluation.




Fig. 5: Example of using our demonstration to generate *New Object* perturbations for the base task “pick up the AAA battery”.

## APPENDIX B AUTOMATIC BENCHMARK DESIGN

We intend for  $\star$ -Gen to provide guidance for more extensive and fine-grained evaluations of generalist robot policies. However, we acknowledge that the evaluation conditions considered in BridgeV2- $\star$ , while based on  $\star$ -Gen, were still chosen using human oversight. We believe that it would be beneficial to limit human involvement when constructing future evaluations, because it can require a significant amount of human effort to design a thorough set of evaluation conditions, and human involvement can result in bias, even if unintentional.

Therefore, we make a preliminary step towards reducing human involvement in robot benchmark design by using foundation models to automatically propose evaluation conditions. In particular, we condition a vision-language model (VLM) on a base task, and ask it to propose perturbations of the base task to evaluate a given axis of generalization from  $\star$ -Gen.

To do this, we prompt the VLM with an initial scene image for the base task, as well as a text prompt that consists of the base task language instruction, and directions for how to modify the task according to a given axis from  $\star$ -Gen. We use a different text prompt for each axis. If the axis is **visual**, we ask the VLM to specify the perturbation as an instruction for an image-editing model that would perform the perturbation. If the axis is **semantic**, we ask for the VLM to generate new language instructions for the perturbed tasks. Note that the VLM can generate both image edits and new language instructions if the given axis is both **visual** and **semantic**.

We provide an interactive demonstration of this system

This is an image of a scene where a robot is to complete the task “put carrot on plate”. Suggest 3 changes to the task that each involve changing a single task-relevant object to a new object with a different visual appearance, semantic description, and physical characteristics. Do this by providing 3 updated language instructions for each of the modified tasks, and corresponding text prompts to an image-editing model that would each perform a single change to the scene to create the modified task. Remember to only change one object, and to only change an object that is involved in the task.

Fig. 6: Example text prompt for generating perturbations of the base task “put carrot on plate” for the axis *New Object*.

on our website [stargen-taxonomy.github.io](https://stargen-taxonomy.github.io), where users can provide their own base tasks (as initial scene images and language instructions). We use Gemini 2.0 Flash as our VLM. For more reliable generations, we configure Gemini to generate perturbed tasks as JSON, using a specified schema. We instantiate the system for the following 5  $\star$ -Gen axes:

- 1) *Visual Task Object* (V-OBJ)
- 2) *Object Properties* (S-PROP)
- 3) *Object Poses* (VB-POSE)
- 4) *Action Verbs* (SB-VRB)
- 5) *New Object* (VSB-NOBJ)

In Fig. 5, we provide an example screenshot of the demonstra-

```

import { SchemaType } from "@google/generative-ai";

const visualSemanticSchema = {
  description: "Visual and language instruction changes for a task.",
  type: SchemaType.ARRAY,
  items: {
    type: SchemaType.OBJECT,
    properties: {
      visualChange: {
        type: SchemaType.STRING,
        description: "Text prompt for an image-editing model to modify the task",
        nullable: false,
      },
      languageChange: {
        type: SchemaType.STRING,
        description: "Updated language instruction for the modified task",
        nullable: false,
      },
    },
    required: ["visualChange", "languageChange"],
  },
};

```

Fig. 7: Node.js JSON schema used for Gemini API to generate perturbations that are both **visual** and **semantic**, such as those for the axis *New Object*.

tion used to generate perturbations for a base task that was not used in BridgeV2-★. In Fig. 6, we provide an example text prompt used for the axis *New Object*, and in Fig. 7 we provide the Node.js JSON schema used for this axis.