
Open-Event Procedure Planning in Instructional Videos

Yilu Wu¹, Hanlin Wang¹, Jing Wang¹, Limin Wang^{1,2,*}

¹State Key Laboratory for Novel Software Technology, Nanjing University

²Shanghai AI Lab

<https://github.com/MCG-NJU/OEPP>

Abstract

Given the current visual observations, the traditional procedure planning task in instructional videos requires a model to generate goal-directed plans within a given action space. All previous methods for this task conduct training and inference under the same action space, and they can only plan for pre-defined events in the training set. We argue this setting is not applicable for human assistance in real lives and aim to propose a more general and practical planning paradigm. Specifically, in this paper, we introduce a new task named Open-event Procedure Planning (OEPP), which extends the traditional procedure planning to the open-event setting. OEPP aims to verify whether a planner can transfer the learned knowledge to similar events that have not been seen during training. We rebuild a new benchmark of OpenEvent for this task based on existing datasets and divide the events involved into base and novel parts. During the data collection process, we carefully ensure the transfer ability of procedural knowledge for base and novel events by evaluating the similarity between the descriptions of different event steps with multiple stages. Based on the collected data, we further propose a simple and general framework specifically designed for OEPP, and conduct extensive study with various baseline methods, providing a detailed and insightful analysis on the results for this task.

1 Introduction

Humans can learn procedural knowledge from instructional videos and figure out what actions should be performed to achieve their desired goals. This ability is crucial for the next-generation AI system as such a model can analyze complex human behaviors and help people with goal-directed problems like cooking. Recent works [1–9] have shown great promise for the procedure planning problem in instructional videos, which requires a model to generate proper action sequences to transform from the given start state to goal state. In this task, all actions that make up the planning sequences are selected from a given action space provided by the instructional video dataset, both for training and inference.

Given that models for the initial procedure planning problem are trained and inferred with the same action space, actually these models do not need to understand the meaning of actions performed at each step, but only needs to imitate the process in training videos. However, in addition to completing tasks through instructions, it is more important that humans can transfer their learned knowledge to similar events they have never seen before. As shown in Figure 1, for the new event *Replace Battery On TV Control* whose steps are very similar to *Replace Battery On Key To Car* which has seen before, we can roughly deduce the entire sequence of actions: *open the cover first* → *remove the old battery* → *put new battery in* → *close the cover*. This transfer ability requires people to fully understand the meaning of each action and master the procedural knowledge learned from seen videos, thus helps

*Corresponding author (lmwang@nju.edu.cn).




Figure 1: Illustration of procedure planning and open-event procedure planning. Procedure planning train and infer model under the same action space, while open-event procedure planning conducts inference under both base (*Replace Battery On Key To Car*) and novel (*Replace Battery On TV control*) action spaces.

people better handle real-life situations. In this sense, methods for procedure planning which are all based on a close-set assumption can only identify and plan under events and actions presented in the training set. This greatly limits the application scope of procedure planning since covering all real-life events in the training set is really hard.

Recently, visual language models (VLMs) [10–13] pre-trained on large-scale vision-text pairs have shown their remarkable zero-shot performance recently. These VLMs align vision and language features into the same space, fulfilling the gap between visual and language data. Many open vocabulary [14–18] approaches thus eliminate the distinction between close-set and open-set by exploiting the aligned features learned by VLMs. Inspired by these methods, we extend the procedure planning task from close-set to open-set, with an aim to develop planning models that can truly understand action meanings and transfer procedural knowledge to new tasks like human. Compared with the initial procedure planning, such a planning setting is more general and practical.

In this paper, we propose a new task named Open-event Procedure Planning (OEPP). As shown in Figure 1, we extend procedure planning to the open-event setting which requires the model to plan action sequences for novel events unseen during training. Specifically, we train model under the base action space and conduct inference under base and novel action spaces to evaluate their transfer ability. The base and novel action spaces are provided during training and inference, respectively. It is worth noting that we still provide an action space for novel events. This is because if we directly require the model to plan without an action space, the description and variety of actions generated by the model may differ significantly from the manually action annotation results in the dataset, making it hard to evaluate the correctness of the generated results. Moreover, since our main motivation is to evaluate whether the model can transfer learned procedure knowledge to events and actions it has not seen before rather than action generation, we still provide novel action space for better evaluation.

Another point worth noting is that we should ensure the procedural knowledge of base events can transfer to novel events, indicating a key aspect of “transfer ability”. For example, we can learn *How to replace battery on TV control* from *How to replace battery on key to car*, but can not learn *How to make a cake* from it. However, the existing instructional video datasets [19–26] do not take this into account, thus not suitable for our new setting. Simply dividing base and novel events with existing datasets will create a significant gap between the training and test sets, making the transfer hard and meaningless. Therefore, we rebuild a new benchmark named OpenEvent by combining two large instructional video datasets, COIN [25] and CrossTask [24], to evaluate the open-event procedure planning problem. We utilize an approach based on text similarity and human verify combination to create the dataset, which involves four main stages: text similarity clustering, human verification, action descriptions refinement, and dataset split. Details will be shown later.

We further propose a simple and general framework specifically designed for open-event procedure planning. Specifically, we transform this problem into a visual-text matching problem, and apply several procedure planners, such as simple MLP-based method, Transformer-based method and modified version of PDPP [5] to generate T embeddings as the action plan. Here T denotes the length

of planning horizon. Then the output will be used to calculate the similarity with text features in the given action space. We match the output with correct actions during training phase and select action with the highest similarity at each step to get the final action sequence for inference.

Our **contributions** are summarized in three aspects: (i) We propose a new task called Open-event Procedure Planning (OEPP), which extends procedure planning to an open-event setting. (ii) We rebuild a new benchmark termed as OpenEvent based on COIN [25] and CrossTask [24] for OEPP. (iii) We propose a simple and general framework specifically designed for OEPP, and conduct extensive study with various baseline methods, providing a detailed and insightful analysis on the results for this new task. We hope our work can inspire more works on OEPP, which is more practical for real-life applications. Our code and data: <https://github.com/FOXamber/OEPP>.

2 Related work

Procedure planning. The initial planning task [27, 28] plans the actions in a very simple environment, such as stacking blocks on a table. Later, Chang et al. [1] propose to migrate procedure planning to more complex real life, so procedure planning is naturally scaled to instructional videos. Previous methods can be divided according to the supervision method: (i) one-hot label and visual information supervision [1–3], these methods generate both action sequences and visual states for intermediate steps during training. (ii) one-hot label and text supervision [4, 9], which use a non-autoregressive transformer-based [29] architecture. (iii) one-hot label supervision [5, 7, 8], these approaches treat this problem as a distribution fitting problem using diffusion model [30, 31] or transformer. (iv) text information supervision [6], which plans out actions based on both the states and predicted events. However, all the above methods are based on the close-set assumption, that is, these methods cannot plan action sequences for events that have not appeared in the training set.

Open vocabulary learning. For visual scene understanding, most approaches focus on the close-set assumption, meaning that the model can only identify pre-defined categories that are present in the training set. Recently, due to the rapid progress of vision language pre-training models (VLMs) [10–13], open vocabulary settings were proposed including a wide range of computer vision tasks, object detection [14, 32], segmentation [33], video understanding [18, 16], and 3D scene understanding [17]. Following open vocabulary learning tasks, we propose the concept of open-event procedure planning. In contrast to traditional open vocabulary, we aim to open the event category rather than the action category. Due to this difference, our base and novel categories are not entirely independent and there is a small overlap.

Instructional videos. Instructions can take various forms such as text, voice, and video. Video instructions are more intuitive and easier to comprehend, which has led to the creation of many instructional video datasets in recent years [20–26, 34]. In particular, HowTo100M [34] provides a large amount of training data for video-text representation learning. We summarize existing instructional video datasets and find that early datasets primarily focused on kitchen scenes, resulting in a relatively narrow domain. However, with the proposal of CrossTask [24] and COIN [25], more and more domains and events are considered, which also provides huge basic data for our dataset.

3 Open-event procedure planning

In this section, we provide a detailed overview of our Open-event Procedure Planning (OEPP). We first present the definition of OEPP task, then we elaborate on the data collection process of our OpenEvent benchmark. Finally, we introduce the evaluation metrics we applied for this task.

3.1 Task definition

In general, given the start and end observations, o_{start} and o_{end} , the model need to plan an action sequence π under an action space \mathcal{A} to transfer from o_{start} to o_{end} : $\pi = \{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T\}, a_i \in \mathcal{A}$. Here T defines the number of actions we need to plan. The initial procedure planning train and infer model under the same action space \mathcal{A}_{base} , which is composed of subspaces of E_b base events, $\mathcal{A}_{base} = \{\mathcal{A}_1 \cup \mathcal{A}_2 \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{E_b}\}$. To extend to the open-event setting, we also evaluate the model under the novel action space \mathcal{A}_{novel} , which is composed of subspaces of E_n novel events, $\mathcal{A}_{novel} = \{\mathcal{A}_{E_b+1} \cup \mathcal{A}_{E_b+2} \cup \dots \cup \mathcal{A}_{E_b+E_n}\}$.

Table 1: Comparisons of existing instructional video datasets, “Hierarchical” refers to whether the dataset contains a hierarchical structure, such as “Domain-Event-Action”. “Transferable” refers to whether the dataset considers the transfer ability between events.

Dataset	Domains	Events	Actions	Videos	Segments	Annotation	Hierarchical	Transferable
MPII [19]	1	14	65	44	5609	✓	✗	✗
YouCook [22]	1	-	-	88	-	✗	✗	✗
50salads [21]	1	1	17	50	966	✓	✗	✗
Breakfast [20]	1	10	48	1989	11267	✓	✗	✗
NIV [26]	5	5	48	150	-	✓	✗	✗
YouCook2 [23]	1	89	-	2000	13829	✓	✗	✗
EPIC-KITCHENS [35]	1	-	-	432	39596	✓	✗	✗
CrossTask [24]	4	18	105	2763	-	✓	✗	✗
COIN [25]	12	180	778	11827	46354	✓	✓	✗
HowTo100M [34]	12	23611	-	1.22M	136.6M	✗	✓	✗
Assembly101 [36]	1	4	1456	4321	1M	✓	✗	✗
Ours	8	43	161	2771	12210	✓	✓	✓

3.2 Benchmark: data

In this part, we introduce the reconstruction process of the dataset in detail. Considering the diversity of events, domains and the consistency of annotation, we use COIN [25] and CrossTask [24] as our raw data. COIN includes 180 events and CrossTask includes 18 events, involving a total of 12 different domains. We remove duplicate tasks and tasks with less than three actions, such as *Change A Tire* in CrossTask which is duplicated with the *Change Car Tire* in COIN, and *Prepare Canvas* in COIN which only contains two actions. Additionally, we remove events that do not contain procedural knowledge, such as *Use Earplugs*, *Put On Hair Extensions* and *Practice Karate* in COIN. After preliminary screening, there are a total of 189 events that can be used in subsequent stages. Then we conduct the dataset construction process with the following four stages.

Stage one: text similarity clustering. Human verification of 189 events can be time-consuming and subjective. To address this issue, we propose using text similarity as an initial clustering method. We start by rewriting each action into a sentence that includes the event and the guiding action sequence provided by the dataset. For example, the sentence of *Draw Blood*: “Draw Blood: 1.tie the tourniquet 2.disinfect 3.collect blood 4.pull out the needle and press with cotton.” Then we use the existing sentence encoder Sentence-Bert [37] to encode each sentence into a vector. Finally, we calculate the cosine similarity to group events with high similarity into the same cluster. As shown in the algorithm in supplementary material, we set the threshold θ to 0.6 and group all event sentences into different clusters. For each cluster, the events within it have similar steps. Clusters with only one event means that there are no other events similar to it. In such cases, we temporarily remove these events.

Stage two: human verification. Comparing the text similarity of two sentences can help identify whether two events can be transferred, but cannot serve as the final judgment. Based on clusters obtained in the first stage, we further verified whether the events in the clusters can truly be transferred. With human verification, we delete some unreasonable events such as *Make Flower Crown* and *Make Flower Press*. The text similarity between these two events is high since the word “flower” appears both in the two event sentences, while actually these events cannot learn procedural knowledge from each other. Additionally, we add some new clusters, such as *Replace Graphics Card* and *Replace Memory Chip*. Ten annotators are involved in this validation process to assess whether tasks within the same cluster are transferable, and results considered transferable by over half of the annotators are kept. After this stage, we get 14 clusters with a total of 43 events and 161 actions.

Stage three: action description refinement. We notice that some action descriptions in events are not reasonable. For example, task *Replace Battery On TV Control* in COIN contains action *put battery in*, while task *Replace Battery On Key To Car* contains action *put in the battery*. The two actions are actually the same action but have different descriptions, which may interfere with our evaluation. We thus conduct a refinement on all action descriptions to ensure these descriptions accurate and consistent. The final cleaned results are in the supplementary materials.

Stage four: dataset split. In order to ensure that all novel events can be transferred from one or more base events, we select one event from each cluster as novel event, and all remaining events as base events. For dataset split, we select 80% samples of base events for training and 20% for testing. Samples of novel events are used for testing only. We then select 20% samples from the training set as the validation set for model selection.



Figure 2: Visualization of OpenEvent. We show examples of two clusters, with every two rows coming from the same cluster. Different actions are marked with different colors.

After the above four stages, we get OpenEvent, which includes 43 events across 8 domains (shown in Table 1). In general, our OpenEvent contains rich action data covering multiple domains and events. Meanwhile we also ensure the transfer capabilities between similar events, which has not been considered before. More detailed statistics are shown in supplementary materials. We show the visualization results of our dataset in Figure 2, including videos of 4 events in two clusters. The domains of events in the last two rows are different, which shows that our dataset also attempts to include cross-domain knowledge transfer.

3.3 Benchmark: evaluation metrics

We follow procedure planning and evaluate the performance using three increasingly strict metrics. (i) mean Intersection over Union (mIoU), which is the least restrictive metric. This metric requires the model to output the right actions without requiring the actions to be in the correct order. We calculate the IoU by $\frac{|\{\tilde{a}_i\} \cap \{a_i\}|}{|\{\tilde{a}_i\} \cup \{a_i\}|}$ on a single sample, where $\{a_i\}$ is the set of ground truth actions, and $\{\tilde{a}_i\}$ is the set of predicted actions. (ii) Accuracy (Acc), which considers the accuracy of action at each step. This metric only focuses on the accuracy of each step, and does not require the entire sequence completely correct. (iii) Success Rate (SR), which requires that the entire action sequence is completely consistent with the ground truth. SR is the strictest metric and the most important metric for evaluating procedure planning. Since the testing set of OEPP includes two parts of samples, base and novel, we will calculate three metrics under each part when evaluating the model.

4 Method

We deal with the open-event procedure planning problem by considering it as visual-text pair matching task. In this section, we introduce our customized framework for open-event procedure planning in detail. Our framework aims to provide a simple and general baseline without any complex design for the empirical study on this new OEPP task.

4.1 Overview

We treat open-event procedure planning as a visual-text pair matching problem just like CLIP [10], which learns perception from the supervision contained with large-scale image-language pairs. As shown in Figure 3, for planning horizon T , given the action space $\mathcal{A} = a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N$ that can be used for planning, we will get $T \times N$ visual-text pairs. Unlike CLIP and other VLMs, we cannot directly obtain the state information of T actions since the input of OEPP only contains the start and end observations (o_{start} and o_{end}). The intermediate state information is unavailable, so we need to generate the intermediate state information x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T through a planning model and then match the generated results with text.

4.2 Video and text encoders

Open-event procedure planning consumes visual observations o_{start}, o_{end} and action space \mathcal{A} as input. We encode them separately with video and text encoders (frozen) f_v, f_t , which makes no




Figure 3: The overview of our framework. When prediction horizon $T = 4$, given the start and end observations and the action space, we feed them into video and text encoder separately. Then we use several procedure planners to generate T embeddings and calculate the similarity matrix with the action text features. The green grid in the matrix is the ground truth.

assumptions about the encoder architecture and can be used with any video and text backbone. We feed o_{start} and o_{end} into video encoder f_v to obtain video tokens v_{start} and v_{end} . Similarly, vectors $\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\}$ for actions in \mathcal{A} are obtained via text encoder f_t . The video tokens and action vectors have the same embedding dimension.

$$v_{start} = f_v(o_{start}), v_{end} = f_v(o_{end}), o_{start}, o_{end} \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (1)$$

$$\{t_1, t_2, \dots, t_N\} = f_t(\{a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N\}), t_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (2)$$

4.3 Visual and text pair matching

Given the start and end video tokens v_{start}, v_{end} , we apply procedure planning model $f_{Planner}$ to generate visual embedding of T steps, x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T . The dimension of x_i is the same as text tokens.

$$\{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_T\} = f_{Planner}(\{v_{start}, v_{end}\}), x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \quad (3)$$

To train this model, we first construct a ground truth matrix G with dimensions $T \times N$ for each sample. The row in the matrix represents the label of the action in the sequence in the form of one-hot encoding. $G_{ij} = 1$ represents that the i -th step is the j -th action in the current action space. Then we calculate the cosine similarity between T visual embeddings and N action text tokens to obtain a prediction matrix S , in which the rows are the logits of the action steps.

$$S_{ij} = \text{Cosine_similarity}(x_i, t_j), 0 < i < T, 0 < j < N \quad (4)$$

After that, we pass the similarity matrix S through Softmax to get the action probability at each step P . We calculate the Cross Entropy loss for each row of the prediction matrix P and the ground truth matrix G to obtain the loss. Considering that OEPP is not a complete classification task and we need to generate T embeddings, we also use Mean Squared Error loss to measure the difference between the predicted embedding x_i and the target embedding t_j . The final loss is the weighted sum of these two parts, $L_{sum} = \theta_1 L_{ce} + \theta_2 L_{mse}$, where

$$L_{ce} = \sum_{i=1}^T CE_loss(P_i, G_i), \quad L_{mse} = \sum_{i=1}^T MSE_loss(x_i, t_j). \quad (5)$$

4.4 Implementation details

We choose the video and text encoder of VideoCLIP [13] as our feature encoders, f_v, f_t , which is pre-trained on HowTo100M [34]. We train our model with base action space and optimize it for 200 epochs with ADAM [38] on a single TITAN XP GPU for each prediction horizon T . We then select the best performed model on the validation set as our final model. We conduct inference with the base and novel action spaces, respectively. For each predicted embedding, we select the action with the highest cosine similarity to it. Thus we can still plan a sequence based on the similarity though there are many unseen actions in the novel action space.

Table 2: Results of Open-event Procedure Planning on OpenEvent for prediction horizon $T = 3, 4$. Model marked with * means that we reimplement the model based on the open-event settings.

Models	T	Base			Novel		
		SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU
Random	3	<0.01	0.91	1.26	<0.01	0.83	1.28
Matching	3	0.09	10.46	10.65	0.35	20.97	24.14
MLP-based	3	29.44	56.09	60.43	11.41	36.45	42.42
Transformer-based	3	26.27	55.30	59.41	11.41	37.28	43.38
PDPP* [5]	3	30.76	57.09	61.90	9.76	33.81	37.99
Random	4	<0.01	0.84	1.62	<0.01	0.77	1.44
Matching	4	<0.01	9.52	10.26	0.23	19.04	23.92
MLP-based	4	17.79	50.42	59.98	7.48	35.06	43.93
Transformer-based	4	15.99	49.24	57.98	7.94	35.12	43.88
PDPP* [5]	4	19.48	50.96	61.64	7.63	32.52	39.71

5 Experiments

In this section, we detail the video curation process and evaluate several methods with our framework on OpenEvent, presenting our experimental results and ablation studies.

5.1 Video curation

We follow previous work [1, 2, 5] and treat each video as image sequence $I_{1:L}$ including M action clips with action labels $a_{1:M}$ and temporal boundaries $(ts_{1:M}, te_{1:M})$. For the i -th action clip, we choose images around the beginning $I_{ts_i:ts_i+\delta}$ as os_i , and $I_{te_i-\delta:te_i}$ as oe_i . For procedure planning, we need to select an action sequence of length T , but the number of actions in most videos is not equal to T . For videos with more than T actions, we curate the videos with a sliding window of time horizon T to consider all procedure plans. For videos whose actions are less than T , we repeat the action until the length is equal to T . Each sample will thus contain T actions. Among these actions, os_1 of the first action is os_{start} , and oe_T of the last action is oe_{end} . Then os_{start} and oe_{end} will be used as the input of our model.

5.2 Quantitative results

We evaluate several procedure planners with our proposed framework for Open-event procedure planning:

Random. This method just randomly selects the action sequence from the given action space. The Random baseline shows a lower limit of model performance.

Matching. The matching baseline directly match the visual and text features obtained from the pre-trained VLMs without any training. Specifically, we calculate the similarity between the visual features of input and the text features of all actions in the action space separately, and select the two actions with the highest similarity score as start and end actions. For the intermediate actions, we first average pool the visual features of the start and end and then calculate the similarity. $T - 2$ actions with the highest similarity score will be selected as the intermediate actions.

MLP-based Method. We use a simple three-layer MLP with T linear heads to predict T embeddings.

Transformer-based Method. Following previous work [4, 3, 9], we construct a transformer-based baseline method, using transformer encoder module and position embedding to enhancing the temporal modeling ability.

PDPP. For the initial procedure planning task, PDPP aims to fit the distribution of the intermediate action sequence $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T]$, which depends on the given observations, os_s, og , and task class predicted in advance. PDPP concatenates them along the action feature dimension and thus the model input of PDPP for training can be represented as a multi-dimension array. Each column in the input represents the condition information (task class), action one-hot vector, and corresponding observation for a certain action, as shown in Eq 6.

$$\begin{bmatrix} c & c & & c & c \\ a_1 & a_2 & \dots & a_{T-1} & a_T \\ os_s & 0 & & 0 & og \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

Table 3: The results of Success Rate on OpenEvent for longer prediction horizon T .

Models	Action Space	T=3	T=4	T=5	T=6
		SR	SR	SR	SR
MLP-based	Base	29.44	17.79	16.12	15.68
Transformer-based	Base	26.27	15.99	15.29	14.24
PDPP* [5]	Base	30.76	19.48	16.80	16.48
MLP-based	Novel	11.41	7.48	5.11	6.20
Transformer-based	Novel	11.41	7.94	6.31	5.66
PDPP* [5]	Novel	9.76	7.63	6.96	7.16

Table 4: Ablation study on loss functions for $T = 3$ using Transformer-based method

L_{ce}	L_{mse}	Val			Base			Novel		
		SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU
✓		19.48	50.74	55.70	22.32	51.00	54.78	8.69	32.41	38.90
	✓	23.22	53.68	56.97	23.20	53.02	56.39	8.75	34.67	39.70
✓	✓	25.71	55.53	59.73	26.27	55.30	59.41	11.41	37.28	43.38

For open-event procedure planning, we modify the input of PDPP in the following two aspects. (i) For open setting, actions can not be represented as one-hot vectors since there are novel actions unseen during inference. Thus we replace the one-hot vectors $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T]$ with the text embedding features of the corresponding step name $[t_1, t_2, \dots, t_T]$, which is extracted by the pretrained text encoder. (ii) Open-event procedure planning does not provide event names for novel tasks, thus the application of task information in PDPP is not available under the new setting. To deal with this conflict, we delete the task related condition information in PDPP. Note that the “task” mentioned in PDPP is the “event” here. So the new input of PDPP for open-event procedure planning can be represented as Eq 7.

$$\begin{bmatrix} t_1 & t_2 & \dots & t_{T-1} & t_T \\ o_s & 0 & & 0 & o_g \end{bmatrix} \quad (7)$$

For training, in order to maintain a consistence training strategy, we utilize both the L_{MSE} and L_{CE} to train PDPP. For inference, the initial PDPP take out the $[a_1, a_2, \dots, a_T]$ and select the index of every maximum value, while we take out the $[t_1, t_2, \dots, t_T]$ to calculate the cosine similarity with the action text embedding in the given action space, and select the action of every maximum similarity.

GPT-4o. We also use GPT-4o [39] to test on both base and novel test sets. To obtain quantitative metrics, we provided GPT-4o with an optional action space and informed GPT-4o of the number of actions included in the sequence. Given that we do not know the training data of GPT-4o, which has probably seen most of the tasks and actions in the novel test set, comparing GPT-4o with the above baselines is not entirely fair. We thus include the detailed experimental results of GPT-4o in the supplementary materials.


In Table 2, we evaluate the performance of various baselines for OEPP. It is clear that methods involving training significantly outperform the direct matching baseline, which does not utilize training. PDPP* demonstrates impressive performance under the base testing set and substantially surpasses other methods. However, for novel testing set, PDPP* can not completely outperform other methods. We assume the reason for this is that PDPP* has a strong ability to fit the training distribution, thus its performance is better on base testing set. However, the great fitting ability can limit the knowledge transferable ability of PDPP*, so other methods can perform better under the novel action space, especially for the Acc metric. We also evaluate these methods with longer prediction horizons in Table 3. It can be seen that PDPP* achieves the best results when $T = 5, 6$. This is because the design of action sequence modeling in PDPP has greater advantages under longer prediction steps. Overall, the metrics for the novel test set are significantly worse than those for the base test set, indicating that these methods fail to effectively learn knowledge transfer between different events. This also reveals the need to improve procedural knowledge transfer ability for OEPP models.

5.3 Ablation

Loss Function. In Table 4, we investigate the effect of loss function, where each of the following losses is adopted: L_{mse} only, L_{ce} only and the combination of the two losses. We found that using the weighted sum of L_{mse} and L_{ce} best facilitates the model for both base and novel events. Using

Table 5: Ablation study on features for $T = 3$

Method	Features	Val			Base			Novel		
		SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU
Transformer-based	MIL-NCE [12]	14.50	43.53	48.82	16.26	44.93	48.54	3.31	25.74	31.76
Transformer-based	VideoCLIP [13]	25.71	55.53	59.73	26.27	55.30	59.41	11.41	37.28	43.38
PDPP* [5]	MIL-NCE [12]	19.37	47.49	52.64	17.93	45.31	49.93	5.32	25.67	31.57
PDPP* [5]	VideoCLIP [13]	30.92	56.44	61.25	30.76	57.09	61.90	9.76	33.81	37.99

Figure 4: Visualization of successful results on OpenEvent for $T = 3, 4$.

L_{mse} only results in better performance than using L_{ce} only, considering that the target of L_{mse} is to fit the action feature in the pre-trained VLMs space, which is more suitable for the OEPP. Based on the experiment results, our final loss function is designed as the weighted sum of L_{mse} and L_{ce} .

Feature Encoders. In Table 5, we conduct ablation experiments with different feature encoders, opting for MIL-NCE [12], a VLM that has also been pretrained on the Howto100M [34] dataset. The video encoder used is S3D [40], and the text encoder is Word2Vec [41]. The experiments demonstrate that VideoCLIP better aligns visual and textual information, yielding superior results for OEPP.

5.4 Qualitative results

In Figure 5, we present the visualizations of our planning results on OpenEvent for prediction horizons $T = 3, 4$. For each prediction horizon, we select one sample from the base and novel events respectively, and in order to reflect that our method has learned procedural knowledge, we select two samples from the same cluster.

6 Limitation and conclusion

In this section, we discuss the limitations of our work and summarize our conclusion. The first limitation is that our dataset is based on existing datasets, which means that we have a limited number of events. To address the problem of procedure planning in the open-event setting more effectively, we wish to expand our dataset further and explore the utilization of instructive articles from platforms like WikiHow in order to provide a large-scale procedural knowledge base. Additionally, we must acknowledge that our task is still an understanding task rather than a generative task, which means the novel action space is still needed for planning for unseen tasks. We hope that in the future, open-event procedure planning can be extended to a generative task containing a wider range of events and domains, thus be more general and practical.

In this paper, we propose a new task termed as Open-event Procedure Planning (OEPP), which extends the traditional procedure planning to an open-event setting. To better promote the progress of OEPP, we rebuild a new instructional video benchmark OpenEvent using existing datasets. We carefully design the principles to build a reasonable benchmark by ensuring the transfer possibility between events. Based on our experimental results, we find that it is possible for the model to understand the essential procedural knowledge in an open-event setting. We believe that with the development of VLMs and LLMs, the open-event setting can become increasingly meaningful and practical in the future.

References

- [1] Chien-Yi Chang, De-An Huang, Danfei Xu, Ehsan Adeli, Li Fei-Fei, and Juan Carlos Niebles. Procedure planning in instructional videos. In *ECCV (11)*, volume 12356 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 334–350. Springer, 2020.
- [2] Jing Bi, Jiebo Luo, and Chenliang Xu. Procedure planning in instructional videos via contextual modeling and model-based policy learning. In *ICCV*, pages 15591–15600. IEEE, 2021.
- [3] Jiankai Sun, De-An Huang, Bo Lu, Yun-Hui Liu, Bolei Zhou, and Animesh Garg. Plate: Visually-grounded planning with transformers in procedural tasks. *IEEE Robotics Autom. Lett.*, 7(2):4924–4930, 2022.
- [4] He Zhao, Isma Hadji, Nikita Dvornik, Konstantinos G. Derpanis, Richard P. Wildes, and Allan D. Jepson. P³_{iv}: Probabilistic procedure planning from instructional videos with weak supervision. In *CVPR*, pages 2928–2938. IEEE, 2022.
- [5] Hanlin Wang, Yilu Wu, Sheng Guo, and Limin Wang. PDPP: projected diffusion for procedure planning in instructional videos. In *CVPR*, pages 14836–14845. IEEE, 2023.
- [6] An-Lan Wang, Kun-Yu Lin, Jia-Run Du, Jingke Meng, and Wei-Shi Zheng. Event-guided procedure planning from instructional videos with text supervision. In *ICCV*, pages 13519–13529. IEEE, 2023.
- [7] Fen Fang, Yun Liu, Ali Koksai, Qianli Xu, and Joo-Hwee Lim. Masked diffusion with task-awareness for procedure planning in instructional videos. *CoRR*, abs/2309.07409, 2023.
- [8] Zhiheng Li, Wenjia Geng, Muheng Li, Lei Chen, Yansong Tang, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. Skip-plan: Procedure planning in instructional videos via condensed action space learning. In *ICCV*, pages 10263–10272. IEEE, 2023.
- [9] Yulei Niu, Wenliang Guo, Long Chen, Xudong Lin, and Shih-Fu Chang. Schema: State changes matter for procedure planning in instructional videos. In *ICLR*, 2024.
- [10] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Ilya Sutskever. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *ICML*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8748–8763. PMLR, 2021.
- [11] Chao Jia, Yinfei Yang, Ye Xia, Yi-Ting Chen, Zarana Parekh, Hieu Pham, Quoc V. Le, Yun-Hsuan Sung, Zhen Li, and Tom Duerig. Scaling up visual and vision-language representation learning with noisy text supervision. In *ICML*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 4904–4916. PMLR, 2021.
- [12] Antoine Miech, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Lucas Smaira, Ivan Laptev, Josef Sivic, and Andrew Zisserman. End-to-end learning of visual representations from uncurated instructional videos. In *CVPR*, pages 9876–9886. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2020.
- [13] Hu Xu, Gargi Ghosh, Po-Yao Huang, Dmytro Okhonko, Armen Aghajanyan, Florian Metze, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Christoph Feichtenhofer. Videoclip: Contrastive pre-training for zero-shot video-text understanding. In *EMNLP (1)*, pages 6787–6800. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2021.
- [14] Yuhang Zang, Wei Li, Kaiyang Zhou, Chen Huang, and Chen Change Loy. Open-vocabulary DETR with conditional matching. In *ECCV (9)*, volume 13669 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 106–122. Springer, 2022.
- [15] Siyuan Li, Tobias Fischer, Lei Ke, Henghui Ding, Martin Danelljan, and Fisher Yu. Ovtrack: Open-vocabulary multiple object tracking. In *CVPR*, pages 5567–5577. IEEE, 2023.
- [16] Chen Ju, Tengda Han, Kunhao Zheng, Ya Zhang, and Weidi Xie. Prompting visual-language models for efficient video understanding. In *ECCV (35)*, volume 13695 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 105–124. Springer, 2022.

- [17] Renrui Zhang, Ziyu Guo, Wei Zhang, Kunchang Li, Xupeng Miao, Bin Cui, Yu Qiao, Peng Gao, and Hongsheng Li. Pointclip: Point cloud understanding by CLIP. In *CVPR*, pages 8542–8552. IEEE, 2022.
- [18] Mengmeng Wang, Jiazheng Xing, and Yong Liu. Actionclip: A new paradigm for video action recognition. *CoRR*, abs/2109.08472, 2021.
- [19] Marcus Rohrbach, Sikandar Amin, Mykhaylo Andriluka, and Bernt Schiele. A database for fine grained activity detection of cooking activities. In *CVPR*, pages 1194–1201. IEEE Computer Society, 2012.
- [20] Hilde Kuehne, Ali Bilgin Arslan, and Thomas Serre. The language of actions: Recovering the syntax and semantics of goal-directed human activities. In *CVPR*, pages 780–787. IEEE Computer Society, 2014.
- [21] Sebastian Stein and Stephen J. McKenna. Combining embedded accelerometers with computer vision for recognizing food preparation activities. In Friedemann Mattern, Silvia Santini, John F. Canny, Marc Langheinrich, and Jun Rekimoto, editors, *The 2013 ACM International Joint Conference on Pervasive and Ubiquitous Computing, UbiComp '13, Zurich, Switzerland, September 8-12, 2013*, pages 729–738. ACM, 2013.
- [22] Pradipto Das, Chenliang Xu, Richard F. Doell, and Jason J. Corso. A thousand frames in just a few words: Lingual description of videos through latent topics and sparse object stitching. In *2013 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, Portland, OR, USA, June 23-28, 2013*, pages 2634–2641. IEEE Computer Society, 2013.
- [23] Luowei Zhou, Chenliang Xu, and Jason J. Corso. Towards automatic learning of procedures from web instructional videos. In *AAAI*, pages 7590–7598. AAAI Press, 2018.
- [24] Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Ramazan Gokberk Cinbis, David F. Fouhey, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Cross-task weakly supervised learning from instructional videos. In *CVPR*, pages 3537–3545. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019.
- [25] Yansong Tang, Dajun Ding, Yongming Rao, Yu Zheng, Danyang Zhang, Lili Zhao, Jiwen Lu, and Jie Zhou. COIN: A large-scale dataset for comprehensive instructional video analysis. In *CVPR*, pages 1207–1216. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019.
- [26] Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Piotr Bojanowski, Nishant Agrawal, Josef Sivic, Ivan Laptev, and Simon Lacoste-Julien. Unsupervised learning from narrated instruction videos. In *CVPR*, pages 4575–4583. IEEE Computer Society, 2016.
- [27] Chelsea Finn and Sergey Levine. Deep visual foresight for planning robot motion. In *ICRA*, pages 2786–2793. IEEE, 2017.
- [28] Chelsea Finn, Xin Yu Tan, Yan Duan, Trevor Darrell, Sergey Levine, and Pieter Abbeel. Deep spatial autoencoders for visuomotor learning. In *ICRA*, pages 512–519. IEEE, 2016.
- [29] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N. Gomez, Lukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. In *NIPS*, pages 5998–6008, 2017.
- [30] Jonathan Ho, Ajay Jain, and Pieter Abbeel. Denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *NeurIPS*, 2020.
- [31] Alexander Quinn Nichol and Prafulla Dhariwal. Improved denoising diffusion probabilistic models. In *ICML*, volume 139 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 8162–8171. PMLR, 2021.
- [32] Yiwu Zhong, Jianwei Yang, Pengchuan Zhang, Chunyuan Li, Noel Codella, Liunian Harold Li, Luowei Zhou, Xiyang Dai, Lu Yuan, Yin Li, and Jianfeng Gao. Regionclip: Region-based language-image pretraining. In *CVPR*, pages 16772–16782. IEEE, 2022.
- [33] Zheng Ding, Jieke Wang, and Zhuowen Tu. Open-vocabulary panoptic segmentation with maskclip. *CoRR*, abs/2208.08984, 2022.

- [34] Antoine Miech, Dimitri Zhukov, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Makarand Tapaswi, Ivan Laptev, and Josef Sivic. Howto100m: Learning a text-video embedding by watching hundred million narrated video clips. In *ICCV*, pages 2630–2640. IEEE, 2019.
- [35] Dima Damen, Hazel Doughty, Giovanni Maria Farinella, Sanja Fidler, Antonino Furnari, Evangelos Kazakos, Davide Moltisanti, Jonathan Munro, Toby Perrett, Will Price, and Michael Wray. The EPIC-KITCHENS dataset: Collection, challenges and baselines. *IEEE Trans. Pattern Anal. Mach. Intell.*, 43(11):4125–4141, 2021.
- [36] Fadime Sener, Dibyadip Chatterjee, Daniel Shelepov, Kun He, Dipika Singhania, Robert Wang, and Angela Yao. Assembly101: A large-scale multi-view video dataset for understanding procedural activities. In *CVPR*, pages 21064–21074. IEEE, 2022.
- [37] Nils Reimers and Iryna Gurevych. Sentence-bert: Sentence embeddings using siamese bert-networks. In *EMNLP/IJCNLP (1)*, pages 3980–3990. Association for Computational Linguistics, 2019.
- [38] Diederik P. Kingma and Jimmy Ba. Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *ICLR (Poster)*, 2015.
- [39] OpenAI. Gpt-4o release. 2024.
- [40] Saining Xie, Chen Sun, Jonathan Huang, Zhuowen Tu, and Kevin Murphy. Rethinking spatiotemporal feature learning: Speed-accuracy trade-offs in video classification. In *ECCV (15)*, volume 11219 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 318–335. Springer, 2018.
- [41] Tomas Mikolov, Kai Chen, Greg Corrado, and Jeffrey Dean. Efficient estimation of word representations in vector space. In *ICLR (Workshop Poster)*, 2013.

7 Appendix

7.1 Data and code

Our data and code: <https://github.com/FOXamber/OEPP>

7.2 Experiment

7.2.1 Implementation details

Our loss function is $L_{sum} = \theta_1 L_{ce} + \theta_2 L_{mse}$. During training, we set the two parameters to 1.0 and 0.2 for three baselines. The learning rate is set to 0.0001 for MLP-based and Transformer-based methods, and to 0.0005 for PDPP*. For more details, please refer to the code.

7.2.2 More results for different horizons

Table 6: Results of Open-event Procedure Planning on OpenEvent for prediction horizon $T \in \{3, 4, 5, 6\}$. The model marked with an asterisk (*) means that we reimplement the model based on the open-event settings.

Models	T	Base			Novel		
		SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU
MLP-based	3	29.44	56.09	60.43	11.41	36.45	42.42
Transformer-based	3	26.27	55.30	59.41	11.41	37.28	43.38
PDPP* [5]	3	30.76	57.09	61.90	9.76	33.81	37.99
MLP-based	4	17.79	50.42	59.98	7.48	35.06	43.93
Transformer-based	4	15.99	49.24	57.98	7.94	35.12	43.88
PDPP* [5]	4	19.48	50.96	61.64	7.63	32.52	39.71
MLP-based	5	16.12	48.54	63.48	5.11	35.15	43.44
Transformer-based	5	15.29	48.87	62.05	6.31	36.10	45.89
PDPP* [5]	5	16.80	49.94	65.32	6.96	32.76	39.62
MLP-based	6	15.68	49.23	64.96	6.20	35.10	43.95
Transformer-based	6	14.24	47.65	62.40	5.66	35.36	45.41
PDPP* [5]	6	16.48	49.44	63.88	7.16	33.76	41.33

In Table 6, we show the entire results of our baselines for prediction horizon $T = 3, 4, 5, 6$.

7.2.3 Error bar

We test the error bars of different models using different random seeds. For $T=3$, the error bar of the MLP-based method is slightly larger compared to Transformer-based method. The error for Transformer-based method on SR is no more than 1%, while for MLP-based method it is around 2%.

7.2.4 Results of GPT

Table 7: Results of GPT-4o for OEPP. The first row presents the results without sliding window.

Models	T	Num of images	Base			Novel		
			SR	Acc	mIoU	SR	Acc	mIoU
GPT-4o [39]	-	1	8.05	21.70	37.91	13.93	30.38	49.52
GPT-4o [39]	3	1	4.27	24.64	32.23	9.11	34.12	49.46
GPT-4o [39]	3	3	3.63	22.72	32.70	7.45	31.87	48.02
GPT-4o [39]	4	1	1.40	18.86	30.56	3.93	29.30	54.31
GPT-4o [39]	4	3	0.82	18.74	31.92	3.24	27.04	50.56

We use GPT-4o [39] to test on both base and novel test sets. To obtain quantitative metrics, we provided GPT-4o with an optional action space and informed GPT-4o of the number of actions included in the sequence. Given that we do not know the training data of GPT-4o, which has probably seen most of the tasks and actions in the novel test set, comparing GPT-4o with the above baselines is not entirely fair. We report the evaluation results with and without the using of sliding window data curation. We also ablate the results by selecting 1 or 3 frames from the start and end video clips as input observations. The prompt is as followed:

Table 8: Statistics of OpenEvent Benchmark.

OpenEvent	Events	Actions	Videos	Segments
Total	43	161	2771	12210
Train	29	122	1285	5833
Val	29	122	337	1479
Test_base	29	122	416	1888
Test_novel	14	55	733	3010

System:

You are a helpful assistant, an expert in answering questions about action planning in instructional videos. Based on the start and end images, you need to infer the actions to transform from the start images to the end images. You must choose from the following actions [action_pool]. Output the name of the actions step by step.

Example: 1. cut in half 2. slice the pulp

Example: 1. dip detergent with rag or apply detergent 2. clean the floor 3. wash the floor

User:

Infer the actions to transform from the start images to the end images. The actions must be actions from the given action pool.

The number of actions is [T]. The start images: [images encoded with base64].

The end images: [images encoded with base64].

Assistant:

1. open the car key cover 2. take out the car key battery 3. put in the battery 4. close the car key cover

As shown in Table 7, the planning results without using the sliding window data curation are better. We believe this is because GPT’s pre-training samples typically consist of complete action sequences, so using sliding windows to extract partial sequences might degrade its performance. Additionally, the results on novel set are much better. We attribute this to two reasons. First, since we conduct zero-shot evaluation with GPT-4o, there is no difference between planning on the base or novel sets and GPT has likely seen all these actions during training with a high probability. Therefore, the results of the novel set will not be very poor. Second, we request GPT-4o to select actions from the given action space, and the action space in the novel set contains far fewer actions than in the base set (base: 122; novel: 55), making planning in the novel set much easier. Additionally, we find that when more images are provided as observation, the planning results get worse. This reflects that for planning problems, GPT-4o can not better understand the meaning of multiple image sequences than single image. Overall, the performance of GPT on OEPP is not ideal. This also reveals the need to improve procedural knowledge transfer ability for OEPP models.

7.3 Dataset

7.3.1 More visualization of OpenEvent

In Figure 5, we present more visualization results of OpenEvent. We show more examples of three clusters, with every two rows coming from the same cluster. We show some frames sampled from a video, with each row representing a video. Specifically, we sample one frame for each action in each video for three consecutive seconds, and different actions are marked with different colors.

7.3.2 The algorithm of text similarity clustering

In our main paper, we construct our dataset OpenEvent with four stage, the first stage we divide different events into different clusters based on the text similarity, the Alg 1 shows the clustering algorithm.

7.3.3 Statistics of OpenEvent

In Table 8, we show the detail statistics of OpenEvent. In Figure 6, we show the sample distributions of OpenEvent.




Figure 5: Visualization of OpenEvent.

Algorithm 1 Text similarity clustering algorithm

Require: *Sentences*: a set of N sentences, θ

Ensure: *Clusters*: a list of clusters

```

1: for sentence  $\in$  Sentences do
2:   is_similar  $\leftarrow$  False
3:   for cluster  $\in$  Clusters do
4:     sim  $\leftarrow$  avg_text_sim(sentence, cluster)
5:     if sim  $>$   $\theta$  then
6:       is_similar  $\leftarrow$  True
7:       cluster.append(sentence)
8:     break
9:   end if
10: end for
11: if is_similar = False then
12:   new_cluster  $\leftarrow$  []
13:   new_cluster.append(sentence)
14:   Clusters.append(new_cluster)
15: end if
16: end for

```

7.3.4 Details of event clusters and action description

In Table 9, we present the detail event clusters of our dataset. In Table 10, we list all refined actions with the old action labels and the new action labels.

7.4 License

The dataset [25, 24] we are using is collected from publicly accessible source. We have followed all legal requirements to integrate this data into our research, emphasizing the importance of transparency in data licensing for proper attribution and appropriate use.




Figure 6: The sample distributions of all the events in OpenEvent.

Table 9: The event clusters of OpenEvent.

Domain	Cluster	Event
Nursing and Care	0	BandageDogPaw
Nursing and Care	0	BandageHead
Nursing and Care	1	GiveAnIntramuscularInjection
Nursing and Care	1	UseEpinephrineAuto-injector
Nursing and Care	1	DrawBlood
Vehicle	2	ChangeCarTire
Vehicle	2	ChangeBikeTires
Vehicle	3	RemoveScratchesFromWindshield
Gadgets	3	FixLaptopScreenScratches
Gadgets	4	RefillMechanicalPencils
Gadgets	4	RefillFountainPen
Gadgets	4	RefillAStapler
Electrical Appliance	4	RefillCartridge
Gadgets	5	ChangeBatteryOfWatch
Gadgets	5	ReplaceBatteryOnTVControl
Gadgets	5	ReplaceBatteryOnKeyToCar
Gadgets	5	ChangeMobilePhoneBattery
Gadgets	6	ReplaceMobileScreenProtector
Electrical Appliance	6	PasteScreenProtectorOnPad
Electrical Appliance	7	ReplaceGraphicsCard
Electrical Appliance	7	ReplaceMemoryChip
Electrical Appliance	7	ReplaceHardDisk
Electrical Appliance	8	ReplaceFilterForAirPurifier
Electrical Appliance	8	ReplaceRefrigeratorWaterFilter
Science and Craft	9	MakeCandle
Science and Craft	9	MakeSoap
Pets and Fruit	10	CutMango
Pets and Fruit	10	CutGrapeFruit
Pets and Fruit	10	CutCantaloupe
Drink and Snack	11	MakeMatchaTea
Drink and Snack	11	MakeTea
Drink and Snack	11	MakeALatte
Drink and Snack	11	MakeIrishCoffee
Drink and Snack	11	MakeOrangeJuice
Drink and Snack	11	MakeLemonade
Drink and Snack	11	MakeJelloShots
Drink and Snack	12	MakeChocolate
Drink and Snack	12	MakeCookie
Housework	13	CleanWoodenFloor
Housework	13	CleanCementFloor
Housework	13	CleanToilet
Housework	13	CleanBathub
Housework	13	CleanLeatherSeat

Table 10: The action description refinement of OpenEvent.

Event	Action Label	New Action Label
BandageDogPaw	wind legs with bandage	wind legs around bandage
DrawBlood	disinfect	disinfect the injecting place
RemoveScratchesFromWindshield	spray the cleaning agent on the car window	apply cleaning agent to scratch
FixLaptopScreenScratches	wipe the toothpaste	wipe off toothpaste or other cleaning agent
RefillMechanicalPencils	remove cap	take off the cap
RefillMechanicalPencils	buckle the cap	close the cap
RefillCartridge	take out the label	remove label
ChangeBatteryOfWatch	open the back cover	open the watch cover
ReplaceBatteryOnTVControl	open cover	open the TV control cover
ReplaceBatteryOnTVControl	put battery in	put in the battery
ReplaceBatteryOnTVControl	close cover	close the TV control cover
ReplaceBatteryOnKeyToCar	take out the car key battery	remove battery
ChangeMobilePhoneBattery	take down the old battery	remove battery
ChangeMobilePhoneBattery	load a new battery	put in the battery
PasteScreenProtectorOnPad	wipe screen	wipe the screen
PasteScreenProtectorOnPad	wipe screen again	wipe the screen
MakeSoap	put the melted soap block into the vessel	pour the melted soap block into the vessel
CutGrapeFruit	remove the peel	peel
MakeTea	prepare and boil water	boil water
MakeTea	prepare and add the tea	add tea
MakeTea	add some water to the tea	pour water
MakeTea	add some ingredients to the tea	add some ingredients
MakeOrangeJuice	juice the oranges	squeeze oranges
MakeCookie	pour raw materials	add raw materials
CleanWoodenFloor	mop the floor	clean the floor
CleanToilet	scrub the toilet interior	wipe the toilet interior
CleanBathtub	scrub the bathtub	wipe the bathtub
CleanLeatherSeat	wipe the detergent	wipe the leather