
Towards Open-World Mobile Manipulation in Homes: Lessons from the Neurips 2023 HomeRobot Open Vocabulary Mobile Manipulation Challenge

<p>Sriram Yenamandra^{*2} Karmesh Yadav^{*1} Michael Büttner⁵ Gora Chand Nandi⁸ Rahul Kala¹⁰ Jinxin Zhu¹¹ Xuan Gu¹¹ Qiting Ye¹¹ Volodymyr Kuzma⁶ Jonathan Francis^{4,7} Alexander Clegg¹ Ram Ramrakhya² Tsung-Yen Yang¹ Binit Shah³ Roobeh Mottaghi¹</p>	<p>Arun Ramachandran^{*2} Jay Vakil^{*1} Leon Harz⁵ Arjun PS⁹ Robert Haschke⁵ Yansen Han¹¹ Qinyuan Liu¹¹ Chenxiao Dou¹¹ Vladyslav Humennyi⁶ Devendra Singh Chaplot¹ Theophile Gervet^{1,4} Andrew Szot² Aaron Edsinger³ Zsolt Kira² Yonatan Bisk^{1,4}</p>	<p>Mukul Khanna^{*2} Andrew Melnik⁵ Lyon Brown⁵ Gaurav Kumar Yadav⁸ Yang Luo¹¹ Bingyi Lu¹¹ Yaping Zhao¹¹ Yansong Chua¹¹ Ruslan Partsey⁶ Gunjan Chhablani² Vidhi Jain⁴ Austin Wang¹ Charlie Kemp^{2,3} Dhruv Batra^{1,2} Chris Paxton¹</p>
<p>¹FAIR, AI @ Meta ⁴Carnegie Mellon ⁷Bosch Center for AI ¹⁰IITM</p>	<p>²Georgia Tech ⁵Bielefeld University ⁸IITM ¹¹CNAEIT</p>	<p>³Hello Robot Inc ⁶Ukrainian Catholic University ⁹IIT ISM Dhanbad</p>

homerobot-info@googlegroups.com

Abstract

In order to develop robots that can effectively serve as versatile and capable home assistants, it is crucial for them to reliably perceive and interact with a wide variety of objects across diverse environments. To this end, we proposed *Open Vocabulary Mobile Manipulation* as a key benchmark task for robotics: finding *any* object in a novel environment and placing it on **any** receptacle surface within that environment. We organized a NeurIPS 2023 competition featuring both simulation and real-world components to evaluate solutions to this task. Our baselines on the most challenging version of this task, using real perception in simulation, achieved only an 0.8% success rate; by the end of the competition, the best participants achieved an 10.8% success rate, a 13x improvement. We observed that the most successful teams employed a variety of methods, yet two common threads emerged among the best solutions: enhancing error detection and recovery, and improving the integration of perception with decision-making processes. In this paper, we detail the results and methodologies used, both in simulation and real-world settings. We discuss the lessons learned and their implications for future research. Additionally, we compare performance in real and simulated environments, emphasizing the necessity for robust generalization to novel settings.

1 Introduction

The future of in-home assistive robots will require robots that are capable of generalization and reasoning over increasingly complex environments, while manipulating a wide variety of objects,

many of which are not well represented in training data. To encourage work in this direction, we proposed the HomeRobot OVMM benchmark [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#), which posits that one fundamental problem in robotics and embodied AI is *open vocabulary pick and place*:

Move (*object*) from (*start location*) to (*goal location*)

Solving this challenging problem in *any* previously-unseen environment requires bringing together research in perception, planning, and policy learning. Increasingly, we’ve seen a number of works which solve parts of this problem [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#), [Chang et al. \[2023\]](#), [Liu et al. \[2024\]](#), [Hu et al. \[2023\]](#), being able to perform multi-step manipulation in previously-unseen environments.

In addition, there have been a number of robotics challenges in the past [Paull et al. \[2017\]](#), [Wispeintner et al. \[2010\]](#), [Bauer et al. \[2022\]](#), while a separate, parallel community has looked at simulation-based challenges, such as the Habitat Rearrangement Challenge [Szot et al. \[2022\]](#) and iGibson [Li et al. \[2021\]](#). Simulation has the advantage of being extremely accessible; regardless of resources, teams can use simulations like Mujoco [Todorov et al. \[2012\]](#), ManiSkill [Mu et al. \[2021\]](#), or AI2 Thor [Kolve et al. \[2017\]](#). This makes simulation-based challenges quite appealing, but unfortunately it’s not so clear how well simulations transfer to the real world [Deitke et al. \[2022\]](#); in fact, there’s strong evidence they do *not* transfer particularly well [Gervet et al. \[2022\]](#). At the same time, a proliferation of capable, low-cost robot hardware [Kemp et al. \[2022a\]](#), [Fu et al. \[2024\]](#) means that real-world experiments are accessible and increasingly reproducible, even if not all labs are using the same platforms yet.

As such, we proposed a competition with both simulation and physical robot evaluation for open-vocabulary mobile manipulation¹. The aim is to facilitate research that leverages recent advances in machine learning, computer vision, natural language, and robotics to build agents able to navigate in a novel environment and manipulate previously-unseen objects. This is in contrast to most prior work, which assumed a closed world with known classes [Szot et al. \[2021\]](#). The real and simulation versions of the challenge are shown in Fig. 1. We constructed training and test splits for our task both within the simulation and the real world, using the affordable but capable Hello Robot Stretch platform [Kemp et al. \[2022b\]](#), [Grady et al. \[2022\]](#). To our knowledge, no such competition or benchmark has rigorously demonstrated all of these abilities, but many have tackled facets of the problem [Dasari et al. \[2022\]](#), [Deitke et al. \[2020\]](#), [Shridhar et al. \[2020\]](#), [Szot et al. \[2021\]](#).

In addition, we provided a modular control stack where advances in perception, grasping, navigation, and so forth, can be tested without requiring the re-implementation of the entire robot control infrastructure [Paxton et al. \[2023\]](#). We took an algorithm-agnostic approach when implementing this baseline, providing both reinforcement learning and heuristic baselines related to prior work [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#).

The competition spanned 6 months, with 61 teams and 79 submissions, from which three were selected for real-world evaluation. On the technical side, we see that open-vocabulary perception methods were still the main bottleneck for real-world embodied AI, with a very large number of methods failing in challenging real and simulated scenarios [Zhou et al. \[2022\]](#), [Zhang et al. \[2023a\]](#), [Fu et al. \[2024\]](#)

Some core takeaways are:

- **Current perception models are essential, but are not good enough on their own.** All our participant teams spent time engineering around current open-vocabulary vision models and attempting to improve performance.
- **Error detection and recovery is crucial.** Especially since perception is not reliable from larger distances, it’s very important that agents be constantly planning and reasoning over what they can try next.
- **Use Docker to share code and reproduce results.** Docker-based evaluations allow us to try the same methods on other robots, and to try the same methods in simulation vs. the real world. Especially as robotic systems grow more complicated, it’s difficult to easily reproduce code without containerization.

¹Found at https://aihabitat.org/challenge/2023_homerobot_ovmm/




Figure 1: We have designed simulated homes with articulated and moveable objects. Policies can be trained and evaluated in simulation (bottom row) with the same control stack as on physical hardware (top row) while performing the OVMM task. Agents that can accurately navigate around, search for, and manipulate objects in simulation were transferred to the real world benchmark. Figure from [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#).

- **How best to use robot learning in open environments is still not clear.** It did not seem like reinforcement learning resulted in less engineering effort; in fact, tuning RL reward functions was quite difficult, and resulted in a lot of issues for our teams, vs. running a classical robotics stack.

2 Competition Setup

The competition is split into two components: the Simulation Challenge and the Real World Challenge. We first describe the Simulation Challenge in Sec. 2.1, which serves as the qualifier for inclusion in the Real-World Challenge. The top three entrants were then evaluated in a real environment, as described in Sec. 2.2. Participating entries were evaluated – both in simulation for the automatic leaderboard and on the physical robot – using three metrics. Metrics were averaged over evaluation episodes, though winners were chosen based on overall success.

Overall Success. A trial is successful if, at the end of the trial, the specified object is anywhere on top of a target receptacle of the correct category. Anywhere on top of the surface is acceptable. If at any point the real robot collides with scene geometry, the task fails immediately.

Partial Success. In addition to the overall success, we report success for each of the four individual sub-tasks: (1) finding the target object on a start receptacle, (2) grasping the object, (3) finding the goal receptacle, and (4) placing the object on the goal receptacle (full success).

Steps. The number of actions taken to solve each episode, a proxy for task completion efficiency.

2.1 Simulation Challenge

We used Habitat [Savva et al. \[2019\]](#), [Szot et al. \[2021\]](#) as our simulation platform. Habitat provides a rich environment useful for training control, navigation, perception, and language understanding models. Participants had access to complex cluttered environments populated with diverse objects, receptacles, and an extensive array of clutter assets. The richness of this simulated environment facilitated rapid iteration and training cycles, specially enabling inexpensive data generation for reinforcement learning-based policies.



(a) *cup from couch to chair* (b) *toy animal from chair to table* (c) *lemon from chair to table*

Figure 2: Maps used for real-world testing and evaluation. We ran real-world evaluations on three different environments, testing search, grasping, and placement of different types of objects and given different queries.

We used EvalAI² to host the challenge, a popular platform for evaluating machine learning problems which has hosted over 200 AI challenges with over 180k submissions. Participants uploaded Docker images containing their agents, as described in Sec. 2.3, which were then evaluated on an AWS GPU-enabled instance. EvalAI provided a public leaderboard that will show all participant submissions.

For the challenge, we created an episode dataset consisting of 5 splits: train, val, minival, test standard and test challenge, using a total of 60 scenes from the Habitat Synthetic Scenes Dataset (HSSD) Khanna et al. [2023]. We released the train, val, and minival episode splits, which were created from the train and val scenes consisting of 38 and 10 scenes, respectively. These splits allowed the participants to train and evaluate their agents locally. The minival and test splits were hosted on EvalAI. The test splits contained previously unseen object categories and scenes which were held out from public training and validation datasets, in order to ensure that our participants’ methods were actually generalizing to unseen objects and environments. Each of the hosted split (referred to as phase by EvalAI) had its own leaderboard and served a distinct purpose:

1. *Minival* split: The purpose of this split was to confirm that remote evaluation ran properly and reported the same result as local evaluation. Each team was allowed up to 100 submissions per day, on a very small set of validation episodes.
2. *Test Standard* split: The purpose of this split is to serve as the public leaderboard establishing the state of the art. This is what should be used to report results in papers. Each team is allowed up to 10 submissions per day.
3. *Test Challenge* split: This split was used to decide the teams that would move to the next split of the challenge. Each team was allowed a total of 5 submissions until the end of the challenge submission split. Results on this split were not be made public until the announcement of final results at NeurIPS 2023.

Agents were evaluated on 250 episodes and had a total available time of 48 hours to finish each run. All evaluations used an AWS EC2 p2.xlarge instance which has a Tesla K80 GPU (12 GB Memory), 4 CPU cores, and 61 GB RAM. The use of Docker containers for evaluation, a hidden test set, and the constraint on the number of official challenge submissions helped to prevent overfitting on the test set while allowing broad participation.

²<https://eval.ai/>



Figure 3: Examples of object manipulation from real-world experiments. The participant teams needed to find and move three objects (fig 3d) from the held-out apartment environment: a plastic cup, a toy animal, and a yellow toy lemon.




Figure 4: Left: challenge Docker files hierarchy. Both the participant and environment docker images are built off of the same image; the environment image actually contains the task itself, and the participant docker image sends actions and receives observations over the network. Right: challenge evaluation infrastructure.

2.2 Real Robot Challenge

At the end of the simulation challenge phase, the top three teams from the test-challenge leaderboard were selected for the real robot challenge. We used Hello Robot’s Stretch RE2 robot [Kemp et al. \[2022a\]](#) to evaluate the agents in the real environment. The stretch 2 is a lightweight, low-cost mobile manipulator which can fit into a variety of different environments and is broadly suitable for homes. Additionally, as noted, participants do not need access to robot hardware to participate in the challenge.

We ran three evaluations per team in a controlled real-world apartment. The layouts for these different environments were shown in Fig. 2 and snapshots from the experiments are shown in Fig. 3. We ran a total of ~10 hours of experimentation and evaluations to measure our real-world metrics and determine the results of the experiments. Docker containers were used to leverage using the same environment and code from simulations for a seamless transition.

2.3 Containerized Testing

In order to support running the same experiments on the real hardware as in simulation, and reduce setup times/bugs, we had users submit their agent in a Docker image. We set up the challenge evaluation pipeline using three Docker images (see Fig. 4):

- **Task image:** This served as a base Docker image, pre-installed with all libraries required by the software stack. This image includes a gRPC-based interface enabling communication between the participant Docker container and the environment Docker container. Participants are required to use the task image as the base for their submissions.
- **Environment image:** This is a private image which builds upon the task image by replacing public dataset paths with private dataset paths and initiating the environment service, a gRPC wrapper on top of the simulation environment.
- **Participant image:** This image also uses the task image as its base, adding the participant’s specific approach implementation, which have to be encapsulated in the agent interface (with act and reset methods). Additionally, we provide an example participant image that launches home-robot baselines.

When the participating teams upload their solution Docker images, EvalAI stores them in the AWS Docker registry and schedules an evaluation of their submissions. Then, the platform spawns an evaluation worker that runs the environment and participant Docker containers. The two containers exchange sensor observations and actions using gRPC until the evaluation is over. Finally, the evaluation results are collected and displayed on the leaderboard (see Fig. 4).

To evaluate the teams in the real-world setup, we were able to pull submitted participant Docker images from AWS for the respective teams and run the code.

2.4 HomeRobot Library

In order to provide participants a starting point, we provided an open-source library titled HomeRobot [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#), [Paxton et al. \[2023\]](#) containing implementations for two baseline systems: a heuristic system based on prior work [Gervet et al. \[2022\]](#) and a reinforcement learning (RL) baseline [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#).

As a part of the modular system, we provided code for: (1) simple grasping, (2) inverse kinematics, (3) frontier-based exploration [Yamauchi \[1997\]](#), (4) RL policy evaluation, (5) open-vocab detection using Detic [Zhou et al. \[2022\]](#), (6) simple robot-base motion planning to goals using Fast Marching Method [Sethian \[1999\]](#), and (7) simple whole-body motion planning for manipulation. We provide modular components so that contest entrants can choose as much of the problem as they want to address. For example, if they do not have access to a real robot platform, they could choose to use the discrete grasp planning pipeline implemented by us³.

For training the model-free RL agent, we use the implementation of DD-PPO [Wijmans et al. \[2020\]](#) provided by Habitat [Szot et al. \[2021\]](#). The RL agent uses a different policies for the: (1) navigate to object, (2) gaze, (3) navigate to receptacle and (4) place task. Each policy takes in the output from a sensor and an open-vocabulary object detector as input and output actions for either navigation or rearranging objects.

3 Results

In this section, we present the results obtained by the participants in the simulation and real world phases of the OVMM challenge.

3.1 Simulation

The first stage of the OVMM competition was conducted in simulation. The simulation phase started accepting submission on July 12th 2023 and concluded on October 20th 2023. Overall, the simulation phase saw a participation from 61 teams with a total of 368 submission. Out of this, 79 submissions were recorded on the final test-challenge leaderboard by 21 teams. Only 7 teams surpassed the baselines from our original HomeRobot [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#) paper. Table 1 reports the simulation metrics for those teams along with the baseline on the test-challenge leaderboard. The top-performing team [Melnik et al. \[2023\]](#) achieved an overall success rate of 10.8% significantly outperforming next best team by +7.6% overall success. In Table 3 we report the results on the test-standard split.

³Software stack: <https://github.com/facebookresearch/home-robot>

Team Name	Overall Success	Partial Success	Avg. steps
UniTeam Melnik et al. [2023]	10.8	32.8	993.2
Rulai	3.2	16.8	1044.3
KuzHum (RL YOLO+DETIc (full tracker +)	2.4	22.2	1139.3
LosKensingtons (Longer)	2.0	17.0	1075.6
GXU-LIPE-Li (xtli312/maniskill2023:heuristi)	1.6	13.9	1035.4
GVL	1.6	12.5	1109.0
VCEI	1.2	15.0	1,058.7
Baseline (Heuristic)	0.8	17.7	962.2
Baseline (RL)	0.0	12.7	1203.6

Table 1: Simulation results on test-challenge set for the top 6 teams, as well as the baselines from our original HomeRobot paper [Yenamandra et al. \[2023\]](#). We saw a dramatic improvement over our baseline methods over the course of the competition, although the best team, UniTeam [Melnik et al. \[2023\]](#), still achieved only a fairly low success rate due to the difficulty of the problem.

3.2 Real World

During evaluations, we picked out the objects and placed them in locations marked as a red dot in Fig 2 and the robot in the position and orientation as the green arrow. Once the setup configuration was set, we ran the docker image containing the multi-step policy code to explore the environment, navigate to goal receptacle, pick, navigate to place receptacle, and place. When exploring, the robot would occasionally collide with several furniture objects, so we set a limit of 3 collisions per evaluation. If this number was reached, the trial would be halted, and the episode would get partial success based on the step it reached.

Team Name	Overall Success	Partial Success
UniTeam Melnik et al. [2023]	33.3%	100.0%
Rulai	0.00%	66.6%
KuzHum (RL YOLO+DETIc (full tracker +)	0.00%	33.3%
Baseline (Heuristic)	33.3%	63.3%
Baseline (RL)	66.6%	86.7%

Table 2: Real-world results for the top 3 teams. We assigned partial success if the episode was halted or a step failed. The simulation results were predictive of the real-world results as UniTeam [Melnik et al. \[2023\]](#) was able to get a successful run.

4 Analysis and Discussion

We saw a large diversity of different types of solutions attempted, from purely motion planning based to reinforcement learning to imitation learning. We will describe the results and methodology of the top three performing teams [Melnik et al. \[2023\]](#), [Kuzma et al. \[2024\]](#), and then describe overall trends. We also performed a survey of the participant teams, in order to capture thoughts going beyond this. More detailed summaries of the different teams’ performance are in Appendix Sec. A, Sec. B.2, and Sec. C. We additionally ran a survey of our participants.

Perception Perception was one of the biggest issues that our teams saw. They used a variety of solutions: Detic [Zhou et al. \[2022\]](#), as in the original paper, YOLOv8 [Jocher et al. \[2023\]](#), [Limberg et al. \[2022\]](#), Owl-ViT [Matthias Minderer \[2023\]](#), and variants of Segment Anything [Kirillov et al. \[2023\]](#) including MobileSAM [Zhang et al. \[2023a\]](#) and LangSam⁴. Some methods made use of

⁴<https://github.com/luca-medeiros/lang-segment-anything>




Figure 5: The architecture of *UniTeam*'s agent. It is build as a state machine with four states: (*Find and*) *Navigate to object*, *Pick object*, (*Find and*) *Navigate to end receptacle*, and *Place object*. In the *Find*-phases, the *Exploration* skill is used. The agent's perception model is Detic Zhou et al. [2022], it segments the object and receptacles in the RGB image. This segmentation, together with other observations such as the pose, joints and a depth image, are the input to the agent.

foundation models like CLIP Radford et al. [2021], while others did not at all and just used off-the-shelf detection and motion planning. On their own, these models were not sufficient; many of our teams note detecting previously-unseen objects as the most challenging part.

Taking confidence into account was not enough. UniTeam noted that often, *goal receptacles* in particular could be predicted with very high confidence, even if they were incorrect.

Task Model One key aspect of many of the solutions we see was properly representing the task. Our baselines used a very simple "task model," wherein we would attempt to execute each of four skills in sequence with no retrying: find an example of the target object on the start receptacle, pick it up, find a goal receptacle, place. Many of our contest entrants correctly noted this was a major problem. For example, see Fig. 5, used by our winning team Melnik et al. [2023]. They used the same object detection system that we did in our baselines, but they add many steps where the robot determine if it has been successful, and will either try again or revert to an earlier step in the task plan. Team Rulai similarly made retrying past skills a priority (see Appendix B.2).

Determining when and how to retry failed skills is an important area for future research; there is evidence that for example vision-language models could play a strong role in this going forward, versus manual engineering, for automatic construction of behavior with error recovery Zhang et al. [2023b], Ahn et al. [2024].

Manipulation Manipulation skills were a challenge for all of the teams. Reward engineering for improving the placement skill was very difficult, as was predicting and avoiding collisions between the arm and the environment with motion planning. Teams spent time improving placement However, the basic skills were able to transfer to the real world reasonably well.

Simulation vs Real World None of the teams who responded to the survey had access to a real-world Stretch robot, which included all of the top three teams chosen for real-world testing, which suggests that the simulation is useful for testing and development.

The Role of Learning in Successful Solutions Notably, the winning team did not use any learning at all, though two of the top three teams did some amount of finetuning. Teams commented that they did not have time to make learning solutions work, compared to improving model-based solutions. Future competitions should probably allocate more time.

5 Running the Challenge: Lessons Learned

Enhancing Communication for Future Challenges. For future challenges, we recommend enabling better, faster, and more reliable communication channels. One survey response indicated a lack of information about challenge changes, such as deadlines or the number of submissions: "we lacked information about challenge changes, like a deadline or the number of submissions." Another participant expressed frustration with late-breaking changes: "the most frustrating thing about the OVMM competition was deadline postponement in the last 24 hours of the challeng... as by the time of it we nearly spent all of the submission attempts."

Other challenges have successfully used tools like Discord⁵ to build responsive and active communities, allow users to assist one another, and facilitate rapid communication. Discord supports quick interactions through threads and direct messages and has been employed by research projects Liu et al. [2024], companies and open-source initiatives. Unfortunately, we did not adopt this approach, but we recognize its potential. For future contests, we recommend using a platform like Discord instead of a mailing list to improve communication with participants.

Distributed Evaluation. One limitation of our approach was the reliance on a single evaluation environment in the real world. Although this was dictated by the high cost of setup, it resulted in a bottleneck for scaling real-world evaluation, constrained by the availability of the robot and the evaluation apartment. To address this, a potential recommendation for future challenges is to implement distributed evaluation systems, which would enhance both diversity and resilience.

Containerized Testing. The use of Docker for submissions in both simulation and real-world testing proved highly effective. This approach allowed us to test identical policies in both environments across various countries and labs without encountering dependency issues. This was a significant success, and we strongly recommend continuing with this type of evaluation in the future. It facilitates more real-world and sim-to-real competitions, enhancing the robustness and applicability of the results.

6 Conclusions

We consider the competition to have been a success, with a mixture of interesting lessons. There is substantial work to be done in improving perception, error recovery, and in making sure robot learning scales to real-world environments. We also identified some promising tools: simulations do allow people to write useful robot code, which can be tested in previously-unseen environments, which makes robotics research more accessible to everyone. In addition, tools like the containerized testing setup we deployed make reproduction across teams and labs much easier.

References

- Michael Ahn, Montserrat Gonzalez Arenas, Matthew Bennice, Noah Brown, Christine Chan, Byron David, Anthony Francis, Gavin Gonzalez, Rainer Hessmer, Tomas Jackson, et al. Vader: Visual affordance detection and error recovery for multi robot human collaboration. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.16021*, 2024. 8
- Stefan Bauer, Manuel Wüthrich, Felix Widmaier, Annika Buchholz, Sebastian Stark, Anirudh Goyal, Thomas Steinbrenner, Joel Akpo, Shruti Joshi, Vincent Berenz, Vaibhav Agrawal, Niklas Funk, Julen Urain De Jesus, Jan Peters, Joe Watson, Claire Chen, Krishnan Srinivasan, Junwu Zhang, Jeffrey Zhang, Matthew Walter, Rishabh Madan, Takuma Yoneda, Denis Yarats, Arthur Allshire, Ethan Gordon, Tapomayukh Bhattacharjee, Siddhartha Srinivasa, Animesh Garg, Takahiro Maeda, Harshit Sikchi, Jilong Wang, Qingfeng Yao, Shuyu Yang, Robert McCarthy, Francisco Sanchez, Qiang Wang, David Bulens, Kevin McGuinness, Noel O’Connor, Redmond Stephen, and Bernhard Schölkopf. Real robot challenge: A robotics competition in the cloud. In Douwe Kiela, Marco Ciccone, and Barbara Caputo, editors, *Proceedings of the NeurIPS 2021 Competitions and Demonstrations Track*, volume 176 of *Proceedings of Machine Learning Research*, pages 190–204. PMLR, 06–14 Dec 2022. URL <https://real-robot-challenge.com>. 2
- Matthew Chang, Theophile Gervet, Mukul Khanna, Sriram Yenamandra, Dhruv Shah, So Yeon Min, Kavitha Shah, Chris Paxton, Saurabh Gupta, Dhruv Batra, et al. Goat: Go to any thing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.06430*, 2023. 2
- Sudeep Dasari, Jianren Wang, Joyce Hong, Shikhar Bahl, Yixin Lin, Austin Wang, Abitha Thankaraj, Karanbir Chahal, Berk Calli, Saurabh Gupta, et al. Rb2: Robotic manipulation benchmarking with a twist. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.08098*, 2022. 2
- Matt Deitke, Winson Han, Alvaro Herrasti, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Eric Kolve, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Jordi Salvador, Dustin Schwenk, Eli VanderBilt, Matthew Wallingford, et al. Robothor: An open

⁵<https://discord.com/>

- simulation-to-real embodied ai platform. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 3164–3174, 2020. 2
- Matt Deitke, Dhruv Batra, Yonatan Bisk, Tommaso Campari, Angel X. Chang, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Changan Chen, Claudia Pérez D’Arpino, Kiana Ehsani, Ali Farhadi, Li Fei-Fei, Anthony Francis, Chuang Gan, Kristen Grauman, David Hall, Winson Han, Unnat Jain, Aniruddha Kembhavi, Jacob Krantz, Stefan Lee, Chengshu Li, Sagnik Majumder, Oleksandr Maksymets, Roberto Martín-Martín, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Sonia Raychaudhuri, Mike Roberts, Silvio Savarese, Manolis Savva, Mohit Shridhar, Niko Sünderhauf, Andrew Szot, Ben Talbot, Joshua B. Tenenbaum, Jesse Thomason, Alexander Toshev, Joanne Truong, Luca Weihs, and Jiajun Wu. Retrospectives on the embodied ai workshop. *ArXiv*, 2022. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.06849>. 2
- Zipeng Fu, Tony Z Zhao, and Chelsea Finn. Mobile aloha: Learning bimanual mobile manipulation with low-cost whole-body teleoperation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.02117*, 2024. 2
- Theophile Gervet, Soumith Chintala, Dhruv Batra, Jitendra Malik, and Devendra Singh Chaplot. Navigating to objects in the real world. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2212.00922*, 2022. 2, 6
- Patrick Grady, Jeremy A. Collins, Samarth Brahmabhatt, Christopher D. Twigg, Chengcheng Tang, James Hays, and Charles C. Kemp. Visual pressure estimation and control for soft robotic grippers. In *2022 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*, pages 3628–3635, 2022. doi: 10.1109/IROS47612.2022.9982073. 2
- Agrim Gupta, Piotr Dollár, and Ross B. Girshick. LVIS: A dataset for large vocabulary instance segmentation. In *IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, CVPR 2019, Long Beach, CA, USA, June 16-20, 2019*, pages 5356–5364. Computer Vision Foundation / IEEE, 2019. doi: 10.1109/CVPR.2019.00550. URL http://openaccess.thecvf.com/content_CVPR_2019/html/Gupta_LVIS_A_Dataset_for_Large_Vocabulary_Instance_Segmentation_CVPR_2019_paper.html. 16
- Augustin Harter, Andrew Melnik, Gaurav Kumar, Dhruv Agarwal, Animesh Garg, and Helge Ritter. Solving physics puzzles by reasoning about paths. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.07357*, 2020. 14
- Yafei Hu, Quanting Xie, Vidhi Jain, Jonathan Francis, Jay Patrikar, Nikhil Keetha, Seungchan Kim, Yaqi Xie, Tianyi Zhang, Zhibo Zhao, et al. Toward general-purpose robots via foundation models: A survey and meta-analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08782*, 2023. 2
- Glenn Jocher, Ayush Chaurasia, and Jing Qiu. Ultralytics yolov8. 2023. URL <https://github.com/ultralytics/ultralytics>. 7, 17
- Charles C Kemp, Aaron Edsinger, Henry M Clever, and Blaine Matulevich. The design of stretch: A compact, lightweight mobile manipulator for indoor human environments. In *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3150–3157. IEEE, 2022a. 2, 5
- Charles C. Kemp, Aaron Edsinger, Henry M. Clever, and Blaine Matulevich. The design of stretch: A compact, lightweight mobile manipulator for indoor human environments. In *2022 International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 3150–3157, 2022b. 2
- Mukul Khanna, Yongsen Mao, Hanxiao Jiang, Sanjay Haresh, Brennan Schacklett, Dhruv Batra, Alexander Clegg, Eric Undersander, Angel X Chang, and Manolis Savva. Habitat synthetic scenes dataset (hssd-200): An analysis of 3d scene scale and realism tradeoffs for objectgoal navigation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11290*, 2023. 4
- Alexander Kirillov, Eric Mintun, Nikhila Ravi, Hanzi Mao, Chloe Rolland, Laura Gustafson, Tete Xiao, Spencer Whitehead, Alexander C Berg, Wan-Yen Lo, et al. Segment anything. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 4015–4026, 2023. 7
- Eric Kolve, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Winson Han, Eli VanderBilt, Luca Weihs, Alvaro Herrasti, Matt Deitke, Kiana Ehsani, Daniel Gordon, Yuke Zhu, et al. Ai2-thor: An interactive 3d environment for visual ai. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1712.05474*, 2017. 2
- Volodymyr Kuzma, Vladyslav Humennyi, and Ruslan Partsey. Homerobot open vocabulary mobile manipulation challenge 2023 participant report (team kuzhum). *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.12048*, 2024. 7

- Chengshu Li, Fei Xia, Roberto Martín-Martín, Michael Lingelbach, Sanjana Srivastava, Bokui Shen, Kent Vainio, Cem Gokmen, Gokul Dharan, Tanish Jain, et al. igibson 2.0: Object-centric simulation for robot learning of everyday household tasks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2108.03272*, 2021. [2](#)
- Christian Limberg, Andrew Melnik, Augustin Harter, and Helge Ritter. Yolo—you only look 10647 times. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2201.06159*, 2022. [7](#)
- Chuang Lin, Peize Sun, Yi Jiang, Ping Luo, Lizhen Qu, Gholamreza Haffari, Zehuan Yuan, and Jianfei Cai. Learning object-language alignments for open-vocabulary object detection. In *The Eleventh International Conference on Learning Representations, ICLR 2023, Kigali, Rwanda, May 1-5, 2023*. OpenReview.net, 2023. URL <https://openreview.net/pdf?id=mjHlitXvReu>. [16](#)
- Peiqi Liu, Yaswanth Orru, Jay Vakil, Chris Paxton, Nur Muhammad Mahi Shafiullah, and Lerrel Pinto. Ok-robot: What really matters in integrating open-knowledge models for robotics, 2024. [2](#), [9](#)
- Neil Houlsby Matthias Minderer, Alexey Gritsenko. Scaling open-vocabulary object detection. *NeurIPS*, 2023. [7](#), [15](#)
- Andrew Melnik, Felix Schüler, Constantin A Rothkopf, and Peter König. The world as an external memory: the price of saccades in a sensorimotor task. *Frontiers in behavioral neuroscience*, 12: 253, 2018. [14](#)
- Andrew Melnik, Augustin Harter, Christian Limberg, Krishan Rana, Niko Sünderhauf, and Helge Ritter. Critic guided segmentation of rewarding objects in first-person views. In *KI 2021: Advances in Artificial Intelligence: 44th German Conference on AI, Virtual Event, September 27–October 1, 2021, Proceedings 44*, pages 338–348. Springer, 2021. [13](#)
- Andrew Melnik, Michael Büttner, Leon Harz, Lyon Brown, Gora Chand Nandi, Arjun PS, Gaurav Kumar Yadav, Rahul Kala, and Robert Haschke. Uniteam: Open vocabulary mobile manipulation challenge. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.08611*, 2023. [6](#), [7](#), [8](#), [13](#)
- Tongzhou Mu, Zhan Ling, Fanbo Xiang, Derek Yang, Xuanlin Li, Stone Tao, Zhiao Huang, Zhiwei Jia, and Hao Su. Maniskill: Generalizable manipulation skill benchmark with large-scale demonstrations. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2107.14483*, 2021. [2](#)
- Liam Paull, Jacopo Tani, Heejin Ahn, Javier Alonso-Mora, Luca Carlone, Michal Cáp, Yu Fan Chen, Changyun Choi, Jeff Dusek, Yajun Fang, Daniel Hoehener, Shih-Yuan Liu, Michael Novitzky, Igor Franzoni Okuyama, Jason Papis, Guy Rosman, Valerio Varricchio, Hsueh-Cheng Wang, Dmitry S. Yershov, Hang Zhao, Michael Benjamin, Christopher Carr, Maria T. Zuber, Sertac Karaman, Emilio Frazzoli, Domitilla Del Vecchio, Daniela Rus, Jonathan P. How, John J. Leonard, and Andrea Censi. Duckietown: An open, inexpensive and flexible platform for autonomy education and research. In *ICRA*, pages 1497–1504. IEEE, 2017. ISBN 978-1-5090-4633-1. [2](#)
- Chris Paxton, Austin Wang, Binit Shah, Blaine Matulevich, Dhruv Shah, Karmesh Yadav, Santhosh Ramakrishnan, Sriram Yenamandra, and Yonatan Bisk. Homerobot: An open source software stack for mobile manipulation research. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Symposium Series*, volume 2, pages 518–525, 2023. [2](#), [6](#)
- Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, Gretchen Krueger, and Joao Brunu. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.00020*, 2021. [8](#)
- Manolis Savva, Abhishek Kadian, Oleksandr Maksymets, Yili Zhao, Erik Wijmans, Bhavana Jain, Julian Straub, Jia Liu, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, et al. Habitat: A platform for embodied ai research. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 9339–9347, 2019. [3](#)
- James A Sethian. Fast marching methods. *SIAM review*, 41(2):199–235, 1999. [6](#)

- Mohit Shridhar, Jesse Thomason, Daniel Gordon, Yonatan Bisk, Winson Han, Roozbeh Mottaghi, Luke Zettlemoyer, and Dieter Fox. Alfred: A benchmark for interpreting grounded instructions for everyday tasks. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 10740–10749, 2020. 2
- Andrew Szot, Alex Clegg, Eric Undersander, Erik Wijmans, Yili Zhao, John Turner, Noah Maestre, Mustafa Mukadam, Devendra Chaplot, Oleksandr Maksymets, Aaron Gokaslan, Vladimir Vondrus, Sameer Dharur, Franziska Meier, Wojciech Galuba, Angel Chang, Zsolt Kira, Vladlen Koltun, Jitendra Malik, Manolis Savva, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat 2.0: Training home assistants to rearrange their habitat. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems (NeurIPS)*, 2021. 2, 3, 6
- Andrew Szot, Karmesh Yadav, Alex Clegg, Vincent-Pierre Berges, Aaron Gokaslan, Angel Chang, Manolis Savva, Zsolt Kira, and Dhruv Batra. Habitat rearrangement challenge 2022. https://aihabitat.org/challenge/2022_rearrange, 2022. 2
- Emanuel Todorov, Tom Erez, and Yuval Tassa. Mujoco: A physics engine for model-based control. In *2012 IEEE/RSJ international conference on intelligent robots and systems*, pages 5026–5033. IEEE, 2012. 2
- Erik Wijmans, Abhishek Kadian, Ari Morcos, Stefan Lee, Irfan Essa, Devi Parikh, Manolis Savva, and Dhruv Batra. Dd-ppo: Learning near-perfect pointgoal navigators from 2.5 billion frames. In *International Conference on Learning Representations (ICLR)*, 2020. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/1911.00357>. 6
- Thomas Wisspeintner, Tijn van der Zan, Luca Iocchi, and Stefan Schiffer. Robocup@home: Results in benchmarking domestic service robots. In Jacky Baltes, Michail G. Lagoudakis, Tadashi Naruse, and Saeed Shiry Ghidary, editors, *RoboCup 2009: Robot Soccer World Cup XIII*, pages 390–401, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2010. Springer Berlin Heidelberg. ISBN 978-3-642-11876-0. 2
- Brian Yamauchi. A frontier-based approach for autonomous exploration. In *Proceedings 1997 IEEE International Symposium on Computational Intelligence in Robotics and Automation CIRA'97: Towards New Computational Principles for Robotics and Automation*, pages 146–151. IEEE, 1997. 6
- Sriram Yenamandra, Arun Ramachandran, Karmesh Yadav, Austin Wang, Mukul Khanna, Theophile Gervet, Tsung-Yen Yang, Vidhi Jain, Alexander William Clegg, John Turner, et al. Homerobot: Open-vocabulary mobile manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11565*, 2023. 2, 3, 6, 7
- Chaoning Zhang, Dongshen Han, Yu Qiao, Jung Uk Kim, Sung-Ho Bae, Seungkyu Lee, and Choong Seon Hong. Faster segment anything: Towards lightweight sam for mobile applications. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.14289*, 2023a. 2, 7, 15, 17
- Xiaohan Zhang, Yan Ding, Saeid Amiri, Hao Yang, Andy Kaminski, Chad Esselink, and Shiqi Zhang. Grounding classical task planners via vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.08587*, 2023b. 8
- Xingyi Zhou, Rohit Girdhar, Armand Joulin, Philipp Krähenbühl, and Ishan Misra. Detecting twenty-thousand classes using image-level supervision. In *Computer Vision–ECCV 2022: 17th European Conference, Tel Aviv, Israel, October 23–27, 2022, Proceedings, Part IX*, pages 350–368. Springer, 2022. 2, 6, 7, 8, 13, 15, 17

A Team UniTeam

UniTeam’s method is mostly based on the heuristic baseline of the OVMM challenge with additional improvements [Melnik et al. \[2023\]](#). They used Detic [Zhou et al. \[2022\]](#) for detection, and made a number of specific improvements to navigation, exploration, and manipulation skills. They (in this section "we") largely did not use any learning in their solution.

A.1 Overview

The agent’s capabilities are divided into the following key skills:

1. **Detection:** Object detection and segmentation on the agent’s camera RGB-D images. Building *Bird’s Eye View* (BEV) map with semantic areas.
2. **Exploration:** Exploring the environment to find the start location (`start_receptacle`) and the goal location (`end_receptacle`). Exploring `start_receptacles` to find the object.
3. **Navigation:** Move towards the specified navigation goal: the object, start- or end receptacle.
4. **Picking:** Picking up the object, supported by a high-level action command due to the absence of simulated gripper interaction in Habitat.
5. **Placing:** Adjusting the agent’s position in front of the `end_receptacle` and placing the object.

The skills are executed in a certain order. At the beginning, the agent turns 360° to get an overview of its surroundings. After that, the agent uses the Exploration skill to find the object, navigates towards it if the object is found and uses the Picking skill to pick it up. Should the Picking procedure be unsuccessful, the agent goes back to use the Exploration skill to find the object. After the object was successfully picked, the agent uses either the Exploration skill again if no entity of the *end receptacle* was found, or it skips directly to the Navigation skill to move to the nearest *end receptacle*, and ends with the Placing skill to place the object.

The Detection skill is executed in every frame of the run. This means that the agent collects information of *start* and *end receptacles* even if the current goal is to find the object. The baseline uses the perception model Detic [Zhou et al. \[2022\]](#) to generate masks for objects and receptacles. An overview of our *UniTeam*-agent’s architecture can be found in [Figure 5](#).

A.2 Improvements over the Baseline

UniTeam decided to iteratively analyze the problems of the baseline and find solutions for them.

A.2.1 Detection

Initially, the baseline agent employed the same confidence threshold value for all receptacles and objects. During testing, it became evident that the agent frequently overlooked objects with this threshold value. However, reducing the threshold value increased the misclassification rate of *end receptacles*. The implementation of a dynamic object/receptacle-specific threshold proved effective in mitigating this issue. This allowed for a lower confidence threshold for objects and a higher confidence threshold for *end receptacles*, enabling the detection module to identify objects more reliably and reducing misclassifications of *end receptacles*.

The perception module also encounters challenges due to incorrect detection of objects on the floor or the floor itself (see [Fig. 6](#)) as objects or receptacles. To minimize the occurrence of these false positives [Melnik et al. \[2021\]](#), we established a height threshold for receptacles within the perception module using the depth information. This eliminates detections corresponding to the floor level, thereby facilitating more accurate planning.

A.2.2 Exploration

The baseline agent frequently encountered challenges when strictly adhering to a single goal, as the heuristic consistently selected the same action, leading to infinite oscillations between two adjacent



Figure 6: Example of an incorrect floor classifications. The floor is classified as a table (blue cluster), which is the *end receptacle*. The floor is filtered out in the *UniTeam*-agent, otherwise the agent would want to place the knife on there.

states. To mitigate this issue, a decision-making mechanism was introduced to operate on the goal map. This mechanism allows the agent to choose between the goal point and exploring the frontier during navigation, preventing persistent commitment to an unattainable goal [Melnik et al. \[2018\]](#).

In the baseline approach, the agent directs itself towards the nearest identified receptacle. However, due to imperfect object detection, the nearest receptacle may not align with the intended goal. To address this, our agent only stores the most probable *end receptacles* in the Bird’s Eye View (BEV) map [Harter et al. \[2020\]](#), depending on their confidence score. Subsequently, the agent selects the reachable receptacle with the highest matching probability, reducing the likelihood of placing the object on incorrectly classified receptacles. As the agent begins adding identified *end receptacles* to the goal map during the *Navigate to object* phase, a sufficient number of *end receptacles* are typically available for selection.

A.2.3 Navigation

When the baseline agent detected a potential collision, the collision was not incorporated efficiently into the new planning, leading the agent to attempt the same movement as before. To rectify this behavior, the detected collision is now integrated at the last short-term goal on the obstacle map. This refinement provides a more detailed representation of the environment in the BEV map, enabling the agent to formulate improved plans. Due to the strategy followed by the baseline agent, instances arose where the agent was not well-aligned with the *end receptacle*, resulting in an inadequate position for successful object placement. To address this limitation, the navigation in our agent aims to position the agent near the center of the goal receptacles. This adjustment ensures generally improved starting positions for the object placement routine.

A.2.4 Picking

The baseline picking routine necessitates the presence of the target object within the field of view of the agent’s camera. However, in certain scenarios, the object is not visible anymore after the agent moved towards the receptacle, thus resulting in picking failures. To address this issue, our agent rotates left and right if the initial picking attempt fails, expanding its overall field of view of the receptacle and thereby increasing the probability of object detection.

In our agent a check has been introduced to verify whether the object was successfully picked up. Only upon a successful pick, the agent transitions to the next phase; in case of a failed pick, however, our agent reverts to the navigation phase, exploring different locations for the object.

A.2.5 Placing

The baseline agent encountered challenges in accurately calculating the distance between the agent and the placing point, resulting in attempts to move either too far away or too close to the receptacle.

This issue was mitigated in our agent by moving the agent toward the receptacle in small steps over multiple iterations, ensuring that the agent is positioned appropriately for successful object placement.

Additionally, the baseline agent often placed objects close to the edges of receptacles, causing the object to fall down. To address this, the placing point was adjusted to maintain a safe distance from the receptacle edges, preventing later object falling down.

In situations where the detection module does not recognize the *end receptacle*, the baseline agent previously placed the object blindly, resulting in failures due to collisions or misplaced objects. In such cases, our agent places the object on any flat surface in front of him, assuming that they belong to the *end receptacle*. This reduces the occurrence of misplacements.

Furthermore, in the placing phase, large objects grasped by the baseline agent frequently collide with the *end receptacle*. This issue is alleviated in our agent by dropping the object onto the *end receptacle* from an increased height.

A.3 Panorama Update

After the challenge concluded, UniTeam worked on a new approach which utilizes panorama images. As discussed above, the baseline and their submitted architecture used Detic Zhou et al. [2022] to do segmentation on the RGB image of each timestep. This means that in some cases important objects or receptacles could be missed because the camera didn't happen to point towards them during exploration, or because they are located at the edge of the image and could not be classified correctly. These problems can be solved by using panorama images. The idea is that by creating panorama images regularly, the agent gets a good overview over large parts of the scene without missing important areas.

To create a panoramic image, we rotate the robot by 360° while taking images, do an equirectangular transformation of each image and stitch these images together. To minimize stitching artifacts, we turn the robot's camera by 180° before creating a panorama image, ensuring the camera lens remains closely aligned with the rotation axis. We used OWL-ViT v2 Matthias Minderer [2023] as a detection module to create bounding boxes and MobileSAM Zhang et al. [2023a] to segment the insides of these bounding boxes.

A new approach is introduced to decide when to create a panorama image. The agent starts each episode with a panorama image. While updating the map, the agent saves the places which have been covered by the panorama image, taking a maximum depth limit into account. During exploration, the agent moves towards unexplored parts of the map. When such a part is reached, another panorama image is taken. This ensures that all parts of the apartment are covered in a panorama image. Since the agent would often take panorama images at door frames, which provide an unoptimal angle for the subsequent room, we let the agent move into the unexplored area a bit before taking another panorama image.

A.4 Major Issues

The most prominent issue UniTeam ran into was the correct detection of objects and receptacles. In most episodes that failed, the issue was that either the object or the receptacles were not detected, or that the wrong objects and receptacles were incorrectly classified as the correct one. The latter issue is still a problem even with our approach of saving the confidence scores, since incorrect *end receptacles* could still have a high confidence. The precision of the detection model varies depending on the specific object or receptacle.

Another major issue we ran into was arm collisions while placing and picking. While attempting either of the procedures, the robot would extend the arm and sometimes hit either miscellaneous objects on the receptacles or the receptacle itself. Other issue we frequently encountered were not having the object in the camera frame once during the episode and thus not finding the object, *end receptacles* being too large to place objects on them without collisions, or the robot getting stuck at some part of the environment. We also encountered issues with the simulation itself. For example there was a scene with a sink in a bathroom that was not marked as a sink in the ground truth. Thus, attempts to place objects on them would fail. Another issue arose when the robot places objects like pens on the correct *end receptacles*. The objects would roll back and forth on the receptacles forever without coming to rest, which is a requirement for counting as a success.

B Team Rulai

Team Rulai mostly based their method on the heuristic baseline. In the OVMM competition, they divided the vision-language task into three parts: detection, navigation, and manipulation (picking and placing). Our method is based on domain adaptive semantic segmentation and policy-based mobile manipulation

- **Detection:** To enhance the performance in indoor scenes, we build up a mixed dataset by combining simulator images with real images in common datasets like LVIS [Gupta et al. \[2019\]](#), and select VLDet [Lin et al. \[2023\]](#) as the baseline detection model to finetune.
- **Navigation:** The pipeline is built upon the heuristic baseline. We propose strategies for autonomous escape, target region selection, and accelerated exploration.
- **Manipulation:** To approach a reachable location with enough space to execute the placement action, the agent explores open areas and finds an optimal placement point.

B.1 Improvements over the Baseline

The team made improvements to detection, navigation, and manipulation in order to achieve their second-place performance.

B.1.1 Detection

Rulai used two approaches to improve detection performance:

- 1) Mixed data finetuning: The baseline model is trained on large open-source images rather than indoor scenes of the OVMM task, thus we collect indoor images from common datasets and mix them with images observed from the simulation platform to finetune our baseline model.
- 2) Baseline model selection: The OVMM task has a requirement of running time, therefore a suitable baseline model needs to balance performance and response time. We re-implement eight vision-language detection models and compare them within a benchmark constructed from images we extracted from Habitat-Sim, and finally choose the one that performs best within the time of competition requirement.

B.1.2 Navigation

Team Rulai made three major changes to navigation to improve performance over the baseline:

1. They implemented a self-rescue strategy to prevent the agent from getting stuck in one place and wasting steps.
2. They designed a rapid exploration algorithm based on prior state encoding to reduce the overall number of operations.
3. They added an algorithm to identify the optimal target navigation area in order to satisfy the conditions for convergence.

B.1.3 Manipulation

After the navigation to the receiver task is completed, the agent will stop at a fixed distance from the placement container. This position may not necessarily be the best place to perform placement actions, therefore, we first need to adjust it to reach the optimal executable placement position. We rotate the robot 360 degrees with a fixed number of steps and determine if the agent can see the appropriate placement area in the field of view after each rotation. If a suitable placement area is not found after the rotation ends, switch back to navigation to another receiving container.

After seeing the appropriate placement area in the field of view, the agent should adjust the orientation of the host towards the target area and move to the nearest position to stop.

After reaching the closest position to the target area, in order to ensure the success rate of placement, it is necessary to explore the optimal placement point. We match the mask area of the target area with the footprint of the placement object to find the appropriate and optimal placement point.

B.2 Major Issues

Team Rulai noted a few issues with their solution.

1) Detection: One key issue is the word-object mismatch due to the non-custom baseline model and the low-fidelity simulator images. They observed that the detection model trained on a general dataset performs poorly in the simulated environment, resulting in a high false positive rate. Mixed data training may alleviate this problem while preserving perception ability in the real world. Methods to further fill the reality gap are worth exploring.

2) Navigation: Unknown environment: The agent cannot know the layout and positions of obstacles in advance, which increases the difficulty of path planning and navigation. 2) No distance sensors: The lack of distance sensors means the agent cannot directly measure the distance to obstacles or the target, limiting its ability to perceive the environment. 3) Imprecise target navigation area: The inaccuracy of the target location makes it challenging for the agent to determine an exact navigation route, increasing the difficulty of finding the target.

3) Manipulation: After the navigation task is completed, the position where the agent stops may not be the best place to perform placement actions. If the position of the agent host is not adjusted, the agent may fail to place due to the inability of the robotic arm to reach the target placement position. At the end of the navigation task, the agent does not determine the best placement area, which can lead to objects being placed in inappropriate positions, causing them to slide or shake. After finding a suitable placement area, it is also necessary to determine the optimal placement point within the area. It is necessary to place the object in the middle of the target container or in an open area to further avoid the risk of slipping.

C Team KuzHum

Team KuzHum’s agent was based on the RL baseline, provided by the organizers. We introduce an improved perception module that uses fine-tuned YOLOv8 [Jocher et al. \[2023\]](#) model for detection of known object classes, combined with segmentation by MobileSAM [Zhang et al. \[2023a\]](#), and Detic [Zhou et al. \[2022\]](#) detection and segmentation model for unseen classes. We enable object tracking in the YOLO model to achieve more robust segmentation, similar to ground truth that was used for training of the policies. We also utilize fine-tuned place module, trained with modified reward function, and a small change in global skill sequence that repeats navigation to object and pick object skills if the object was not picked after a try.

C.1 Improvements over the Baseline

KuzHum’s improvements focused on detection, as well as improving the reinforcement learning skills, and allowing for retrying of various high-level skills.

C.1.1 Detection

During initial analysis of the baseline, we observed a significant impact of accurate semantic segmentation on the success of the baseline agent: switch from ground truth segmentation to Detic was followed by a big drop in success rate of all skills. As expected, the perception module of the agent influenced every skill and overall episode completion, therefore, during our work we mainly focused on its improvement.

We enhanced the baseline segmentation module, which initially utilized only Detic, by adding an extra pipeline using the MobileSAM model for segmentation. This model is prompted with bounding boxes from YOLOv8 (as shown in Fig. 7). The masks from both modules are combined, with task-specific objects overlaid on top of other detected objects. This combination allows us to preserve the open-vocabulary Detic segmentations while incorporating task-specific YOLO-SAM, which is trained to distinguish furniture types and small objects.

C.1.2 RL Checkpoint Finetuning

Besides improving the segmentation models, we also focused on fine-tuning the model’s baseline RL checkpoints. For the Place phase, we customized the training reward to encourage the agent to keep




Figure 7: Semantic segmentation pipeline used by Team KuzHum. They overlaid masks from two different models in order to improve performance.

the object in the camera view and move closer to the goal receptacle. These additional changes were motivated by the low success rate of the place skill, which directly impacted the overall success of the task.

C.1.3 Task Model

During the evaluation, we observed that the agent prematurely ended its exploration after performing an unsuccessful Gaze skill. This led to abruptly ended episodes, even if the agent had not failed. However, since we had a sensor indicating whether the object was successfully picked, we could implement conditional behavior for the agent based on success or failure. This prompted us to add a few improvements:

1. Multiple trials for the Gaze skill: If the agent initiates the Gaze skill, it attempts it up to 10 times unless it succeeds.
2. If the agent fails the Gaze skill 10 times, it reverts to the Navigate to object skill.

That change to heuristic led to more robust algorithm, which could handle faulty detections of goal object and consequent gaze skill call.

C.2 Major Issues

The most problematic and challenging task was fine-tuning of RL based place policy. Initially, the policy reward was sparse, giving almost all positive feedback to the agent after the actions were finished: for successful drop and stable position of an object on the receptacle. This led to inefficient iterations during training, requiring much more resources and time for improvements than we could find. Subsequent modification of the reward, described in the previous part, had a positive impact at first but caused the success rate to drop after we further prolonged training. The agent got stuck in the local maximum of the reward function, exploiting it while not achieving successful placement (it sometimes dropped the object right from the start of the episode while, on average, achieving a higher reward than ever before). Debugging of the reward terms did not yield any positive results, so we had to drop most of the training results and use the weights with moderate improvement over baseline. Also, some problems in the agent’s behavior that were addressed by modifications of reward, such as frequent blocking of the camera view by the manipulator, remained.

D Simulation Results on Test-Standard Split

In Table 3, we provide the results of the evaluation of the Docker for all the teams on the test-standard split. Comparing it to the test-challenge set (Table 2), we see that UniTeam is still the best performing team, while Rulai had attained the 4th position on test-standard. Only 6 of the teams were able to get more than 1.0% on the leaderboard which shows the difficulty of the challenge.

E Full Set of Test Environments

Fig. 8 shows all environments that were used for baseline testing and development during the real-world robot experiments. Due to time constraints, we were only able to test on three of these for competition, given in Fig. 2.




Figure 8: The ten environments used for real-world testing of the baseline methods, from which we chose three for contest entries. These employ a combination of seen and unseen objects, including ones that did not appear in test or training data.

Rank	Team Name	Overall Success	Partial Success	Avg. Steps
1	UniTeam	6.0	27.6	1048.8
2	KuzHum (RL)	2.8	19.1	1153.0
3	PieSquare	2.0	11.1	1082.6
4	Rulai	1.6	11.1	1037.3
5	cucumber	1.2	11.2	943.5
6	VCEI	1.2	12.3	1058.5
7	PoorStandard (rl_deterministic_self_trained)	0.8	9.3	1218.1
8	Clear	0.4	13.4	961.3
9	scale_robotics	0.4	10.7	1061.2
10	extreme ProArt (v0)	0.4	11.3	1070.0
11	GXU-LIPE-Li	0.4	10.6	1063.2
12	USTCAIGroup (baseline_sam_rl_with_heuristic)	0.4	10.9	1211.1
13	KuDA	0.4	11.5	1219.2
14	HomeRobot Challenge Organizers (rl)	0.4	10.9	1196.8
15	T-1511	0.0	10.5	1063.7
16	LosKensingtons	0.0	10.5	1063.7
17	USC-GVL	0.0	10.5	1063.7
18	GVL	0.0	10.5	1063.7
19	HomeRobot Challenge Organizers (heuristic)	0.0	10.5	1063.7

Table 3: Simulation Challenge results on the test-standard set for all the teams that successfully submitted their Dockers on EvalAI. UniTeam is still the top team on the test-standard, while Rulai does not even feature in the top 3.

F Survey Questions

Our survey floated as a Google Form and sent to challenge participants involved the following questions:

- Team Name
- Which organizations are your team members affiliated with?
- Describe your method in a few lines.
- What kind of approach was your method based on?
 - Reinforcement learning based
 - Imitation learning based
 - Path planning based
 - Mixed
 - Other (mention in textbox)
- For navigation, did you build off of motion planning or RL?
 - Motion Planning
 - Reinforcement Learning (including our pretrained skills)
 - Imitation learning
 - Other (mention in textbox)
- For manipulation, did you build off of motion planning, use hand-tuned heuristics, or RL?
 - Heuristics (including ours)
 - Reinforcement learning (including our pretrained skills)
 - Motion planning
 - Imitation learning
 - Other (mention in textbox)
- Which foundation models did you use?
 - CLIP
 - VC-1
 - R3M

- GPT3/4/etc
 - None
 - Other (mention in textbox)
- Did you change the object detection approach?
 - Yes
 - No
- Which model did you use to detect open-vocabulary object categories?
- Did your team own a Stretch robot and try your method in the real world at the time of the challenge?
 - Yes
 - Did not own Stretch
 - Did not try in real world
- Do you have a report/manuscript associated with your submitted approach? If yes, please provide the link.
- What was the biggest surprise when attempting the challenge?
- How was your overall experience with the challenge? Rate 1-5
- Are you participating in the follow-up challenge?
- If no, why not?
 - I am participating
 - No time
 - No prize
 - No sim-to-real
 - OVMM problem was too hard
 - OVMM problem was not hard enough
- Any other feedback on the OVMM challenge?