

A tale of two goals: leveraging sequentiality in multi-goal scenarios

Olivier Serris, Stéphane Doncieux, Olivier Sigaud

Keywords: goal-conditioned reinforcement learning, intermediate goals

Summary

Several hierarchical reinforcement learning methods leverage planning to create a graph or sequences of intermediate goals, guiding a lower-level goal-conditioned (GC) policy to reach some final goals. The low-level policy is typically conditioned on the current goal, with the aim of reaching it as quickly as possible. However, this approach can fail when an intermediate goal can be reached in multiple ways, some of which may make it impossible to continue toward subsequent goals. To address this issue, we introduce two instances of Markov Decision Process (MDP) where the optimization objective favors policies that not only reach the current goal but also subsequent ones. In the first, the agent is conditioned on both the current and final goals, while in the second, it is conditioned on the next two goals in the sequence. We conduct a series of experiments on navigation and pole-balancing tasks in which sequences of intermediate goals are given. By evaluating policies trained with TD3 +HER on both the standard GC-MDP and our proposed MDPs, we show that, in most cases, conditioning on the next two goals improves stability and sample efficiency over other approaches.

Contribution(s)

1. We show failures when a goal-conditioned policy only aware of the next goal is used to follow sequences of goals.
Context: Several hierarchical reinforcement learning methods ([Eysenbach et al. \(2019\)](#), [Levy et al. \(2019\)](#)) rely on goal-conditioned (GC) policies that are iteratively conditioned on each individual goal to traverse sequences of goals.
2. We propose two specific instances of Markov Decision Process framework designed to reach several sequences of goals crafted by a fixed planner.
Context: Prior work dealt with the case of a single sequence of goals ([Chenu et al., 2023](#))
3. In our evaluation environments, we show that targeting the next two goals is more stable and sample efficient than targeting the next and final goals.
Context: We train TD3 +HER agents on each MDP formulation, using an expert-crafted planner to supply intermediate goal sequences that lead to final goals. We focus on differences in low-level training, and all policies are evaluated on navigation and pole balancing tasks.

A tale of two goals: leveraging sequentiality in multi-goal scenarios

Olivier Serris, Stéphane Doncieux, Olivier Sigaud

olivier.serris@isir.upmc.fr, stephane.doncieux@isir.upmc.fr,
olivier.sigaud@isir.upmc.fr

Sorbonne Université, CNRS, ISIR, F-75005, Paris, France

Abstract

Several hierarchical reinforcement learning methods leverage planning to create a graph or sequences of intermediate goals, guiding a lower-level goal-conditioned (GC) policy to reach some final goals. The low-level policy is typically conditioned on the current goal, with the aim of reaching it as quickly as possible. However, this approach can fail when an intermediate goal can be reached in multiple ways, some of which may make it impossible to continue toward subsequent goals. To address this issue, we introduce two instances of Markov Decision Process (MDP) where the optimization objective favors policies that not only reach the current goal but also subsequent ones. In the first, the agent is conditioned on both the current and final goals, while in the second, it is conditioned on the next two goals in the sequence. We conduct a series of experiments on navigation and pole-balancing tasks in which sequences of intermediate goals are given. By evaluating policies trained with TD3 +HER on both the standard GC-MDP and our proposed MDPs, we show that, in most cases, conditioning on the next two goals improves stability and sample efficiency over other approaches.

1 Introduction

In reinforcement learning (RL), an agent learns to control a system to accomplish a task over a sequence of actions by maximizing some reward signal. Standard RL methods struggle when the sequence of actions is long and the reward signal is sparse. Goal-conditioned (GC) policies (Schaul et al., 2015) are not exceptions, often failing to reach distant goals. To address this, several hierarchical reinforcement learning (HRL) approaches propose to decompose the task into a sequence of intermediate goals, with the GC policy iteratively conditioned on each goal until the final one is reached (Eysenbach et al., 2019; Levy et al., 2019).

However, as shown in Chenu et al. (2023), when intermediate goals do not fully specify the states in which they are achieved, a *chaining* issue arises: the system may achieve a goal in a state that is incompatible with the achievement of the next goal. To counteract this, Chenu et al. (2023) propose the DCIL-II framework in which the agent prepares for the next goal while aiming at the current one. Their solution integrates successive goals into the Markov Decision Process (MDP) and conditions the policy on both the next goal and its corresponding goal index, allowing the agent to complete a fixed sequence of goals reliably while also leveraging the powerful reward propagation mechanism provided by Hindsight Experience Replay (HER) (Andrychowicz et al., 2018).

In this paper, we address a more challenging context in which the agent must learn to achieve any goal from any starting state, and a high-level planner provides various sequences of intermediate goals depending on the final goal. In this context, learning a GC policy that prepares for the next goal may not be enough, as the way to achieve the next goal may itself depend on the final goal.

Our main contribution is to adapt the DCIL framework for multi-goals tasks. We propose two Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) in which the state, transition and reward functions account for sequential goal reaching and make it possible to benefit from goal relabeling as in HER. In the first MDP, the policy is conditioned on the current and next goals, and in the second one, it is conditioned on the current and final goals.

Then, to evaluate these instances, we implement four agents on top of the same actor-critic architecture: an agent conditioned only on the final goal, a myopic agent that only learns to reach the current goal but is iteratively guided by a sequence of intermediate goals, and our solutions: two agents conditioned on the current goal and, respectively, on the next goal and the final goal. We compare these agents on various benchmarks in which the agent is trained to reach any goal from any state given the corresponding sequences of intermediate goals. Our results show that agents based on our framework overcome limitations of the myopic and non-sequential agents. In particular, we show that conditioning on the next two goals is more efficient than doing so on the next and final goals, as it requires to propagate the value in the critic over a shorter horizon.

2 Background & Related Work

All the agents used in this work are goal-conditioned, they rely on the same actor-critic algorithm, they leverage hindsight relabeling and they can be seen as the low-level part of a hierarchical approach. In this section we provide background information about these elements and present some related algorithms.

2.1 TD3 and SAC

The agents we compare in this paper all use the twin delayed deep-deterministic policy gradient (TD3) actor-critic algorithm (Fujimoto et al., 2018). TD3 inherits from the DDPG algorithm (Lillicrap et al., 2015) where the actor and the critic are deterministic neural networks. The main innovation of TD3 with respect to DDPG consists in using two critic networks and taking the minimum of their Q-values to prevent overestimation bias.

The Soft Actor-Critic (SAC) algorithm (Haarnoja et al., 2018) can be seen as an extension of TD3 where the policy is stochastic and both the critic and the policy are trained under an entropy regularized regime.

2.2 Goal-conditioned reinforcement learning

Goal conditioned reinforcement learning (GCRL) can be formalized as an extension of Markov Decision Processes (MDPs) that we note $\mathcal{M}_{gc} = (S_{gc}, A, R_{gc}, P, \gamma, \mathcal{T})$. At the beginning of each episode, an initial state s_0 from the initial state distribution ρ_0 and a single goal $g \in G$ are selected. The goal space G is generally defined as a subset of the state space. For instance, the goal might be only the position of the center of mass of a robot, without considering the information relative to its limbs. At each step, the agent observes $(s_t, g) \in S_{gc} = S \times G$. The agent chooses an action $a_t \in A$, moves to a new state s_{t+1} according to an unknown probability distribution $p(s_{t+1}|s_t, a_t) \in P$ and then receives a reward r_t .

If S_g is the set of all states for which g is achieved, the reward is defined as: $R_{gc}(s_t, g, a_t, s_{t+1}) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s_{t+1} \in S_g, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

The discount factor γ defines the importance of future rewards. Finally, $\mathcal{T}(g)$ defines the set of terminal states based on the current goal g . Some states may be terminal independently from the current goal (e.g. a robot falling on the floor). Reaching a goal can be terminal or not depending on the task at hand. For instance, in a maze environment, the task ends as soon as the agent reaches the

goal position, while in a pole-balancing task, the pole must stay at equilibrium in the goal state until the episode ends.

The objective of GCRL algorithms is to find a policy that maximizes the expected cumulative reward:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{a \sim \pi_\theta \\ s_0 \sim \rho_0 \\ g \sim P(g)}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{gc}(s_t, g, a_t, s_{t+1}) \prod_{i=0}^t 1 - I[s_i \in \mathcal{T}(g)] \right]. \quad (1)$$

Hindsight relabeling: Learning directly from collected data is very hard, as an untrained agent rarely or never reaches its goal. This sparse reward regime can completely prevent learning. A critical ingredient for performance and sample efficiency is the Hindsight Experience Replay (HER) algorithm (Andrychowicz et al., 2018). During actor and critic updates, the agent learns from transitions $\{s_t, g, a_t, r(s_{t+1}, g), s_{t+1}\}$ where most of the time, the agent does not receive a reward. In the following notation, we show how HER modifies transitions by substituting the current goal with a goal achieved later in the trajectory, where ag_t represents the goal achieved at time step t and t_{max} represents the last step of a given trajectory:

$$(s_t, g, R_{gc}(s_t, g, a, s_{t+1}), a_t, s_{t+1}) \rightarrow (s_t, ag_k, R_{gc}(s_t, ag_k, a_t, s_{t+1}), a_t, s_{t+1}), \text{ where } k \in [t, t_{max}]. \quad (2)$$

2.3 Hierarchical RL

When the agent’s goal is too far from its current state, combining GCRL with HER is not enough. In that case, one can leverage a divide-and-conquer approach by using hierarchical RL (HRL).

HRL approaches decompose long horizon RL problem into sequences of shorter problems. Generally speaking, a high-level component or a hierarchy of such components selects a sequence of intermediate goals leading to the final goal, and a low-level component is in charge of steering the agent from goal to goal. The main approaches to HRL are the options framework (Sutton et al., 1999), the feudal framework (Dayan & Hinton, 1992), and the graph-based framework (Lee et al., 2022).

With **options**, a different policy is used to achieve each of the intermediate and final goals, which are all considered terminal for their respective policy. In this framework, the option-critic algorithm (Bacon et al., 2017) addresses a *skill chaining* concern related to ours, but it does so with separate option policies. As we are interested in learning the low-level agent as a single policy, we do not cover the options framework further.

In all other approaches, the low-level agent is a GC policy which learns to achieve any local goal from its current state. During inference, the GC agent is iteratively conditioned on each intermediate goal until it reaches the final goal. Below, we focus on the way the low-level policy is learned.

In **graph-based methods** (Huang, Liu, and Su, 2019; Lee, Kim, Jang, and Kim, 2022; Kim, Seo, Ahn, Son, and Shin, 2023), a GC policy is trained on single goals using DDPG (Silver et al., 2014), TD3 (Fujimoto et al., 2018), or SAC (Haarnoja et al., 2018), combined with HER (Andrychowicz et al., 2018).

Feudal approaches, such as HAC (Levy et al., 2019), also use DDPG +HER, while HRAC (Zhang et al., 2022) and HIRO (Nachum et al., 2018) use dense rewards without HER. In contrast, LEAP (Nasiriany et al., 2019) trains its low-level GC policy with TDM (Pong et al., 2018) where DDPG is used to optimize a policy that is additionally conditioned on the remaining time to reach its goal. The reward function $r(s, g, t) = -I[t = T_{max}]d(s, g)$, motivates the agent to get as close to the goal as possible within the available time.

In this work, we abstract away the differences between graph-based and feudal approaches by considering a generic planner that provides a sequence of intermediate goals given a final goal. In all these methods, the low-level policy treats each goal as if it were the only one without considering subsequent goals. However, when goals are defined as a subset of the state space, they can be

achieved in multiple configurations. In particular, when the agent reaches a goal that does not fully specify the corresponding state, nothing ensures that it is in a configuration that enables the next goal to be reached. This is the problem addressed in the next section.

2.4 Following a single sequence of goals

The DCIL-II algorithm (Chenu et al., 2023) is an imitation learning algorithm designed to deal with the case in which chaining two subsequent goals can be an issue. In DCIL-II, the agent learns a behavior from a single demonstration that is split into a unique sequence of goals $\tau_{\mathcal{G}} = \{g_i\}_{i \in [0, N_{goals}]}$. The problem is defined as an extended MDP $M_{seq} = \{S_{seq}, A, R_{seq}, P, \gamma, \mathcal{T}, \tau_{\mathcal{G}}\}$. The agent observes $(s_t, g_t, i_t) \in S_{seq} = S \times G \times \mathbb{N}$, where $g_t \in G$ is the current goal the agent is targeting and i_t the index of the goal in sequence $\tau_{\mathcal{G}}$. When the agent takes an action, it moves to a new state, where $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$ and g_{t+1}, i_{t+1} follows:

$$g_{t+1}, i_{t+1} = f_{DCIL}(s_t, g_t, i_t) = \begin{cases} \tau_{\mathcal{G}}[i + 1], i + 1 & \text{if } s_{t+1} \in S_{g_t}, \\ g_t, i_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As soon as the agent reaches a goal, it switches to the next one. The agent is rewarded each time it reaches its current goal with $R_{seq}(s_t, g_t, s_{t+1}) = \mathbb{1}[s_{t+1} \in S_{g_t}]$.

The low-level agent combines SAC +HER and maximizes the expected cumulative reward:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{s_0 \sim \rho_0 \\ g_{t+1}, i_{t+1} \sim f_{DCIL}(s_t, g_t, i_t)}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{seq}(s_t, g_t, s_{t+1}) \prod_{i=0}^t 1 - \mathbb{1}[s_i \in \mathcal{T}(\tau_{\mathcal{G}}[N_{goals}])] \right]. \quad (3)$$

The above formulation has two advantages. First, when the agent aims for its current goal, it also tries to reach it in a configuration that is valid for also reaching the rest of the sequence. Second, since the agent is also conditioned on the current goal index i , it can differentiate intermediate goals from terminal goals, which helps appropriately handling terminal conditions and using goal relabeling.

3 Methods

As the DCIL-II agent learns from a single demonstration, the learned policy is only capable of imitating a single trajectory, not reaching an arbitrary goal. In this paper, we propose extending DCIL-II to develop an agent capable of reaching any goal by following a sequence of intermediate goals. We do so by conditioning the policy on the current goal and another goal, which can be either the next goal or the final one. But this raises another issue: When reaching one of its goals, should the policy consider it as terminal or not? In general, intermediate goals should not be considered terminal whereas for final goals, they can be terminal or not depending on the environment.

Thus, the approach we describe in the next section maintains two key properties: it prepares the agent for future goals and it properly handle terminal conditions.

3.1 Following multiple sequences of goals

We propose a method to solve a GC MDP \mathcal{M}_{gc} (see Section 2.2) by combining a low-level GC-agent and a high-level planner. Since our focus is on the low level, we utilize an expert planner that provides a sequence of intermediate goals from the agent’s current state s to a given final goal fg . The low-level agent follows this sequence by iteratively reaching each intermediate goal up to the final one. The planner provides a function $next : S \times G \rightarrow G$, which determines the next intermediate goal the agent should reach based on its current state and its final goal.

As in DCIL-II, we encourage the agent to prepare for future goals while pursuing intermediate ones by rewarding each goal reached and integrating successive goals into the transition function. However, if we were to rely on the GC-MDP \mathcal{M}_{gc} , where the agent is conditioned only on its current

state and goal, the transition $(s_t, bg_t) \rightarrow (s_{t+1}, bg_{t+1})$ would contain a transition between goals that depends on an unobserved final goal, making the process a Partially Observable Markov Decision Process. In DCIL-II, the problem of non-Markovian goal transitions was resolved by adding the ID of the current goal to the observation. In the multi-goal case, ensuring that goal transitions remain Markovian requires including the final goal in the observation: $(s_t, bg_t, fg) \rightarrow (s_{t+1}, bg_{t+1}, fg)$. In this setup, the next goal bg_{t+1} can be implicitly determined from the observation, as shown in (4).

In order to properly formalize this process, we propose the following MDP formulation: $\mathcal{M}_{gseq} = (S_{gseq}, A, R_{gseq}, P, \gamma, \mathcal{T})$. At the beginning of the episode, the planner computes the sequence of intermediate goals up to the final goal fg . At each step, the agent observes $(s_t, bg_t, fg) \in S_{gseq} = S \times G \times G$ which is composed of the state s_t , a behavioral goal bg_t that the agent must reach, and the final goal fg which stays fixed during the episode. When the agent takes an action, it moves to a new state, where $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot | s_t, a_t)$ and bg_{t+1} follows:

$$bg_{t+1} = f_{gseq}(s_t, bg_t, fg) = \begin{cases} next(s_{t+1}, fg) & \text{if } s_{t+1} \in S_{bg_t}, \\ bg_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

The reward function is defined as $R_{gseq}(s_t, bg_t, s_{t+1}) = \mathbf{1}[s_{t+1} \in S_{bg_t}]$ so that the agent is rewarded for each behavioral goal reached during the trajectory. Finally, $\mathcal{T}(fg)$ is the set of terminal state according to the current goal fg . The objective is to find a policy that maximizes the classic expected cumulative reward:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{s_0 \sim \rho_0 \\ fg \sim P(fg) \\ bg_{t+1} \sim f_{gseq}(s_t, bg_t, fg)}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{gseq}(s_t, bg_t, s_{t+1}) \prod_{i=0}^t \mathbf{1} - \mathbf{1}[s_i \in \mathcal{T}(fg)] \right]. \quad (5)$$

Based on this formulation, we can directly use TD3 to learn a policy. The advantages of this formulation are the following. First, the agent is rewarded for chaining all goals of the trajectory, not only for reaching its current goal. Second, it enables proper handling of terminal states, as we can differentiate intermediate and final goals.

\mathcal{M}_{gseq} -Relabeling: Since the agent is conditioned on two goals, each of them can be relabeled. Given a sample $(s_t, bg_t, fg, s_{t+1}, bg_{t+1})$, we can relabel $bg_t \rightarrow ag_{k_1}$ and $fg \rightarrow ag_{k_2}$ where ag_t represents the achieved goal at step t and $t < k_1 < k_2 < t_{max}$.

However, \mathcal{M}_{gseq} was made to also integrate successive goals in the transition dynamic: Once the current goal is reached, the next goal must be updated to be the one the planner would have selected next to reach the final goal. When bg_t and fg are relabeled, bg_{t+1} is updated according to (4). Skipping this step would cause the agent to learn from transitions between goals that violate the Markov property. However, this re-planning step for each relabeled transitions can be prohibitively costly if paths cannot be precomputed and cached.

The full pseudocode for this algorithm is provided in Appendix A. In the next section, we introduce a computationally more efficient method that does not require planning during relabeling.

3.2 Two-goal sequence following: formalization

In feudal methods, the low-level agents only optimize the way they reach the next goal without taking the sequence into account. In Section 3.1, we proposed a method to optimize the way the agent reaches all goals in the sequence. Now we propose an intermediate formulation: the agent only optimizes the way it reaches a set of two goals. Despite the fact that the agent ignores the planner during its policy and critic updates, it can still be used to traverse any sequence of goals, by iteratively conditioning the policy on the upcoming two goals within a planner-provided sequence of goals.

We use the following MDP to formalize this objective: $M_{2G} = \{S_{2G}, A, R_{2G}, P, \gamma, \mathcal{T}\}$. At each step, the agent observes $(s_t, bg_t, fg) \in S_{2G} = S \times G \times G$ where s is the current state of the

agent, bg_t is the first goal that the agent must reach and fg is the second. In practice, those goals correspond to the first two goals of a sequence provided by the planner. When the agent takes an action, it moves to a new state $s_{t+1} \sim P(\cdot|s_t, a_t)$, the final goal fg_t stays fixed and bg_{t+1} follows:

$$bg_{t+1} = f_{2G}(s_t, bg_t, fg) = \begin{cases} fg & \text{if } s_{t+1} \in S_{bg_t}, \\ bg_t & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

The agent is rewarded for reaching bg_t though $R_{2G}(s_t, bg_t, s_{t+1}) = \mathbb{1}[s_{t+1} \in S_{bg_t}]$. In this simplified goal-switching dynamic, the agent must learn how to always be able to reach a first goal in a configuration compatible with reaching the second one. Finally, $\mathcal{T}(fg)$ is the set of terminal state according to the final goal fg . This formulation being a special case of an MDP, the objective is still to find a policy that maximizes the expected cumulative reward:

$$\mathbb{E}_{\substack{s_0 \sim \rho_0 \\ fg \sim P(fg) \\ bg_{t+1} \sim f_{2G}(s_t, bg_t, fg)}} \left[\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R_{2G}(s_t, bg_t, s_{t+1}) \prod_{i=0}^t 1 - \mathbb{1}[s_i \in \mathcal{T}(fg)] \right]. \quad (7)$$

M_{2g} -Relabeling Given a sample $(s_t, bg_t, fg, s_{t+1}, bg_{t+1})$, we can relabel $bg_t \rightarrow ag_{k_1}$ and $fg_t \rightarrow ag_{k_2}$ where ag_t represents the goal achieved at state time step t and $t < k_1 < k_2 < t_{max}$.

Similarly to the previous example, we must ensure that the goal switching mechanism is valid within M_{2GC} , so that bg_{t+1} is updated following (6). This method requires less computation during the update steps while still being less myopic than an agent conditioned on a single goal. However, in complex cases, only preparing for the two next goals may be insufficient.

The full pseudocode for this algorithm is provided in Appendix A.

4 Experiments

Our experimental study is designed to compare agents that prepare for the next or the final goals together with myopic agents that do not prepare at all and non-sequential agents which ignore intermediate goals. In particular, we define three low-dimensional environments with various goal chaining difficulties and various terminal conditions to highlight the pros and cons of the different approaches. We compare their success rate and time-to-goal, as considering an intermediate goal as terminal or not can have a large effect on the way the agent reaches goals.

4.1 Environments




Figure 1: The environments used in our experiments. In *Dubins Hallway*, the agent is evaluated on five goals, starting in the main corridor and aiming for each goal shown as a red circle. In *GC-Cartpole*, the agent is evaluated on the two goals farthest from the center, shown as red rectangles. In *PointMaze: Serp3*, the agent, shown as a green ball, is evaluated only on the hardest goal.

Dubins Hallway is a navigation task where the agent controls a car in a 2D maze. The state $s = \{x, y, \cos(\theta), \sin(\theta)\}$ includes the position and orientation of the agent. Each goal g is defined as a position (x, y) and is considered reached if the agent is within a ball of radius 0.1 centered at that position. The agent moves forward at a fixed speed at each step, the action controls the variation of

the orientation $\dot{\theta}$ for the agent. During a training episode, both the agent’s initial position and the goal are randomly sampled within the maze boundaries. If the agent hits a wall, it stays stuck until the episode ends. The state is only terminal when the agent reaches the goal. A key feature of this environment is that, when the agent is in the central hallway, it should not prepare for the next goals in the same way depending on whether the final goal is on the left- or right-hand side. In contrast, the velocity of the agent being constant, the time-to-goal does not vary much in this environment, so we do not present results on this aspect.

In **Goal-Conditioned Cartpole**, the agent must reach a given position while balancing a pole. The state $s = (\dot{x}, \theta, \dot{\theta})$ contains velocity \dot{x} , angle θ , and angular velocity $\dot{\theta}$. As explained in more details in Appendix C, the agent’s goal is the difference between its current position x and a fixed target position x_{dg} . The goal is reached once $\|x - x_{dg}\| < 0.05$. Actions are continuous values in $[-1, 1]$ proportional to the force applied to the cart. During a training episode, the agent targets a random uniform goal in the range $[-5, 5]$. A state is terminal when θ leaves the $[-0.12^\circ, 0.12^\circ]$ interval. As reaching a goal is not terminal, the agent must learn to reach its target position and stay there while keeping the pole balanced.

PointMaze Serp3 (de Lazcano et al., 2024) is a navigation task where the agent controls a ball in a 2D maze. The state $s = \{x, y, \dot{x}, \dot{y}\}$ includes the position and velocity of the agent. Each goal g is defined as a (x, y) position and is considered reached if the agent is within a ball of radius 0.45 centered at that position. The action represents the linear force exerted on the ball in the x and y directions. In (de Lazcano et al., 2024), the agent’s velocity was capped; we have removed this constraint. During a training episode, both the agent’s initial position and the goal are randomly sampled within the maze boundaries. The state is only terminal when the agent reaches the goal. As shown in Figure 1, the agent is only evaluated on the farthest goal.

4.2 Compared agents

We compare the following methods:

- TD3+HER: An agent only conditioned on the final goal,
- TD3+HER+SEQ: An agent conditioned iteratively on the successive goals provided by the expert planner. This is the formulation adopted by most feudal and graph-based approaches (see Section 2.3),
- M_{gseq} -TD3: the agent presented in Section 3.1,
- M_{2g} -TD3: the agent presented in Section 3.2.

All these agents rely on TD3+HER with the same hyper-parameters (see Appendix D).

4.3 Results in Dubins Hallway

In this section, we evaluate all methods in *Dubins Hallway*.

Figure 2(a) presents the mean success ratio across the five goals depicted in Figure 1(a). TD3+HER+SEQ plateaus at 20%, indicating that it has failed to achieve any challenging goal. TD3+HER does not fully converge, but it manages to reach slightly more than half of the evaluation goals. In contrast, our two formulations, M_{2g} -TD3 and M_{gseq} -TD3, successfully reach all goals.

To further analyze the behavior of each algorithm, Figure 2(b,c) presents a representative trajectory and the corresponding value function over time for each method. The value function is estimated as $V(s_t) \simeq Q(s_t, \pi(a|s))$. In the selected run, TD3+HER exhibits an almost flat value function, indicating that it has failed to back-propagate rewards effectively. TD3+HER+SEQ focuses solely on its next goal, and its value increases toward 1 when the goal appears attainable. However, when it reaches the second goal in a configuration where it is too late to turn, the value drops sharply to 0. The value profile of M_{2g} -TD3 is often above 1, suggesting that it evaluates the policy as capable




Figure 2: **(a)** Comparison of Success Rate for each methods. Evaluation is performed 10 times every 2K steps, with results reported as the mean 95% confidence interval over 10 seeds. **(b)**: Set of trajectories of trained agents on *Dubins Hallway*. **(c)**: Value function over episodes matching trajectories in (b). Our sequential approaches outperform the myopic and non-sequential agents. The M_{gseq} -TD3 agent struggles to propagate value over full episodes.

of reaching both its current and next goals. At the end of the trajectory, its value reaches 1, which corresponds to the final reward before transitioning to a terminal state. M_{gseq} -TD3 also manages to turn; however, its value profile does not align with the optimal value function of \mathcal{M}_{gseq} . An optimal agent would receive rewards for all future goals, leading to a staircase-like decrease in the value function. Instead, we observe that value updates have only propagated from the next two goals or, at best, the next three goals, which suggests a weakness of M_{gseq} -TD3 in front of long range value propagation.

4.4 Results in Cartpole & PointMaze



Figure 3: **(a) Top**: Comparison of success rates for each method. Evaluation is performed 10 times every 2K steps, with results reported as the mean and 95% confidence interval over 10 runs. For all runs, metrics are smoothed using a moving average with a window size of 5 to increase readability. **(a) Bottom**: Time required to reach the goal state, considering only successful trajectories for computing the mean and confidence interval. **(b)** A set of trajectories generated by trained agents on *PointMaze: Serp3*. Again, M_{2g} -TD3 seems to outperform M_{gseq} -TD3.

In *GC-Cartpole*, all methods successfully achieve the evaluation goals in most cases (see Figure 3(a)). However, TD3+HER+SEQ takes longer to reach the evaluation goal. As the state is never terminal for reaching a goal, the optimal behavior of TD3+HER+SEQ decelerates before reaching each goal, to ensure it could stop at equilibrium there and receive a reward of +1 for all subsequent steps. In contrast, the optimization process for both M_{2g} -TD3 and M_{gseq} -TD3 is structured such that reaching an intermediate goal yields only a +1 reward and triggers a subsequent goal transition. As a result, these methods favors passing through each intermediate goal without slowing down, enabling them to achieve a speed similar to TD3, which directly targets the final goal.

In *PointMaze: Serp3*, iteratively conditioning the agent on intermediate goals is very efficient, as shown in Figure 3(a). In particular, TD3, which is only conditioned on the final goal, fails to reach distant goals. TD3+HER+SEQ completes long sequence of goals, but the agent does so in a sub-optimal way, moving too quickly and bouncing off walls as shown in Figure 3(b). This behavior results from its MDP formulation, in which the agent always tries to reach the next goal as quickly as possible. M_{2g} -TD3, on the other hand, prepares for the next two goals and achieves both the fastest speed and stability. M_{gseq} -TD3 learns at a slower rate, and does not reach the same success rate as the other methods following sequence of goals. Again, slow value propagation might be the issue.

4.5 Ablations

Across all previously used environments, we assess the importance of relabeling both the current and final goals in M_{2g} -TD3 and M_{gseq} -TD3.




Figure 4: Ablation study: Success rate for all previous environments. Evaluation is performed 10 times every 2K steps, with results reported as the mean and 95% confidence interval over 10 runs. For all runs, metrics are smoothed using a moving average with a window size of 5 to increase readability. **Top:** Ablation study for M_{2g} -TD3, where the blue and red curves represent the removal of the first and second relabeling mechanisms, respectively. **Bottom:** Ablation study for M_{gseq} -TD3, where the blue and red curves correspond to the removal of the first and final goal relabeling mechanisms, respectively.

As shown in Figure 4, in *PointMaze: Serp3*, omitting to relabel the current goal has minimal impact. This is because the graph guiding the agent is dense (as shown in Figure 5) and the threshold required

to reach a goal is large, thus the task reward cannot be considered sparse. However, in all other environments, excluding current goal relabeling significantly affects performance. In M_{2g} -TD3, while omitting final goal relabeling also impacts performance, its effect is less pronounced. For M_{gseq} -TD3 omitting the final goal relabeling substantially reduces performances for *GC-Cartpole* and *PointMaze: Serp3*.

4.6 General discussion

Our experimental results indicate that, beyond outperforming the myopic and the non-sequential agents, M_{2g} -TD3 performs better than M_{gseq} -TD3. Indeed, agents trained on M_{2G} learned faster and with greater stability than agents trained on M_{seq} , which struggle to learn an optimal policy. Besides, M_{gseq} -TD3 is more sensitive to the ablation of HER. A first explanation for this better performance of M_{2g} -TD3 could be that M_{2g} is defined on a shorter temporal horizon, facilitating value propagation.

Furthermore, while both M_{2g} -TD3 and M_{gseq} -TD3 condition on a single state and two goals, the M_{gseq} -TD3 variant faces much higher diversity because its final goal can be any goal in the goal space. In contrast, in M_{2g} -TD3, the final goal corresponds to the next goal on the path provided by the planner. This high diversity forces M_{gseq} -TD3 to generalize over a wider set of inputs, which makes learning more difficult.

However, M_{2g} -TD3 benefits from a less global information. As a consequence, its performance may degrade in more complex environments. In such cases, an agent might reach an initial goal in a valid configuration to reach the immediate next goal, yet that configuration may not be compatible with reaching subsequent goals. We keep the evaluation of M_{2g} -TD3 and M_{gseq} -TD3 in more difficult environments for future work.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we have addressed the problem of following diverse sequences of low-dimensional goals when a planner is provided. We have shown that navigating goal sequences by considering only the next goal can lead to failure cases. We proposed the M_{seq} MDP framework, in which we formalize goal transitions and terminal states to ensure the objective is to reach all goals in the sequence. Additionally, we proposed the M_{2g} MDP, where the objective is solely to reach the next two goals in the sequence. Through navigation and pole-balancing experiments, we have shown that agents trained with M_{2g} were more stable and sample-efficient. One of the main limitations of this work is the use of a fixed planner. While it is possible to access one through expert knowledge, this element is often learned. Since successive goals are integrated into the transition function of our MDP, having a planner that evolves over time would cause the low-level MDP on which the GC agents are trained to change as well, making the learning process more challenging.

Acknowledgments

References

- Marcin Andrychowicz, Filip Wolski, Alex Ray, Jonas Schneider, Rachel Fong, Peter Welinder, Bob McGrew, Josh Tobin, Pieter Abbeel, and Wojciech Zaremba. Hindsight Experience Replay, February 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1707.01495>. arXiv:1707.01495 [cs].
- Pierre-Luc Bacon, Jean Harb, and Doina Precup. The option-critic architecture. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-First AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence, AAAI'17*, pp. 1726–1734, San Francisco, California, USA, February 2017. AAAI Press.
- Alexandre Chenu, Olivier Serris, Olivier Sigaud, and Nicolas Perrin-Gilbert. Leveraging Sequen-
tiality in Reinforcement Learning from a Single Demonstration, April 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.04786>. arXiv:2211.04786 [cs].

- Peter Dayan and Geoffrey E Hinton. Feudal reinforcement learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 5, 1992.
- Rodrigo de Lazcano, Kallinteris Andreas, Jun Jet Tai, Seungjae Ryan Lee, and Jordan Terry. Gymnasium robotics, 2024. URL <http://github.com/Farama-Foundation/Gymnasium-Robotics>.
- Benjamin Eysenbach, Ruslan Salakhutdinov, and Sergey Levine. Search on the Replay Buffer: Bridging Planning and Reinforcement Learning, June 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1906.05253>. arXiv:1906.05253 [cs].
- Scott Fujimoto, Herke Hoof, and David Meger. Addressing Function Approximation Error in Actor-Critic Methods. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1587–1596. PMLR, July 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/fujimoto18a.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- Tuomas Haarnoja, Aurick Zhou, Pieter Abbeel, and Sergey Levine. Soft Actor-Critic: Off-Policy Maximum Entropy Deep Reinforcement Learning with a Stochastic Actor. In *Proceedings of the 35th International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1861–1870. PMLR, July 2018. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v80/haarnoja18b.html>. ISSN: 2640-3498.
- Zhiao Huang, Fangchen Liu, and Hao Su. Mapping State Space using Landmarks for Universal Goal Reaching, August 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1908.05451>. arXiv:1908.05451 [cs, stat].
- Junsu Kim, Younggyo Seo, Sungsoo Ahn, Kyunghwan Son, and Jinwoo Shin. Imitating Graph-Based Planning with Goal-Conditioned Policies, March 2023. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2303.11166>. arXiv:2303.11166 [cs].
- Seungjae Lee, Jigang Kim, Inkyu Jang, and H Jin Kim. Dhrl: a graph-based approach for long-horizon and sparse hierarchical reinforcement learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:13668–13678, 2022.
- Andrew Levy, George Konidaris, Robert Platt, and Kate Saenko. Learning multi-level hierarchies with hindsight. In *Proceedings of International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2019.
- Timothy P Lillicrap, Jonathan J Hunt, Alexander Pritzel, Nicolas Heess, Tom Erez, Yuval Tassa, David Silver, and Daan Wierstra. Continuous control with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1509.02971*, 2015.
- Ofir Nachum, Shixiang Gu, Honglak Lee, and Sergey Levine. Data-Efficient Hierarchical Reinforcement Learning, October 2018. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1805.08296>. arXiv:1805.08296 [cs, stat].
- Soroush Nasiriany, Vitchyr H. Pong, Steven Lin, and Sergey Levine. Planning with Goal-Conditioned Policies, November 2019. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/1911.08453>. arXiv:1911.08453 [cs, stat].
- Vitchyr Pong, Shixiang Gu, Murtaza Dalal, and Sergey Levine. Temporal difference models: Model-free deep rl for model-based control. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2018.
- Tom Schaul, Daniel Horgan, Karol Gregor, and David Silver. Universal Value Function Approximators. In *Proceedings of the 32nd International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 1312–1320. PMLR, June 2015. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v37/schaul15.html>. ISSN: 1938-7228.

David Silver, Guy Lever, Nicolas Heess, Thomas Degris, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Deterministic Policy Gradient Algorithms. In *Proceedings of the 31st International Conference on Machine Learning*, pp. 387–395. PMLR, January 2014. URL <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v32/silver14.html>. ISSN: 1938-7228.

Richard S Sutton, Doina Precup, and Satinder Singh. Between mdps and semi-mdps: A framework for temporal abstraction in reinforcement learning. *Artificial intelligence*, 112(1-2):181–211, 1999.

Tianren Zhang, Shangqi Guo, Tian Tan, Xiaolin Hu, and Feng Chen. Adjacency constraint for efficient hierarchical reinforcement learning, August 2022. URL <http://arxiv.org/abs/2111.00213>. arXiv:2111.00213 [cs].

Supplementary Materials

The following content was not necessarily subject to peer review.

A Pseudo-code

Algorithm 1 provides the pseudocode for the main loop, illustrating how M_{2g} -TD3 and M_{gseq} -TD3 operate within the environment using a planner. Additionally, Algorithm 2 outlines the relabeling mechanism for both methods.

Algorithm 1 Main Loop

```

Require:  $Q, \pi, \text{planner}, \text{env}$ 
 $RB \leftarrow []$ 
for  $N = 1 : N_{\text{episodes}}$  do
   $s, \text{env}_g \leftarrow \text{env.reset}()$ 
   $\text{path} \leftarrow [g_1, g_2, \dots, \text{env}_g] \leftarrow \text{planner.path}(s, \text{env}_g)$ 
   $bg \leftarrow \text{path}[0]$ 
  if  $\text{algo} = \mathcal{M}_{2g}$  then
     $fg \leftarrow \text{path}[1]$ 
  end if
  if  $\text{algo} = \mathcal{M}_{gseq}$  then
     $fg \leftarrow \text{env}_g$ 
  end if
   $\text{done} \leftarrow \text{false}$ 
  while not done do
     $a \leftarrow \pi(a|s, bg, fg)$ 
     $s', r, \text{term}, \text{trunc} \leftarrow \text{env.step}(a)$ 
    if  $s' \in bg$  then
       $\text{path} \leftarrow [g_1, g_2, \dots, \text{env}_g] \leftarrow \text{planner.path}(s, \text{env}_g)$ 
       $bg' \leftarrow \text{path}[0]$ 
      if  $\text{algo} = \mathcal{M}_{2g}$  then
         $fg \leftarrow \text{path}[1]$ 
      end if
    end if
     $RB \leftarrow RB + (s, a, r, bg, fg, s', bg', \text{term})$ 
     $s, bg = s', bg'$ 
     $Q, \pi \leftarrow \text{Learn\_Step}(\pi, Q, RB, \text{next}, \text{env.terminal\_func})$ 
     $\text{done} \leftarrow \text{term} \vee \text{trunc}$ 
  end while
end for

```

B Expert graph

The expert planner finds the shortest path using handcrafted graphs shown in Figure 5.




Figure 5: For each environment, graph used to implement the expert planner.

Algorithm 2 Learn_Step

Require: $Q, \pi, RB, \text{planner}, \text{terminal_func}$

$\tau \leftarrow$ Sample trajectory from RB

$ag[] \leftarrow \tau$ ▷ Get all achieved goal in the trajectory

$s_t, a_t, bg_t, r_t, fg, s_{t+1}, bg_{t+1}, term_t \leftarrow$ Sample from τ

$relabel \leftarrow (\text{random}(0.0, 1.0) < 0.8)$

if $relabel$ **then**

$k_2 \sim \text{random}(t, t_{max})$

$fg \leftarrow ag_{k_2}$

$k_1 \sim \text{random}(t, k_2)$

$bg_t \leftarrow ag_{k_1}$

end if

if $s_{t+1} \in bg_t$ **then**

if $algo = \mathcal{M}_{2g}$ **then** $bg_{t+1} \leftarrow fg$

end if

if $algo = \mathcal{M}_{gseq}$ **then** $bg_{t+1} \leftarrow \text{planner.next}(s_t, fg)$

end if

end if

$r_t \leftarrow 1$ **if** $s_{t+1} \in bg_t$ **else** 0

$term_t \leftarrow \text{terminal_func}(s_t, a_t, s_{t+1}, fg)$

$\text{transition} = s_t, a_t, bg_t, r_t, s_{t+1}, bg_{t+1}, fg, term_t$

$\pi, Q \leftarrow \text{TD3_Update}(\text{transition}, \pi, Q)$

C Absolute and relative goals

Absolute goals are goals that correspond to absolute positions in the goal space, while relative goals are goals whose positions are relative to the agent.

The relative goal formulation is better suited in *GC-Cartpole*. Indeed, with an absolute goal formulation, going from $x = -2$ to $x = 0$ and from $x = 8$ to $x = 10$ are two different things, whereas with a relative goal formulation, the agent must only learn how to go to $x_{rel} = 2$ to solve both cases at once.

D Hyper-parameters

The hyper-parameters used for each environment are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Hyper-parameters used for TD3

Hyper-parameters	<i>Dubins Hallway</i>	<i>PointMaze: Serp3</i>	<i>GC- Cartpole</i>
Random actions	5K	5K	5K
Critic hidden size	[256, 256]	[256, 256]	[256, 256]
Policy hidden size	[256, 256]	[256, 256]	[256, 256]
Activation functions	ReLU	ReLU	ReLU
Batch size	256	256	256
Discount factor	0.95	0.99	0.99
Critic lr	1×10^{-3}	1×10^{-3}	1×10^{-3}
Policy lr	1×10^{-3}	1×10^{-4}	1×10^{-4}
HER Relabel	80%	80%	80%