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Abstract

Can an autonomous agent navigate in a new environment without building an explicit map?

For the task of PointGoal navigation (‘Go to $\Delta x$, $\Delta y$’) under idealized settings (no RGB-D and actuation noise, perfect GPS+Compass), the answer is a clear ‘yes’ – mapless neural models composed of task-agnostic components (CNNs and RNNs) trained with large-scale reinforcement learning achieve 100% Success on a standard dataset (Gibson [24]). However, for PointNav in a realistic setting (RGB-D and actuation noise, no GPS+Compass), this is an open question; one we tackle in this paper. The strongest published result for this task is 71.7% Success [39].

First, we identify the main (perhaps, only) cause of the drop in performance: absence of GPS+Compass. An agent with perfect GPS+Compass faced with RGB-D sensing and actuation noise achieves 99.8% Success (Gibson-v2 val). This suggests that (to paraphrase a meme) robust visual odometry is all we need for realistic PointNav; if we can achieve that, we can ignore the sensing and actuation noise.

With that as our operating hypothesis, we scale dataset size, model size, and develop human-annotation-free data-augmentation techniques to train neural models for visual odometry. We advance state of the art on the Habitat Realistic PointNav Challenge – SPL by 40% (relative), 53 to 74, and Success by 31% (relative), 71 to 94. While our approach does not saturate or ‘solve’ this dataset, this strong improvement combined with promising zero-shot sim2real transfer (to a LoCoBot robot) provides evidence consistent with the hypothesis that explicit mapping may not be necessary for navigation, even in a realistic setting.

1. Introduction

The ability to navigate in a novel environment solely from egocentric perception is an essential requirement for building intelligent and helpful robots. To make progress on this long-term vision, the task of PointGoal navigation (PointNav) [1], i.e. asking a robot to ‘go to $(\Delta x, \Delta y)$’ relative to its starting location, has become a core task.

We are interested in the question – can an agent navigate in a new environment without building an explicit map?2

This question is of deep scientific interest. Decades of research in intelligent animal navigation show that various animals build ‘cognitive maps’ [21, 31] of their environment. For decades, robotics research has treated explicit mapping and localization [2, 20, 27, 30] as integral components in a navigation robot. There are many good reasons to develop mapping technology, but we simply don’t know whether mapping is necessary for navigation. One way to resolve this is to refute the contrapositive – if we demonstrate a map-less approach that can navigate, that will imply that explicit mapping is not necessary for successful navigation.

Under idealized settings – perfect localization via a noise-free GPS+Compass sensor, egocentric sensing via

---

2We distinguish an explicit mapping mechanism from implicit spatial understanding that may emerge from building task-specific end-to-end-learned representations. The former is designed, the latter is emergent.
a noise-free RGB-D sensor, and absence of any actuation noise – map-less navigation models composed of task-agnostic neural components (CNNs and RNNs) trained with large-scale reinforcement learning achieve 100% Success [24, 33] on a standard dataset (Gibson [35]). However, under realistic settings – where the agent must self-localize (i.e. no GPS+Compass sensor), and must contend with RGB-D sensing noise and actuation noise – this is an open question; one we tackle in this paper. The strongest published result for this task is 71.7% Success [39].

To make systematic progress, we first study a simpler version of the realistic setting where the agent is given ground-truth GPS+Compass, isolating localization difficulties from the ability to deal with noisy perception and control. While prior work in this setting [39] reported fairly high success rate (97%), we significantly sharpen this and demonstrate near-perfect performance again (99.8% Success rate on Gibson val split). Our results leave no room for doubt and confirm that the only performance-limiting factor is the agent’s ability to self-localize.

With this limiting-factor identified, we study the localization, or visual odometry (VO) module. It takes as input two successive observations $O_{t-1}$ and $O_t$ and outputs the relative pose change $(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z, \Delta \theta)$, that is then used to update the location of the goal relative to the robot, which is consumed by the navigation policy.

We present a series of broadly-applicable modifications that improve agent navigation performance considerably, from 64% Success/52% SPL to 96% Success/77% SPL on the Habitat Challenge 2021 setting. These modifications are all motivated by the need for robust visual odometry in service of navigation, specifically:

1. **Action conditioning via action embeddings.** It is important to recognize that our goal is not visual odometry in isolation but in the context of navigation. Specifically, we know what action (move_forward 0.25m, turn_left 30° or turn_right 30°) was executed and should use this information; this observation is not new and has been made in prior work [39]. We find that converting a 1-hot representation of the actions into continuous embeddings and concatenating them to the last two fully-connected layers in the VO network significantly improves performance by +8 Success/+5 SPL.

2. **Training-time data augmentation.** Data augmentation is one of the most successful methods for regularizing learning techniques [17, 37, 38]. We construct navigation- and odometry-specific augmentations – e.g. when an agent rotates in-place to produce observations $O_{t-1}$ and $O_t$, we can create a new training image that relates $O_t$ and $O_{t-1}$ via the inverse pose and turning action. We also propose a new augmentation called Flip (described in Sec. 4.2). Cumulatively, they improve performance by +2 Success/+1 SPL.

3. **Test-time data augmentation for ensembling.** To improve robustness we perform all augmentations at test-time and aggregate predictions across all combinations. This improves performance by +3 Success/+3 SPL.

4. **Increased dataset size and model size.** Finally, we study the effects of increased dataset size from 500k to 1.5M observation pairs (+8 Success/+7 SPL), larger model size (+3 Success/+3 SPL), and a further dataset increase from 1.5M to 5M (+8 Success/+6 SPL).

2. Preliminaries: PointGoal Navigation

In PointNav (illustrated in Fig. 1), an agent is initialized in previously unseen environment and is tasked to reach the goal specified relative to its starting location. The action space is discrete and consists of four types of actions: stop (to end the episode), move_forward by 0.25m, turn_left and turn_right by angle $\alpha^\circ$.

The agent is evaluated via three primary metrics. 1) Success, $S_i$, where an episode $i$ is considered successful if the agent issues the stop command within 0.36m (2×agent radius) of the goal. 2) Success weight by (inverse normalized) Path Length (SPL) [1], where success is weighted by the efficiency of the agent’s path. Formally, for episode $i$, let $S_i$ be a binary indicator of success, $p_i$ be the length of the agent’s path, and $l_i$ be the length of the shortest path (geodesic distance), then for $N$ episodes

$$\text{SPL} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} S_i \cdot \frac{l_i}{\max(p_i, l_i)}. \quad (1)$$

3) SoftSPL [9], where binary success is replaced by progress towards goal. Formally, for episode $i$, let $d_{0_i}$ be the initial distance to goal and $d_{T_i}$ be the distance to goal at the end of the episode (on both successes and failures), then

$$\text{SoftSPL} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(1 - \frac{d_{T_i}}{d_{0_i}} \right) \left(\frac{l_i}{\max(p_i, l_i)}\right). \quad (2)$$

**Embodyment.** Driven by experiments in reality the agent’s specification matches the LoCoBot’s specification. The agent is equipped with an RGB-D camera mounted at a height of 0.88m and tilted $-20^\circ$ (angled downwards towards the floor; pitch or camera azimuth angle). Camera’s resolution is 360 × 640 pixels with 70° horizontal field of view. Base radius is 0.18m.

2.1. PointNav-v1: Idealized (Noise-less) Setting

In idealized setting (named ‘v1’), the agent was equipped with noise-free RGB-D camera, given access to ground-truth localization (via an GPS+Compass sensor), and movement was deterministic/noise-free (meaning turn_right 10° always turned the agent exactly 10°).

In PointNav-v1 $\alpha = 10^\circ$, in PointNav-v2 $\alpha = 30^\circ$.

LoCoBot is a low-cost mobile manipulator suitable for both navigation and manipulation (http://www.LoCoBot.org).
The agent could also ‘slide’ along walls – a commonplace behavior in video games that improves human control but was later found to degrade sim-to-real performance [14].

State-of-the-art approaches for this task rely on large-scale reinforcement learning and have begun to saturate the available datasets: e.g. Wijmans et al. [33] reported 99% Success/94% SPL on Gibson test, Ramakrishnan et al. [24] sharpened this result to 100% Success/94% SPL on Gibson test, 94% Success/83 SPL on MP3D test, and 99% Success/92% SPL on HM3D test. Overall, PointNav-v1 is largely considered saturated or ‘solved’.

2.2. PointNav-v2: Realistic (Noisy) Setting

Noiseless sensing and actuation simply do not exist. Different lighting conditions, surface properties (such as friction), and other sources of error cause actuation and sensing noise that introduce significant drift over a long trajectory. Moreover, high-precision localization in indoor environments cannot be assumed in realistic settings.

The so-called ‘realistic’ (or v2) setting of PointNav addresses these shortcomings of the v1 by introducing actuation noise (modeled by benchmarking the LoCoBot robot [19]), removing GPS+Compass, and adding noise to the RGB-D camera. To simulate real-world camera RGB and Depth, noise models from [8] were used (Gaussian noise model for RGB and Redwood noise model for Depth).

Initial attempts to directly apply PointNav-v1 techniques to PointNav-v2 were largely unsuccessful (~5% Success [9]). More recent methods [9, 39] train a navigation policy with access to ground-truth localization and then replace ground-truth localization with estimated localization by integrating the egomotion estimates from a visual odometry module. The strongest published result for this task is 71.7% Success and 53% SPL [39], indicating that navigation with noisy actuation and sensing continues to be an open frontier for research.

3. Navigation Policy

Our pipeline consists of two components: a navigation policy (nav-policy) that gives observations $O_t$ at time step $t$ and a visual odometry (VO) module that gives a consecutive set of observations $(O_{t-1}, O_t)$ estimates relative pose change (egomotion) that is further used to update the goal coordinates after each step (see Fig. 2). This decoupling of roles is a natural choice. It builds upon the results in the idealized setting that has been used in prior work and is used in the previous state of the art [9, 39]. In this section we describe our navigation policy and show that it is capable of near-perfect navigation with noisy actuations and noisy RGB-D sensing when given ground-truth localization, demonstrating that visual odometry is the bottleneck. We describe the details of our visual odometry module in the next section (Sec. 4). We use the Habitat platform [25] to simulate navigation experiments.

![Figure 2. Agent architecture for Realistic PointGoal navigation consisting of an RNN-based RL navigation policy and CNN-based visual odometry (VO) module. Inputs are $g_{t-1}$ - goal coordinates wrt. previous pose, $a_{t-1}$ - previous action, $O_{t-1}$ - observations at previous timestep, and $O_t$ - current observations. First, VO predicts the change between $t-1$ and $t$ and then update the goal to be wrt. current pose. The updated goal location is given to the navigation policy along with $O_t$ to predict the next action $a_t$. The initial goal location estimate is equal to ground truth goal location (as per the task specification).](image-url)
Wijmans et al.’s reward structure to train the policy.

For an episode $i$, the agent receives a ‘terminal’ reward of $r_T = 2.5 \cdot \text{Success}_i$ ($r_T = 2.5 \cdot \text{SPL}_i$ in later experiments) that encourages it to stop at the correct location (and take an efficient path), and a shaped reward $r_i(a_i, s_i) = -\Delta_{\text{geo\_dist}} - 0.01$, that encourages it to take steps towards the goal (while being efficient), where $\Delta_{\text{geo\_dist}}$ is the change in geodesic distance to the goal by performing action $a_i$ in state $s_i$. Note that reward is not available at test-time. We train with 64 GPUs (workers). Throughout our experiment, we never discarded the weights of a trained navigation policy. We trained for 2.5 billion steps on Gibson 4+, then for another 2.5 billion steps on Gibson 0+, and finally for another 2.5 billion steps on Gibson 0+ with the terminal reward weighted by SPL. We started each stage with the best (by val performance) agent from the previous stage.

### 3.3. Ground-Truth Localization Performance

To isolate the performance of the navigation policy from the visual odometry module, we examine the performance of our agent with access to ground-truth GPS+Compass. On the Gibson val dataset, our agent achieves 99.8% Success and 80% SPL in the PointNav-v2 setting. This result shows that near-perfect success, even with noisy observations and actuations, is achievable without building an explicit map.

To answer if near-perfect SPL is also achievable, we need a tight upper-bound on SPL in the realistic setting. Recall that in the realistic setting actuations are noisy. Thus, even an oracle agent with full knowledge of the environment may not be able to follow the shortest path and achieve 100% SPL. This particular problem is exacerbated because ‘sliding’ is disabled, meaning that if an agent is traveling close to an obstacle (as shortest path typically do), noisy actuation may bring it into contact with the obstacle, requiring backtracking or dislodging and adding to its path length.

To determine a tighter upper-bound on SPL, we implement a heuristic planner that uses the ground-truth map to choose motion primitives ($\text{turn}_{\{\text{left, right}\}} \times \text{N}$, then $\text{move\_forward}$). The planner selects the primitive that best reduces distance to goal using the ground-truth geodesic distance (thereby using the ground-truth map), executes the first action in the selected primitive, and then re-runs the selection process until the goal is reached. On Gibson validation, the oracle achieves 84% SPL. Thus, we shouldn’t expect 100% SPL in the realistic setting.

We then further tighten the upper-bound by accounting for the privileged information (the ground-truth map) given to the oracle. Consider the idealized setting, in this setting the challenge for the agent is path-planning in unknown environments, not additionally contenting with noisy actuations and observations. This setting is also considered ‘solved’ on the Gibson dataset, making it an ideal setting the quantify the impact of the ground-truth map. In the idealized setting, on Gibson val, the oracle achieves 99% SPL while the best known result for a learned agent is 97% SPL [33]. Using either the absolute or relative difference, we would expect approximately 82% SPL to be achievable by a learned agent in the realistic setting as the oracle achieves 84% SPL. While 80% is not quite 82%, this indicates that visual odometry is the limiting factor (the best result with visual odometry is 63% SPL) and we turn our focus towards this component for the rest of the paper.

### 4. Visual Odometry

The visual odometry model takes a pair of 180×360 RGB-D frames stacked channel-wise as input and predicts the relative pose change between the two camera positions, $\Delta_{\text{pose}} = (\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z, \Delta \theta)$, where $\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z$ refer to

![Figure 3. Visual odometry module. At inference the input pair of observations $(O_{t-1}, O_t)$ is transformed by applying Swap and Flip augmentations. In total the visual odometry model receives two observation pairs for move_forward (original and flipped) and four observation pairs for turn_{left,right} actions (original, flipped, swapped(original), swapped(flipped)). In the aggregation stage outputs are transformed back to original coordinate frame by applying the inverse transformation for each augmentation and then averaging to produce the final egomotion estimate (details in Sec. 4.3).](image-url)
the 3D translation of the camera center and $\Delta \theta$ refers to the rotation about the gravity vector ('yaw' or robot heading).

The visual odometry model is represented as ResNet [11] encoder followed by a compression block and two fully connected (FC) layers. We replace BatchNorm [13] with GroupNorm [34] (we found it to work better) and use half of the width. The compression block consists of 3x3 Conv2d+GroupNorm+ReLU. We apply DropOut [28] with 0.2 probability between fully connected layers. Full VO pipeline is illustrated in Fig. 3.

4.1. Action Embedding

Actuation noise and collisions affect agent translation and rotation for each action type differently (the agent may rotate while moving forward and move while rotating in place [19]). This motivated us to study incorporating knowledge of the action taken between two consecutive observations as an additional input. We represent the action taken as an embedding – fixed action-specific vector of length 16 that is concatenated to the flattened output from the feature encoder. We do not apply a DropOut to action embedding as we find this harms performance. To further increase the importance of the action, we concatenated the embedding to the input of all fully connected layers.

4.2. Train-Time Augmentations

Given a pair of observations, $(O_{t-1}, O_t)$, the action taken between them, $a_{t-1}$, and their relative change in pose $\Delta_{\text{pose}}$, we use the following augmentations.

**Swap.** For every training tuple $(O_{t-1}, O_t, a_{t-1}, \Delta_{\text{pose}})$ where $a_{t-1}$ is a rotation action we create an extra training example $(O_t, O_{t-1}, a_{t-1}, \Delta_{\text{pose}}^{\text{swap}})$ where $a_{t-1}^{\text{swap}}$ is the effective action taken (turn_left $\rightarrow$ turn_right and turn_right $\rightarrow$ turn_left) and $\Delta_{\text{pose}}^{\text{swap}}$ is the change in pose after swapping (negation of all components). As in Zhao et al. [39], this augmentation leverages the order invariance of $\text{turn}_{\{\text{left, right}\}}$ actions.

**Flip.** In architecture and indoor design, it is common to prepare mirror-image floor plans (e.g., kitchen on the left, living on the right and vice versa) to increase the number of options. As shown in Fig. 4, we simulate the robot navigating in a mirror-image house by flipping its camera image about the vertical axis. Specifically, for every training tuple $(O_{t-1}, O_t, a_{t-1}, \Delta_{\text{pose}})$ we generate an additional training example $(O_t^{\text{flip}}, O_{t-1}^{\text{flip}}, a_{t-1}^{\text{flip}}, \Delta_{\text{pose}}^{\text{flip}})$, where $O_t^{\text{flip}}, O_t^{\text{flip}}$ are the RGB-D observations flipped along their vertical axis, $a_{t-1}^{\text{flip}}$ is the effective action after the flip (turn_left $\rightarrow$ turn_right, turn_right $\rightarrow$ turn_left, and move_forward remains the same), and $\Delta_{\text{pose}}^{\text{flip}} = (\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z, -\Delta \theta)$.

We also apply the composition of Flip and Swap (similar to torchvision.transforms.Compose [22]). Note that Flip then Swap is the same as Swap then Flip. All four combinations of Flip and Swap are shown in Fig. 4.

4.3. Test-Time Augmentations

We adapt the common practice of test-time augmentation in image classification to visual odometry. Specifically, we apply Flip and Swap augmentations during the test time (i.e., during navigation) then aggregate pose-predictions. The aggregation consists of two steps: first we transform egomotion estimates for transformed input pairs back to original coordinate system, $F_\text{flip}^{-1}(\Delta_{\text{pose}}) = (\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z, -\Delta \theta)$, $F_\text{swap}^{-1}(\Delta_{\text{pose}}) = -\Delta_{\text{pose}}$, and then take the average (illustrated in Fig. 3).
Encoder with ResNet50 encoder.

4.5. Dataset and Model Size

We analyze two possible ways of incorporating meta-information: concatenating the embedding to 1-st fully connected and 2-nd fully connected layer, flip augmentation is turned on during training, and navigation metrics are reported with no augmentations during evaluation.

5. Experiments

We report experiments results in Tab. 1. Experiments in rows 1-15 were run for 50 epochs and 90 epochs for row 16 - best HC 2021 PointNav agent. We perform early-stopping via validation loss. To study the impact of different visual odometry modules we fixed the navigation policy (used the same network weights) across all experiments.

5.1. Ablations

In this section we study the importance of proposed additions over a baseline VO model: incorporating meta-information available to the agent by adding action embeddings, Flip and Swap, and larger datasets. We start from a baseline ResNet18 model (Tab. 1, row 1). Action embedding. We analyze two possible ways of incorporating meta-information: concatenating the embedding to the first FC layer that goes after encoder (Tab. 1, row 2) and concatenating the embedding to all FC layers (row 3). Concatenating action embedding to first FC layer improves performance by +7 Success/+5 SPL compared to a baseline (row 2 vs row 1). Concatenating action em-
bedding to all FC layers improves performance further by +1 Success/+1 SPL (row 3 vs row 2). We believe this allows the FC layers to receive more context to learn more accurate egomotion for each action type using shared encoder.

**Train-time augmentations.** Enriching the VO dataset diversity by applying \texttt{Flip} improves performance by +2 Success/+1 SPL (row 6 vs row 3). Interestingly, we found \texttt{Swap} hurts performance by -2 Success/-2 SPL (row 4 vs row 3) while \texttt{Flip} + \texttt{Swap} achieves performance equivalent to \texttt{Flip} (row 8 vs row 6).

**Test-time augmentations.** The biggest performance boost from augmentations comes when they are also applied at test-time (navigation). At inference \texttt{Swap} and \texttt{Flip} are applied (turned no/off) independently. Turning \texttt{Flip} on at test-time improves performance by +2 Success/+2 SPL compared to a model with \texttt{Flip} on only at train-time (row 10 vs row 6). With \texttt{Swap} on at train- and test-time, performance is still worse than achieved by model without \texttt{Swap}, -1 Success/-1 SPL (row 5 vs row 3). However, when both \texttt{Swap} and \texttt{Flip} are on at train- and test-time performance improves further by +1 Success/+1 SPL compared to model with \texttt{Flip} (row 11 vs row 10). That is a total improvement of +5 Success/+4 SPL compared to a model trained and evaluated without augmentations (row 11 vs row 3).

**Larger dataset.** To study the impact of large scale training we increased the training dataset size 3× (from 500k to 1.5M training pairs) following the same dataset collection protocol, described in Sec. 4.4. Without augmentations, increasing dataset size 3× improves performance by +5 Success/+4 SPL (row 12 vs row 3) and by +8 Success/+4 SPL (row 14 vs row 11) with augmentations.

We also examine the impact of augmentations with this larger dataset. Surprisingly, we find that they are more influential with a larger training dataset. At train-time, \texttt{Swap} + \texttt{Flip} improve performance by +2 Success/+1 SPL with a small dataset (row 8 vs row 3) while they improve performance by +3 Success/+2 SPL (row 13 vs row 12) with a large dataset. A test-time, \texttt{Swap} + \texttt{Flip} improve performance by +3 Success/+3 SPL (row 11 vs row 8) with a small dataset while they improve performance by +5 Success/+4 SPL (row 14 vs row 13) with a large dataset.

**Deeper encoder.** We find that training with more sophisticated encoder architecture (ResNet50 instead of ResNet18) improves navigation performance further by +3 Success/+3 SPL (row 15 vs row 14). Given the additional representational capacity of ResNet50, we further increase the training dataset size to 5M pairs. This improves performance by +8 Success/+6 SPL (row 16 vs row 15).

**Dataset transfer.** We examine how the two components of our agent transfer from their training dataset, Gibson, to the Matterport3D dataset [5]. We find that while the performance of the agent with ground-truth localization is reduced by only a small amount, -6 Success/-6 SPL (Tab. 2, row 5 vs row 2), the performance of the agent with visual odometry is reduced by considerably more, -19 Success/-18 SPL (row 6 vs row 3). This is inline with observed in the idealized case where Depth-only agents (like our agent with ground-truth) transfer from Gibson to Matterport3D well, agents with RGB-D (like our agent with VO) transfer poorly [24, 25]. This leaves the question – is there a universal (cross-dataset) VO module? We anticipate creating one will require training on multiple large-scale datasets.

### 5.2. Habitat Challenge 2021 PointNav Track

We evaluate our most performant agent (Tab. 1, row 16) on the Habitat Challenge 2021 benchmark test-std split. Our agent achieves 94% Success and 74% SPL (Tab. 3) on the test-std split. This is an increase of +16% Success/+15% SPL over prior published state-of-the-art, Zhao et al. [39]. An unpublished concurrent work increased performance to 91% Success/70% SPL and our method improves upon that further.

While our results do not effectively ‘solve’ PointGoal navigation under realistic settings, they improve performance significantly and add more evidence that navigation without building an explicit map is possible, even under harsh realistic conditions.

### 6. Real-World Transfer

We perform an initial exploration of our method in reality and deploy our learned agent on a LoCoBot with no sim2real adaptation. Across 9 episodes, it achieves 11% Success, 71% SoftSPL, and makes it 92% of the way to the goal (SoftSuccess). Based on the navigation videos
provided on the website 5 the agent does a good job avoiding obstacles. These initial results show promise, and adaptation methods may improve the performance.

7. Related Work

Autonomous navigation has long been a subject of research in robotics and computer vision [10,18,20]. With advances in computer vision and deep learning, there has been a renewed interest in the use of learning to derive navigation policies for a variety of tasks (such as rearrangement [3,29], visual navigation, [1,4,7], and vision-and-language [1,16]).

Classical vs learned navigators. Classical approaches decompose the problem into a sequence of sub-tasks, such as localization, mapping, planning, and control. Each of the sub-tasks is addressed separately and corresponding solutions are then composed into one pipeline. When properly tuned, such methods can perform well. Wijmans et al. [33] showed that learned approaches can outperform their classical counterparts with sufficient data and training.

Visual odometry for navigation. Given the importance of localization for navigation, design choices of the CNN-based relative pose regression given the two consecutive RGB/RGB-D frames and their influence on the downstream navigation metrics of navigation agents has been a subject of prior works [6,9,15,23,39].

Neural SLAM [6] integrates learning into classical modular SLAM components and estimates agent pose change by using its predicted egocentric map to update the noisy localization sensor on a LoCoBot. Built on top of Neural SLAM architecture, Occupancy Anticipation [23] learns to estimate egomotion directly from RGB-D input and uses egocentric occupancy maps as an auxiliary signal. Differentiable SLAM-net [15] jointly optimizes all SLAM components by backpropagating through a particle-filter based SLAM algorithm. Such approach significantly improved environment map accuracy that translated into improved downstream navigation performance.

Approaches that do not build an explicit map divide learning agent dynamics and visual odometry (VO) into two separate components. Initial attempts achieved worse results than approaches that use an explicit map [9]. Zhao et al. [39] focused on improving VO for navigation and showed that map-less approaches can outperform map-building approaches. We continue improvements to VO for navigation and reduce the gap between state-of-the-art performance and an oracle from 31% SPL to 7% SPL.

8. Concluding Remarks

We studied the question ‘can an autonomous agent navigate in a new environment without building an explicit map?’ under harsh realistic conditions. Towards answering this question we first demonstrated that when given ground-truth localization (GPS+Compass) map-less agents are able to overcome actuation noise and sensor noise and learn to navigate with near-perfect performance, thereby identifying localization as the limiting factor.

To improve localization performance, we presented a series of broadly-applicable additions to visual odometry (VO) that improve performance from 64% Success/52% SPL to 96% Success/77% SPL. While our results do not effectively ‘solve’ PointGoal navigation in the realistic setting, they improve performance significantly and add more evidence that navigation without building an explicit map is possible even under harsh realistic conditions.

Limitations. While our work presents a significant advance in map-less navigation methods for realistic conditions it has several limitations. 1) Embodiment specificity. While our VO model and training procedure are policy agnostic, they are not embodiment agnostic. The importance of action embeddings implies that relaxing this will be challenging, meaning that the VO model may need to be re-trained for each embodiment, which is wasteful. 2) Dataset specificity. Similarly, our learned VO model does not transfer well between datasets and may need to be re-trained for each dataset. We believe large-scale multi-dataset training may be a solution but this remains an open question. 3) Compute requirements. Our best navigation policy used a total of 7.5 billion steps of experience. Training our best VO model required first generating 5M training pairs and then training on 64 GPUs (~5,000 GPU hours total). High compute requirements were swiftly reduced for PointNav-v1 [26,32,36] and we anticipate they will reduce for PointNav-v2 too, but this remains an open direction.

With regard to the core question, we studied the direct link between mapping and navigation and found increasing evidence that it is a weak link. We have not studied indirect links between mapping and navigation and these may be strong. For instance, there is reason to believe that mapping is needed for accurate localization over long time horizons and localization is needed for navigation (illustrated in Fig. 5). Studying indirect links is an avenue for future work.
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