

---

# Active Offline Policy Selection

---

**Ksenia Konyushkova\***  
DeepMind  
kksenia@deepmind.com

**Yutian Chen \***  
DeepMind  
yutianc@deepmind.com

**Thomas Paine**  
DeepMind  
tpaine@deepmind.com

**Caglar Gulcehre**  
DeepMind  
caglarg@deepmind.com

**Cosmin Paduraru**  
DeepMind  
paduraru@deepmind.com

**Daniel J Mankowitz**  
DeepMind  
dmankowitz@deepmind.com

**Misha Denil**  
DeepMind  
mdenil@deepmind.com

**Nando de Freitas**  
DeepMind  
nandodefreitas@deepmind.com

## Abstract

This paper addresses the problem of policy selection in domains with abundant logged data, but with a very restricted interaction budget. Solving this problem would enable safe evaluation and deployment of offline reinforcement learning policies in industry, robotics, and healthcare domain among others. Several off-policy evaluation (OPE) techniques have been proposed to assess the value of policies using only logged data. However, there is still a big gap between the evaluation by OPE and the full online evaluation in the real environment. To reduce this gap, we introduce a novel *active offline policy selection* problem formulation, which combined logged data and limited online interactions to identify the best policy. We rely on the advances in OPE to warm start the evaluation. We build upon Bayesian optimization to iteratively decide which policies to evaluate in order to utilize the limited environment interactions wisely. Many candidate policies could be proposed, thus, we focus on making our approach scalable and introduce a kernel function to model similarity between policies. We use several benchmark environments to show that the proposed approach improves upon state-of-the-art OPE estimates and fully online policy evaluation with limited budget. Additionally, we show that each component of the proposed method is important, it works well with various number and quality of OPE estimates and even with a large number of candidate policies.

## 1 Introduction

Reinforcement learning (RL) has recently proven to be successful in a range of applications from computer and board games [44, 52, 55] to robotics and chip design [35, 9, 43]. However, many challenges of real-world systems still prevent RL from being applied at scale in practice [14]. One of the limiting factors in real applications is that environment interactions are often expensive. Thus, training and evaluating agents becomes prohibitively slow and costly. Offline RL attempts to address this problem by training agents on a dataset without environment interactions [2, 21]. This enables researchers to train policies with multiple algorithms and different hyperparameter settings [48] on a single dataset. The best policy can then be chosen with off-policy policy evaluation (OPE) approaches

---

\*equal contribution




Figure 1: Offline policy selection attempts to choose the best policy from a set of policies, given only a dataset of logged experiences. *Active offline policy selection* additionally assumes a restricted environment interaction budget which is assigned intelligently to evaluate the most promising policies.

[50, 38]. These techniques attempt to estimate the expected agent performance by relying on the same pre-recorded dataset [26, 39, 34, 67].

Unfortunately, OPE estimates are not yet precise enough to be relied upon for choosing which agent to deploy. Moreover, OPE is intrinsically limited by the pre-recorded dataset: When there is a distribution shift between a trained policy and a behavioural policy, *i.e.*, when the trained policy behaves very differently from the data collection policy, OPE is imprecise [36]. In many applications, however, a subset of policies can be evaluated *online* prior to final deployment [21, 17], even though this process can be hard and laborious. For example, in robotics a small subset of offline RL policies can be tested on the real hardware. Another example is recommender systems, which allow for restricted policy evaluation via A/B tests on a small fraction of user traffic.

In this paper, we introduce the *active offline policy selection* problem. The goal is to identify the best policy where we benefit from both offline evaluation with logged data and online evaluation with limited interaction (Fig. 1). In our approach we advance a solution based on Bayesian optimization (BO). It entails learning a Gaussian process (GP) surrogate function that maps policies to their expected returns. Then, we build on the GP statistics to construct an acquisition function to decide which policy to test next. To make BO successful in this problem setting, our approach has two key features. First, we incorporate existing OPE estimates as additional noisy observations (subsection 2.2). This allows us to warm start online policy evaluation and to overcome the difficulties of GP hyper-parameter optimisation at the start. Second, we model correlation between policies through a kernel function based on actions that the policies take in the same states of the environment (Fig. 3). This makes our method data efficient [24] as the information about the performance of one policy informs us about the performance of similar behaving policies without costly execution in the environment. It is particularly valuable when the number of candidate policies is large (or even larger than the interaction budget).

The contributions of this paper are as follows.

1. We introduce the *active offline policy selection* problem. This problem is important in practice, but so far it has not been studied in the literature to the best of our knowledge.
2. We build a BO solution with an extended observation model to integrate both OPE estimates and interaction data. The use of OPE estimates enables us to warm-start learning a GP.
3. We propose a novel GP kernel to capture the dependency between the policies through the actions that they take. As a result, our method infers the value of one policy from those of similar policies.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 1.1 gives background on offline policy evaluation and selection. In section 2, we propose a GP model for policy value estimation, explain how we approach the sequential decision making with BO and introduce a novel kernel based on the similarity of policy outputs. Section 3 discusses the related work. Section 4 shows that active policy evaluation can improve upon the OPE after merely a few interactions, and our kernel ensures that our selection is data-efficient. Additionally, our method works reliably with OPEs of varying amount and quality and scales well with the number of candidate policies. The paper is concluded with a discussion in section 5.

## 1.1 Off-policy policy evaluation and selection

We consider a Markov decision process (MDP) defined by a tuple  $(S, A, T, R, d_0, \gamma)$ , with state space  $S$ , action space  $A$ , transition distribution  $T(s'|s, a)$ , reward function  $R(s, a)$ , initial state distribution  $d_0(s)$ , and discount factor  $\gamma \in [0, 1]$ . A policy  $\pi(a|s)$  maps from  $S$  to  $A$ . The value of a policy  $\pi$  is measured by the expected sum of discounted rewards:

$$\mu_\pi = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \gamma^t R(s_t, a_t) \right], \text{ with } s_0 \sim d_0(\cdot), a_t \sim \pi(\cdot|s_t), s_{t+1} \sim T(\cdot|s_t, a_t). \quad (1)$$

Typically, estimating the value of a given policy requires executing the policy in the environment many times. However, practical constraints make it difficult to run policies of unknown quality in the environment frequently. To address this, OPE estimates a value  $\hat{\mu}_\pi$  using a dataset of trajectories  $\mathcal{D}$  collected by a separate behavior policy  $\pi_\beta$ . In offline policy selection (OPS) the task is to select the policy with the highest value from a set of policies  $\pi_1, \pi_2, \dots, \pi_K$  given access only to a dataset  $\mathcal{D}$  (Fig. 1, left). A straightforward approach is to select the policy with the highest OPE estimate  $\hat{\mu}_{\pi_1}, \dots, \hat{\mu}_{\pi_K}$  [18], and alternative approaches can be used depending on the quality metric [66].

## 2 Active offline policy selection

### 2.1 Problem definition

We now formally define the active offline policy selection problem. Suppose we are given a set of  $K$  candidate policies  $\pi_k, 1 \leq k \leq K$ . Denote by  $\mu_k$  the unknown policy value and by  $\rho_k$  an OPE estimate computed from an offline dataset. At every step,  $i$ , we can choose a policy  $k_i$  to execute in the environment once and observe the trajectory with (discounted) episodic return  $r_i$ , which is a noisy sample of the true policy value:  $\mathbb{E}[r_i] = \mu_{k_i}$ . We would like to find the policy with the highest value,  $k^* = \arg \max_k \mu_k$ , with as few trajectories as possible. Policy selection algorithm estimates the mean as  $m_k$  and recommends a policy that maximizes it:  $\hat{k} = \arg \max_k m_k$ . Simple regret of the recommended policy measures of how close we are to the best policy:

$$\text{regret} = \mu_{k^*} - \mu_{\hat{k}}. \quad (2)$$

To solve this sequential decision problem, we introduce GP over the policy returns and OPE estimates (subsection 2.2), and design the GP kernel over policies to model their correlated returns (subsection 2.3). Then we use these as part of a BO strategy (subsection 2.4).

### 2.2 Gaussian process over policy values

Given a limited interaction budget and a large number of policies, it is impossible to obtain accurate estimates of their values by executing them. Fortunately, similar policies tend to have similar values. Thus, propagating the information between them helps to improve the value prediction. Intuitively, the number of policies that we need to execute to find a good policy should depend on their diversity instead of the total number of policies in the candidate set (see experiments supporting this in subsubsection 4.5.2). Formally, we use GP to predict a joint distribution over the policy values.

A GP is a stochastic process, that is an indexed collection of random variables, such that every finite collection of them has a multivariate normal distribution [51]. In our case, we assume that the policy value  $\mu$  as a function of policy  $\pi$  follows a GP, with a kernel function  $\mathcal{K}(\pi_i, \pi_j)$  over policies and mean  $m$ . Specifically, we consider the following generative process for the latent policy value  $\mu(\pi)$ , OPE estimate  $\rho$ , and episodic return  $r$ :

$$\mu(\pi) \sim \text{GP}(m(\cdot), \mathcal{K}(\cdot, \cdot)), \quad \rho \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\pi), \sigma_\rho^2), \quad r \sim \mathcal{N}(\mu(\pi), \sigma_r^2). \quad (3)$$

We use a constant mean  $m$  without loss of generality. We assume a flat prior for the hyper-parameter  $m$ , and weakly informative inverse Gamma prior for the variance  $\sigma_\rho^2$  and  $\sigma_r^2$ . Our probabilistic model is illustrated in Fig. 2.

As we have a finite number of policies, the input space is a finite set  $\mathcal{X} = \{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_K\}$ , where each index corresponds to a candidate policy. The joint distribution of the  $K$  policy values reduces to a multivariate normal distribution,

$$\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K \sim \mathcal{N}(m\mathbf{1}_K, \mathbf{K}), \text{ with } \mathbf{K}_{k,k'} = \mathcal{K}(\pi_k, \pi_{k'}), \quad (4)$$




Figure 2: Gaussian process of the policy value function. We observe OPE estimates for all policies and noisy episodic returns for some of them. Neighboring policies (measured by kernel  $\mathcal{K}$ ) have similar values, and the posterior variance is lower where there are more observations. Policies are aligned in 1D for visualization purposes, but in practice they reside in a high dimensional space.




Figure 3: **Left:** The distance between two policies  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$  is computed as an average distance across pairs of action vectors that are selected by each policy on a set of states. **Middle:** Pairwise distance matrix between policies on humanoid-run task. High distance is shown in yellow and low distance is in dark blue. The  $3 \times 3$  block structure of the matrix reflects the 3 types of training algorithm. Smaller blocks correspond to the increasing number of training steps with the same hyperparameters. **Right:** Policy value ( $\mu_\pi$ ) versus action distance to the behavior policy  $\bar{d}(\pi, \pi_\beta)$ . Policies with the same training algorithm are in the same color.

where  $\mathbf{1}_K$  is a  $K$ -length vector of ones. For each policy  $\pi_k$ , we have one noisy observation from an OPE method  $\rho_k$ , and zero or multiple noisy episodic return observations  $r_k^i$ . As the policies are related through the covariance matrix  $\mathbf{K}$ , observing a return sample from one policy updates the posterior distribution of all of them. Given the OPE estimates  $\rho = [\rho_1, \dots, \rho_K]$  and return observations  $\mathbf{r}_k = [r_k^1, \dots, r_k^{N_k}]$  for each policy  $\pi_k$ , the posterior distribution of the mean return is also a Gaussian,

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_1, \dots, \mu_K | \rho, \{\mathbf{r}_k\}_k &\sim \mathcal{N}(\mathbf{m}, \Sigma), \text{ with} \\ \mathbf{m} &= \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{K} + \Lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{y}, \quad \Sigma = \mathbf{K} - \mathbf{K}(\mathbf{K} + \Lambda)^{-1} \mathbf{K}. \\ \mathbf{y}_k &= \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_\rho^2} + \frac{N_k}{\sigma_r^2} \right)^{-1} \left( \frac{\rho_k}{\sigma_\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_r^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} r_k^i \right), \quad \Lambda_{kk} = \left( \frac{1}{\sigma_\rho^2} + \frac{N_k}{\sigma_r^2} \right)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where  $\Lambda$  is a diagonal matrix with diagonal entries defined above.

### 2.3 Kernel

A key component of the GP model is the kernel that measures our belief about the policy correlation. To obtain a kernel we make a key assumption: *Policies that are similar in the actions that they take, yield similar returns*. Then, our insight is to measure the distance between the policies through the actions that each of them takes on a fixed set of states from the offline dataset (Fig. 3, left).

Formally, to measure the similarity between  $\pi_1$  and  $\pi_2$ , we obtain the policy actions at a given state  $s$  and measure the distance between these two action vectors  $d(\pi_1(s), \pi_2(s))$ <sup>2</sup>. We then define the

<sup>2</sup>In this work, we use Euclidean distance for deterministic policies with continuous actions, but an extension to stochastic and discrete actions is straightforward.

distance between the two policies as the average distance over the offline dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ ,

$$\bar{d}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}} d(\pi_1(s), \pi_2(s)). \quad (6)$$

In practice we approximate  $\bar{d}$  using a randomly sampled subset of states  $\mathcal{D}' \subset \mathcal{D}$ .

An example of a pairwise distance matrix for a set of policies is shown in Fig. 3, middle. Rows and columns are the policies which are arranged first by the type of the training algorithm, then by hyperparameters and finally by the training steps (none of which is observed by our method). Notice the block structure of this illustration that reflects the different nature of training algorithms. Smaller blocks of increasing policy distances correspond to policies with more training steps and same hyperparameters.

Additionally, Fig. 3, right shows an example of policy distances to the behaviour policy. The value of policies produced by the same algorithm changes gradually as a function of this distance. This evidence is promising that our kernel construction is informative for predicting the value of a policy.

Finally, we compute Matérn 1/2 kernel as:  $\mathcal{K}(\pi_1, \pi_2) = \sigma_k^2 \exp(-\bar{d}(\pi_1, \pi_2)/l)$ , where  $\sigma$  and  $l$  are the trainable variance and length-scale hyperparameters. This is a popular kernel choice [53]. As the distance metric is computed as the average distance over states, using it in this kernel is equivalent to a multiplication of kernels on these states and it is a valid positive semi-definite matrix.

## 2.4 Active offline policy selection with Bayesian optimization

Under a GP formulation, we can employ BO [53] to search for the best policy efficiently. BO optimizes an unknown function  $\mu(\pi)$  with  $\pi \in \mathcal{X}$  using a limited number of function queries that render noisy observations. BO has been used successfully in many applications including experimental design [5], robotics [40, 41], hyper-parameter optimization [56, 25, 11], preference learning and interactive machine learning [8, 7]. The key component of a BO algorithm is an acquisition function  $u_i(\pi)$  that balances exploration and exploitation when selecting a query. Widely used acquisition functions include upper confidence bounds (UCB), expected improvement (EI) or epsilon-greedy. Here, we simply choose the UCB acquisition function [57, 28].<sup>3</sup> Specifically, at every step  $i$ , we compute the score for a policy  $\pi_k$  using

$$u_i(k) = \mathbf{m}_k + \sqrt{\beta_i \Sigma_{kk}}, \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta_i$  is a constant depending on  $i$ . We then choose the policy with the highest score,  $k_i = \arg \max_k u_i(k)$ , to execute next. After observing a new return  $r_{k_i}$ , we update  $\mathbf{m}$  and  $\Sigma$  in Eq. 5. We also update the hyper-parameters ( $m, \sigma_\rho^2, \sigma_r^2, \sigma_k^2$  and  $l$ ) with the maximum a posteriori estimate (see details in the appendix).

Estimating the hyper-parameters with limited data is challenging in practice. Fortunately, in the active offline policy selection formulation, we can take advantage of the OPE estimates as a priori observations to fit the hyper-parameters before launching the interactive optimization process. In some ablations where OPE is not available we instead execute 5 randomly sampled policies before fitting the hyperparameters.

## 3 Related work

Offline RL is becoming increasingly popular due to their ability to leverage offline data to learn policies for RL in the real world. As a results, recently several benchmark datasets have become available [21, 17]. We categorize offline RL methods into the following groups: policy-constraint approaches that regularize the learned policy to stay close to the behavior policy [65, 19], value-based approaches that encourage more conservative estimates, either through regularization or uncertainty [33, 20], model-based approaches [68, 29], and standard RL methods used off-policy RL [6].

OPE has been studied extensively across many domains [37, 63, 27, 47]. Generally OPE methods can be grouped into methods that use importance sampling [49] or stationary state distribution [39, 46, 64], value function methods [60, 42, 61], and learned transition models [69], as well as methods that combine two or more approaches [45, 13, 26, 16]. OPS is a related practical problem that receives increasing interest [48, 66, 18]. Our work has two notable distinctions in contrast to

---

<sup>3</sup>Experiments with other acquisition functions appear in the appendix.




Figure 4: Environment used in the experiments. 9 environments from the dm-control domain (3 examples on the left) and 4 from the MPG domain (3 examples on the right).

these prior works: 1) we consider similarities between policies when making value predictions, and 2) we focus on active offline policy selection, where we allow a small number of evaluations in the environment to quickly improve our estimate of which policy is best.

Similar to our kernel computation based on policy’s actions, Policy Evaluation Networks [22] work considers a network fingerprinting that learns a policy embedding through the output of the policy on probing states. The principal difference to our approach is that we only consider a very limited online policy evaluation budget (in the order of 100) while network fingerprinting needs many policy evaluations to train the policy embeddings (in the order of 100 000).

Applying BO in a finite set of indices reduces to a Bayesian multiarmed bandit problem. Exploring the shared structure among arms using Bayesian models has been studied in the literature [57, 30, 24]. Our work considers the Bayesian bandit model in the particular setting of policy selection and we build our model by exploiting the offline dataset.

Active learning has been considered in RL [15, 3, 12, 31] for better exploration or learning reward models. It has not been studied for the OPE or OPS problems to the best of our knowledge. Related to the policy representation through actions, classifiers in active learning can be also characterised by their predictions (class probabilities) on a subset of datapoints [32].

## 4 Experiments

### 4.1 Datasets and environments

In our experiments we consider two domains (Fig. 4) with different properties. One domain is a standard benchmark in RL and another one is motivated by the challenges of evaluating control policies for robots. For each domain we describe the environments, datasets for offline RL and OPE, and sets of policies below.

**DeepMind Control Suite (dm-control)** This is a standard set of continuous control environments [62]. It contains 9 tasks of locomotion and manipulation and a subset of tasks is shown in Fig. 4, left. The observations are the state of the MPD, including joint angles and velocities. The dimensionality and semantics of the continuous actions vary across tasks. The dataset from the RL Unplugged benchmark [21] is used for policies and kernel. The offline RL policies are obtained from DOPE [18], a benchmark for OPE and OPS. For each task, there are up to 96 policies trained with various algorithms (including D4PG [6], ABM [54], and CRR [65]), hyperparameters, and number of training steps.

**Manipulation Playground (MPG)** This is a simulated robotics environment. The task is to control a simulated Kinova Jaco arm with 9 degrees of freedom. Joint velocity control of 6 arm and 3 hand joints is used. The policies are learnt from image input from frontal and in-hand cameras of  $64 \times 64$  dimensions and proprioception. We perform 4 manipulation tasks within a  $20 \times 20$  cm basket (Fig. 4, right). The dataset is generated by running an online RL algorithm as in [65] and the policies are generated as in [48]. For each task, there are up to 256 policies trained with various algorithms (including BC, D4PG, and CRR), and hyperparameters.

We obtain OPE estimates for each policy by running Fitted Q-Evaluation (FQE) [42, 34] on the dataset from offline RL. FQE is the default OPE method used in our experiments unless stated otherwise.




Figure 5: Comparison of A-OPS approach, offline policy selection with OPE, and online policy selection with IND+UNIFORM on dm-control and MPG environments. The results are averaged across 9 and 4 tasks and 100 experiments in each of them. Shaded areas show standard deviation of the mean. Our method A-OPS quickly surpasses the baselines and achieves the lowest regrets.

#### 4.2 Experimental setting and implementation

To evaluate the policy selection procedure in each experiment we randomly select a subset of  $K$  policies out of all trained policies. We set  $K = 50$  for dm-control and  $K = 200$  for MPG. Then, we repeat each experiment 100 times, and report the average results and the standard deviation of the mean estimate. As a performance metric we look at the simple regret (Eq. 2) as a function of the number of executed episodes. To make the results comparable across domains and environments, we first compute the gap between the best and the worst performing policy in each environment across all the policies. Then, we normalise the scores in each experiment by dividing them by this gap.

All online and offline RL algorithms, as well as offline policy evaluation algorithms in this work are implemented with Acme [23] and Reverb [10], and run on GPUs on an internal cluster. We implement GP and IND together with all BO algorithms using the same TensorFlow [1] codebase, and run all the policy selection experiments using CPUs. Details about the tasks and policies, hyperparameter values, a breakout of the results by tasks, and additional BO algorithms and ablations are presented in the appendix.

**Independent policy model** To study the contribution of modeling the policy correlation with GP, we consider a baseline model with independently distributed value  $\mu_k$  across policies. The data generating process for the  $k$ -th policy follows a hierarchical Gaussian distribution,

$$r_k^i \stackrel{iid}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \sigma_{k,r}^2), \forall i, \text{ with } \mu_k \sim \mathcal{N}(\rho_k, \sigma_{k,\rho}^2), \quad (8)$$

where we assume a weakly informative inverse Gamma prior for variance  $\sigma_{k,r}^2$  and  $\sigma_{k,\rho}^2$  as in GP. We refer to this model as independent policy model (IND). Such model can be used in pure online evaluation or under active learning setting.

#### 4.3 Comparison to the existing methods

In our main experiments we would like to verify that the proposed method performs better than two strategies commonly employed in practice (see section 1). To this end, we compare:

1. **A-OPS**: our proposed method that uses OPE estimates to bootstrap GP learning and performs UCB policy sampling as discussed in section 2.
2. **OPE**: standard OPS that selects the policy with the best OPE estimate [48].
3. **IND+UNIFORM**: standard online selection where we sample policies uniformly and select the one with the highest return belief (estimated with independent policy model).

Fig. 5 presents the simple regret as a function of the number of executed trajectories. The results are averaged across 9 tasks from dm-control and 4 tasks from MPG. Our proposed method A-OPS combines offline and online policy evaluations. It quickly outperforms OPE and improves with more trajectories. A-OPS estimate of the best policy may be erroneous initially due to noisy reward samples (e.g., in MPG), but it quickly updates, thus allowing for significant improvements over OPE only after a few actively selected trajectories.

Table 1: Design of the ablation experiments across three axes: the use of OPE, GP or independent policy model, active policy selection or uniform sampling. We refer to our method that combines all the components as A-OPS.

	No OPE		With OPE	
	Independent	GP	Independent	GP
Uniform	IND+UNIFORM	GP+UNIFORM	IND+UNIFORM+OPE	GP+UNIFORM+OPE
UCB	IND+UCB	GP+UCB	IND+UCB+OPE	A-OPS




Figure 6: Ablations. In two domains, we ablate each of three components of our approach. 1) The use of OPE (with OPE in the first row and without in the second). 2) The choice of policy model: GP (purple and red) and independent (green and blue). 3) The policy selection strategy: active (dark, solid line) and uniform sampling (bright, dashed line). In general, active is better than uniform, methods that exploit policy correlation are better than methods that do not, and methods that use an OPE prior are better than those that do not.

When comparing offline and online policy selection we notice that for the range of considered budgets, online policy selection IND+UNIFORM performs worse than OPE. It suggests that single trajectory returns are noisier than OPE estimates in these environments. Naturally, we expect that given a larger budget the online baseline will eventually surpass its offline counterpart.

#### 4.4 Component ablations

We are not aware of other works on active offline policy selection. Thus, in this section we investigate alternative solutions that help us to understand the importance of the proposed components of A-OPS.

We design our ablation studies to test the contribution of the three components of A-OPS:

- 1) *OPE*: selection algorithms with or without OPE estimates.
- 2) *active learning*: active policy selection (UCB) or uniform sampling (UNIFORM).
- 3) *policy kernel*: GP model or independent model baseline (IND).

Tab. 1 summarises the 8 possible combinations of the components. We refer to our full method (GP+UCB+OPE) simply as A-OPS. We also include the pure offline OPE estimates as before.

The results with all the baselines in two domains are presented in Fig. 6. First of all we observe that A-OPS outperforms all other methods across a wide range of budgets, thus, all the components are crucial for the performance of our method and excluding any of them leads to significantly worse results. Next, we answer three questions about each component individually.




Figure 7: The performance of A-OPS on dm-control with varying number of FQE (left) and type of OPE estimate with a budget of 50 trajectories (right). A-OPS can improve upon the initial OPE estimates in all cases.

**1. How important is it to incorporate OPE estimates?** Across all the experiments, incorporating OPE estimates (top row of Fig. 6) always considerably improves the results compared to starting policy selection from scratch (bottom row). For example, in MPG when A-OPS starts with OPE, it is able to cut the OPE regret by more than half before executing 100 trajectories. For this budget, GP+UCB, which starts from scratch, does not reach the same regret as OPE.

**2. How informative is our kernel?** To understand the value of modelling the correlation between policies through the kernel, we compare the GP method with the independent policy model (IND). In Fig. 6 purple and red lines use GP as the policy model and green and blue use the Ind model. In the vast majority of settings (7 out of 8) the use of a kernel significantly improves the results and in one setting (IND+UNIFORM+OPE vs GP+UNIFORM+OPE) they perform on par. We conclude that the kernel is a key ingredient for improving data efficiency.

**3. How important is the selection strategy?** The active selection of policies is generally beneficial for identifying a good policy. For this we refer to the results of dashed lines that correspond to UNIFORM policy selection and solid lines that correspond to the use of UCB. Using IND+UCB yields a high regret in the initial exploration stage, but it improves substantially over IND+UNIFORM later. Moreover, incorporating OPE estimates and a kernel (resulting in A-OPS) significantly shortens the exploration stage.

## 4.5 More ablation studies

### 4.5.1 Dependence on OPE estimates

Incorporating the OPE estimates is clearly beneficial for policy selection. Here, we further study **How does the performance depend on the amount and quality of OPE estimates?**

Computing OPE estimates (like FQE or model-based OPE) can sometimes be expensive. Fig. 7, left depicts the performance of A-OPS by providing OPE estimates for a random subset of  $k \in [0, 50]$  policies. Increasing the number of OPE observations consistently improves the results. This result demonstrates that our method A-OPS can seamlessly incorporate all the available information and benefit from the increasing number of initial observations.

Fig. 7, right compares A-OPS using estimates from different OPE algorithms in DOPE [18] with a small budget of 50 trajectories. A-OPS always improves upon the OPE estimate it starts with, and the performance clearly depends on the quality of the associated OPE estimate. The performance of GP+UCB with 50 trajectories that does not rely on any OPE metric is shown as a horizontal line. Some OPE estimates (e.g., IS, VPM and DICE) have large estimation errors and even a negative correlation with the ranks of policies [18]. As expected, A-OPS is negatively impacted by poor OPE estimates and ignoring them could yield better results. It should be possible to correct for this to a greater extent with more online observations. For now we follow the recommendation to use the FQE estimates.

#### 4.5.2 Dependence on the number of policies

In subsection 2.2 we hypothesised that A-OPS method should be data efficient as it would scale with the diversity of policies and not their number. We next try to verify it and answer the questions **How does the policy selection algorithm scale with the growing number of candidate policies?** In Fig. 8 we show the simple regret for A-OPS and IND+UNIFORM in the MPG domain when we sample 25, 50, 100 and 200 policies. We see that when the number of policies is not very high (25), the algorithm that treats policies independently and samples them at uniform (IND+UNIFORM-25) can closely approach the performance of our method A-OPS-25 after 100 trajectories. However, when the number of policies grows, this small interaction budget is not enough for the naive algorithm: IND+UNIFORM-200 significantly degrades its performance. At the same time, A-OPS-200 is minimally affected by the increase in the number of policies as the diversity of the policies stays approximately the same.




Figure 8: Performance of A-OPS and IND+UNIFORM with varying number of policies available for execution. IND+UNIFORM is affected a lot by the increase in the number of policies. Our approach A-OPS performs similarly when the number of policies is increased by a factor of almost 10.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we introduced the active offline policy selection problem. We proposed a BO solution that integrates OPE estimates with evaluations obtained by interacting with environment. We also proposed a novel kernel that models correlation over policies.

Experiments on two simulated control domains showed that our proposed solution is very effective. The experiments also ablated the different components of the solution, highlighting the value of modelling correlation via the kernel, active selection, and incorporation of OPE estimates in the observation model.

Having tested the method and demonstrated its efficacy, our future plan is to conduct experiments in real domains. The active offline policy selection formulation is also applicable to settings beyond offline RL. For example, in sim2real, we could apply the same method to select the best policy obtained in simulation for deployment in real robots. We have focused on reducing data complexity with BO, but have not considered the potential risks of evaluating offline policies directly in real environments. It is possible that we could alleviate this limitation in a similar fashion by applying constrained BO techniques [59] to search for the best policy without violating safety constraints.

## References

- [1] Martín Abadi, Ashish Agarwal, Paul Barham, Eugene Brevdo, Zhifeng Chen, Craig Citro, Greg S. Corrado, Andy Davis, Jeffrey Dean, Matthieu Devin, Sanjay Ghemawat, Ian Goodfellow, Andrew Harp, Geoffrey Irving, Michael Isard, Yangqing Jia, Rafal Jozefowicz, Lukasz Kaiser, Manjunath Kudlur, Josh Levenberg, Dandelion Mané, Rajat Monga, Sherry Moore, Derek Murray, Chris Olah, Mike Schuster, Jonathon Shlens, Benoit Steiner, Ilya Sutskever, Kunal Talwar, Paul Tucker, Vincent Vanhoucke, Vijay Vasudevan, Fernanda Viégas, Oriol Vinyals, Pete Warden, Martin Wattenberg, Martin Wicke, Yuan Yu, and Xiaoqiang Zheng. TensorFlow: Large-scale machine learning on heterogeneous systems, 2015. Software available from tensorflow.org.
- [2] Rishabh Agarwal, Dale Schuurmans, and Mohammad Norouzi. An optimistic perspective on offline reinforcement learning. 2019.
- [3] Takayuki Akiyama, Hirotaka Hachiya, and Masashi Sugiyama. Efficient exploration through active learning for value function approximation in reinforcement learning. *Neural Networks*, 23(5):639–648, 2010.
- [4] Jean-Yves Audibert, Sébastien Bubeck, and Rémi Munos. Best arm identification in multi-armed bandits. In *Conference on Computational Learning Theory*, pages 41–53, 2010.
- [5] Javad Azimi, Ali Jalali, and Xiaoli Zhang Fern. Hybrid batch bayesian optimization. In *ICML*, 2012.
- [6] Gabriel Barth-Maron, Matthew W Hoffman, David Budden, Will Dabney, Dan Horgan, TB Dhruba, Alistair Muldal, Nicolas Heess, and Timothy Lillicrap. Distributed distributional deterministic policy gradients. In *International Conference for Learning Representations*, 2018.
- [7] E. Brochu, T. Brochu, and N. de Freitas. A Bayesian interactive optimization approach to procedural animation design. In *Proceedings of the 2010 ACM SIGGRAPH/Eurographics Symposium on Computer Animation*, pages 103–112, 2010.
- [8] E. Brochu, N. de Freitas, and A. Ghosh. Active preference learning with discrete choice data. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 409–416, 2007.
- [9] Serkan Cabi, Sergio Gómez Colmenarejo, Alexander Novikov, Ksenia Konyushkova, Scott Reed, Rae Jeong, Konrad Zolna, Yusuf Aytar, David Budden, Mel Vecerik, Oleg Sushkov, David Barker, Jonathan Scholz, Misha Denil, Nando de Freitas, and Ziyu Wang. Scaling data-driven robotics with reward sketching and batch reinforcement learning. In *Robotics: Science and Systems Conference*, 2020.
- [10] Albin Cassirer, Gabriel Barth-Maron, Eugene Brevdo, Sabela Ramos, Toby Boyd, Thibault Sottiaux, and Manuel Kroiss. Reverb: A framework for experience replay, 2021.
- [11] Yutian Chen, Aja Huang, Ziyu Wang, Ioannis Antonoglou, Julian Schrittwieser, David Silver, and Nando de Freitas. Bayesian optimization in AlphaGo. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1812.06855*, 2018.
- [12] Christian Daniel, Malte Viering, Jan Metz, Oliver Kroemer, and Jan Peters. Active reward learning. In *Robotics: Science and systems*, volume 98, 2014.
- [13] Miroslav Dudík, John Langford, and Lihong Li. Doubly robust policy evaluation and learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1103.4601*, 2011.
- [14] Gabriel Dulac-Arnold, Daniel J. Mankowitz, and Todd Hester. Challenges of real-world reinforcement learning. 2019.
- [15] Arkady Epshteyn, Adam Vogel, and Gerald DeJong. Active reinforcement learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th international conference on Machine learning*, pages 296–303, 2008.
- [16] Mehrdad Farajtabar, Yinlam Chow, and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. More robust doubly robust off-policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1447–1456, 2018.
- [17] Justin Fu, Aviral Kumar, Ofir Nachum, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. D4RL: Datasets for deep data-driven reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.07219*, 2020.
- [18] Justin Fu, Mohammad Norouzi, Ofir Nachum, George Tucker, ziyu wang, Alexander Novikov, Mengjiao Yang, Michael R Zhang, Yutian Chen, Aviral Kumar, Cosmin Paduraru, Sergey Levine, and Thomas Paine. Benchmarks for deep off-policy evaluation. In *International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2021.
- [19] Scott Fujimoto, David Meger, and Doina Precup. Off-policy deep reinforcement learning without exploration. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2019.

- [20] Caglar Gulcehre, Sergio Gómez Colmenarejo, Ziyu Wang, Jakub Sygnowski, Thomas Paine, Konrad Zolna, Yutian Chen, Matthew Hoffman, Razvan Pascanu, and Nando de Freitas. Regularized behavior value estimation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2103.09575*, 2021.
- [21] Caglar Gulcehre, Ziyu Wang, Alexander Novikov, Tom Le Paine, Sergio Gomez Colmenarejo, Konrad Zolna, Rishabh Agarwal, Josh Merel, Daniel Mankowitz, Cosmin Paduraru, et al. RL unplugged: A suite of benchmarks for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.13888*, 2020.
- [22] Jean Harb, Tom Schaul, Doina Precup, and Pierre-Luc Bacon. Policy evaluation networks. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2002.11833*, 2020.
- [23] Matt Hoffman, Bobak Shahriari, John Aslanides, Gabriel Barth-Maron, Feryal Behbahani, Tamara Norman, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Albin Cassirer, Fan Yang, Kate Baumli, Sarah Henderson, Alex Novikov, Sergio Gómez Colmenarejo, Serkan Cabi, Caglar Gulcehre, Tom Le Paine, Andrew Cowie, Ziyu Wang, Bilal Piot, and Nando de Freitas. Acme: A research framework for distributed reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.00979*, 2020.
- [24] Matthew Hoffman, Bobak Shahriari, and Nando Freitas. On correlation and budget constraints in model-based bandit optimization with application to automatic machine learning. In *Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 365–374, 2014.
- [25] F. Hutter, H. H. Hoos, and K. Leyton-Brown. Sequential model-based optimization for general algorithm configuration. In *LION*, pages 507–523, 2011.
- [26] Nan Jiang and Lihong Li. Doubly robust off-policy value evaluation for reinforcement learning. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, volume 48, pages 652–661, 2016.
- [27] Dmitry Kalashnikov, Alex Irpan, Peter Pastor, Julian Ibarz, Alexander Herzog, Eric Jang, Deirdre Quillen, Ethan Holly, Mrinal Kalakrishnan, Vincent Vanhoucke, et al. Qt-opt: Scalable deep reinforcement learning for vision-based robotic manipulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1806.10293*, 2018.
- [28] Emilie Kaufmann, Olivier Cappé, and Aurélien Garivier. On bayesian upper confidence bounds for bandit problems. In *Artificial intelligence and statistics*, pages 592–600, 2012.
- [29] Rahul Kidambi, Aravind Rajeswaran, Praneeth Netrapalli, and Thorsten Joachims. Morel: Model-based offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.05951*, 2020.
- [30] Andreas Krause and Cheng S Ong. Contextual gaussian process bandit optimization. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems 24*, pages 2447–2455, 2012.
- [31] David Krueger, Jan Leike, Owain Evans, and John Salvatier. Active reinforcement learning: Observing rewards at a cost. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2011.06709*, 2020.
- [32] Pascal Fua Ksenia Konyushkova, Raphael Sznitman. Discovering general-purpose active learning strategies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1810.04114*, 2019.
- [33] Aviral Kumar, Aurick Zhou, George Tucker, and Sergey Levine. Conservative Q-learning for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2006.04779*, 2020.
- [34] Hoang Le, Cameron Voloshin, and Yisong Yue. Batch policy learning under constraints. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 3703–3712. PMLR, 2019.
- [35] Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, Trevor Darrell, and Pieter Abbeel. End-to-end training of deep visuomotor policies. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):1334–1373, 2016.
- [36] Sergey Levine, Aviral Kumar, George Tucker, and Justin Fu. Offline reinforcement learning: Tutorial, review, and perspectives on open problems. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.01643*, 2020.
- [37] Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Robert E Schapire. A contextual-bandit approach to personalized news article recommendation. In *World Wide Web*, pages 661–670, 2010.
- [38] Lihong Li, Wei Chu, John Langford, and Xuanhui Wang. Unbiased offline evaluation of contextual-bandit-based news article recommendation algorithms. In *Proceedings of the fourth ACM international conference on Web search and data mining*, pages 297–306, 2011.
- [39] Qiang Liu, Lihong Li, Ziyang Tang, and Dengyong Zhou. Breaking the curse of horizon: Infinite-horizon off-policy estimation. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 5356–5366, 2018.
- [40] Daniel J Lizotte, Tao Wang, Michael H Bowling, and Dale Schuurmans. Automatic gait optimization with gaussian process regression. In *IJCAI*, volume 7, pages 944–949, 2007.

- [41] R. Martinez–Cantin, N. de Freitas, E. Brochu, J. Castellanos, and A. Doucet. A Bayesian exploration-exploitation approach for optimal online sensing and planning with a visually guided mobile robot. *Autonomous Robots*, 27(2):93–103, 2009.
- [42] Martino Migliavacca, Alessio Pecorino, Matteo Pirotta, Marcello Restelli, and Andrea Bonarini. Fitted policy search: Direct policy search using a batch reinforcement learning approach. In *3rd International Workshop on Evolutionary and Reinforcement Learning for Autonomous Robot Systems*, page 35, 2010.
- [43] Azalia Mirhoseini, Anna Goldie, Mustafa Yazgan, Joe Jiang, Ebrahim Songhori, Shen Wang, Young-Joon Lee, Eric Johnson, Omkar Pathak, Sungmin Bae, et al. Chip placement with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2004.10746*, 2020.
- [44] Volodymyr Mnih, Koray Kavukcuoglu, David Silver, Alex Graves, Ioannis Antonoglou, Daan Wierstra, and Martin Riedmiller. Playing atari with deep reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1312.5602*, 2013.
- [45] Remi Munos, Tom Stepleton, Anna Harutyunyan, and Marc Bellemare. Safe and efficient off-policy reinforcement learning. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 1054–1062. 2016.
- [46] Ofir Nachum, Yinlam Chow, Bo Dai, and Lihong Li. Dualdice: Behavior-agnostic estimation of discounted stationary distribution corrections. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2318–2328, 2019.
- [47] Xinkun Nie, Emma Brunskill, and Stefan Wager. Learning when-to-treat policies. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1905.09751*, 2019.
- [48] Tom Le Paine, Cosmin Paduraru, Andrea Michi, Caglar Gulcehre, Konrad Zolna, Alexander Novikov, Ziyu Wang, and Nando de Freitas. Hyperparameter selection for offline reinforcement learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.09055*, 2020.
- [49] Doina Precup. Eligibility traces for off-policy policy evaluation. *Computer Science Department Faculty Publication Series*, page 80, 2000.
- [50] Doina Precup, Richard S. Sutton, and Satinder P. Singh. Eligibility traces for off-policy policy evaluation. In *Proceedings of the Seventeenth International Conference on Machine Learning*, ICML ’00, page 759–766, San Francisco, CA, USA, 2000. Morgan Kaufmann Publishers Inc.
- [51] Carl Edward Rasmussen and Christopher K. I. Williams. *Gaussian Processes for Machine Learning (Adaptive Computation and Machine Learning)*. The MIT Press, 2005.
- [52] Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Thomas Hubert, Karen Simonyan, Laurent Sifre, Simon Schmitt, Arthur Guez, Edward Lockhart, Demis Hassabis, Thore Graepel, Timothy P. Lillicrap, and David Silver. Mastering Atari, Go, Chess and Shogi by Planning with a Learned Model. *Nature*, 588(7839):604–609, 2020.
- [53] Bobak Shahriari, Kevin Swersky, Ziyu Wang, Ryan P Adams, and Nando De Freitas. Taking the human out of the loop: A review of Bayesian optimization. *Proceedings of the IEEE*, 104(1):148–175, 2015.
- [54] Noah Siegel, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Felix Berkenkamp, Abbas Abdolmaleki, Michael Neunert, Thomas Lampe, Roland Hafner, Nicolas Heess, and Martin Riedmiller. Keep doing what worked: Behavior modelling priors for offline reinforcement learning. In *International Conference for Learning Representations*, 2020.
- [55] David Silver, Aja Huang, Chris J Maddison, Arthur Guez, Laurent Sifre, George Van Den Driessche, Julian Schrittwieser, Ioannis Antonoglou, Veda Panneershelvam, Marc Lanctot, et al. Mastering the game of Go with deep neural networks and tree search. *Nature*, 529(7587):484, 2016.
- [56] J. Snoek, H. Larochelle, and R. P. Adams. Practical Bayesian optimization of machine learning algorithms. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, pages 2951–2959, 2012.
- [57] Niranjan Srinivas, Andreas Krause, Sham Kakade, and Matthias Seeger. Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 1015–1022, 2010.
- [58] Niranjan Srinivas, Andreas Krause, Sham M Kakade, and Matthias Seeger. Gaussian process optimization in the bandit setting: No regret and experimental design. *arXiv preprint arXiv:0912.3995*, 2009.
- [59] Yanan Sui, Alkis Gotovos, Joel Burdick, and Andreas Krause. Safe exploration for optimization with gaussian processes. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 997–1005. PMLR, 2015.

- [60] Richard S Sutton, Hamid Reza Maei, Doina Precup, Shalabh Bhatnagar, David Silver, Csaba Szepesvari, and Eric Wiewiora. Fast gradient-descent methods for temporal-difference learning with linear function approximation. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 993–1000, 2009.
- [61] Richard S Sutton, A Rupam Mahmood, and Martha White. An emphatic approach to the problem of off-policy temporal-difference learning. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 17(1):2603–2631, 2016.
- [62] Yuval Tassa, Saran Tunyasuvunakool, Alistair Muldal, Yotam Doron, Siqi Liu, Steven Bohez, Josh Merel, Tom Erez, Timothy Lillicrap, and Nicolas Heess. dm\_control: Software and tasks for continuous control, 2020.
- [63] Georgios Theocharous, Philip S Thomas, and Mohammad Ghavamzadeh. Personalized ad recommendation systems for life-time value optimization with guarantees. In *International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2015.
- [64] Masatoshi Uehara, Jiawei Huang, and Nan Jiang. Minimax weight and Q-function learning for off-policy evaluation. In *Proceedings of Machine Learning and Systems*, pages 1023–1032. 2020.
- [65] Ziyu Wang, Alexander Novikov, Konrad  o lna, Jost Tobias Springenberg, Scott Reed, Bobak Shahriari, Noah Siegel, Josh Merel, Caglar Gulcehre, Nicolas Heess, and Nando de Freitas. Critic regularized regression. In *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2020.
- [66] Mengjiao Yang, Bo Dai, Ofir Nachum, George Tucker, and Dale Schuurmans. Offline policy selection under uncertainty. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2012.06919*, 2020.
- [67] Mengjiao Yang, Ofir Nachum, Bo Dai, Lihong Li, and Dale Schuurmans. Off-policy evaluation via the regularized lagrangian. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2007.03438*, 2020.
- [68] Tianhe Yu, Garrett Thomas, Lantao Yu, Stefano Ermon, James Zou, Sergey Levine, Chelsea Finn, and Tengyu Ma. MOPO: Model-based offline policy optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2005.13239*, 2020.
- [69] Michael R Zhang, Tom Le Paine, Ofir Nachum, Cosmin Paduraru, George Tucker, Ziyu Wang, and Mohammad Norouzi. Autoregressive dynamics models for offline policy evaluation and optimization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2104.13877*, 2021.

## A Algorithmic Details

### A.1 GP model

Following the data generative process in Sec. 2.2, the hierarchical probabilistic model of all the latent policy values  $\mu$ , OPE estimates  $\rho$ , and episodic returns  $r$  at the given  $K$  policies  $\{\pi_k\}_{k=1}^K$  is given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K &\sim \mathcal{N}(m\mathbf{1}_K, \mathbf{K}) \\ \rho_k &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \sigma_\rho^2), \forall k \in \{1, \dots, K\} \\ r_k^i &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \sigma_r^2), \forall i \in \{1, \dots, N_k\} \\ \sigma_\rho^2 &\sim \text{IG}(\alpha, \beta) \\ \sigma_r^2 &\sim \text{IG}(\alpha, \beta),\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

where the mean  $m$  is a constant hyper-parameter and the covariance  $\mathbf{K}(\pi_k, \pi_{k'}) = \mathcal{K}(\pi_k, \pi_{k'})$ . The kernel function is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{K}(\pi_k, \pi_{k'}) &= \sigma_k^2 \exp(-\bar{d}(\pi_k, \pi_{k'})/l) \\ \bar{d}(\pi_k, \pi_{k'}) &= \mathbb{E}_{s \sim \mathcal{D}'} d(\pi_k(s), \pi_{k'}(s)) \\ \sigma_k^2 &\sim \text{IG}(\alpha, \beta),\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

with  $\mathcal{D}'$  being a fixed set of states that is randomly subsampled from the entire offline dataset  $\mathcal{D}$ .  $\sigma_k^2$  and  $l$  are hyper-parameters. We assume an uninformative prior for  $l$ .

The posterior distribution of  $[\mu_1, \dots, \mu_K]$  given all the observation and hyper-parameters is also a multivariate normal distribution given in Eq. 5. The log-marginal likelihood of all the hyper-parameters with  $\mu_k$ 's integrated out is as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\log P(m, \sigma_\rho^2, \sigma_r^2, \sigma_k^2, l | \boldsymbol{\rho}, \{\mathbf{r}_k\}_k) \\ = -\frac{1}{2} \log |\boldsymbol{\Sigma}| - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T \boldsymbol{\Sigma} \mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2} \left( K \log(\sigma_\rho^2) + n \log(\sigma_r^2) - \sum_{k=1}^K \log(\Lambda_{kk}) \right) \\ - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^K \left( \frac{\rho_k^2}{\sigma_\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_r^2} \sum_{i=1}^{N_k} (r_k^i)^2 - \frac{\mathbf{y}_k^2}{\Lambda_{kk}} \right) + \log \text{IG}(\sigma_\rho^2) + \log \text{IG}(\sigma_r^2) + \log \text{IG}(\sigma_k^2) + \text{const.},\end{aligned}\tag{11}$$

where  $n = \sum_k N_k$  and const. is a constant.

### A.2 Independent policy value baseline model (IND)

In Sec. 4.2, we consider a baseline model with independent policy value distributions as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}r_k^i &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\mu_k, \sigma_{k,r}^2), \forall i, \text{ with} \\ \mu_k &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \mathcal{N}(\rho_k, \sigma_{k,\rho}^2), \forall k \\ \sigma_{k,\rho}^2 &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{IG}(\alpha, \beta), \forall k \\ \sigma_{k,r}^2 &\stackrel{i.i.d.}{\sim} \text{IG}(\alpha, \beta), \forall k.\end{aligned}\tag{12}$$

Since the model is i.i.d. across policies, we omit the index  $k$  for ease of notation. The posterior distribution of  $\mu$  given  $\mathbf{r} = [r^1, \dots, r^N]$ ,  $\sigma_r^2$  and  $\sigma_\rho^2$  is then given as

$$\begin{aligned}\mu &\sim \mathcal{N}(m, s^2) \\ m &= \frac{\sum_{i=1}^N r^i + (\sigma_r^2/\sigma_\rho^2)\rho}{N + (\sigma_r^2/\sigma_\rho^2)} \\ s^2 &= \frac{\sigma_r^2}{N + (\sigma_r^2/\sigma_\rho^2)}.\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

The log-marginal likelihood with  $\mu$  integrated out can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned} & \log P(\sigma_\rho^2, \sigma_r^2 | \rho, \mathbf{r}) \\ &= -\frac{1}{2} (\log(\sigma_\rho^2) + N \log(\sigma_r^2) - \log(s^2)) - \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\rho^2}{\sigma_\rho^2} + \frac{1}{\sigma_r^2} \sum_{i=1}^N (r^i)^2 - \frac{y^2}{s^2} \right) \\ &+ \log \text{IG}(\sigma_\rho^2) + \log \text{IG}(\sigma_r^2) + \text{const.}, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

where const. is a constant.

### A.3 Hyperparameter fitting

We fit the hyperparameters in both models whenever a new observation is obtained by searching for the maximum a posteriori (MAP) estimate using a few steps of gradient descent on the log-marginal likelihood.

Fitting the hyper-parameters at the beginning with few observations is challenging. When we do not use OPE to warm start GP inference such as in GP+UCB and GP+UNIFORM, we start by randomly selecting the first 5 policies to execute. Besides, it is important in this case to apply a prior for hyperparameters to prevent variance from shrinking towards zero. When OPE is available, we find neither of these techniques is required for a robust estimation and we can start fitting the hyperparameters of GP from the first step.

### A.4 Hyperparameter values

The initial values of the hyperparameters of GP and our method in general are listed next.

- We find using a constant value  $\sqrt{\beta_i} = 5$  in GP-UCB works well across different budgets, Bayesian models, and environments, although a more sophisticated scheduling [58, 4, 24] could further improve the results.
- The hyperparameters of the prior for IND were set to:  $\alpha = 1, \beta = 1000$
- Observation noise variance of GP was set to the initial value of 1000 or prior with  $\alpha = 1, \beta = 200$  when the prior is used. Initial value of the offset  $m$  was 0.
- For GP optimisation we used Adam optimiser with learning rate 0.001 and 1000 optimisation steps per observation update.  $\beta_1 = 0.9, \beta_2 = 0.999$ .
- Initial variance of the kernel was set to 10. When the prior is use, we set  $\alpha = 1, \beta = 200$  in all the experiments.
- To compensate to the non-zero mean in the GP, we use a constant component in the kernel with trainable variance parameter initially set to 10.

### A.5 Kernel selection

In our preliminary experiments, we experimented with a few ways to compute the kernel over policies. To quickly select promising ideas, we tested them in a simple regression task where we split all policies with their true returns into training and testing sets and predict the returns of the test policies based on the training policies. Then, we select the kernel that gives the highest log likelihood and lowest squared prediction error. We choose the best type of kernel using 3 dm-control environments (`cartpole_swingup`, `fish_swim` and `manipulator_insert_ball`) and apply the same kernel to all tasks of both domains in the experiments. The most important variations of the kernel that we studied are enumerated below. We highlight the variant that was used in the final experiments.

- As a subset  $\mathcal{D}'$  of states for computing policy's actions, we select 1000 states. We tried to use 1) *random states*, 2) initial states, 3) states with high rewards, 4) states with low rewards, 5) states in the trajectories with high returns, 6) states in the trajectories with low returns. Several options looked promising, including 1, 2, 4. At the end we chose the simplest option that yielded good results (1).
- As a way to construct a kernel from the policy actions on several states, we considered: 1) *multiplication of kernels on separate states*, 2) concatenating action predictions into a single

feature vector. We chose kernel multiplication because we found in our experiments that concatenating the action in a single vector makes the distances not very informative. This happens because the dimensionality of the policy representation becomes very high.

- After obtaining the distances matrix for the policies, we compute the kernel. We tried 1) RBF, 2) Matérn 5/2, 3) Matérn 3/2, 4) Matérn 1/2 kernels. While the difference between these versions was not large, the less smooth kernel Matérn 1/2 performed slightly better and reflected our intuition that the return of policies trained with different algorithms can change quickly (Fig. 3, right).

## A.6 Bayesian optimization algorithm

The pseudo-code of the Bayesian optimization algorithm for both models is presented in algorithm 1.

---

**Algorithm 1:** UCB algorithm for active offline policy selection

---

**Data:** Environment env, set of policies  $\{\pi_k\}$ ,  $1 \leq k \leq K$ , number of initial random samples  $n_{\text{init}}$ , total number of steps  $n$ , (optional) OPE estimates  $\{\rho_k\}$

**Result:** Final recommendation  $\hat{k}$

**for**  $i : 1 \rightarrow n$  **do**

**if**  $i \leq n_{\text{init}}$  **then**

    | Sample a policy  $k_i$  uniformly from  $\{1, 2, \dots, K\}$

**else**

    | Fit hyper-parameters by maximizing the log-marginal likelihood (Eq. 11 or Eq. 14) with

      | all the return samples  $r_i$  and OPE estimates  $\rho_k$ ;

    | Update the posterior of  $\mu$  using Eq. 5 or Eq. 13;

    | Compute the UCB acquisition function  $u_i(k)$  for every policy  $k$  using Eq. 7;

    | Choose a policy  $k_i = \arg \max_k u_i(k)$ ;

**end**

  | Apply policy  $\pi_{k_i}$  in env for one episode and receive the discounted episodic return  $r_i$ ;

**end**

Maximize the log-marginal likelihood (Eq. 11 or Eq. 14) wrt the hyper-parameters using Adam;

Update the posterior of  $\mu$  using Eq. 5 or Eq. 13;

**return**  $\hat{k} = \arg \max_k \mathbf{m}_k$  with  $\mathbf{m}_k$  being the posterior mean of  $k$ -th policy

---

## B DeepMind Control Suite Results

We use policies from the DOPE benchmark [18], which results in a diverse set of policies with varying algorithms (D4PG, ABM, CRR), hyperparameters like learning rate, and number of learner steps, giving up to 96 policies per task, and a diverse range of returns. There are 9 environments as shown in the top row of Fig. 9: `cartpole_swingup`, `cheetah_run`, `finger_turn_hard`, `fish_swim`, `humanoid_run`, `manipulator_insert_ball`, `manipulator_insert_peg`, `walker_stand`, `walker_walk`.

In the experiments with various OPE metrics we considered Fitted Q Evaluation with a standard L2 loss (FQE-L2), Variational Power Method (VPM), Distribution Correction Estimation (DICE), Model-Based OPE with a feedforward transition model (MB-FF), Model-Based OPE with an auto-regressive transition model (MB-AR), Double Robust (DR), and Importance Sampling (IS).

### B.1 Results by task

While subsection 4.3 and subsection 4.4 present the aggregated results across all tasks, here we present figures for each task separately.

Similar to Fig. 5, Fig. 10 shows the comparison between our proposed method A-OPS, completely offline policy selection with OPE and completely online selection with IND+UNIFORM on each of 9 task from dm-control. Depending on the quality of the initial OPE values and the variance of the policy returns, A-OPS may take different number of trajectories before it outperforms all the




Figure 9: Environments used in the experiments. Top: 9 environments from the dm-control domain. Bottom: 4 environments from the MPG domain.

baselines, but usually it only takes a few steps. Eventually, A-OPS reaches the best performance with the limited budget.




Figure 10: Comparison of A-OPS approach, offline policy selection with OPE, and online policy selection with IND+UNIFORM on each environment in dm-control domain. The results are averaged across 100 experiments. We do not show OPE performance in `manipulator_insert_peg` in order to respect the y-axis limits. The value is 0.88 as D4PG policies are highly overestimated. Shaded areas show standard deviation of the mean. Our method A-OPS quickly surpasses the baselines and achieves the lowest regrets.

Similar to Fig. 6 (first row), Fig. 11 shows the contribution of each of the components of the method. Our method A-OPS is preferable in all environments across a wide range of interaction budget except for `cheetah_run` with less than 50 trajectories. Again we observe that modelling correlated policies as in GP performs better than independent policies as in IND, active policy selection as in UCB is better than uniform policy selection as in UNIFORM.

Similar to Fig. 6 (second row), Fig. 12 shows the contribution of each of the components of the method in case when OPE is not used. It is clear that the results are significantly worse than when




Figure 11: Ablations. In 9 environments of dm-control domain, we ablate two components of our approach when using OPE metrics. 1) The choice of policy model: GP (purple) and independent (green). 2) The policy selection strategy: active (dark, solid line) and uniform sampling (bright, dashed line). We do not show OPE performance in `manipulator_insert_peg` in order to respect the y-axis limits. The value is 0.88 as D4PG policies are highly overestimated. In general, active is better than uniform, methods that exploit policy correlation are better than methods that do not.

using OPE (Fig. 11) which clearly indicated the benefit of OPE component in A-OPS. When OPE estimates are not available, the combination of modelling correlated policies as in GP and intelligent policy selection as in UCB gives the best results on average. It performs better than the next best method in 6 environments, slightly worse in 1 and approximately the same in 2. On average, the GP+UCB strategy is the best when OPE estimates are not available.

## C MPG Results

To generate policies we follow the protocol in [48]. For each task, we generate up to 256 policies trained with various algorithms (BC, D4PG, and CRR), and hyperparameters including number of hidden units (64, 1024), number of blocks (1, 5), learning rate (1e-3, 1e-5), learning steps (50k, 250k, 25k), and for CRR the beta parameter (0.1, 10). This ensures there is a diverse range of policies that span the range of possible returns. There are four tasks in MPG domain: `box`, `insertion`, `slide`, and `stack_banana`.

### C.1 Results by task

Similar to Fig. 5, Fig. 13 shows the comparison between our proposed method A-OPS, completely offline policy selection with OPE and completely online selection with IND+UNIFORM on each of 4 tasks from MPG. In 2 environments, A-OPS only approaches the OPE baseline, but in the other 2 environments, A-OPS quickly surpasses OPE. This difference is due to the excellent performance of OPE method on 2 environments (regret close to 0). Besides, we observed that the returns in the online policy executions vary greatly, and this requires a large number of environment interactions




Figure 12: Ablations. In 9 environments of dm-control domain, we ablate two components of our approach when NOT using OPE metrics. 1) The choice of policy model: GP (red) and independent (blue). 2) The policy selection strategy: active (dark, solid line) and uniform sampling (bright, dashed line). We do not show OPE performance in `manipulator_insert_peg` in order to respect the y-axis limits. The value is 0.88 as D4PG policies are highly overestimated. In general, active is better than uniform, methods that exploit policy correlation are better than methods that do not.

for an online policy evaluation method to provide accurate estimates. However, the most important observations is that A-OPS achieves a small regret in all environments.

Similar to Fig. 6 (first row), Fig. 14 shows the contribution of each of the components of the method. Our method A-OPS is preferable in all environments across a wide range of interaction budgets. The same observation as before holds: modelling correlated policies as in GP performs better than modelling independent policies as in IND, active policy selection as in UCB is better than uniform policy selection as in UNIFORM.

Similar to Fig. 6 (second row), Fig. 15 shows the contribution of each of the components of the method in case when OPE is not used. As before, the results are significantly worse than when using OPE (Fig. 14). When OPE estimates are not available, the combination of modelling correlated policies as in GP and intelligent policy selection as in UCB gives the best results in each task. Notice the degraded performance of IND+UCB in the first 200 iterations (mostly exploration stage). This happens because each policy is treated independently and until each of them is executed (200 policies) the regret is quite high. Modelling correlation between the policies as in GP methods helps to alleviate this problem.

## D Additional Experiments

### D.1 Ranking as performance measure

We quantified the performance of the policy selection algorithms based on the simple regret so far. Other performance metrics could be used, for example, the rank of the selected policy. The best rank




Figure 13: Comparison of A-OPS approach, offline policy selection with OPE, and online policy selection with IND+UNIFORM on each environment in MPG domain. The results are averaged across 100 experiments. Shaded areas show standard deviation of the mean. Our method A-OPS quickly surpasses IND+UNIFORM baseline. A-OPS achieves the regret close to 0 in all environments.




Figure 14: Ablations. In 4 environments of MPG domain, we ablate two components of our approach when using OPE metrics. 1) The choice of policy model: GP (purple) and independent (green). 2) The policy selection strategy: active (dark, solid line) and uniform sampling (bright, dashed line). In general, active is better than uniform, methods that exploit policy correlation are better than methods that do not.

is 1 that means that the best policy was found and the worst rank is  $K$ , where  $K$  is the number of




Figure 15: Ablations. In 4 environments of MPG domain, we ablate two components of our approach when NOT using OPE metrics. 1) The choice of policy model: GP (red) and independent (blue). 2) The policy selection strategy: active (dark, solid line) and uniform sampling (bright, dashed line). In general, active is better than uniform, methods that exploit policy correlation are better than methods that do not.

candidate policies. Fig. 16 shows results similar to Fig. 5 and Fig. 6 for the ranking metric. The same observations still hold.




Figure 16: Ranking performance metric. Aggregated across 9 environments of the dm-control domain, we show the performance of the policy selection methods in terms of the rank of the selected policy. The same observations hold: A-OPS is the best strategy, active is better than uniform, methods that exploit policy correlation are better than methods that do not.

## D.2 Different selections strategies

Finally, we note that the selected best strategy A-OPS as GP+UCB+OPE is just one realisation of the active policy selection strategy. We chose UCB as our strategy as it demonstrated promising results across different environments and domains. However, other active selection strategies apply as well, for example, epsilon-greedy or expected improvement (EI). In Fig. 17 we show the performance of various selection strategies in one domain. The choice of a BO strategy makes a considerably smaller difference than the increase of regret when using uniform sampling (GP+UNIFORM+OPE).




Figure 17: Performance of various selection strategies in conjunction with GP+OPE in 9 environments of dm-control domain. The difference between uniform and active selection strategies is significant, while the difference between various active selection strategies is small. For better visualization, we do not show the standard deviation, which is comparable to the A-OPS result in Fig. 6.