## A CLARIFICATION

**Terminology and Notations.** In order to minimize confusion of the terminologies, here we give comprehensive description of visual granularity, knowledge space, and principal scene components with figure illustration for each concept.



Below are additional notations and explanations we used in the paper:

**Principle Query**  $(\mathbf{Q}_p)$ : A variable within Gaussian primitives, designed to encode low-rank embeddings.

Scene  $\left( V\right)$  : A 3D environment observable from multiple viewpoints.

 ${\tt View}~({\bf V}_*):~{\tt A}$  single perspective or projection of the 3D scene.

Foundation Models  $(\mathbf{F}): \star\star$  Large vision-language models that map views into structured knowledge spaces.

 ${\tt Embeddings}~(E):$  Outputs generated by foundation models, representing data in their respective knowledge spaces.

**Raw Features**  $(\mathbf{R})$ : A comprehensive collection of embeddings produced by foundation models, encompassing the full knowledge space.

**Rendered Feature** ( $\hat{\mathbf{R}}$ ): Features derived through Gaussian splatting, computed using Gaussian memory attention.

**Gaussian Memory Attention.** Gaussian Memory Attention, as defined in the main paper, is the procedure to render the raw feature from principal query of a single view:

$$\hat{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{A}_{gm}(\mathbf{Q}_p^{\mathbf{V}_*}) = \text{Softmax}(\mathbf{Q}_p^{\mathbf{V}_*} \times \mathbf{W}_m \times \mathbf{PSC}^T) \times \mathbf{PSC}.$$
(4)

The high level logic of Gaussian Memory Attention is to first project the principal query  $(\mathbf{Q}_p^{\mathbf{V}*})$ , which the the compressed representation of **PSC** into its original dimensionality. Then we compute the similarity of the up-sampled principal queries  $(\mathbf{Q}_p^{\mathbf{V}*} \times \mathbf{W}_m)$  with principal scene components. Finally, according to the similarity score, we do a weighted sum of the principal scene components, the resulted feature is the final rendered feature in-aligned with foundation model features.

In the figure below, we show the visualization of principal query, psc, raw feature and the final render feature. All the images, including the circles  $(\bullet, \bullet, \bullet, \bullet)$  are directly draw by algorithm. We will explain how each component is drawn in details:

**Principal Query:** Given an image with size [h, w], the rendered principal queries of the given view is [c, h, w]. We compute the umap of the principal query and downsample the feature dimension to 3, and visualize umap feature in rgb format via colormap. We overlay the original rgb image and the visualization of rendered pricipal components. Finally, in order to use visualization to proof-of-concept of Gaussian Memory Attention, we sample four principal queries on location [0.25, 0.25], [0.25, 0.75], [0.75, 0.25], [0.75, 0.75]. And those four points are corresponding to the circle drawn in the image with  $\bullet, \bullet, \bullet$ .

**Principal Scene Component** (best viewed with zoom-in) : The principal scene components are the subset of raw feature. In the second column, we visualize the umap down-sampled principal scene component ( $\bullet$ ) and around 1/20 original raw feature ( $\bullet$ ). The top-5 PSC components to the corresponding principal queries are represented with  $\bullet$ ,  $\bullet$ ,  $\bullet$ ,  $\bullet$  again. In this way, we could know where the original four pixel of principal query falls in the PSC space.

**Principal Scene Component** (best viewed with zoom-in) : This part is the most important in the table. It traces back to the original feature location for the top-1 PCA component in the second column. The circles •, •, •, • are draw with the center of the traced pixel in the feature map. It clearly shows that the train, sky, ground, stars are clearly correlated to the correct PSC component that is part of the original raw features.

**Render Feature:** Finally we clearly show the final rendered feature after gaussian memory attention in the last column.



## B M3 LMM BENCHMARK

**Grounding.** We create the LMM evaluation benchmark on grounding using SoM [43] and Semantic-SAM [20]. The pipeline first uses Semantic-SAM to label the marked image and then uses SoM and GPT4-o to label the marked region with proper text. Below we show examples of the datasets Train, Geisel, and Garden.



**Retrieval & Captioning.** Similar to grounding, we also use SoM [43] and Semantic-SAM [20] labeled images to generate the description for the evaluation dataset including Train, Geisel, Garden, Drjohnson, and Playroom. Below, we show examples in Drjohnson and Garden to show variants with the grounding examples.



## C QUALITATIVE RESULTS

**Real Robot Experiments.** In addition to the main paper. We conduct additional real robot experiments on (1) Part-level understanding. (2) Multi-Scene Scenario. (3) Long-Horizon Task. Below we show the command and demo video frames for each task. Note, for the multi-scene task, we use CLIP and SigLIP for grounding different scenes to achieve the multi-foundation model scenario.

(1) Pick up the screwdriver by its handle and place it on the plate.



Figure 8: Real robot deployment on part-level understanding, multi-scene and long-horizon tasks.

**Feature Comparison.** Here we visualize the feature PCA comparison between **M3** and F-3DGS. Noted that different from the original paper of F-3DGS that uses semantic clustering for VLM features, in our work, we train both **M3** and F-3DGS for the original VLM features for fair comparison. Looking at the visualization below, we can observe that while numerical performance is not too far away between these two methods, the feature quality and continuity of F-3DGS are much lower than **M3**. We show features from both CLIP and SigLIP models on train and Geisel datasets.

F-3DGS, CLIP, Train			
M3, CLIP, Train			
F-3DGS, SigLIP, Train			
M3, SigLIP, Train			
F-3DGS, CLIP, Geisel			
		artanakan Pulangkan	
M3, CLIP, Geisel			
		huck	
F-3DGS, SigLIP, Geisel			
M3, SigLIP, Geisel			
Ser			

**Knowledge Space** ( $\mathcal{KS}$ ) **Visualization.** We visualize the knowledge space across datasets and foundation models. As shown in the figure below, we visualize both the Tabletop and Train dataset. The knowledge space manifold was built by all the feature pixels for each foundation model in the video, the blue point is the raw feature, and the red point is the principal component, the first and second rows are multi-view visualizations of the feature manifold. We could interestingly observe that the feature manifold pattern is different across foundation models, and especially the LLaMAv feature is the most diverse and continuous. This is actually interestingly aligned with the feature visualization of Fig.6 in the main paper.

