

# Image-based Geo-localization for Robotics: Are Black-box Vision-Language Models there yet?

Sania Waheed<sup>1</sup>, Bruno Ferrarini<sup>2</sup>, Michael Milford<sup>3</sup>, Sarvapali D. Ramchurn<sup>1</sup> and Shoaib Ehsan<sup>1,4</sup>.

**Abstract**—The advances in Vision-Language models (VLMs) offer exciting opportunities for robotic applications involving image geo-localization – the problem of identifying the geo-coordinates of a place based on visual data only. Recent research works have focused on using a VLM as embeddings extractor for geo-localization, however, the most sophisticated VLMs may only be available as black boxes that are accessible through an API, and come with a number of limitations: there is no access to training data, model features and gradients; retraining is not possible; the number of predictions may be limited by the API; training on model outputs is often prohibited; and queries are open-ended. The utilization of a VLM as a stand-alone, zero-shot geo-localization system using a single text-based prompt is largely unexplored. To bridge this gap, this paper undertakes the first systematic study, to the best of our knowledge, to investigate the potential of some of the state-of-the-art VLMs as stand-alone, zero-shot geo-localization systems in a black-box setting with realistic constraints. We consider three main scenarios for this thorough investigation: a) fixed text-based prompt; b) semantically-equivalent text-based prompts; and c) semantically-equivalent query images. We also take into account the auto-regressive and probabilistic generation process of the VLMs when investigating their utility for geo-localization task by using model consistency as a metric in addition to traditional accuracy. Our work provides new insights in the capabilities of different VLMs for the above-mentioned scenarios.

## I. INTRODUCTION

The advances in Vision-Language models (VLMs) offer exciting opportunities for robotic applications involving image geo-localization, such as autonomous driving and navigation [1], [2], [3], scene understanding [4], augmented reality applications, and environmental monitoring. However, image geo-localization remains a highly challenging task due to the vast scale and diversity of our planet, as well as environmental variations caused by different factors such as seasonal, climatic, and lighting changes.

Traditionally, geo-localization efforts have been focused on classification and retrieval approaches, using either CNN or transformer-based architectures for feature extraction.

This work was supported by the U.K. Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council under Grant EP/Y009800/1 and Grant EP/V00784X/1

<sup>1</sup>Sania Waheed and Sarvapali D. Ramchurn are with the School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ. (swlm24@soton.ac.uk; sdr1@soton.ac.uk)

<sup>2</sup>Bruno Ferrarini is with MyWay srl, Via Osti, 6 - 29010 Vernasca (PC). (bferrarini.ac.uk@gmail.com)

<sup>3</sup>M. Milford is with the School of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane, QLD 4000, Australia. (michael.milford@qut.edu.au)

<sup>1,4</sup>Shoaib Ehsan is with the School of Electronics and Computer Science, University of Southampton, SO17 1BJ Southampton, U.K., and also with the School of Computer Science and Electronic Engineering, University of Essex, CO4 3SQ Colchester, U.K. (s.ehsan@soton.ac.uk)




Fig. 1. Proposed framework for investigating VLMs in a black-box setting for geo-localization task. **Scenario 1:** A fixed prompt is used with the given query image to measure the model’s accuracy in predicting image geo-location. **Scenario 2:** The prompt sensitivity of the model is tested using semantically-equivalent prompts, assessing both accuracy and self-consistency across varied input prompts. **Scenario 3:** The model’s response to environmental variations in the query image is evaluated by using semantically-equivalent images, measuring both accuracy and self-consistency.

More recently, VLMs have helped incorporate broader semantic and contextual knowledge to the extracted features. Despite their potential, VLMs have primarily been used as feature extractors [5], [6], [7] rather than as stand-alone geo-localization systems. Although this approach has shown promising results, a major limitation is that the most advanced models are only available through APIs, which restricts access to model features and gradients.

Recently, [8] has shown that state-of-the-art (SOTA) VLMs, such as GPT-4v, are capable geo-locators even in a black-box setting using a single text-based prompt. This conclusion, however, is based on a single experiment using a standard publicly available image geo-localization dataset [9] which may have been seen by the model during pre-training. It is therefore important to examine the model’s geo-localization accuracy across both publicly available and non-public datasets. Secondly, semantically-equivalent text-based prompts and semantically-equivalent query images need to be taken into consideration before drawing a conclusion about the geo-localization capabilities of VLMs. Thirdly, the auto-

regressive and probabilistic generation process of the VLMs requires to be taken into account while investigating the utility for geo-localization task.

To overcome the above-mentioned shortcomings, this paper performs a systematic study to thoroughly investigate the geo-localization capabilities of some of the SOTA VLMs. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first paper that attempts to answer several key questions in this context: Are black-box VLMs reliable geo-locators using a single text-based prompt? What is the sensitivity of VLMs to semantically-equivalent text-based prompts? What is the sensitivity of VLMs to semantically-equivalent query images? What is the relationship between model accuracy and model consistency, and how does this affect the reliability of the model?

This paper makes three main contributions (as illustrated in Fig. 1):

- First, we conduct a comprehensive study on the performance of three SOTA VLMs (GPT-4v, IDEFICS-80b-Instruct, and LLaVA-13b) for the geo-localization task in a black-box setting, providing an in-depth analysis of their applicability as stand-alone, zero-shot geo-localization systems for robotic applications. We benchmark the performance of these models on two standard publicly available datasets (IM2GPS [9] and Tokyo 24/7 [10]) and two non-public datasets (CSN and LZR).
- Second, we systematically investigate the models' sensitivity to text-based prompt variations (while keeping the query images fixed) in terms of model accuracy and consistency for assessing how different prompt formulations impact the geo-localization predictions.
- Third, we thoroughly examine the models' sensitivity to semantically-equivalent query images with environmental variations (while keeping the text-based prompt fixed), including factors such as lighting, weather, and seasonal changes, using model accuracy and consistency as metrics. This perspective highlights how real-world environmental conditions can significantly influence VLM accuracy.

Our findings reveal that SOTA VLMs exhibit strong performance in black-box geo-localization tasks at broader spatial levels, such as country or regional level localization. However, their fine-grained localization accuracy does not generalize well to non-public datasets, suggesting potential performance inflation due to overlap between public datasets and the models' training data. Furthermore, these models also struggle to generalize effectively under environmental or prompt variations.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section II reviews related work, section III describes the proposed framework and evaluation metrics. Section IV details the experimental setup, including datasets, models, and prompting methods. Section V presents the results and discussions and section VI concludes the paper with future research directions.

### Single-Sentence Prompt Variations

- **Prompt 1:** What is this location? Give me the geo-coordinates only.
- **Prompt 2:** Where is this place on Earth? Can you predict the geo-coordinates?
- **Prompt 3:** Predict the geo-coordinates for the input image.
- **Prompt 4:** Provide a latitude and longitude for this place.
- **Prompt 5:** Can you specify the exact geo-coordinates for this image?

Fig. 2. Single-Sentence Prompt Variations

## II. RELATED WORK

This section provides an overview of the related work in image-based geo-localization and VLMs.

### A. Image Based Geo-localization

This task aims to determine the precise geographic coordinates of a location based solely on visual input. Approaches in this field can be broadly categorized into restricted and planet-scale geo-localization [11], [12]. Restricted geo-localization focuses on specific environments, such as individual cities or well-known landmarks [13], [14], [15], [16], [17], [18], [19]. In contrast, planet-scale geo-localization tackles the more challenging task of global localization without geographic restrictions [9] which is significantly more complex due to the diversity of environments and the variability in image conditions. To address these challenges, geo-localization methods primarily rely on retrieval or classification techniques [20], [21], [22], [23], [24], [25], [26], [27], [28]. Both these approaches utilize feature extraction models built on CNNs [29], [12], [30] or transformer architectures [27], [31].

### B. VLMs in Geo-localization

VLMs have recently gained prominence in image-based place recognition tasks due to their ability to incorporate semantic and contextual understanding during feature extraction. VLMs, such as CLIP [32] have predominantly been used as feature extractors for image based geo-localization [6], [33], [7], [5]. Beyond this, VLMs are now being explored for geo-localization task in a black-box setting [8], [7], [34]. Notably, GPT-4v [35] has demonstrated exceptional geo-localization accuracy, occasionally outperforming specialized systems. [7] bench-marked GPT-4v using prompting and Retrieval-Augmented Generation (RAG), while [8] highlighted that even prompt alone is sufficient for capable geo-location. However, much of the current research focuses on public datasets, which may overlap with the models' training data. Moreover, the impact of prompt and environmental variations on model predictions remains unexplored.

### III. PROPOSED FRAMEWORK

Motivated by recent findings [8] that SOTA VLMs exhibit strong geo-localization capabilities even in black-box settings, this work evaluates their performance across three scenarios, Fig. 3. First, we test their reliability using a single text-based prompt on public and private datasets. Second, we assess their sensitivity to semantically-equivalent text prompts. Third, we evaluate their robustness to environmental variations in semantically-equivalent query images.

#### A. Scenario 1

Consistent performance of a model across both public and private datasets would underscore its true geo-localization capabilities. For this scenario, we use the prompt formulation from [8], applying a least-to-most (LTM) prompting strategy that incrementally addresses sub-tasks to accomplish the main geo-localization objective. The model’s outputs comprise an explanation and geo-coordinates that serve as final predictions. The predicted geo-coordinates are used to measure error distance relative to ground truth coordinates.

#### B. Scenario 2

This scenario evaluates the impact of prompt variations on the geo-localization performance of VLMs using two distinct prompting approaches. Initially, a single-sentence prompt format is used with five manually-crafted, semantically-equivalent prompts. Subsequently, the more structured LTM-prompt format is tested, also with five semantically-equivalent versions, to examine the effects of both prompting style and phrasing on the results.

#### C. Scenario 3

For this scenario, we extend our evaluation by shifting focus to environmental variations in the query image. This case examines the model’s ability to consistently interpret and prioritize the essential features of an image and adhere to the specified task under changing conditions. To achieve this, we use datasets comprising multiple images of the same locations captured under varying conditions, including illumination, weather, and viewpoint variations with a fixed LTM prompt. This case is designed to test the resilience of VLMs for the geo-localization task under real-world environmental factors.

#### D. Evaluation Metrics

1) *Accuracy*: We measure the error distance between the predicted geo-coordinates and the ground truth coordinates for each image. Let  $p = (p_{lat}, p_{lon})$  represent the predicted coordinates, and  $g = (g_{lat}, g_{lon})$  represent the ground truth coordinates for a given image. The error distance  $d$  between the predicted and ground truth coordinates is calculated using the Haversine distance.

$$d(p, g) = \text{Haversine}(p_{lat}, p_{lon}, g_{lat}, g_{lon}) \quad (1)$$

The overall accuracy of the model is computed as proportion of predictions whose error distance is below a specific threshold  $T$ . For each prediction, if  $d(p, g) < T$ , the

prediction is considered accurate. The model accuracy is computed as:

$$\text{Accuracy} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{1}(d(p_i, g_i) < T) \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}$  is an indicator function that equals 1 if the condition  $d(p_i, g_i) < T$  is satisfied, and 0 otherwise and  $N$  is the total number of images in the dataset.

2) *Consistency*: Model consistency in auto-regressive and probabilistic models like VLMs is a critical metric that assesses the stability and reliability of the model’s outputs when presented with semantically-equivalent inputs. We use this as an additional evaluation metric for the second and third scenario. To evaluate the consistency, we compare the predicted geo-coordinates generated for variations of the same input (e.g., prompts or images), focusing on the agreement between predictions without considering ground truth coordinates. Consistency measures how closely the predicted coordinates align across variations, irrespective of their accuracy.

Let  $p_i^j$  represent the predicted geo-coordinates for the  $j$ -th variation of the  $i$ -th location or prompt. For a given location or prompt  $i$  with  $V$  variations (e.g., day, sunset, night for images or semantically-equivalent prompts for text), we compute the error distance  $d(p_i^j, p_i^k)$  between each pair of predicted coordinates, where  $j$  and  $k$  index the variations and  $j \neq k$ . The error distance for a pair of predictions is compared to a predefined threshold  $T$ . The model is considered consistent for that pair if the error distance is below  $T$ :

$$C_i^{jk} = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{if } d(p_i^j, p_i^k) \leq T, \\ 0, & \text{if } d(p_i^j, p_i^k) > T. \end{cases} \quad (3)$$

Here,  $C_i^{jk}$  is a binary indicator of consistency for the pair of variations  $(j, k)$ .

The consistency for each location or prompt,  $C_i$ , is computed as the average consistency across all unique pairs of variations:

$$C_i = \frac{2}{V(V-1)} \sum_{j=1}^{V-1} \sum_{k=j+1}^V C_i^{jk}. \quad (4)$$

where  $V$  is the number of variations for the given location or prompt, and  $\frac{2}{V(V-1)}$  is the normalization factor that accounts for the total number of unique pairs.

The overall consistency of the model is obtained by averaging the consistency scores across all locations or prompts in the dataset:

$$\text{Model Consistency} = \frac{1}{M} \sum_{i=1}^M C_i, \quad (5)$$

where  $M$  is the total number of locations or prompts in the dataset.




Fig. 3. Examples using GPT-4v across the three proposed scenarios.

#### IV. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The following section provides the details of the datasets and models used, the prompting strategies employed, and the specific evaluation metrics applied in our experiments.

1) *Datasets:* The IM2GPS test set, a standard benchmark for geo-localization models, is limited by its single-image-per-location structure, which restricts evaluation under varying conditions. To address this, we include three additional datasets: Tokyo 24/7 [10] (315 images across daytime, sunset, and nighttime) introducing viewpoint and time-of-day variations; and two non-public datasets, CSN and LZR, adding challenges like weather, illumination, and viewpoint changes. These datasets are captured along the same routes at different times in urban and countryside environments. For evaluation, we use 100 corresponding images per traverse from morning and noon traverses in CSN, and morning and dusk traverses in LZR. Illumination variation dominates across datasets, enabling consistent comparisons of model performance under diverse conditions. performance under diverse conditions.

2) *Models:* We evaluate three state-of-the-art VLMs in our experiments: GPT-4v [35], IDEFICS-80b-Instruct [36], and LLaVA-1.5-13b [37]. These models were selected to represent diverse model sizes and architectures, offering a comprehensive analysis of VLM performance for the geo-localization task.

3) *Prompting:* For Scenarios 1 and 3, we use the LTM prompting method from [8] to enhance reasoning during generation. In Scenario 2, we create five semantically equivalent variations for both single-sentence and LTM prompts. Fig. 2 lists the single-sentence prompt variations, where each prompt is accompanied with sample geo-coordinates. For the LTM prompt, we adapt the original version from [8] without including specific examples here.

4) *Evaluation:* The predicted geo-coordinates are extracted from the dialogue response using the regular expression  $r'[-+]?[d*]\.[d+]|[d+]'$ . The evaluation is then performed at various geo-localization thresholds, following standard practice for both accuracy and consistency metrics: Street level (1 km), City level (25 km), Region level (200 km), Country level (750 km), and Continent level (2500 km), providing insights into the model's reliability across different geographic scales. For instances where the models fail to generate geo-coordinates, the error distance is set to  $\infty$ , to ensure that such cases are appropriately accounted for during evaluation.

#### V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In this section, we present the results of our experiments across three scenarios. The findings highlight the impact of various factors, including prompt formulation, prompt variations, and environmental conditions, on model accuracy and consistency. Fig 4 provides examples from the Tokyo





Fig. 4. Correctly predicted examples from the Tokyo 24/7 dataset by **GPT-4v** (top row), **IDEFICS-80b-Instruct** (middle row), and **LLaVA-13b** (bottom row), across varying error thresholds (where  $d$  is defined in Eq 1).

24/7 dataset, illustrating the performance of the evaluated models across varying error thresholds.

#### A. Scenario 1

Fig. 5 presents heat-maps illustrating the performance of GPT-4v, IDEFICS-80b-Instruct, and LLaVA-13b across various datasets at different error thresholds. Each heat-map displays the accuracy within thresholds ranging from 1 km to 2500 km, with green shades indicating higher accuracy and red shades representing lower accuracy. These visualizations effectively highlight the models’ performance trends and allow comparisons across datasets and geographic scales.

As seen in Fig. 5, all three models perform exceptionally well on public datasets, IM2GPS and Tokyo 24/7, compared to non-public datasets, CSN and LZR. This discrepancy may stem from data contamination during the training phase, where models might have encountered these public datasets. GPT-4v achieving 70% street-level accuracy for Tokyo 24/7 highlights the models’ potential for geo-localization in urban and familiar settings. However, the significant drop in performance with the non-public datasets underscores challenges in generalizing to unfamiliar and diverse scenarios.

Interestingly, the largest accuracy gains for the non-public datasets occur between the 50 km and 200 km thresholds. This behavior reflects the inherent structure of the datasets, where the images share common visual elements that the models successfully utilize to make region- or country-level predictions. Beyond the 200 km threshold, accuracy becomes saturated, leaving little room for further improvement. While this demonstrates VLMs capability to generalize at coarser scales, it also highlights their limitations as fine-grained geo-locators in their current form. Nonetheless, their ability to reliably predict broader regions remains a noteworthy

outcome.

TABLE I  
CONSISTENCY FOR SINGLE-SENTENCE PROMPT AND LTM PROMPT ON IM2GPS DATASET.

Threshold (km)	GPT-4v		IDEFICS-80b-Instruct		LLaVA-13b	
	Single	LTM	Single	LTM	Single	LTM
1	0.254	<b>0.328</b>	0.003	<b>0.009</b>	<b>0.003</b>	0.000
25	0.303	<b>0.453</b>	0.000	<b>0.018</b>	<b>0.017</b>	0.006
50	0.307	<b>0.472</b>	0.005	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.022</b>	0.006
75	0.309	<b>0.482</b>	0.008	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.026</b>	0.007
100	0.310	<b>0.486</b>	0.008	<b>0.019</b>	<b>0.030</b>	0.007
200	0.320	<b>0.503</b>	0.008	<b>0.020</b>	<b>0.035</b>	0.008
750	0.327	<b>0.541</b>	0.017	<b>0.030</b>	0.054	<b>0.189</b>
2500	0.329	<b>0.576</b>	0.060	<b>0.061</b>	0.079	<b>0.315</b>

#### B. Scenario 2

The results in Fig. 6 highlight the significant impact of prompt formulation on geo-localization accuracy across all three models for IM2GPS dataset. Single-sentence prompts consistently under-perform compared to the LTM prompt formulation, emphasizing the importance of detailed contextual cues for guiding models in spatial reasoning. The single-sentence prompts exhibit high variability, with no prompt achieving consistent performance across all models. In contrast, the LTM prompt formulation reduces this instability, displaying clearer trends across models. For instance, prompt variant 5 consistently performs best, followed by prompt variant 1, indicating that structured and detailed prompts elicit more reliable reasoning patterns.

While calculating consistency, we identified an issue where some models, particularly LLaVA-13b, replicate the geo-coordinates from the prompt rather than generating their




Fig. 5. Performance comparison the three evaluated models (GPT-4V, IDEFICS-80B-Instruct, and LLaVA-13B) across different error thresholds and datasets. All three models demonstrate significantly higher accuracy on **public** datasets (IM2GPS and Tokyo 24/7) compared to **non-public** datasets (CSN and LZR).



Fig. 6. Impact of prompt formulation and variation on geo-localization performance. **Single-sentence** prompts (top row) exhibit significant variability and lower accuracy, while structured **LTM** prompts (bottom row) improve overall performance and consistency. However, even with the added structure of LTM prompts, performance remains sensitive to semantically equivalent variations in phrasing.




Fig. 7. Impact of environmental variations on geo-localization accuracy. Performance tends to decline under suboptimal conditions, such as less favorable lighting ( $CSN_{Noon}$ ,  $LZR_{Dusk}$ ), compared to images captured under better illumination ( $CSN_{Morning}$ ,  $LZR_{Morning}$ ). This highlights the models' sensitivity to variations in environmental conditions in query images.

own predictions. This behavior artificially inflates the consistency scores, as repeated outputs appear consistent despite not reflecting genuine reasoning. To address this, we exclude

such instances before calculating the final consistency values to ensure the results accurately represent the models' performance. Table I shows that LTM-prompting improves




Fig. 8. Consistency of GPT-4v, IDEFICS-80b-Instruct, and LLaVA-13b across different thresholds. Environmental changes, such as transitions from bright daytime to dark dusk, significantly affect model predictions. However, consistency improves at larger thresholds, indicating that while fine-grained localization is impacted by environmental factors, the models perform more reliably for broader regional areas.

consistency scores, for both GPT-4v and IDEFICS-80b-Instruct, as this approach elicits more consistent reasoning patterns. Additionally, it is evident that consistency and accuracy do not always align. For instance, while IDEFICS-80b-Instruct achieves relatively higher accuracy across almost all prompt variants in both single-sentence and LTM formulation as compared to LLaVA-13b but these results are highly inconsistent, leading to a low consistency score. This issue is particularly pronounced with single-sentence prompts, where IDEFICS-80b-Instruct’s consistency drops even lower than that of LLaVA-13b.

### C. Scenario 3

The accuracy results from Table II and Fig. 7 highlight the significant influence of environmental variations on the performance of VLMs in the geo-localization task. Across the datasets, model performance tends to decline under darker conditions compared to well-lit, morning images. This pattern is especially evident in non-public datasets like CSN and LZR, where morning settings almost consistently outperform dusk or noon conditions. These findings show the importance of accounting for environmental conditions during geo-localization, a factor often overlooked in previous research.

The consistency results from Fig. 8 reveal interesting dynamics across models and datasets. GPT-4v demonstrates strong consistency across all datasets, though a notable decline is observed for LZR compared to Tokyo 24/7 and CSN. This is likely due to LZR’s drastic transitions from bright daytime to dark dusk, which pose greater challenges for the model. In contrast, CSN exhibits milder lighting shifts, from bright daytime to noon, resulting in slightly better consistency. The disparity in model consistency between public and non-public datasets further reinforces the idea of training data contamination. Interestingly, the consistency of both GPT-4v and IDEFICS-80b-Instruct stabilizes at larger thresholds (e.g., beyond 100 km), suggesting that while environmental conditions hinder fine-grained localization, broader regional

predictions remain relatively unaffected. This indicates that VLMs can reliably localize at city or country scales despite environmental variations. On the other hand, LLaVA-13b consistently struggles across all datasets in terms of both accuracy and consistency, highlighting its poor performance due to its significantly smaller size compared to the other two models.

TABLE II  
ACCURACY COMPARISON ACROSS GEO-LOCALIZATION THRESHOLDS  
UNDER VARYING ENVIRONMENTAL CONDITIONS.

Model	1 km	25 km	50 km	75 km	100 km	200 km	750 km	2500 km
<b>GPT-4v</b>								
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Day</sub>	65.38	97.11	97.11	97.11	97.11	97.11	99.03	99.03
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Sunset</sub>	67.61	100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Night</sub>	69.52	100	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00	100.00
CSN <sub>Morning</sub>	0	0	15.00	75.00	81.00	98.00	99.00	100.00
CSN <sub>Noon</sub>	0	2	21.00	72.00	77.00	97.00	99.00	100.00
LZR <sub>Morning</sub>	0	0	20.00	44.00	56.00	97.00	99.00	100.00
LZR <sub>Dusk</sub>	0	0	7.00	26.00	31.00	71.00	85.00	94.00
IM2GPS <sub>Testset</sub>	15.18	54.4	57.38	59.91	64.13	70.46	83.54	94.09
<b>IDEFICS-80b-Instruct</b>								
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Day</sub>	8.5	71.42	71.42	71.42	71.42	71.42	71.42	71.42
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Sunset</sub>	4.7	76.19	76.19	76.19	76.19	76.19	76.19	76.19
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Night</sub>	3.80	73.33	73.33	73.33	73.33	73.33	73.33	73.33
CSN <sub>Morning</sub>	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	16.00	50.00	52.00
CSN <sub>Noon</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	8.00	21.00	22.00
LZR <sub>Morning</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	36.00	59.00	59.00
LZR <sub>Dusk</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	9.00	9.00
IM2GPS <sub>Testset</sub>	9.70	28.2	29.11	29.53	30.80	37.55	47.67	57.80
<b>LLaVA-13b</b>								
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Day</sub>	0.95	30.47	30.47	30.47	30.47	31.42	31.42	32.38
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Sunset</sub>	1.90	27.61	27.61	27.61	27.61	27.61	28.57	28.57
Tokyo 24/7 <sub>Night</sub>	0	30.47	30.47	30.47	30.47	30.47	30.47	31.42
CSN <sub>Morning</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	9.00
CSN <sub>Noon</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	2.00	6.00
LZR <sub>Morning</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	5.00	15.00
LZR <sub>Dusk</sub>	0	0	0.00	0.00	0.00	1.00	1.00	4.00
IM2GPS <sub>Testset</sub>	0.42	5.90	8.01	8.86	9.28	11.39	23.20	35.44

### D. Discussion

Our findings reveal significant sensitivities in VLMs to both prompt variations and environmental changes. While prompt variations affect overall accuracy, environmental conditions like lighting and weather primarily impact fine-grained localization. Nonetheless, these models consistently identify region- or country-level locations, even with generic images from non-public datasets, showcasing their robustness at broader geographic scales. This indicates their potential for applications like regional mapping and large-scale environmental monitoring, where precise localization is less critical.

## VI. CONCLUSIONS

This work provides a systematic analysis of SOTA VLMs in zero-shot image-based geo-localization, emphasizing their strengths and limitations. The study highlights that while these models excel at broader spatial predictions, such as city- or country-level localization, their precision decreases significantly under challenging conditions, including non-public datasets and environmental variations. Prompt formulation and environmental factors are found to significantly in-

fluence both accuracy and consistency, highlighting the need for new methods to enhance fine-grained localization. Future research should focus on developing hybrid approaches that combine VLM capabilities with traditional geo-localization techniques, improving resilience to diverse conditions, and addressing ethical considerations such as privacy in location-based tasks, ensuring responsible deployment in real-world applications.

## REFERENCES

- [1] D. Shah, B. Osinski, B. Ichter, and S. Levine, "Lm-nav: Robotic navigation with large pre-trained models of language, vision, and action," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.04429>
- [2] C. Huang, O. Mees, A. Zeng, and W. Burgard, "Visual language maps for robot navigation," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.05714>
- [3] V. S. Dorbala, G. Sigurdsson, R. Piramuthu, J. Thomason, and G. S. Sukhatme, "Clip-nav: Using clip for zero-shot vision-and-language navigation," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2211.16649>
- [4] S. Y. Gadre, M. Wortsman, G. Ilharco, L. Schmidt, and S. Song, "Cows on pasture: Baselines and benchmarks for language-driven zero-shot object navigation," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2203.10421>
- [5] L. Haas, M. Skreta, S. Alberti, and C. Finn, "Pigeon: Predicting image geolocations," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2307.05845>
- [6] M. Wu and Q. Huang, "Im2city: image geo-localization via multi-modal learning," in *Proceedings of the 5th ACM SIGSPATIAL International Workshop on AI for Geographic Knowledge Discovery*, ser. GeoAI '22. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2022, p. 50–61. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/3557918.3565868>
- [7] Z. Zhou, J. Zhang, Z. Guan, M. Hu, N. Lao, L. Mu, S. Li, and G. Mai, "Img2loc: Revisiting image geolocalization using multi-modality foundation models and image-based retrieval-augmented generation," in *Proceedings of the 47th International ACM SIGIR Conference on Research and Development in Information Retrieval*, ser. SIGIR 2024, vol. 35. ACM, July 2024, p. 2749–2754. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/3626772.3657673>
- [8] E. Mendes, Y. Chen, J. Hays, S. Das, W. Xu, and A. Ritter, "Granular privacy control for geolocation with vision language models," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2407.04952>
- [9] J. Hays and A. A. Efros, "im2gps: estimating geographic information from a single image," in *Proceedings of the IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2008.
- [10] A. Torii, R. Arandjelović, J. Sivic, M. Okutomi, and T. Pajdla, "24/7 place recognition by view synthesis," 06 2015, pp. 1808–1817.
- [11] J. Brejcha and M. Čadfk, "State-of-the-art in visual geo-localization," *Pattern Anal. Appl.*, vol. 20, no. 3, p. 613–637, aug 2017. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10044-017-0611-1>
- [12] E. Müller-Budack, K. Pustularen, and R. Ewerth, "Geolocation estimation of photos using a hierarchical model and scene classification," in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:52954003>
- [13] A. Kendall, M. Grimes, and R. Cipolla, "Posenet: A convolutional network for real-time 6-dof camera relocalization," 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1505.07427>
- [14] L. Liu, H. Li, and Y. Dai, "Stochastic attraction-repulsion embedding for large scale image localization," 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.08779>
- [15] T. Sattler, A. Torii, J. Sivic, M. Pollefeys, H. Taira, M. Okutomi, and T. Pajdla, "Are large-scale 3d models really necessary for accurate visual localization?" in *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017, pp. 6175–6184.
- [16] H. Wang, C. Wang, and L. Xie, "Online visual place recognition via saliency re-identification," in *2020 IEEE/RSJ International Conference on Intelligent Robots and Systems (IROS)*. IEEE, Oct. 2020. [Online]. Available: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/IROS45743.2020.9341703>
- [17] T. Weyand, A. Araujo, B. Cao, and J. Sim, "Google landmarks dataset v2 – a large-scale benchmark for instance-level recognition and retrieval," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2004.01804>
- [18] R. Arandjelović, P. Gronat, A. Torii, T. Pajdla, and J. Sivic, "Netvlad: Cnn architecture for weakly supervised place recognition," 2016. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1511.07247>
- [19] Y. Avrithis, Y. Kalantidis, G. Toliás, and E. Spyrou, "Retrieving landmark and non-landmark images from community photo collections," in *Proceedings of the 18th ACM International Conference on Multimedia*, ser. MM '10. New York, NY, USA: Association for Computing Machinery, 2010, p. 153–162. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.1145/1873951.1873973>
- [20] H. Yang, X. Lu, and Y. Zhu, "Cross-view geo-localization with layer-to-layer transformer," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, M. Ranzato, A. Beygelzimer, Y. Dauphin, P. Liang, and J. W. Vaughan, Eds., vol. 34. Curran Associates, Inc., 2021, pp. 29009–29020.
- [21] Y. Tian, C. Chen, and M. Shah, "Cross-view image matching for geo-localization in urban environments," in *2017 IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR)*, 2017, pp. 1998–2006.
- [22] Y. Shi, X. Yu, D. Campbell, and H. Li, "Where am i looking at? joint location and orientation estimation by cross-view matching," 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2005.03860>
- [23] S. Zhu, L. Yang, C. Chen, M. Shah, X. Shen, and H. Wang, "r<sup>2</sup>-former: Unified retrieval and reranking transformer for place recognition," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2304.03410>
- [24] S. Workman, R. Souvenir, and N. Jacobs, "Wide-area image geolocalization with aerial reference imagery," 2015. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1510.03743>
- [25] S. Zhu, T. Yang, and C. Chen, "Vigor: Cross-view image geolocalization beyond one-to-one retrieval," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2011.12172>
- [26] B. Clark, A. Kerrigan, P. P. Kulkarni, V. V. Cepeda, and M. Shah, "Where we are and what we're looking at: Query based worldwide image geo-localization using hierarchies and scenes," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.04249>
- [27] S. Pramanick, E. M. Nowara, J. Gleason, C. D. Castillo, and R. Chellappa, "Where in the world is this image? transformer-based geo-localization in the wild," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.13861>
- [28] M. Izbicki, E. E. Papalexakis, and V. J. Tsotras, "Exploiting the earth's spherical geometry to geolocate images," in *Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery in Databases*, U. Brefeld, E. Fromont, A. Hotho, A. Knobbe, M. Maathuis, and C. Robardet, Eds. Cham: Springer International Publishing, 2020, pp. 3–19.
- [29] P. H. Seo, T. Weyand, J. Sim, and B. Han, "Cplanet: Enhancing image geolocalization by combinatorial partitioning of maps," 2018. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.02130>
- [30] G. Kordopatis-Zilos, P. Galopoulos, S. Papadopoulos, and I. Kompatsiaris, "Leveraging efficientnet and contrastive learning for accurate global-scale location estimation," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.07645>
- [31] S. Zhu, M. Shah, and C. Chen, "Transgeo: Transformer is all you need for cross-view image geo-localization," 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2204.00097>
- [32] A. Radford, J. W. Kim, C. Hallacy, A. Ramesh, G. Goh, S. Agarwal, G. Sastry, A. Askell, P. Mishkin, J. Clark, G. Krueger, and I. Sutskever, "Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision," 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2103.00020>
- [33] G. Luo, G. Biamby, T. Darrell, D. Fried, and A. Rohrbach, "g<sup>3</sup>: Geolocation via guidebook grounding," 2022.
- [34] X. Han, C. Zhu, X. Zhao, and H. Zhu, "Swarm intelligence in geo-localization: A multi-agent large vision-language model collaborative framework," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2408.11312>
- [35] "Gpt-4 technical report," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08774>
- [36] H. Laurençon, L. Saulnier, L. Tronchon, S. Bekman, A. Singh, A. Lozhkov, T. Wang, S. Karamcheti, A. M. Rush, D. Kiela, M. Cord, and V. Sanh, "Obelics: An open web-scale filtered dataset of interleaved image-text documents," 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.16527>
- [37] H. Liu, C. Li, Y. Li, and Y. J. Lee, "Improved baselines with visual instruction tuning," 2024. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.03744>