

Fine-Grained Evaluation of Large Vision-Language Models in Autonomous Driving

Yue Li¹ Meng Tian² Zhenyu Lin² Jiangtong Zhu² Dechang Zhu²
 Haiqiang Liu² Zining Wang³ Yueyi Zhang¹ Zhiwei Xiong^{1*} Xinhai Zhao^{2*}

¹ University of Science and Technology of China

² Huawei Noah's Ark Lab ³ University of California, Berkeley

{yueli65@mail., zixiong@}ustc.edu.cn {tianmeng25, zhaoxinhai1}@huawei.com

Abstract

Existing benchmarks for Vision-Language Model (VLM) on autonomous driving (AD) primarily assess interpretability through open-form visual question answering (QA) within coarse-grained tasks, which remain insufficient to assess capabilities in complex driving scenarios. To this end, we introduce **VLADBench**, a challenging and fine-grained dataset featuring close-form QAs that progress from static foundational knowledge and elements to advanced reasoning for dynamic on-road situations. The elaborate **VLADBench** spans 5 key domains: Traffic Knowledge Understanding, General Element Recognition, Traffic Graph Generation, Target Attribute Comprehension, and Ego Decision-Making and Planning. These domains are further broken down into 11 secondary aspects and 29 tertiary tasks for a granular evaluation. A thorough assessment of general and domain-specific (DS) VLMs on this benchmark reveals both their strengths and critical limitations in AD contexts. To further exploit the cognitive and reasoning interactions among the 5 domains for AD understanding, we start from a small-scale VLM and train the DS models on individual domain datasets (collected from 1.4M DS QAs across public sources). The experimental results demonstrate that the proposed benchmark provides a crucial step toward a more comprehensive assessment of VLMs in AD, paving the way for the development of more cognitively sophisticated and reasoning-capable AD systems. The benchmark and DS model will be available at <https://github.com/Depth2World/VLADBench>.

1. Introduction

Large Vision-Language Models (VLMs) are rapidly transforming numerous fields, demonstrating their potential to

*Corresponding author. The work was done during Yue Li's internship at Huawei Noah's Ark Lab.




Figure 1. A sunburst chart of **VLADBench** categories. The proposed dataset spans 5 key domains, 11 secondary aspects and 29 tertiary tasks, including about 2,000 static scenes and 3000 dynamic scenarios, comprising 12,000 close-form questions.

revolutionize how we interact with information and technology. Their ability to seamlessly integrate visual and textual data unlocks new possibilities across diverse applications, including visual content generation [2, 37, 42], medical image analysis [11, 51, 77], robotic control [29, 84], and autonomous driving (AD) [15, 16, 61, 64, 74].

Recent VLM-based AD algorithms address the limitations of end-to-end AD approaches, including interpretability and long-tail problem, which refers to the limited generalization to new scenarios, unexpected events, and diverse traffic patterns [10, 63]. State-of-the-art models [49, 50, 52, 61, 64, 74] demonstrate promising results in scene perception, description, and decision-making with analysis in open form visual question answers (VQA) task. Most existing

datasets concentrate on broad task categories (such as perception, prediction, planning, etc.) in AD.

Despite recent advances, effective transfer of foundational VLMs to AD-specific models remains under-explored, in part due to the insufficient validation protocols within the context of AD. A comprehensive evaluation is necessary to guide the model transfer, focusing on strengths and weaknesses and highlighting the specific competencies that require attention, beyond merely achieving high scores on open-form VQA tasks. Current benchmarks designed for VLM-based AD face several notable limitations: 1) **Coarse-grained Categories**: The underlying datasets of the VLM-based models are often simplistic, typically categorizing tasks into perception, prediction, and planning with reasoning, which are incomplete for evaluating the nuanced cognitive and reasoning abilities required for safe and reliable AD. A holistic evaluation framework remains necessary to fully assess these critical competencies. 2) **Lack of Dynamic Elements Analysis**: Both static and dynamic scenes are crucial for evaluating AD systems, a robust analysis of dynamic elements is particularly important for validating the temporal reasoning capabilities, especially in understanding traffic participant intentions within the scene and executing the nuanced spatio-temporal reasoning required for safe navigation. 3) **Homogeneous Datasets**: Existing VLM-based AD datasets often suffer from a lack of diversity, which limits the ability to test models across a wide range of real-world scenarios. The narrow results restrict the evaluation of zero-shot generalization and the performance on challenging corner cases. A more diverse dataset is required to thoroughly assess the robustness and adaptability of VLMs in real-world settings.

To overcome these limitations, we introduce a novel benchmark, **VLADBench**, specifically designed to rigorously evaluate the capabilities of VLMs in AD. **VLADBench** addresses the shortcomings of existing benchmarks by employing a hierarchical structure that reflects the complex skill set required for reliable driving, progressing from fundamental scene and traffic elements comprehension to advanced reasoning and decision-making. With 2000 static scenes and 3000 dynamic scenarios, **VLADBench** spans 5 primary domains: Traffic Knowledge Understanding (TKU), General Element Recognition (GER), Traffic Graph Generation (TGG), Target Attribute Comprehension (TAC), and Ego Decision-making and Planning (EDP). For a more detailed assessment, 11 secondary aspects and 29 tertiary tasks are defined, resulting in a total of 12,000 questions. The dataset is built from existing publicly available datasets, meticulously curated through a manual selection across 12 sources, aimed at challenging VLM capabilities in diverse challenging driving situations. To further investigate the intersections among the 5 key domains, we collect and construct approximately 1.4M AD-specific

QAs from public resources. We then categorize these QAs using GPT-4 and train models on individual domain-specific (DS) datasets. Finally, we validate the trained models on **VLADBench** to assess their performance across different domains.

A thorough evaluation on **VLADBench** of the prominent VLMs, encompassing both open-source (ranging from 4B to 76B), close-source and DS models, reveals the following key findings:

- Current VLMs, including the state-of-the-art large-scale Qwen2.5-VL-72B [69], GPT-4o, and the DS model DriveMM [26], struggle to achieve 60% accuracy on **VLADBench**, remaining a large room for improvement.
- Significant challenges persist especially in areas: traffic signals and graph generation, intention judgment, and meta decision-making, which are essential capabilities for achieving reliable autonomous driving.
- Biased DS training data enhance the performance in certain specialized areas of autonomous driving but will lead to a loss of generalization ability in tasks that require broader and general knowledge.
- The DS data from the five key domains is interconnected, providing mutual benefits across domains and demonstrating a clear synergy effect.
- Elevating the vision encoder may be more impactful than simply scaling up the language model for AD context.

2. Related Work

2.1. Large Vision-Language Models

Recent advancements in Large Language Models (LLMs) like the GPT series [1] and LLaMA [66] have revolutionized natural language processing. This progress has spurred the development of Large Vision-Language Models, aiming to extend LLM capabilities to encompass visual understanding and reasoning. Models such as LLaVA [42, 43], MiniGPT-4 [83], InstructBLIP [14], Cambrain [65], ShareGPT4V [9] integrate visual information, enabling tasks like image captioning and visual question answering. These VLMs typically align visual and linguistic features using cross-attention mechanisms or MLP projections, trained on extensive image-text datasets. Early VLMs focused on static images, but recent efforts have extended their capabilities to video understanding, such as BLIP2 [35], InternLM-XComposer2.5 [80], InternVL2 [13], VILA [41], Qwen2-VL [69], etc., incorporating temporal dynamics into the language feature space for sequence comprehension. VLMs have demonstrated promising capabilities across diverse domains, including content creation, medical image analysis, robotics and autonomous driving.

Table 1. Comparison between the existing datasets and our proposed dataset. V. and Cate. represent video and category.

Dataset	Source	V.	QAs	Cate.
CODA-LM [38]	CODA [36]	×	1.5K	3
LingoQA [50]	Self-collected	✓	1K	4
IDKB [45]	Internet	✓	20K	4
nuScenes-QA [57]	nuScenes [6]	✓	83K	5
DriveLM [61]	nuScenes [6]	✓	15K	4
DriveBench [61]	nuScenes [6]	✓	21K	5
MME-Realworld [82]	[6, 36, 59]	×	5K	15
NuInstruct [16]	nuScenes [6]	✓	16K	17
VLADBench	[6, 47, 48, 71]			
	[19, 22, 31, 36]	✓	12K	29
	[20, 32, 50, 58]			

2.2. VLM-based Autonomous Driving

End-to-end AD [24, 27] represents a shift from traditional modular pipelines to a singular framework, which learns relevant features directly from raw sensor data and discovers effective representations with all modules training together. While models trained on specific datasets encounter the reliance on ego status [39, 78] and long-tail dilemma, i.e., fail to generalize on new scenarios, unexpected events, or traffic patterns [10, 63]. Besides, these approaches typically lack interpretability, making it difficult to explain their actions and hindering trust and regulatory approval.

To address these problems, several recent works explore the potential of VLMs for AD. LingoQA [50] and Dolphins [46], for example, employ VQA to bridge the gap between data-driven driving and user trust. Besides, decision-making and planning are also being integrated into VLMs, as seen in DriveVLM [64], DriveLM [61], Reason2drive [52], BEV-InMLMM [16], OmniDrive [70], where the training data is always divided into perception, prediction, and planning components. These models often produce outputs via a chain-of-thought (CoT) process, encompassing scene descriptions, action analysis, hierarchical planning, etc. Approaches such as DriveGPT4 [74], VLP [53], AsyncDriver [12] and LMDrive [60] attempt to directly map visual and linguistic inputs to planning or low-level control signals. The end-to-end AD systems based on VLMs offer strong interpretability, trustworthiness, and the ability to understand complex scenes.

2.3. Benchmark and Metrics

Established evaluation benchmarks like MME [17], Video-MME [18], MMBench [44] and Seed-Bench [33], while valuable for foundation models, are not ideally suited for evaluating AD models, because that these benchmarks primarily comprise natural images, lacking the specific characteristics of driving scenarios, such as traffic elements and the dynamic interactions of participants. Recent works have introduced specified AD datasets with extensive VQA pairs. Nuscenes-QA [57], CODA-LM [38], VLAAD [56]

Table 2. Prompt setting of **VLADBench**. * denotes optional.

Most Question
[Image / Video] [Visual Prompt]* [Question] [Tips]*.
Select one as the answer from the list below:
[Choice A, B, C, D, E].
No explanation is needed. The best answer is:
Other Question: Detection, Traffic Graph, Trajectory
[Image / Video] [Visual Prompt]* [Question] [Tips]*.
[Output Format].
No explanation is needed. The answer is:

and LingoQA [50] start from scene description and analysis, general perception, action reasoning and driving suggestions. DriveLM [61], NuInstruct [16], Reason2Drive [52] divide the data into perception, prediction, and planning with reasoning. DriveLM [61] also includes behavior understanding, and NuInstruct [16] includes risk estimation. IDKB [45] mined plenty of questions about 4 traffic knowledge domains from various handbooks. DriveBench [73] further introduce corruption data for robustness validation. With the rapid advancement, a coarse categorization is insufficient to support a complete analysis of AD models.

For the metric, language-based metrics like BLEU [54], ROUGE [40], METEOR [5] and CIDEr [67], commonly used to evaluate question-answering models, however, demonstrate poor correlation with human judgment. This is problematic because semantically distinct sentences with opposite meanings also can receive similar scores, posing unacceptable risks in safety-critical AD applications. While recent metrics leveraging ChatGPT ratings [38, 74], they exhibit positional and stylistic biases and produce inconsistent scores across iterations. In this paper, we revisit the simple yet effective metric: Accuracy. Through the close-form instruction annotations, we try to achieve a precise evaluation in terms of the no tolerance for evaluation error.

3. Benchmark

3.1. Data Source and Annotation

Data Source. A comprehensive and diverse benchmark dataset is able to reduce testing bias, which helps probe a thorough evaluation of zero-shot generalization capabilities and better expose the weakness of VLMs in various AD scenarios. As shown in Tab. 1, existing benchmarks often suffer from a lack of diversity. In contrast, our proposed dataset **VLADBench**, covering 5 domains, 11 aspects and 29 tasks, constructed from the 12 publicly available datasets: GTSDb [22], JAAD [32], PIE [58], HAD [31], nuScenes [6], SODA [20], ONCE [48], Argoverse2 [71], CODA and CODA2022 [36], DRAMA [47], RS10K [19], and LingoQA [50]. The instance counts for the five domains TKU, GER, TGG, TAC, and EDP are 2369, 2812, 3090, 1303 and 2418, respectively. Detailed number for each task




Figure 2. Real-world examples of the tasks in (a) Traffic Knowledge Understanding, (b) General Element Recognition, and (c, d) Traffic Graph Generation domains. ‘Rec.’ and ‘RL’ denote recognition and relation.

is included in the supplement.

Annotation. Based on the designed domains and tasks, we meticulously hand-select 2000 static and 3000 dynamic scenes for a diverse range of challenging driving situations. During the selection process, we control the visual prominence of objects and scenes to avoid immediate recognition. Existing datasets predominantly feature object- or caption-level annotations, lacking detailed and task-specific annotations. Consequently, we engage 5 human annotators for fine-grained annotation and implement a quality double-check with 2 professional researchers. Each instance takes about 5 minutes to annotate.

3.2. Instruction and Criterion

Instruction. For most of the questions in the proposed dataset, we first construct each question-answer pair and then we collect all the answers in each task as a database. After that, we select the correct answer and randomly select the incorrect answers to form a choice list for each question. The choices in the list are semantically or structurally similar, increasing the ambiguity and difficulty of the question. The instruction format is listed in Tab. 2 and the length of the list ranges from 4 to 10. For the other types of questions, i.e., visual detection, traffic graph generation and trajectory planning, we specify the output format for each question to guide the instruction following. Additionally, some ques-

tions are constructed with visual prompts and descriptive tips. The visual prompts include the bounding boxes on the image or the coordinates of these boxes in the instructions, which are employed for regional perception representations. The tips consist of the perceptual descriptions within the scene, aiming at assisting the challenging task by providing accurate perceptual prior. These are particularly useful for domains like traffic graph generation.

Criterion. For the evaluation of each task, the core metrics are accuracy and instruction compliance rate. Besides, there are IOU for detection in the recognition task, judgment accuracy for the intention judgment task, and L2 distance and collision rate for the ego trajectory planning task. The final score for each task is weighted by these metrics. Note that a rule-based filter is employed to align the responses generated by VLMs with the choice list in the instruction, removing symbols and special tokens.

3.3. Data Statistics

Traffic Knowledge Understanding. This domain comprises two primary tasks: *Road Traffic Signals* (encompassing the pavement marking, traffic sign, and traffic light tasks, with questions pertaining to type, status, meaning, and optical character recognition) and *Road Passage Provisions* (Determining the right-of-way between ego vehicle and other traffic participants), as illustrated in Fig. 2 (a).




Figure 3. Examples in *intention judgment* and *ego action reasoning* aspects. ST.RL.: spatio-temporal reasoning, K.O.D.: key object detection.

General Element Recognition. This domain consists of *Background* and *Foreground* elements. *Background* includes light and weather conditions, while *Foreground* focuses on lane recognition, vehicle recognition, vehicle status, vulnerable road user (VRU) recognition, and obstruction recognition. The recognition tasks also involve visual grounding questions, such as instructions with coordinates or object detection. The vehicle status task identifies the external states of the vehicle, such as brake lights, open doors, and trunk. The obstruction (including animals) recognition task, also addresses whether obstacles can be safely driven over, with examples illustrated in Fig. 2 (b).

Traffic Graph Generation. The aforementioned assessment allows for the perception of low-level scene elements, which forms the basis for a high-level understanding of the interrelationships between traffic elements, called traffic graph generation. This domain encompasses both *Signal Element Relation*, with Fig. 2 (c) illustrating the light-lane relation, sign-lane relation and sign-sign relation, and *Lane Element Relation*, with Fig. 2 (d) exhibiting lane speed relation and lane change relation. Based on the above-perceived results, we further organize descriptive tips for part questions, e.g., we provide the type and status of lights, and the type and meaning of the lanes for light-lane relation task to support more nuanced scene understanding.

Target Attribute Comprehension. The comprehension of dynamic scenes is paramount in AD. In this domain, we address the temporal aspects by incorporating the prediction of future (unoccurred) events *Intention Judgment* and the analysis of the past (occurred) events *Behavior Understanding*. The visualization is presented in Fig. 3 (a) and Fig. 3 (b). *Intention Judgment* is composed of vehicle cut-in, VRU cut-in, VRU cross, and long-short parking, with the questions pertaining to the underlying intention and motivation. *Behavior Understanding* involves analyzing vehicle and VRU behavior by describing the sequence of temporal events. Moreover, we include pedestrian gesture analysis related to right-of-way determination in VRU behavior, fur-

ther testing human-vehicle interaction capabilities.

Ego Decision-Making and Planning. We construct this domain in a reasoning mechanism from *Ego Action Reasoning*, the high-level *Meta Decision-Making* and the final *Ego Trajectory Planning*. *Ego Action Reasoning* contains the fine-grained tasks: key object detection, drive efficiency, risk prediction, and spatio-temporal reasoning, all of which significantly influence subsequent driving strategies. Specifically, in spatio-temporal reasoning, we devise the challenge of inferring the state or meaning of part-occluded traffic signals, lane type, and lane destination at the end of a video sequence. At the moment of the last frame, information from previous frames, such as traffic signs and pavement markings, must be integrated and reasoned upon to answer these questions, as Fig. 3 (c) showcasing the real-world samples. *Meta Decision-Making* focuses on the short-term lateral and longitudinal decisions, which are tactical and on immediate execution. The decisions include but are not limited to straight, changing lane to the left/right, in-lane left/right avoidance, borrowing lane for left/right avoidance, accelerating, stop, maintaining, decelerating, and decelerating to stop. *Ego Trajectory Planning* is formulated as a vision and language task, given the critical perception and prediction results, along with high-level decisions. Besides, the ego status and the historical waypoints (last 2 seconds, given by four points) are included in the instruction. The VLMs then generate a feasible 3-second driving trajectory consisting of 6 waypoints.

4. Experiments

4.1. Baselines and Settings

Baselines. To conduct a comprehensive evaluation on static and dynamic scenes, we compare 20 VLM models including the foundation and domain-specific models, which can be divided into the open-source VLMs: VILA-U (VU) [72], InternLM-XComposer2.5 (IXC2.5) [80], Openflamingo [2], CogVLM2 (CV) [21], LongVILA (LoV) [75],

Table 3. Results evaluated on different VLMs. TKU: Traffic Knowledge Understanding, GER: General Element Recognition, TGG: Traffic Graph Generation, TAC: Target Attribute Comprehension, EDP: Ego Decision-Making and Planning. The gray, yellow and purple cell color denotes the open-source, closed-source, and domain-specific VLMs. The best score for each aspect in red. The detailed results about the 29 tasks are listed in the supplement. Note our baseline is excluded for comparison with existing models.

Domains	Aspects	IXC2.5	CV	LoV	QW	IVL2	MCV	IVL2	QW2	OV	QW2.5	LV	GEM	GPT	Senna	Dols	DriLM	DriMM	DriLM-B	Ours
		8B	8B	8B	7B	4B	8B	8B	7B	7B	7B	7B	1.5pro	4o	7B	9B	4B	7B	4B	4B
TKU	Road Traffic Signals	24.89	47.00	37.46	47.40	48.97	43.91	54.97	54.77	56.89	62.45	57.49	67.56	69.09	10.29	28.39	55.04	57.15	52.56	65.65
	Road Passage Provisions	32.69	59.35	49.45	79.22	80.58	22.72	69.45	71.52	70.81	80.32	74.11	42.98	78.96	15.53	21.10	81.36	42.33	73.85	80.58
GER	Background	22.54	58.79	63.93	63.97	66.83	70.76	70.49	71.07	69.11	69.29	69.11	65.71	68.35	25.36	58.75	64.46	70.31	68.21	71.61
	Foreground	26.20	29.10	38.16	38.09	51.73	45.00	49.34	50.88	53.40	53.64	53.03	52.00	53.82	15.51	29.24	52.80	60.52	51.68	60.47
TGG	Signal Element Relation	10.34	19.06	32.26	19.04	26.41	30.04	31.83	32.15	30.46	28.78	30.58	36.36	41.25	3.14	22.55	22.44	30.97	30.56	43.37
	Lane Element Relation	29.82	43.27	38.12	29.83	38.39	46.60	39.26	39.78	51.54	40.14	53.61	54.49	51.18	41.22	26.29	19.22	21.59	44.06	44.48
TAC	Intention Judgment	67.47	38.98	34.76	68.23	41.56	60.08	46.79	60.62	57.60	53.42	59.52	55.95	47.79	52.79	57.64	47.13	43.27	60.89	52.97
	Behavior Understanding	30.61	33.74	17.99	28.60	44.13	37.54	46.82	41.79	41.68	42.23	43.13	50.61	52.63	12.96	0.11	40.78	40.11	42.91	42.91
EDP	Ego Action Reasoning	45.91	36.89	52.03	64.24	46.47	58.85	61.91	54.93	47.35	58.87	56.50	61.20	65.75	12.96	58.72	55.95	52.99	56.60	69.73
	Meta Decision-Making	55.60	22.98	18.45	23.87	47.62	35.65	40.83	35.24	36.61	35.48	41.19	56.43	48.04	15.00	13.69	37.26	50.00	46.31	57.14
Total		30.93	35.85	38.67	43.24	44.97	45.45	48.58	49.40	49.97	50.75	51.73	54.23	56.00	20.21	33.87	44.86	47.45	49.83	57.39

QWen-VL (QW)[3], MiniCPM-V-2.6 (MCV) [76], InternVL2 (IVL2) [13], Qwen2-VL (QW2) [69], OneVision (OV) [34], LLaVA-Video (LV) [81], QW2.5-VL (QW2.5)[4], the closed-source VLMs: Gemini-1.5-pro (GEM) [62], GPT-4o*, and the domain-specific VLMs: Dolphins (Dols) [46], Senna [28] (VLM part), DriveLM [61](trained on DriveLM [61] (DriLM) and trained on BDD [30] (DriLM-B)), and DriveMM (DriMM) [26].

Settings. For the sequence data, we adjust the frames extraction to ensure all the frames are fed into the model. To ensure a fair comparison, system prompts are not utilized for models that offer them. As mentioned above, each task employs 2 to 3 metrics, which are weighted to compute the final score for the task. The instruction compliance rate is weighted at 0.2, while accuracy is weighted differently: 0.8 for most tasks, 0.5 for the TGG domain, and 0.7 for intention judgment tasks. The mean aspect score is then computed as an average of the task scores, with weights proportional to the number of tasks within each aspect.

Domain Data for Training. To further exploit the interactions among the 5 key domains for AD understanding, we start from a small-scale VLM, IVL2-4B [13], and train the DS models on individual domain datasets. These datasets, sourced from [7, 19, 31, 36, 45–47, 49, 50, 55, 61, 68, 74], contain a total of 1.4M QAs, covering perspectives from the ego vehicle, including single-view, sequential single-view, and multi-view. The type of each QA is classified using GPT-4. Besides, we also incorporate 1.3M QAs from general data for avoiding general ability loss. The IVL2-4B [13], trained on 2.7M QAs, serves as our baseline in this paper. More details are provided in the supplement.

4.2. Experimental Results

First, we assess the existing open-source, closed-source, and DS models. The qualitative results across 10 aspects of VLADBench for the small-scale VLMs and closed-source

Table 4. Results evaluated on Large-scale VLMs.

Aspects	VU 40B	OV 72B	LV 72B	IVL2 76B	QW2 72B	QW2.5 72B
Road Traffic Signals	32.32	54.15	59.09	59.94	68.31	70.76
Road Passage Provisions	46.34	76.96	80.06	71.07	81.36	80.58
Background	65.13	70.67	71.43	72.68	70.00	71.96
Foreground	42.37	51.91	52.27	56.36	60.56	56.51
Signal Element Relation	32.06	30.63	31.72	33.71	29.91	40.14
Lane Element Relation	39.40	51.58	55.69	40.32	49.95	54.79
Intention Judgment	35.57	50.30	50.43	53.57	60.66	54.26
Behavior Understanding	11.5	41.56	44.36	47.49	45.47	50.28
Ego Action Reasoning	52.84	56.26	57.13	65.72	64.49	67.15
Meta Decision-Making	19.29	53.45	38.45	58.33	53.81	47.86
Total	38.76	50.21	51.62	53.20	56.51	58.00

VLMs, are listed in Tab. 3. Besides, we present the results of large-scale VLMs in Tab. 4 for a thorough assessment. For comparison with the existing VLMs, we exclude our baseline model which serves for the following exploration.

Then, we conduct the domain experiments to explore the cognitive and reasoning interactions among the 5 key domains. The DS models trained on TKU data, GER data, TGG data, TAC data, EDP data, and the total data are compared with the base model for improvement visualization.

Finally, we briefly discuss how the understanding of the five key domains by AD-specialized VLMs will impact the final trajectory prediction.

4.2.1. Evaluation on VLADBench

Holistic Results. The top score is held by the large-scale QW2.5-72B [69], which achieves 58.00%, and followed by GPT-4o. For small-scale VLM models, LV [81] leads with a score of 51.73%, which is 6.27% below the maximum. Even state-of-the-art VLMs such as GPT-4o and QW2.5 [69] achieve less than 60% accuracy on our proposed benchmark, demonstrating the significant gap between current VLMs and human-level capabilities in real-world driving scenarios.

Granular Results. Through the results on 10 secondary aspects, the main findings are as follows:

- In TKU, *Road Traffic Signal* represents a fundamental knowledge of AD. Existing open-source models, with the exception of large-scale QW series [4, 69], still remain a

*<https://openai.com/index/hello-gpt-4o/>




Figure 4. Gain chart of the five key domains. This chart shows the performance improvements of models trained on datasets categorized by the five key domains, evaluated on ADBench, compared to the base model.

large room for performance improvement.

- On *Signal Element Relation* aspect, GPT-4o and QW2.5-72B [4] showcase the superiority, where it outperforms the second best model by nearly 20%, demonstrating the excellent spatial reasoning capability for AD scenarios.
- On *Intention Judgment* aspect, almost all the models exhibit unsatisfactory performance. However, QW-7B [3], trained without sequential data, achieves promising results, suggesting that VLMs can predict potential sequential events through training on non-sequential events.

Large-scale vs. Small-scale VLMs. To investigate how the performance of a general model varies with scalability, we present 6 large-scale models in Tab. 4. Firstly, the large-scale VLM models do not always surpass the small-scale models. Among the large-scale models, only half outperform the best small-scale VLM model LV-7B [81]. Secondly, for a given model, scaling up the language model typically results in a performance improvement. However, this trend is not universally consistent in AD. For instance, with LV[81], the larger model generally outperforms its smaller counterpart across most aspects, yet it underperforms in the important *intention judgment* and *meta decision-making* aspects, resulting in a lower final score.

Domain-specific Results. As training data from the AD domain is incorporated, the DS model exhibits outstanding performance in certain tasks, e.g., Dols[46] on vehicle cut-in task (86.70 ranked 1st), DriLM[61] on traffic light task (75.14 ranked 1st), DriMM[26] on foreground aspect (60.52 ranked 2nd). However, these DS models always perform poorly in TAC domain. By comparing DriLM[61] and DriLM-B[61] with the base model IVL2-4B [13], we can further observe that biased domain-specific data will lead to a loss of generalization ability in unseen tasks. DriLM[61] outperforms the base model in fundamental traffic knowledge but performs significantly worse in the TAC domain.

Meanwhile, DriLM-B[61] excels in *intention Judgment* but falls short in *meta decision-making* compared to the base model. DS Data bias will influences the model capabilities, and single-direction optimization may lead to a loss of generalization in other tasks even within the same domain.

4.2.2. Interactions in Key Domains of VLADBench

As discussed above, biased domain-specific training data can enhance the performance in certain specialized areas of autonomous driving but may loss the generalization ability in tasks that require broader and more general knowledge. To deeply explore the interrelationships among the 5 key domains, we train DS models using different DS datasets (with generic data kept constant) and test them on **VLAD-Bench**. The gain chart, comparing these models to the base model, is shown in Fig. 4. It can be concluded that:

- The role of each domain data is not isolated, it also positively influences other domains. For example, TKU data boosts the EDP domain significantly, GER data benefits TAC domain (especially *intention judgment*), TGG data enhance the understanding of the traffic element (lanes and traffic signs).
- Synergy effect occurs when combining all the datasets for training. When all the data trained together, the performance across all domains (except for TGG) is higher than when training each domain individually, e.g., TKU performance increased by 67%.
- Although the all-data model achieved significant improvements in the TGG domain, models trained on GER and EDP data both experienced negative gains in the TGG domain, suggesting that the collected GER and EDP training datasets are still basised for TGG domain.
- Adjusting the data ratio between different domains may lead to better training results. For example, both TKU data and GER data contribute more to TAC than TAC

Table 5. Motion planning performance. The metrics are following the setting in UniAD [25] and ST-P3 [23].

Models	ST-P3								UniAD							
	L2(m)↓				Collision(%)↓				L2(m)↓				Collision(%)↓			
	1s	2s	3s	Avg.	1s	2s	3s	Avg.	1s	2s	3s	Avg.	1s	2s	3s	Avg.
ST-P3	1.28	2.03	2.81	2.04	0.14	0.72	1.28	0.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
UniAD	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.47	1.80	3.73	3.00	0.13	0.53	1.50	0.72
TKU	0.30	0.67	1.15	0.70	0.13	0.25	0.82	0.40	0.43	1.28	2.41	1.37	0.13	0.51	2.53	1.06
GER	0.28	0.61	1.04	0.65	0.06	0.26	0.69	0.34	0.41	1.16	2.16	1.24	0.13	0.52	2.07	0.91
TGG	0.34	0.78	1.31	0.81	0.00	0.38	0.95	0.44	0.50	1.50	2.66	1.55	0.00	0.88	2.40	1.10
TAC	0.35	0.83	1.43	0.87	0.00	0.28	1.09	0.46	0.53	1.62	2.94	1.70	0.00	0.76	3.40	1.39
EDP	0.28	0.71	1.25	0.75	0.13	0.25	0.77	0.38	0.41	1.42	2.66	1.50	0.13	0.50	2.51	1.05
All	0.27	0.60	1.04	0.64	0.13	0.25	0.61	0.33	0.39	1.15	2.15	1.23	0.13	0.51	1.65	0.76

data, indicating that selecting an appropriate ratio could yield improved performance.

4.2.3. Contribution of Key Domains for Motion Planning

In **VLADBench**, tasks for comprehension dominate the evaluation. After assessing the 5 key domains for AD understanding tasks, we finally evaluate the contributions of 5 key domains for trajectory prediction. Note that the goal is not to pursue the state-of-the-art results. For training, we construct about 4K dataset from nuScenes [6], which includes scene analysis and trajectory points, and then train the model by incorporating individual domain-specific data. The quantitative motion planning results are shown in Tab. 5. It can be observed that the GER is the most important domain for trajectory prediction, followed by EDP domain. The results from TKU domain are comparable to those from EDP domain, suggesting that the understanding of traffic knowledge plays a crucial role, which is a capability that traditional models are unable to achieve. Although the experimental results from TGG and TAC domains perform poorly in terms of L2 distance, they significantly reduce the collision rate in the short term. More details about the trajectory dataset and results from open-source and domain-specific models are presented in the supplement materials.

4.3. Further Analysis

Bottlenecks in Traffic Graph Generation. In TGG domain, analyzing the relations between elements presents significant challenges. As discussed above in Sec. 3.3, we further incorporate additional descriptive guidance about the traffic elements as tips within the instructions. Experiments after and before adding these tips showcase a 10% improvement in the light-lane relation task and a 20% improvement in the lane change relation task, suggesting that embedding traffic-related knowledge can directly enhance knowledge graph construction. Nevertheless the accuracy remains at approximately 60%, indicating that spatial reasoning ability is still limited. The detailed experimental results are listed in the supplementary material.

The larger, the better? OV-7B [34] and LV-7B [81] perform as the top models at the small scale. However, when the language model is scaled up to 72B, the vision encoder, SigLIP [79], remains unchanged, and the observed superiority no longer holds. Specifically, OV-72B [34] shows only marginal improvement, and LV-72B even [81] experiences a performance decline. In contrast, IVL2-76B[81], with a significantly larger vision encoder (scaled from 300M to 6B parameters), achieved first place across two aspects. QW2-72B[69] and QW2.5-72B[4], featuring a larger vision encoder than OV[34] and LV[81] and employing a dynamic resolution mechanism to avoid visual information loss, approaches the performance of closed-source models, achieving a well-balanced performance across cognitive and reasoning tasks. These findings suggest that a large or specialized vision encoder may be more critical than merely scaling up the language model for AD.

5. Conclusion and Limitation

Conclusion. In this paper, we present a fine-grained benchmark for evaluating large vision-language models on autonomous driving. The proposed **VLADBench** covers 5 key domains, 11 aspects and 29 tasks, addressing critical gaps in current datasets, including coarse-grained categories, and a lack of dynamic element analysis and diversity. Extensive experiments on general and domain-specific models uncover the significant performance gaps across a wide range of tasks. Our in-depth experiments further reveals the interactions among the five key domains, and the individual contribution for motion planning performance.

Limitations. There are still several limitations: 1) The current benchmark focuses on evaluating the understanding and reasoning capabilities from the perspective view. Future research will incorporate multi-view inputs to further assess the 3D spatial perception capabilities of these models. 2) The training of domain-specific models in this paper is straightforward. Exploring the scalability of domain-specific models and optimizing data sampling strategies are the crucial directions for future researches.

References

- [1] Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, et al. Gpt-4 technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2303.08774*, 2023. 2
- [2] Anas Awadalla, Irena Gao, Josh Gardner, Jack Hessel, Yusuf Hanafy, Wanrong Zhu, Kalyani Marathe, Yonatan Bitton, Samir Gadre, Shiori Sagawa, et al. Openflamingo: An open-source framework for training large autoregressive vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.01390*, 2023. 1, 5
- [3] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Shusheng Yang, Shijie Wang, Sinan Tan, Peng Wang, Junyang Lin, Chang Zhou, and Jingren Zhou. Qwen-vl: A versatile vision-language model for understanding, localization, text reading, and beyond. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.12966*, 1(2):3, 2023. 6, 7
- [4] Shuai Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, Sibao Song, Kai Dang, Peng Wang, Shijie Wang, Jun Tang, et al. Qwen2. 5-vl technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.13923*, 2025. 6, 7, 8
- [5] Satyanjeev Banerjee and Alon Lavie. Meteor: An automatic metric for mt evaluation with improved correlation with human judgments. In *Proceedings of the acl workshop on intrinsic and extrinsic evaluation measures for machine translation and/or summarization*, pages 65–72, 2005. 3
- [6] Holger Caesar, Varun Bankiti, Alex H Lang, Sourabh Vora, Venice Erin Liong, Qiang Xu, Anush Krishnan, Yu Pan, Giancarlo Baldan, and Oscar Beijbom. nuscenes: A multi-modal dataset for autonomous driving. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2020. 3, 8, 1
- [7] Xu Cao, Tong Zhou, Yunsheng Ma, Wenqian Ye, Can Cui, Kun Tang, Zhipeng Cao, Kaizhao Liang, Ziran Wang, James M Rehg, et al. Maplm: A real-world large-scale vision-language benchmark for map and traffic scene understanding. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 21819–21830, 2024. 6, 1
- [8] Kai Chen, Yanze Li, Wenhua Zhang, Yanxin Liu, Pengxiang Li, Ruiyuan Gao, Lanqing Hong, Meng Tian, Xinhai Zhao, Zhenguo Li, et al. Automated evaluation of large vision-language models on self-driving corner cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10595*, 2024. 1
- [9] Lin Chen, Jisong Li, Xiaoyi Dong, Pan Zhang, Conghui He, Jiaqi Wang, Feng Zhao, and Dahua Lin. Sharegpt4v: Improving large multi-modal models with better captions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12793*, 2023. 2
- [10] Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Kashyap Chitta, Bernhard Jaeger, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. End-to-end autonomous driving: Challenges and frontiers. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024. 1, 3
- [11] Yinda Chen, Che Liu, Wei Huang, Sibao Cheng, Rossella Arcucci, and Zhiwei Xiong. Generative text-guided 3d vision-language pretraining for unified medical image segmentation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.04811*, 2023. 1
- [12] Yuan Chen, Zi-han Ding, Ziqin Wang, Yan Wang, Lijun Zhang, and Si Liu. Asynchronous large language model enhanced planner for autonomous driving. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024. 3
- [13] Zhe Chen, Jiannan Wu, Wenhai Wang, Weijie Su, Guo Chen, Sen Xing, Muyan Zhong, Qinglong Zhang, Xizhou Zhu, Lewei Lu, et al. Internvl: Scaling up vision foundation models and aligning for generic visual-linguistic tasks. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024. 2, 6, 7, 1
- [14] Wenliang Dai, Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Anthony Meng Huat Tiong, Junqi Zhao, Weisheng Wang, Boyang Li, Pascale Fung, and Steven Hoi. Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning, 2023. 2
- [15] Xinpeng Ding, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Wei Zhang, and Xiaomeng Li. Hilm-d: Towards high-resolution understanding in multimodal large language models for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.05186*, 2023. 1
- [16] Xinpeng Ding, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, Xiaodan Liang, Wei Zhang, and Xiaomeng Li. Holistic autonomous driving understanding by bird’s-eye-view injected multi-modal large models. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 13668–13677, 2024. 1, 3
- [17] Chaoyou Fu, Peixian Chen, Yunhang Shen, Yulei Qin, Mengdan Zhang, Xu Lin, Jinrui Yang, Xiwu Zheng, Ke Li, Xing Sun, et al. Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.13394*, 2023. 3
- [18] Chaoyou Fu, Yuhang Dai, Yondong Luo, Lei Li, Shuhuai Ren, Renrui Zhang, Zihan Wang, Chenyu Zhou, Yunhang Shen, Mengdan Zhang, et al. Video-mme: The first-ever comprehensive evaluation benchmark of multi-modal llms in video analysis. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.21075*, 2024. 3
- [19] Yunfei Guo, Fei Yin, Xiao-hui Li, Xudong Yan, Tao Xue, Shuqi Mei, and Cheng-Lin Liu. Visual traffic knowledge graph generation from scene images. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 21604–21613, 2023. 3, 6, 1
- [20] Jianhua Han, Xiwen Liang, Hang Xu, Kai Chen, Lanqing Hong, Jiageng Mao, Chaoqiang Ye, Wei Zhang, Zhenguo Li, Xiaodan Liang, et al. Soda10m: A large-scale 2d self/semi-supervised object detection dataset for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11118*, 2021. 3
- [21] Wenyi Hong, Weihang Wang, Ming Ding, Wenmeng Yu, Qingsong Lv, Yan Wang, Yean Cheng, Shiyu Huang, Junhui Ji, Zhao Xue, et al. Cogvlm2: Visual language models for image and video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.16500*, 2024. 5
- [22] Sebastian Houben, Johannes Stallkamp, Jan Salmen, Marc Schlipsing, and Christian Igel. Detection of traffic signs in real-world images: The German Traffic Sign Detection Benchmark. In *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, 2013. 3
- [23] Shengchao Hu, Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Hongyang Li, Junchi Yan, and Dacheng Tao. St-p3: End-to-end vision-based autonomous driving via spatial-temporal feature learning. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2022. 8
- [24] Yihan Hu, Jiazhi Yang, Li Chen, Keyu Li, Chonghao Sima, Xizhou Zhu, Siqi Chai, Senyao Du, Tianwei Lin, Wenhai

- Wang, Lewei Lu, Xiaosong Jia, Qiang Liu, Jifeng Dai, Yu Qiao, and Hongyang Li. Planning-oriented autonomous driving. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023. 3
- [25] Yihan Hu, Jiazhi Yang, Li Chen, Keyu Li, Chonghao Sima, Xizhou Zhu, Siqi Chai, Senyao Du, Tianwei Lin, Wenhai Wang, et al. Planning-oriented autonomous driving. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2023. 8
- [26] Zhijian Huang, Chengjian Feng, Feng Yan, Baihui Xiao, Zequn Jie, Yujie Zhong, Xiaodan Liang, and Lin Ma. Drivemm: All-in-one large multimodal model for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.07689*, 2024. 2, 6, 7
- [27] Bo Jiang, Shaoyu Chen, Qing Xu, Bencheng Liao, Jiajie Chen, Helong Zhou, Qian Zhang, Wenyu Liu, Chang Huang, and Xinggang Wang. Vad: Vectorized scene representation for efficient autonomous driving. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2023. 3
- [28] Bo Jiang, Shaoyu Chen, Bencheng Liao, Xingyu Zhang, Wei Yin, Qian Zhang, Chang Huang, Wenyu Liu, and Xinggang Wang. Senna: Bridging large vision-language models and end-to-end autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.22313*, 2024. 6
- [29] Siddharth Karamcheti, Suraj Nair, Annie S Chen, Thomas Kollar, Chelsea Finn, Dorsa Sadigh, and Percy Liang. Language-driven representation learning for robotics. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.12766*, 2023. 1
- [30] Jinkyu Kim, Anna Rohrbach, Trevor Darrell, John Canny, and Zeynep Akata. Textual explanations for self-driving vehicles. In *European conference on computer vision*, 2018. 6
- [31] Jinkyu Kim, Teruhisa Misu, Yi-Ting Chen, Ashish Tawari, and John Canny. Grounding human-to-vehicle advice for self-driving vehicles. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2019. 3, 6, 1
- [32] Iuliia Kotseruba, Amir Rasouli, and John K Tsotsos. Joint attention in autonomous driving (jaad). *arXiv preprint arXiv:1609.04741*, 2016. 3
- [33] Bohao Li, Yuying Ge, Yixiao Ge, Guangzhi Wang, Rui Wang, Ruimao Zhang, and Ying Shan. Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal large language models. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024. 3
- [34] Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Dong Guo, Renrui Zhang, Feng Li, Hao Zhang, Kaichen Zhang, Yanwei Li, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-onevision: Easy visual task transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.03326*, 2024. 6, 8
- [35] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Silvio Savarese, and Steven Hoi. BLIP-2: bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models. In *ICML*, 2023. 2
- [36] Kaican Li, Kai Chen, Haoyu Wang, Lanqing Hong, Chaoqiang Ye, Jianhua Han, Yukuai Chen, Wei Zhang, Chunjing Xu, Dit-Yan Yeung, et al. Coda: A real-world road corner case dataset for object detection in autonomous driving. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2022. 3, 6
- [37] KunChang Li, Yinan He, Yi Wang, Yizhuo Li, Wenhai Wang, Ping Luo, Yali Wang, Limin Wang, and Yu Qiao. Videochat: Chat-centric video understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.06355*, 2023. 1
- [38] Yanze Li, Wenhua Zhang, Kai Chen, Yanxin Liu, Pengxiang Li, Ruiyuan Gao, Lanqing Hong, Meng Tian, Xinhai Zhao, Zhenguo Li, et al. Automated evaluation of large vision-language models on self-driving corner cases. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.10595*, 2024. 3
- [39] Zhiqi Li, Zhiding Yu, Shiyi Lan, Jiahao Li, Jan Kautz, Tong Lu, and Jose M Alvarez. Is ego status all you need for open-loop end-to-end autonomous driving? In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024. 3
- [40] Chin-Yew Lin. Rouge: A package for automatic evaluation of summaries. In *Text summarization branches out*, pages 74–81, 2004. 3
- [41] Ji Lin, Hongxu Yin, Wei Ping, Pavlo Molchanov, Mohammad Shoeybi, and Song Han. Vila: On pre-training for visual language models. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 26689–26699, 2024. 2
- [42] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Qingyang Wu, and Yong Jae Lee. Visual instruction tuning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 36, 2023. 1, 2
- [43] Haotian Liu, Chunyuan Li, Yuheng Li, Bo Li, Yuanhan Zhang, Sheng Shen, and Yong Jae Lee. Llava-next: Improved reasoning, ocr, and world knowledge, 2024. 2
- [44] Yuan Liu, Haodong Duan, Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, Songyang Zhang, Wangbo Zhao, Yike Yuan, Jiaqi Wang, Conghui He, Ziwei Liu, et al. Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player? In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024. 3
- [45] Yuhang Lu, Yichen Yao, Jiadong Tu, Jiangnan Shao, Yuexin Ma, and Xinge Zhu. Can lvlms obtain a driver’s license? a benchmark towards reliable agi for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.02914*, 2024. 3, 6, 1
- [46] Yingzi Ma, Yulong Cao, Jiachen Sun, Marco Pavone, and Chaowei Xiao. Dolphins: Multimodal language model for driving. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2024. 3, 6, 7, 1
- [47] Srikanth Malla, Chiho Choi, Isht Dwivedi, Joon Hee Choi, and Jiachen Li. Drama: Joint risk localization and captioning in driving. In *Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2023. 3, 6, 1
- [48] Jiageng Mao, Minzhe Niu, Chenhan Jiang, Hanxue Liang, Jingheng Chen, Xiaodan Liang, Yamin Li, Chaoqiang Ye, Wei Zhang, Zhenguo Li, et al. One million scenes for autonomous driving: Once dataset. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2106.11037*, 2021. 3
- [49] Jiageng Mao, Yuxi Qian, Junjie Ye, Hang Zhao, and Yue Wang. Gpt-driver: Learning to drive with gpt. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.01415*, 2023. 1, 6
- [50] Ana-Maria Marcu, Long Chen, Jan Hünemann, Alice Karnsund, Benoit Hanotte, Prajwal Chidananda, Saurabh Nair, Vijay Badrinarayanan, Alex Kendall, Jamie Shotton, et al. Lingoqa: Visual question answering for autonomous driving. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2024. 1, 3, 6
- [51] Michael Moor, Qian Huang, Shirley Wu, Michihiro Yasunaga, Yash Dalmia, Jure Leskovec, Cyril Zakka, Eduardo Pontes Reis, and Pranav Rajpurkar. Med-flamingo: a

- multimodal medical few-shot learner. In *Machine Learning for Health (ML4H)*, pages 353–367. PMLR, 2023. 1
- [52] Ming Nie, Renyuan Peng, Chunwei Wang, Xinyue Cai, Jianhua Han, Hang Xu, and Li Zhang. Reason2drive: Towards interpretable and chain-based reasoning for autonomous driving. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*. Springer, 2024. 1, 3
- [53] Chenbin Pan, Burhaneddin Yaman, Tommaso Nesti, Abhirup Mallik, Alessandro G Allievi, Senem Velipasalar, and Liu Ren. Vlp: Vision language planning for autonomous driving. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024. 3
- [54] Kishore Papineni, Salim Roukos, Todd Ward, and Wei-Jing Zhu. Bleu: a method for automatic evaluation of machine translation. In *Proceedings of the 40th annual meeting of the Association for Computational Linguistics*, 2002. 3
- [55] Chirag Parikh, Rohit Saluja, CV Jawahar, and Ravi Kiran Sarvadevabhatla. Idd-x: A multi-view dataset for ego-relative important object localization and explanation in dense and unstructured traffic. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 14815–14821. IEEE, 2024. 6, 1
- [56] SungYeon Park, MinJae Lee, JiHyuk Kang, Hahyeon Choi, Yoonah Park, Juhwan Cho, Adam Lee, and DongKyu Kim. Vlaad: Vision and language assistant for autonomous driving. In *Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision Workshop*, pages 980–987, 2024. 3
- [57] Tianwen Qian, Jingjing Chen, Linhai Zhuo, Yang Jiao, and Yu-Gang Jiang. Nuscenes-qa: A multi-modal visual question answering benchmark for autonomous driving scenario. In *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2024. 3
- [58] Amir Rasouli, Iuliia Kotseruba, Toni Kunic, and John K Tsotsos. Pie: A large-scale dataset and models for pedestrian intention estimation and trajectory prediction. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, 2019. 3
- [59] Enna Sachdeva, Nakul Agarwal, Suhas Chundi, Sean Roelofs, Jiachen Li, Mykel Kochenderfer, Chiho Choi, and Behzad Dariush. Rank2tell: A multimodal driving dataset for joint importance ranking and reasoning. In *Winter Conference on Applications of Computer Vision*, 2024. 3
- [60] Hao Shao, Yuxuan Hu, Letian Wang, Guanglu Song, Steven L Waslander, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. Lmdrive: Closed-loop end-to-end driving with large language models. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2024. 3
- [61] Chonghao Sima, Katrin Renz, Kashyap Chitta, Li Chen, Hanxue Zhang, Chengen Xie, Ping Luo, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. Drivelm: Driving with graph visual question answering. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2024. 1, 3, 6, 7
- [62] Gemini Team, Rohan Anil, Sebastian Borgeaud, Jean-Baptiste Alayrac, Jiahui Yu, Radu Soricut, Johan Schalkwyk, Andrew M Dai, Anja Hauth, Katie Millican, et al. Gemini: a family of highly capable multimodal models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.11805*, 2023. 6
- [63] Siyu Teng, Xuemin Hu, Peng Deng, Bai Li, Yuchen Li, Yunfeng Ai, Dongsheng Yang, Lingxi Li, Zhe Xuanyuan, Fenghua Zhu, et al. Motion planning for autonomous driving: The state of the art and future perspectives. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 8(6):3692–3711, 2023. 1, 3
- [64] Xiaoyu Tian, Junru Gu, Bailin Li, Yicheng Liu, Yang Wang, Zhiyong Zhao, Kun Zhan, Peng Jia, Xianpeng Lang, and Hang Zhao. Drivevlm: The convergence of autonomous driving and large vision-language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.12289*, 2024. 1, 3
- [65] Shengbang Tong, Ellis Brown, Penghao Wu, Sanghyun Woo, Manoj Middepogu, Sai Charitha Akula, Jihan Yang, Shusheng Yang, Adithya Iyer, Xichen Pan, et al. Cambrian-1: A fully open, vision-centric exploration of multimodal llms. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.16860*, 2024. 2
- [66] Hugo Touvron, Thibaut Lavril, Gautier Izacard, Xavier Martinet, Marie-Anne Lachaux, Timothée Lacroix, Baptiste Rozière, Naman Goyal, Eric Hambro, Faisal Azhar, et al. Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.13971*, 2023. 2
- [67] Ramakrishna Vedantam, C Lawrence Zitnick, and Devi Parikh. Cider: Consensus-based image description evaluation. In *Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, 2015. 3
- [68] Huijie Wang, Tianyu Li, Yang Li, Li Chen, Chonghao Sima, Zhenbo Liu, Bangjun Wang, Peijin Jia, Yuting Wang, Shengyin Jiang, et al. Openlane-v2: A topology reasoning benchmark for unified 3d hd mapping. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:18873–18884, 2023. 6, 1
- [69] Peng Wang, Shuai Bai, Sinan Tan, Shijie Wang, Zhihao Fan, Jinze Bai, Keqin Chen, Xuejing Liu, Jialin Wang, Wenbin Ge, et al. Qwen2-vl: Enhancing vision-language model’s perception of the world at any resolution. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.12191*, 2024. 2, 6, 8
- [70] Shihao Wang, Zhiding Yu, Xiaohui Jiang, Shiyi Lan, Min Shi, Nadine Chang, Jan Kautz, Ying Li, and Jose M Alvarez. Omnidrive: A holistic llm-agent framework for autonomous driving with 3d perception, reasoning and planning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.01533*, 2024. 3
- [71] Benjamin Wilson, William Qi, Tanmay Agarwal, John Lambert, Jagjeet Singh, Siddhesh Khandelwal, Bowen Pan, Ratnesh Kumar, Andrew Hartnett, Jhony Kaesemodel Pontes, Deva Ramanan, Peter Carr, and James Hays. Argoverse 2: Next generation datasets for self-driving perception and forecasting. In *Neural Information Processing Systems Track on Datasets and Benchmarks*, 2021. 3
- [72] Yecheng Wu, Zhuoyang Zhang, Junyu Chen, Haotian Tang, Dacheng Li, Yunhao Fang, Ligeng Zhu, Enze Xie, Hongxu Yin, Li Yi, et al. Vila-u: a unified foundation model integrating visual understanding and generation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2409.04429*, 2024. 5
- [73] Shaoyuan Xie, Lingdong Kong, Yuhao Dong, Chonghao Sima, Wenwei Zhang, Qi Alfred Chen, Ziwei Liu, and Liang Pan. Are vlms ready for autonomous driving? an empirical study from the reliability, data, and metric perspectives. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.04003*, 2025. 3
- [74] Zhenhua Xu, Yujia Zhang, Enze Xie, Zhen Zhao, Yong Guo, Kwan-Yee K Wong, Zhenguo Li, and Hengshuang Zhao.

- Drivegpt4: Interpretable end-to-end autonomous driving via large language model. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2024. [1](#), [3](#), [6](#)
- [75] Fuzhao Xue, Yukang Chen, Dacheng Li, Qinghao Hu, Ligeng Zhu, Xiuyu Li, Yunhao Fang, Haotian Tang, Shang Yang, Zhijian Liu, et al. Longvila: Scaling long-context visual language models for long videos. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.10188*, 2024. [5](#)
 - [76] Yuan Yao, Tianyu Yu, Ao Zhang, Chongyi Wang, Junbo Cui, Hongji Zhu, Tianchi Cai, Haoyu Li, Weilin Zhao, Zhihui He, et al. Minicpm-v: A gpt-4v level mllm on your phone. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.01800*, 2024. [6](#)
 - [77] Jiabo Ye, Anwen Hu, Haiyang Xu, Qinghao Ye, Ming Yan, Yuhao Dan, Chenlin Zhao, Guohai Xu, Chenliang Li, Junfeng Tian, et al. mplug-docowl: Modularized multimodal large language model for document understanding. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2307.02499*, 2023. [1](#)
 - [78] Jiang-Tian Zhai, Ze Feng, Jinhao Du, Yongqiang Mao, Jiang-Jiang Liu, Zichang Tan, Yifu Zhang, Xiaoqing Ye, and Jingdong Wang. Rethinking the open-loop evaluation of end-to-end autonomous driving in nuscenes. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2305.10430*, 2023. [3](#)
 - [79] Xiaohua Zhai, Basil Mustafa, Alexander Kolesnikov, and Lucas Beyer. Sigmoid loss for language image pre-training. In *International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 11975–11986, 2023. [8](#)
 - [80] Pan Zhang, Xiaoyi Dong, Bin Wang, Yuhang Cao, Chao Xu, Linke Ouyang, Zhiyuan Zhao, Haodong Duan, Songyang Zhang, Shuangrui Ding, et al. Internlm-xcomposer: A vision-language large model for advanced text-image comprehension and composition. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.15112*, 2023. [2](#), [5](#)
 - [81] Yuanhan Zhang, Bo Li, haotian Liu, Yong jae Lee, Liangke Gui, Di Fu, Jiashi Feng, Ziwei Liu, and Chunyuan Li. Llava-next: A strong zero-shot video understanding model. 2024. [6](#), [7](#), [8](#)
 - [82] Yi-Fan Zhang, Huanyu Zhang, Haochen Tian, Chaoyou Fu, Shuangqing Zhang, Junfei Wu, Feng Li, Kun Wang, Qingsong Wen, Zhang Zhang, et al. Mme-realworld: Could your multimodal llm challenge high-resolution real-world scenarios that are difficult for humans? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.13257*, 2024. [3](#)
 - [83] Deyao Zhu, Jun Chen, Xiaoqian Shen, Xiang Li, and Mohamed Elhoseiny. Minigpt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2304.10592*, 2023. [2](#)
 - [84] Brianna Zitkovich, Tianhe Yu, Sichun Xu, Peng Xu, Ted Xiao, Fei Xia, Jialin Wu, Paul Wohlhart, Stefan Welker, Ayzaan Wahid, et al. Rt-2: Vision-language-action models transfer web knowledge to robotic control. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 2165–2183. PMLR, 2023. [1](#)

Fine-Grained Evaluation of Large Vision-Language Models in Autonomous Driving

Supplementary Material

In the supplementary, we present more details about the benchmark, training setting, and results on each tasks. Then we conduct additional experimental results related to the tips in instructions for *Traffic Graph Generation* aspect. Also, we compare the domain-specific model Dols [46] and the underlying foundation model Openflamingo [2] on static tasks. Finally, we provide a detailed definition of each task in the proposed dataset **VLADBench**, illustrated with examples, including the images and corresponding questions. Note that the visual prompts and the choice lists are omitted.

6. Benchmark details

Following the selection principle, we first choose scenarios, annotate the visual elements with descriptions, design the questions, and then annotate the correct answers. 5 human annotators perform fine-grained annotations, with 2 researchers verifying the results. Each instance takes about 5 to annotate. The instance counts for the five domains TKU, GER, TGG, TAC, and EDP are 2369, 2812, 3090, 1303, and 2418. The instance numbers of Traffic Light, Pavement Marking, Traffic Sign, Right Of Way, VRU Recognition, Vehicle Recognition, Vehicle Status, Lane Recognition, Obstruction Recognition, Light, Weather, Sign-Sign Relation, Light-Lane Relation, Sign-Lane Relation, Lane-Change Relation, Road-Speed Relation, VRU Cut-in, VRU Cross, Vehicle Cut-in, Long-Short Parking, VRU Behavior, Vehicle Behavior, Key Obstruction Detection, Risk Prediction, Drive Efficiency, Spatio-Temporal Reasoning, Lateral, Longitudinal, and Trajectory tasks are 795, 564, 701, 309, 424, 223, 257, 780, 680, 200, 248, 192, 702, 1072, 784, 340, 267, 276, 261, 320, 99, 80, 547, 272, 303, 161, 235, 101, and 799, respectively.

7. Training Setting

Training Data. The domain-specific dataset are collected from [7, 8, 19, 31, 45–47, 49, 50, 55, 61, 68, 74], including DriveLM-nuscenes [61] (377956 QAs), LingoQA [50] (413829 QAs), CODA-LM [8] (20495 QAs), Dolphins [46] (102025 QAs), IDKB [45] (188486 QAs), MapLM [7] (143252 QAs), DriveGPT4 [74] (26751 QAs). Besides, we employ structured rules to generate 109309 QAs, using the original annotations from [19, 31, 47, 55]. Then we use GPT-4o to increase the diversity of the 109309 QAs.

For the trajectory training data, we selected 4,072 samples from nuScenes [6]. To generate analytical data for each

scenario, we first collect questions related to each sample from [16, 61]. Then, we utilize GPT-4o to summarize these questions and transform them into declarative statements. Finally, by incorporating images, we use GPT-4o to generate detailed scenario analyses. We will publicly release this dataset to support research in the autonomous driving field.

Training Details. The training framework is inherited from IVL2 [13]. We finetune the pre-trained IVL2-4B with full parameters (including the vision encoder) for 2 epochs, with a batch size of 1 and a learning rate of $1e-5$. The max token length is set to 4096. All experiments are conducted on 16 nodes, each equipped with 8 V100 GPUs, with each task taking approximately 24 hours.

8. Bottlenecks in Traffic Graph Generation

As discussed, *traffic graph generation* is challenging, even with the provision of visual prompts. To dig into underlying reasons further, we incorporate descriptive guidance on traffic knowledge, including the meaning of signs, types of lights, and lane characteristics. Tab. 6 and Tab. 7 list the accuracy improvement across the five tasks. Almost all models show improvement, suggesting that embedding traffic-related knowledge aids in graph construction. For example, GPT-4o demonstrates a 10.63% improvement in sign-lane relation and a 17.21% improvement in lane speed relation tasks. However, accuracy remains around 60%, highlighting ongoing limitations in relational reasoning. The marginal improvement in the sign-sign relation task further underscores these constraints. Put things together, two points can be drawn: 1) Current Visual Language Models (VLMs) still lack sufficient perception and understanding of traffic knowledge. 2) Even when provided with all the relevant knowledge, existing VLMs still exhibit weak reasoning capabilities in traffic graph tasks.

9. Dols versus Base Model

Dols [46] focuses on autonomous vehicle behavior understanding and achieves state-of-the-art performance in the vehicle cut-in intention judgment task. However, Dols [46] perform quite worse on most other tasks. One reason for this is the poor performance of the underlying foundation model (Openflamingo [2]), as demonstrated by the results on the static parts of our proposed dataset in Tab. 8. Additionally, we observe a notable performance drop in the *road traffic signals* aspect, with no improvements in recognition tasks or graph construction. These phenomena highlight

Table 6. The improvement rate of accuracy on *traffic graph generation* aspect. S.S. RL.: Sign-Sign Relation, S.L.RL.: Sign-Lane Relation, L.L.RL.: Light-Lane Relation, L.S. RL.: Lane Speed Relation, L.C. RL.: Lane Change Relation.

Task	VU 8B	IXC2.5 8B	VILA 8B	CV 8B	LoV 8B	QW 7B	MCV 8B	IVL2 8B	QW2 7B	OV 7B	QW2.5 7B	LV 7B	VILA 40B	OV 72B	LV 72B	IVL2 72B	QW2 72B	QW2.5 72B	GEM 1.5pro	GPT 4o
S.S.RL	0.52	0.26	0.78	0.00	0.26	0.26	3.65	0.78	0.00	0.00	0.26	0.26	0.78	1.04	1.04	0.00	0.00	0.78	3.13	5.21
S.L.RL	5.60	5.50	6.16	6.86	6.25	4.99	5.13	5.60	6.16	5.18	3.78	4.62	6.39	3.87	4.94	5.60	5.32	10.03	9.14	10.63
L.L.RL	6.48	4.99	2.92	11.11	5.27	6.62	6.41	7.55	5.48	5.27	5.91	2.99	3.92	12.61	13.11	8.05	8.90	8.55	10.75	8.19
MEAN	5.42	4.81	4.48	7.71	5.32	5.11	5.44	5.82	5.32	4.70	4.20	3.61	4.96	6.71	7.48	5.93	6.08	8.60	9.13	9.23
L.S.RL	4.56	14.26	4.85	6.18	2.06	0.29	8.97	9.12	12.65	8.24	14.26	8.97	7.94	12.06	12.06	15.88	17.79	17.06	12.94	17.21
L.C.RL	0.00	4.21	7.97	14.54	7.91	11.35	13.84	8.35	7.72	17.22	7.78	17.28	7.97	19.32	17.98	7.72	13.39	18.88	19.77	15.69
MEAN	1.38	7.25	7.03	12.01	6.14	8.01	12.37	8.59	9.21	14.50	9.74	14.77	7.96	17.13	16.19	10.19	14.72	18.33	17.70	16.15

Table 7. The improvement rate of accuracy on traffic graph generation aspect. The results are from the domain-specific models.

Task	Dols 9B	Senna 7B	DriLM 4B	DriMM 7B	DriLM-B 4B	IVL2 4B	Ours 4B
S.S.RL	0.78	0.00	0.78	1.82	0.00	0.00	0.52
S.L.RL	4.20	0.42	1.40	6.86	4.24	2.85	7.00
L.L.RL	4.34	0.07	9.33	4.70	7.34	3.99	8.69
MEAN	3.92	0.25	4.17	5.60	4.93	2.98	6.97
L.S.RL	0.00	0.00	7.21	7.50	8.38	9.12	7.79
L.C.RL	7.72	17.28	0.00	0.00	7.72	7.79	11.80
MEAN	5.38	12.06	2.18	2.27	7.92	8.14	10.59

focusing on only one capability when adapting a foundational model to an autonomous driving domain is suboptimal. This approach prevents other relevant autonomous driving capabilities from improving and may even lead to significant performance degradation.

10. Detailed Results

The detailed results of the tertiary tasks are listed in Tab. 10, and more motion planning results are presented in Tab. 9.

11. Examples of VLADBench



Figure 5. Examples of Pavement Marking.

Pavement Marking refers to markings painted or applied to roads, pavements, and other traffic areas to guide drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians. In this task, the questions include the type (a total of 20) and meaning of various pavement

markings, including lane lines, arrows, symbols, text, etc., as illustrated by the samples in Fig. 5.



Figure 6. Examples of Traffic Sign.

Traffic Sign refers to a visual display placed at the roadside or above a road to inform drivers, cyclists, and pedestrians about the road, its conditions, and traffic regulations. The category includes lane signs, directional signs, regulatory signs, prohibitory signs, warning signs and construction signs, encompassing a total of 168 types. Specifically, we present two important and intriguing questions in Fig. 6, which are designed to conduct an in-depth evaluation of VLM-based AD.

Traffic Light refers to a signaling device used to control the flow of traffic at intersections and other locations. The types include the motor vehicle light, non-motorized light, pedestrian crossing light, lane light, and arrow light. The traffic light statuses include red, yellow, green and malfunction. In addition to the type and status, we also incorporate questions regarding countdown timers, as illustrated in Fig. 7.

Right Of Way refers to the legal right of a person or vehicle to proceed before an ego vehicle at an intersection or other point on a road. Examples are illustrated in Fig. 8. Additionally, we provide descriptions of the actions to take when there are no visual prompts.

VRU Recognition refers to the classification and detection

Table 8. Results on the static parts of our proposed dataset from the domain-specific model (Dols) and its foundation model (Openflamingo). P.M.: Pavement Marking, T.S.: Traffic Sign, T.L.: Traffic Light, L.I.: Light, WE.: Weather, L.Rec.: Lane Recognition, V.S.: Vehicle Status, V.Rec.: Vehicle Recognition, VRU.Rec.: VRU Recognition, O.Rec.: Obstruction Recognition, S.S. RL.: Sign-Sign Relation, S.L.RL.: Sign-Lane Relation, L.L.RL.: Light-Lane Relation, L.S. RL.: Lane Speed Relation, L.C. RL.: Lane Change Relation, K.O.D: Key Object Detection.

Task	P.M.	T.S.	T.L.	L.I.	WE.	L.Rec.	V.S.	V.Rec.	VRU.Rec	O.Rec.	S.S.RL.	S.L.RL.	L.L.RL.	L.S.RL	L.C.RL	K.O.D.
Openflamingo	30.92	31.61	58.04	45.2	54.84	46.21	27.32	0.00	0.38	0.00	1.04	2.10	5.84	1.18	7.46	0.00
Dolphins	12.09	25.02	42.92	56.40	60.65	30.97	3.97	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.78	4.20	4.34	0.00	7.72	74.11

Table 9. More motion planning result from the State-of-the-art models and DS models.

Data	ST-P3								UniAD							
	L2(m)				Collision				L2(m)				Collision			
	1s	2s	3s	Avg	1s	2s	3s	Avg	1s	2s	3s	Avg	1s	2s	3s	Avg
ST-P3	1.28	2.03	2.81	2.04	0.14	0.72	1.28	0.71	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Uniad	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	0.47	1.80	3.73	3.00	0.13	0.53	1.50	0.72
IVL-4B	5.93	7.39	8.91	7.41	6.51	8.49	9.73	8.25	6.92	9.58	12.66	9.72	7.66	10.44	14.00	10.70
DriveMM	11.46	15.05	18.74	15.08	1.92	6.46	12.93	7.12	10.24	12.17	14.06	12.06	1.06	2.94	5.69	3.23
GPT-4o	4.74	8.41	11.74	8.30	4.26	10.98	11.11	8.79	3.64	5.57	7.36	5.53	2.78	6.17	7.92	5.62
Gemini-1.5pro	3.70	6.67	9.44	6.61	5.11	8.68	7.54	7.11	2.78	4.35	5.84	4.33	3.32	5.62	6.45	5.13

Table 10. Detailed results evaluated on different VLMs. For the abbreviation, P.M.: Pavement Marking, T.S.: Traffic Sign, T.L.: Traffic Light, R.O.W: Right Of Way, L.I.: Light, WE.: Weather, L.Rec.: Lane Recognition, V.S.: Vehicle Status, V.Rec.: Vehicle Recognition, VRU.Rec.: VRU Recognition, O.Rec.: Obstruction Recognition, S.S. RL.: Sign-Sign Relation, S.L.RL.: Sign-Lane Relation, L.L.RL.: Light-Lane Relation, L.S. RL.: Lane Speed Relation, L.C. RL.: Lane Change Relation, VRU.CI.: VRU Cut-in, V.CI: Vehicle Cut-in, VRU.C: VRU Crossing, L.S.P.: Long-Short Parking, V.B.: Vehicle Behavior, VRU. B: VRU Behavior, K.O.D: Key Object Detection, ST.R.: Spatio-temporal Reasoning, R.P: Risk Prediction, D.E.: Drive Efficiency, LO: Longitudinal, LA: Lateral.

Task	IXC2.5	VILA	CV	LoV	QW	IVL2	MCV	IVL2	QW2	OV	QW2.5	LV	VILA	OV	LV	IVL2	Q2-VL	GEM	GPT	QW2.5	Dols	DriLM	DriMM	DriLM-B	Ours
	8B	8B	8B	8B	7B	4B	8B	8B	7B	7B	7B	7B	40B	72B	72B	76B	72B	1.5pro	4o	72B	9B	4B	7B	4B	4B
T.L.	30.24	44.53	62.82	44.88	67.37	69.51	60.86	67.70	65.11	62.57	62.77	60.05	43.85	73.11	70.92	71.32	66.79	66.79	67.72	74.54	42.92	75.14	68.20	71.77	74.94
P.M.	22.59	31.21	38.51	50.60	36.42	38.62	34.72	46.38	57.38	58.37	62.91	63.51	31.03	53.72	65.11	51.38	66.88	73.01	71.17	72.45	12.09	39.50	54.11	40.99	58.33
T.S.	20.68	13.50	35.89	18.46	33.58	34.01	32.10	47.45	40.94	49.27	61.71	49.73	20.29	32.98	40.83	53.92	71.18	64.05	68.96	65.11	25.02	44.74	47.05	40.09	61.00
MEAN	24.89	30.32	47.00	37.46	47.40	48.97	43.91	54.97	54.77	56.89	62.45	57.49	32.32	54.15	59.09	59.94	68.31	67.56	69.09	70.76	28.39	55.04	57.15	52.56	65.65
R.O.W.	32.69	46.34	59.35	49.45	79.22	80.58	22.72	69.45	71.52	70.81	80.32	74.11	46.34	76.96	80.06	71.07	81.36	42.98	78.96	80.58	21.10	81.36	42.33	73.85	80.58
MEAN	32.69	46.34	59.35	49.45	79.22	80.58	22.72	69.45	71.52	70.81	80.32	74.11	46.34	76.96	80.06	71.07	81.36	42.98	78.96	80.58	21.10	81.36	42.33	73.85	80.58
VRU.Rec	20.78	15.97	20.84	21.21	18.75	39.10	36.65	38.34	45.24	36.99	39.79	35.95	31.99	35.51	34.00	47.89	53.12	47.02	40.58	38.85	21.20	30.47	51.07	34.56	46.05
V.Rec	42.19	24.62	27.34	36.39	50.16	61.33	56.11	61.92	66.07	60.30	52.54	58.27	53.09	63.20	63.82	74.97	64.70	62.71	58.75	58.78	46.41	47.71	74.93	56.76	74.14
V.S.	23.66	26.77	24.67	41.95	24.36	51.05	54.09	49.26	47.16	54.09	52.61	52.53	48.40	53.62	54.94	59.69	54.16	55.41	54.86	55.95	3.97	51.36	55.49	48.79	56.96
L.Rec	32.92	45.97	54.36	49.26	54.23	57.72	47.90	48.62	52.51	67.69	63.49	66.15	49.85	67.54	64.05	64.44	62.87	51.26	63.49	70.87	30.97	73.44	66.49	66.62	74.26
O.ORG	17.58	29.70	7.62	35.15	32.87	49.83	39.81	52.94	48.95	44.73	51.74	47.11	34.46	39.88	45.36	45.00	63.62	51.15	48.97	50.51	36.18	45.25	56.74	44.65	50.47
MEAN	26.20	31.81	29.13	38.16	38.09	51.73	45.00	49.34	50.88	53.40	53.64	53.03	42.37	51.91	52.27	56.36	60.56	52.00	53.82	56.51	29.24	52.80	60.52	51.68	60.47
LI.	16.40	63.80	58.60	62.50	58.30	63.30	70.40	66.30	70.40	69.60	68.40	70.00	62.20	70.00	70.40	70.40	67.20	56.40	67.20	73.20	56.40	63.60	68.70	66.40	68.40
WE.	27.50	65.81	58.95	65.08	68.55	69.68	71.05	73.87	71.61	68.71	70.00	68.39	67.50	71.21	72.26	74.52	72.26	73.23	69.27	70.97	60.65	65.16	71.61	69.68	74.19
MEAN	22.54	64.91	58.79	63.93	63.97	66.83	70.76	70.49	71.07	69.11	69.29	69.11	65.13	70.67	71.43	72.68	70.00	65.71	68.35	71.96	58.75	64.46	70.31	68.21	71.61
S.S.RL	0.25	21.09	10.00	20.78	16.93	19.90	26.41	21.02	20.00	22.00	20.73	22.99	20.57	21.26	22.96	20.00	20.13	25.36	31.87	21.45	17.58	9.01	23.20	20.00	19.24
L.R.RL	10.84	32.07	22.17	33.02	19.59	29.14	31.58	34.77	33.44	32.61	31.85	32.14	31.86	39.45	38.75	39.81	33.82	41.12	42.90	43.65	23.73	28.09	28.49	34.55	49.19
S.L.RL	11.82	33.48	18.64	33.81	19.05	25.79	29.68	31.84	33.48	30.57	28.21	30.93	34.25	26.54	28.69	32.17	29.09	35.21	41.84	41.19	22.67	21.14	33.99	29.84	40.20
MEAN	10.34	31.77	19.06	32.26	19.04	26.41	30.04	31.83	32.15	30.46	28.78	30.58	32.06	30.63	31.72	33.71	29.91	36.36	41.25	40.14	22.55	22.44	30.97	30.56	41.37
L.C.RL	22.64	41.40	56.19	40.36	42.47	37.81	50.87	38.96	37.75	56.99	37.77	59.75	40.25	55.26	61.05	37.75	47.81	56.16	49.58	54.62	37.68	13.88	16.89	46.74	47.71
L.S.RL	46.37	8.59	13.49	32.97	0.66	39.72	36.75	39.94	44.46	38.99	45.60	39.46	37.46	43.10	43.32	46.24	54.90	50.65	54.87	55.19	0.00	31.56	32.43	37.88	37.04
MEAN	29.82	31.47	43.27	38.12	29.83	38.39	46.60	39.26	39.78	51.54	40.14	53.61	39.40	51.58	55.69	40.32	49.95	54.49	51.18	54.79	26.29	19.23	21.59	44.06	44.48
VRU.CI	61.39	44.64	57.83	46.37	62.40	55.51	57.36	62.53	61.07	59.96	53.76	59.66	45.84	62.38	62.38	63.31	68.54	64.72	54.96	59.38	51.25	58.65	58.41	63.30	63.43
VRU.C	88.15	35.94	31.16	37.55	80.92	37.23	78.86	45.49	82.52	74.96	70.98	77.77	37.52	66.20	55.49	65.05	75.38	72.39	51.07	54.46	66.05	44.29	47.45	83.97	59.40
V.CI	62.59	36.25	20.80	33.05	83.10	21.84	52.24	24.14	39.31	36.17	25.52	42.53	36.51	27.64	28.47	26.93	34.48	26.17	23.54	28.28	86.70	29.31	18.72	44.60	26.09
L.S.P	58.69	24.44	44.81	24.06	50.10	49.75	52.56	53.25	58.75	58.13	60.75	57.50	24.56	45.00	54.00	57.25	62.75	58.75	58.75	71.00	32.00	54.50	47.06	52.25	60.63
MEAN	67.47	34.80	38.98	34.76	68.23	41.56	60.08	46.79	60.62	57.60	53.42	59.52	35.57	50.30	50.43	53.57	60.66	55.95	47.79	54.26	57.64	47.16	43.27	60.89	52.97
VRU.B.	27.88	10.50	43.64	23.84	29.00	43.43	41.21	45.86	44.04	39.80	44.04	42.42	11.50	45.25	46.87	47.88	44.24	53.94	58.79	52.93	0.00	36.77	40.20	42.02	41.21
V.B.	34.00	10.50	21.50	10.75	27.00	45.00	33.00	48.00	39.00	44.00	40.00	44.00	11.50	37.00	41.25	47.00	47.00	46.50	45.00	47.00	0.25	45.75	40.00	44.00	45.00
MEAN	30.61	10.50	33.74	17.99	28.60	44.13	37.54	46.82	41.79	41.68	42.23	43.13	11.50	41.56	44.36	47.49	45.47	50.61	52.63	50.28	0.11	40.78	40.11	42.91	42.91
K.O.D	26.62	54.52	44.42	53.93	76.01	54.66	59.49	69.73	62.41	59.49	58.17	69.73	55.50	71.33	69.87	73.53	72.94	63.44	70.60	75.72	74.11	66.95	64.75	75.72	74.55
R.P.	73.09	75.06	11.94	69.47	62.16	31.18	72.61	59.29	41.91	30.88	55.40	33.04	71.75	48.90	42.17	71.97	44.92	57.10	66.57	54.60	68.01	40.88	24.78	33.60	79.15
D.E.	48.58	38.88	54.30	40.75	44.95	46.47	48.78	54.85	51.68	61.29	61.19	55.92	40.86	48.38	50.83	46.36	63.04	60.33	53.61	63.70	47.68	53.47	59.27	46.60	58.15
ST.R	54.92	33.98	36.44	38.94	64.08	44.49	52.36	53.06	57.59	32.81	62.72	53.99	34.42	32.27	50.95	56.30	71.56	62.18	62.71	65.71	28.45	48.73	48.82	49.26	59.20
MEAN	45.91	52.60	36.89	52.03	64.24	46.47	58.85	61.91	54.93	47.35	58.87	56.50	52.84	56.26	57.13	65.72	64.49	61.20	65.75	67.15	58.72	55.95	52.99	56.60	69.73
LA.	63.91	22.55	24.17	23.49	26.81	56.77	40.26	41.45	30.21	32.43	33.62	41.11	24.43	46.81	35.15	62.55	55.40	56.09	43.83	44.85	11.74	39.74	50.98	53.36	59.83
LO.	36.24	9.31	20.20	6.73	17.03	26.34	24.95	39.41	46.93	46.34	39.80	41.39	7.33	68.91	46.14	48.51	50.10	57.23	57.82	54.85	18.22	31.49	47.72	29.90	50.89
MEAN	55.60	18.57	22.98	18.45	23.87	47.62	35.65	40.83	35.24	36.61	35.48	41.19	19.29	53.45	38.45	58.33	53.81	56.43	48.04	47.86	13.69	37.26	50.00	46.31	57.14
TOTAL	30.93	35.17	35.86	38.67	43.24	44.97	45.45	48.58	49.40	49.97	50.75	51.73	38.76	50.21	51.62	53.20	56.51	54.23	56.00	58.00	33.87	44.90	47.45	49.83	57.39



The state of the Motor Vehicle Light in the blue box is green.
How many seconds are left?



The state of the Pedestrian Crossing Light in the blue box is green.
How many seconds are left?

Figure 7. Examples of Traffic Light.



The input image sequence is captured from the front view of ego vehicle, the object in the red box is SUV. Determine the right of way at the current road. [Choice List]



In an unsignalized intersection, the ego vehicle makes a left turn while vehicles in the oncoming lane make a right turn. Determine the right of way at the current road. [Choice List]

Figure 8. Examples of Right Of Way.

for vulnerable road users (VRUs). There are 8 types of VRUs: moped, tricycle, cart, cyclist, bicycle, stroller, motorcycle, and wheelchair. Note that these VRUs are selected from corner cases. Examples are shown in Fig. 9.

Vehicle Recognition refers to the classification and detection for 5 types of corner-case level vehicles, including car, construction vehicle, truck, bus, and sanitation vehicle. Examples are shown in Fig. 10.

Obstruction Recognition refers to the classification and detection for the 19 types of corner-case level obstacles, including debris, suitcase, concrete block, plastic bag, chair, machinery, phone booth, dustbin, basket, stone, garbage, tire, carton, cardboard, garbage bag, traffic cone, traffic box,




Figure 9. Examples of VRU Recognition.




Figure 10. Examples of Vehicle Recognition.





Figure 11. Examples of Obstruction Recognition.

traffic island, and dog. These obstacles, often found unexpectedly on the road or in parking areas, pose significant risks to the safety and efficiency of autonomous vehicles. The ability to accurately detect and classify such obstructions is critical for ensuring smooth navigation and avoiding accidents in dynamic environments. Examples are shown in Fig. 11.

Lane Recognition involves identifying various types of lanes, such as motorized vehicle lanes, non-motorized vehicle lanes, emergency lanes, dedicated bus lanes, ETC-exclusive lanes, and sidewalks. Additionally, we increase



Figure 12. Examples of Lane Recognition.

the complexity of the lane recognition task by distinguishing between opposing lanes and classifying motor vehicle lanes as fast, slow, or regular. The added complexity helps validate the ability to navigate complex roadways, enhancing its decision-making process in various traffic conditions. Accurate lane recognition is crucial for safe lane changes, merging, and ensuring the vehicle stays within the correct lane. Examples are shown in Fig. 12.




Figure 13. Examples of Vehicle Status.

Vehicle Status focuses on the light state and operational status, referring to observable exterior conditions of a target vehicle. There are 17 possible statuses, including right turn light on, left turn light on, brake light on, hazard lights on, empty car light on, passenger light on, right door open, left door open, trunk open, trunk open for loading, right door open for boarding, left door open for boarding, rear compartment door open for loading, all compartment doors open, construction work, accident scene, and cargo hanging from trunk. The exterior status provides critical information about the current state of the target vehicle, which is essential for autonomous systems to make accurate decisions in real-time traffic scenarios. For instance, recognizing whether doors are open or if hazard lights are on helps the system assess the vehicle's intent or possible hazards. Examples are shown in Fig. 13.

Weather & Light refer to the driving conditions in the scenarios. The questions are first addressed in terms of daytime, nighttime, and dawn&dusk conditions, followed by




Figure 14. Examples of Weather & Light .

considerations of light and weather. The light conditions comprise diffuse, backlit, snowy, shadowed light, bright, low, very low, and dark. The weather conditions consist of overcast, clear, rainy, cloudy, and snowy. These environmental factors significantly impact the perception and decision-making processes of AD systems, as they affect visibility, road conditions, and overall driving safety. For instance, driving in low-light or snowy conditions requires the vehicle to adjust its speed and navigation strategy. Examples are shown in Fig. 14.




Figure 15. Examples of Sign-Sign Relation.

Sign-Sign Relation refers to the traffic graph connections between different signs. In the image, traffic signs are highlighted with red boxes, and the closest red numbers indicate the corresponding traffic sign identifiers. The Sign-Sign Relation task analyzes which sign corresponds to a specified sub-sign, capturing the hierarchical or contextual relationships between signs. Examples are shown in Fig. 15.




Figure 16. Examples of Lane-Sign Relation.

Lane-Sign Relation refers to the traffic graph about the lanes and traffic signs. In the image, the lanes are represented by red lines, with the adjacent red numbers indicating the lane identification. Traffic signs are depicted within blue boxes, with the nearest blue numbers indicating traffic sign numbers. The Lane-Sign Relation task focuses on determining which lane corresponds to a specified traffic sign, enabling the system to interpret lane-specific rules or guidance effectively. Examples are shown in Fig. 16.




Figure 17. Examples of Light-Lane Relation.

Light-Lane Relation refers to the traffic graph about the lanes and lights. In the image, the lanes are represented by red lines, with the adjacent red numbers indicating the lane identification. Traffic lights are represented by blue boxes, with the adjacent blue numbers indicating the traffic light identification. The Light-Lane Relation task analyzes which lane corresponds to a specified traffic light, facilitating an understanding of how traffic signals regulate specific lanes. Examples are shown in Fig. 17.

Lane Speed Relation involves analyzing the low-speed and high-speed limits for a specified lane, based on the traffic signs present in the image. This task requires identifying the speed-related traffic signs and associating them with the relevant lanes to determine the permissible speed range. Examples are shown in Fig. 18.

Lane Change Relation analyzes the permissibility and rules governing lane changes. This task is based on road





Figure 18. Examples of Lane Speed Relation.



1. Legally, can the vehicle in No.0 Lane change lanes to No.1 Lane in the image?
2. No.0 Lane is Ego Vehicle Lane, Straight Lane, No.1 Lane is Ego Vehicle Left Lane, Straight Lane, No.2 Lane is Ego Vehicle Right Lane, Straight Lane. No.0 Road Marking is Left Road Line, White Broken Line, No.1 Road Marking is Right Road Line, White Broken Solid Line. Legally, can the vehicle in No.0 Lane change lanes to No.1 Lane in the image?

Figure 19. Examples of Lane Change Relation.

markings, represented here by a blue box, and involves determining whether a lane change from one lane to another is allowed. Understanding lane-change relationships is critical for autonomous systems to safely navigate dynamic traffic environments, such as highways or multi-lane roads, where precise adherence to road markings is necessary to avoid collisions and ensure smooth traffic flow. Examples are shown in Fig. 19.

Vehicle Cut-in refers to the task of judging whether a target vehicle intends to merge from an adjacent lane or other areas into the lane of the ego vehicle, and analyzing the motivation behind the behavior. Examples are shown in Fig. 20.

VRU Cut-in refers to the task of judging whether a target VRU intends to merge from a different lane into the lane of the ego vehicle, and analyzing the motivation behind the behavior. Examples are shown in Fig. 21.

VRU Cross refers to determining whether a VRU intends to cross laterally from one side to the other across the ego vehicle's path of travel, and analyzing the motivation behind the behavior. Examples are shown in Fig. 22.



Figure 20. Examples of Vehicle Cut-in.



Figure 21. Examples of VRU Cut-in.



Figure 22. Examples of VRU Cross.

Long-Short Parking focuses on analyzing the parking time of the target vehicle. Whether the target vehicle is considered to be long-term or short-term parking (e.g., waiting for the traffic light, yielding, ever-changing passengers) is determined by whether the ego vehicle needs to perform a detour or execute an escape maneuver. Examples are shown in Fig. 23.

Vehicle & VRU Behavior focuses on describing events that have occurred, with an emphasis on understanding and interpreting behaviors in the traffic environment. Vehicle be-




Figure 23. Examples of Long-Short Parking.




Figure 24. Examples of the pedestrian gesture of VRU Behavior.

havior is characterized by longitudinal and lateral movements, capturing actions such as acceleration, braking, and lane changes. VRU behavior encompasses critical maneuvers, including cut-in and crossing actions, which are essential for predicting potential conflicts. Additionally, pedestrian gesture analysis is incorporated to assess claims of right of way, providing a deeper evaluation of interactions between pedestrians and vehicles. Examples are shown in Fig. 24.




Figure 25. Examples of Key Object Detection.

Key Object Detection refers to the identification of objects that play a critical role in determining the vehicle's ability to maintain its current trajectory or safely execute lane changes to the left or right. These key objects may include vehicles, obstacles, or environmental elements that directly

or indirectly influence driving decisions and safety. Examples are shown in Fig. 25.



1. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, at the moment of the final image, how about the driving efficiency of the ego vehicle? [Choice List].
2. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, the ego vehicle is moving straight, at the moment of the last image, how the driving efficiency of the ego vehicle will be? [Choice List]
3. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, the ego vehicle is moving straight, at the moment of the last image, the future driving efficiency of the ego vehicle will increase. Select the most appropriate reason from the following options: [Choice List]

Figure 26. Examples of Drive Efficiency.

Drive Efficiency aims to evaluate the operational effectiveness of ego vehicles in relation to traffic congestion levels. The evaluation framework considers three aspects: the current driving efficiency under prevailing congestion conditions, projected efficiency changes as congestion evolves, and the factors influencing these changes. By emphasizing congestion as a key metric, this task provides insights into optimizing driving strategies in dense traffic environments. Examples are shown in Fig. 26.

Risk Prediction evaluates the presence of significant potential risks in the environment as the vehicle proceeds straight or attempts to change lanes to the left or right. This task is divided into two steps: first, determining whether a risk exists; and second, given the source of the risk, analyzing the underlying cause of the risk. Examples are shown in Fig. 27.

Spatio-Temporal Relation leverages information from preceding frames to infer the current driving conditions, such as unseen or occluded traffic lights and signs, or the attributes of lanes. The questions in this task are designed to require associative reasoning or recollection of previously observed information, instead of being solvable directly through simple visual cues. Examples are shown in Fig. 28.

Longitudinal refers to the management of a vehicle’s speed and acceleration/deceleration along its direction of travel. The longitudinal operation includes maintain speed, accelerate, stop, decelerate, and decelerate to stop. Examples are




1. Based on the given sequence of images, assess whether there are any significant potential risks present in the environment if the vehicle proceeds straight or changes lanes to the left or right.
2. In the given image sequence, the pedestrian poses significant risks to the vehicle’s straight driving and lane changes to the left or right. Please choose the most appropriate description to describe this risk:[Choice List]
3. In the given image sequence, the cyclist poses significant risks to the vehicle’s straight driving and lane changes to the left or right. Please choose the appropriate description for the risk:[Choice List]

Figure 27. Examples of Risk Prediction.



1. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, at the moment of the final image, which type is the ego lane?
2. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, at the moment of the final image, what is the status of the traffic light at this time?



1. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, at the moment of the final image, what is the type of the lane ego vehicle in?
2. In the given autonomous driving image sequence, at the moment of the final image, is the right lane available for going straight?

Figure 28. Examples of Spatio-Temporal Relation.

shown in Fig. 29.

Lateral refers to the management of a vehicle’s position and direction within its lane or on the road. The lateral operation includes in-lane left avoidance, in-lane right avoidance, maintain straight or change lane to the left, maintain straight or change lane to the right, borrow lane for right avoidance, borrow lane for left avoidance, change lane to the right, change lane to the left, change lane to the left or right, and maintain straight. Examples are shown in Fig. 30.

Trajectory prediction is formulated as a vision-language



Based on the given sequence of autonomous driving vehicle, the current environment is exiting a tunnel ahead, backlight causes inability to observe ahead, ego vehicle is going straight. Based on the assessment of driving risk and traffic efficiency, what longitudinal decision should the vehicle make at this moment?



Based on the given sequence of autonomous driving vehicle, the current environment is the road ahead is narrow, an oncoming vehicle is a bus, and about to meet, ego vehicle is going straight. Based on the assessment of driving risk and traffic efficiency, what longitudinal decision should the vehicle make at this moment?

Figure 29. Examples of Longitudinal.



Based on the given sequence of autonomous driving vehicle, the current environment is narrow road, ahead right stopped construction vehicle, ego vehicle proceeds straight. Based on the assessment of driving risk and traffic efficiency, what lateral decision should the vehicle make at this moment?



1. Ego vehicle proceeds straight through. Based on the assessment of driving risk and traffic efficiency, what lateral decision should the vehicle make at this moment?
2. Ego vehicle turns left. Based on the assessment of driving risk and traffic efficiency, what lateral decision should the vehicle make at this moment?
3. Ego vehicle turns right. Based on the assessment of driving risk and traffic efficiency, what lateral decision should the vehicle make at this moment?

Figure 30. Examples of Lateral.

Autonomous Driving Planner

Role: You are the brain of an autonomous vehicle. Plan a safe 3-second driving trajectory. Avoid collisions with other objects.

Context

- Coordinates: X-axis is perpendicular, and Y-axis is parallel to the direction you're facing. You're at point (0,0).
- Objective: Create a 3-second route using 6 waypoints, one every 0.5 seconds.

Inputs

1. The front view, front left view, front right view, back view, back left view, and back right view of ego vehicle..
2. Historical Trajectory: Your past 2-second route, given by 4 waypoints.
3. Ego-States: Your current state including velocity, heading angular velocity, can bus data, heading speed, and steering signal.
4. Mission Goal: Goal location for the next 3 seconds.

Task

- Thought Process: Following autonomous driving COT thinking mechanism with a total of 5 key domains: 1. Traffic Knowledge Understanding, 2. General Element Recognition, 3. Traffic Graph Generation, 4. Target Attribute Comprehension, and 5. Ego Decision-making and Planning.
- Trajectory Planning: Develop a safe and feasible 3-second route using 6 new waypoints.

(Note that the output thinking process and trajectory results are separated by <thinking_process>,<trajectory>.)

Output- Trajectory (MOST IMPORTANT):

-Thinking Process (Five key domains):

-Trajectory (Most Important)

-(x1,y1), (x2,y2), ... , (x6,y6)]

The inputs are:

< front view > < front left view > < front right view >
< back view > < back left view > < back right view >

Ego-States:

- Velocity (vx,vy): (-0.00,0.01)
- Heading Angular Velocity (v_yaw): (-0.00)
- Acceleration (ax,ay): (0.00,0.00)
- Can Bus: (0.56,0.05)
- Heading Speed: (0.07)
- Steering: (-0.23)

Historical Trajectory (last 2 seconds):

[(0.00,0.00), (0.00,-0.00), (0.00,0.00), (-0.00,-0.00)]

Mission Goal: FORWARD

Figure 31. Examples of Trajectory.

task, incorporating critical perception and prediction results along with high-level decisions. Besides, the ego status and the historical waypoints (last 2 seconds, given by four points) are included in the instruction. The VLMs then generate a feasible 3-second driving trajectory, consisting of 6 waypoints. An example is shown in Fig. 31.