

Talk2BEV: Language-enhanced Bird’s-eye View Maps for Autonomous Driving

<https://llmbev.github.io/talk2bev/>

Tushar Choudhary^{1*}, Vikrant Dewangan^{1*}, Shivam Chandhok^{2*}, Shubham Priyadarshan¹, Anushka Jain¹,
Arun K. Singh³, Siddharth Srivastava⁴, Krishna Murthy Jatavallabhula^{5†}, and K. Madhava Krishna^{1†}
¹IIT Hyderabad, ²University of British Columbia, ³University of Tartu, ⁴TensorTour Inc., ⁵MIT



Fig. 1: *Talk2BEV* builds *language-enhanced bird’s-eye view (BEV) maps* using (a) BEV representations constructed from vehicle sensors (Multi-View Images, LiDAR), and (b) Aligned vision-language features for each object which can be directly used as context within large vision-language models (LVLMs) to query and *talk* to the objects in the scene. These maps embed knowledge about object semantics, material properties, affordances, and spatial concepts and can be queried for visual reasoning, spatial understanding, and making decisions about potential future scenarios, critical for autonomous driving application. Further, we develop the first benchmark *Talk2BEV-Bench* towards evaluating LVLMs for AD applications spanning a diverse set of question categories with human-annotated ground-truth.

Abstract—This work introduces *Talk2BEV*, a large vision-language model (LVLN)¹ interface for bird’s-eye view (BEV) maps in autonomous driving contexts. While existing perception systems for autonomous driving scenarios have largely focused on a pre-defined (closed) set of object categories and driving scenarios, *Talk2BEV* blends recent advances in general-purpose language and vision models with BEV-structured map representations, eliminating the need for task-specific models. This enables a single system to cater to a variety of autonomous driving tasks encompassing visual and spatial reasoning, predicting the intents of traffic actors, and decision-making based on visual cues. We extensively evaluate *Talk2BEV* on a large number of scene understanding tasks that rely on *both* the ability to interpret free-form natural language queries, and in grounding these queries to the visual context embedded into the language-enhanced BEV map. To enable further research in LVLNs for autonomous driving scenarios, we develop and release *Talk2BEV-Bench*, a benchmark encompassing 1000 human-annotated BEV scenarios, with more than 20,000 questions and ground-truth responses from the NuScenes dataset. We encourage the reader to view the demos on our project page: <https://llmbev.github.io/talk2bev/>

I. INTRODUCTION

For safe navigation without human intervention, autonomous driving (AD) systems need to understand the visual world around them to make informed decisions. This

entails not just recognizing specific object categories, but also contextualizing their current and potential future interactions with the environment. Existing AD systems rely on domain-specific models for each scene understanding task, such as detecting traffic actors and signage or forecasting plausible future events. On the other hand, recent advances in large language models (LLMs) [4]–[8] and large vision-language models (LVLNs) [2], [3], [9], [10] have demonstrated a promising alternative to thinking about perception for AD; that of a single model pretrained on web-scale data, capable of performing all the aforementioned tasks and more (particularly, the ability to deal with unforeseen scenarios). In this work we ask, *how do we most efficiently integrate such capabilities of LLMs with scene representations traditionally used in autonomous driving?*

To this end, we introduce *Talk2BEV*, language-enhanced maps for AD that enable holistic scene understanding and reasoning across a broad class of road scenarios. Our framework interfaces LVLNs with bird’s-eye view (BEV) maps—top-down semantic maps of the road plane and traffic actors that are widely used in AD systems [11]–[14]—to enable visual reasoning, spatial understanding, and decision-making. We augment a BEV map with aligned image-language features for each object in the scene. These features can then directly be passed as (visual) context to an LVLN, enabling the model to answer a wide range of questions about the scene and make decisions about potential future scenarios using the vast knowledge base acquired by the

*Equal contribution. † Equal advising.

¹In this work, we use this term to refer to instruction-finetuned vision-language models; i.e., models that can consume text and image as input, and output text conditioned on the visual context [1]–[3].




Fig. 2: **Overall *Talk2BEV* Pipeline:** We first generate the bird’s-eye view (BEV) map from image and LiDAR data. We then construct the language-enhanced map by augmenting the generated BEV with aligned image-language features for each object from large vision-language models (LVLMs). These features can directly be used as context to LVLMs for answering object-level and scene-level queries. For each object in the BEV, we project it to the image (using LiDAR-camera extrinsics), extract a bounding box, and caption the cropped bounding box using an off-the-shelf LVLM. Each object in the language-enhanced map now encodes geometric cues (position, area, centroid), and semantic cues (object and image descriptions).

LVLM during training. We find that these LVLMs can interpret object semantics, material properties, affordances, and spatial concepts; and are an ideal alternative to domain-specific models.

Notably, our approach does not require any BEV-specific or vision-language training/finetuning; and uses existing pre-trained LLMs and LVLMs. This allows our approach to be flexibly and rapidly deployed on a wide class of domains and tasks, and to easily adapt to newer LLMs and LVLMs as newer and better models become available.

To objectively evaluate LVLMs for perception in the AD context and to expedite further research, we also develop *Talk2BEV-Bench*: a benchmark for the evaluation of large vision and language models for autonomous driving systems on a range of tasks, encompassing object-level and scene-level visual understanding.

In summary, our contributions are as follows

- We develop *Talk2BEV*, the first system to augment BEV maps with language to enable general-purpose visiolinguistic reasoning for AD scenarios.
- Our framework does not require any training or finetuning, relying instead on pre-trained image-language models. This allows generalization to a diverse collection of models, scenarios, and tasks.
- We develop *Talk2BEV-Bench*, a benchmark for evaluating LVLMs for AD applications with human-annotated ground-truth for object attributes, semantics, visual reasoning, spatial understanding, and decision-making.

II. RELATED WORK

Large Vision Language Models. Recent advancements in large language models (LLMs) [4]–[8] and large vision-language models (LVLMs) [2], [3], [9], [10] have emerged over the last few months. Evaluating and benchmarking these models remains challenging, with several proposals exploring LVLM benchmarking [15]–[17] through the curation of question-response pairs using off-the-shelf LLMs, which compromises objectivity. Addressing this, SEEDBench [18] introduces a criterion where each question has four potential responses, and the LVLM ranks the best response. We adopt this evaluation methodology for its objectivity.

3D Vision-Language Models. LVLMs have also begun to be applied in scene understanding tasks such as object localization [19]–[21], scene captioning [22], [23], 3D Visual Question Answering utilizing multi-view images [24], [25] or point clouds [26], [27]. 3D-LLM [28] integrates LLMs into point clouds from multi-view images, bridging 2D models to 3D. In contrast, Point-LLM [29] trains solely on point clouds, bypassing the need for images.

Vision-Language Models for Autonomous Driving. Another recent trend, relevant to this work, is the adoption of LVLMs for autonomous driving [30]–[32]. CityScapes-Ref [33], Talk2Car [31] perform language-grounding tasks using the CityScapes [34] and NuScenes [35] datasets respectively. ReferKITT [36] leverages temporal data for referring object detection and tracking on the KITTI dataset. NuPrompt [32] leverages 3D pointcloud information using RoBERTa [37] as their language encoder. Our work offers substantial improvements over this by blending state-of-the-art LLMs and LVLMs with BEV maps, while requiring no training or finetuning.

Concurrent Work: We briefly review recent and unpublished pre-prints that have surfaced after this work had been finalized. NuScenes-QA [38] addresses Visual Question Answering (VQA) in autonomous driving by crafting scene graphs and question templates. Their evaluation demands end-to-end training and exact answer matching. Other efforts have focused on training end-to-end vision-language-action models [39] on large amounts of aligned multimodal data. In contrast to earlier methods, we offer zero-shot scene comprehension using LVLM’s generalization and introduce a broader benchmark, *Talk2BEV-Bench*, to assess LVLMs for scene understanding via BEVs in autonomous driving.

III. TALK2BEV

The key idea of *Talk2BEV* is to enhance a birds-eye view (BEV) map with general-purpose vision-language features derived from pretrained LVLMs. A BEV map, denoted \mathcal{O} , is a top-view multi-channel grid encoding semantic information (in this work, only *vehicle* and *road*)². The ego-vehicle is at

²We use the *vehicle* class to extract LVLM features, and the *road* class only for visualization purposes.

```

#""You will be given, as input a 2D road scene in Bird's Eye View, as a list. The ego-vehicle is at (0,0)
facing along the positive X-axis. Each entry in the list describes one object in the scene. Please ask the
user to input JSON. Once you have parsed the JSON and are ready to generate questions about the
scene. Create a multi-choice questions about the image, and provide the choices and answer. Each
question should have 4 options, out of which only 1 should be correct.
{type-specific-prompt}
""

```

(a) Question Generation System Prompt (Generic)

Evaluation Dimension	type-specific-prompt
Spatial Reasoning	"The question should be about spatial relations between two objects. The questions should be mainly based on the coordinates of the two objects. To answer the questions, one should find the two mentioned objects, and find their relative spatial relation to answer the question."
Instance Attribute	"The questions should be about the attribute of a certain object, such as its color, shape or fine-grained type."
Instance Counting	"The questions should involve the number of appearance of a certain object. Start with "How many". The choices of the question should be numbers. To answer the question, one should find and count all of the mentioned objects in the image."
Visual Reasoning	"Create complex questions beyond describing the scene. To answer such questions, one should first understanding the visual content, then based on the background knowledge or reasoning, either explain why the things are happening that way, or provide guides and help to user's request. Make the question challenging by not including the visual content details in the question so that the user needs to reason about that first."

(c) Type Specific Prompts

```

#""The input to the model is a 2D road scene in Bird's Eye View, described in a JSON format. The
ego-vehicle is at (0,0) facing along the positive Y-axis. The "scene" key will have a list. Each entry in the
list describes one object in the scene. Ask the user to user to prompt JSON. Once you have parsed the
JSON and are ready to answer questions about the scene, say "I'm ready". The user will then begin to
ask questions, and the task is to answer. For each user question, respond as:
{response-format}
""

```

(b) Response Generation System Prompt

Response Format JSON (you here refers to GPT-4)	
key	key description provided to GPT-4
inferred_query	your interpretation of the user query in a succinct form
query_achievable	whether or not the user-specified query is achievable using the objects and descriptions provided in the scene
spatial_reasoning_functions	If the query needs calling one or more spatial reasoning functions, this field contains a list of function calls that conform to the API above. Else, this field contains an empty list.
explanation	A brief explanation of what the most relevant object is, and how it addresses the task.

(d) Response Format JSON

Fig. 3: **LLM System Prompts:** (a) Generic question generation prompt for the LLM [9]. (b) System prompt for response generation. (c) Details the type-specific commands added to generate questions along each evaluation dimension. (d) Displays the response format JSON with a brief explanation provided to LLM as to how it should fill each key of the JSON.

the origin, assumed to be the center of the BEV. Given multi-view RGB images \mathcal{I} a LiDAR pointcloud \mathcal{X} , a BEV can be obtained using a number of off-the-shelf approaches [11], [12], [14], [40], [41].

Our three-phase pipeline (see Fig. 2) proceeds as follows:

- 1) We first estimate a BEV map using onboard vehicle sensors (multi-view images) using an off-the-shelf BEV prediction model [11].
- 2) For each object in this BEV map, we generate aligned image-language features using an LVLM [1], [2], [10]. These features are then passed into the language model of an LVLM to extract object metadata. The object data, in conjunction with geometric information encapsulated in the BEV, forms the language-enhanced map, $\mathbf{L}(\mathcal{O})$.
- 3) Finally, given a user query, we prompt an LLM (eg. GPT-4 [9]) which interprets this query, parses the language-enhanced BEV as needed, and produces a response to this query.

A. Language Enhanced Maps

BEV-Image Correspondence. First, we localize each object in the estimated BEV across the multi-view images used to produce the BEV map. For each object in the BEV map, we compute a set of k closest points in the LiDAR scan (a pointcloud); and project them into the camera frame using an inverse homography.

Map Representation. Our language-enhanced map augments the set of objects in a BEV by computing the image region corresponding to the object and deriving spatial and textual descriptions. For each object i , we compute (a) displacement along the BEV X and Y axes (in m) from the ego-vehicle, (b) object area (in m^2), (c) a text description of the object, and (d) a text description of the background. LVLMs are specifically prompted to generated detailed descriptions

of objects, and their outputs typically encode the type, color, and utility of the vehicle, status of the vehicle indicators, any text displayed on the vehicle, and more³.

Language-enhancement. We then use a point-queryable segmentation model, such as FastSAM [42] with a point-prompt (the center of the image crop) to generate instance segmentation masks. The k back-projected points serve as positive labels to the point-prompt. For each segmentation mask, we crop a tight-fit bounding box and pass it to an LVLM to generate descriptions for the crop. At this stage, we only pass the cropped bounding boxes through the visual encoders, to obtain image-language features that may later be passed as context tokens into language decoders. The descriptions for each object encompass both object-level and scene-level details. These generated metadata are then added to the BEV map in the form of a text entry (see sample JSON-structured entry below, and in Fig. 4).

```

1 [ ...,
2 {  "object_id": 3,
3   "position": [2.5, 1.5],
4   "area": 4,
5   "crop_descriptions": {...}
6 }, ... ]

```

B. Response Generation

Type of queries. The *Talk2BEV* system can handle multiple kinds of user queries. In this work, we categorize them into free-form text queries, multiple choice questions (MCQ) with one correct answer, and spatial reasoning queries (specified via text). Free-form and spatial reasoning queries emulate the natural end-user interface for *Talk2BEV*, whereas MCQs allow us to perform objective evaluation, following the protocol outlined in SEEDBench [18].

³All prompts we used are made available on our webpage.



```

{
  "brief_caption": "This is a blue Toyota car.",
  "indicator": "off",
  "direction": "Forward",
  "crop_text": "",
  "bg_description": "The image shows a busy city
                    street with cars on the road,
                    some stopped at traffic light.",
  "bg_unusual": "",
  "bg_weather": "Sunny daytime with some clouds."
}

```

Fig. 4: **Crop Description:** (a) A sample image $I_n \in \mathcal{I}$ along with (b) the object crop r_i and (c) its description c_i .

Response format: Opposed to directly producing free-form text outputs, we instruct the LLM used in *Talk2BEV* to produce a JSON-formatted output with four fields (i) *inferred_query*, which rephrases the user query first, thereby providing its internal interpretation of that query; (ii) *query_achievable*, indicating whether or not the query is achievable. (iii) *spatial_reasoning_functions*, denoting whether spatial reasoning functions are needed, and (iv) *explanation*, containing a brief explanation of how the LLM addressed the provided task. Fig 3 specifies the system prompts provided to LLM (GPT-4 in this case). This format offers dual advantages: first, it ensures the LLM delivers information organized into key-value pairs. Second, it enables chain-of-thought reasoning [45] by outlining the intermediate steps that lead to the final response.

Spatial Operators To enable the LLM to accurately perform spatial reasoning, we provide access to an API of primitive spatial operators, following [46]. Whenever a user query involves spatial reasoning (locations, distances, orientations), the model is instructed to generate API calls that directly invoke one of these spatial operators, rather than directly attempting to produce an output. A full list of these spatial operators is provided in Table I. An example usage of spatial operators is illustrated in Fig. 6, where we are able to capture the distance between the construction vehicle and the truck carrying materials. Importantly, these vehicles are never co-visible in the same camera, and require a BEV map for reasoning about them jointly.

C. Implementation Details

To generate BEV maps from multi-view images, we use the Lift-Splat-Shoot model [11]. Each BEV is a 200×200 grid, where each cell has a resolution of $0.5m$. All our ground-truth BEV maps (used for evaluation) have the same resolution and grid dimensions. We experiment with

a number of LVLMs to compute vision-language features – BLIP-2 [1], MiniGPT-4 [2] and InstructBLIP-2 [10]. These features are later used as context to language decoder of LVLM to output object descriptions. For BLIP-2, we use the Flan5XXL [47] language decoder and for InstructBLIP-2 and MiniGPT-4, we use the Vicuna-13b language decoder [48]. We use the default temperature value of 0.7 for LVLM for all experiments. We perform inference on NVIDIA DGX A100.

Method	Description
<code>front.filter(objs)</code>	objects to the front
<code>left.filter(objs)</code>	objects to the left
<code>right.filter(objs)</code>	objects to the right
<code>rear.filter(objs)</code>	objects to the rear
<code>dist.filter(objs, X)</code>	objects within “X”m
<code>k.closest(objs, k)</code>	k closest objects
<code>k.farthest(objs, k)</code>	k farthest objects
<code>objs.in.dist(objs, id, dist)</code>	objects within distance “dist” to o_{id}
<code>k.closest.to.obj(objs, id, k)</code>	k closest objects to o_{id}
<code>k.farthest.to.obj(objs, id, k)</code>	k farthest objects to o_{id}
<code>obj.distance(objs, id)</code>	distance (in m) to o_{id}
<code>find.dist(objs, id1, id2)</code>	distance between 2 objects o_{id1}, o_{id2}

TABLE I: **List of spatial operators:** Here *objs* is the list of objects in the BEV, o_{id} refers to the object whose *object_id* is *id*. Operators that do not take in *object_id* as input operate on the ego-vehicle.

IV. THE TALK2BEV-BENCH BENCHMARK

To evaluate the quality of our language-enhanced map and assess the spatial understanding and visual reasoning capabilities of our framework, we present *Talk2BEV-Bench* – the first benchmark for assessing LVLMs for autonomous driving applications. We generate ground-truth language-enhanced maps for 1000 scenes from the NuScenes dataset [35], and more than 20,000 human-verified question-answer pairs in the SEEDBench [18] format⁴. The questions evaluate understanding of object attributes, instance counting, visual reasoning, decision making, and spatial reasoning. To generate the questions and responses, we first extract ground-truth BEV maps from the NuScenes dataset and obtain captions for each object in the map. The captions are refined by human annotators, after which we employ GPT-4 to generate questions and initial responses for each question. These questions and responses are, again, validated by human annotators to result in the final set of MCQs used in the benchmark. This question and answer curation approach is illustrated in Fig. 5, with an example set of generated questions given a ground-truth language-enhanced BEV map.

⁴Each question has multiple answer choices, with one correct answer.




Fig. 5: *Talk2BEV-Bench* Creation: To develop this benchmark, we use the NuScenes Ground Truth BEV annotations and generate object and scene-level descriptions using dense Captioners (GRiT [43]), and Text-Recognition (PaddleOCR [44]) models. The Ground Truth BEV is then passed to an LLM like GPT4 to generate diverse questions including, but not limited to- Spatial Reasoning, Instance Attribute, Visual Reasoning and Instance Counting.




Fig. 6: **Spatial Operators**: To compute distance between bulldozer and white truck, the Language Enhanced Maps for the objects are interpreted by an LLM like GPT4 to invoke relevant spatial operators in our framework with appropriate object IDs as arguments.

A. Ground-truth language-enhanced maps

We first use the BEV maps provided as part of the NuScenes ground-truth data to identify objects of interest, and obtain their image crops by LiDAR-camera projection. For each object, we extract captions for its foreground and background context.

Crop captions: We employ a dense captioning model (GRiT [43]) to generate text descriptions encapsulating fine-grained details within each object bounding box. We also leverage an off-the-shelf text recognition model (PaddleOCR [44]), extracting any foreground text, to enhance understanding of object type and category.

Background information: In addition to object-level (foreground) caption, we also extract information about the scene context (background) features by captioning the images. This captures additional context such as street signs, barriers, weather conditions, time of day, and unique scene elements. Human annotators verify and refine the combined foreground and background captions at this stage, as shown in Fig. 5.

B. Question Generation and Evaluation Metrics

Our evaluation spans four types of visual and spatial understanding tasks – *instance attributes* (questions pertaining to objects and their attributes), *instance counting* (counting the number of objects that correspond to the text query), *visual reasoning* (questions assessing general visual understanding questions not directly captured in the other categories), and *spatial reasoning* (questions pertaining to location, distance, or orientation information). For each scene and evaluation dimension, we prompt GPT-4 five times to generate five such questions per dimension, resulting in 20 questions per scene. For all categories (except spatial operators), we report an accuracy metric (since the questions are multiple-choice). For spatial reasoning queries, we report regression metrics in the form of Jaccard index (for queries that expect a set of objects as output) and distance errors (for queries that require distance values as output).

V. RESULTS

In this section, we evaluate *Talk2BEV* quantitatively on questions from *Talk2BEV-Bench*, and find that

- 1) *Talk2BEV* addresses a broad set of visual and spatial understanding tasks by leveraging the language-enhanced maps
- 2) Access to an API of primitive spatial operators significantly improves performance on spatial reasoning tasks
- 3) The zero-shot nature of *Talk2BEV* allows seamlessly switching LVLMs, enabling easy integration across more performant LVLMs.

We also present qualitative results on challenging scenarios from NuScenes [35], indicating the ability of *Talk2BEV* to interpret the BEV layout at a granularity that allows predicting potential risky driving maneuvers and recourse.

A. Quantitative Results

We first assess the performance of *Talk2BEV* on questions from *Talk2BEV-Bench*. In Table II, we report the performance across task subsets and across LVLMs used. To delineate errors originating from incorrect BEV predictions versus inaccurate LVLM captions, we also present results from an oracle approach that leverages the ground-truth BEV map. When using BEV maps output by LSS [11], we find that InstructBLIP-2 achieves the best performance in *instance*




Fig. 7: *Talk2BEV* in **free-form conversation** with a user. There is a car in front of the ego-vehicle (highlighted in red), which is reversing to park in a parking spot. *Talk2BEV* identifies the parking lights are on, and based on this visual information, and the spatial location of the car in front, *Talk2BEV* deems it unsafe to continue moving forward.

attribute recognition and *visual reasoning* compared to the BLIP-2 and MiniGPT-4 counterparts. In contrast, for *instance counting*, MiniGPT-4 based $L(\mathcal{O})$ map achieves the best accuracy. Overall, we notice that MiniGPT-4 achieves best average performance across different types of questions. We notice that *instance attribute* and *visual reasoning* tasks are more sensitive to the quality of LVLm captions compared to other question categories, which is expected given the complexity of these tasks compared to *instance counting*. We also note that errors in the BEV have only a minor impact on performance (3%); meaning that as more performant LVLms are released, the performance of *Talk2BEV* is expected to improve further.

BEV	LVLm	Instance Attribute	Instance Counting	Visual Reasoning	Avg
LSS	BLIP-2	0.50	0.83	0.47	0.60
	InstructBLIP-2	0.54	0.80	0.50	0.62
	MiniGPT-4	0.50	0.90	0.49	0.63
GT	BLIP-2	0.51	0.83	0.47	0.60
	InstructBLIP-2	0.55	0.80	0.50	0.62
	MiniGPT-4	0.55	0.91	0.51	0.66

TABLE II: **Overall Accuracy on MCQ Queries** (q_{mcq}). Performance of *Talk2BEV* with Language Enhanced Map constructed with different LVLms (BLIP-2, InstructBLIP-2, MiniGPT-4) and BEV variants (LSS and GT) on Multiple Choice Questions (MCQs).

B. Qualitative Results

In Fig. 7, we show a free-form interactive dialogue with *Talk2BEV* where the user intends to advance by 20 m and inquires about potential obstructions. Ahead of the ego-vehicle is another vehicle reversing into a parking spot. *Talk2BEV* leverages the vehicle’s parking light and position information to deduce intent and advises caution. The LLM’s prediction aligns with the vehicle’s future activity from $t = 0$ to $t = 3$ s. In Fig. 8, we compare the performance of multiple LVLms on MCQ queries from *Talk2BEV*-Bench.

C. Impact of Spatial Operators.

	Jaccard Index \uparrow	Distance Error \downarrow
Random	0.16	0.44
Talk2BEV w/o SO*	0.25	0.22
Talk2BEV with SO*	0.83	0.13

*SO: Spatial Operators

TABLE III: **Impact of spatial operators**: When relying directly on the LLM’s abilities to reason about distances, orientations, and areas, we notice a significant performance drop (*Talk2BEV* w/o SO). Providing access to primitive spatial operators via API calls enables strong performance in terms of Jaccard index (higher is better) and distance error (lower is better) metrics.

To assess the impact of explicit spatial operators available to our model via an API, we evaluate the performance of our system with and without spatial operators in Table III. Note that spatial reasoning queries are evaluated using Jaccard index or distance error based on nature of query as explained in Sec. IV-B. For reference, we implement a baseline method, *Random*, which uniformly randomly guesses distances and relevant objects. While *Talk2BEV* without spatial operators demonstrates markedly better performance compared to the *Random* baseline, the model seems to struggle with spatial reasoning queries, often encountering large errors. We see that *Talk2BEV* integrated with our spatial operators achieves significant performance leaps (58% improvement in Jaccard index, 0.09 m reduction in distance error) compared to directly using the LLM (here, GPT-4 [9]) for spatial reasoning.

D. Performance across Object Categories

To assess variance in performance across object categories, we report per-category statistics in Table IV. We note that 2-Wheeler vehicles, including bicycles and motorcycles, consistently showed lower performance compared to other categories. This is mainly due to their smaller BEV segmentation predictions, making it more difficult to accurately back-project when there are minor inconsistencies in the predicted positions. On the contrary, larger vehicles such as trucks and construction vehicles consistently outperformed




Fig. 8: **Qualitative Results:** A BEV corresponding to a scene with multiple vehicles at an interchange. *Talk2BEV* is able to identify emergency vehicles (such as the *police car* shown here). The captions for a police car and a construction vehicle from Language Enhanced maps constructed with with different LVLMs (BLIP-2, InstructBLIP-2, MiniGPT-4) have been visualized. We show the corresponding BEV captions produced by various LVLMs and their performance across 4 questions from *Talk2BEV-Bench* relevant to these 2 objects. The correct answer for each question is highlighted in green.




Fig. 9: **Composition of Spatial Operators:** To find the nearest 2 vehicles in front, LLM like GPT4 composes the spatial operators.

cars in most cases. This can be attributed to their larger BEV segmentations, which enable more accurate back projections.

BEV	LVLN	2-Wheeler	Cars	Trucks	Construction
LSS	BLIP-2	0.56	0.60	0.67	0.67
	InstructBLIP-2	0.52	0.58	0.73	0.61
	MiniGPT-4	0.48	0.59	0.67	0.72
	Average	0.52	0.59	0.69	0.67
GT	BLIP-2	0.56	0.60	0.68	0.67
	InstructBLIP-2	0.56	0.58	0.74	0.67
	MiniGPT-4	0.56	0.66	0.72	0.72
	Average	0.56	0.61	0.71	0.68

TABLE IV: **Object Category-wise Evaluation:** Performance of *Talk2BEV* with Language Enhanced Map constructed with different LVLNs (BLIP-2, InstructBLIP-2, MiniGPT-4) and BEV variants (LSS and GT) on queries q_{mcq} for different vehicle categories.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we presented *Talk2BEV*, a language interface to BEV maps used in autonomous driving systems.

By drawing upon recent advances in LLMs and LVLNs, *Talk2BEV* caters to a variety of AD tasks, including, but not limited to, visual and spatial reasoning, predicting unsafe traffic interactions, and plotting recourse. We also introduced *Talk2BEV-Bench*, a benchmark for evaluating subsequent work in LVLNs for AD applications. While we continue to integrate large pretrained models into AD stacks, we also emphasize the need for safety and alignment research before these models are deployed into safety-critical AD stacks.

REFERENCES

- J. Li, D. Li, S. Savarese, and S. Hoi, "Blip-2: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training with frozen image encoders and large language models," 2023. 1, 3, 4
- D. Zhu, J. Chen, X. Shen, X. Li, and M. Elhoseiny, "Minigt-4: Enhancing vision-language understanding with advanced large language models," 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4
- H. Liu, C. Li, Q. Wu, and Y. J. Lee, "Visual instruction tuning," 2023. 1, 2
- H. W. Chung, L. Hou, S. Longpre, B. Zoph, Y. Tay, W. Fedus, Y. Li, X. Wang, M. Dehghani, S. Brahma, A. Webson, S. S. Gu, Z. Dai, M. Suzgun, X. Chen, A. Chowdhery, A. Castro-Ros, M. Pellat, K. Robinson, D. Valter, S. Narang, G. Mishra, A. Yu, V. Zhao, Y. Huang, A. Dai, H. Yu, S. Petrov, E. H. Chi, J. Dean, J. Devlin, A. Roberts, D. Zhou, Q. V. Le, and J. Wei, "Scaling instruction-finetuned language models," 2022. 1, 2
- L. Zheng, W.-L. Chiang, Y. Sheng, S. Zhuang, Z. Wu, Y. Zhuang, Z. Lin, Z. Li, D. Li, E. P. Xing, H. Zhang, J. E. Gonzalez, and I. Stoica, "Judging llm-as-a-judge with mt-bench and chatbot arena," 2023. 1, 2
- OpenAI. (2021) Chatgpt. Accessed: yyyy-mm-dd. [Online]. Available: <https://www.openai.com/> 1, 2
- H. Touvron, T. Lavril, G. Izacard, X. Martinet, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lacroix, B. Rozière, N. Goyal, E. Hambro, F. Azhar, A. Rodriguez, A. Joulin, E. Grave, and G. Lample, "Llama: Open and efficient foundation language models," 2023. 1, 2
- H. Touvron, L. Martin, K. Stone, B. Albert, A. Almahairi, Y. Babaei, N. Bashlykov, S. Batra, P. Bhargava, S. Bhosale, D. Bikel, L. Blecher, C. C. Ferrer, M. Chen, G. Cucurull, D. Esiobu, J. Fernandes, J. Fu, W. Fu, B. Fuller, C. Gao, V. Goswami, N. Goyal, A. Hartshorn, S. Hosseini, R. Hou, H. Inan, M. Kardas, V. Kerkez, M. Khabsa, I. Kloumann, A. Korenev, P. S. Koura, M.-A. Lachaux, T. Lavril, J. Lee, D. Liskovich, Y. Lu, Y. Mao, X. Martinet, T. Mihaylov, P. Mishra, I. Molybog, Y. Nie, A. Poulton, J. Reizenstein, R. Rungta, K. Saladi, A. Schelten, R. Silva, E. M. Smith, R. Subramanian, X. E. Tan, B. Tang, R. Taylor, A. Williams, J. X. Kuan, P. Xu, Z. Yan, I. Zarov, Y. Zhang, A. Fan, M. Kambadur, S. Narang, A. Rodriguez, R. Stojnic, S. Edunov, and T. Scialom, "Llama 2: Open foundation and fine-tuned chat models," 2023. 1, 2

- [9] OpenAI, “Gpt-4 technical report,” 2023. 1, 2, 3, 6
- [10] W. Dai, J. Li, D. Li, A. M. H. Tiong, J. Zhao, W. Wang, B. Li, P. Fung, and S. Hoi, “Instructblip: Towards general-purpose vision-language models with instruction tuning,” 2023. 1, 2, 3, 4
- [11] J. Phillion and S. Fidler, “Lift, splat, shoot: Encoding images from arbitrary camera rigs by implicitly unprojecting to 3d,” 2020. 1, 3, 4, 5
- [12] Z. Li, W. Wang, H. Li, E. Xie, C. Sima, T. Lu, Q. Yu, and J. Dai, “Bvformer: Learning bird’s-eye-view representation from multi-camera images via spatiotemporal transformers,” 2022. 1, 3
- [13] A. Hu, Z. Murez, N. Mohan, S. Dudas, J. Hawke, V. Badrinarayanan, R. Cipolla, and A. Kendall, “Fiery: Future instance prediction in bird’s-eye view from surround monocular cameras,” 2021. 1
- [14] S. Hu, L. Chen, P. Wu, H. Li, J. Yan, and D. Tao, “St-p3: End-to-end vision-based autonomous driving via spatial-temporal feature learning,” 2022. 1, 3
- [15] C. Fu, P. Chen, Y. Shen, Y. Qin, M. Zhang, X. Lin, Z. Qiu, W. Lin, J. Yang, X. Zheng, K. Li, X. Sun, and R. Ji, “Mme: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for multimodal large language models,” 2023. 2
- [16] Y. Liu, H. Duan, Y. Zhang, B. Li, S. Zhang, W. Zhao, Y. Yuan, J. Wang, C. He, Z. Liu, K. Chen, and D. Lin, “Mmbench: Is your multi-modal model an all-around player?” 2023. 2
- [17] P. Xu, W. Shao, K. Zhang, P. Gao, S. Liu, M. Lei, F. Meng, S. Huang, Y. Qiao, and P. Luo, “Lvlm-hub: A comprehensive evaluation benchmark for large vision-language models,” 2023. 2
- [18] B. Li, R. Wang, G. Wang, Y. Ge, Y. Ge, and Y. Shan, “Seed-bench: Benchmarking multimodal llms with generative comprehension,” 2023. 2, 3, 4
- [19] P. Achlioptas, A. Abdelreheem, F. Xia, M. Elhoseiny, and L. J. Guibas, “Referit3d: Neural listeners for fine-grained 3d object identification in real-world scenes,” in *European Conference on Computer Vision*, 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:221378802> 2
- [20] P.-H. Huang, H.-H. Lee, H.-T. Chen, and T.-L. Liu, “Text-guided graph neural networks for referring 3d instance segmentation,” in *AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:235306096> 2
- [21] M. Feng, Z. Li, Q. Li, L. Zhang, X. Zhang, G. Zhu, H. Zhang, Y. Wang, and A. Mian, “Free-form description guided 3d visual graph network for object grounding in point cloud,” 2021. 2
- [22] D. Z. Chen, A. X. Chang, and M. Nießner, “Scanrefer: 3d object localization in rgb-d scans using natural language,” 2020. 2
- [23] D. Z. Chen, A. Gholami, M. Nießner, and A. X. Chang, “Scan2cap: Context-aware dense captioning in rgb-d scans,” 2020. 2
- [24] D. Azuma, T. Miyanishi, S. Kurita, and M. Kawanabe, “Scanqa: 3d question answering for spatial scene understanding,” 2022. 2
- [25] S.-H. Chou, W.-L. Chao, W.-S. Lai, M. Sun, and M.-H. Yang, “Visual question answering on 360-degree images,” 2020. 2
- [26] E. Wijmans, S. Datta, O. Maksymets, A. Das, G. Gkioxari, S. Lee, I. Essa, D. Parikh, and D. Batra, “Embodied question answering in photorealistic environments with point cloud perception,” 2019. 2
- [27] X. Yan, Z. Yuan, Y. Du, Y. Liao, Y. Guo, Z. Li, and S. Cui, “Comprehensive visual question answering on point clouds through compositional scene manipulation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2112.11691*, 2021. 2
- [28] Y. Hong, H. Zhen, P. Chen, S. Zheng, Y. Du, Z. Chen, and C. Gan, “3d-llm: Injecting the 3d world into large language models,” 2023. 2
- [29] R. Xu, X. Wang, T. Wang, Y. Chen, J. Pang, and D. Lin, “Pointllm: Empowering large language models to understand point clouds,” 2023. 2
- [30] S. N. N. T. Maniar, J. Kalyanasundaram, V. Gandhi, B. Bhowmick, and M. Krishna, “Talk to the vehicle: Language conditioned autonomous navigation of self driving cars,” 11 2019, pp. 5284–5290. 2
- [31] T. Deruyttere, S. Vandenhende, D. Grujicic, L. V. Gool, and M.-F. Moens, “Talk2car: Taking control of your self-driving car,” in *Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, 2019. [Online]. Available: <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:202734592> 2
- [32] D. Wu, W. Han, T. Wang, Y. Liu, X. Zhang, and J. Shen, “Language prompt for autonomous driving,” 2023. 2
- [33] A. B. Vasudevan, D. Dai, and L. V. Gool, “Object referring in videos with language and human gaze,” 2018. 2
- [34] M. Cordts, M. Omran, S. Ramos, T. Rehfeld, M. Enzweiler, R. Benenson, U. Franke, S. Roth, and B. Schiele, “The cityscapes dataset for semantic urban scene understanding,” 2016. 2
- [35] H. Caesar, V. Bankiti, A. H. Lang, S. Vora, V. E. Liong, Q. Xu, A. Krishnan, Y. Pan, G. Baldan, and O. Beijbom, “nuscenes: A multimodal dataset for autonomous driving,” 2020. 2, 4, 5
- [36] D. Wu, W. Han, T. Wang, X. Dong, X. Zhang, and J. Shen, “Referring multi-object tracking,” 2023. 2
- [37] Y. Liu, M. Ott, N. Goyal, J. Du, M. Joshi, D. Chen, O. Levy, M. Lewis, L. Zettlemoyer, and V. Stoyanov, “Roberta: A robustly optimized bert pretraining approach,” 2019. 2
- [38] T. Qian, J. Chen, L. Zhuo, Y. Jiao, and Y.-G. Jiang, “Nuscenes-qa: A multi-modal visual question answering benchmark for autonomous driving scenario,” 2023. 2
- [39] Wayve, “Lingo-1: Exploring natural language for autonomous driving,” <https://wayve.ai/thinking/lingo-natural-language-autonomous-driving/>, Year, accessed: 2 October 2023. 2
- [40] K. Mani, S. Daga, S. Garg, S. Shankar, K. Jatavallabhula, and M. K., “Monolayout: Amodal scene layout from a single image,” in *WACV*, 2020. 3
- [41] K. Mani, S. Shankar, K. Jatavallabhula, and M. K., “Autolay: Benchmarking monocular layout estimation,” in *IROS*, 2020. 3
- [42] X. Zhao, W. Ding, Y. An, Y. Du, T. Yu, M. Li, M. Tang, and J. Wang, “Fast segment anything,” 2023. 3
- [43] J. Wu, J. Wang, Z. Yang, Z. Gan, Z. Liu, J. Yuan, and L. Wang, “Grit: A generative region-to-text transformer for object understanding,” 2022. 5
- [44] Y. Du, C. Li, R. Guo, X. Yin, W. Liu, J. Zhou, Y. Bai, Z. Yu, Y. Yang, Q. Dang, and H. Wang, “Pp-ocr: A practical ultra lightweight ocr system,” 2020. 5
- [45] J. Wei, X. Wang, D. Schuurmans, M. Bosma, B. Ichter, F. Xia, E. Chi, Q. Le, and D. Zhou, “Chain-of-thought prompting elicits reasoning in large language models,” 2023. 4
- [46] K. M. Jatavallabhula, A. Kuwajerwala, Q. Gu, M. Omama, T. Chen, S. Li, G. Iyer, S. Saryazdi, N. Keetha, A. Tewari, J. B. Tenenbaum, C. M. de Melo, M. Krishna, L. Paull, F. Shkurti, and A. Torralba, “Conceptfusion: Open-set multimodal 3d mapping,” 2023. 4
- [47] H. W. Chung, L. Hou, S. Longpre, B. Zoph, Y. Tay, W. Fedus, E. Li, X. Wang, M. Dehghani, S. Brahma, A. Webson, S. S. Gu, Z. Dai, M. Suzgun, X. Chen, A. Chowdhery, S. Narang, G. Mishra, A. Yu, V. Zhao, Y. Huang, A. Dai, H. Yu, S. Petrov, E. H. Chi, J. Dean, J. Devlin, A. Roberts, D. Zhou, Q. V. Le, and J. Wei, “Scaling instruction-finetuned language models,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://arxiv.org/abs/2210.11416> 4
- [48] W.-L. Chiang, Z. Li, Z. Lin, Y. Sheng, Z. Wu, H. Zhang, L. Zheng, S. Zhuang, Y. Zhuang, J. E. Gonzalez, I. Stoica, and E. P. Xing, “Vicuna: An open-source chatbot impressing gpt-4 with 90%* chatgpt quality,” March 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://lmsys.org/blog/2023-03-30-vicuna/> 4