
Self-driving cars: *Are we there yet?*

Merve Atasever Zhuochen Liu Qingpei Li Akshay Hitendra Shah
Hans Walker Jyotirmoy V. Deshmukh Rahul Jain
University of Southern California, Los Angeles, California, USA

Abstract

Autonomous driving remains a highly active research domain that seeks to enable vehicles to perceive dynamic environments, predict the future trajectories of traffic agents such as vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists and plan safe and efficient future motions. To advance the field, several competitive platforms and benchmarks have been established to provide standardized datasets and evaluation protocols. Among these, leaderboards by the CARLA organization and nuPlan and the Waymo Open Dataset have become leading benchmarks for assessing motion planning algorithms. Each offers a unique dataset and challenging planning problems spanning a wide range of driving scenarios and conditions. In this study, we present a comprehensive comparative analysis of the motion planning methods featured on these three leaderboards. To ensure a fair and unified evaluation, we adopt CARLA leaderboard v2.0 [1] as our common evaluation platform and modify the selected models for compatibility. By highlighting the strengths and weaknesses of current approaches, we identify prevailing trends, common challenges, and suggest potential directions for advancing motion planning research.

1 Introduction

Since the DARPA Urban Challenge of 2007, we have been promised that self-driving vehicles are just around the corner. We have been promised Level 5 autonomous driving (AD) technology for the last decade or so; this raises the question: *Are we there yet?* Despite (limited) deployment of test fleets the short answer is *no*; the AV (autonomous vehicles) technology is still at the R&D stage. Any deployed test vehicles require constant human supervision (even if no driver is visible in the vehicle) to avoid various edge cases, and to avoid safety violations. Furthermore, almost all current deployments depend on high-definition (HD) maps which require constant remapping, which limits deployment areas of the test fleets.

To be fair, we have come quite a long way: perception systems aboard AVs have become quite sophisticated and fairly reliable albeit heavily dependent on overly instrumented hardware sensor suite. The planning and control modules are no longer based on rule-based expert systems which had the obvious problem of not being robust to edge/corner cases. And yet, both state estimation and planning and control modules are still at the R&D stage and not ready for mass deployment. Thus, AV technology development remains an active research field.

This has spawned three particular research areas: (1) AV simulation which has emphasized extensive sensor simulation, near real-world physics simulation and hyper-photorealism, (2) (open loop) motion prediction of traffic agents, and (3) motion planning for an ego agent while accounting for actions taken by other agents including pedestrians [2, 3]. There are a number of AI/ML-based models for motion planning that are regarded as being State-of-the-art (SOTA) models and near the top of various leaderboards. However, their systematic comparison is lacking as different models use different datasets, or different platforms for evaluation. In this paper, we do a systematic comparison of a select set of SOTA AD models on the common open source platform CARLA, and in a carefully curated set of traffic scenarios and routes with a common set of evaluation metrics. The goal is to do

an apples-to-apples comparison of these various models and draw insight on which models perform well in what scenarios, and the specific features that give them those advantages on those scenarios.

Most such models utilize modular or end-to-end pipelines to deal with perception, prediction and planning tasks. Those that implement the modular approach try to solve each task separately. Generally, the pipeline starts with multi-sensor data fusion (e.g., LiDAR, camera, radar, and trajectory data) to perceive the environment, and then continues with transformer-based modules to predict, or plan the ego vehicle’s future motion (and the other surrounding agents’ motions in some models). Each module uses the output of the previous module in a sequential manner [4]. However, this leads to compounding errors in which the error of each module accumulates. On the other hand, end-to-end AD systems, leveraging mostly reinforcement or imitation learning, have attracted attention in recent years, where the models aim at optimizing the three tasks together in a unified manner [5, 6, 7, 8]. Here, the models are trained to minimize a unified loss function, and output decisions for the ego vehicle (or multiple vehicles) directly [9, 10]. For both settings, the output can be low level control signals, such as the throttle, speed, steering angle, etc., or can be high-level signals such as planned trajectory, i.e. future waypoints [11]. The high-level outputs can then be converted into low-level actuation signals via PID controllers [12], or similar tools.

Finally, some of recent AD research has harnessed multi-modal foundation models and encompassed both large language models (LLMs) and vision-language models (VLMs) to enhance world modeling, reasoning, and planning [13, 4, 14, 15]. Notable efforts include embedding human-authored reasoning logic into its pipeline for interpretable decision-making. Another batch employs LLMs/VLMs for rich scene understanding, point-cloud interpretation, and rule-compliant driving actions in diverse scenarios [11, 16, 17, 18, 9, 19]. Although, multi-modal FM approaches promise to improve adaptability and explainability of future AD systems, they lie beyond the scope of this paper.

Waymo, nuPlan, and CARLA leaderboards serve as prominent platforms that advance autonomous-driving (AD) research by providing standardized benchmarks which ensure accelerating progress in simulation, motion prediction, and motion planning. Participation in these challenges enables researchers to validate their approaches and gain insight into the comparative strengths and weaknesses of different models. However, it is hard to cross-compare top performers on Waymo and nuPlan leaderboards leading to a doubt whether the models have been optimized to hill-climb for those specific benchmarks.

Thus, in this work, we perform a detailed comparative analysis of SOTA models drawn from these leaderboards on the CARLA Leaderboard v2.0 evaluation platform. We first compiled all top-ranked methods from each competition since 2022 (see Table x in the Appendix), then excluded those lacking publicly available code and pretrained weights to arrive at a final shortlist of five methods. On the Waymo leaderboard, most leading methods adopt the Motion Transformer (MTR) architecture as their backbone, elaborating on it with task-specific enhancements. Because the original MTR only predicts the future trajectories of the ego vehicle and its seven nearest neighbor agents, we augment it with an MPC-based planning module. Thus, performance of MTR+MPC model is being reported for the first time. Details of this integrated pipeline are provided in the following section, and the full list of evaluated methods can be found in Table y.

The main contributions of our paper can be summarized as follows:

- ★ **Unified Benchmarking:** We systematically examine all top-ranked motion planning methods from the CARLA, Waymo Open Dataset, and nuPlan leaderboards on the CARLA Leaderboard v2.0 evaluation platform to enable fair comparison.
- ★ **Insightful Analysis:** We quantitatively evaluate and report each method’s strengths and weaknesses in different traffic scenarios and maps.
- ★ **Roadmap for Future Research:** The common trends and failures of the models are uncovered, which highlights concrete research directions to accelerate future work in AD motion planning.
- ★ **The MTR + MPC Model:** We augment the Motion Transformer (MTR) backbone which was originally designed for forecasting the future trajectories with a MPC-based planning module, and detail this integrated pipeline.

We also refactored the old codebases of InterFuser, TF++, and TCP to be compatible with CARLA 0.9.11, enabling training and testing on the newly added maps and scenarios introduced in CARLA 0.9.15. All of this will be made available on a public Github repo.

Table 1: Architectural Details of Benchmark Models.

Model	Input Data	Output	Model Architecture	Pipeline
TF++	Cameras and Li-dar	Waypoints	Transformer-based multimodal input fusion	E2E
Interfuser	Cameras and Li-dar	Throttle, steering angle	Rule-based planner on top of transformer-based motion prediction	E2E
TCP	Cameras	Waypoints & Throttle, steering angle	Integration of GRU-based trajectory planning and control	E2E
PDM Lite	Map & States of dynamic actors	Throttle, steering angle	Rule-based Planner	Modular
MTR + MPC	Map & Agent’s history	Throttle, steering angle	MPC-based planner on top of transformer-based motion prediction module	Modular

2 Models for Autonomous Driving

Motion planning research has branched into two predominant approaches: modular pipelines and end-to-end learning systems. Both methodologies incorporate their respective architectural advances. The separation of tasks affords interpretability and the ability to mix and match best components, but suffers from compounding errors and decrease performance in some scenarios. End-to-end systems, by contrast, collapse these stages into a single network trained with imitation or reinforcement learning, optimizing a joint objective to map raw sensor inputs to output commands or trajectories. While they can better handle long-tail cases and extract task-specific features, they lack interpretability and can be difficult to tune. Thus, hybrid strategies have emerged as well: transformer-based backbones for multimodal scene understanding and trajectory prediction with rule-based controllers that inject expert knowledge. This hybrid scheme bridges high-level planning with low-level control. Our study helps to illustrate how these branches work in state-of-the-art methods.

TF++: Transfuser. Transfuser [6] was the first approach to effectively leverage transformer architectures for fusing data from diverse sensor modalities in autonomous driving. Prior methods relied on geometric techniques or naive concatenation to combine multi-sensor inputs. It processes three RGB camera views—front, left, and right—cropped to minimize radial distortion, along with a 3-channel bird’s-eye view (BEV) lidar histogram. The RGB views are concatenated and passed through a ResNet backbone [20], while the lidar data is also processed through a separate ResNet. Intermediate features of both the camera and lidar pipelines are then fused using a transformer-based self-attention module [21] that allows effective cross-modal information exchange. The decoder is a Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) [22], initialized with the fused features and the current vehicle coordinates. It generates the next four waypoints in an auto-regressive manner, relative to the vehicle’s position. To enhance learning, Transfuser incorporates auxiliary tasks: depth estimation and semantic segmentation for the camera pipeline, and HD map prediction and bounding box detection for the lidar pipeline. Finally, the predicted waypoints are translated into low-level control commands, i.e., steering angle and acceleration via a standard PID controller.

TCP: Trajectory-guided Control Prediction. TCP [23] is one of the first works to effectively combine two dominant decoder strategies in end-to-end autonomous driving: waypoint prediction and low-level control prediction. TCP leverages Roach [8], a high-performance autonomous driving model with simulation data, as an expert to generate its training data set. The model takes as input a single front-facing RGB camera, along with control signals such as vehicle speed, high-level planner commands, and goal coordinates. The trajectory branch takes the fused features and initializes the hidden state of a GRU (Gated Recurrent Unit) with them. This branch then auto-regressively predicts the next four waypoints relative to the current vehicle state. The Control Branch also takes the fused features and generates an output feature vector at each timestep. These vectors are concatenated with the corresponding hidden states from the trajectory branch to construct an occupancy map over the image feature map. During inference, TCP adaptively selects between the outputs of the two branches based on the driving context. Control predictions are more heavily weighted during turns, whereas trajectory predictions are favored during straight driving. To aid training and improve robustness, TCP introduces several auxiliary tasks, including speed prediction, policy value prediction aligned with Roach’s behavior, and L1 loss on hidden features to align intermediate representations.

Interfuser. InterFuser [24] is a Transformer-based end-to-end driving model that debuted at #1 on the public CARLA Leaderboard when released. It ingests four RGB views—front, left, right, and a centred “focus” crop—plus a 3-channel LiDAR bird’s-eye-view histogram, each stream being compressed by its own CNN into compact feature maps. A shared Transformer encoder fuses all tokens, after which the decoder attends over three query sets: L = 10 waypoint queries, R = 20 object-density queries yielding an R × R grid, and a single traffic-rule query. The waypoint embeddings seed a gated recurrent unit (GRU) that autoregressively outputs the next ten waypoints. The lone traffic-rule vector is linearly projected to predict the upcoming light state, a stop-sign flag, and a junction flag. Trained purely by supervision on ≈3 million expert CARLA frames, InterFuser hands its intermediate predictions to a safety module that de-duplicates detections, tracks objects to estimate velocities, solves a small linear-programming problem to select the maximum safe speed, and finds the desired heading by taking the average of the first 2 waypoints. Finally a PID controller [12] determines the steering angle and acceleration from the desired velocity and heading.

PDM Lite. PDM-Lite [25] is a rule-based planner for CARLA Leaderboard 2.0 that drives solely from the privileged simulator state, i.e., the true ground state. It first modifies the current route around the four types of obstacle categories found in the leaderboard scenarios by inserting cosine-smooth detours. The target speed is determined from the Intelligent Driver Model (IDM) [26]: the ego vehicle adopts the slowest candidate among leading actors, limited to 72% of the speed limit. Trajectories of other vehicles and pedestrians are rolled out for up to 2 seconds at 20 Hz with a Kinematic Bicycle Model [27]; forecast boxes inflate for uncertainty over time (vehicles to 200%, pedestrians to 3 minutes, ego-vehicles to 130%). A predicted vehicle collision sets the target velocity to 0 (pedestrians trigger a fresh IDM query). Steering uses a velocity-scaled PID to take into account slippage at high velocities, while throttle and brake come from a linear-regression model that saturates when $v_{target} - v > 0.53$ or $v/v_{target} > 1.03$. These components enable PDM-Lite to score high on all 38 benchmark scenarios with minimal infractions.

MTR+MPC. Motion Transformer [28] (MTR) is an encoder-decoder architecture for predicting multimodal behavior of traffic agents and is ranked # 1 in Waymo Open Dataset Motion Prediction Challenge in 2022. Since its introduction, most leading motion prediction methods in the Waymo challenge have adopted MTR as their core backbone. Notable variants include MTR-A [29], an ensemble model that aggregates outputs from multiple framework instantiations; MTR++ [30], which extends the architecture to joint multi-agent motion prediction; and MTR v3 [31], which further enhances accuracy by incorporating LiDAR inputs. [32] Building on these advances, we integrate a model-predictive control (MPC) planner on top of the MTR backbone to address motion planning tasks. Our modular design allows any alternate multi-agent prediction model to replace MTR with minimal adaptation.




Figure 1: MTR+MPC Pipeline.

Since MTR was originally trained on the Waymo Open Motion Dataset (WOMD) [33], we first extract CARLA simulator data and convert it to the same input format. MTR then predicts the future trajectories of the ego vehicle and its seven nearest neighbor vehicles over an 80-step (eight-second) horizon. We use the first N steps of these predictions (the receding horizon) to define the constraints and cost function for our model-predictive control (MPC) module, which outputs the final low-level control commands of steering angle and acceleration. The optimization given below is implemented by leveraging CasADi and solved using its IPOPT nonlinear programming solver.

$$\min_{U_{0:N-1}} J = \underbrace{C_T \|p_{N-1} - p_{\text{dest}}\|^2}_{\text{terminal deviation from destination}} + \sum_{k=1}^{N-1} \underbrace{\lambda_\delta (\delta_k - \delta_{k-1})^2}_{\text{steering-rate smoothness}} + \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \underbrace{\lambda_{\text{dyn}} D_{\text{dyn}}(X_k, \hat{O}_k)}_{\text{dynamic obstacle collision cost}} \quad (1)$$

$$\text{s.t. } X_{k+1} = f(X_k, U_k), \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (2)$$

$$-\bar{\delta} \leq \delta_k \leq \bar{\delta}, \quad a_{\min} \leq a_k \leq a_{\max}, \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (3)$$

$$\|p_k - o_{i,k}^s\| \geq d_{\text{safe}}, \quad i = 1, \dots, M_k, \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (4)$$

$$\|p_k - o_{j,k}^{\text{soft}}\| \geq d_{\text{safe}}^{\text{soft}}, \quad j = 1, \dots, S_k, \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1, \quad (5)$$

$$\|p_0 - p_{wp,0}\| \leq d_{tol}, \quad \|p_{N-1} - p_{wp,N}\| \leq d_{tol}, \quad (6)$$

$$X_0 = [x_0, y_0, \psi_0, v_0]^T. \quad (7)$$

The objective function has three components: (i) the terminal deviation from the destination at the end of the receding horizon, (ii) steering-rate smoothness, and (iii) collision cost with neighboring vehicles. The collision term is evaluated using MTR’s predicted trajectories for surrounding traffic agents. The optimization is subject to the following constraints: the vehicle kinematics (bicycle model); the admissible ranges of steering angle and acceleration; safety margins to static obstacles; adherence to reference waypoints (i.e., remaining on the road); and the specified initial condition. [34, 35, 36]

3 Overview of Leaderboards

The CARLA, Waymo Open Dataset, and nuPlan leaderboards have emerged as prominent benchmarks for evaluating motion planning algorithms in autonomous driving. Each of these platforms offers unique datasets and challenges, reflecting diverse driving scenarios and conditions.

The CARLA Leaderboard. The Carla Leaderboard [37] is a closed loop metric used to measure agents performance on routes within Carla. It consists of 2 tracks, SENSORS and MAP track. On the SENSORS track, the agent is given access to the standard AV sensors, such as camera, lidar, radar, etc. On the MAP track, it is additionally given access to an HD map of the area. Agents are evaluated based on a driving score which is the product of two scores: The route completion score, which measures the percent completion of the given route, and the infraction penalty, which is a product of all the infractions the agent commits.

The Waymo Leaderboard. The Waymo Leaderboard [38] evaluates motion prediction models on a large-scale dataset comprising over 100,000 scenes, each 20 seconds long at 10 Hz, totaling more than 570 hours of unique data across six cities. Each scenario provides 1 second of agent history and requires models to predict the future positions of up to 8 predicted objects per scenario over an 8-second horizon. Inputs include rich semantic data such as 3D bounding boxes, map features (lanes, crosswalks, stop signs), and agent metadata (type, velocity, heading). Models output multiple possible future trajectories for each agent, each consisting of 80 time steps, along with associated probabilities. Evaluation metrics include Minimum Average Displacement Error (minADE), Minimum Final Displacement Error (minFDE), Miss Rate, and Overlap Rate, assessing the accuracy and feasibility of the predicted trajectories.

The nuPlan Leaderboard. The nuPlan Leaderboard [39] is a closed-loop planning benchmark that evaluates motion planners on 15 second scenario roll-outs sampled from ≈ 300 -hours of real-world data spanning four cities. It supports three tracks: open-loop, closed-loop non-reactive, and closed-loop reactive—each supplying a 10 Hz top-down semantic state (two seconds of history, routed goal, nearby agents, and HD-map layers) from which the planner must generate a trajectory. Post-simulation, the agent is scored on four things: safety (collisions, time-to-collision), rule compliance (drivable area, direction, speed), efficiency & progress, and comfort (jerk, yaw-rate, etc.). Safety serves as a hard mask; the weighted average of the remaining metrics yields a per-scenario score in [0, 1], and the leaderboard rank is the mean of these scores across all hidden-test scenarios.

4 Experimental Results

The CARLA Autonomous Driving Leaderboard provides an open, reproducible benchmark for assessing the driving performance of autonomous agents in realistic traffic scenarios. In Leaderboard v2.0, each agent is tasked with navigating predefined routes, specified via GPS coordinates and map waypoints, while encountering several traffic scenarios drawn from the NHTSA pre-crash typology¹. This standardized evaluation framework enables fair comparison across diverse approaches by initializing agents at a common start point and measuring their ability to reach specified destinations under specific conditions.

¹National Highway Traffic Safety Administration: "Pre-crash scenario typology for crash avoidance research."

4.1 Benchmarks

For a rigorous assessment of model performance, we executed each model on a diverse suite of benchmark datasets, comprising the CARLA Leaderboard 2.0 scenarios, the CARLA 42 Routes benchmark, and the Town05 benchmark.

★ **Leaderboard 2.0 scenarios:** The official CARLA Leaderboard dataset provides multiple instances of 10 common traffic scenarios selected from the NHTSA pre-crash typology. Our model evaluation is conducted using the scenario set distributed in the dev-test partition.

★ **CARLA 42 routes:** The CARLA 42 routes benchmark is proposed in [40]. The routes are collected from Town01-06 with unique combinations of weather and daylight conditions. Additionally, the multi-lane road layouts, distant traffic lights, and high density of background agents make navigation more challenging.

★ **Town05:** The Town05 benchmark is introduced in [41]. It is a complex town with multi-lane roads, single-lane roads, bridges, highways and exits. The dataset has two settings: (1) Town05 Short consisting of 10 short routes of 100-500m comprising 3 intersections each, and (2) Town05 Long consisting of 10 long routes of 1000-2000m comprising 10 intersections each. Each route consists of a high density of dynamic agents and adversarial scenarios which are spawned at predefined positions along the route.

4.2 Map Data Preprocess for MTR

All benchmark datasets referenced in this work are derived from the CARLA simulator. By contrast, the MTR model is trained on the Waymo Open Dataset, whose map representation diverges fundamentally from CARLA. Specifically, CARLA encodes road geometry in the ASAM OpenDRIVE specification, whereas the Waymo Open Dataset provides a vectorized map expressed in the Lanelet2 [42] standard. To make MTR compatible with CARLA, we convert every CARLA town to Lanelet2: the original OpenDRIVE files are parsed to extract the road network, after which we reconstruct all road and lane topologies as well as associated traffic-control elements in the Lanelet2 schema.

4.3 Evaluation

In the CARLA Leaderboard, agent performance is evaluated using three complementary metrics, each computed per route and then averaged to produce an overall score. Because routes may encompass multiple traffic scenarios, we first decompose each route into its individual scenario segments, scrape and evaluate each scenario separately, and then aggregate both route-level and scenario-level results. This two-tiered analysis provides more precise root-cause insights into which models excel or underperform in specific driving conditions.

★ **Driving Score:** $DS_i = R_i P_i$ where R_i is the percentage of completion of and P_i is the infraction penalty of the i^{th} route. The driving score is the main metric of the leaderboard and ranges from 0 to 100.

★ **Route Completion:** $RC_i = 100 \times \frac{\text{distance traversed}}{\text{total route distance}}$, i.e. the percentage of the planned route successfully covered.

★ **Infraction Penalty:** $IP_i = 100 \times \prod_j p_j^{n_{ij}}$ where n_{ij} is the number of infractions of type j committed on route i . The full list of infractions and their corresponding penalty coefficients p_j can be found in the Appendix.

For all of the above metrics, higher values correspond to better performance.

Compute Resources Used: All benchmarks are run on the same machine with a 32-thread Intel Xeon Gold 6130 CPU, an NVIDIA Quadro P5000 GPU, and 128 GB physical memory.

4.4 Results

Table 2 presents the aggregated metrics, computed by averaging the values in Tables 3, 4 and 5 separately over (i) three maps (42routes, town05-long and town05-short) and (ii) seventeen CARLA leaderboard scenarios (from “parking exit” to “vehicle turning route pedestrian”).

In the CARLA leaderboard, traffic scenarios are organized into the following five subcategories:

Table 2: Aggregated Results. DS: Driving score, RC: Route completion, IP: Infraction penalty.

MODEL	SCENARIO			MAP		
	DS ↑	RC ↑	IP ↑	DS ↑	RC ↑	IP ↑
TF++	7.1	17.3	49.1	63.0	80.1	73.7
INTERFUSER	23.8	41.9	42.6	60.1	88.3	66.2
MTR+MPC	11.9	27.1	46.2	12.7	19.8	76.3
PDM-LITE	54.3	78.0	64.5	70.2	94.5	72.9
TCP	12.6	36.5	43.7	70.0	84.0	82.7

Table 3: Detailed driving (DS) scores for each map and for each traffic scenario.

TRAFFIC SCENARIOS OR MAPS	PDM-LITE	TCP	INTERFUSER	MTR+MPC	TF++
42ROUTES	89.6	67.1	75.1	19.2	68.2
TOWN05 LONG	43.1	63.9	54.1	11.6	55.3
TOWN05 SHORT	89.9	89.0	72.4	10.8	90.2
PARKINGEXIT	99.9	0.7	0.4	0.2	2.0
CONTROLLOSS	61.9	16.2	47.0	10.2	12.6
SIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONLEFTTURN	94.9	2.5	8.6	17.9	6.3
NONSIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONRIGHTTURN	80.0	80.0	59.8	17.7	8.9
NONSIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONLEFTTURN	59.3	22.0	63.9	16.1	21.0
OPPOSITEVEHICLETAKINGPRIORITY	80.0	24.8	100.0	27.4	0.0
OPPOSITEVEHICLERUNNINGREDLIGHT	94.7	8.5	5.5	14.6	14.2
AVERAGE	81.8	27.6	47.6	18.7	10.1
VEHICLEOPENSDOORTWOWAYS	24.1	2.3	1.6	0.7	0.9
PARKEDOBSTACLETWOWAYS	63.1	6.7	0.4	0.9	0.4
INVADINGTURN	58.5	0.0	0.9	16.2	0.0
CONSTRUCTIONOBSTACLE	42.8	1.9	1.1	5.5	0.7
HAZARDATSIDELANE	8.0	0.0	8.3	20.8	1.8
ACCIDENT	22.5	5.6	53.3	3.6	3.4
CONSTRUCTIONOBSTACLETWOWAYS	13.6	6.2	0.3	0.5	7.8
AVERAGE	33.2	3.2	9.4	6.9	2.1
DYNAMICOBJECTCROSSING	57.4	26.7	36.7	37.6	27.2
VEHICLETURNINGROUTE	56.6	6.1	4.2	9.4	11.2
VEHICLETURNINGROUTEPEDESTRAIN	5.2	3.2	12.0	2.3	3.2
AVERAGE	39.7	12.0	17.6	16.4	13.9

- (i) **Control:** In these scenarios the ego-vehicle loses control due to adverse road or encountering an obstacle, and must recover to its original lane.
- (ii) **Parking:** Here, the vehicle must exit a parallel parking bay in the flow of traffic.
- (iii) **Traffic Negotiation:** These are combinations of left or right turns at signalized or nonsignalized intersections, where the opposite Vehicle may have priority, or may have run the red light.
- (iv) **Obstacle Avoidance:** These scenarios encode different kinds of obstacles in the ego-vehicle’s lane such as: construction, parked vehicles or their doors, slow-moving hazards, etc., and resulting maneuvers required by the ego-vehicle.
- (v) **Braking and Lane Changing:** This includes scenarios for dynamic object crossing, vehicle turning routes which may encounter pedestrians.

4.5 Comparative Analysis

At first glance, rule-based PDM-Lite outperforms all other methods in both route completion and driving score at the scenario and map levels. It achieves near-perfect results in challenging scenarios such as Parking Exit (DS 99.9), Signalized Junction Left Turn (DS 94.9), and Opposite Vehicle Running a Red Light (DS 94.7) while the remaining models register only negligible scores. Moreover, the model maintains competitive infraction penalty, though slightly lower than TCP on map-level IP.

TCP has the highest map-level IP (82.7), which indicates very few infractions across routes. While the model performs well on maps (RC of 84.0 and DS of 70.0), it struggles at scenario level route

Table 4: Detailed route completion (RC) scores for each map and for each traffic scenario.

TRAFFIC SCENARIOS OR MAPS	PDM-LITE	TCP	INTERFUSER	MTR+MPC	TF++
42ROUTES	100.0	70.5	91.9	27.8	73.9
TOWN05 LONG	84.9	100.0	88.3	12.2	89.0
TOWN05 SHORT	100.0	92.3	88.9	29.4	90.8
PARKINGEXIT	100.0	1.1	1.4	1.4	11.5
CONTROLLOSS	100.0	16.2	100.0	11.5	21.0
SIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONLEFTTURN	100.0	79.0	23.0	18.0	19.4
NONSIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONRIGHTTURN	100.0	100.0	100.0	34.2	33.7
NONSIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONLEFTTURN	100.0	100.0	100.0	31.0	35.5
OPPOSITEVEHICLETAKINGPRIORITY	100.0	79.6	100.0	88.0	0.0
OPPOSITEVEHICLERUNNINGREDLIGHT	100.0	14.2	13.2	14.6	14.2
AVERAGE	100.0	74.5	67.2	37.2	20.6
VEHICLEOPENSDOORTWOWAYS	56.8	13.7	11.1	2.4	1.2
PARKEDOBSTACLETWOWAYS	100.0	55.4	1.6	3.8	1.6
INVADINGTURN	100.0	0.0	15.1	35.8	0.0
CONSTRUCTIONOBSTACLE	71.7	23.4	19.4	10.2	20.9
HAZARDATSIDELANE	15.8	0.0	41.8	97.6	27.4
ACCIDENT	49.5	13.4	53.3	14.1	8.2
CONSTRUCTIONOBSTACLETWOWAYS	54.9	13.9	0.9	7.2	14.0
AVERAGE	64.1	17.1	20.5	24.4	10.5
DYNAMICOBJECTCROSSING	60.4	54.5	61.2	62.7	56.8
VEHICLETURNINGROUTE	100.0	38.1	52.1	19.0	18.2
VEHICLETURNINGROUTEPEDESTRAIN	17.8	17.8	17.8	9.5	9.9
AVERAGE	59.4	36.8	43.7	30.4	28.3

Table 5: Detailed infraction penalty (IP) scores for each map and for each traffic scenario.

TRAFFIC SCENARIOS OR MAPS	PDM-LITE	TCP	INTERFUSER	MTR+MPC	TF++
42ROUTES	85.1	94.3	79.7	76.3	89.0
TOWN05 LONG	53.0	63.0	56.8	94.0	59.0
TOWN05 SHORT	90.5	93.5	82.2	43.3	97.0
PARKINGEXIT	99.9	70.0	29.6	15.6	17.7
CONTROLLOSS	61.9	100.0	47.0	89.5	60.0
SIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONLEFTTURN	94.9	3.2	37.3	100.0	32.0
NONSIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONRIGHTTURN	80.0	80.0	59.8	52.0	26.0
NONSIGNALIZEDJUNCTIONLEFTTURN	59.3	22.0	63.9	52.0	59.0
OPPOSITEVEHICLETAKINGPRIORITY	80.0	31.2	100.0	31.2	100.0
OPPOSITEVEHICLERUNNINGREDLIGHT	94.7	60.0	42.0	100.0	100.0
AVERAGE	81.8	39.3	60.6	67.0	63.4
VEHICLEOPENSDOORTWOWAYS	42.4	17.0	14.2	30.1	70.0
PARKEDOBSTACLETWOWAYS	63.1	12.0	24.9	25.7	22.0
INVADINGTURN	58.5	100.0	6.0	45.5	100.0
CONSTRUCTIONOBSTACLE	59.6	8.0	5.8	54.6	3.0
HAZARDATSIDELANE	50.9	70.0	19.9	21.4	6.7
ACCIDENT	45.5	42.0	100.0	26.0	42.0
CONSTRUCTIONOBSTACLETWOWAYS	24.8	44.8	38.4	7.0	55.0
AVERAGE	49.3	42.0	29.9	30.0	42.7
DYNAMICOBJECTCROSSING	95.1	49.0	60.0	60.0	47.0
VEHICLETURNINGROUTE	56.6	16.0	8.1	49.6	61.6
VEHICLETURNINGROUTEPEDESTRAIN	29.0	18.0	67.1	25.2	32.0
AVERAGE	60.2	27.7	45.1	44.9	46.9

completion and driving score, especially in obstacle avoidance. This result suggests TCP excels on longer, less variable routes but fails in fine-grained scenarios.

InterFuser achieves the second-highest route completion rate, trailing only PDM-Lite, and posts strong driving scores in traffic negotiation scenarios. However, it struggles with obstacle avoidance (average DS 9.4), which highlights its variability across different scenario types.

MTR + MPC achieves the highest scenario-level infraction penalty (46.2) and a strong map-level IP (76.3), but its completion rates are very low (RC 27.1 at the scenario level and 19.8 at the map level). This is primarily due to conservative receding-horizon constraints and a domain mismatch between the Waymo-trained prediction model and CARLA dynamics. Although the MPC module prioritizes safety, it does so at the expense of progress. Adjusting safety margins or shortening the planning horizon could improve completion without increasing infractions, which suggests a promising avenue for future work.

TF++ struggles with complex scenarios (e.g. Parking Exit DS 2.0) and has a poor scenario completion. Although, the model exhibits decent map-level performance, the lack of an explicit planner obstructs robust navigation in narrow or dynamic scenarios.

4.6 Key Takeaways

- Rule-Based PDM-Lite outperforms all others in raw completion and driving score. This is not a surprise since it has privileged simulator state access. However, it does point the potential of such methods to perform well when perception is highly accurate.
- Hybrid E2E models (TCP, InterFuser) strike a balance between completion and safety on longer routes but need improvement in fine-grained, high-difficulty scenarios.
- Modular MTR + MPC is too conservative: safe but fails to advance far along routes.
- TF++ underdelivers on complex tasks but shows that transformer fusion can work when paired with a stronger control module.
- All evaluated models exhibit two key characteristics: closed-loop evaluation and the use of an agent-centric coordinate frame.

This analysis highlights that combining robust perception and prediction with deterministic planning (as in PDM-Lite) currently yields the best overall results on CARLA v2.0, while end-to-end and hybrid approaches require further adaptation, especially in safety-critical and obstacle-dense scenarios.

5 Conclusions

Level 5 Autonomy promises not only personal ease of transportation, economic productivity gains on societal scale but also safety by far surpassing what we have today. But despite nearly two decades of research since the DARPA Urban Challenge of 2007, we are still quite far from the goal. One of the challenges has been lack of a unified or benchmark evaluation framework since individual models can often be fine-tuned to hill-climb on specific datasets or simulators. We believe CARLA Leaderboard v2.0 provides the right, scalable and open source environment for rigorous evaluation. Thus, we proceeded to evaluate some of the leading SOTA models on it. Unfortunately, not all could be evaluated, either because the code was not public, or the trained models were not available, or the models simply could not be adapted to work with CARLA v2.0. Nevertheless, this paper provides a start.

We hope this paper will incentivize the AI+Autonomy research community to adopt CARLA as a training and evaluation benchmark, and make their code compatible with it. Our work also sheds light on the gaps in the current approaches, and we hope will guide the development of more robust and efficient motion planning algorithms for autonomous vehicles. Our analysis serves as a resource for researchers and practitioners seeking to advance the state of the art in autonomous driving.

Alas, as far as self-driving cars is concerned, it seems that *we are still not there yet!*

References

- [1] Alexey Dosovitskiy, German Ros, Felipe Codevilla, Antonio Lopez, and Vladlen Koltun. Carla: An open urban driving simulator. In *Conference on robot learning*, pages 1–16. PMLR, 2017.
- [2] Nico Montali, John Lambert, Paul Mouglin, Alex Kuefler, Nicholas Rhinehart, Michelle Li, Cole Gulino, Tristan Emrich, Zoey Yang, Shimon Whiteson, et al. The waymo open sim agents challenge. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36, 2024.
- [3] 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 *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 17853–17862, 2023.
- [4] Zhejun Zhang, Alexander Liniger, Dengxin Dai, Fisher Yu, and Luc Van Gool. Trafficbots: Towards world models for autonomous driving simulation and motion prediction. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 1522–1529. IEEE, 2023.
- [5] 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.
- [6] Kashyap Chitta, Aditya Prakash, Bernhard Jaeger, Zehao Yu, Katrin Renz, and Andreas Geiger. Transfuser: Imitation with transformer-based sensor fusion for autonomous driving. *IEEE transactions on pattern analysis and machine intelligence*, 45(11):12878–12895, 2022.
- [7] Zetong Yang, Li Chen, Yanan Sun, and Hongyang Li. Visual point cloud forecasting enables scalable autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14673–14684, 2024.
- [8] Zhejun Zhang, Alexander Liniger, Dengxin Dai, Fisher Yu, and Luc Van Gool. End-to-end urban driving by imitating a reinforcement learning coach. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF international conference on computer vision*, pages 15222–15232, 2021.
- [9] TH Wang, A Maalouf, W Xiao, Y Ban, A Amini, G Rosman, S Karaman, and D Rus. Drive anywhere: Generalizable end-to-end autonomous driving with multi-modal foundation models. arxiv. 2023. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.17642*.
- [10] Zhiyu Huang, Haochen Liu, Jingda Wu, and Chen Lv. Differentiable integrated motion prediction and planning with learnable cost function for autonomous driving. *IEEE transactions on neural networks and learning systems*, 2023.
- [11] Yu Huang, Yue Chen, and Zhu Li. Applications of large scale foundation models for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.12144*, 2023.
- [12] Karl Johan Åström and Tore Hägglund. *Advanced PID control*. ISA-The Instrumentation, Systems and Automation Society, 2006.
- [13] Chonghao Sima, Katrin Renz, Kashyap Chitta, Li Chen, Hanxue Zhang, Chengen Xie, Jens Beißwenger, Ping Luo, Andreas Geiger, and Hongyang Li. Drivelm: Driving with graph visual question answering. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 256–274. Springer, 2024.
- [14] Anthony Hu, Lloyd Russell, Hudson Yeo, Zak Murez, George Fedoseev, Alex Kendall, Jamie Shotton, and Gianluca Corrado. Gaia-1: A generative world model for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17080*, 2023.
- [15] Xiaofeng Wang, Zheng Zhu, Guan Huang, Xinze Chen, Jiagang Zhu, and Jiwen Lu. Drive-dreamer: Towards real-world-driven world models for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.09777*, 2023.
- [16] Jianhua Wu, Bingzhao Gao, Jincheng Gao, Jianhao Yu, Hongqing Chu, Qiankun Yu, Xun Gong, Yi Chang, H Eric Tseng, Hong Chen, et al. Prospective role of foundation models in advancing autonomous vehicles. *Research*, 7:0399, 2024.

- [17] Xu Yan, Haiming Zhang, Yingjie Cai, Jingming Guo, Weichao Qiu, Bin Gao, Kaiqiang Zhou, Yue Zhao, Huan Jin, Jiantao Gao, et al. Forging vision foundation models for autonomous driving: Challenges, methodologies, and opportunities. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.08045*, 2024.
- [18] Haoxiang Gao, Zhongruo Wang, Yaqian Li, Kaiwen Long, Ming Yang, and Yiqing Shen. A survey for foundation models in autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.01105*, 2024.
- [19] Chenbin Pan, Burhaneddin Yaman, Tommaso Nesti, Abhirup Mallik, Alessandro G Allievi, Senem Velipasalar, and Liu Ren. Vlp: Vision language planning for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 14760–14769, 2024.
- [20] Kaiming He, Xiangyu Zhang, Shaoqing Ren, and Jian Sun. Deep residual learning for image recognition. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 770–778, 2016.
- [21] Ashish Vaswani, Noam Shazeer, Niki Parmar, Jakob Uszkoreit, Llion Jones, Aidan N Gomez, Łukasz Kaiser, and Illia Polosukhin. Attention is all you need. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 30, 2017.
- [22] Kyunghyun Cho, Bart Van Merriënboer, Caglar Gulcehre, Dzmitry Bahdanau, Fethi Bougares, Holger Schwenk, and Yoshua Bengio. Learning phrase representations using rnn encoder-decoder for statistical machine translation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1406.1078*, 2014.
- [23] Penghao Wu, Xiaosong Jia, Li Chen, Junchi Yan, Hongyang Li, and Yu Qiao. Trajectory-guided control prediction for end-to-end autonomous driving: A simple yet strong baseline. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:6119–6132, 2022.
- [24] Hao Shao, Letian Wang, Ruobing Chen, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. Safety-enhanced autonomous driving using interpretable sensor fusion transformer. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 726–737. PMLR, 2023.
- [25] Jens Beißwenger. PDM-Lite: A rule-based planner for carla leaderboard 2.0. <https://github.com/OpenDriveLab/DriveLM/blob/DriveLM-CARLA/docs/report.pdf>, 2024.
- [26] Martin Treiber, Ansgar Hennecke, and Dirk Helbing. Congested traffic states in empirical observations and microscopic simulations. *Physical Review E*, 62(2):1805–1824, August 2000. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevE.62.1805.
- [27] Philip Polack, Florent Althé, Brigitte d’Andréa Novel, and Arnaud de La Fortelle. The kinematic bicycle model: A consistent model for planning feasible trajectories for autonomous vehicles? In *2017 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 812–818. IEEE, 2017. doi: 10.1109/IVS.2017.7995816.
- [28] Shaoshuai Shi, Li Jiang, Dengxin Dai, and Bernt Schiele. Motion transformer with global intention localization and local movement refinement. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:6531–6543, 2022.
- [29] Shaoshuai Shi, Li Jiang, Dengxin Dai, and Bernt Schiele. Mtr-a: 1st place solution for 2022 waymo open dataset challenge–motion prediction. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2209.10033*, 2022.
- [30] Shaoshuai Shi, Li Jiang, Dengxin Dai, and Bernt Schiele. Mtr++: Multi-agent motion prediction with symmetric scene modeling and guided intention querying. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(5):3955–3971, 2024.
- [31] Chen Shi, Shaoshuai Shi, and Li Jiang. Mtr v3: 1st place solution for 2024 waymo open dataset challenge - motion prediction. <https://storage.googleapis.com/waymo-uploads/files/research/2024%20Technical%20Reports/2024%20WOD%20Motion%20Prediction%20Challenge%20-%201st%20Place%20-%20MTR%20v3.pdf>, 2024. Waymo Technical Report.
- [32] James Blake Rawlings, David Q Mayne, Moritz Diehl, et al. *Model predictive control: theory, computation, and design*, volume 2. Nob Hill Publishing Madison, WI, 2017.

- [33] Pei Sun, Henrik Kretzschmar, Xerxes Dotiwalla, Aurelien Chouard, Vijaysai Patnaik, Paul Tsui, James Guo, Yin Zhou, Yuning Chai, Benjamin Caine, et al. Scalability in perception for autonomous driving: Waymo open dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 2446–2454, 2020.
- [34] Muhammad Awais Abbas, Ruth Milman, and J Mikael Eklund. Obstacle avoidance in real time with nonlinear model predictive control of autonomous vehicles. *Canadian journal of electrical and computer engineering*, 40(1):12–22, 2017.
- [35] Chang Liu, Seunggho Lee, Scott Varnhagen, and H Eric Tseng. Path planning for autonomous vehicles using model predictive control. In *2017 IEEE Intelligent Vehicles Symposium (IV)*, pages 174–179. IEEE, 2017.
- [36] Boliang Yi, Philipp Bender, Frank Bonarens, and Christoph Stiller. Model predictive trajectory planning for automated driving. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 4(1):24–38, 2018.
- [37] CARLA Autonomous Driving Leaderboard. Get started with Leaderboard 2.0. https://leaderboard.carla.org/get_started_v2_0/, 2025. Version 2.0; accessed May 14, 2025.
- [38] Scott Ettinger, Shuyang Cheng, Benjamin Caine, Chenxi Liu, Hang Zhao, Sabeek Pradhan, Yuning Chai, Ben Sapp, Charles R Qi, Yin Zhou, et al. Large scale interactive motion forecasting for autonomous driving: The waymo open motion dataset. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 9710–9719, 2021.
- [39] Holger Caesar, Juraj Kabzan, Kok Seang Tan, Whye Kit Fong, Eric M. Wolff, Alex H. Lang, Luke Fletcher, Oscar Beijbom, and Sammy Omari. nuplan: A closed-loop ml-based planning benchmark for autonomous vehicles. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, 2021. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11810>.
- [40] Kashyap Chitta, Aditya Prakash, and Andreas Geiger. Neat: Neural attention fields for end-to-end autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 15793–15803, 2021.
- [41] Aditya Prakash, Kashyap Chitta, and Andreas Geiger. Multi-modal fusion transformer for end-to-end autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 7077–7087, 2021.
- [42] Fabian Poggenhans, Jan-Hendrik Pauls, Johannes Janosovits, Stefan Orf, Maximilian Naumann, Florian Kuhnt, and Matthias Mayr. Lanelet2: A high-definition map framework for the future of automated driving. In *2018 21st international conference on intelligent transportation systems (ITSC)*, pages 1672–1679. IEEE, 2018.
- [43] Nigamaa Nayakanti, Rami Al-Rfou, Aurick Zhou, Kratarth Goel, Khaled S Refaat, and Benjamin Sapp. Wayformer: Motion forecasting via simple & efficient attention networks. In *2023 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 2980–2987. IEEE, 2023.
- [44] Hao Shao, Letian Wang, Ruobing Chen, Steven L Waslander, Hongsheng Li, and Yu Liu. Reasonnet: End-to-end driving with temporal and global reasoning. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 13723–13733, 2023.
- [45] Mohammed Elmahgiubi, Fazel Arasteh, Wang Zhitao, Yang Zhou, Yuanxin Zhong, Hamidreza Mirkhani, Weize Zhang, Zhan Qu, Zizhao Huang, and Kasra Rezaee. Kyber-e2e submission to cvpr’s carla autonomous driving challenge.
- [46] Bernhard Jaeger, Kashyap Chitta, and Andreas Geiger. Hidden biases of end-to-end driving models. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 8240–8249, 2023.
- [47] Yiqian Gan, Hao Xiao, Yizhe Zhao, Ethan Zhang, Zhe Huang, Xin Ye, and Lingting Ge. Multi-granular transformer for motion prediction with lidar. In *2024 IEEE International Conference on Robotics and Automation (ICRA)*, pages 15092–15098. IEEE, 2024.

- [48] Yu Wang, Tiebiao Zhao, and Fan Yi. Multiverse transformer: 1st place solution for waymo open sim agents challenge 2023. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2306.11868*, 2023.
- [49] Weitao Xi, Liangchao Shi, and Guangzhi Cao. An imitation learning method with data augmentation and post processing for planning in autonomous driving. In *Proc. IEEE Conf. on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition (CVPR) Workshops*, 2023.
- [50] Zhiyu Huang, Haochen Liu, and Chen Lv. Gameformer: Game-theoretic modeling and learning of transformer-based interactive prediction and planning for autonomous driving. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3903–3913, 2023.
- [51] Daniel Dauner, Marcel Hallgarten, Andreas Geiger, and Kashyap Chitta. Parting with misconceptions about learning-based vehicle motion planning. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1268–1281. PMLR, 2023.
- [52] Zikang Zhou, Hengjian Zhou, Haibo Hu, Zihao Wen, Jianping Wang, Yung-Hui Li, and Yu-Kai Huang. Modeseq: Taming sparse multimodal motion prediction with sequential mode modeling. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2411.11911*, 2024.
- [53] Jiawei Sun, Jiahui Li, Tingchen Liu, Chengran Yuan, Shuo Sun, Yuhang Han, Anthony Wong, Keng Peng Tee, and Marcelo H. Ang Jr. Rmp: 3rd place solution for 2024 waymo open dataset challenge - motion prediction. https://storage.googleapis.com/waymo-uploads/files/research/2024%20Technical%20Reports/2024%20WOD%20Motion%20Prediction%20Challenge%20-%203rd%20Place%20-%20RMP_Ensemble.pdf, 2024. Waymo Technical Report.
- [54] Zhiyu Huang, Zixu Zhang, Ameya Vaidya, Yuxiao Chen, Chen Lv, and Jaime Fernández Fisac. Versatile scene-consistent traffic scenario generation as optimization with diffusion. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.02524*, 3, 2024.
- [55] Xinghua Lou, Meet Dave, Shrinu Kushagra, Miguel Lazaro-Gredilla, and Kevin Murphy. Model predictive simulation using structured graphical models and transformers. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.19635*, 2024.

Table 6: Top Ranked Methods

Method	Year	If pretrained weights are available?
MTR[29]	2022	No
Wayformer[43]	2022	No
Interfuser[24]	2022	Yes
ReasonNet[44]	2022	No
TCP[23]	2022	Yes
Kyber-E2E[45]	2023	No
TF++[46]	2023	Yes
MGTR[47]	2023	No
MTR ++[30]	2023	No
MVTA[48]	2023	No
IDP[49]	2023	No
GameFormer[50]	2023	No
PDM[51]	2023	Yes
MTR v3[31]	2024	No
ModeSeq[52]	2024	No
RMP[53]	2024	No
VDB[54]	2024	No
MPS[55]	2024	No

A Technical Appendices and Supplementary Material

A.1 Long List of Top Ranked Methods

Although pretrained weights for MTR are not publicly available, we trained the model from scratch and included it in our experiments as many other methods (MTR++, MVTA, MTR v3, RMP, MPS) also employ MTR as their backbone.

Additionally, we initially considered evaluating PDM in CARLA, but the method’s lack of lane-change logic makes it a poor fit: according to the authors, PDM “does not execute lane-change manoeuvres,” whereas almost every CARLA leaderboard route demands them. Adding this capability would require redesigning the planner’s proposal-scoring rules and retraining the offset MLP used to refine trajectories, effectively producing a new model rather than a faithful reproduction. Consequently, we chose PDM-Lite, which already includes obstacle-avoidance and lane-changing routines and can be integrated with minimal modification.