DriveMoE: Mixture-of-Experts for Vision-Language-Action Model in End-to-End Autonomous Driving

Zhenjie Yang* Yilin Chai* Xiaosong Jia*

Qifeng Li Yuqian Shao Xuekai Zhu Haisheng Su Junchi Yan[†]

* Equal contributions † Correspondence author

Sch. of Computer Science & Sch. of Artificial Intelligence, Shanghai Jiao Tong University

Project Page:https://thinklab-sjtu.github.io/DriveMoE/

Abstract

End-to-end autonomous driving (E2E-AD) demands effective processing of multiview sensory data and robust handling of diverse and complex driving scenarios, particularly rare maneuvers such as aggressive turns. Recent success of Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architecture in Large Language Models (LLMs) demonstrates that specialization of parameters enables strong scalability. In this work, we propose **DriveMoE**, a novel MoE-based E2E-AD framework, with a **Scene-Specialized Vision MoE** and a **Skill-Specialized Action MoE**. DriveMoE is built upon our π_0 Vision-Language-Action (VLA) baseline (originally from the embodied AI field), called **Drive**- π_0 . Specifically, we add Vision MoE to Drive- π_0 by training a router to select relevant cameras according to the driving context dynamically. This design mirrors human driving cognition, where drivers selectively attend to crucial visual cues rather than exhaustively processing all visual information. In addition, we add Action MoE by training another router to activate specialized expert modules for different driving behaviors. Through explicit behavioral specialization, DriveMoE is able to handle diverse scenarios without suffering from modes averaging like existing models. In Bench2Drive closed-loop evaluation experiments, DriveMoE achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance, demonstrating the effectiveness of combining vision and action MoE in autonomous driving tasks. We will release our code and models of DriveMoE and Drive- π_0 .

1 Introduction

Modern autonomous driving has made significant progress [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6] with an end-to-end paradigm, which directly maps the raw sensor input into the planning results. This paradigm [7, 8] yields many advantages, such as reduced engineering complexity, mitigation of error propagation, and global objective optimization. Despite the encouraging results achieved on various open-loop self-driving benchmarks [9, 10, 11, 12], existing end-to-end models still fail to get satisfactory performance in closed-loop settings [13, 14, 15]. In closed-loop settings, trained driving models can

Correspondence author is also affiliated with Shanghai Innovation Institute. This work was in part supported by by NSFC (62222607) and Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project under Grant 2021SHZDZX0102.

easily encounter out-of-distribution cases [16, 17, 18, 19], requiring stronger generalizability and reasoning abilities.




Figure 1: Comparison of Different Vision and Action Modeling Strategies in VLA-based End-to-End Driving. (a.1) Vanilla visual token encoding [14] processes all surround-view images through a vision tower, leading to token redundancy and increased computational cost. (a.2) Query-based token extraction [20] (e.g., Q-former [21]) selects a subset of visual tokens from each image, but loses spatial structure and requires additional pretraining. (a.3) Our proposed Scene-Specialized Vision MoE dynamically selects a subset of cameras—typically frontal and a few context-relevant side/rear views, reducing redundancy. (b.1) Standard action models adopt one policy head to handle all driving scenarios, limiting performance in rare or skill-specific behaviors. (b.2) Our Skill-Specialized Action MoE, built on a flow-matching planner, activates different experts based on driving intent (e.g., lane following, turning, obstacle avoidance), enabling context-aware and behavior-specialized planning.

Vision Language Models(VLM) and Vision Language Action Models(VLA) recently have gain much attention due to their strong generalizability and transferability across domains [22, 23]. To enhance generalization and contextual reasoning, recent work [24, 25, 13, 14] has attempted to introduce VLA into autonomous driving. However, existing VLA approaches still face two major limitations. Firstly, existing vision processors of VLA introduce information redundancy and significant computational overhead. As shown in the upper part of Figure 1, there are two distinct strategies for processing multiview inputs. The first strategy, termed vanilla vision processor[13, 14, 15], processes all available camera views at each timestep without distinction, resulting in a substantial computational burden and redundant visual representations, thereby limiting efficiency and scalability. The second strategy, termed query-based vision processor, employs learned queries (e.g., Q-former modules[21]) to extract a compact set of visual tokens guided by semantic context. However, these learned queries typically lead to the loss of precise geometric and positional information and require substantial additional pre-training efforts [26]. Secondly, as shown in the lower part of the Figure 1, current VLA-based frameworks [25, 13] generally employ a single unified policy network designed to handle the full spectrum of driving behaviors. Such uniform approaches [27, 28, 29] tend to bias model training towards more frequent scenarios, thereby insufficiently addressing rare but critical driving maneuvers, such as emergency braking or aggressive turning. This lack of explicit specialization restricts their effectiveness in dynamically changing and highly context-dependent driving situations. Addressing these two key limitations demands architectural innovations capable of both context-aware dynamic multi-view selection and explicit fine-grained skill specialization.

Meanwhile, Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architectures [30, 31] have significantly advanced Large Language Models (LLMs) [32, 33, 34] by partitioning model capacity into multiple expert modules, scaling to larger model sizes without proportional increases in computational demands. Despite their demonstrated success, the extension of MoE principles into the vision and action domains, particularly

within autonomous driving, remains largely under-explored. Current end-to-end driving models continue to rely predominantly on unified architectures without explicit dynamic expert selection or specialized behavioral adaptation [24, 25, 13, 14]. This gap motivates exploration into leveraging MoE-based specialization to improve both visual perception and decision-making components in autonomous driving.

To address these challenges, we propose DriveMoE, a novel framework built upon our proposed Drive- π_0 , a Vision-Language-Action (VLA) foundation model extended from the embodied AI model π_0 [22]. DriveMoE introduces both a Scene-Specialized Vision MoE and a Skill-Specialized Action MoE, specifically designed for end-to-end autonomous driving scenarios. DriveMoE dynamically selects contextually relevant camera views and activates skill-specific experts for specialized planning. The Vision MoE employs a learned router to dynamically prioritize camera views aligned with the immediate driving context, integrating projector layers that fuse these selected views into a cohesive visual representation. This approach mirrors human attentional strategies, allowing efficient processing of only critical visual inputs. Concurrently, the Action MoE leverages another routing mechanism to engage distinct experts within a flow-matching planning architecture [35], with each expert dedicated to handling specialized behaviors such as lane following, obstacle avoidance, or aggressive maneuvers. By introducing context-driven dynamic expert selection across both perception and planning modules, DriveMoE ensures efficient resource utilization and robust specialization, significantly improving handling of rare, complex, and long-tail driving behaviors.

The contributions are as follows:

- We extend the VLA foundation model π_0 , originally designed for embodied AI, into the autonomous driving domain, developing $\textbf{\textit{Drive}}$ - π_0 as a unified framework for visual perception, contextual understanding, and action planning.
- Recognizing differences between embodied AI and autonomous driving, we propose *DriveMoE*,
 the first framework integrating Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) into perception and decision-making to
 address inefficiencies in multi-view processing and diverse driving behaviors.
- We design a Scene-specialized Vision MoE for dynamic camera view selection and a Skill-specialized Action MoE for behavior-specific planning, addressing challenges of multi-view redundancy and skill specialization.
- We demonstrate that DriveMoE achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance on the Bench2Drive closed-loop simulation benchmark, significantly improving robustness to rare driving behaviors.

2 Related Work

2.1 VLM/VLA in End-to-end Autonomous Driving

The advancement of Large Language Models (LLMs) [36, 37] has significantly accelerated the development of Vision-Language Models (VLMs) for autonomous driving. Leveraging powerful generalization, open-set reasoning, and scalability, these models have become influential paradigms for end-to-end driving tasks. Notable examples include DriveGPT-4 [38], LMDrive [13], and DriveLM [14], which formulate perception and planning tasks as sequences of discrete tokens, enabling better interpretability and facilitating cross-domain knowledge transfer. However, token-based modeling inherently limits the ability to represent continuous control commands and trajectories, which are critical for real-world autonomous driving systems requiring fine-grained control. To address this limitation, the embodied AI community has proposed vision-language-action (VLA) models that represent actions as continuous variables instead of discrete tokens. Methods such as OpenVLA [39], Diffusion Policy [40] and π_0 [22] demonstrate strong performance by modeling continuous action distributions through sequence prediction and global optimization. Nevertheless, these approaches often rely on task-specific policies or instruction-conditioned models, which struggle to generalize across the long-tail distribution of behaviors seen in complex driving environments.

2.2 Mixture-of-Experts in Large Language Models

Sparse Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architectures have become a mainstream approach for scaling LLMs. By replacing the standard feedforward layers in Transformers with expert modules, models like DeepSeekMoE [41] and Mixtral-8x7B [41] improve task specialization and representation capacity while maintaining inference efficiency through conditional computation. In robotics, MoE architectures have also been used to address task heterogeneity and long-tailed data distributions. For




Figure 2: **Framework of DriveMoE.** Our proposed framework comprises two main Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) modules tailored for end-to-end autonomous driving. The Scene-Specialized Vision MoE dynamically selects relevant camera views based on real-time driving contexts, efficiently reducing visual redundancy. Subsequently, selected views are fused into a unified representation by projector layers. The Skill-Specialized Action MoE, integrated within a flow-matching planner, activates expert controllers specifically optimized for distinct driving behaviors such as merging, overtaking, emergency braking, yielding, and responding to traffic signs. This dual MoE structure enhances computational efficiency, adaptability, and robustness to rare, safety-critical driving scenarios.

example, MENTOR [42] replaces the MLP backbone with MoE layers to enable gradient routing among modular experts, helping mitigate gradient interference in multi-task learning. Despite promising results in language modeling and robot policy learning, the use of MoE in end-to-end autonomous driving remains underexplored.

3 Method

3.1 Preliminary: Drive- π_0 Baseline

We first establish a strong baseline, Drive- π_0 , which builds upon the recently proposed π_0 [22] Vision-Language-Action (VLA) framework from embodied AI, and extends it to the domain of end-to-end autonomous driving. As shown in Figure 2, specifically, the input to Drive- π_0 includes: (i) a sequence of surround-view images from onboard multi-camera sensors; (ii) a fixed text prompt (e.g., "Please predict future trajectory"); and (iii) the current vehicle state (e.g., speed, yaw rate, and past trajectory). The network design follows π_0 framework with pre-trained Paligemma VLM [43] as the backbone and a flow-matching-based action module for planned future trajectory generation.

3.2 Motivation: From Drive- π_0 to DriveMoE

With Drive- π_0 as the baseline, we identify two major challenges: (i) adopting VLM to process spatial-temporal surround-view video tokens poses significant challenges to computational resource; (ii) driving performance for rare and difficult scenarios are deficient, even if there is similar data for training. It might be related to the interfere effect of different behaviors, as mentioned in the π_0 paper [22]. Inspired by the recent success of Mixture of Experts (MoE) in VLM field [44, 45], we introduce **DriveMoE**, which extends Drive- π_0 by adding two new Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) modules to tackle the aforementioned challenges: (i) We propose a Scene-Specialized Vision MoE that dynamically selects the most relevant camera views based on the current driving context, effectively reducing redundant visual tokens. (ii) We incorporate a Skill-Specialized Action MoE within a flow-matching transformer to generate more accurate future trajectory distributions tailored to diverse driving skills. Figure 2 illustrates the complete DriveMoE architecture.

3.3 Scene-Specialized Vision MoE

Typical Vision-Language-Action Models (VLAs) [39, 22] usually handle only a single or a few images at a time, whereas autonomous driving must handle multi-view, multi-timestep visual inputs. Concatenating all camera frames into a transformer leads to a visual token bottleneck – an explosion in sequence length that drastically slows training and inference and hampers convergence. Among existing works, [13, 14] adopts a vanilla vision processor to directly handle all visual tokens, while query-based compression modules (e.g. Q-Former [21]) reduce token count but sacrifice spatial structure, often treating images as a "bag of patches" without fine spatial correspondence [26].

In this work, we seek a simple and efficient approach that reduces the token load without losing the rich spatial context crucial for driving. *Inspired by human drivers—who naturally prioritize specific*




Figure 3: The Scene-Specialized Vision Mixture-of-Experts.

visual information based on driving context—we propose a Scene-Specialized Vision Mixture-of-Experts (Vision MoE) module. Specifically, as shown in Figure 3, our Vision MoE dynamically selects a subset of the most relevant camera views according to the current driving situation and future goal waypoint provided by the route planner. Unlike token-level annotations (which are impractical and costly), camera-view annotations are straightforward and inexpensive, allowing human priors to be integrated effectively. This dynamic attention strategy significantly reduces the number of visual tokens processed per timestep, greatly improving computational efficiency and decision accuracy.

Formally, we define the image from camera view v at timestep t as \boldsymbol{I}_t^v , where $v \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$ for N available camera views. In particular, the front-view image at timestep t is denoted by $\boldsymbol{I}_t^{\text{front}}$. We introduce a lightweight vision router module $\boldsymbol{R}_{\text{vision}}$, which takes as inputs the front-view embedding $\boldsymbol{e}_t^{\text{front}}$ and the future goal waypoint \boldsymbol{g}_t , computing a probability distribution $\boldsymbol{p}_t \in \mathbb{R}^N$ across all camera views:

$$p_t = \text{Softmax}\left(\boldsymbol{R}_{\text{vision}}\left(\boldsymbol{e}_t^{\text{front}}, \boldsymbol{g}_t\right)\right),$$
 (1)

where each element p_t^v indicates the selection probability of camera view v at timestep t. Notably, this routing happens before the expensive backbone computation, so views not selected can be skipped entirely to save compute. Thus, we obtain the input for VLM:

$$\langle \text{fixed_view} \rangle, \langle \text{fixed_view} \rangle, \dots, \langle \text{dynamic_view} \rangle, \langle \text{dynamic_view} \rangle, \langle \text{text} \rangle, \langle \text{text} \rangle, \dots$$

We further incorporate learnable positional embeddings (**PE**) that are unique to each camera viewpoint into their corresponding vision tokens to preserve spatial and positional relation across different camera views. The label for selection of views is annotated by manually designed filters based on future trajectories, bounding box, and maps, detailed in Appendix A. With the annotated binary camera-view selection labels $y_t \in \{0,1\}$, the vision router is trained using the cross-entropy loss:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Vision-Router}} = -\lambda_0 \sum_{v=1}^{N} \boldsymbol{y_t^v} \log(\boldsymbol{p_t^v}), \tag{2}$$

which explicitly encourages the model to proactively select informative camera views relevant for decision-making. λ_0 represents the loss weight of vision router.

3.4 Skill-Specialized Action MoE

Human drivers fluidly transition among different driving skills—such as smoothly cruising down a highway, carefully merging into traffic, swiftly overtaking slower vehicles, or urgently braking in response to sudden obstacles. Each of these driving skills is associated with distinct behavioral patterns and trajectory characteristics. Although the original flow-matching decoder of π_0 could already generate diverse trajectories, employing one single model inevitably averages across these diverse behaviors [22], making the model fail to accurately generate rare yet safety-critical maneuvers.

To address these issues, inspired by human intuition—where drivers naturally select the appropriate driving skill based on the current context, we propose a Skill-Specialized Action MoE architecture built on the original flow-matching trajectory transformer. The central idea is to decompose the




Figure 4: The Skill-Specialized Action Mixture-of-Experts.

policy's representation of behaviors by replacing each dense feed-forward network (FFN) in the decoder with a Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) layer containing multiple skill-specific experts. Essentially, each decoder layer is no longer a single monolithic mapping, but an ensemble of K expert FFNs each intended to specialize in a subset of driving skills. By conditionally routing each input through a small subset of these experts, the model isolates distinct behavior modes instead of forcing them into a single decoder stream. This design prevents the averaging effect observed in one single model and thereby allocates dedicated model capacity to rare maneuvers. The result is a policy network that preserves the multimodality of the trajectory data, modeling both frequent and infrequent behaviors with appropriate specialization.

Formally, consider a Transformer decoder layer ℓ with input hidden state $\mathbf{h}^{(\ell-1)} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We introduce \mathbf{K} shared expert models $E_{\mathrm{share}_1}^{(\ell)}, E_{\mathrm{share}_2}^{(\ell)}, \dots, E_{\mathrm{share}_K}^{(\ell)}$ and \mathbf{M} non-shared expert models $E_{\mathrm{non-share}_1}^{(\ell)}, E_{\mathrm{non-share}_1}^{(\ell)}, \dots, E_{\mathrm{non-share}_K}^{(\ell)}$ in this layer, each an independent FFN with its own parameters. Each expert processes the input to produce an output $\mathbf{y}^{(\ell)} = E^{(\ell)}(\mathbf{h}^{(\ell-1)})$. In parallel, an action router $\mathbf{R}_{\mathrm{action}}$ computes a set of non-shared routing logits $r_1^{(\ell)}, \dots, r_K^{(\ell)}$ based on the same input. We then convert these logits into a probability distribution over experts via a softmax:

$$\boldsymbol{r}_{k}^{(\ell-1)} = \operatorname{Softmax}(\boldsymbol{R}_{\operatorname{action}}(\mathbf{h}^{(\ell-1)})), \quad k \in \{1, 2, \dots, \boldsymbol{K}\}. \tag{3}$$

The updated feature combines the outputs of individual experts weighted by the router's confidence:

$$\boldsymbol{h}^{(\ell)} = \sum_{k=1}^{K} r_k^{(\ell-1)} \boldsymbol{y}_k^{(\ell-1)} + \sum_{m=1}^{M} \boldsymbol{y}_m^{(\ell-1)}$$
(4)

In practice, we use a sparse activation mechanism [44] to select only a few experts with the highest ranking for calculation (only activate the Top-1 or Top-2 experts), thereby reducing the amount of calculation, preventing mutual interference between experts, and strengthening the degree of expert skill specialization. This sparse routing mechanism is consistent with the mechanism we use in the Vision MoE module, ensuring that each expert clearly focuses on a specific behavior mode.

To explicitly guide our model toward meaningful skill specialization—mirroring structured and intuitive human-defined skill categories—we utilize driving skill labels $y_k \in \{1, \dots, K\}$, annotated based on scenarios, and train the skill router via a cross-entropy loss as well:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Action-Router}} = -y_k \log(r_k) \tag{5}$$

Additionally, we optimize the entire Action MoE module using a flow-matching trajectory loss \mathcal{L}_{FM} to ensure accurate trajectory predictions, and introduce a load-balancing regularization loss \mathcal{L}_{LB} to maintain balanced expert utilization, preventing expert collapse:

$$\mathcal{L}_{Action} = \lambda_1 \mathcal{L}_{FM} + \lambda_2 \mathcal{L}_{Action-Router}$$
 (6)

where λ_1 represents loss weight of flow matching policy, λ_2 represents loss weight of action router. We introduce noise into the action router following [41], which increases randomness and encourages exploration, effectively mitigating the risk of expert collapse.

3.5 Two Stage Training: From Teacher-Forcing to Adaptive Training

DriveMoE loads the Paligemma VLM pretrained weights [43] and we finetune it in the autonomous driving scene via a *two-stage training* procedure. In the first stage, both vision and action MoEs only select ground-truth experts while the router is trained jointly, which significantly stabilize the training. In the second stage, we transition to select experts based on the outputs of Vision and Action MoE routers, removing reliance on GT annotation about experts. It develops robustness against potential mistakes or inaccuracies made by routers, thereby enhancing the overall model's generalization capability under realistic inference conditions.

4 Experiments

4.1 Datasets & Benchmark & Metric

We employ the CARLA simulator [46] (version 0.9.15.1) for closed-loop driving performance evaluation, and adopt the latest public closed-loop evaluation benchmark, Bench2Drive [47] which includes 220 short routes with one challenging corner case per route for analysis of different driving abilities. It provides an official training set, where we use the base set (1000 clips, 950 training, 50 test/validation) for fair comparison with all the other baselines.

We use the official 220 routes and official metrics of Bench2Drive for evaluation. The **Driving Score** (**DS**) is defined as the product of Route Completion and Infraction Score, capturing both task completion and rule adherence. The **Success Rate** (**SR**) measures the percentage of routes completed successfully within the allocated time and without committing any traffic violations. **Efficiency** quantifies the vehicle's velocity relative to surrounding traffic, encouraging progressiveness without aggression. **Comfort** reflects the smoothness of the driving trajectory. Meanwhile, Bench2Drive evaluates driving capabilities across multiple critical dimensions, including tasks such as **Merging**, **Overtaking**, **Emergency Braking**, **Yielding**, and **Traffic Signs**.

4.2 Implementation Details

Vision Routing Annotations: We introduce additional camera-view importance annotations into the Bench2Drive [47] dataset. This annotation approach is both inexpensive and straightforward, yet it significantly improves model performance through efficient and effective utilization of multi-camera inputs. The details about camera annotation rules refer to Appendix A.

Action Routing Annotations: We maintain skill definitions consistent with Bench2Drive [47] setup. There are five driving skills: Merging, Overtaking, Emergency Brake, Give Way, and Traffic Sign.

Drive π_0 : We utilize 2 sequential front-view images as input to our model to effectively estimate the velocities of surrounding traffic agents. Additionally, the input state incorporates both current and historical information, including position, velocity, acceleration, and heading angle, enabling the model to predict 10 future waypoints accurately.

DriveMoE: We utilize 2 sequential front-view images combined with a dynamically selected camera view as inputs to our model. The sequential front-view images primarily capture temporal changes to model the velocities of surrounding traffic agents, while the dynamic view is obtained by selecting the Top-1 view from the vision router, which enhances spatial perception according to driving context. The input state representation remains consistent with the π_0 framework, including current and historical position, velocity, acceleration, and heading angle information. In the action model, we employ 1 shared expert and 6 non-shared experts. During the training and inference, the top-3 experts selected by the action router are utilized to generate the final trajectory prediction consisting of 10 future waypoints. We adopt a two-stage post-training strategy for our model:

Training Stage 1. We train the model for 10 epochs. The Vision-Language Model (VLM) component is initialized from the pretrained weights of Paligemma-3b-pt-224 [43]. The VLA and Action MoE experts are optimized separately using two optimizers, both configured as follows: learning rate = 5×10^{-5} , and warmup steps enabled. Gradient clipping is applied with a maximum gradient norm of 1.0. Gradient accumulation is used to simulate a batch size of 1024. To balance different loss components effectively, we set the vision router loss weight λ_0 to 0.05, action router loss weight λ_2 to 0.03, flow matching loss weight λ_1 to 1.

Training Stage 2. We continue training for an additional 5 epochs, initializing from the checkpoint obtained at the end of Stage 1. In this stage, input camera views and action experts are dynamically

Table 1: **Performance on Bench2Drive Multi-Ability Benchmark**. * denotes expert feature distillation.

Method	Venue	Ability (%) ↑					
Method	od venue		Overtaking	Emergency Brake	Give Way	Traffic Sign	Mean
TCP-traj* [7]	NeurIPS 2022	8.89	24.29	51.67	40.00	46.28	34.22
AD-MLP [48]	Arxiv 2023	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	4.35	0.87
UniAD-Base [2]	CVPR 2023	14.10	17.78	21.67	10.00	14.21	15.55
ThinkTwice* [49]	CVPR 2023	27.38	18.42	35.82	50.00	54.23	37.17
VAD [3]	ICCV 2023	8.11	24.44	18.64	20.00	19.15	18.07
DriveAdapter* [50]	ICCV 2023	28.82	26.38	48.76	50.00	56.43	42.08
DriveTrans [51]	ICLR 2025	17.57	35.00	48.36	40.00	52.10	38.60
DiffAD [10]	Arxiv 2025	30.00	35.55	46.66	40.00	46.32	38.79
$Drive\pi_0$ (Ours)	-	29.35	36.58	48.83	40.00	54.45	41.84
DriveMoE (Ours)	-	34.67	40.00	65.45	40.00	59.44	47.91

selected based on outputs from the routers. We set the action router loss weight λ_2 to 0.025, emphasizing trajectory learning. Other hyperparameters remain consistent with Stage 1.

PID Controller. All methods use the same PID controller for fair comparison in closed-loop evaluation. The PID controller module takes as input the current vehicle speed and the future trajectory predicted by the model, consisting of 10 waypoints, and outputs throttle, brake, and steering angle commands. Specifically, for the steering control, the PID gains are: $K_D^{\rm turn} = 1.25$, $K_I^{\rm turn} = 0.75$, $K_D^{\rm turn} = 0.3$ For speed control, the PID gains are: $K_D^{\rm speed} = 5.0$, $K_I^{\rm speed} = 0.5$, $K_D^{\rm speed} = 1.0$. The desired vehicle speed is computed from the 7th waypoint of the predicted trajectory, whereas the steering angle is determined using the 10th waypoint. This configuration ensures stable and responsive vehicle control aligned with the model's trajectory predictions.

4.3 Comparison with State-of-the-Art Works

As shown in Table 2, our proposed method achieves state-of-the-art (SOTA) performance in terms of both driving score and success rate on the Bench2Drive closed-loop benchmark. Specifically, compared to the baseline Drive- π_0 , our method improves the driving score by 22.8% and the success rate by 62.1%. On the open-loop metric, our method achieves the lowest L2 error. We observe that diffusion policy-based trajectory prediction significantly reduces L2 errors compared to traditional methods. However, as highlighted in prior studies such as AD-MLP [16], TransFuser++ [8], and Bench2Drive [47], open-loop metrics mainly serve as indicators of model convergence, whereas closed-loop metrics provide a more reliable assessment of true driving performance. Moreover, in the multi-dimensional capability evaluation, as shown in Table 1, our method obtains state-of-the-art results across five key capabilities and their overall average.

4.4 Ablation Study

Drive π_0 **vs DriveMoE.** We conduct ablation studies to evaluate the individual contributions of the Vision MoE and Action MoE components within our DriveMoE framework. As shown in Table 3, removing either the Vision MoE or the Action MoE leads to a noticeable decline in both driving score and success rate, indicating that each component contributes meaningfully to the overall performance. Compared to the baseline Drive- π_0 , our complete DriveMoE model substantially improves driving performance, highlighting the complementary effectiveness of both MoE modules.

Vision MoE. As shown in Table 5, we investigate the contribution of camera view selection and supervision signals within our Vision MoE module. The baseline $(\textcircled{1}, Drive-\pi_0)$ utilizes two consecutive front-view images $(I_t^{front} + I_{t-1}^{front})$ primarily to estimate velocities of surrounding agents. Adding a third fixed view such as the back view (2), front-left view (3), or front-right view (4) provides additional spatial context, yielding moderate improvements. By introducing dynamically selected views without supervision (5), the driving score and success rate significantly improve. Ultimately, incorporating explicit supervision signals (6), DriveMoE) for the dynamic view selection further enhances both driving score and success rate, demonstrating the effectiveness of our Vision MoE module in leveraging dynamic and supervised multi-view perception. Table 6 shows the accuracy of the vision and action routers on the test set under open-loop evaluation.

Table 2: **Results on the Bench2Drive Benchmark**. The result includes both **Closed-Loop** and **Open-Loop** metrics. * denotes expert feature distillation.

Method	Venue	Closed-loop Metric				Open-loop Metric
venue -		DS ↑	SR(%) ↑	Efficiency ↑	Comfort ↑	Avg. L2↓
TCP-traj* [7]	NeurIPS 2022	59.90	30.00	76.54	18.08	1.70
AD-MLP [48]	Arxiv 2023	18.05	0.00	48.45	22.63	3.64
VAD [3]	ICCV 2023	42.35	15.00	157.94	46.01	0.91
UniAD-Base [2]	CVPR 2023	45.81	16.36	129.21	43.58	0.73
ThinkTwice* [49]	CVPR 2023	62.44	31.23	69.33	16.22	0.95
DriveAdapter* [50]	ICCV 2023	64.22	33.08	70.22	16.01	1.01
GenAD [17]	ECCV 2024	44.81	15.90	-	-	-
DriveTrans [51]	ICLR 2025	63.46	35.01	100.64	20.78	0.62
MomAD [9]	CVPR 2025	44.54	16.71	170.21	48.63	0.82
WoTE [52]	Arxiv 2025	61.71	31.36	-	-	_
DiffAD [10]	Arxiv 2025	67.92	38.64	-	-	1.55
$Drive\pi_0(Ours)$	-	60.45	30.00	168.41	14.88	0.56
DriveMoE(Ours)	-	74.22	48.64	175.96	15.31	0.38

Table 3: **Drive** $-\pi_0$ **vs DriveMoE**. Evaluate the Vision MoE and Action MoE. "w/o" denotes removing the respective modules from DriveMoE.

Method	DS↑	SR (%) ↑
Drive- π_0	60.45	30.00
w/o Vision MoE	68.68	42.45
w/o Action MoE	67.31	40.56
DriveMoE	74.22	48.64

Table 4: **Ablation Study in Action MoE**. Compare various configurations of non-share expert numbers within Action MoE.

Num	Non-share	DS↑	$\mathbf{SR}(\%) \uparrow$
1	5	73.81	47.73
2	6	74.22	48.64
3	13	70.88	44.50
4	44	68.22	43.18

Table 5: **Ablation Study of Vision MoE**. Compare different camera view combinations and supervision signals. Dynamic View represents the camera view dynamically selected by the vision router as the top-1 relevant view. ① is our baseline Drive- π_0 using two consecutive front-view images to model velocities of other traffic agents. ⑥ is DriveMoE, adding a dynamically selected camera view supervised by an explicit supervision signal to enhance perception learning.

Num	Camera View	Supervision	DS↑	SR (%) ↑
1	$oldsymbol{I_t^{ ext{front}}} + oldsymbol{I_{t-1}^{ ext{front}}}$	-	60.45	30.00
2	$oxedsymbol{I_t^{ ext{front}}} + oxedsymbol{I_{t-1}^{ ext{front}}} + oxedsymbol{I_t^{ ext{back}}}$	-	64.52	32.73
3	$oxed{I_t^{ ilde{ ext{front}}}} + oxed{I_{t-1}^{ ilde{ ext{front}}}} + oxed{I_t^{ ilde{ ext{front}}}}$	-	65.38	33.64
4	$oxed{I_t^{ ext{front}}} + oxed{I_{t-1}^{ ext{front}}} + oxed{I_t^{ ext{front_right}}}$	-	63.26	31.82
(5)	$I_t^{\text{front}} + I_{t-1}^{\text{front}} + D$ ynamic View	×	69.71	44.09
6	$I_t^{\text{front}} + I_{t-1}^{\text{front}} + \text{Dynamic View}$	✓	74.22	48.64

Action MoE. We investigate the impact of the number of non-shared experts within our Action MoE, as shown in Table 4. Specifically, configuration ① corresponds to the original five skills defined by Bench2Drive [47], while ② introduces an additional expert for the classic *ParkingExits* scenario, resulting in improved performance. To further analyze the effect of expert specialization, we conducted additional experiments: ③ adds experts targeting several challenging scenarios identified from configuration ②, and

Table 6: **Router Accuracy**. The vision router and action router accuracy in Bench2Drive-Base validation set.

Router	Accuracy($\%$) \uparrow
Vision Router	88.85
Action Router	65.40

4 assigns a distinct expert to each of the 44 scenarios in Bench2Drive. We observe that excessively increasing the number of experts (3,4) negatively affects performance due to the induced load imbalance among experts. Thus, an appropriate balance in the number of specialized experts is crucial for optimal driving performance.

5 Conclusion

In this paper, we introduced DriveMoE improving from our $Dirve-\pi_0$, a novel end-to-end autonomous driving framework that integrates Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architectures into both vision and action components. DriveMoE effectively addresses challenges inherent in existing VLA models by dynamically selecting relevant camera views through a Scene-Specialized Vision MoE, and by employing a Skill-Specialized Action MoE that activates expert modules tailored to specific driving behaviors. Extensive evaluations on the Bench2Drive benchmark demonstrate that DriveMoE achieves state-of-the-art performance, significantly enhancing computational efficiency and robustness to rare, safety-critical driving scenarios. The introduction of MoE into end-to-end driving opens promising avenues for future research, and we will publicly release our code and models to facilitate continued exploration and advancement in this domain.

References

- [1] Kashyap Chitta, Aditya Prakash, Bernhard Jaeger, Zehao Yu, Katrin Renz, and Andreas Geiger. Transfuser: Imitation with transformer-based sensor fusion for autonomous driving. *TPAMI*, 2023.
- [2] 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 *CVPR*, pages 17853–17862, 2023.
- [3] 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. ICCV, 2023.
- [4] Penghao Wu, Li Chen, Hongyang Li, Xiaosong Jia, Junchi Yan, and Yu Qiao. Policy pre-training for autonomous driving via self-supervised geometric modeling, 2023.
- [5] Yutao Zhu, Xiaosong Jia, Xinyu Yang, and Junchi Yan. Flatfusion: Delving into details of sparse transformer-based camera-lidar fusion for autonomous driving. arXiv preprint arXiv:2408.06832, 2024.
- [6] Hongyang Li, Chonghao Sima, Jifeng Dai, Wenhai Wang, Lewei Lu, Huijie Wang, Jia Zeng, Zhiqi Li, Jiazhi Yang, Hanming Deng, et al. Delving into the devils of bird's-eye-view perception: A review, evaluation and recipe. *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 46(4):2151–2170, 2023.
- [7] 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. In *NeurIPS*, 2022.
- [8] Bernhard Jaeger, Kashyap Chitta, and Andreas Geiger. Hidden biases of end-to-end driving models. In Proc. of the IEEE International Conf. on Computer Vision (ICCV), 2023.
- [9] Ziying Song, Caiyan Jia, Lin Liu, Hongyu Pan, Yongchang Zhang, Junming Wang, Xingyu Zhang, Shaoqing Xu, Lei Yang, and Yadan Luo. Don't shake the wheel: Momentum-aware planning in end-to-end autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.03125*, 2025.
- [10] Tao Wang, Cong Zhang, Xingguang Qu, Kun Li, Weiwei Liu, and Chang Huang. Diffad: A unified diffusion modeling approach for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2503.12170*, 2025.
- [11] Xiaosong Jia, Shaoshuai Shi, Zijun Chen, Li Jiang, Wenlong Liao, Tao He, and Junchi Yan. Amp: Autoregressive motion prediction revisited with next token prediction for autonomous driving. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2403.13331, 2024.
- [12] Junqi You, Xiaosong Jia, Zhiyuan Zhang, Yutao Zhu, and Junchi Yan. Bench2drive-r: Turning real world data into reactive closed-loop autonomous driving benchmark by generative model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.09647*, 2024.
- [13] Hao Shao, Yuxuan Hu, Letian Wang, Steven L. Waslander, Yu Liu, and Hongsheng Li. Lmdrive: Closed-loop end-to-end driving with large language models, 2023.
- [14] 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. *arXiv* preprint *arXiv*:2312.14150, 2023.
- [15] Yuan Chen, Zi han Ding, Ziqin Wang, Yan Wang, Lijun Zhang, and Si Liu. Asynchronous large language model enhanced planner for autonomous driving, 2024.
- [16] Jiang-Tian Zhai, Ze Feng, Jihao 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.
- [17] Wenzhao Zheng, Ruiqi Song, Xianda Guo, Chenming Zhang, and Long Chen. Genad: Generative end-to-end autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:* 2402.11502, 2024.
- [18] Xiaosong Jia, Liting Sun, Masayoshi Tomizuka, and Wei Zhan. Ide-net: Interactive driving event and pattern extraction from human data. *IEEE robotics and automation letters*, 6(2):3065–3072, 2021.
- [19] Han Lu, Xiaosong Jia, Yichen Xie, Wenlong Liao, Xiaokang Yang, and Junchi Yan. Activead: Planning-oriented active learning for end-to-end autonomous driving, 2024.
- [20] Wenhai Wang, Jiangwei Xie, ChuanYang Hu, Haoming Zou, Jianan Fan, Wenwen Tong, Yang Wen, Silei Wu, Hanming Deng, Zhiqi Li, et al. Drivemlm: Aligning multi-modal large language models with behavioral planning states for autonomous driving. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.09245*, 2023.

- [21] 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 *International conference on machine learning*, pages 19730–19742. PMLR, 2023.
- [22] Kevin Black, Noah Brown, Danny Driess, Adnan Esmail, Michael Equi, Chelsea Finn, Niccolo Fusai, Lachy Groom, Karol Hausman, Brian Ichter, et al. *pi*_0: A vision-language-action flow model for general robot control. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.24164*, 2024.
- [23] Physical Intelligence, Kevin Black, Noah Brown, James Darpinian, Karan Dhabalia, Danny Driess, Adnan Esmail, Michael Equi, Chelsea Finn, Niccolo Fusai, et al. pi_0.5: a vision-language-action model with open-world generalization. arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.16054, 2025.
- [24] Zhenjie Yang, Xiaosong Jia, Hongyang Li, and Junchi Yan. Llm4drive: A survey of large language models for autonomous driving. *ArXiv*, abs/2311.01043, 2023.
- [25] Katrin Renz, Long Chen, Ana-Maria Marcu, Jan Hünermann, Benoit Hanotte, Alice Karnsund, Jamie Shotton, Elahe Arani, and Oleg Sinavski. Carllava: Vision language models for camera-only closed-loop driving, 2024.
- [26] Zhangyang Qi, Ye Fang, Zeyi Sun, Xiaoyang Wu, Tong Wu, Jiaqi Wang, Dahua Lin, and Hengshuang Zhao. Gpt4point: A unified framework for point-language understanding and generation. In Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition, pages 26417–26427, 2024.
- [27] Xiaosong Jia, Liting Sun, Hang Zhao, Masayoshi Tomizuka, and Wei Zhan. Multi-agent trajectory prediction by combining egocentric and allocentric views. In *Conference on Robot Learning*, pages 1434–1443. PMLR, 2022.
- [28] Xiaosong Jia, Li Chen, Penghao Wu, Jia Zeng, Junchi Yan, Hongyang Li, and Yu Qiao. Towards capturing the temporal dynamics for trajectory prediction: a coarse-to-fine approach. In *CoRL*, pages 910–920. PMLR, 2023.
- [29] Xiaosong Jia, Penghao Wu, Li Chen, Yu Liu, Hongyang Li, and Junchi Yan. Hdgt: Heterogeneous driving graph transformer for multi-agent trajectory prediction via scene encoding. *IEEE transactions on pattern* analysis and machine intelligence, 45(11):13860–13875, 2023.
- [30] Weilin Cai, Juyong Jiang, Fan Wang, Jing Tang, Sunghun Kim, and Jiayi Huang. A survey on mixture of experts in large language models. *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, 2025.
- [31] Zhongwei Wan, Xin Wang, Che Liu, Samiul Alam, Yu Zheng, et al. Efficient large language models: A survey. arXiv preprint arXiv:2312.03863, 1, 2023.
- [32] Tong Zhu, Xiaoye Qu, Daize Dong, Jiacheng Ruan, Jingqi Tong, Conghui He, and Yu Cheng. Llama-moe: Building mixture-of-experts from llama with continual pre-training. In *Proceedings of the 2024 Conference on Empirical Methods in Natural Language Processing*, pages 15913–15923, 2024.
- [33] Jinze Bai, Shuai Bai, Yunfei Chu, Zeyu Cui, Kai Dang, Xiaodong Deng, Yang Fan, Wenbin Ge, Yu Han, Fei Huang, et al. Qwen technical report. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.16609*, 2023.
- [34] OpenAI, Josh Achiam, Steven Adler, Sandhini Agarwal, Lama Ahmad, Ilge Akkaya, Florencia Leoni Aleman, Diogo Almeida, Janko Altenschmidt, Sam Altman, Shyamal Anadkat, Red Avila, Igor Babuschkin, Suchir Balaji, Valerie Balcom, Paul Baltescu, Haiming Bao, Mohammad Bavarian, Jeff Belgum, Irwan Bello, Jake Berdine, Gabriel Bernadett-Shapiro, Christopher Berner, Lenny Bogdonoff, Oleg Boiko, Madelaine Boyd, Anna-Luisa Brakman, Greg Brockman, Tim Brooks, Miles Brundage, Kevin Button, Trevor Cai, Rosie Campbell, Andrew Cann, Brittany Carey, Chelsea Carlson, Rory Carmichael, Brooke Chan, Che Chang, Fotis Chantzis, Derek Chen, Sully Chen, Ruby Chen, Jason Chen, Mark Chen, Ben Chess, Chester Cho, Casey Chu, Hyung Won Chung, Dave Cummings, Jeremiah Currier, Yunxing Dai, Cory Decareaux, Thomas Degry, Noah Deutsch, Damien Deville, Arka Dhar, David Dohan, Steve Dowling, Sheila Dunning, Adrien Ecoffet, Atty Eleti, Tyna Eloundou, David Farhi, Liam Fedus, Niko Felix, Simón Posada Fishman, Juston Forte, Isabella Fulford, Leo Gao, Elie Georges, Christian Gibson, Vik Goel, Tarun Gogineni, Gabriel Goh, Rapha Gontijo-Lopes, Jonathan Gordon, Morgan Grafstein, Scott Gray, Ryan Greene, Joshua Gross, Shixiang Shane Gu, Yufei Guo, Chris Hallacy, Jesse Han, Jeff Harris, Yuchen He, Mike Heaton, Johannes Heidecke, Chris Hesse, Alan Hickey, Wade Hickey, Peter Hoeschele, Brandon Houghton, Kenny Hsu, Shengli Hu, Xin Hu, Joost Huizinga, Shantanu Jain, Shawn Jain, Joanne Jang, Angela Jiang, Roger Jiang, Haozhun Jin, Denny Jin, Shino Jomoto, Billie Jonn, Heewoo Jun, Tomer Kaftan, Łukasz Kaiser, Ali Kamali, Ingmar Kanitscheider, Nitish Shirish Keskar, Tabarak Khan, Logan Kilpatrick, Jong Wook Kim, Christina Kim, Yongjik Kim, Jan Hendrik Kirchner, Jamie Kiros, Matt Knight, Daniel Kokotajlo, Łukasz Kondraciuk, Andrew Kondrich, Aris Konstantinidis, Kyle Kosic, Gretchen Krueger, Vishal Kuo, Michael Lampe, Ikai Lan, Teddy Lee, Jan Leike, Jade Leung, Daniel Levy, Chak Ming

- Li, Rachel Lim, Molly Lin, Stephanie Lin, Mateusz Litwin, Theresa Lopez, Ryan Lowe, Patricia Lue, Anna Makanju, Kim Malfacini, Sam Manning, Todor Markov, Yaniv Markovski, Bianca Martin, Katie Mayer, Andrew Mayne, Bob McGrew, Scott Mayer McKinney, Christine McLeavey, Paul McMillan, Jake McNeil, David Medina, Aalok Mehta, Jacob Menick, Luke Metz, Andrey Mishchenko, Pamela Mishkin, Vinnie Monaco, Evan Morikawa, Daniel Mossing, Tong Mu, Mira Murati, Oleg Murk, David Mély, Ashvin Nair, Reiichiro Nakano, Rajeev Nayak, Arvind Neelakantan, Richard Ngo, Hyeonwoo Noh, Long Ouyang, Cullen O'Keefe, Jakub Pachocki, Alex Paino, Joe Palermo, Ashley Pantuliano, Giambattista Parascandolo, Joel Parish, Emy Parparita, Alex Passos, Mikhail Pavlov, Andrew Peng, Adam Perelman, Filipe de Avila Belbute Peres, Michael Petrov, Henrique Ponde de Oliveira Pinto, Michael, Pokorny, Michelle Pokrass, Vitchyr H. Pong, Tolly Powell, Alethea Power, Boris Power, Elizabeth Proehl, Raul Puri, Alec Radford, Jack Rae, Aditya Ramesh, Cameron Raymond, Francis Real, Kendra Rimbach, Carl Ross, Bob Rotsted, Henri Roussez, Nick Ryder, Mario Saltarelli, Ted Sanders, Shibani Santurkar, Girish Sastry, Heather Schmidt, David Schnurr, John Schulman, Daniel Selsam, Kyla Sheppard, Toki Sherbakov, Jessica Shieh, Sarah Shoker, Pranav Shyam, Szymon Sidor, Eric Sigler, Maddie Simens, Jordan Sitkin, Katarina Slama, Ian Sohl, Benjamin Sokolowsky, Yang Song, Natalie Staudacher, Felipe Petroski Such, Natalie Summers, Ilya Sutskever, Jie Tang, Nikolas Tezak, Madeleine B. Thompson, Phil Tillet, Amin Tootoonchian, Elizabeth Tseng, Preston Tuggle, Nick Turley, Jerry Tworek, Juan Felipe Cerón Uribe, Andrea Vallone, Arun Vijayvergiya, Chelsea Voss, Carroll Wainwright, Justin Jay Wang, Alvin Wang, Ben Wang, Jonathan Ward, Jason Wei, CJ Weinmann, Akila Welihinda, Peter Welinder, Jiayi Weng, Lilian Weng, Matt Wiethoff, Dave Willner, Clemens Winter, Samuel Wolrich, Hannah Wong, Lauren Workman, Sherwin Wu, Jeff Wu, Michael Wu, Kai Xiao, Tao Xu, Sarah Yoo, Kevin Yu, Qiming Yuan, Wojciech Zaremba, Rowan Zellers, Chong Zhang, Marvin Zhang, Shengjia Zhao, Tianhao Zheng, Juntang Zhuang, William Zhuk, and Barret Zoph. Gpt-4 technical report, 2024.
- [35] Yaron Lipman, Ricky TQ Chen, Heli Ben-Hamu, Maximilian Nickel, and Matt Le. Flow matching for generative modeling. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2210.02747, 2022.
- [36] Kairui Yang, Zihao Guo, Gengjie Lin, Haotian Dong, Zhao Huang, Yipeng Wu, Die Zuo, Jibin Peng, Ziyuan Zhong, Xin Wang, et al. Trajectory-Ilm: A language-based data generator for trajectory prediction in autonomous driving. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [37] Cunxin Fan, Xiaosong Jia, Yihang Sun, Yixiao Wang, Jianglan Wei, Ziyang Gong, Xiangyu Zhao, Masayoshi Tomizuka, Xue Yang, Junchi Yan, et al. Interleave-vla: Enhancing robot manipulation with interleaved image-text instructions. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2505.02152, 2025.
- [38] 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.
- [39] Moo Jin Kim, Karl Pertsch, Siddharth Karamcheti, Ted Xiao, Ashwin Balakrishna, Suraj Nair, Rafael Rafailov, Ethan Foster, Grace Lam, Pannag Sanketi, et al. Openvla: An open-source vision-language-action model. arXiv preprint arXiv:2406.09246, 2024.
- [40] Cheng Chi, Zhenjia Xu, Siyuan Feng, Eric Cousineau, Yilun Du, Benjamin Burchfiel, Russ Tedrake, and Shuran Song. Diffusion policy: Visuomotor policy learning via action diffusion. *The International Journal* of Robotics Research, page 02783649241273668, 2023.
- [41] Damai Dai, Chengqi Deng, Chenggang Zhao, RX Xu, Huazuo Gao, Deli Chen, Jiashi Li, Wangding Zeng, Xingkai Yu, Yu Wu, et al. Deepseekmoe: Towards ultimate expert specialization in mixture-of-experts language models. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.06066*, 2024.
- [42] Suning Huang, Zheyu Zhang, Tianhai Liang, Yihan Xu, Zhehao Kou, Chenhao Lu, Guowei Xu, Zhengrong Xue, and Huazhe Xu. Mentor: Mixture-of-experts network with task-oriented perturbation for visual reinforcement learning. *arXiv* preprint arXiv:2410.14972, 2024.
- [43] Lucas Beyer, Andreas Steiner, André Susano Pinto, Alexander Kolesnikov, Xiao Wang, Daniel Salz, Maxim Neumann, Ibrahim Alabdulmohsin, Michael Tschannen, Emanuele Bugliarello, et al. Paligemma: A versatile 3b vlm for transfer. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2407.07726*, 2024.
- [44] Albert Q Jiang, Alexandre Sablayrolles, Antoine Roux, Arthur Mensch, Blanche Savary, Chris Bamford, Devendra Singh Chaplot, Diego de las Casas, Emma Bou Hanna, Florian Bressand, et al. Mixtral of experts. arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.04088, 2024.
- [45] DeepSeek-AI. Deepseek-v3 technical report, 2024.
- [46] 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.

- [47] Xiaosong Jia, Zhenjie Yang, Qifeng Li, Zhiyuan Zhang, and Junchi Yan. Bench2drive: Towards multi-ability benchmarking of closed-loop end-to-end autonomous driving. In *NeurIPS 2024 Datasets and Benchmarks Track*, 2024.
- [48] 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.
- [49] Xiaosong Jia, Penghao Wu, Li Chen, Jiangwei Xie, Conghui He, Junchi Yan, and Hongyang Li. Think twice before driving: Towards scalable decoders for end-to-end autonomous driving. In *CVPR*, 2023.
- [50] Xiaosong Jia, Yulu Gao, Li Chen, Junchi Yan, Patrick Langechuan Liu, and Hongyang Li. Driveadapter: Breaking the coupling barrier of perception and planning in end-to-end autonomous driving. In ICCV, 2023.
- [51] Xiaosong Jia, Junqi You, Zhiyuan Zhang, and Junchi Yan. Drivetransformer: Unified transformer for scalable end-to-end autonomous driving. In *The Thirteenth International Conference on Learning Representations*, 2025.
- [52] Yingyan Li, Yuqi Wang, Yang Liu, Jiawei He, Lue Fan, and Zhaoxiang Zhang. End-to-end driving with online trajectory evaluation via bev world model. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2504.01941*, 2025.

A Annotation for Router

Vision Router: We developed a set of heuristic rules based on annotation information from the Bench2Drive dataset to identify special driving scenarios, enabling effective camera-view-level supervision. The Camera Annotation Rules are,

- **Intersection Turning:** When the ego-vehicle is required to turn at an intersection (i.e., is_in_junction is true and the current command is either "turn left" or "turn right"), we annotate the front-side camera view pointing toward the intended exit of the intersection.
- Lane Change: When a lane change is required, identified by conditions such as the current command being "change left" or "change right," an obstacle appearing within a certain distance ahead in the current lane, or the ego-vehicle not being in the target lane, the annotation depends on lane direction:
 - If the target lane is in the same direction as the ego-vehicle's current movement, we annotate the corresponding rear-side camera.
 - If the ego-vehicle must temporarily occupy the opposing lane, we annotate the corresponding front-side camera.
- **Highway Merging and Cut-in:** In scenarios such as highway merging or vehicle cut-ins (scenario labeled as "merging" or "cut-in"), we determine the merging location based on the ego-vehicle's lane position and distance to the junction, annotating the side camera facing the merging location.
- Yielding to Emergency Vehicles: If a high-speed emergency vehicle is present in the scenario, the ego-vehicle must yield, and we annotate the camera facing the direction of the approaching emergency vehicle.

Action Router: As shown in Table 7, Bench2Drive [47] divides 44 scenarios into 5 skills.

Skill Scenario Merging CrossingBicycleFlow, EnterActorFlow, HighwayExit, InterurbanActor-Flow, HighwayCutIn, InterurbanAdvancedActorFlow, MergerIntoSlowTrafficV2, MergeIntoSlowTraffic, NonSignalizedJunctionLeftTurn, NonSignalized-JunctionRightTurn, NonSignalizedJunctionLeftTurnEnterFlow, ParkingExit, LaneChange, SignalizedJunctionLeftTurn, SignalizedJunctionRightTurn, SignalizedJunctionLeftTurnEnterFlow Overtaking Accident, AccidentTwoWays, ConstructionObstacle, ConstructionObstacleTwoWays, HazardAtSideLaneTwoWays, HazardAtSideLane, ParkedObstacleTwoWays, ParkedObstacle, VehicleOpenDoorTwoWays BlockedIntersection, DynamicObjectCrossing, HardBreakRoute, OppositeVe-**Emergency Brake** hicleTakingPriority, OppositeVehicleRunningRedLight, ParkingCutIn, PedestrianCrossing, ParkingCrossingPedestrian, StaticCutIn, VehicleTurningRoute, VehicleTurningRoutePedestrian, ControlLoss Give Way InvadingTurn, YieldToEmergencyVehicle Traffic Sign EnterActorFlow, CrossingBicycleFlow, NonSignalizedJunctionLeftTurn, NonSignalizedJunctionRightTurn, NonSignalizedJunctionLeftTurnEnterFlow, OppositeVehicleTakingPriority, OppositeVehicleRunningRedLight, PedestrianCrossing, SignalizedJunctionLeftTurn, SignalizedJunctionRightTurn, SignalizedJunctionLeftTurnEnterFlow, TJunction, VanillaNonSignalizedTurn, VanillaSignalizedTurnEncounterGreenLight, VanillaSignalizedTurnEncounterRedLight, VanillaNonSignalizedTurnEncounterStopsign, VehicleTurningRoute, VehicleTurningRoutePedestrian

Table 7: Skill Set & Scenarios

B Limitations and Social Impact

Limitations: DriveMoE is the first end-to-end autonomous driving method to integrate Mixture-of-Experts (MoE) architectures within both vision and action components. Although DriveMoE

demonstrates superior performance in empirical evaluations, effectively achieving load balancing among experts remains a significant challenge as the number of experts grows. Future research directions may include exploring adaptive expert assignment and dynamic routing strategies, which could enhance computational efficiency and scalability, ultimately improving the generalization and industrial applicability of end-to-end autonomous driving solutions.

Social Impact: DriveMoE introduces an efficient and effective Mixture-of-Experts-based VLA framework for end-to-end autonomous driving, addressing inefficiencies in multi-view processing and diverse driving behaviors. DriveMoE has significant potential for practical application in industry due to its simplicity and efficiency.

C Visualization

See the supplementary material DriveMoE.mov file for details.