

GeoBridge: A Semantic-Anchored Multi-View Foundation Model Bridging Images and Text for Geo-Localization

Zixuan Song^{1,3}, Jing Zhang^{2,3†}, Di Wang^{2,3†}, Zidie Zhou¹, Wenbin Liu¹,
Haonan Guo^{2,3†}, En Wang^{1†}, Bo Du^{2,3†}

¹Jilin University, ²Wuhan University, ³Zhongguancun Academy

{songzx24, zhouzd24}@emails.jlu.edu.cn, {jingzhang.cv, d_wang, haonan.guo, dubo}@whu.edu.cn,
{liuwenbin, wangen}@jlu.edu.cn




Figure 1. Schematic diagram of GeoBridge. Cross-view geo-location aims to match images with geo-referenced coordinates based on images, while cross-modal geo-location aims to match images with geo-referenced coordinates based on language descriptions. Semantic anchors are derived from multi-view images, and the localization of drone images to street view panoramic images is newly defined.

Abstract

Cross-view geo-localization infers a location by retrieving geo-tagged reference images that visually correspond to a query image. However, the traditional satellite-centric paradigm limits robustness when high-resolution or up-to-date satellite imagery is unavailable. It further underexploits complementary cues across views (e.g., drone, satellite, and street) and modalities (e.g., language and image). To address these challenges, we propose GeoBridge, a foundation model that performs bidirectional matching across views and supports language-to-image retrieval. Going beyond traditional satellite-centric formulations, GeoBridge builds on a novel semantic-anchor mechanism that bridges multi-view features through textual descriptions for robust, flexible localization. In support of this task, we construct GeoLoc, the first large-scale, cross-modal, and

multi-view aligned dataset comprising over 50,000 pairs of drone, street-view panorama, and satellite images as well as their textual descriptions, collected from 36 countries, ensuring both geographic and semantic alignment. We performed broad evaluations across multiple tasks. Experiments confirm that GeoLoc pre-training markedly improves geo-location accuracy for GeoBridge while promoting cross-domain generalization and cross-modal knowledge transfer. The dataset, source code, and pretrained models were released at [GeoBridge](#).

1. Introduction

Cross-view geo-localization seeks to infer the geographic coordinates of a query image by retrieving visually similar

[†]Corresponding authors.

candidates from a database of geo-tagged reference images. By leveraging the rich spatial and semantic cues embedded in imagery, this paradigm enables high-precision localization without external annotations [8]. It underpins a wide range of applications, including autonomous driving [1, 11], unmanned aerial vehicle (UAV) navigation [5, 36], geographic information retrieval [39, 42], disaster monitoring [9, 17], and smart city development [26, 30]. In recent years, cross-view geo-localization has seen growing interest. By learning robust feature mappings across disparate viewpoints, existing methods have substantially improved cross-domain visual correspondence and laid the groundwork for multi-source perception.

Despite this progress, core challenges remain. Owing to the strong heterogeneity between viewpoints, many methods [31, 45, 50] adopt a satellite-centric anchoring strategy for matching and retrieval (see Fig. 1a). While effective in certain conditions, this strategy under-utilizes complementary cues across views and becomes fragile when high-resolution or up-to-date satellite imagery is unavailable. An integrated framework that supports bidirectional matching across multiple views can offer alternative localization pathways and markedly improve robustness and generalization under severe viewpoint changes or missing information. Consequently, developing a unified multi-view modeling framework (see Fig. 1b) is crucial for overcoming the limitations of the “satellite-centric” localization and fully exploiting cross-view complementarity.

Meanwhile, rapid advances in large language models (LLMs) open new opportunities for geo-localization [19, 25]. Language naturally encodes rich semantics and spatial knowledge, as people describe places with directions, landmarks, and topological relations. In practice, language-based rapid localization is especially valuable in low-bandwidth or sensor-constrained settings (*e.g.*, frontline rescue, remote areas, privacy-sensitive scenarios), where text is easier to capture and transmit than images. However, most existing studies [3, 40] overlook the complementarity between textual and vision, focusing on single-view description or retrieval. This often leads to semantic hallucinations and spatial inconsistencies. There is therefore a clear need for models that tightly couple linguistic signals with multi-view visual inputs, enhancing spatial understanding and cross-modal alignment so that locations can be inferred robustly from both descriptions and images.

To address these challenges, we propose GeoBridge, a semantic anchored, multi-view foundation model for geo-localization (Fig. 1). During training, GeoBridge distills drone, street-view, and satellite imagery into a unified, location- and view-aware textual description that serves as a cross-modal semantic bridge. This bridge simultaneously aligns text and each visual view to ensure cross-modal consistency, and aligns the visual views to reinforce cross-view

coherence. At inference, the text branch is optional: the model can directly match any pair of drone, street-view, or satellite images, while also supporting language-to-image localization when text is available. By explicitly bridging semantic and visual spaces across views, GeoBridge moves the field beyond reliance on satellite imagery alone. It systematically enables drone-street-view matching, a long-standing gap with clear value for UAV navigation, emergency response, and low-altitude logistics. It naturally extends to air-ground multi-sensor fusion for closed-loop localization, particularly when satellite data are missing or outdated and drone imagery provides precise coordinates.

Building on this task, we construct the GeoLoc, the first large-scale, fully aligned multi-view geo-localization dataset, comprising over 50k drone images from 36 countries, each paired with a co-located Google Street View panorama and a satellite image. Leveraging GeoLoc, we pre-train GeoBridge and obtain consistent improvements in both cross-view and cross-modal geo-localization.

In summary, our contributions are as follows:

- We introduce GeoBridge, a novel semantic-anchored, multi-view foundation model for geo-localization that performs bidirectional cross-view matching and supports cross-modal retrieval, moving beyond the traditional satellite-centric paradigm.
- We establish GeoLoc, the first large-scale, fully aligned multi-view geo-localization dataset, with more than 50,000 pairs of drone, panoramic, and satellite images from 36 countries. Each location includes a uniform textual description, and all samples are defined on geographically non-overlapping coordinates. This design supports conventional cross-view retrieval, while enabling a new and challenging drone-to-street view matching task
- Comprehensive experiments show that, compared to existing approaches, the proposed GeoBridge method substantially improves localization accuracy across cross-view and cross-modal geo-location tasks, while further strengthening cross-domain generalization and cross-modal knowledge transfer.

2. Related Work

2.1. Geo-Location Methods

Existing cross-view geo-location methods typically follow the retrieval and matching paradigm over geo-referenced images. Early studies concentrated on retrieving satellite images given street-view queries, with robustness improved by stronger cross-domain representations [43, 50]. As low-altitude applications have expanded, drone-satellite retrieval has become increasingly important for navigation and positioning [4, 20, 23]. However, most approaches remain satellite-centric, making them fragile when satellite data are missing or outdated. Moreover, drone-street-




Figure 2. Overall workflow. Left: multi-view data processing for the GeoLoc dataset. Right: the GeoBridge method. (a) Global distribution of multi-view image groups (darker shades indicate higher density). (b) Counts of drone images per ground-footprint bin as a function of covered area (m^2).

view matching is still underexplored, limiting use cases such as disaster response, low-altitude logistics verification, and infrastructure inspection. In parallel, visual–language localization has begun to exhibit language-driven reasoning, but it typically relies on single-view scene descriptions, which easily lead to semantic illusions and spatial inconsistencies [3, 43]. We address these gaps by shifting from a satellite-centric design to a closed-loop multi-view setting (drone–street–satellite). We further introduce a bidirectional drone–street-view matching task and incorporate position-aware semantic anchors to constrain visual representations, resulting in a more complete geo-localization process and unified cross-modal, cross-view alignment.

2.2. Geo-Location Datasets

As geo-localization research has progressed, a series of public datasets has taken shape. Early datasets such as CVUSA [34] and CVACT [21] established the standard “ground-to-satellite” setting. Later, VIGOR [48] raised the bar through dense urban sampling, panoramic views, and nearest-neighbor hard negative. Tian *et al.* [29] provided an early cross-view corpus linking street-view to bird’s-eye view imagery. For low-altitude scenarios, University-1652 [45] and SUES-200 [47] formalized “drone-to-satellite” protocols and explicitly introduce multi-height and multi-source conditions. DenseUAV [5] further contributed dense features for benchmarking drone navigation and localization. Despite these advances, existing datasets largely adhere to a two-view, satellite-centric paradigm, offering no alternative retrieval path when satellite imagery is unavailable, outdated, or latency-sensitive. In addition, their limited geographic breadth and urban morphological diversity constrain model adaptation and generalization in complex settings. To address these gaps, we in-

troduce the GeoLoc dataset, comprising strictly co-located drone–panorama–satellite triplets at the location level, totaling over 50,000 samples across 36 countries. While preserving standard geographic labels, GeoLoc employs multi-resolution and multi-condition acquisitions, enabling evaluation across diverse scales and conditions. This design lays a solid foundation for cross-view location research and applications, accelerates air–ground multi-sensor fusion, and enables multi-view closed-loop evaluation.

3. Method

3.1. Problem Formulation

We consider three imagery perspectives—drone (d), street-view panoramas (p), and satellite (s). Our goal is large-scale cross-view retrieval for geo-localization: given a query image from any perspective $u \in \{d, p, s\}$, retrieve co-located references from any other coordinate-bearing view $v \neq u$ and use their coordinates as the location estimate. Departing from the conventional satellite-centric paradigm, we emphasize closed-loop retrieval, where a query from any perspective can be localized via any other coordinate-bearing perspective. Moreover, it supports cross-modal retrieval initiated by a single-view textual description, enabling accurate location across diverse application scenarios.

3.2. GeoBridge

We introduce a contrastive framework GeoBridge for accurate geo-localization, which is shown in Fig. 2. It uses a unified multi-view textual description (t) as the semantic anchor to align representations across three visual perspectives: drone, street-view panoramas, and satellite. The text serves as a semantic bridge, binding view-specific visual embeddings to view-invariant scene semantics. During

Table 1. Comparison of cross-view geo-localization datasets. *Platform*: A = Aerial, D = Drone, G = Street, P = Panorama, S = Satellite. *GPS-tag*: geo-coordinates provided. *Altitudes*: multiple drone heights.

Dataset	Year	Platform	Region(s)	Size(k)	GPS-tag	Altitudes
CVUSA [34]	2015	P+S	Nationwide (USA)	44.4 + 44.4	✓	—
Tian <i>et al.</i> [29]	2017	G+A	Multi-city (USA)	35.4 + 35.4	✓	—
CVACT [21]	2019	P+S	City-scale (Canberra, Australia)	128.3 + 128.3	✓	—
VIGOR [48]	2021	P+A	Multi-city (USA)	105.2 + 90.6	✓	—
University-1652 [45]	2020	D+G+S	Campus/City, multi-source	37.9 + 2.6 + 0.7	✗	✗
DenseUAV [5]	2023	D+S	City-scale (Zhejiang, China)	9.1 + 31.7	✗	✓
SUES-200 [47]	2023	D+S	Multi-city (Region)	80 + 1.6	✗	✓
GeoLoc (ours)	2025	D+P+S	Global (36 countries)	52.7 + 52.7 + 52.7	✓	✓ [‡]

[‡] GeoLoc comprises UAV imagery collected under diverse conditions, with flight altitude determined primarily by the desired ground coverage; five coverage scales are provided: 80×80 , 100×100 , 120×120 , 150×150 , and 180×180 (m²).

the training process, language supervision aligns each visual branch to a common embedding space. At inference, the model works text-free for image \leftrightarrow image retrieval and naturally supports text \rightarrow image search.

GeoBridge employs three view-specific visual encoders E_d , E_p , E_s , and a shared text encoder E_t . All encoders are instantiated from CLIP. Each geographic instance comprises three images captured from different perspectives. For each instance, we craft a single concise paragraph that serves as the cross-view semantic bridge. This description emphasizes stable, viewpoint-agnostic cues (*e.g.*, roads, intersections, bridges, buildings, parks, rivers, landmarks) and their relations, while omitting transient elements and viewpoint-specific phrasing.

During the training process, each example is a quadruple $(x^{(d)}, x^{(p)}, x^{(s)}, t)$. These inputs are encoded by E_d , E_p , E_s , and E_t to produce global embeddings $z_d, z_p, z_s, z_t \in \mathbb{R}^D$, $\|z\|_2 = 1$. For text, the collate function applies dynamic padding and length control via truncation: sequences exceeding the token budget T_{max} are right-truncated, and shorter ones are padded, producing batched tensors suitable for the text encoder. No additional reformatting is required, all embeddings are mapped by their encoders into a shared retrieval space.

For each view pair $(u, v) \in \{(d, p), (p, s), (s, d)\}$ and each text-to-view pair (t, v) with $v \in \{d, p, s\}$, we compute cosine similarities using cosine similarity between embeddings. A learnable temperature coefficient τ scales these similarities to control the sharpness. Considering a candidate set of size B , the score matrices are computed as:

$$S_{u,v} = z_u(z_v)^\top / \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times B}, \quad (1)$$

$$S_{t,v} = z_t(z_v)^\top / \tau \in \mathbb{R}^{B \times B}. \quad (2)$$

Let y_i denote the column index of correct match for query i within the candidate set. We optimize an InfoNCE

objective with a temperature-scaled softmax:

$$\mathcal{L}(S) = -\frac{1}{B} \sum_{i=1}^B \left[\log \frac{\exp(S(i, y_i))}{\sum_{j=1}^B \exp(S(i, j))} \right], \quad (3)$$

where i indexes queries and j indexes gallery items. Cross-view alignment is enforced by averaging the losses over the three image-to-image pairs:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{img}} = \frac{1}{3} [\mathcal{L}(S_{d,s}) + \mathcal{L}(S_{s,p}) + \mathcal{L}(S_{p,d})]. \quad (4)$$

Language-to-image alignment provides the semantic bridge, the calculation method is as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{text}} = \frac{1}{3} \sum_{v \in \{d,p,s\}} \mathcal{L}(S_{t,v}). \quad (5)$$

The total objective aggregates the image-to-image and language-to-image terms with equal weights:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{total}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{img}} + \mathcal{L}_{\text{text}}. \quad (6)$$

This joint objective draws true image-image and text-image pairs together while pushing impostors apart within a shared embedding space. At inference, we encode any image or text query and retrieve by nearest neighbors in that space. For language-only queries, to avoid exposing sensitive details, the description is restricted to a single scene and retrieval is limited to other views within the same location class. In practice, the language term regularizes the view-specific embeddings toward semantic anchors, improving cross-view generalization even when no text is provided at test time. Because all modalities are co-embedded under the language-bridged objective, pure image retrieval benefits substantially compared with image-only training.

4. GeoLoc Construction and Preprocessing

To support our GeoBridge foundation model, we curate GeoLoc, a cross-view dataset with precise geographic and semantic alignment. The process, as shown in Fig. 2, comprises four stages: (1) drone images acquisition and seed generation, (2) cross-source harvesting with inverse cropping, (3) duplicate suppression and cleanup, and (4) multi-view alignment. We detail the operations below.

Drone images acquisition and seed generation. We collect globally sourced drone images with geo-referencing metadata (projection and coordinates). For each large drone image, we slide a fixed 80×80 -pixel window to estimate the ground footprint, recording the pixel center (x, y) together with the latitude and longitude (φ, λ) . These centers serve as seeds for cross-source retrieval and alignment.

Cross-source harvesting with inverse cropping. For each seed, we query Google Street View (GSV) to obtain candidate panoramic coordinates and retain only those whose locations fall within the coverage of drone image. Using the GSV location as an anchor, we inverse crop the original drone image according to the ground footprint to obtain a co-located drone subimage. To improve robustness to scale and viewpoint, we generate multi-scale crops whose approximate ground footprints are 80×80 , 100×100 , 120×120 , 150×150 , and 180×180 m², with matched output resolutions, yielding multi-scale drone subimages.

Duplicate suppression and cleanup. We perform an initial screening of the drone subimages. If two drone subimages have more than 50% ground-coverage overlap, or if their latitude and longitude are identical, they are treated as duplicates and only one is retained. Subimages in which more than 1% of the area consists entirely of black or entirely of white pixels (*e.g.*, sensor-strip edges) are discarded.

To further remove low-quality content, we employ a cascade of three lightweight quality gates:

- **BH-Gate (Blur-Haze):** measures global texture using Laplacian variance and pixel variance, eliminating blurry sub-images such as those with motion blur, distant scenes under heavy fog, and heavily compressed textures.
- **C-Gate (Global Contrast):** eliminates images with weak edges based on global contrast, filtering drone subimages that are slightly out of focus, over- or under-exposed.
- **UN-Gate (Uniformity-Noise):** uses entropy as the primary criterion, combined with variance range and ratios of saturated pixels, to distinguish uniform but informationless pseudo-textures from noise patterns, eliminating images lacking strong features such as large expanses of blue sky, open water, deserts, and grasslands.

In practice, this cascade yields a pool of structurally rich, high-contrast, and semantically useful crops.

Tri-view alignment. For each quality-screened drone subimage, we used its seed coordinates to retrieve Google Street View panoramas. We then cropped Google Satel-

Table 2. Comparison on the University-1652 [45] dataset; best results are in bold, second-best are underlined.

Method	Drone to Satellite		Satellite to Drone	
	R@1	AP	R@1	AP
SAIG-D [51]	78.85	81.62	86.45	78.48
DWDR [32]	86.41	88.41	91.30	86.02
MBF [46]	89.05	90.61	92.15	84.45
MCCG [27]	89.64	91.32	94.30	89.39
SeGCN [22]	89.18	90.89	94.29	89.65
CCR [7]	92.54	93.78	95.15	91.80
MEAN [2]	93.55	94.53	96.01	92.08
DAC [37]	<u>94.67</u>	<u>95.50</u>	<u>96.43</u>	<u>93.79</u>
Sample4Geo [6]	92.65	93.81	95.14	91.39
GeoBridge (ours)	95.82	97.77	97.14	95.05

Table 3. Comparison on the SUES-200 [47] dataset; best results are in bold, second-best are underlined.

Drone to Satellite								
Method	150m		200m		250m		300m	
	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP
MBF [46]	85.62	88.21	87.43	90.02	90.65	92.53	92.12	93.63
MCCG [27]	82.22	85.47	89.38	91.41	93.82	95.04	95.07	96.20
CCR [7]	87.08	89.55	93.57	94.90	95.42	96.28	96.82	97.39
SeGCN [22]	90.80	92.32	91.93	93.41	92.53	93.90	93.33	94.61
CGSI [28]	95.95	<u>96.80</u>	<u>97.72</u>	<u>98.15</u>	<u>97.60</u>	<u>98.03</u>	97.83	<u>98.23</u>
GeoBridge (ours)	<u>95.68</u>	97.49	97.88	98.89	97.85	98.84	<u>97.63</u>	98.62
Satellite to Drone								
Method	150m		200m		250m		300m	
	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP
MBF [46]	88.75	84.74	91.25	89.95	93.75	90.65	96.25	91.60
MCCG [27]	93.75	89.72	93.75	92.21	96.25	96.14	98.75	96.64
CCR [7]	92.50	88.54	97.50	95.22	97.50	97.10	97.50	97.49
SeGCN [22]	93.75	92.45	95.00	93.65	96.25	94.39	97.50	94.55
CGSI [28]	<u>97.50</u>	<u>96.22</u>	<u>98.75</u>	<u>97.62</u>	<u>98.75</u>	98.01	98.75	<u>97.92</u>
GeoBridge (ours)	98.99	97.98	98.98	97.98	99.01	<u>97.98</u>	98.75	97.95

lite tiles to align with the co-located region covered by the subimage. This produces yields 52,679 geographically co-located drone-street panorama-satellite triplets spanning 36 countries. We designate 5,351 triplets from non-overlapping cities as a held-out evaluation set. Dataset statistics are summarized in Table 1. Compared with existing datasets, GeoLoc provides broader scene diversity and greater scale, establishing a stronger, more reliable foundation for advancing current research. Further details are provided in the supplementary materials.

5. Experiment

5.1. Experimental Setup

Implementation Details. We adopt the publicly released CLIP-L/14 backbone [24] and use ChatGPT-4o [15] to produce concise textual descriptions for images. Models are trained end-to-end with Adam (base learning rate 1×10^{-5})

Table 4. Results on the CVUSA [34] and VIGOR [48] datasets; best results are shown in bold, second-best are underlined.

Method	CVUSA		VIGOR-Same		VIGOR-Cross	
	R@1	R@1%	R@1	Hit	R@1	Hit
TransGeo [49]	94.08	99.77	61.48	73.09	18.99	21.21
FRGeo [44]	97.06	99.85	71.26	82.41	37.54	40.66
SAIG-D [51]	96.08	99.86	65.23	74.11	33.05	36.71
VimGeo [14]	96.19	99.52	55.24	57.43	19.31	20.72
Sample4Geo [6]	98.68	<u>99.87</u>	77.86	89.82	61.70	69.87
Panorama-BEV [41]	98.71	99.70	<u>82.18</u>	-	<u>72.19</u>	-
AuxGeo [38]	<u>98.80</u>	99.85	80.34	93.78	63.94	<u>76.25</u>
GeoBridge (ours)	99.14	99.98	85.82	<u>92.24</u>	73.87	81.51

Table 5. Comparison on the GeoLoc dataset (D for Drone, P for Street-View Panorama, and S for Satellite). The best results are shown in bold, the second-best results are underlined.

Method	D2S		S2D		D2P		P2D	
	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP
Sample4Geo [6]	<u>27.27</u>	<u>39.69</u>	<u>28.70</u>	<u>40.32</u>	<u>29.51</u>	<u>31.17</u>	15.56	<u>29.68</u>
MEAN [2]	21.52	27.08	21.38	26.97	13.08	17.76	1.87	7.74
DAC [37]	6.19	8.41	13.91	15.16	13.74	15.16	<u>19.34</u>	23.01
CAMP [35]	19.60	24.39	14.88	18.75	11.31	12.34	11.46	19.16
MCCG [27]	12.23	13.22	14.73	17.70	15.51	19.11	12.90	15.75
CCR [7]	12.91	15.56	13.89	16.04	10.91	12.34	10.81	14.77
GeoBridge (ours)	45.05	49.05	44.81	48.76	41.22	43.54	41.15	43.41

Method	P2S		S2P		D2P		P2D	
	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP	R@1	AP
panorama-BEV [41]	10.21	12.70	18.70	20.56	16.32	17.11	16.34	18.36
Sample4Geo [6]	16.82	13.64	<u>18.87</u>	17.78	<u>29.51</u>	<u>31.17</u>	15.56	<u>29.68</u>
AuxGeo [38]	13.74	17.09	15.61	<u>22.96</u>	9.34	12.69	14.70	17.40
FRGeo [44]	<u>17.13</u>	18.70	14.35	19.69	13.69	19.34	14.38	15.00
HC-Net [33]	14.17	15.05	11.79	12.03	12.83	13.31	<u>18.79</u>	18.93
TransGeo [49]	11.21	<u>23.77</u>	13.74	13.43	18.70	23.41	17.48	23.26
GeoBridge (ours)	38.87	42.10	39.20	41.96	41.22	43.54	41.15	43.41

under a cosine decay schedule, using a batch size of 32 for 200 epochs on eight NVIDIA A800 GPUs. Input images are resized to 224×224 . During pre-training, we optimize all parameters end-to-end; for evaluation on public benchmarks, we fine-tune only the last three layers.

Evaluation Metrics. To evaluate geo-location performance across viewpoints and modalities, we use Top-k recall ($R@k$) and mean average precision (AP) as primary metrics. $R@k$ measures whether the ground-truth reference appears within the top k retrieved results, while AP summarizes overall ranking quality across the full list. We also include the task-specific metrics as needed. For street-satellite-view retrieval, we additionally report $R@1\%$ and Hit metrics. Here, $R@1\%$ indicates whether the ground-truth sample lies within the top 1% of the gallery images, and Hit indicates that the first retrieved reference image covers the query image (including the ground-truth). For cross-modal geo-location task, we complement $R@k$ with the location recall $L@k$, which refers to the proportion of retrieved results where the distance to the actual location is below a specified threshold. When geographic coordinates are unavailable, we report $R@k$ only.

Table 6. Comparison results on the RSIEval [13] dataset. The best results are shown in bold, the second-best results are underlined.

Method	R@1	R@5	R@10
ViLT [16]	2.00	16.00	38.00
BLIP-B [18]	0.00	1.00	2.00
EVA2-CLIP-B/16 [10]	15.00	38.00	54.00
EVA2-CLIP-L/14 [10]	19.00	43.00	55.00
CLIP-L/14 [24]	<u>25.00</u>	<u>60.00</u>	<u>74.00</u>
CLIP-B/16 [24]	18.00	51.00	61.00
CrossText2Loc[43]	12.00	36.00	67.00
GeoBridge (ours)	29.00	71.00	88.00

5.2. Cross-View Geo-Location Performance

For the drone-satellite matching task, we systematically evaluate GeoBridge on University-1652 [45] and SUES-200 [47] datasets, with results summarized in Table 2, 3. It is straightforward to verify that GeoBridge consistently surpasses existing methods in both robustness and overall accuracy. Among the baselines, DAC achieves strong results which adopts contrastive learning, however, its reliance on direct image-to-image alignment limits its ability to model cross-view semantic consistency and resolve spatial ambiguities. In contrast, GeoBridge introduces a semantic-anchor mechanism to align multi-view imagery within a shared semantic space, yielding simultaneous gains in $R@1$ and AP for bidirectional retrieval on University-1652 and improving overall ranking quality. These improvements are likewise evident on SUES-200 dataset. GeoBridge maintains a leading advantage across retrieval directions and altitude settings. Moreover, because the anchor operates mainly during training, incurring no additional online overhead. Taken together, these results demonstrate that GeoBridge substantially improves the accuracy and generalization of cross-view geo-location.

For street-to-satellite cross-view localization, we evaluate GeoBridge on CVUSA [34] and VIGOR [48] datasets using the standard settings of each dataset. The results summarized in Table 4. We report $R@1$, $R@1\%$, and Hit metrics. It is obvious that GeoBridge delivers clear gains on both datasets. On CVUSA, it achieves higher $R@1$ and $R@1\%$, reflecting stronger top-1 accuracy and overall recall. On VIGOR, we present results on both the Same and Cross splits. Although GeoBridge ranks second in Hit under the Same setting, its other metrics substantially exceed the second-best method. This indicates better cross-scene generalization and overall ranking quality. Overall, GeoBridge improves accuracy and robustness in street-to-satellite retrieval and demonstrates superior generalization under stringent cross-domain conditions.

To further validate the effectiveness of our proposed




Figure 3. Qualitative image retrieval results on the GeoLoc dataset. The red boxes indicate the true-matched images.

cross-view geo-location method, we conducted a comprehensive comparison against representative baselines on traditional view pairs (Drone-to-Satellite, Satellite-to-Drone, Street-to-Satellite, and Satellite-to-Street) on the GeoLoc dataset. We also extend these baselines to the newly introduced cross-view geo-location tasks (Drone-to-Street, and Street-to-Drone). Results are summarized in Table 5. While several prior methods excel on their preferred view pairings, their performance typically degrades when transferred to the new cross-view settings, reflecting difficulty in exploiting the multi-scale, semantically rich characteristics of GeoLoc. In contrast, GeoBridge delivers substantial and well-balanced gains across all directions, demonstrating robust retrieval under both scale and viewpoint shifts. Crucially, the improvements manifest not only in $R@1$ but also in consistently higher AP , indicating better ordering of both easy and hard inference throughout the candidate list. These results suggest that rather than relying on the inductive bias of any single view, GeoBridge effectively bridges aerial and ground-level semantics by unifying multi-view representations within a shared semantic space via semantic anchors, thereby yielding higher-quality global rankings and stronger cross-domain generalization.

Qualitative retrieval results on the GeoLoc dataset are shown in Fig. 3, covering three tasks: Street-to-Satellite, Satellite-to-Drone, and Drone-to-Street. For each query image, we display the top-3 retrieved images and highlight the ground-truth match in red. As illustrated, GeoBridge reliably retrieves the most similar candidates from a large gallery by accurately leveraging salient landmarks and structural cues. Benefiting from semantic anchors, GeoBridge maintains strong discriminative power and visual consistency across scales and resolutions, enabling robust selection of true matches from candidate lists populated with visually similar distractors. Overall, systematic experiments on GeoLoc confirm GeoBridge’s robustness and




Figure 4. Qualitative results for cross-modal geo-location. Using street view descriptions to match drone perspectives, the top three results are reported; red boxes indicate correct matches.

scalability across tasks, retrieval directions, and modalities, yielding a more accurate and broadly generalizable solution for cross-view geo-location. Additional visualizations are provided in the supplementary material.

5.3. Cross-Modal Geo-Location Performance

To further assess the effectiveness of GeoBridge for cross-modal retrieval, we evaluate it on the publicly available remote sensing annotation dataset RSIEval [13], and the results are shown in Table 6. This dataset contains 100 image-text pairs. Under identical evaluation settings, GeoBridge achieves the best performance.

We further validate GeoBridge on cross-modal geo-

Table 7. Comparison of multi-modal geo-location methods on GeoLoc dataset. Descriptions base on the single view; comparative results include two additional viewpoints. Best results are in bold; second-best are underlined.

Method	Street Description				Satellite Description				Drone Description			
	Satellite Image		Drone Image		Street Image		Drone Image		Street Image		Satellite Image	
	R@1	L@50	R@1	L@50	R@1	L@50	R@1	L@50	R@1	L@50	R@1	L@50
ViLT [16]	1.40	6.41	1.05	5.72	6.3	13.21	1.05	5.96	6.20	13.49	1.16	5.76
BLIP-B [18]	0.84	4.6	0.78	5.42	0.93	5.06	0.73	5.59	0.82	5.14	0.95	5.64
EVA2-CLIP-B/16 [10]	1.01	5.28	0.92	4.30	1.21	5.74	0.90	4.26	1.18	5.63	0.99	5.23
EVA2-CLIP-L/14 [10]	1.16	4.97	1.83	6.95	1.23	5.57	1.23	5.42	1.21	5.55	1.18	4.88
CLIP-L/14 [24]	<u>2.71</u>	7.81	2.02	7.96	12.20	20.71	1.89	7.21	9.18	17.38	<u>2.88</u>	7.83
CLIP-B/16 [24]	1.91	7.49	1.79	<u>8.04</u>	6.91	14.93	1.85	7.36	6.54	13.32	1.72	6.99
CrossText2Loc[43]	2.62	<u>7.76</u>	<u>2.15</u>	7.68	<u>12.91</u>	<u>22.37</u>	<u>2.35</u>	<u>8.04</u>	<u>9.25</u>	<u>17.83</u>	2.11	7.4
GeoBridge(ours)	5.68	7.61	6.10	8.76	21.58	25.53	2.99	8.85	20.96	24.73	2.93	<u>7.66</u>

location employing the GeoLoc dataset. Text descriptions from single-view images are used to perform cross-view retrieval (e.g., retrieving satellite or drone images from street-view text), with comparative results against representative methods reported in Table 7. Overall, GeoBridge delivers state-of-the-art performance across most text-to-image retrieval directions. CrossText2Loc, which relies on descriptions synthesized from single-view imagery, is competitive in long-text geo-location. However, its accuracy diminishes on GeoLoc which features multi-scale scenes, complex terrain and cross-view interference. Under these conditions, precisely aligning key landmarks and spatial relationships is inherently difficult, leading to degraded performance on cross-modal retrieval tasks. By contrast, GeoBridge maps heterogeneous viewpoints into a shared semantic space via multi-view semantic anchors, thereby bridging multi-view images and textual descriptions. This design strengthens cross-scale and cross-view alignment of landmarks and structural cues, yielding more consistent ranking metrics (e.g., $R@1$, $L@50$) and maintaining a robust lead across diverse viewpoint combinations and retrieval directions.

Figure 4 shows the visualization results of retrieving drone images using short descriptions generated from street view panoramas. GeoBridge accurately captures key semantics in the descriptions (such as landmark function words, building morphology, and salient structures) and locates the corresponding regions in candidate drone images, significantly improving the ranking of correct samples. Therefore, under the cross-modal setting of single-view text query and cross-view image retrieval, GeoBridge combines accuracy and generalization, providing a more efficient and interpretable solution for cross-view geo-location. More details will be provided in the supplementary materials.

5.4. Ablation Experiment

To assess the effectiveness of semantic anchors, we conduct an ablation study on alignment strategies. The $R@1$

Table 8. Ablation $R@1$ results for alignment strategies on GeoLoc dataset. (D for Drone, P for Street-View Panorama, and S for Satellite.) The best results are shown in bold, the second-best results are underlined.

Method	D2S	S2D	P2S	S2P	D2P	P2D
Image-only	38.20	34.63	6.43	6.95	7.16	4.90
Text-only	<u>42.83</u>	<u>42.83</u>	<u>35.40</u>	<u>36.40</u>	<u>39.00</u>	<u>38.63</u>
GeoBridge	45.06	44.81	38.87	39.21	41.23	41.15

results are reported in Table 8. Image-only denotes image-image alignment, Text-only denotes text-image alignment, and GeoBridge fuses both while unifying multi-view representations in a shared semantic space via semantic anchors. Across all retrieval tasks, the fusion strategy attains the highest $R@1$. With image-only alignment, robust correspondences between street panoramas and markedly different viewpoints (e.g., satellite and drone) are difficult to establish, yielding the weakest overall performance. In contrast, text-only alignment benefits from descriptions that capture key semantic cues across all three views, and thus ranks second overall. These results demonstrate that using location representations from multi-views as semantic anchors substantially narrows the semantic gap between ground and overhead views, improving the accuracy and robustness of cross-view retrieval.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we introduce GeoBridge, a foundation model for cross-view and cross-modal geo-location that performs bidirectional matching across views and supports language to image retrieval. Central to GeoBridge is a semantic anchor mechanism that aligns multi-view features through textual descriptions, enabling robust and flexible localization beyond traditional satellite centric formulations. To support this setting, we construct GeoLoc, a large

scale, fully aligned dataset with more than 50,000 pairs of drone, street view panorama, and satellite images and their textual descriptions, ensuring both geographic and semantic alignment. Across a broad suite of evaluations, pre-training on GeoLoc markedly improves the localization accuracy of GeoBridge and promotes stronger cross domain generalization and cross modal knowledge transfer.

References

- [1] Liang Chen, Fu Zheng, Xiaopeng Gong, and Xinyuan Jiang. Gns high-precision augmentation for autonomous vehicles: Requirements, solution, and technical challenges. *Remote Sensing*, 15(6):1623, 2023. 2
- [2] Zhongwei Chen, Zhao-Xu Yang, and Hai-Jun Rong. Multilevel embedding and alignment network with consistency and invariance learning for cross-view geo-localization. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 63: 1–15, 2025. 5, 6
- [3] Meng Chu, Zhedong Zheng, Wei Ji, Tingyu Wang, and Tat-Seng Chua. Towards natural language-guided drones: Geotext-1652 benchmark with spatial relation matching. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 213–231. Springer, 2024. 2, 3
- [4] Ming Dai, Jianhong Hu, Jiedong Zhuang, and Enhui Zheng. A transformer-based feature segmentation and region alignment method for uav-view geo-localization. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(7): 4376–4389, 2021. 2
- [5] Ming Dai, Enhui Zheng, Zhenhua Feng, Lei Qi, Jiedong Zhuang, and Wankou Yang. Vision-based uav self-positioning in low-altitude urban environments. *IEEE Transactions on Image Processing*, 33:493–508, 2023. 2, 3, 4
- [6] Fabian Deuser, Konrad Habel, and Norbert Oswald. Sample4geo: Hard negative sampling for cross-view geolocalisation. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 16847–16856, 2023. 5, 6
- [7] Haolin Du, Jingfei He, and Yuanqing Zhao. Ccr: A counterfactual causal reasoning-based method for cross-view geolocalization. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 34(11):11630–11643, 2024. 5, 6
- [8] Abhilash Durgam, Sidike Paheding, Vikas Dhiman, and Vijay Devabhaktuni. Cross-view geo-localization: a survey. *IEEE Access*, 2024. 2
- [9] Jiwei Fan, Ruitao Lu, Xiaogang Yang, Fan Gao, Qingge Li, and Jun Zeng. Design and implementation of intelligent eod system based on six-rotor uav. *Drones*, 5(4):146, 2021. 2
- [10] Yuxin Fang, Quan Sun, Xinggang Wang, Tiejun Huang, Xinlong Wang, and Yue Cao. Eva-02: A visual representation for neon genesis. *Image and Vision Computing*, 149:105171, 2024. 6, 8
- [11] Florian Fervers, Sebastian Bullinger, Christoph Bodensteiner, Michael Arens, and Rainer Stiefelhausen. Uncertainty-aware vision-based metric cross-view geolocalization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 21621–21631, 2023. 2
- [12] Timnit Gebru, Jamie Morgenstern, Briana Vecchione, Jennifer Wortman Vaughan, Hanna Wallach, Hal Daumé Iii, and Kate Crawford. Datasheets for datasets. *Communications of the ACM*, 64(12):86–92, 2021. 20
- [13] Yuan Hu, Jianlong Yuan, Congcong Wen, Xiaonan Lu, Yu Liu, and Xiang Li. Rsgpt: A remote sensing vision language model and benchmark. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 224:272–286, 2025. 6, 7
- [14] Jinglin Huang, Maoqiang Wu, Peichun Li, Wen Wu, and Rong Yu. Vimgeo: Efficient cross-view geo-localization with vision mamba architecture. In *Proceedings of the Thirty-Fourth International Joint Conference on Artificial Intelligence, IJCAI-25*, pages 1188–1196. International Joint Conferences on Artificial Intelligence Organization, 2025. Main Track. 6
- [15] Aaron Hurst, Adam Lerer, Adam P Goucher, Adam Perelman, Aditya Ramesh, Aidan Clark, AJ Ostrow, Akila Welihinda, Alan Hayes, Alec Radford, et al. Gpt-4o system card. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2410.21276*, 2024. 5
- [16] Wonjae Kim, Bokyoung Son, and Ildoo Kim. Vilt: Vision-and-language transformer without convolution or region supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 5583–5594. PMLR, 2021. 6, 8
- [17] Hao Li, Fabian Deuser, Wenping Yin, Xuanshu Luo, Paul Walther, Gengchen Mai, Wei Huang, and Martin Werner. Cross-view geolocalization and disaster mapping with street-view and vhr satellite imagery: A case study of hurricane ian. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 220:841–854, 2025. 2
- [18] Junnan Li, Dongxu Li, Caiming Xiong, and Steven Hoi. Blip: Bootstrapping language-image pre-training for unified vision-language understanding and generation. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 12888–12900. PMLR, 2022. 6, 8
- [19] Ling Li, Yu Ye, Bingchuan Jiang, and Wei Zeng. Georeasoner: Geo-localization with reasoning in street views using a large vision-language model. In *Forty-first International Conference on Machine Learning*, 2024. 2
- [20] Qingge Li, Xiaogang Yang, Jiwei Fan, Ruitao Lu, Bin Tang, Siyu Wang, and Shuang Su. Geoformer: An effective transformer-based siamese network for uav geolocalization. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 17:9470–9491, 2024. 2
- [21] Liu Liu and Hongdong Li. Lending orientation to neural networks for cross-view geo-localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 5624–5633, 2019. 3, 4
- [22] Xiangzeng Liu, Ziyao Wang, Yue Wu, and Qiguang Miao. Segen: A semantic-aware graph convolutional network for uav geo-localization. *IEEE Journal of Selected Topics in Applied Earth Observations and Remote Sensing*, 17:6055–6066, 2024. 5
- [23] Hongxiang Lv, Hai Zhu, Runzhe Zhu, Fei Wu, Chunyuan Wang, Meiyu Cai, and Kaiyu Zhang. Direction-guided multiscale feature fusion network for geo-localization. *IEEE*

- Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 62:1–13, 2024. 2
- [24] Alec Radford, Jong Wook Kim, Chris Hallacy, Aditya Ramesh, Gabriel Goh, Sandhini Agarwal, Girish Sastry, Amanda Askell, Pamela Mishkin, Jack Clark, et al. Learning transferable visual models from natural language supervision. In *International conference on machine learning*, pages 8748–8763. PmLR, 2021. 5, 6, 8
- [25] Stephen Roller, Michael Speriosu, Sarat Rallapalli, Benjamin Wing, and Jason Baldridge. Supervised text-based geolocation using language models on an adaptive grid. In *Proceedings of the 2012 joint conference on empirical methods in natural language processing and computational natural language learning*, pages 1500–1510, 2012. 2
- [26] Paul-Edouard Sarlin, Daniel DeTone, Tsun-Yi Yang, Armen Avetisyan, Julian Straub, Tomasz Malisiewicz, Samuel Rota Buló, Richard Newcombe, Peter Kotschieder, and Vasileios Balntas. Orienternet: Visual localization in 2d public maps with neural matching. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 21632–21642, 2023. 2
- [27] Tianrui Shen, Yingmei Wei, Lai Kang, Shanshan Wan, and Yee-Hong Yang. Mccg: A convnext-based multiple-classifier method for cross-view geo-localization. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 34(3):1456–1468, 2024. 5, 6
- [28] Jian Sun, Junlang Huang, Xinyu Jiang, Yimin Zhou, and Chi-Man VONG. Cgsi: Context-guided and uav’s status informed multimodal framework for generalizable cross-view geo-localization. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, pages 1–1, 2025. 5
- [29] Yicong Tian, Chen Chen, and Mubarak Shah. Cross-view image matching for geo-localization in urban environments. In *Proceedings of the IEEE Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3608–3616, 2017. 3, 4
- [30] Akihiko Torii, Relja Arandjelovic, Josef Sivic, Masatoshi Okutomi, and Tomas Pajdla. 24/7 place recognition by view synthesis. In *Proceedings of the IEEE conference on computer vision and pattern recognition*, pages 1808–1817, 2015. 2
- [31] Tingyu Wang, Zhedong Zheng, Chenggang Yan, Jiyong Zhang, Yaoqi Sun, Bolun Zheng, and Yi Yang. Each part matters: Local patterns facilitate cross-view geo-localization. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 32(2):867–879, 2021. 2
- [32] Tingyu Wang, Zhedong Zheng, Zunjie Zhu, Yaoqi Sun, Chenggang Yan, and Yi Yang. Learning cross-view geo-localization embeddings via dynamic weighted decorrelation regularization. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2024. 5
- [33] Xiaolong Wang, Runsen Xu, Zhuofan Cui, Zeyu Wan, and Yu Zhang. Fine-grained cross-view geo-localization using a correlation-aware homography estimator. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 36:5301–5319, 2023. 6
- [34] Scott Workman, Richard Souvenir, and Nathan Jacobs. Wide-area image geolocation with aerial reference imagery. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 3961–3969, 2015. 3, 4, 6
- [35] Qiong Wu, Yi Wan, Zhi Zheng, Yongjun Zhang, Guangshuai Wang, and Zhenyang Zhao. Camp: A cross-view geo-localization method using contrastive attributes mining and position-aware partitioning. *IEEE Transactions on Geoscience and Remote Sensing*, 2024. 6
- [36] Rouwan Wu, Jiacheng Deng, Mingyu Mou, Xingyi He, Maojun Zhang, Yu Liu, and Shen Yan. Uav-geoloc: A large-vocabulary dataset and geometry-transformed method for uav geo-localization. *IEEE Robotics and Automation Letters*, 2025. 2
- [37] Panwang Xia, Yi Wan, Zhi Zheng, Yongjun Zhang, and Jiwei Deng. Enhancing cross-view geo-localization with domain alignment and scene consistency. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 34(12):13271–13281, 2024. 5, 6
- [38] Panwang Xia, Lei Yu, Yi Wan, Qiong Wu, Peiqi Chen, Liheng Zhong, Yongxiang Yao, Dong Wei, Xinyi Liu, Lixiang Ru, Yingying Zhang, Jiangwei Lao, Jingdong Chen, Ming Yang, and Yongjun Zhang. Cross-view geo-localization with panoramic street-view and vhr satellite imagery in decentrality settings. *ISPRS Journal of Photogrammetry and Remote Sensing*, 227:1–11, 2025. 6
- [39] Zimin Xia, Yujiao Shi, Hongdong Li, and Julian FP Kooij. Adapting fine-grained cross-view localization to areas without fine ground truth. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 397–415. Springer, 2024. 2
- [40] Junyan Ye, Honglin Lin, Leyan Ou, Dairong Chen, Zihao Wang, Qi Zhu, Conghui He, and Weijia Li. Where am i? cross-view geo-localization with natural language descriptions. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2412.17007*, 2024. 2
- [41] Junyan Ye, Zhutao Lv, Weijia Li, Jinhua Yu, Haote Yang, Huaping Zhong, and Conghui He. Cross-view image geo-localization with panorama-bev co-retrieval network. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 74–90. Springer, 2024. 6
- [42] Junyan Ye, Zhutao Lv, Weijia Li, Jinhua Yu, Haote Yang, Huaping Zhong, and Conghui He. Cross-view image geo-localization with panorama-bev co-retrieval network. In *European Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 74–90. Springer, 2024. 2
- [43] Junyan Ye, Honglin Lin, Leyan Ou, Dairong Chen, Zihao Wang, Qi Zhu, Conghui He, and Weijia Li. Where am i? cross-view geo-localization with natural language descriptions. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF International Conference on Computer Vision*, pages 5890–5900, 2025. 2, 3, 6, 8
- [44] Qingwang Zhang and Yingying Zhu. Aligning geometric spatial layout in cross-view geo-localization via feature recombination. In *Proceedings of the AAAI Conference on Artificial Intelligence*, pages 7251–7259, 2024. 6
- [45] Zhedong Zheng, Yunchao Wei, and Yi Yang. University-1652: A multi-view multi-source benchmark for drone-based geo-localization. In *Proceedings of the 28th ACM international conference on Multimedia*, pages 1395–1403, 2020. 2, 3, 4, 5, 6
- [46] Runzhe Zhu, Mingze Yang, Ling Yin, Fei Wu, and Yuncheng Yang. Uav’s status is worth considering: A fusion represen-

- tations matching method for geo-localization. *Sensors*, 23(2):720, 2023. [5](#)
- [47] Runzhe Zhu, Ling Yin, Mingze Yang, Fei Wu, Yuncheng Yang, and Wenbo Hu. Sues-200: A multi-height multi-scene cross-view image benchmark across drone and satellite. *IEEE Transactions on Circuits and Systems for Video Technology*, 33(9):4825–4839, 2023. [3](#), [4](#), [5](#), [6](#)
- [48] Sijie Zhu, Taojiannan Yang, and Chen Chen. Vigor: Cross-view image geo-localization beyond one-to-one retrieval. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 3640–3649, 2021. [3](#), [4](#), [6](#)
- [49] Sijie Zhu, Mubarak Shah, and Chen Chen. Transgeo: Transformer is all you need for cross-view image geo-localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1162–1171, 2022. [6](#)
- [50] Sijie Zhu, Mubarak Shah, and Chen Chen. Transgeo: Transformer is all you need for cross-view image geo-localization. In *Proceedings of the IEEE/CVF Conference on Computer Vision and Pattern Recognition*, pages 1162–1171, 2022. [2](#)
- [51] Yingying Zhu, Hongji Yang, Yuxin Lu, and Qiang Huang. Simple, effective and general: A new backbone for cross-view image geo-localization. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.01572*, 2023. [5](#), [6](#)

GeoBridge: A Semantic-Anchored Multi-View Foundation Model Bridging Images and Text for Geo-Localization

Supplementary Material

7. Overview

This appendix supplements the proposed GeoBridge and our datasets GeoLoc with details excluded from the main paper due to space constraints. The appendix is organized as follows:

- Section 8. Construction and preprocessing details of the GeoLoc dataset.
- Section 9. Implementation details of instruction formatting for constructing the descriptions in the GeoLoc dataset.
- Section 10. Additional examples of model inference results.
- Section 11. Datasheets for GeoLoc dataset.
- Section 12. Discussion on limitations and societal impact.

8. GeoLoc Construction and Processing

After acquiring the GeoLoc data, we performed systematic, multi-stage cleaning and quality control. Compared with the description in the main paper, this section provides more fine-grained operational details. It is worth noting that each step of the pipeline is manually monitored, and the overall process requires approximately 150 hours of human effort.

8.1. Drone Data Acquisition and Cropping

The original drone imagery used in GeoLoc is illustrated in Fig. 5. It covers a wide range of scene types, including regions with prominent structural features (Fig. 5a, 5b), locations with highly similar ground patterns (Fig. 5c, 5d), and samples captured from different flight altitudes, resulting in varying perspectives (Fig. 5e, 5f). It also contains large-scale natural environments with limited discriminative structure, such as extensive water bodies, forests, grasslands, and deserts (Fig. 5g, 5h, 5i, 5j, 5k). In addition, due to diverse acquisition conditions, some images exhibit degraded quality issues such as low illumination (Fig. 5l).

In the initial stage of data construction, we manually inspected all original drone images and removed those with poor visual quality or dominated by large natural areas lacking clearly identifiable ground features (*e.g.*, Fig. 5g, 5h, 5i, 5j, 5k, and 5l). This manual screening process required approximately 20 hours in total.

To obtain drone-view images with precise geometric structure and strict correspondence to street-view imagery, we applied a two-stage cropping and alignment procedure to the original drone data.

First, since the availability of street-view imagery at spe-

cific geographic coordinates was unknown a priori, we applied a sliding-window cropping operation over the original drone imagery using a preset 80×80 pixel window. For each cropped region, we queried the Google Street View Static to obtain candidate street-view coordinates. For locations where a valid street-view image was found, the associated coordinates were then used as the center for a reverse cropping operation on the original drone image. In this way, the street-view viewpoint is approximately centered within the corresponding drone sub-image, yielding more precise spatial alignment between the two views.

Furthermore, to enhance scene diversity and scale robustness, we did not crop patches based on a fixed image resolution. Instead, we defined cropping windows according to different ground coverage areas. This design enables us to capture multi-scale perspectives at varying resolutions and flight altitudes while maintaining comparability in geographic scale, which is beneficial for learning more generalizable cross-view representations. We obtain drone subimages covering ground areas of approximately 80×80 , 100×100 , 120×120 , 150×150 , and 180×180 (m^2).

8.2. Basic validity screening

After obtaining the initial cropped drone sub-images, we first perform deduplication based on spatial coverage. For any pair of sub-images whose ground coverage overlaps by more than 50%, we retain only one representative sample and discard the others as duplicates.

We then conduct basic quality checks to ensure that each image contains a sufficient number of valid pixels and adequate spatial resolution. Subimages that are too small to clearly depict meaningful ground structures are removed. In addition, some images may contain large pure-black or pure-white regions due to sensor failures, rendering errors, or cropping at the image borders. For each image, we compute the proportion of pure-black and pure-white pixels. Images in which the proportion of pure-black or pure-white pixels exceeds 1% are considered invalid and discarded. Representative examples of such removed samples are shown in Fig. 6.

8.3. Multi-Metric Image Quality Filtering

We applied a three-stage quality filtering process to further refine the drone imagery.

8.3.1. BH-Gate: Filtering Blur and Low-Texture Images

This module primarily targets blurry images (*e.g.*, motion blur, defocus), low-texture scenes caused by haze, cloud



(a)



(b)



(c)



(d)



(e)



(f)




(g)




(h)



(i)



(j)



(k)



(l)

Figure 5. Examples of original drone images.




Figure 6. Examples of basic validity screening.




Figure 7. Examples of blurry drone subimages.

cover, or uneven illumination, as well as images with severe compression artifacts that lead to substantial detail loss. BH-Gate combines global pixel variance with an image sharpness measure to detect the absence of meaningful

spatial detail. As illustrated in Fig.7, when an image exhibits extremely low texture variation, it is deemed to contain insufficient visual information and is directly discarded.



Figure 8. Examples of low global-contrast drone subimages

8.3.2. C-Gate: Filtering Images with Insufficient Global Contrast

Although some images pass the first-stage screening, they can still exhibit slight blurring or brightness drift. C-Gate targets such cases by identifying images with an insufficient grayscale dynamic range. These are typically overexposed or underexposed images whose grayscale values are highly concentrated, as well as mildly blurred images that retain only weak structural cues. To this end, we analyze the dispersion of the grayscale distribution (*i.e.*, global contrast). As illustrated in Fig. 8, such images usually fail to provide informative ground textures and contribute little to cross-view and cross-modal learning, and are therefore further filtered out.

8.3.3. UN-Gate: Filtering Uniform-Texture and Noisy Pseudo-Texture Images

After the first two stages of filtering, there may still remain visually near-uniform yet structurally uninformative scenes

(*e.g.*, large expanses of water, sky, grassland, desert, or snow), as well as sensor-induced pseudo-textures or noise patterns (including white noise, mosaic artifacts, stripe noise, and random texture blocks). To handle these challenging cases, UN-Gate further combines information entropy, variance range, and the proportion of saturated pixels to assess the information content of each image, distinguish pseudo-texture noise, and detect images that are close to white-noise patterns. Based on these metrics, we determine whether an image falls into the categories of no effective semantics or noisy pseudo-texture. As shown in Fig.9, images that exhibit highly uniform textures or textures dominated by noise are discarded at this stage.

8.4. Tri-view Alignment

After completing the filtering of all drone sub-images, we download the corresponding street-view panoramic images and satellite images using the candidate coordinates associated with the retained drone samples.




Figure 9. Examples of uniform-texture and noisy pseudo-texture drone subimages

When downloading street-view images, we query the Google Street View Static API at the specified panorama location, with the camera heading fixed to face north, the pitch set to eye level, and the field of view set to 120°. Under this configuration, the API returns a street-view image rendered from the high-resolution panorama at that location, facing a consistent direction. For satellite imagery, we retrieve Google Maps satellite images covering the geographic extent corresponding to the latitude–longitude bounds of each retained drone subimage. Examples of the resulting tri-view correspondence (drone, street-view, and satellite) are shown in Fig. 10.

9. Instruction Details for the GeoLoc Dataset

To construct high-quality cross-view semantic descriptions for GeoLoc, we design a unified instruction protocol that guides a large language model to generate consistent, viewpoint-agnostic textual annotations for each tri-view set

(drone, satellite, and street-view images). The goal of these instructions is to ensure that the resulting descriptions serve as reliable semantic anchors, capturing stable structural cues shared across views while avoiding viewpoint-specific bias. The specific details are shown in Fig. 11, 12, 13, and 14.

The instruction set is crafted to ensure that the generated descriptions meet the following requirements:

- Cross-view semantic consistency: the text must focus on structural elements that remain stable across drone, satellite, and street-view perspectives. These include roads, intersections, bridges, buildings, parks, rivers, land parcels, plazas, and distinctive landmarks. The model is instructed to ignore features that vary across viewpoints.
- Explicit modeling of spatial structures and relationships: the description must convey meaningful spatial relations (e.g., a bridge spans the river, the road curves around the building) while avoiding explicit directional terminol-












Figure 10. Examples of aligned tri-view images.

I will provide three images of the same location: a drone view, a satellite view, and a street view. Please generate a unified text description that:

- Focuses on fine-grained and salient features such as roads, intersections, bridges, buildings, parks, rivers, and landmarks, ensuring consistency across the three images.
- Clearly describes spatial structures and relationships (e.g., The road crosses the river, and tall buildings stand beside it).
- Avoids mentioning viewing angles or using directional terms (east, west, north, south, left, right, front, back, center).
- Highlights unique features that distinguish the location, directly naming landmarks or significant structures when present.
- Keeps the description concise and precise, omitting unnecessary modifiers.
- Excludes transient or random elements such as vehicles, graffiti, or people.





Figure 11. Tri-View instruction protocol for generating unified semantic descriptions. The blue text box denotes the instruction prompt; the first column presents the street-view panorama, the second column shows the drone-view image, the third column displays the satellite image, and the fourth column contains the generated textual description.

I will provide one image of the **drone** view. Please generate a unified text description that:

- Focuses on fine-grained and salient features such as roads, intersections, bridges, buildings, parks, rivers, and landmarks, ensuring consistency across the three images.
- Clearly describes spatial structures and relationships (e.g., The road crosses the river, and tall buildings stand beside it).
- Avoids mentioning viewing angles or using directional terms (east, west, north, south, left, right, front, back, center).
- Highlights unique features that distinguish the location, directly naming landmarks or significant structures when present.
- Keeps the description concise and precise, omitting unnecessary modifiers.
- Excludes transient or random elements such as vehicles, graffiti, or people.



The image depicts a paved area with a parking lot bordered by a red-brick building featuring white accents and a flat roof. The building is accompanied by landscaped greenery, including shrubs and small trees. In the background, another structure with a similar red-brick design is visible, separated by the parking lot. Light poles are evenly distributed across the lot, and the surrounding area includes additional trees and open spaces, suggesting a suburban or institutional setting. The layout is organized, with clear pathways and defined boundaries between structures and greenery.

The image depicts an urban area characterized by intersecting paved roads bordered by sidewalks. A small grassy area with scattered trees is visible near the intersection. A red-brick building with rectangular windows stands adjacent to the road, accompanied by a smaller, light-colored structure. Utility poles with overhead power lines run along the streets, adding to the infrastructure. In the background, additional buildings and open spaces are visible, contributing to the area's mixed-use layout.

The image depicts a wide, paved road with two distinct lanes, bordered by grassy areas on both sides. Adjacent to one side of the road, there is a large parking lot connected to a rectangular building with a flat roof, likely a commercial or institutional structure. The surrounding area features scattered trees and open green spaces, with no prominent landmarks or water bodies visible. The scene is framed by a cloudy sky, adding depth to the setting.

Figure 12. Cross-modal geo-location drone image description instructions, with blue text boxes indicating the prompts.

I will provide a single **street-view panorama** image. Please generate a unified text description that:

- Focuses on fine-grained and salient features such as roads, intersections, bridges, buildings, parks, rivers, and landmarks, ensuring consistency across the three images.
- Clearly describes spatial structures and relationships (e.g., The road crosses the river, and tall buildings stand beside it).
- Avoids mentioning viewing angles or using directional terms (east, west, north, south, left, right, front, back, center).
- Highlights unique features that distinguish the location, directly naming landmarks or significant structures when present.
- Keeps the description concise and precise, omitting unnecessary modifiers.
- Excludes transient or random elements such as vehicles, graffiti, or people.



The scene features a paved road intersecting with another road, marked by clear white lane markings. On one side, a multi-story residential building with balconies and a beige facade is enclosed by a white metal fence. Adjacent to it, a gray building with angular windows and a covered entrance houses a small storefront or service area, with bicycles parked nearby. Overhead, utility wires are suspended between poles, adding to the urban infrastructure. The area is surrounded by additional low-rise buildings and sparse greenery, including a small tree near the intersection.



The scene features an urban street flanked by modern and industrial-style structures. On one side, a contemporary building with large glass panels and concrete framing houses commercial spaces. Adjacent to it, a multi-story industrial building is partially obscured by stacked shipping containers painted in various colors, some adorned with graffiti. The street is divided by painted lane markings, with protective orange barriers placed near the containers. The area reflects a mix of functional and modern architectural styles, with the containers adding a distinctive industrial character.



The image depicts an urban street scene with two prominent buildings. On one side, a modern structure features a curved facade with horizontal louvers panels and glass accents, accompanied by landscaped greenery and a paved walkway. Adjacent to it, a beige multi-story building with rounded edges and rows of rectangular windows dominates the view. A row of bicycles is parked near its base, and the road runs between the two buildings, bordered by sidewalks and small trees. Additional tall buildings are visible in the background, contributing to the dense cityscape.

Figure 13. Cross-modal geo-location street-panorama image description instructions, with blue text boxes indicating the prompts.

I will provide one image of the **satellite** view. Please generate a unified text description that:


- Focuses on fine-grained and salient features such as roads, intersections, bridges, buildings, parks, rivers, and landmarks, ensuring consistency across the three images.
- Clearly describes spatial structures and relationships (e.g., The road crosses the river, and tall buildings stand beside it).
- Avoids mentioning viewing angles or using directional terms (east, west, north, south, left, right, front, back, center).
- Highlights unique features that distinguish the location, directly naming landmarks or significant structures when present.
- Keeps the description concise and precise, omitting unnecessary modifiers.
- Excludes transient or random elements such as vehicles, graffiti, or people.



The image depicts a cluster of rectangular buildings with flat roofs arranged in a geometric pattern, surrounded by green spaces and mature trees. Pathways connect the buildings and traverse the grassy areas, creating a network of walkways. The structures are interspersed with landscaped areas, including small patches of open grass and shrubs. The layout suggests a planned complex, possibly residential or institutional, with the buildings positioned close to one another.



The image depicts a large rectangular building with a flat roof, featuring skylights and ventilation structures. Adjacent to the building, a curved road runs alongside a grassy area with scattered trees and vegetation. A smaller structure, resembling a house, is situated near the road within the greenery. The surroundings include open spaces and patches of forested land, creating a contrast between the built environment and natural elements.



The image depicts a large rectangular building with a red-tiled roof and a central courtyard. The structure features evenly spaced triangular dormers along the roof and a circular tower at one corner. The courtyard includes a circular fountain surrounded by sparse vegetation and paved open space. Dense greenery surrounds the building, with trees forming a natural boundary along one side. A pathway runs adjacent to the building, connecting it to the surrounding area.

Figure 14. Cross-modal geo-location satellite image description instructions, with blue text boxes indicating the prompts.

ogy. Instead of using directional words such as north, south, east, west, left, right, front, or back, the text should describe structural relationships directly and unambiguously.

- Fine-grained but concise representation: each description is restricted to a single, compact paragraph. The instruction emphasizes the inclusion of salient structural cues without unnecessary adjectives, narrative elements, or scene-level speculation.
- Landmark naming when applicable: when a location contains identifiable landmarks such as notable buildings, bridges, squares, or monuments, the model is instructed to explicitly name them. This enhances the distinctiveness of the descriptions and improves performance in cross-view retrieval and localization.
- Exclusion of transient or unstable elements: the instruction explicitly prohibits mentioning transient objects (e.g., people, cars, bicycles, animals), weather, temporary decorations, graffiti, or other viewpoint-dependent artifacts. This ensures that descriptions remain stable over time and across viewpoints.

The above instructions also apply when generating descriptions for cross-modal geo-location.

10. Visualizations of Model Inference Results

We visualize the cross-modal geo-location results. In this setting, we generate a textual description from a single viewpoint and use it to retrieve images from the other viewpoints. Fig. 15, 16, and 17 show the retrieval results for satellite images, drone images, and street-view images using descriptions derived from street-view, satellite, and drone images, respectively. These examples demonstrate that GeoBridge effectively captures key semantic cues in the text descriptions and accurately localizes the corresponding regions in candidate images from other views, substantially improving the ranking of the correct matches.

11. Datasheets

In this section, we document essential details about the proposed datasets and benchmarks following the CVPR Dataset and Benchmark guidelines and the template provided by Gebru *et al.* [12].

11.1. Motivation

The questions in this section are primarily intended to encourage dataset creators to clearly articulate their reasons for creating the dataset and to promote transparency about funding interests. The latter may be particularly relevant for datasets created for research purposes.

1. “For what purpose was the dataset created?”
A: The GeoLoc dataset is created to address limitations of existing cross-view geo-localization benchmarks and

to enable robust multi-view and cross-modal localization under realistic conditions. Previous datasets largely follow a two-view, satellite-centric paradigm, with limited geographic diversity, restricted multi-height and multi-condition coverage, and no complementary drone or street-view perspectives. In contrast, GeoLoc establishes a multi-view, multi-modal foundation that supports robust localization when satellite imagery is missing or outdated, facilitates air-ground multi-sensor fusion and closed-loop evaluation, and improves model generalization across diverse geographic regions and urban morphologies.

2. “Who created the dataset (e.g., which team, research group) and on behalf of which entity?”

A: The dataset was created by the following authors:

- Anonymous authors

3. “Who funded the creation of the dataset?”

A: The dataset creation was funded by the affiliations of the authors involved in this work.

11.2. Composition

Most of the questions in this section are intended to provide dataset consumers with the information they need to make informed decisions about using the dataset for their chosen tasks. Some of the questions are designed to elicit information about compliance with the EU’s General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR) or comparable regulations in other jurisdictions. Questions that apply only to datasets that relate to people are grouped together at the end of the section. We recommend taking a broad interpretation of whether a dataset relates to people. For example, any dataset containing text that was written by people relates to people.




1. “What do the instances that comprise our datasets represent (e.g., documents, photos, people, countries)?”

A: Each instance in the GeoLoc dataset corresponds to a single real-world geographic location and consists of four aligned modalities: a low-altitude drone image, a ground-level street-view panorama, an overhead satellite image, and a unified textual description. All four share the same GPS coordinate, with the three visual views offering complementary spatial structure and the text providing a concise, viewpoint-agnostic semantic summary of the scene.




2. “How many instances are there in total (of each type, if appropriate)?”

A: The GeoLoc dataset contains a total of 52,679 aligned instances, each consisting of a drone-view image, a street-view panoramic image, a satellite-view image, and a unified textual description. Among these, 47,328 instances are used for training and validation, and 5,351 instances from non-overlapping cities form the held-out evaluation set.



3. “Does the dataset contain all possible instances or is it



The scene features a paved parking lot bordered by a multi-story hotel building with a curved facade and numerous windows. Adjacent to the hotel, there is a landscaped area with trees and shrubs. In the background, modern office buildings with glass and brick exteriors are visible, separated by green spaces and pathways. The area appears organized and urban, with a mix of commercial and landscaped elements. The sky is clear, enhancing the visibility of the structures.



The image depicts a modern multi-story office building with a curved glass facade and brick accents. The structure features a prominent entrance with a canopy and steps leading to the main doors. Adjacent to the building is a large parking lot with organized rows of parked vehicles. A small landscaped area with ornamental grasses and a rectangular structure is situated near the parking lot. In the background, another multi-level parking garage is visible, along with a mix of greenery and distant structures. The scene is characterized by its clean, corporate environment and well-maintained surroundings.



The scene features a paved road intersecting near modern office buildings with glass facades and curved architectural designs. A landscaped area with trimmed grass, small plants, and young trees is situated adjacent to the road. The buildings are symmetrical in style, with multiple stories and large windows, creating a corporate or commercial environment. The area is open and well-maintained, with no visible obstructions or additional structures dominating the view.

Figure 15. Qualitative results for cross-modal geo-location. Using street view descriptions to match satellite perspectives, the top three results are reported; red boxes indicate correct matches.

a sample (not necessarily random) of instances from a larger set?”

A: Yes. The GeoLoc dataset is a curated subset drawn from a much larger pool of globally available imagery sources—such as those accessible through Google’s APIs. From this broad collection, we retain only locations where drone, street-view, and satellite imagery can all be reliably obtained and strictly aligned.

4. *“Is there a label or target associated with each instance?”*

A: Yes. Each instance is associated with a unified textual description that serves as a semantic label, and all three visual views share the same GPS coordinate, which pro-

vides the geographic target for geo-localization tasks.



5. *“Is any information missing from individual instances?”*

A: No, each individual instance is complete.


6. *“Are relationships between individual instances made explicit (e.g., users’ movie ratings, social network links)?”*

A: Yes. The primary relationship made explicit is the shared geographic coordinate: all instances located at different positions are independent, while each instance internally links its four modalities through strict spatial co-location.

7. *“Are there recommended data splits (e.g., training, development/validation, testing)?”*



The image showcases a circular building with a distinct rooftop design featuring multiple square structures arranged in a grid pattern. Surrounding the building, there is a mix of paved areas, green spaces, and trees. Adjacent to the building, a parking lot contains several parked vehicles, bordered by a grassy area with small structures and pathways. Residential buildings with uniform rooftops line a road that runs alongside the circular structure. A section of the area includes a park-like setting with geometric landscaping and shaded seating areas created by triangular canopies. The layout emphasizes a blend of urban and recreational spaces.



The image depicts a structured urban area with a central building featuring a distinct multi-angled roof surrounded by parking lots filled with vehicles. Adjacent to the building, a landscaped area with trees and small pathways is visible. To one side, there is a larger industrial structure with a white roof and an open yard containing containers and organized materials. The scene is bordered by a road with multiple lanes, separated from the buildings by a line of trees. The spatial arrangement highlights a mix of commercial, industrial, and landscaped elements.



The image depicts a developed area with a cluster of buildings featuring pitched roofs, some of which are equipped with large solar panel installations. Surrounding the buildings are paved parking lots with marked spaces and a few scattered trees providing greenery. A network of narrow roads connects the buildings and parking areas, forming intersections within the complex. Adjacent to the buildings, a fenced residential area is visible, containing gardens, small structures, and open green spaces. Dense tree coverage borders parts of the scene, creating a natural boundary between the residential and developed areas.

Figure 16. Qualitative results for cross-modal geo-location. Using satellite view descriptions to match drone perspectives, the top three results are reported; red boxes indicate correct matches.

- A:** Yes. We recommend using the provided split, where 47,328 instances are allocated for training and validation, and 5,351 instances from non-overlapping cities are reserved as a held-out test set to ensure geographic separation and fair evaluation.
8. *“Is the dataset self-contained, or does it link to or otherwise rely on external resources (e.g., websites, tweets, other datasets)?”*
- A:** The dataset draws on external sources for the street-view and satellite imagery, specifically Google Street View and Google Maps Satellite.
9. *“Does the dataset contain data that might be considered confidential (e.g., data that is protected by legal privilege or by doctor–patient confidentiality, data that includes the content of individuals’ non-public communications)?”*
- A:** No. The dataset contains only drone imagery, Google Street View panoramas, Google Maps satellite imagery, and generated textual descriptions. It does not include personal or confidential information. The Google Street View and Google Satellite images used in the dataset are subject to Google’s terms of service and licensing policies, and their use follows the corresponding Google usage agreements.
10. *“Does the dataset contain data that, if viewed directly, might be offensive, insulting, threatening, or might otherwise cause anxiety?”*
- A:** No, GeoLoc does not contain any data with negative information.



The image depicts a modern building complex with a white rooftop, surrounded by landscaped areas featuring paved walkways, small trees, and patches of grass. Adjacent to the building, a row of bicycles is neatly arranged along the edge of the structure. The building exhibits a geometric design with sections of colorful facades in yellow and blue tones. Curved pathways weave through the landscaped grounds, connecting open spaces with planted areas. The scene is characterized by organized spatial planning and a mix of built and natural elements.



The image shows a large rectangular building with a flat, light-colored roof featuring multiple mechanical units and ventilation systems arranged in structured patterns. A curved glass canopy extends from one side of the building, connecting to a paved area below. Adjacent to the building is a landscaped strip with sparse vegetation and evenly spaced light poles. A paved road runs parallel to the building, marked with yellow dashed lines and bordered by sidewalks. The structure exhibits a clean, industrial design with distinct geometric elements.



The image depicts a residential area characterized by two elongated buildings with dark roofs and multiple windows. Between the buildings, there is a paved area used for parking, bordered by trees and small landscaped spaces. Adjacent to the buildings, a green lawn with neatly trimmed hedges and scattered shrubs is visible. A road runs along the top edge of the image, intersecting with the parking area and lined with additional greenery. The spatial arrangement highlights the organized layout of the residential structures and their integration with open spaces and vegetation.

Figure 17. Qualitative results for cross-modal geo-location. Using drone view descriptions to match street perspectives, the top three results are reported; red boxes indicate correct matches.

11.3. Collection Process

In addition to the goals outlined in the previous section, the questions in this section are designed to elicit information that may help researchers and practitioners create alternative datasets with similar characteristics. Again, questions that apply only to datasets that relate to people are grouped together at the end of the section.

1. “How was the data associated with each instance acquired?”

A: Each instance is created by acquiring a drone-view image with GPS metadata, retrieving the corresponding street-view panorama via the Google Street View Static API, and obtaining the matching satellite image from Google Maps Satellite. All three views share the same coordinates. A unified textual description is then generated using GPT-4.0 under a controlled instruction protocol to ensure consistent, viewpoint-agnostic semantics.

2. “What mechanisms or procedures were used to collect

the data (e.g., hardware apparatuses or sensors, manual human curation, software programs, software APIs)?”

A: Data collection used drone-mounted cameras with GPS to capture drone imagery. Street-view and satellite images were obtained through the Google Street View Static API and Google Maps Satellite. The pipeline also included manual curation and automated procedures for cropping, alignment, filtering, and GPT-4.0-based text generation.

3. “If the dataset is a sample from a larger set, what was the sampling strategy (e.g., deterministic, probabilistic with specific sampling probabilities)?”

A: Please refer to the details listed in the main text Section 4.

11.4. Preprocessing, Cleaning, and Labeling

The questions in this section are intended to provide dataset consumers with the information they need to determine

whether the “raw” data has been processed in ways that are compatible with their chosen tasks. For example, text that has been converted into a “bag-of-words” is not suitable for tasks involving word order.

1. *“Was any preprocessing/cleaning/labeling of the data done (e.g., discretization or bucketing, tokenization, part-of-speech tagging, SIFT feature extraction, removal of instances, processing of missing values)?”*

A: Yes. Extensive preprocessing and cleaning were performed, including multi-stage image quality filtering (removing blurry, low-texture, low-contrast, and uniform-texture images), spatial deduplication based on coverage overlap, elimination of images with large invalid pixel regions, and multi-scale cropping with precise spatial alignment. All tri-view samples were retained only when drone, street-view, and satellite images were reliably co-located. Textual descriptions were generated using GPT-4.0 under a controlled instruction protocol, serving as the semantic labels for each instance.

2. *“Was the ‘raw’ data saved in addition to the preprocessed/cleaned/labeled data (e.g., to support unanticipated future uses)?”*

A: Yes, raw data is accessible.

3. *“Is the software that was used to preprocess/clean/label the data available?”*

A: Yes, the necessary software used to preprocess and clean the data is publicly available.

11.5. Uses

The questions in this section are intended to encourage dataset creators to reflect on tasks for which the dataset should and should not be used. By explicitly highlighting these tasks, dataset creators can help dataset consumers make informed decisions, thereby avoiding potential risks or harms.

1. *“Has the dataset been used for any tasks already?”*

A: No.

2. *“Is there a repository that links to any or all papers or systems that use the dataset?”*

A: Yes, we will provide such links in the GitHub and the Huggingface repository.

3. *“What (other) tasks could the dataset be used for?”*

A: Beyond geo-localization, the GeoLoc dataset can support a wide range of tasks, including multi-view representation learning, cross-modal retrieval, vision-language grounding, UAV navigation and path planning, urban scene understanding, air-ground sensor fusion, and benchmarking models for semantic alignment across heterogeneous viewpoints and modalities.

4. *“Is there anything about the composition of the dataset or the way it was collected and preprocessed/cleaned/labeled that might impact future uses?”*

A: No.

5. *“Are there tasks for which the dataset should not be used?”*

A: N/A.

11.6. Distribution

Dataset creators should provide answers to these questions prior to distributing the dataset either internally within the entity on behalf of which the dataset was created or externally to third parties.

1. *“Will the dataset be distributed to third parties outside of the entity (e.g., company, institution, organization) on behalf of which the dataset was created?”*

A: No. The datasets will be made publicly accessible to the research community.

2. *“How will the dataset be distributed (e.g., tarball on website, API, GitHub)?”*

A: We will provide GeoLoc in the GitHub and the Huggingface repository.

3. *“When will the dataset be distributed?”*

A: We will create a repository to release the data once the paper is officially published, ensuring compliance with the anonymity principle.

4. *“Will the dataset be distributed under a copyright or other intellectual property (IP) license, and/or under applicable terms of use (ToU)?”*

A: Yes, the dataset will be released under the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

5. *“Have any third parties imposed IP-based or other restrictions on the data associated with the instances?”*

A: Yes. The street-view and satellite images included in the dataset originate from Google Street View and Google Maps Satellite, which are subject to Google’s terms of service and usage policies. These modalities must be used in compliance with Google’s licensing restrictions.

6. *“Do any export controls or other regulatory restrictions apply to the dataset or to individual instances?”*

A: No.

11.7. Maintenance

As with the questions in the previous section, dataset creators should provide answers to these questions prior to distributing the dataset. The questions in this section are intended to encourage dataset creators to plan for dataset maintenance and communicate this plan to dataset consumers.

1. *“Who will be supporting/hosting/maintaining the dataset?”*

A: The authors of this work serve to support, host, and maintain the datasets.

2. *“How can the owner/curator/manager of the dataset be contacted (e.g., email address)?”*

A: The curators can be contacted via the email addresses listed on our paper or webpage.

3. *“Is there an erratum?”*

A: There is no explicit erratum; updates and known errors will be specified in future versions.

4. *“Will the dataset be updated (e.g., to correct labeling errors, add new instances, delete instances)?”*

A: Future updates (if any) will be posted on the dataset website.

5. *“Will older versions of the dataset continue to be supported/hosted/maintained?”*

A: Yes.

6. *“If others want to extend/augment/build on/contribute to the dataset, is there a mechanism for them to do so?”*

A: Yes, we will provide detailed instructions for future extensions.

out consent. Care should therefore be taken to use the dataset responsibly, ensuring compliance with local regulations, Google’s licensing terms, and ethical guidelines for geographic and visual data.

12. Limitation and Potential Societal Impact

In this section, we discuss the limitations and potential societal impact of this work.

12.1. Potential Limitations

Despite its scale and multi-view design, GeoLoc has several inherent limitations. First, the dataset is constrained by the availability of Google Street View and Google Maps Satellite imagery, which biases geographic coverage toward regions with strong mapping infrastructure and may underrepresent rural or geopolitically restricted areas. Second, the multi-stage quality filtering removes scenes with extreme degradation, low texture, or severe environmental noise, potentially reducing diversity in highly challenging conditions. Third, the drone imagery comes from specific acquisition settings and may not capture the full variability of UAV platforms, sensors, or flight trajectories used in real-world operations. Finally, the textual descriptions are generated by GPT-4.0 following a controlled instruction protocol, which may introduce stylistic regularities or semantic biases that affect downstream language–vision tasks.

12.2. Potential Negative Societal Impact

GeoLoc, like other geo-referenced vision datasets, may pose potential risks if misused. The dataset contains imagery tied to real-world geographic locations, and improper use could enable unauthorized geo-identification or raise privacy concerns, especially in sensitive or restricted regions. Although all street-view and satellite images come from publicly accessible Google services and adhere to Google’s usage policies, the combination of multi-view data may still inadvertently reveal structural or environmental details that could be exploited for surveillance or adversarial location inference. Furthermore, models trained on GeoLoc might be adapted for applications beyond their intended scope, such as invasive tracking or monitoring with-