

Crowdsense Roadside Parking Spaces with Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm

Wenjun Zheng, Zhan Shi, Qianyu Ou, and Ruizhi Liao

Abstract—In the context of smart city development, mobile sensing emerges as a cost-effective alternative to fixed sensing for on-street parking detection. However, its practicality is often challenged by the inherent accuracy limitations arising from detection intervals. This paper introduces a novel Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm (DGRA), which is a crowdsensing-based approach aimed at addressing this question through parking detection data collected by sensors on moving vehicles. The algorithm’s efficacy is validated through real drive tests and simulations. We also present a Driver-Side and Traffic-Based Model (DSTBM), which incorporates drivers’ parking decisions and traffic conditions to evaluate DGRA’s performance. Results highlight DGRA’s significant potential in reducing the mobile sensing accuracy gap, marking a step forward in efficient urban parking management.

Index Terms—Roadside parking, crowdsensing, performance evaluation

I. INTRODUCTION

PARKING in urban areas is a challenging task [1]. The clueless cruising for roadside parking can lead to congestion and wasted time and fuel. The urban parking pain arises from 1) increased car ownership, 2) limited availability of land for parking, and 3) lack of information on parking occupancy. A report by the International Energy Agency (IEA) [2] projects a 60% boost in car ownership by 2070, and recent smart parking surveys [3] [4] reveal that urban parking facilities already took up to 31% of urban lands. Given that the first two factors, i.e., high car ownership and limited land for parking, are beyond our control, it is crucial to develop a smart and effective solution to provide parking occupancy information.

In fact, most off-street parking lots, e.g., municipal car parks, already have systems to monitor parking occupancy either by entrance counters or fixed parking sensors [5] [6]. Though on-street parking has lots of advantages, the effect methods to detect the information of on-street are not well

This work was supported in part by NSFC (61902332), Shenzhen Education Project (JYPJ22001), Shenzhen Stability Science Program (20231130170021001), Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Mathematical Foundations for Artificial Intelligence (2023B1212010001), and SRIBD Doctoral Scholarship Program. Wenjun Zheng and Zhan Shi contributed equally to this work. (Corresponding author: Ruizhi Liao).

Wenjun Zheng, Zhan Shi and Qianyu Ou are with School of Data Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China (e-mail: wenjunzheng@link.cuhk.edu.cn; zhanshi1@link.cuhk.edu.cn; qianyuou@link.cuhk.edu.cn).

Ruizhi Liao is with Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Mathematical Foundations for Artificial Intelligence; Shenzhen Key Laboratory of IoT Intelligent Systems and Wireless Network Technology; School of Humanities and Social Science, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen, China (e-mail: rzliao@cuhk.edu.cn).

established [7]. Thus, in this paper, we focus on discussing effective methods for providing on-street (roadside) parking information.

In general, there are three types of techniques for getting parking information: fixed sensing, mobile sensing and data-based modeling.

- *Fixed sensing*: Fixed sensing is the most conventional technique among the three. It utilizes fixed-sensing devices, such as cameras, magnetic, infrared, ultrasonic, or radar sensors, to monitor changes in parking status [3]. This technique is quite reliable, but the deployment and maintenance costs associated with it can be prohibitively high. Firstly, covering an entire city with sensors would require an enormous number of sensing and related devices. The ratio of required sensors to the number of parking spaces (ψ) is equal to or greater than 1, i.e., $\psi \geq 1$. Secondly, the installation, replacement, and maintenance of these devices on municipal roads are costly and complex.
- *Mobile sensing*: In contrast, mobile sensing uses sensors on vehicles to detect parking, offering easier operation and reduced maintenance compared to fixed sensing. It requires fewer sensors, as they scan spaces while vehicles move randomly through the city, significantly lowering the sensor-to-space ratio ($\psi \ll 1$), as shown in Figure 1. In [8], the authors demonstrate that Crowd Sensing Intelligence (CSI) leverages diverse sensors for data collection but faces a trade-off in mobile sensing: higher detection accuracy demands more sensors on vehicles, increasing the required number of sensing units. In [9], they design an intelligent mobile charging control mechanism for electric vehicles (EVs), which can be integrated with mobile sensing.
- *Data-based modeling*: Data-based modeling involves the use of mathematical machinery and machine learning algorithms to predict available parking spaces [10]. The prediction model can be refined by using historical parking data, drivers’ parking behavior, or parking demands. The performance of the prediction model can be further improved by considering additional factors such as time, weather, public holidays, and events. However, the inclusion of these factors increases the computing cost, and thus, complexity and performance are a trade-off in data-based modeling.




Fig. 1. Working scenarios of mobile sensing and fixed sensing techniques in monitoring parking status

Mobile sensing systems offer a cost-effective solution for on-street parking detection, further enhanced by crowdsourcing techniques [11]–[13]. In our previous work [14], we deployed ultrasonic sensors on buses and taxis to monitor citywide roadside parking availability, using a supervised learning algorithm to determine parking status. We also introduced the Regular-Normal (R-N) algorithm [15] to improve crowdsensing accuracy. However, three key challenges remain unresolved.

- 1) While mobile sensing provides a cost-effective solution for on-street parking detection, improving the detection accuracy between two consecutive detection intervals remains a challenge.
- 2) External factors like traffic and weather conditions can significantly influence parking patterns [16], [17]. A static parking detection approach fails to capture these urban dynamics, resulting in a gap between predictions and actual availability.
- 3) Conventional parking algorithms are typically assessed using numerical metrics like the recall rate [18], overlooking the crucial aspect of drivers' parking decisions. Thus, a more comprehensive and practical assessment scheme is required.

We propose a Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm (DGRA), based on the integrated learning and optimization framework [19], to address the challenges 1) and 2). DGRA is designed to improve the detection accuracy of the crowdsensing solutions. For example, the predictions between two consecutive detections of the R-N algorithm [15] were made at

the middle time point of two adjacent detections. DGRA automates the determination of detection frequency and the prediction time point by solving a stochastic optimization problem, which ensures that both decisions are optimized to maximize detection accuracy. The key features of DGRA include: dynamic enhancement of detection accuracy with an online algorithm, integration of external influencing factors (e.g., traffic conditions), and adoption of Integrated Learning and Optimization (reducing the significance of distribution assumptions).

For the challenge 3), we introduce a driver-side traffic-based model (DSTBM) to incorporate drivers' perspectives into the algorithm, thereby enhancing its robustness and relevance for real-world scenarios.

We validate the effectiveness and adaptability of DGRA through three categories of experiments: 1) tests using data from open data platforms, 2) comparing the performance of SFpark with that of DGRA, and 3) real-world drive tests at The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shenzhen (CUHK-Shenzhen). The results confirm our system's cost-efficiency, attributed to its use of crowdsensing, while maintaining robust performance both in numerical metrics and practical urban settings.

The rest of this paper is structured as follows: Section II reviews techniques for predicting parking availability. Section III introduces DGRA and discusses real-world deployment challenges. Section IV and V detail the driver perspective model and drive tests at CUHK-Shenzhen. Section VI analyzes numerical results, comparing scenarios with and without the

TABLE I
FEATURES OF THREE CATEGORIES OF PARKING SOLUTIONS

Type	Authors/Project Name	Features
Fixed sensing	Jung et al. [20]	Laser radar-based street corner detection
	SFPark [21]	The wireless sensor network structure is adopted. The pilot deployment cost is high
	Jin et al. [22]	Sensing by Proxy (SbP) as a new paradigm for occupancy detection
Mobile sensing	Roman et al. [14]	The mobile sensing approach can perform as well as the fixed system, but the number of sensing units is significantly smaller
	Bock et al. [23], [24]	Consider multiple factors, such as road segments, taxi transit frequencies, and fleet sizes
	Kong et al. [25]	An integrated auction and market design method for parking space sharing and allocation
	ParkNet [26]	Reduce GPS error with the environmental fingerprinting approach
Data-based modelling	Rajabioun et al. [10]	Parking guidance and information (PGI) systems using multivariate spatiotemporal models
	Kopecky et al. [27]	Combine linked data and extra information, such as events and services, to make predictions more sensible
	Kim et al. [28]	Minimize parking expenses and balance demand among public and private parking lots (PLs)
	An et al. [29]	Destination privacy-preserving online parking sharing (DPOPS) incentive scheme that addresses urban congestion and illegitimate parking

DGRA. Finally, Section VII concludes the paper, outlines current limitations and highlights potential research directions.

II. RELATED WORK

This section reviews the solutions that provide on-street parking information. The main features of those solutions are summarized in Table I.

A. Fixed sensing

Jung *et al.* [20] proposed a method for scanning parking spaces by using laser-based radars. They developed a novel corner-detection strategy, including the detection of both rectangular and round corners, to enhance the detection accuracy. The high accuracy of a laser radar-based parking solution is remarkable, but the high cost of laser sensors limits the scalability of such systems.

In the U.S. parking project SFPark [21] by the San Francisco Municipal Transportation Agency, 8000 parking spaces were equipped with 11711 magnetometer sensors for periodically collecting and broadcasting information about the availability of parking spaces so that drivers can save time in cruising for parking spaces and congestion can be reduced.

Jin [22] introduces Sensing by Proxy (SbP) as a sensing paradigm for occupancy detection, leveraging proxy measurements like temperature and CO₂ concentrations. The proposed framework employs constitutive models to capture the effects of occupants on indoor environments, enabling sensor fusion of multiple environmental parameters. Experimental results demonstrate the effectiveness of SbP in accurately inferring the number of occupants and its potential to significantly reduce

ventilation energy consumption while maintaining occupant comfort.

Fixed sensing-based parking solutions, recognized for their precision and stability, are prevalent due to their capacity to promptly update parking status. Despite this, the substantial installation expenses and maintenance requirements hinder their widespread urban deployment. As fixed sensing is beyond this paper's scope, we direct readers to a comprehensive survey [3] for further insight.

B. Mobile sensing

Mobile sensing-based parking solutions eliminate the need to equip individual parking spots with sensors. The ParkNet model [26] endeavors to construct a real-time parking map by utilizing ultrasonic sensors and GPS units to acquire information regarding already parked vehicles. Additionally, environmental fingerprinting is used to enhance the precision of GPS. The model demonstrates an accuracy of over 90% in the developed occupancy map, using the 500-mile parking data collected from test runs over two months.

Roman *et al.* [14] developed a mobile sensing scheme as an alternative to the traditional fixed sensing approach, where the sensors are installed on the passenger side of a vehicle for measuring the distance from the vehicle to the nearest roadside obstacles. They evaluated their crowdsensing solution against that of a fixed sensing system obtained in Surrey in the UK. The obtained results showed that the mobile sensing approach could perform at an accuracy level similar to that of the fixed sensing approach even when the number of sensing units is significantly smaller.

Bock *et al.* [23] simulated the sensing coverage of roadside parking by down-sampling the parking data from the SFpark project [26]. Assuming that a fleet of taxis equipped with sensors were capable to detect the available roadside parking spots, Bock *et al.* [24] estimated the sensing coverage of different probing taxis based on their moving trajectories. They further investigated the suitability of the taxis to crowdsense on-street parking availability by considering multiple factors, such as road segments, taxi transit frequencies, and fleet size. The obtained results showed the crowdsensing of parking occupancy via taxis as a promising alternative to the expensive fixed-sensing based solutions. Kong [25] introduces an integrated auction and market design method for parking space sharing and allocation, utilizing a cloud platform enabled by the Internet of Things. The system employs price-compatible top trading cycles and chains mechanism for private parking spaces and a one-sided auction for public spaces. Experimental results demonstrate that these mechanisms are effective.

In the mobile sensing paradigm, a single moving sensor can monitor multiple parking spots, not just individual ones, significantly minimizing sensor count through reuse. This crowdsensing technique gathers parking data directly from drivers, thereby offering dependable parking information through crowd-derived data analysis.

C. Analytical modeling

Data-based modeling involves making predictions using external inputs, such as traffic conditions, historical parking data, or drivers' parking demands. Rajabioun *et al.* [10] proposed a parking guidance and information (PGI) system with multivariate spatiotemporal models. The authors evaluated the model using data provided by SFpark [21], and demonstrated the its effectiveness under different scenarios.

Kopecky *et al.* developed an application scheme based on linked data for helping drivers in finding parking spots [27]. The application also integrates some additional data sources, such as municipal events and services, to make the predictions more sensible.

Kim *et al.* [28] addresses the issue by formulating a parking assignment problem aiming to minimize parking expenses and balance demand among public and private parking lots (PLs). Using a mixed-integer linear programming, the proposed method improves parking utilization by 27.5%. An *et al.* [29] proposes a destination privacy-preserving scheme to address urban congestion and illegitimate parking by sharing private parking spaces. The scheme formulates the problem as a social welfare maximization issue in a two-sided market, using threshold rules and nonlinear programming to match winners while protecting customer location privacy with the Laplace mechanism.

The data-based modeling uses historical parking data to predict parking occupancy, which is a balance between the cost and accuracy. Although it is statistically feasible, the stable prediction of specific parking spaces remains as a challenging issue.

III. DYNAMIC GAP REDUCTION ALGORITHM FOR CROWDSENSING ROADSIDE PARKING SPACES

In this section, we introduce the Dynamic Gap Reduction algorithm (DGRA) for increasing the detection accuracy of crowdsensing parking solutions. DGRA is extended based on our previous work [15]. Subsection A illustrates the conceptual foundations of the Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm. Subsection B provides a detailed exploration of the algorithmic framework, which consists of two integral components: a predictive model and a stochastic optimization problem. Subsection C articulates the rationale for selecting the predictive model. Subsection D introduces the stochastic optimization problem. Lastly, Subsection E discusses the real-world deployment of DGRA.

A. Example of detection error

In this paper, we use '0' to represent an occupied parking spot and '1' to represent an empty parking spot, as shown in Fig. 2. This notation follows the binary coding principle, where '0' denotes 'no', i.e., no free parking space, and '1' signifies 'yes', i.e., a free one. The parking and detection process is depicted in a timeline format, as shown in Fig. 2(a).

In this crowdsensing method, the status of parking spaces is updated each time a detection car passes by. The timeline uses two colors to show different statuses: blue for a free parking space ('1') and green for an occupied one ('0'). When two rectangles of different colors intersect, it indicates a change in parking status. For instance, as seen in Fig. 2(a), a change from blue to green indicates that a vehicle has taken the parking space.

In Fig. 2(b), the red arrow indicates the moment when the parking status is updated after the detection vehicles pass by the parking regions. The update frequency can be determined by measuring the time difference between two adjacent red arrows. For instance, the update frequency is once every two hours. However, an inaccurate prediction may occur because the parking status between two red arrows (a rectangle) is only checked at the first arrow point. Therefore, the detection result may be misleading if the parking status changes at any time instance between two adjacent arrows. Intuitively, increasing the update frequency can improve the detection accuracy.

Guided by this observation, we can generate additional predictions regarding the status of parking spots by considering historical detection results and factors influencing parking status, for example, an extra parking prediction between two detections, as shown in Fig. 2(b).

As shown in Fig. 2(c), there are three detection timelines: parking information obtained through crowdsensing detection, parking information in reality, and parking information generated by applying DGRA. By comparing the first two timelines, it becomes apparent that inaccurate detection can occur. To mitigate these errors in crowdsensing, the extra prediction is made using DGRA at the time indicated by the dashed arrow. Thus, the detection accuracy can be increased.

B. The framework of the Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm

As mentioned in the preceding subsection, our task involves making predictions based on historical detection results and




Fig. 2. Detection Error between two detections. (a) The process of entering or exiting a parking space, (b) The process of extra prediction between two detections, and (c) The benefit of DGRA prediction between two detections




Fig. 3. The Framework of DGRA. (a) The process of DGRA in theory (b) The process of DGRA in practice

current environmental factors such as weather conditions and traffic flow, along with other influences on parking behavior. In this section, we discuss the framework of the Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm.

Let x denote a multi-dimensional vector representing features/observations, encompassing variables such as weather conditions, traffic flow, and other factors influencing parking behavior. Consider y as a two-dimensional random variable. Specifically, y_1 signifies the duration a car remains parked in a parking spot, while y_2 denotes the duration a parking spot remains unoccupied.

Intuitively, as illustrated in the Fig. 3(a), optimization is performed considering the distribution of y to minimize inaccuracies arising from the crowdsensing method. In spite that in practical scenarios, the distribution of y is unknown, we can infer this distribution based on the features x . This can be regarded as the domain of contextual optimization [30]. [31] [32] [33] also mentioned the concept of contextual information in parking problem. However, they do not consider adapting

it into the mobile sensing setting.

The DGRA consists of two primary components, as depicted in the Fig. 3(b). The first part is a predictive model that takes the feature vector x as input and produces the conditional distribution of y given x , where y is a two-dimensional vector. The second part is a stochastic optimization model, determining the predicted time point and outcomes (i.e., whether a parking space is available at the predicted time point). In this context, we employ the Integrated Learning and Optimization (ILO) method from [19].

C. Kernel choice of random variable y

In this section, we will present the selection of two random variables, namely y_1 and y_2 . The probability density function of random variable y_i is represented by $f_i(\cdot)$, and $F_i(\cdot)$ stands for the cumulative distribution function of y_i .

• Assumption of y_1

In practice, parking demands tend to concentrate in some specific time periods of the day. Additionally, the likeli-




Fig. 4. Flowchart of generating probability function $P('1')$ for case 2

hood of a car being parked for either a very short or very long duration during those time periods is considerably low. Accordingly, we assume that the continuous random variable y_1 follows a normal distribution with mean value μ and variance σ^2 , i.e., $y_1 \sim N(\mu, \sigma^2)$.

When the value of δ is sufficiently small, $\int_{y_1-\delta}^{y_1+\delta} F(x)dx$ can be interpreted as the probability that a driver keeps the car parked in the parking spot for a duration close to y_1 .

- *Assumption of y_2*

Let θ represent the mean time required for a parking spot to be re-occupied after the previous car leaves. Then, we can use $F_2(y_2) = \int_0^{y_2} f_2(x)dx$ to represent the probability of a parking spot being occupied in the next moment after remaining empty for a duration of y_2 .

1) When y_2 is not too large (specifically, not significantly larger than θ), the probability function $F_2(y_2)$ is likely to behave as an exponential distribution with θ as a parameter, i.e., $F_2(y_2) = 1 - e^{-\frac{y_2}{\theta}}$.

2) If y_2 is much larger than θ , it is an indication that parking demands are much later than usual. In such cases, we assume that some external factors, such as inclement weather or road work, affect parking activities. Consequently, the probability function should be adjusted to reflect this potential abnormality, resulting in a longer time required for the probability to increase. Specifically, suppose $y_{2,i} = i \cdot T + t$, where $0 \leq t < T$, and the modified probability function $F_2(y_2)'$ must satisfy the

following three conditions:

- (i) $F_2(y_{2,i})' < F_2(y_{2,i})'$, for any $y_2 > 0$, $i \geq 0$
- (ii) $F_2(y_{2,1})' > F_2(y_{2,2})' > \dots > F_2(y_{2,n})'$
- (iii) $F_2(y_{2,1})' - F_2(y_{2,2})' \leq F_2(y_{2,2})' - F_2(y_{2,3})' \leq \dots \leq F_2(y_{2,n-1})' - F_2(y_{2,n})'$.

Condition (i): External factors such as inclement weather or road construction can reduce the likelihood of parking activity. Therefore, the actual probability of a parking spot being occupied in the next moment should be lower, implying that for the same $y_2 > 0$, $F_2(y_2, i)' < F_2(y_2, i)$.

Condition (ii): The duration for which a parking spot remains unoccupied positively correlates with the abnormal impact's severity. When the abnormal factor has a high impact on parking activity, the unoccupied duration is longer. Thus, we consider the unoccupied duration as posterior information that reflects the severity of the abnormal impact. As the severity increases, the probability of a parking spot being occupied in the next moment decreases. In other words, an increase in unoccupied time results in a decrease in $F_2(y_2, i)'$, such that $F_2(y_2, 1)' > F_2(y_2, 2)' > \dots > F_2(y_2, n)'$.

Condition (iii): As the duration of unoccupied time increases, the rate of decrease in $F_2(y_2, i)'$ should generally be faster, indicating a steeper slope of the decrease. Therefore, $F_2(y_2, 1)' - F_2(y_2, 2)' \leq F_2(y_2, 2)' - F_2(y_2, 3)' \leq \dots \leq F_2(y_2, n-1)' - F_2(y_2, n)'$.

D. The stochastic optimization problem

Let z be a two-dimensional decision variable in the optimization problem. z_1 indicates the predicted time point of DGRA, constrained within the interval $[0, \infty]$. Meanwhile, z_2 represents the predicted parking results, where '0' indicates an occupied parking spot, and '1' denotes an empty one. Let $P(z_2|z_1)$ be the probability that a parking spot is in state z_2 given the predicted time z_1 . For example, $P(0|5)$ denotes the probability of the parking spot being occupied at time 5. Similarly, $P_{y|x}(z_2|z_1)$ represents $P(z_2|z_1)$ within the context of the conditional distribution $P_{y|x}$. Then, the stochastic optimization problem is formulated as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \max_z P_{y|x}(z_2|z_1) \\ \text{s.t. } z_1 \geq 0 \\ z_2 \in \{0, 1\} \end{aligned}$$

The computation of $P_{y|x}(z_2|z_1)$ follows specific procedures that vary depending on two different cases.

Case I: If the latest detection of parking occurred at t_1 with a result of '0', and for a given z_2 , DGRA aims to predict the parking status at time $t_1 + z_2$. Let m represent the number of '0's from t_0 to t_1 , obtained from historical detection results. Let T_i be the time duration between the i -th and $(i+1)$ -th detection results of '0' among the m detections. Then,

$$P_{y|x}(0|z_2) = \int_{\frac{2m-1}{2}z_2-\delta}^{\frac{2m-1}{2}z_2+\delta} f_1(x)dx + (1 - \int_{z_2-\delta}^{z_2+\delta} f_1(x)dx) \left(\sum_{k=0}^{m-2} \int_{\frac{2k-1}{2}T_k-\delta}^{\frac{2k-1}{2}T_k+\delta} f_1(x)dx \right), \quad (1)$$

$$P_{y|x}(1|z_2) = 1 - P_{y|x}(0|z_2) \quad (2)$$

The computation of $P(0)$ comprises two components: the first part indicates the probability of the parking space being empty, while the second part denotes the probability of the parking space being occupied but becoming empty within the time interval of 2δ .

Case II: If the parking information at time t_1 is '1', indicating that the parking spot is currently unoccupied, and considering that the last car vacated the spot at time t_0 , let n represent the count of '1's observed from t_0 to t_1 . In this scenario, two sub-cases arise as a part of the kernel of y_2 . To delineate these sub-cases, the time parameter $\alpha_{0.95}$ is defined to satisfy the condition $\int_0^{\alpha_{0.95}} h(x)dx = 0.95$, where $h(x) = 1 - e^{-\frac{x}{\theta}}$.

Sub-case (1) $y_2 \leq \alpha_{0.95}$:

The probability $P_{y|x}(0|z_2) = 1 - e^{-\frac{y_2}{\theta}}$. So,

$$P_{y|x}(1|z_2) = 1 - P_{y|x}(0|z_2) = e^{-\frac{y_2}{\theta}}. \quad (3)$$

Sub-case (2) $y_2 > \alpha_{0.95}$:

In Sub-case (2), we need to modify the probability function as defined in Sub-case (1) in two steps, as shown in Fig. 4. Recall that θ represents the mean time required for a parking spot to be re-occupied after the last car leaves it. Now we consider n as newly gathered data and add it to the dataset w times, where $w > 1$ is an integer constant. This step ensures that the change in the mean duration θ is significant, as adding n data only once may result in a negligible change, given the large size of the dataset. Consequently, we obtain a new exponential distribution with the modified mean duration constant, θ' . Finally,

$$P_{y|x}(1|z_2) = 1 - P_{y|x}(0|z_2) = e^{-\frac{y_2}{\theta'}}. \quad (4)$$

It is easy to verify that the modified probability function $P_{y|x}(0|z_2)$ satisfies the three properties specified in Assumption 2. Hence, it is straightforward that $P_{y|x}(1|z_2)$ also satisfies the same assumption.

It's worth noting that in both cases, if any change in the parking status is detected during the latest detection period (e.g., from '0' to '1' or vice versa), the algorithm will reset the starting time to the latest detection time. Additionally, as the parking status has changed, the computation procedure will also change.

E. Real-world deployment of DGRA

1) **Data Privacy:** In the real-world deployment, ensuring data privacy and security is of utmost importance. Inspired by the security framework for crowdsensing solutions [34], the following strategies for enhancing data privacy can be considered.

Anonymization: DGRA can benefit from integrating pseudonymous techniques. By assigning pseudo IDs to crowdsensing nodes, the system can maintain ID and location privacy but ensure secure contribution tracking and reward distribution.

Encryption: The adoption of location-based symmetric key generation and proxy encryption can bolster data confidentiality without relying on a central authority.

2) **Data Integration and Processing:** In terms of data integration and processing, our algorithm examines the sonar trace's structure to distinguish between parked cars and road

TABLE II
IMPLEMENTATION COST ESTIMATION

Key Components	Function	Unit Price
Ultrasonic sensor	Measure space depth	¥4.4 (\$0.63)
Raspberry Pi Zero	Process data	¥105 (\$15)
GPS module	Provide geo-location data	¥72 (\$10.3)
4G module	Data transmission	¥69 (\$9.9)
Cloud infrastructure	Computation and storage	¥15/month (\$2.1/month)
Subtotal for one unit:		¥265.4 (\$37.9)

clutter. The analyzed data, which includes identified parked vehicles, available parking spaces, GPS coordinates, vehicle speed, and timestamps, is then transmitted to a cloud server for further processing. Key considerations during this procedure are discussed as follows.

Selection bias: Crowdsensing is susceptible to selection bias and error. Offering incentives is a good way to foster participation from a more diverse cohort and more comprehensive data to mitigate this issue.

Data synchronization: Combining data from multiple vehicles can introduce data synchronization challenges. To address this, algorithms such as decision-level data fusion [35] and correctness verification [36] can be employed to merge data from various sources with decent accuracy.

3) Implementation Cost: The DGRA crowdsensing system incorporates key components, a micro-controller, a GPS module, a communication module and a cloud server for data processing and storage. To estimate the implementation cost of the DGRA algorithm, we use an example setup with ultrasonic sensors and a Raspberry Pi Zero, as detailed in Table II.

IV. DRIVER-SIDE AND TRAFFIC-BASED EVALUATION MODEL

Drivers' behavior in evaluating parking solutions is important. To account for this factor, we develop a Driver-Side and Traffic-Based Evaluation Model (DSTBM)¹. It consists of a driver's decision tree and a simulation process, which provide a standardized tool for evaluating the accuracy of parking detection by integrating drivers' perspectives on whether to park or not and the actual traffic conditions.

A. DSTBM Preliminary

As discussed in Section II, various techniques exist for detecting the availability of on-street parking spaces, each with a specific approach for evaluating its detection accuracy. While some techniques focus on the temporal availability of parking spaces, others emphasize the spatial accuracy. Thus, a standard evaluation method is required to compare different parking detection solutions. To this end, we present DSTBM, which considers drivers' perspectives and actual traffic conditions in the parking region. DSTBM is developed based on four assumptions.

- Assumption 1: Each car passes through a parking region at a constant speed, and the difference between the speeds of any two cars is negligible.
- Assumption 2: Drivers are patient and willing to wait for a parking spot to become vacant, rather than leaving the area to seek parking elsewhere.
- Assumption 3: If a car is parked, its parking duration y_1 ($y_1 \geq 0$) is considered as a random variable that follows a normal distribution having a mean of μ and variance of σ^2 . This assumption, justified by the Central Limit Theorem [38] due to the model's large data size,

leverages historical parking data from Shenzhen open data platform² to estimate μ and σ^2 .

- Assumption 4: Drivers arrive at the parking region at a time interval of $T_{interval}$, which is treated as a continuous random variable that follows an exponential distribution with an arriving rate of λ . Since the drivers' behaviors are independent of $T_{interval}$, the memory-less feature of the exponential distribution is upheld.

B. Drivers' decision tree

Upon arriving at the entrance of the parking region, drivers must take into account various factors before deciding whether to park their vehicles. The following section presents the drivers' decision model, which aims to predict their parking decisions.

The drivers' parking decision model is summarized in Fig. 5. The model takes a car's arrival time t_0 as input and generates the driver's parking decision D_m as output. When a car arrives at the parking region, the model counts the total number of cars (N_c) cruising for parking spaces using traffic flow data. It then compares N_c with the crowdsensing result (D_r , the number of available parking spaces detected by a mobile sensing system) to predict the drivers' parking decisions. If $N_c > D_r$, it indicates that there are insufficient parking spots in the parking region for all the cruising cars. However, individual drivers may still opt to park depending on the traffic conditions. When a driver's speed V_{car} equals or exceeds the minimum speed of other cars ($V_{car} \geq V_{min}$), the driver will remain and compete with others for a parking spot ($D_m = 1$). Otherwise, considering our assumption that $N_c > D_r$, any vehicles entering the parking region will inevitably compete for the limited parking spots. Consequently, vehicles with lower speeds have a low probability of securing a parking spot in this competitive environment. Therefore, we incorporated a prioritization system in our model to favor faster-moving vehicles and increase their likelihood of finding an available parking spot.

If $N_c \leq D_r$, it means that there are enough parking spaces to accommodate all the cruising vehicles. Thus, the driver will stay and get a parking spot ($D_m = 1$).

DSTBM integrates the drivers' decision model and a detection simulation process as shown in Fig. 6. In the simulation process, DSTBM takes the drivers' parking decision as input to obtain the prediction accuracy P_a . Note that the output $D_m = 1$ of the drivers' decision model means that a driver decides to park. However, if the driver fails to park at the end, we consider the output as a wrong prediction (a false positive). Hence, the prediction accuracy P_a of a parking solution can be calculated as true positive plus true negative as follows:

$$P_a = \frac{\text{free space estimated \& driver actually parked}}{\text{total prediction}} + \frac{\text{no free space estimated \& driver actually not parked}}{\text{total prediction}}$$

¹It is built upon our previous publication [37] at the 2022 18th International Conference on Intelligent Environments (IE), where it received the Best Presentation Award. DOI: 10.1109/IE54923.2022.9826771

²https://opendata.sz.gov.cn/data/dataSet/toDataDetails/29200_00403592




Fig. 5. Drivers' decision model based on external factors




Fig. 6. Working flows of DSTBM

C. Illustration of the whole process

The number of available parking spots (N_p), number of available parking spaces (D_r) detected by a mobile sensing

technique, and traffic flows (T_i/T_o) on the parking street are updated continuously. The real-time number of cruising cars (N_c) in the parking region is calculated in terms of the above

three variables and updated in the drivers' decision model.

Suppose $G(T_{interval})$ is the probability density function of $T_{interval}$, which is the time interval of cars reaching the parking region. Hence, the probability that a car will enter the parking lot at the next moment is $\int_{t-\delta_1}^{t+\delta_1} G(x)dx$, where δ_1 is a small number and $G(x) = \lambda e^{-\lambda x}$, $x \geq 0$. Accordingly, a time sequence for the cars reaching the parking region can be generated.

Upon a car's arrival at the parking region (the red star in Fig. 6), the drivers' decision model is activated, which combines N_c and V_{car} to produce the output D_m indicating whether the car will be parked or not. Then, the driver behaves according to the output of the decision model. Meanwhile, D_m is transmitted to the simulation process as the input, which is combined with y_1 (the parking duration of a car) to determine the prediction accuracy.

According to *Assumption 3*, the parking duration y_1 follows a normal distribution. So, the probability that the car is still parked in the parking space after y_1 is $\int_{d-\delta_2}^{d+\delta_2} F(y)dy$, where δ_2 is a small number and $F(y) = \frac{1}{\sigma\sqrt{2\pi}} e^{-\frac{(y-\mu)^2}{2\sigma^2}}$, $y \geq 0$.

When the next car arrives at the entrance of the parking region, the same procedure is repeated. Therefore, using the real-time value of y_1 , we can obtain the prediction accuracy of the parking solution.

D. Sensitivity Analysis of DSTBM

The sensitivity of DSTBM to the detection schedule parameter D_s is evaluated and presented in Fig. 7. This parameter, crucial for determining the update frequency of parking occupancy status, directly affects the model's predictive accuracy.

We conducted experiments on the dataset from the open data platform of Nanshan District of Shenzhen, China, spanning from September 1st, 2018, to January 1st, 2019, which consists of 624,464 parking event records, with a network of 1735 sensors deployed for parking status detection [39]. Fig. 7 demonstrates detection accuracy against time over several weeks, with lines representing different D_s values: 15, 35, and 50 minutes. Generally, a 15-minute detection schedule ($D_s = 15$, red line) achieves higher accuracy against other schedules, which is consistent with the expectation that more frequent updates improve prediction quality.




Fig. 7. DSTBM with various D_s

There are instances where $D_s = 50$ outperforms $D_s = 15$, likely due to the inherent variability in the real parking data. An extended version of DSTBM [40] addresses these fluctuations. However, the current version of DSTBM remains effective in capturing the necessary patterns for accurate predictions.

V. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

In this section, we present the practical implementation of the DGRA framework using ultrasonic sensors as a case study. A comprehensive description of the experimental setup is provided, including the evaluation metrics, equipment specifications, drive-test route, and the step-by-step experimental procedure.



Fig. 8. Mobile sensing vehicles

- 1) *Evaluation indicator*: The new indicator can be regarded as a composite of two factors: the accuracy of parking detection and information accuracy. The concept of detection accuracy is extensively elaborated throughout the paper. On the other hand, information accuracy refers to the percentage of instances in which drivers perceive the instructions provided by the system were consistent with the ground truth. This indicator holds greater significance compared to detection accuracy alone. It was inspired by a prominent topic in economics that combines prediction and optimization. Traditionally, the focus has been on minimizing prediction error as the primary performance criterion. However, this approach has limitations. Thus, the newly introduced decision error factor combines optimality and prediction error into a unified measure, providing a more comprehensive performance evaluation.
- 2) *Experimental equipment*: Two mobile sensing vehicles are deployed in this test, as shown in Fig. 8. Each vehicle is equipped with a detection kit, containing an ultrasonic sensor and a micro-controller command system. In Fig. 8, the ultrasonic sensors are marked by solid-line rectangles and the command system by dash-line rectangles.
- 3) *Drive-test route*: The experiment was conducted in the lower campus of CUHK-Shenzhen. As shown in Fig. 9, there are two parking regions along the drive-test route, Region A and Region B. All the parking units in those regions are perpendicular to the street. Region




Fig. 9. Configuration of the drive test in the campus

A has 20 parking units and Region B has 4 parking units, with each parking unit containing five individual parking spots. Hence, there are in total 120 roadside parking spaces. The detected vehicles started at the blue mark, drove along the red line and passed by Region A and Region B every 10 minutes.

- 4) *Experimental procedure*: The experiment was conducted in the morning from 08:00 hours to 09:00 hours, and in the afternoon from 16:00 hours to 18:00 hours. The main reason for selecting the two time periods is that the parking occupancy changes frequently in these periods. The ultrasonic sensors scanned the parking occupancy when a detection vehicle drove by the parking regions. Then, the command system analyzed the collected data with/without applying DGRA. Finally, the detection performance was evaluated by DSTBM.

VI. NUMERICAL RESULTS

We employed three distinct scenarios to assess the performance of DGRA. In Scenario I, we utilized historical parking data obtained from open data platforms in Shenzhen [39] and Shanghai [41] in China. This was done to illustrate the practical application of DGRA. In Scenario II, we present results based on data from SFpark, aiming to compare the algorithm's performance against other prominent projects. In Scenario III, we conducted a real-world experiment using traffic and parking data collected from drive tests on the CUHK-Shenzhen campus.

A. Results of Scenario I

In the method I, we assume that buses are equipped with ultrasonic sensors. The roadside parking spaces are divided into

two groups: on-bus-route and off-bus-route parking spaces. The detection frequency is highly related to the number of sensing buses.

1) *Results without DGRA*: The relationship between the detection accuracy and the number of sensors is shown in Fig. 10(a). It is obvious that the detection accuracy increases as the number of sensors or detection frequency increases.

2) *Results with DGRA*: Using the identical collection of open data ($g = 0.05$), while keeping the same detection accuracy, the number of required sensors can be reduced, as shown in Fig. 10(b). The corresponding data are presented in TABLE III. Setting the speed of the detection vehicle to $V = 45$ km/h, the number of sensors to 3286, and the detection frequency to $T = 20$ minutes, a detection accuracy of 93.9% is obtained (TABLE III). The results indicate that the implementation of DGRA can improve detection accuracy. In comparison to the supervised learning algorithm presented in [14], the proposed DGRA algorithm enhances detection accuracy by inserting additional predictions between two consecutive mobile scans.

To further investigate, we compared the results obtained with and without the DGRA algorithm ($g = 0.05$, $V = 45$ km/h) as shown in Fig. 11. The results demonstrate that DGRA significantly improves detection accuracy, particularly when the detection frequency is low (i.e. the number of sensors is small). Table IV presents a sampled comparison, indicating that DGRA performs better with larger sensing intervals.

B. Results of Scenario II

In this scenario, we present results based on data provided by SFpark [23] to showcase the performance of DGRA. As illustrated in Fig. 12, several observations are obtained.

- As the detection frequency increases, the detection accuracy improves in all three methods presented.




Fig. 10. Visualization of the experiment results. (a) Without DGRA, and (b) The reduction in number of sensors with DGRA

TABLE III
DETECTION ACCURACY AND NUMBER OF SENSORS WITH DGRA

Detection Interval (T)	Detection Accuracy	Number of Sensors = 3286		
		V = 15km/h	V = 30km/h	V = 45km/h
15min	96.2%	9646	7446	4568
20min	93.9%	6835	4384	3286
25min	92.4%	4689	2973	1743
30min	88.7%	3961	2172	1544

TABLE IV
WITH AND WITHOUT APPLYING DGRA

Detection Interval (T)	15min	20min	25min	30min	35min	
Detection Accuracy	Without DGRA	94.5%	90.2%	89.4%	79.5%	74.2%
	With DGRA	96.3%	93.8%	92.4%	88.7%	86.0%
Improvements After Applying DGRA	1.8%	3.6%	7.5%	9.2%	11.8%	




Fig. 11. Accuracy against number of moving sensors with $g = 0.05$ and $V = 45\text{km/h}$

- In the high detection frequency range, SFpark outperforms the crowdsensing method. Conversely, in the low detection frequency range, SFpark performs less effectively than the crowdsensing method.

- DGRA improves the crowdsensing performance, surpassing that of SFpark across the entire range.

C. Results of Scenario III

We aim to compare the detection performance before and after the implementation of DGRA. To achieve this, we conducted drive tests in the CUHK-Shenzhen campus. The results of the experiment are presented in Table V.

1) *Notations in Table V:* The algorithm was executed 9 times in the morning and 9 times in the afternoon. We also recorded GPS data as it influenced the spatial results of the parking spaces. The *Visual Truth* denotes the ground truth of the parking status. The parking lot had a total of 120 spaces, and the number of free and occupied spaces are represented by *Free* and *Occupied* respectively. Additionally, we calculated the free time of the parking spaces, denoted by "FT," which sums up the time periods when the parking spaces remain unoccupied for more than 10 minutes. In contrast, *OT* counts the time when the parking spaces remain occupied. In the crowdsensing column, *Spaces* means the number of parking spaces detected by a mobile sensing vehicle. *Length* indicates the total length of the detected parking spaces. Detected accuracy (*DA*) is the ratio of the number of occupied spaces detected to the number of spaces occupied in reality.

TABLE V
DRIVE-TEST RESULTS

Run	GPS Quality	Visual Truth				Crowdsensing							
		Free	Occupied	FT (min)	OT (min)	Spaces	Length (m)	DA	Without DGRA		With DGRA		
Morning (08:00 – 09:30)													
									OT (min)	IA	OT (min)	IA	
1	H	91	29	851	349	21	71.4	0.7241	210	0.6017	278	0.7965	
2	H	85	35	778	422	30	99.9	0.8571	300	0.7109	381	0.9028	
3	H	73	47	675	525	42	130.2	0.8936	420	0.8000	453	0.8628	
4	H	60	60	567	633	53	169.6	0.8833	530	0.8373	557	0.8401	
5	I	54	66	497	703	62	210.8	0.9393	620	0.8819	634	0.9018	
6	I	51	69	522	678	37	122.1	0.5362	370	0.5457	501	0.7389	
7	L	47	73	499	701	56	179.2	0.7671	560	0.7989	663	0.9457	
8	H	42	78	389	811	70	238.0	0.8974	700	0.8631	731	0.9013	
9	H	39	81	377	823	77	277.2	0.9506	770	0.9356	786	0.9550	
Afternoon (16:30 – 18:00)													
10	I	29	91	338	862	75	232.5	0.8241	750	0.8701	778	0.9025	
11	L	35	85	385	815	61	225.7	0.7176	610	0.7485	685	0.8368	
12	H	37	83	356	844	71	234.3	0.8554	710	0.8412	756	0.8957	
13	H	40	80	387	813	70	224.0	0.8750	700	0.8610	745	0.9163	
14	H	47	73	455	745	65	202.8	0.8904	650	0.8725	675	0.9060	
15	I	59	61	571	629	45	140.9	0.7377	450	0.7154	564	0.8966	
16	H	71	49	688	512	45	141.8	0.9183	450	0.8789	466	0.9101	
17	H	79	41	788	412	37	118.8	0.9024	370	0.8981	381	0.9247	
18	H	87	33	865	335	30	94.5	0.9090	300	0.8955	313	0.9343	
Average									0.8377	0.8087	0.8871		
No low-Quality GPS									0.8496	0.8131	0.8866		
Only High-Quality GPS									0.8797	0.8330	0.8955		

Legend: ● - High Quality (> 75%); ● - Intermediate Quality (≥ 50%, ≤ 75%); ● - Low Quality (< 50%)

*. FT: Free Time of Parking Spaces

**-. OT: Occupied Time of Parking Spaces

***-. DA: Detected Accuracy, the Accuracy of Occupancy Status of Parking Spaces Are Correctly Detected

****-. IA: Information Accuracy, Detected Information of Parking Spaces over Reality Information during A Fixed Period of Time




Fig. 12. Comparing DGRA with SFpark

Information accuracy (*IA*) is defined as the ratio of the detected time during which the parking spaces remained occupied to the actual time during which the spaces were occupied, over a fixed period of 10 minutes.

2) *Analysis of experimental results*: Table V shows that the average detection accuracy (*DA*) across all runs is approximately 84%, with a detection frequency of once every 10 minutes. As expected, poor GPS quality leads to a decrease in *DA*, indicating that GPS quality has a significant impact on detection accuracy.

We can also observe that information accuracy (*IA*) is enhanced upon applying DGRA. The average *IA* with DGRA is above 88%, and it goes up to 90% with high GPS quality.

It is evident from our results that the implementation of DGRA leads to an improvement in *IA*, particularly when the accuracy is around 80%. This finding is consistent with

our previous observation that the lower the initial accuracy rate, the better the performance we can achieve with DGRA. Specifically, we found that DGRA resulted in an *IA* of above 82% in nearly 88% of runs.

VII. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

This paper presents Dynamic Gap Reduction Algorithm (DGRA) designed to improve the detection accuracy and algorithm generalizability of a crowdsensing parking solution. In addition, we introduce a novel evaluation method that takes into account drivers' perspectives, with the goal of achieving a more robust algorithm. Our study demonstrates that DGRA enjoys a high level of cost-efficiency while maintaining robust performance both in numerical metrics and practical urban settings.

However, DGRA has certain limitations and potential failures that must be acknowledged. First, its effectiveness is highly dependent on the quality and granularity of historical parking data, with inaccuracies potentially leading to unreliable predictions. Second, DGRA's performance may be compromised in highly dynamic environments where parking patterns shift rapidly due to factors like municipal events, road closures, or traffic fluctuations. Lastly, the scalability of the algorithm could be impacted by device limitations and network connectivity issues when applied across diverse urban settings.

In future research, we plan to address these limitations and improve DGRA. Our focus will be on robustly handling historical parking data to mitigate inaccuracies. Additionally, we will strive to enhance the algorithm's adaptability and scalability across different urban environments.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Khalid, K. Wang, N. Aslam, Y. Cao, N. Ahmad, and M. K. Khan, "From smart parking towards autonomous valet parking: A survey, challenges and future works," *Journal of Network and Computer Applications*, vol. 175, p. 102935, 2021.
- [2] A. F. Pales and S. Bennett, "Energy technology perspectives 2020," Tech. Rep.). International Energy Agency. <https://www.iea.org/reports/energy-technology-perspectives-2020>, Tech. Rep., 2020.
- [3] T. Lin, H. Rivano, and F. Le Mouél, "A survey of smart parking solutions," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 18, no. 12, pp. 3229–3253, 2017.
- [4] H. Zulfiqar, H. M. Ul Haque, F. Tariq, and R. M. Khan, "A survey on smart parking systems in urban cities," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 35, no. 15, p. e6511, 2023.
- [5] D. Shoup, "On-street parking management v. off-street parking requirements," *The access almanac*, vol. 42, pp. 38–40, 2013.
- [6] J. Simićević and N. Milosavljević, "The impact of on-street and off-street parking regulations on parking type choice," *Transportation Planning and Technology*, vol. 46, no. 7, pp. 912–928, 2023.
- [7] S. Biswas, S. Chandra, and I. Ghosh, "Effects of on-street parking in urban context: A critical review," *Transportation in developing economies*, vol. 3, pp. 1–14, 2017.
- [8] Y. Zhao, C. Hu, Z. Zhu, S. Qiu, B. Chen, P. Jiao, and F.-Y. Wang, "Crowd sensing intelligence for its: Participants, methods, and stages," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Vehicles*, 2023.
- [9] X. Zhang, Y. Cao, L. Peng, J. Li, N. Ahmad, and S. Yu, "Mobile charging as a service: A reservation-based approach," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1976–1988, 2020.
- [10] T. Rajabioun and P. A. Ioannou, "On-street and off-street parking availability prediction using multivariate spatiotemporal models," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 5, pp. 2913–2924, 2015.
- [11] C.-W. Yi, Y.-T. Chuang, and C.-S. Nian, "Toward crowdsourcing-based road pavement monitoring by mobile sensing technologies," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 16, no. 4, pp. 1905–1917, 2015.
- [12] Z. Liu, Z. Li, and K. Wu, "Unitask: A unified task assignment design for mobile crowdsourcing-based urban sensing," *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, vol. 6, no. 4, pp. 6629–6641, 2019.
- [13] X. Zhang, Z. Yang, Z. Zhou, H. Cai, L. Chen, and X. Li, "Free market of crowdsourcing: Incentive mechanism design for mobile sensing," *IEEE transactions on parallel and distributed systems*, vol. 25, no. 12, pp. 3190–3200, 2014.
- [14] C. Roman, R. Liao, P. Ball, S. Ou, and M. de Heaven, "Detecting on-street parking spaces in smart cities: Performance evaluation of fixed and mobile sensing systems," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 19, no. 7, pp. 2234–2245, 2018.
- [15] W. Zheng and R. Liao, "R-n algorithm for crowdsensing on-street parking spaces," in *2021 International Wireless Communications and Mobile Computing (IWCMC)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 2062–2067.
- [16] F. Zhang, Y. Liu, N. Feng, C. Yang, J. Zhai, S. Zhang, B. He, J. Lin, X. Zhang, and X. Du, "Periodic weather-aware lstm with event mechanism for parking behavior prediction," *IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering*, vol. 34, no. 12, pp. 5896–5909, 2021.
- [17] H. Yang, C. Liu, Y. Zhuang, W. Sun, K. Murthy, Z. Pu, and Y. Wang, "Truck parking pattern aggregation and availability prediction by deep learning," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 23, no. 8, pp. 12778–12789, 2021.
- [18] Y. Zhu, A. Gupta, S. Hu, W. Zhong, L. Su, and C. Qiao, "Driver behavior-aware parking availability crowdsensing system using truth discovery," *ACM Transactions on Sensor Networks (TOSN)*, vol. 17, no. 4, pp. 1–26, 2021.
- [19] A. N. Elmachtoub and P. Grigas, "Smart "predict, then optimize"," *Management Science*, vol. 68, no. 1, pp. 9–26, 2022.
- [20] H. G. Jung, Y. H. Cho, P. J. Yoon, and J. Kim, "Scanning laser radar-based target position designation for parking aid system," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 406–424, 2008.
- [21] "Sfpark—a project of san francisco municipal transportation authority (sfmta)," <http://www.sfpark.org>, accessed: 10-July-2024.
- [22] M. Jin, N. Bekiaris-Liberis, K. Weekly, C. J. Spanos, and A. M. Bayen, "Occupancy detection via environmental sensing," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 443–455, 2016.
- [23] F. Bock and S. Di Martino, "On-street parking availability data in san francisco, from stationary sensors and high-mileage probe vehicles," *Data in brief*, vol. 25, p. 104039, 2019.
- [24] F. Bock, S. Di Martino, and A. Origlia, "Smart parking: Using a crowd of taxis to sense on-street parking space availability," *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, vol. 21, no. 2, pp. 496–508, 2019.
- [25] X. T. Kong, S. X. Xu, M. Cheng, and G. Q. Huang, "Iot-enabled parking space sharing and allocation mechanisms," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 15, no. 4, pp. 1654–1664, 2018.
- [26] S. Mathur, T. Jin, N. Kasturirangan, J. Chandrasekaran, W. Xue, M. Gruteser, and W. Trappe, "Parknet: drive-by sensing of road-side parking statistics," in *Proceedings of the 8th international conference on Mobile systems, applications, and services*, 2010, pp. 123–136.
- [27] J. Kopecký and J. Domingue, "Parkjam jam: Crowdsourcing parking availability information with linked data," in *The Semantic Web: ESWC 2012 Satellite Events: ESWC 2012 Satellite Events, Heraklion, Crete, Greece, May 27-31, 2012. Revised Selected Papers 9*. Springer, 2015, pp. 381–386.
- [28] O. T. T. Kim, N. H. Tran, C. Pham, T. LeAnh, M. T. Thai, and C. S. Hong, "Parking assignment: Minimizing parking expenses and balancing parking demand among multiple parking lots," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 1320–1331, 2019.
- [29] D. An, Q. Yang, D. Li, W. Yu, W. Zhao, and C.-B. Yan, "Where am i parking: Incentive online parking-space sharing mechanism with privacy protection," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 19, no. 1, pp. 143–162, 2020.
- [30] U. Sadana, A. Chenreddy, E. Delage, A. Forel, E. Frejinger, and T. Vidal, "A survey of contextual optimization methods for decision-making under uncertainty," *European Journal of Operational Research*, 2024.
- [31] H. Mahfooz Ul Haque, H. Zulfiqar, A. Ahmed, and Y. Ali, "A context-aware framework for modelling and verification of smart parking systems in urban cities," *Concurrency and Computation: Practice and Experience*, vol. 33, no. 2, p. e5401, 2021.
- [32] J. Rico, J. Sancho, B. Cendon, and M. Camus, "Parking easier by using context information of a smart city: Enabling fast search and management of parking resources," in *2013 27th international conference on advanced information networking and applications workshops*. IEEE, 2013, pp. 1380–1385.
- [33] H. M. Ul Haque, H. Zulfiqar, S. U. Khan, and M. Ul Haque, "Context-aware parking systems in urban areas: a survey and early experiments," in *Context-Aware Systems and Applications, and Nature of Computation and Communication: 7th EAI International Conference, ICCASA 2018, and 4th EAI International Conference, ICTCC 2018, Viet Tri City, Vietnam, November 22–23, 2018, Proceedings 7*. Springer, 2019, pp. 25–35.
- [34] Y. Jiang, K. Zhang, Y. Qian, and L. Zhou, "P2ae: Preserving privacy, accuracy, and efficiency in location-dependent mobile crowdsensing," *IEEE Transactions on Mobile Computing*, 2021.
- [35] Y. Wei, D. Wu, and J. Terpenney, "Decision-level data fusion in quality control and predictive maintenance," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 1, pp. 184–194, 2020.
- [36] C. Liu, Q. Zeng, L. Cheng, H. Duan, M. Zhou, and J. Cheng, "Privacy-preserving behavioral correctness verification of cross-organizational workflow with task synchronization patterns," *IEEE Transactions on Automation Science and Engineering*, vol. 18, no. 3, pp. 1037–1048, 2020.
- [37] Q. Ou, W. Zheng, Z. Shi, and R. Liao, "Driver-side and traffic-based evaluation model for on-street parking solutions," in *2022 18th International Conference on Intelligent Environments (IE)*. IEEE, 2022, pp. 1–7.
- [38] L. Le Cam, "The central limit theorem around 1935," *Statistical science*, pp. 78–91, 1986.
- [39] "Nanshan parking occupancy list," Shenzhen Municipal Open Data Platform. https://opendata.sz.gov.cn/data/dataSet/toDataDetails/29200_00403593, accessed: 10-July-2024.
- [40] Z. Shi, Q. Ou, W. Zheng, and R. Liao, "A driver-side parking evaluation model for roadside spaces," *IEEE Sensors Journal*, 2024.
- [41] "Shanghai Parking Data," Shanghai Municipal Open Data Platform. https://data.sh.gov.cn/view/detail/index.html?type=jk&id=2403&dataset_name=%E8%BD%A6%E8%BE%86%E5%81%9C%E8%BD%A6%E5%9C%BA%E6%95%B0%E6%8D%AE, accessed: 10-July-2024.

TABLE VI
PARAMETERS OF DGRA

Notation	Meaning
0	representation of an occupied parking spot
1	representation an empty parking spot
x	observations/features
y_1	a random variable representing the duration a car remains parked in a parking spot
y_2	a random variable representing the duration a parking spot remains unoccupied.
$f_i(\cdot)$	the probability density function of random variable y_i
$F_i(\cdot)$	the cumulative distribution function of random variable y_i
z_1	decision variable indicating the predicted time point of the dynamic gap reduction algorithm
z_2	binary decision variable indicating the predicted parking results
$P_{y x}$	conditional distribution of y given x
$P(z_2 z_1)$	the probability that a parking spot is in state z_2 given the predicted time z_1
$P_{y x}(z_2 z_1)$	$P(z_2 z_1)$ within the context of the conditional distribution $P_{y x}$

TABLE VII
PARAMETERS OF DSTBM

Variable	Explanation
c	The number of all parking spaces in parking region
ρ	Service intensity of the parking system
A	The distribution of drivers arriving at the parking region
N	The number of drivers arriving at the parking region (the same as N_a in the simulation process)
d	Time matrix for drivers' arrival and leaving
st/lt	Arrival time / leaving time of drivers
T	Total simulation time
D_s	Cruising schedule of detection vehicles