Unlicensed Taxis Detection Service based on Large-Scale Vehicles Mobility Data
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Abstract—Unlicensed taxis are widely considered as major obstacles to city traffic regulation and public safety. Thus, many governments have issued restrictions for car-hailing services and alleged that the use of unlicensed vehicles was illegal. However, it is very challenging that traffic administrative enforcements face limited manpower to prohibit unlicensed taxis, due to costly and time-consuming procedure of on-site evidence collection. In this paper, we propose an effective service to incorporate human mobility mechanism into unlicensed taxis detection from massive city-wide vehicles. We first extract 276 spatio-temporal features, which are grouped into two categories, including daily behaviors and sustainable behaviors to capture the mobility characteristics of unlicensed taxis. Second, we investigate the detection accuracy of three machine learning techniques, viz. support vector machines, decision tree, and logical regression. We illustrate our approach using real-world vehicle license plate recognition dataset in Xiamen, China, which contains 336 million passing records for 6.2 million vehicles filmed by 439 devices in August 2016. Experimental results reveal that LR outperforms SVM and DT in prediction accuracy and F-score measurement, while SVM is capable of identifying the largest number of unlicensed taxis.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Unlicensed taxis (UT) are private vehicles that illegally ferry passengers for the commercial purpose without a taxi license [1]. Nowadays, many metropolitan cities have considered unlicensed taxis as major obstacles to city traffic regulation and public safety1. Especially, UT activities are harmful to many passengers due to issues, such as overcharging price by taking unnecessary detours, after-accident risk with inadequate liability insurance, and potential risk victims of crimes. Therefore, many governments have issued detailed restrictions for car-hailing services and alleged that the use of both unlicensed and crowd-sourced vehicles was unsafe and illegal2.

Example: Reported from Shanghai Municipal Transportation Commission, 7,578 unlicensed taxis were caught and seized in 2016 in Shanghai, China, with year-on-year growth of 30.27%3. In fact, the phenomenon of UT operations is not solely existing in China. Big cities such as New York City, Paris, and Abu Dhabi, are reported to crack down illegal drivers who could face a large number of fines, up to 90-day in jail, or both4. However, due to the costly and time-consuming procedure of collecting evidences from massive regular private vehicles on-site, it is quite challenging for the traffic administrative enforcement department with limited manpower to prohibit UT.

With the advancement of sensing and location-aware technologies, human mobility studies try to employ a data-driven approach, instead of manual efforts, to solve such kind of outlier detection problem [5]. In fact, it is possible to identify UT using large-scale vehicle mobility records because human behavioral patterns can be discovered in their mobility footprints. Examples of such suspicious behaviors include, driving daily for extraordinarily many trips, making frequent stops at transportation hubs and hot scenic spots, and being extremely active in both weekends and late nights, and so on.

Massive human mobility data, such as call details records [6], GPS trajectories [7], and social network check-ins [8], provide the possibility to uncover mobility patterns to separate suspicious unlicensed taxis from regular private vehicles. More recently, a novel dataset, vehicle license plate recognition (VLPR) data, are considered as an emerging analytics tool for traffic law enforcement [9]. However, there are inherent complexities involved in unlicensed taxis activities that it is a non-trivial task for detecting such activities from large-scale VLPR records generated from millions of regular private vehicles. Specially, we need to address the following research challenges. The first challenge is city-scale detection. Identifying UT from massive private vehicles is computationally intensive. Second, it is difficult to classify UT behaviors. In particular, private vehicles may be occasionally used as unlicensed taxis in peak hours or weekends to make profits. For example, Fig. 1 shows that the difference between a known unlicensed taxi (i.e., b) and several regular commuting vehicles (i.e., a, c, d, and e) in morning peak is quite small.

Therefore, an efficient feature extraction model is needed to uncover the UT mobility pattern. In this paper, we propose an effective service which incorporates human mobility
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mechanism into unlicensed taxis detection from massive city-wide vehicles. We first extract 276 spatio-temporal features which are grouped into two categories, including daily behaviors and sustainable behaviors to capture the mobility characteristics of UT. Second, we investigate the detection accuracy of three machine learning techniques, viz., support vector machines (SVM), decision tree (DT), and logical regression (LR). We illustrate our approach using real-world VLPR dataset\(^{5}\), which contains nearly 336 million passing records generated by 6.2 million all kinds of vehicles and filmed by 439 VLPR devices in Xiamen, China, in August 2016. Experimental results reveal that LR outperforms SVM and DT in prediction accuracy and F-score measurement, while SVM is capable of identifying the largest number of unlicensed taxis.

\[ F(v_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{(UT)} \\ -1 & \text{(RPV)} \end{cases} \]  

\(^{5}\) Our study has been approved by the research ethics board of Institute of Computer Architecture, Lanzhou University. The data is legally used without leaking any sensitive information.

III. PRELIMINARY AND MOBILITY CHARACTERISTICS

A. Preliminary

Definition 1 (Vehicle License Plate Recognition (VLPR) Device): A VLPR device is a tuple \(D_i = (d_i, l_{o_i}, l_{a_i})\), where \(d_i\) is a ID of the device, and \(l_{o_i}\) and \(l_{a_i}\) refer to the longitude and latitude of \(d_i\), respectively.

Definition 2 (Vehicle License Plate Recognition (VLPR) Record): An VLPR Record is a record of plate numbers captured by VLPR Device. Each record can be denoted as \(VR_{i,k} = (d_k, v_i, tme_{i,k})\), where \(d_k\) is the ID of the VLPR device, \(v_i\) denotes the recognized vehicle plate number of the vehicle passing by \(d_k\), and \(tme_{i,k}\) is the time stamp of the record.

Definition 3 (Vehicle Trajectory): A vehicle trajectory \(VT_{v_i}\) is represented by the sequence of VLPR records for a vehicle \(v_i\), i.e., \(VT_{v_i} = (VR_{i,1}, VR_{i,2}, ..., VR_{i,m}, VR_{i,m})\), where \(VR_{i,1}\) is the 1-th passing record of vehicle \(v_i\).

Definition 4 (Visited Location): If the interval time between two consecutive VLPR records for a vehicle \(v_i\) is bigger than a threshold, a visited location is presented by \(VL_{i,m}\), where \(VL_{i,m}\) is the \(m\)-th visited location of vehicle \(v_i\).

B. Problem Definition

Given a set of vehicles \(\{v_1, v_2, ..., v_n\}, \ 1 \leq i \leq n\), the unlicensed taxis detected problem is to design a binary classifier \(F\) to identify whether a vehicle is an unlicensed taxi (UT) or a regular private vehicle (RPV), formally defined as: 

\[ F(v_i) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{(UT)} \\ -1 & \text{(RPV)} \end{cases} \]
### C. VLPR Datasets

The VLPR sensors could recognize a vehicle’s license plate number with advanced techniques such as image processing and pattern recognition [9]. Recently, VLPR sensors have been widely used in urban traffic applications, such as road traffic monitoring, traffic law enforcement, access control for parking lots, and so on. For example, there are over 439 VLPR sensors deployed in Xiamen, China, which is a coastal city with 3.8 million populations and 1.4 million local vehicles. Thus, hundreds of VLPR sensors deployed on city-wide road networks are capable of generating a large-scale mobility dataset, which depicts the traffic congestion, accident, as well as human moving patterns by vehicles.

There are two VLPR datasets, including VLPR records for passing vehicles, and VLPR information. Table I shows a sample of VLPR records. Specifically, a VLPR record contains attributes as follows: 1) Device ID, which is an identifier for each VLPR sensor; 2) driving direction of the vehicle; 3) the number of vehicle’s license plate; 4) the color of vehicle’s license plate; and 5) lane number of the vehicle; and 6) a timestamp. Specifically, license plate numbers have been redacted for privacy-protection issues. Furthermore, the VLPR information is the location and type of the VLPR sensors, described by Device ID, Device Type, Device Location, Longitude, Latitude. An example of VLPR information is “620115, 0304, North Hubin Road and Yuxiu Road (East→West), 118.117, 24.488”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Device ID</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>License plate No.</th>
<th>Color</th>
<th>Lane No.</th>
<th>Time Stamp</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>62068</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>000001</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016-5-11-07:05:03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>62143</td>
<td>2B</td>
<td>000002</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016-5-11-07:04:57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60201</td>
<td>2A</td>
<td>000003</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2016-5-11-07:05:03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D. DB Mobility Characteristics

The daily behavior contains five features as follows.

1) **Number of VLPR records** is the total number of VLPR records for a vehicle $v_i$ during the interval $t$, described as:

$$N_{VLPR,t} = |VT_{v_i,t}|$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

2) **Number of VLPR devices**, is the total number of passing devices in time period $t$, which is described as:

$$N_{VLPRD,t} = |VD_{v_i,t}|$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

where $VD_{v_i,t}$ is the set of VLPR devices passed by vehicle $v_i$ in a time period $t$.

As shown in Fig. 2(a), the observations are: 1) unlicensed taxis have both more VLPR records and passing devices than regular private vehicles; and 2) there is an interval of curve between UT’s records and devices. This indicates that UT could visit a certain number of locations in a frequent pattern, because they pass several VLPR devices repeatedly.

3) **Travel distance**, represents the distance a vehicle could drive within the time period $t$, described as:

$$TD_{v_i,t} = \sum_{n=1}^{m} distance(VR_{i,t+1}, VR_{i,t}) \quad VR_{i,t+1} \in VT_{v_i,t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $distance(VR_{i,t+1}, VR_{i,t})$ is the distance between the two consecutive VLPR records $VR_{i,t}$ and $VR_{i,t+1}$.

Fig. 2(b) shows the CDF (i.e., cumulative distribution function) curve of the average distance of unlicensed taxis and regular private vehicles during 6am–6pm of week days in a month. The average travel distance of UTs is longer than RPVs.

Indeed, unlicensed taxis could drive a much longer distance because they are used by plenty of passengers.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.8\textwidth]{image}
\caption{CDF curve of (a) the average number of VLPR records and VLPR devices during 6am–6pm of week days in a month; (b) the average distance of unlicensed taxis and regular private vehicles during 6am–6pm of week days in a month; (c) trip number of unlicensed taxis and regular private vehicle; (d) radius of gyration for unlicensed taxis and regular private vehicle during 6am–6pm of week days in a month.}
\end{figure}

4) **Trip number**. In the Definition 4 of Section III.A, we have given the definition of visited location. We consider that the travel from $VL_{i,n}$ to $VL_{i,n+1}$ is a trip, presented by $tri$. Also, a vehicle trajectory $VT_{v_i}$ in the time period $n$ is represented by the sequence of $tri$ for a vehicle $v_i$, i.e. $VT_{v_i,t} = TRI_{v_i,t} = \{tri_{i,1}, tri_{i,2}, ..., tri_{i,1}, ..., tri_{i,n,t}\}$, where $tri_{i,t}$ is the $l$-th visited location of vehicle $v_i$ in a time period $t$. The trip number is defined as:

$$N_{v_i,tri,t} = |TRI_{v_i,t}|$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

Fig. 2(c) shows that the average trip number for unlicensed taxis is more than that of regular private vehicles.

5) **Radius of gyration** is widely used by physicians to characterize the distance which a person would travel during a given time period $t$, which can be defined as:

$$r^v_g(t) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (r_{cm}^v(t) - r^v_{i}(t))^2}$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

where $r_{cm}^v(t)$ denotes the $l$-th location of the vehicle $v_i$, and $r^v_{cm}(t)$ is the center of mass that represents the centroid location of all passing records for $v_i$. Fig. 2(d) demonstrates that the average radius of gyration for unlicensed taxis is larger than that of regular private vehicles.

### E. SB Mobility Characteristics

The sustainable behaviors are considered as long-term or periodical patterns of a vehicle in a time duration. We use mean, the standard deviation and the frequency of the daily features observed in a month (e.g., 31 days) for each vehicle to present their sustainable behaviors. Specifically, the standard deviation indicates the degree of variation of the daily behaviors of vehicles. For instance, regular private vehicles following routine trajectories are normally with less variations. In addition, the frequency indicates the activeness of each vehicle.
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IV. THE PROPOSED SOLUTION

A. Framework

The general architecture of our system for detecting unlicensed taxis is presented in Fig. 3. In this section, we describe the input and output of the system, and the functional components, including active vehicle filtering, feature extraction and classification, as well as data flows connecting components.

![Figure 3. Overview of system architecture](image)

B. Algorithm

In order to distinguish unlicensed taxi from a large number of private vehicles with high accuracy and low false-positive, we develop a three-step framework including active vehicles filtering, feature extraction and suspect detection.

Step 1. Active Vehicles Filtering.

First, we select private vehicles from massive VLPR records of all kinds of vehicles (i.e., 6.2 million vehicles in August 2016). Then, we selected VLPR records of private vehicles whose license plate color is blue since most unlicensed taxis are private vehicles. As a result, nearly 5 million private vehicles (including vehicles with both local and non-local license plate) are obtained.

Second, we extract active private vehicles based on the high frequency of vehicles in August 2016. We filter out those with lower than 10 active days, (here an active day means that a vehicle should have at least 9 VLPR records). Then, we obtained 295,674 active vehicles from all private vehicles.

Step 2. Feature Extraction.

According to two categories of features mentioned in Section III.B (viz. daily behavior and sustainable behavior), we extract six features before training of data. First, for daily behaviors, we take into account five features (viz. number of VLPR records, number of passing devices, travel distance, trip number and radius of gyration). More specifically, we extract different features in different time periods as described in Table 1. As a result, daily behavior of each vehicle has $23 \times 4 \times 2 + 8 \times 4 + 31 = 247$ daily features.

Second, for sustainable behavior, we consider other three features (viz. the mean, standard deviation, and frequency of vehicle appearance) for each vehicle, representing the sustainability of the vehicle behavior in a month. As a result, each vehicle has $4 \times 2 \times 2 + 4 \times 3 = 29$ sustainable features.

In summary, as shown in Table II, the total number of spatio-temporal features for each vehicle is $247 + 29 = 276$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Features</th>
<th>Time periods</th>
<th>No. of Features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DB Features</td>
<td>Number of records, number of devices, travel distances, radius of gyration</td>
<td>6am–6pm in weekdays (23); 6pm–6am in weekends (23); and holidays (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SB Features</td>
<td>Mean and standard deviation</td>
<td>6am–6pm in weekdays (23); 6pm–6am in weekdays (23); and holidays (8)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frequency of vehicle appearance</td>
<td>Weekdays morning, weekdays evening and holidays</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Step 3. Suspect Detection

We adopt the binary classification methodology that are capable of incorporating heterogeneous features to effectively detect the unlicensed taxis. Specifically, we first train a supervised classifier model with known unlicensed taxis, and then detect unlicensed taxi from candidates using this model. The whole procedure is presented as below.

![Algorithm: Unlicensed taxi detection](image)

V. EXPERIMENTS AND EVALUATIONS

In this section, we present experiments and evaluations with our proposed framework. First, we describe the experimental environment and the detail of datasets. Then we demonstrate the effectiveness of our framework.

A. Experimental Settings

We conduct our experiments on real-world datasets containing nearly 336 million passing records generated by 6.2 million vehicles in August 2016. The records are generated by 439 VLPR devices installed in the city. In addition, we use 800 known unlicensed taxis as positive examples and 3200 private
vehicles as negative examples to train the model. To evaluate the performance of the proposed model, we split all examples into training set and test set. The simulation and experiment are developed with MATLAB 2014b and JDK1.7, and conducted on an ASUS K55V PC with Windows 7 operating system, 32 GB RAM and Intel Core I7 3.6 GHZ CPU.

B. Evaluation Metrics
We investigate the detection accuracy of three machine learning techniques, viz. support vector machines (SVM), decision tree (DT), and logical regression (LR). For all the methods with parameters, we optimize the parameters with 5-fold cross-validation by dividing the training set into 80% for model fitting and 20% for parameter validation. In addition, we repeat the experiment five times and report the average results.

We use accuracy, precision, recall, and F-score as metrics to evaluate the performance of our method. Specially, accuracy is defined as the number of correctly identified instances divided by the number of identified test instances; precision is defined as the number of correctly identified positives divided by the number of identified positives instances; recall is defined as the number of correctly identified positives divided by the number of all positive instances in the test set; and the F-score is defined as:

\[
\text{F-score} = 2 \times \frac{\text{precision} \times \text{recall}}{\text{precision} + \text{recall}}
\]

C. Results Summary
Table III summarizes the performance of these methods and the baselines. The experimental results show that: (1) LR outperforms SVM and DT in prediction accuracy and F-score measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SVM</th>
<th>DT</th>
<th>LR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy (%)</td>
<td>88.36</td>
<td>87.18</td>
<td>89.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision (%)</td>
<td>76.13</td>
<td>67.70</td>
<td>77.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall (%)</td>
<td>59.72</td>
<td>68.72</td>
<td>68.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1 (%)</td>
<td>66.87</td>
<td>68.12</td>
<td>72.72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D. Features Analysis
To further study the effectiveness of the features, we evaluate the performance of our framework with different feature categories. As shown in Fig. 4, we use DB and SB to represent features of daily behaviors and sustainable behaviors, respectively. The results show that the precision, recall and F-score are improved when DB and SB are used together. Such improvement demonstrates the effectiveness of sustainable behaviors features.

VI. CONCLUSION
This paper proposed a service to detect unlicensed taxis (UT) from a large number of vehicles in the city level. The service can be further used to identify active UT activities in densely-populated areas. Specifically, we first extracted 276 spatio-temporal features to capture the mobility characteristics of UT. Second, we investigated the detection accuracy of three machine learning algorithms (viz. SVM, DT, and LR). Finally, we employed a large-scale Vehicle License Plate Recognition (VLPR) dataset for model training and validation. Experimental results on a real-world vehicles dataset demonstrated the effectiveness of our proposed approach. In the future, the learning phase of the model can be further enhanced. Furthermore, it is also interesting to investigate where and when to seize UTs to assist traffic administrative enforcement department, with the consideration of other heterogeneous datasets, such as demographics, point of interests and so on.
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