Executive Summary

• Through meticulous field research, the following report showcases an in-depth effort to collect, analyze and measure parking lot data accuracy across five urban regions globally and compare data feeds from INRIX’s ParkMe data with other supplier Parkopedia

• SBD’s ground-truth assessment looked at 488 randomized parking lots in November 2015 across Berlin, Munich, and Stuttgart in Germany, as well as Boston and San Francisco in the United States, compiling more than 7,200 data points and collecting 2,000 photos. SBD sent trained data collectors to actual parking locations in all five regions, collected on-site attribute data lot by lot (backed by photographic evidence), and the field data collected was compared against published attribute information of the respective ParkMe and Parkopedia Webpages immediately after collection

• ParkMe scored 12% more accurate overall than Parkopedia across the leading attributes leading automakers deem essential for customer satisfaction - most important, ParkMe was 23% more accurate in providing the precise entrance location compared to Parkopedia. ParkMe was also the clear winner across all other core attributes including pricing information accuracy at 91% versus 81%, as well as correct parking lot operating hours at 87% versus 83% (ParkMe vs. Parkopedia, respectively)
Since 1995, SBD has been the world-leading knowledge partner to the global automotive industry, providing actionable insights and strategic support in the development of more connected, secure and safe vehicles. SBD works with more than 90% of the world’s global vehicle manufacturers and the majority of their partners to help them select the right technologies, suppliers and strategies.

In October 2015, INRIX commissioned SBD to conduct an independent and objective benchmarking comparison to gauge parking data accuracy in five cities across the United States and Germany.

The study compared accuracy rates of ParkMe (wholly-owned INRIX subsidiary) vs. Parkopedia vs. the ground truth recorded by in-person specialists trained by SBD to collect on-site data in each city.

Dates of data collection commenced on November 2, 2015 (Germany) and November 9, 2015 (USA) and concluded by end of November 2015.

488 randomized parking lots were visited; field results across 8 attributes were uploaded daily to validate data integrity, and compared to the public Websites published by ParkMe and Parkopedia using an industry standard confidence level of 95% resulting in a statistical margin of error of +/- 3.2%.

Ground truth results were further judged accurate using objective standards (outlined in the methodology section) general “consumer’s point of view” as best possible.
From an accuracy standpoint, ParkMe outscored Parkopedia 90% to 82% across all parking lots overall.

ParkMe scored higher on each attribute measured.
Among Core Attributes (most important to consumers), ParkMe’s accuracy exceeded Parkopedia by wider margins than Other Attributes considered as less influential.
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Berlin, Germany Results
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attribute</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entrance</td>
<td>All properties were recorded based on the street where the respective entrance was located and NOT the formal postal address (provided one existed).</td>
<td>1 (correct) / 0 (incorrect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rates</td>
<td>Parking rates were measured based on what was available in the field at the time of recording. Of which, hourly, evening, overnight, early bird, event, oversize and monthly rates were the predominant pricing attributes used in scoring.</td>
<td>1 (correct) / 0 (incorrect)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hours of Operation</td>
<td>As noted from the field or attendant, daily hours (including 24/7 &amp; day-to-day) were recorded and measured against published information.</td>
<td>1 (correct) / 0 (incorrect)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Lot Name        | Lot names were closely compared to published information. Through field research, two naming conventions were encountered for parking lots:  
- A proper name given to the parking lot  
- The parking lot being named as its location or address  
The first of these two naming conventions takes priority. If a lot did not have a proper name, credit was given in certain cases where parking lots were named after their location or address. | 1 (correct) / 0 (incorrect)    |
The study notes that ParkMe and Parkopedia do not share common nomenclature when describing "Lot Type". As a result and to maintain a fair and balanced scoring approach the following were deemed as having the same/equal interpretation (PM = ParkMe; PP = Parkopedia) based on the general interpretation of the term.

Lot Type

- Structure (PM) = Garage (PP) = Covered (PP)
- Subterranean (PM) = Underground (PP)
- Surface (PM) = Not Covered (PP)

1 (correct) / 0 (incorrect) / 0.5 (partial)

Accepted Payment

As noted from the field, payment types consisted of cash/coin, credit, check (rare) and mobile payment. Note: Cash/coin were considered synonymous.

1 (correct) / 0 (incorrect)
### Attribute

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Scoring Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Height Clearance</strong></td>
<td>Through analysis it was discovered that select ParkMe/Parkopedia lots differed by exactly one inch in their reporting (1&quot;). When using English/Metric units it was assumed that acceptable rounding decisions were made that led to this difference. As a result, all lots within a one inch difference of published heights were considered equal. Some lots were discovered to have two entrances at varying heights.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Phone Number</strong></td>
<td>Field measurements were compared directly to respective vendor (PP/PM) provided phone numbers. The minimum requirement for a correct score was to match at least one correct phone number.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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