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Abstract

Many city residents cannot install their private electric vehicle (EV) charging stations due to lack of dedicated parking spaces or insufficient grid capacity. This presents a significant barrier towards large-scale EV adoption. To address this concern, this paper considers a novel business model, on-demand valet charging, that unlocks the potential of under-utilized public charging infrastructure to promise higher EV penetration. In the proposed model, a platform recruits a fleet of couriers that shuttle between customers and public charging stations to provide on-demand valet charging services to EV owners at an affordable price. Couriers are dispatched to pick up out-of-battery EVs from the customer residence, deliver the EVs to the charging station, plug them in, and then return the fully-charged EVs to customers. To depict the proposed business model, we develop a queuing network to represent the stochastic matching dynamics, and further formulate an economic equilibrium model to capture the incentives of couriers, customers as well as the platform. These models are used to examine how charging infrastructure planning and government regulation affect the market outcome. First, we find that the optimal charging station densities for distinct stakeholders are different: couriers prefer a lower density; the platform prefers a higher density; while the density in-between leads to the highest EV penetration as it balances the time traveling to and queuing at charging stations. Second, we evaluate a regulatory policy that imposes a tax on the platform and invests the tax revenue in public charging infrastructure. Numerical results suggest that this regulation can suppress the platform’s market power associated with monopoly pricing, increase social welfare, and facilitate market expansion.
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1. Introduction

Electric vehicles (EVs) have significantly reshaped the landscape of urban sustainability, leading to higher energy efficiency and lower greenhouse gas emissions as opposed to their gasoline-powered counterparts. Many governments are devoted to accelerating the shift towards electrified urban mobility, announcing to phase out fossil fuel vehicles in a near future \cite{1,2}. With heavy subsidies from governments and awakening public awareness of environmental protection, people become more receptive to EVs. According to the International Energy Agency, the global stock of electric vehicles continues to surge and has reached 7.1 million as of 2019 \cite{3}.

However, the era of e-mobility is yet to come. The commercial success of EVs is on the premise of an ecosystem with ubiquitous charging infrastructure, which consists of home chargers and workplace chargers...
for a long dwell-time recharge, and public chargers for occasional top-up [4]. The major barrier towards massive adoption of EVs is the charging inconvenience arising from two aspects. On the one hand, private charging infrastructure is not accessible to a large number of potential EV customers. In dense cities where apartment dwelling is prevalent, installing a residential charger is not possible for plenty of people who do not have dedicated parking spaces or adequate grid capacity. On the other hand, for EV owners that solely rely on public charging stations, they have to drive miles away to plug in their EV, wait for hours until the recharge is completed, and then fetch the vehicle with perfect timing to avoid over-stay penalty, which is inconvenient for those who live out of walking distance to a public charging station [5]. As a result, public charging infrastructure is limited to long-distance travel or occasional battery top-up, leading to a lower utilization rate than expected. China locates the world’s largest charging station network, while its public charging stations are idle for 85% of the time [6]. In the United States, over 90% of the EV owners recharge their vehicles at home or workplace, other than at public charging stations [7].

To address the aforementioned challenges, a large body of literature has investigated the deployment and operation of charging infrastructure to reduce the charging inconvenience. With an objective to maximize facility utilization, Xi et al. [8] tackled charging stations siting problem in a simulation-optimization framework and asserted that the optimal locations are sensitive to the specific optimization criterion. Yang et al. [9] formulated the charger allocation problem as an integer linear programming and captured the charging dynamics using a queuing model. Interestingly, they showed that charger utilization will increase when extra waiting spots are provided. Huang and Kockelman [10] developed a network equilibrium model to identify the profit-maximizing charging stations placement considering the endogenously determined travel time and on-site charging congestion. Gan et al. [11] introduced both spatial and temporal penalties to characterize the elastic demand in deploying fast charging stations. Shen et al. [12] offered a comprehensive literature review. Mak et al. [13] established a robust optimization framework to address the planning of battery-swapping stations. Sarker et al. [14] incorporated day-ahead scheduling, battery demand uncertainty, and electricity price uncertainty into the optimization model to address the operation and scheduling of battery-swapping stations. Widrick et al. [15] integrated vehicle-to-grid (V2G) technique with battery-swapping stations and explored the optimal charging and discharging policy that maximize the total profit.

Distinct from the above studies that focus on charging infrastructure planning and operation, a concept of Charging-as-a-Service (CaaS) has emerged recently. Guo et al. [16] proposed a business model that offers on-demand battery delivery services to electrify the Mobility-as-a-Service vehicles (e.g., ride-sourcing vehicles, taxis). They found that only 250 service vehicles can satisfy the battery delivery demand of 13000 electric taxis in NYC with a five-minute average waiting time. Zhang et al. [17] explored CaaS in a mobile manner, where mobile chargers offer on-site plug-in services. They show that when reservation is introduced, accurate estimations on charging demand can be achieved, and charging demands across the network can be efficiently and effectively satisfied with the support of intelligent system-level decisions. Qiu and Du [18] examined the dispatch and routing problem in providing EV-to-EV charging services, which allows a pair of EVs to cooperate with each other and exchange electricity on the move. They showed that the CaaS performs better in low EV penetration markets while traffic congestion is mild and demands require energy earlier.

Although aforementioned studies can facilitate transport electrification, few of them have fundamentally addressed the inconvenience of using public charging stations for long dwell-time EV recharge. In contrast, this paper represents the first attempt in the literature to break down the barrier to using public charging stations as a daily charging option. Such attempt can eliminate the range anxiety for city dwellers who do not have access to private residential chargers. This will bypass the difficulty of installing private charging stations, unleash the immense potential in public charging infrastructure, and promote mass EV adoption among metropolitan residents.
To realize this vision, we propose a novel business model that provides on-demand valet charging services to EV owners, enabling them to conveniently utilize public charging stations for daily charging. The business model involves three entities: EV owners, couriers, and a valet charging platform. EV owners can request this service whenever needed and drop off their keys wherever convenient. Couriers are then dispatched to pick up the out-of-battery EVs from the customers, drive the EVs to charging stations, plug in the vehicles, and return fully-charged EVs to customers. Couriers and EV owners are connected by a third-party platform that offers a user interface to EV owners and employs a fleet of couriers to provide on-demand valet charging services at an affordable price. With the deliver-to-door valet charging service, EV drivers are free from traveling back and forth to charging stations, making public charging as convenient as residential charging. As such, it offers a convenient charging option and enables millions of apartment dwellers without private chargers to embrace EVs. Since 2016, Luxe has partnered with Tesla and integrated charging service into valet parking [19]. However, it is offered as a luxury service exclusively for Tesla EVs. In contrast, our model is targeted at the entire EV community, which achieves economy of scale that can reduce operational cost and improve service quality. The key contributions of this paper are three-fold:

- We propose the novel business model of on-demand valet charging that enables city residents without private chargers to adopt EVs and recharge EVs using public charging stations with minimal inconvenience. We formulate a mathematical model to characterize the interaction among stakeholders involved in the valet charging market. The model includes a queuing network that describes matching dynamics between EVs, couriers, and charging stations, and an economic equilibrium model that captures the incentives of multiple market participants.

- We investigate charging infrastructure planning under the proposed business model. We find that the interests of different stakeholders are not consistent: couriers receive higher surplus at a lower charging station density, while the platform prefers a higher density such that it enjoys a higher markup from the lower marginal cost. The optimal density that leads to the highest EV penetration is in-between that trades off the time traveling to and waiting at charging stations. We also show that the monopoly platform has a strong market power that reaps most of the benefits associated with improved charging convenience, resulting in inefficient market outcomes.

- We explore a prospective regulatory policy that levies a tax on the platform for serving each customer and invests the tax revenue in public charging infrastructure. We show that the tax burden is primarily imposed on the platform as opposed to EV owners. When the tax rate is in a certain range, imposing this tax can weaken the platform’s market power, improve social welfare, and further facilitate EV adoption. Nonetheless, city planners need to jointly redeploy charging stations with the regulation to effectively bring more EVs into use.

The reminder of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 provides a brief sketch of the proposed business model and some fundamental remarks. Section 3 formulates a mathematical model for the valet charging market. Section 4 examines how charging infrastructure planning will affect the market outcome. Section 5 introduces and verifies a potential regulatory policy for the proposed business model. Section 6 concludes key findings of this study and possible directions for future work.

2. Preliminaries

This section elucidates the business model of valet charging and elaborates the interaction among the platform, EV owners, couriers, and charging infrastructure. The platform dispatches a fleet of couriers to provide app-based on-demand chauffeur charging services for EV owners. Customers order valet charging services via the user interface, specify the pickup location, then wait for an idle courier to pick up the vehicle.
Drivers can register as couriers and offer EV delivery services contingent on their schedules. Couriers are paid on *per-delivery* basis. Resembling designated drivers, couriers typically shuttle between customers and charging stations by public transit, bicycle, or scooter. Upon receiving each request, the platform dispatches a vacant courier to pick up and drive the out-of-battery EV to a nearby charging station. The charging process will not be interrupted until the battery is fully recharged unless an early recall is issued. Upon charging completion, another vacant courier will be sent to drive the EV back to its owner. The platform charges a service fare from customers, pays wages to couriers and keeps the difference between service fare and courier wage as a commission to make a profit. Figure 1 demonstrates the interaction among different entities in the valet charging market. We have fundamental remarks as below.

- As highlighted in Figure 1, there are two delivery trips in the process of valet charging services: first deliver out-of-battery EVs to charging stations and then return fully-charged EVs to customers. We argue that two delivery trips can be accomplished by different couriers. For one thing, a full charge usually lasts several hours. It is clearly a waste of time for couriers to wait hours in charging stations. For another, customer arrival and departure are random. It is inefficient to designate the same courier to drive the fully-charged EV back to its owner. Hence, couriers should be flexibly dispatched to serve another delivery trip, which benefits both the platform and couriers: the platform will enjoy a higher labor efficiency as there are more dispatchable couriers in the system; couriers will idle a shorter time and receive a higher income since they are paid on per-delivery basis.

- EV charging may suffer from delay due to congestion at charging stations. We argue that when such delay occurs, couriers should be liberated from the queue and a dedicated coordinator should be employed to manage the waiting EVs at each charging station. This is well-reasoned and necessary: a coordinator is in need to settle the rotation between fully-charged EVs and queuing EVs and take care of the keys. Couriers are not appropriate candidates for these jobs because of the uncertainty and stochasticity in the customer arrival and departure. The advantages of this strategy are two-fold. First, couriers can be free from being stuck in line and therefore receive higher wages. Second, dedicated coordinators can promptly unplug the fully-charged EVs without delay and hand over chargers to the waiting vehicles, which can address the “overstay” issue in charging stations [21].

---

1The term “designated driver” refers to a driver who is dedicated to driving alcohol consumers home safe in their own cars [20]. This concept is intened to discourage drunk driving. Designated drivers typically come and forth between customers’ home and restaurants.

2Prevailing Alternating Current (AC) Level 2 charging stations supply power at 1.4 - 19.2kW, while the battery capacity of a standard-range Tesla Model 3 is 50kW.
Public charging stations are typically operated by government agencies or third-party companies. Charging station operators charge an electricity fare from all EVs using charging facilities, while the valet charging platform independently charges a service fare from their customers. We consider the electricity fare as exogenous and only focus on the pricing strategy of the valet charging platform. The case that the platform operates its own charging stations dedicated to valet charging service is beyond the scope of this paper and will be discussed in future research.

3. Formulation

This section presents a queuing network to capture the matching dynamics among customers, couriers, and charging stations, followed by an economic equilibrium model to predict the market outcome.

3.1. Queuing Network

As shown in Figure 2, the service process is characterized by a queuing network that consists of a delivery queue and multiple charging queues (one at each charging station). The delivery queue captures the matching process between EVs and couriers. From entering to leaving the queue, each EV experiences a waiting time (time for couriers to pick up the vehicle) and a delivery time (time for couriers to deliver the vehicle). On the other hand, the charging queue captures the matching process between EVs and charging stations. Each EV experiences a waiting time and a charging time before it exits from the charging queue. For each valet charging service, an out-of-battery EV first enters the delivery queue and is delivered to the nearest charging station. It then enters a charging queue and waits for an available outlet. After the charging is completed, it enters the delivery queue again, returned to its owner. During the entire process, each EV enters the delivery queue twice, once from the EV owner’s residence to the charging station, and once from the charging station back to the EV owner’s residence.

In the above queuing network model, we implicitly assume that couriers are uniformly distributed across the city such that the waiting time in the delivery queue does not depend on where the EV is picked up. We further assume that the charging infrastructure is uniformly distributed across the city such that the waiting times at distinct charging stations have the same average value. We comment that the proposed queuing model can be extended to incorporate the spatial heterogeneity of charging demand where the waiting time in the delivery queue is location-dependent, and the waiting times in different charging queues (different zones in the city) are asymmetric. However, we argue that an aggregate model that predicts the average market outcome suffices our purpose as we primarily focus on infrastructure planning and regulatory policy at the city level.
3.1.1. Delivery Queue

In the delivery queue, couriers act as “servers” and each delivery trip is defined as a “job”. Denote $N$ as the number of couriers. Let $\lambda$ represent the arrival rate (per unit time) of new-coming valet charging customers, and denote $\lambda_d$ as the arrival rate (per unit time) of delivery request in the delivery queue. Note that because each EV will enter the delivery queue twice, the delivery request may be initiated from either an empty-battery EV or a fully-charged EV. In this case, we have $\lambda_d = 2\lambda$. For each EV that enters the delivery queue, its dwell time consists of a pickup time $t_p$ and a delivery time $t_d$ (see Figure 2). These are endogenous variables that depend on the density of couriers and charging stations, which will be modeled below.

The pickup time $t_p$ depends on the availability of idle couriers. It captures the time elapsed from a valet charging service being initiated to the EV being picked up. This duration can be divided into two segments: (a) from the service being requested to a courier being designated, (b) from a courier being designated to the vehicle being picked up. We assume that there are adequate couriers in the market so that the first period can be neglected. In this case, the waiting time for pickup is primarily determined by the travel distance between customers and the nearest idle courier. It is well-established that when couriers are uniformly distributed, this distance is proportional to the square root of the density of idle couriers [22], [23], thus we have:

$$t_p = \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{N_I/A}},$$  

(1)

where $\phi$ is a model parameter, $A$ is the total area of the city, and $N_I$ denotes the number of idle couriers. This equation states that the EV will be picked up more promptly with more dispatchable couriers per unit area. It is consistent with the intuition that the distance between a customer and the closest idle courier depends on the average distance between any two nearby idle couriers. Please refer to [23, Proposition 1] for a detailed proof. Based on the Little’s formula, the number of idle couriers can be computed by

$$N_I = N - \lambda_d t_d.$$  

(2)

Note that $N_I$ is required to be positive to stabilize the queue.

Remark 1. In (2), $N_I$ includes couriers that are waiting for their next delivery trips, and couriers that are already matched with a customer but still heading to the pickup location. The latter class of couriers are counted as idle because they can be reassigned to serve new coming customers according to the real-time updated location of couriers and customers, even when they are on the way to pick up the vehicle. This is in line with the dispatching policy of Uber.

The delivery time $t_d$ corresponds to the travel time to the nearest charging station, which depends on the number of charging stations per unit area. In valet charging services, the average delivery time $t_d$ equals the average travel time to the nearest charging station, which is inversely proportional to the density of charging stations [24]:

$$t_d = \theta \sqrt{\frac{A}{K}},$$  

(3)

where $\theta$ is a model parameter and $K$ is the number of charging stations in the city. The rationale behind this is straightforward. Assume the city is equally partitioned into $K$ non-overlapping zones and a charging station locates at the center of each zone. If the customer demand follows a uniform distribution, the the expected distance to the closet charging station is proportional to the radius of the zone, i.e., $\sqrt{A/K}$.

3.1.2. Charging Queue

The charging queue at each station models the matching dynamics between EVs and chargers. After arriving at the charging station, each EV joins the charging queue and experiences a waiting time $t_w$ and a charging
time \( t_c \). This is modeled as a continuous-time queuing process that follows first-come-first-served (FCFS) principle. We assume that the arrival process of out-of-battery EVs is subject to Poisson distribution and that the charging time is exponential with mean \( t_c \). Consider there are \( K \) charging stations in total and there are \( S \) charging outlets in each station. This constitutes \( K \) homogeneous \( M/M/S \) queues (one at each charging station),\(^3\) and the arrival rate of EVs to each queue is \( \bar{\lambda} = \lambda/K \). The average waiting time in a standard \( M/M/S \) queue can be derived based on Erlang C Formula \(^{[25]}\):

\[
    t_w = \frac{Q_0(\bar{\lambda}t_c)^S\rho}{S!(1-\rho)^2\bar{\lambda}},
\]

where \( \rho = \bar{\lambda}t_c/S < 1 \) is the occupancy of chargers, i.e., the expected fraction of time that each charger is busy, and \( Q_0 \) represents the probability that there is no customer waiting in the queue:

\[
    Q_0 = \frac{1}{\sum_{n=0}^{S-1} \frac{(\bar{\lambda}t_c)^n}{n!} + \frac{(\bar{\lambda}t_c)^S}{S!} \cdot \frac{1}{1-\rho}}.
\]

Equation (4) is expressed explicitly. However, since summation and factorial are involved, the computation procedure is tedious and the formula is intractable for further analysis. In this regard, we adopt the formula in \(^{[26]}\) to approximate the mean waiting time \( t_w \):

\[
    t_w = t_c \rho \sqrt{2S+2-1} S \sqrt{1-\rho}.
\]

We emphasize that (5) is a sufficiently accurate approximation of the mean waiting time. The performance of this approximation is evaluated in Appendix A.

### 3.2. Market Equilibrium Model

#### 3.2.1. Customer Incentives

Customers decide whether to use valet charging services according to the generalized cost, which is the weighed sum of service fare and the customer total waiting time. The generalized cost \( c \) can be written as follows:

\[
    c = p_v + \alpha t_p + \beta (t_w + 2t_d),
\]

where \( p_v \) is the average price per valet charging service, and \( \alpha > \beta > 0 \) represents the customer’s value of time. The non-monetary component within the generalized cost (6) reflects the time spent on each valet charging service. In particular, from placing a request the receiving the returned vehicle, each customer experiences a waiting period that can be divided into the following segments: (a) waiting to be confirmed, (b) waiting to be picked up, i.e., \( t_p \), (c) delivering to a charging station, i.e., \( t_d \), (d) waiting at the charging station for an idle charger, i.e., \( t_w \), (e) completing the charging process, i.e., \( t_c \), (f) waiting to be picked up again, i.e., \( t_p \), and (g) delivering back to the customer, i.e., \( t_d \). As each service request is usually responded in seconds, the confirmation time is negligible. Under this assumption, the customer waiting time before the first EV pickup is \( t_p \), whereas the waiting time after the EV pickup is \( 2t_d + t_w + t_c + t_p \). Since \( t_c \) is an exogenous parameter, it can be normalized to 0 without loss of generality.\(^4\) In this case, the post-pickup waiting time can be expressed as \( 2t_d + t_w + t_p \). Crucially, customers perceive the pre-pickup waiting time \( t_p \)

---

\(^3\)We assume that charging outlets are uniformly distributed among charging stations. This assumption can be easily relaxed by differentiating the number of chargers of distinct stations.

\(^4\)For EV owners, either valet charging or self-charging has to wait \( t_c \) for an available outlet at charging stations. Hence, in the discrete choice model, e.g., logit model, this term can be absorbed into the cost of outside option.
and the post-pickup waiting time $2t_d + t_w + t_p$ differently: they tend to be impatient when waiting for the courier’s arrival. However, after the EV is picked up, customers become less sensitive to the time that the vehicle is returned. For this reason, we let $\alpha > \beta$. Note that we combine two different $t_p$ in (6) for brevity.

The valet charging demand is determined by the average generalized cost:

$$\lambda = \tau \lambda_0 F_v(c),$$

where $\tau$ is the percentage of EVs that run out of power per unit time, $\lambda_0$ is the total number of potential customers who owns or intends to purchase a private vehicle (either EV or conventional combustion engine vehicle), and $F_v(c)$ represents the proportion of private vehicle owners that adopt EVs and use valet charging services. As such, $\lambda_0 F_v(c)$ refers to the number of EV owners that use valet charging as a daily charging option. By assuming that there is a certain percentage $\tau$ of EVs will need to be recharged per unit time, we can express the arrival rate of valet charging customers as $\tau \lambda_0 F_v(c)$. Note that $F_v(\cdot)$ is a strictly decreasing function, indicating that customers will be deterred by a higher cost. We emphasize that the generalized cost varies from different customers. Each element in (6) is random and $c$ only represents the average value. We assume that the arrival rate is only determined by the average cost and does not depend on the higher-order moments of the cost distribution among customers. The logit model is a special case of (7) that satisfies the above assumption [27].

**Remark 2.** To capture EV penetration, we define $\lambda_0$ as the total number of customers that intend to purchase private vehicles, including both EVs and conventional combustion engine vehicles. In this case, $F_v(c)$ should be interpreted as the proportion of drivers who chooses EV (instead of gasoline vehicles) and at the same time decides to use the valet charging service. The explicit form of $F_v(c)$ can be derived either from a logit model 5 or a nested logit model 6.

### 3.2.2. Courier Incentives

Couriers will receive a payment $p_c$ from the platform for providing each delivery trip. However, they decide whether to join the platform based on the expected earning in a period of time instead of the per-trip income [28]. Couriers’ average wage $w$ is collectively determined by the delivery demand $\lambda_d$, average per-trip payment $p_c$, and the number of couriers $N$. It equals the total payment to all couriers divided by the number of couriers, i.e.,

$$w = \frac{p_c \lambda_d}{N}.$$  

The courier supply is then given by

$$N = N_0 F_c(w),$$

where $N_0$ is the number of overall potential couriers (i.e., drivers looking for a job), and $F_c(w)$ is the proportion of drivers that enter the valet charging industry. Note that $F_c(\cdot)$ is a strictly increasing function, reflecting that more drivers would engage in the business if the expected income is higher. We emphasize that we do not assume each courier has the same wage. In general, different couriers may receive different earnings. To derive equation (9), we only need to assume that the total number of couriers depends on the average wage instead of any higher-order moments of the wage distribution. The well-established logit model is a special case of (9).

---

5 Customers choose whether to buy a gasoline vehicle, or buy an EV and use the valet charging service, or buy the EV without using the valet charging service.

6 Customers first choose whether to buy a gasoline vehicle or an EV. If they choose EV, then they further determine whether to use the valet charging service or not.
3.2.3. Platform Decisions

We consider a monopolistic platform that determines the service fare $p_v$ and the courier payment $p_c$ to maximize its profit. For an exogenous $K$, the platform’s profit is the difference between the gross revenue from customers (i.e., $\lambda p_v$) and the total salary expenditure. The latter consists of two components: (a) total payment to couriers, i.e., $\lambda p_c$, (b) payment to dedicated coordinators, i.e., $KC$ (recall the “dedicated coordinator” strategy in Section 2). Here $C$ is regarded as a constant that represents the per-time wage for the coordinator in each charging station. The platform’s decisions are subject to the demand model (7), the supply model (9), and the queuing network model (1),(3),(5). The profit-maximizing problem can be cast as follows:

$$\max_{p_v, p_c} \lambda(p_v - p_c) - KC$$

$$\lambda = \tau \lambda_0 F_v (p_v + \alpha t_p + \beta(t_w + 2t_d))$$

$$N = N_0 F_v \left( \frac{\lambda p_c}{N} \right)$$

$$t_p = \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{(N - 2\lambda t_d)/A}}$$

$$t_d = \theta \sqrt{A/K}$$

$$t_w = t_c \rho^{2S+2-1} S(1 - \rho)$$

where (11a) specifies the valet charging demand, (11b) gives the number of couriers, and (11c)-(11e) defines the endogenous pickup time, delivery time, and waiting time, respectively. It is important to note that the queuing network implicitly imposes an upper bound on the number of customers:

$$\lambda < \min \left\{ \frac{K S}{t_c}, \frac{N}{2 t_d} \right\}$$

which requires that the arrival rate of valet charging customers should not exceed the service capacity of both delivery queue and charging queue.

We have the following proposition that establishes the existence of solution to (10).

**Proposition 1.** For any given $K > 0$, if $F_v \left( \alpha \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{N_0/A}} + 2\beta t_d \right) > 0$ and $N_0 > \frac{2t_d KS}{t_c}$, there exist $p_v > 0$, $w > 0$, $\lambda > 0$, and $N > 0$ that satisfy (11).

The first condition $F_v \left( \alpha \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{N_0/A}} + 2\beta t_d \right) > 0$ ensures that there will be a positive number of customers when the platform provides valet charging services for free ($p_v = 0$) and hires all potential couriers ($N = N_0$). The second condition $N_0 > \frac{2t_d KS}{t_c}$ amounts to $N_0 > \frac{KS}{2t_d}$, which means that the overall driver supply $N_0$ should be substantial enough to satisfy the demand even when the charging queue reaches its highest utilization, i.e., $\lambda = \frac{KS}{t_c}$. It rules out the case where the platform recruits $N_0$ couriers but still cannot meet the need. This assumption is realistic since the charging infrastructure supply is more limited than the labor supply, and the market scale of valet charging is smaller than that of ride-sourcing and taxicab industries. These two conditions suffice to guarantee at least one intersection between the demand and supply curves. The proof is deferred to Appendix C.

To solve (10), we use the average wage $w$ in place of the courier payment $p_c$ as a decision variable. Rigorously speaking, the platform can directly determine the payment $p_c$, which indirectly affect the average driver wage $w$. However, given the customer demand, $w$ and $p_c$ has one-to-one mapping, and thus optimizing over
and \( p_c \) are mathematically equivalent. Moreover, constraints (11c)-(11e) can be inserted into (11a), then by plugging the expressions of \( \lambda \) and \( N \) into (10), we can transform (10) into an unconstrained optimization problem as follows:

\[
\max_{p_v, w} \tau_0 F_v \left( p_v + \frac{\alpha \phi \sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{N_0 F_c(w) - 2\theta \lambda \sqrt{A/K}} + \beta \left( t_c \left( \frac{\lambda t_c}{K S} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} \phi + 1} + 2 \theta \sqrt{A/K} \right)} \right) p_v - N_0 F_c(w) - KC \tag{13}
\]

where \( \lambda \) is given by (11a). Clearly, (13) is non-convex. However, since its dimension is small and the objective function is uniquely determined by each pair of \((p_v, w)\), we can efficiently solve it through a grid search over \((p_v, w)\), which provides the globally optimal solution to (10).

4. Charging Infrastructure Planning

This section uncovers the strategic effect of charging infrastructure planning on the valet charging market.

4.1. Problem Statement

Appropriate deployment of public charging infrastructure can significantly alleviate the barriers to higher EV uptake. The siting and sizing problems of charging stations have been extensively studied. Particularly, some studies highlight the elasticity between driving distance and queuing time when planning charging infrastructure \([9][10][11]\). The elastic demand refers to the phenomenon that customers will neither travel too far nor stay in line too long to obtain the service \([29]\). In this sense, under a limited budget, the charging facility placement is actually a trade-off between accessibility and charging congestion: (1) large and sparsely distributed charging stations may cause inconvenience for EV recharge due to the driving distance, (2) small but densely distributed charging stations may result in congested charging queues and therefore a long waiting time.

Note that our model also demonstrates such characteristics. To see this, we assume that the total number of chargers is fixed as \( M_0 \). Since there are \( K \) charging stations, each charging station would have an average number of \( S = M_0/K \) charging outlets. By substituting \( S = M_0/K \) and \( \bar{\lambda} = \lambda/K \) into (5), we can rewrite the waiting time \( t_w \) as:

\[
t_w = \frac{t_c K}{M_0 - \lambda t_c} \left( \frac{\lambda t_c}{M_0} \right)^{\frac{1}{2} \phi + 1} \] \tag{14}

Clearly, the partial derivative of \( t_w \) with respect to \( K \) is positive. On the contrary, according to (3), the derivative of \( t_d \) with respect to \( K \) is negative. This reveals that when the number of charging stations is fixed,\(^7\) building more charging stations will intensify the congestion, i.e., \( \frac{\partial t_w}{\partial K} > 0 \), but at the same time reduce the travel distance to charging stations, i.e., \( \frac{\partial t_d}{\partial K} < 0 \).

To capture the aforementioned trade-off, we consider the following charging infrastructure planning problem. Given a fixed charging facility supply \( M_0 \), the city planner equally allocates the resources into \( K \) homogeneous charging stations to maximize the EV ownership, which is equivalent to maximize the valet

---

\(^7\)This can be viewed as a limited budget for charging infrastructure.
charging demand \( \lambda \) under the proposed business model.\(^8\) To this end, the city planner should subtly balance the delivery time and waiting time by determining an appropriate density of charging stations. We will demonstrate the decision-making problem with a numerical example, followed by a formal analysis that reveals in-depth economic insights.

4.2. Numerical Example

As a numerical example, we consider that the valet charging demand follows a binary logit model. In this case, the demand function (7) can be rewritten as

\[
\lambda = \tau \lambda_0 \frac{e^{-\epsilon c}}{e^{-\epsilon c} + e^{-\epsilon c_0}},
\]

where \( \epsilon > 0 \) is a sensitivity parameter, and \( c_0 \) is the cost of outside option, i.e., buying other vehicles or using other charging methods than valet charging. In the same vein, the courier supply can also be described by a logit model:

\[
N = N_0 \frac{e^{\eta w}}{e^{\eta w} + e^{\eta w_0}},
\]

where \( \eta > 0 \) is a sensitivity parameter, and \( w_0 \) is the utility of outside option, e.g., selecting other jobs. Note that the logit model is a special case of (7) and (9).

Under the above assumptions, the model parameters in this study include

\[
\Theta = \{ \lambda_0, N_0, M_0, A, C, \tau, \theta, \phi, \alpha, \beta, \epsilon, \eta, c_0, w_0, t_c \}.
\]

These parameters are calibrated with partial reference to existing studies and official data in Hong Kong, which are specified as below:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda_0 &= 600000, \quad N_0 = 10000, \quad M_0 = 3000, \quad A = 1000 \text{km}^2, \quad C = \text{HK$70}, \quad \tau = 1\%, \quad \theta = 0.06, \quad \phi = 0.04, \\
\alpha &= \text{HK$60/hr}, \quad \beta = \text{HK$10/hr}, \quad \epsilon = 0.1, \quad \eta = 0.1, \quad c_0 = \text{HK$70}, \quad w_0 = \text{HK$110/hr}, \quad t_c = 5\text{hr}.
\end{align*}
\]

The calibration procedure of these parameters is given in Appendix B. We emphasize that they are only for preliminary illustration of the proposed business model. The economic insights we derive later is independent of their value. One may fine-tune the parameters with real-world data in future research.

To evaluate how the market outcome is affected by charging station density under an exogenous charging supply \( M_0 \), we first fix \( K \) and solve the profit maximizing problem (10). By varying \( K \), we then trace the market outcomes as a function of \( K \). Simulation results are reported in Figure 3-11.

4.3. Analysis

According to numerical results, the market outcomes under different density \( K \) can be segmented into four regimes:

- When \( K \leq 30 \), the market expands sharply, which benefits all participants. The service price drops and the service quality improves. The platform’s profit rises. Couriers receive higher wages. The number of couriers is maximized at \( K^*_N = 30 \).

\(^8\)In this work, we aim to explore a convenient and affordable charging option for those who do not have a private charger. We should focus on the increment of EV ownership associated with the emergence of valet charging services. In this spirit, the more EV owners use valet charging, the higher is the EV penetration.
• When $30 < K \leq 49$, the courier fleet reduces, while more customers use valet charging services. The platform’s profit increases. The number of customers peaks at $K^*_\lambda = 49$.

• When $49 < K \leq 96$, both the demand and supply reduce. In contrast, the platform’s profit remains increasing, which reaches the maximum at $K^*_\Pi = 96$.

• When $K > 96$, customers, couriers, and the platform all suffer varying degrees of loss: customers pay a higher cost, couriers earn a lower wage, and the platform receives a lower profit. The decrease of courier supply outpaces that of customer demand.

The results indicate that the charging station density should fall in an appropriate range, i.e., $K \in [K^*_N, K^*_\Pi]$, where the delivery time and queuing time are traded off. The city planner should determine an optimal deployment policy within this range in accordance with her objective: (a) select $K^*_N$ to maximize courier welfare, (b) select $K^*_\lambda$ to maximize EV penetration, and (c) select $K^*_\Pi$ to maximize the platform’s profit. Any charging station density outside this appropriate range will lead to inefficient market outcomes and inferior surplus for the stakeholders. For instance, at a lower charging station density, i.e., $K < K^*_N$, the delivery time is so long that the platform needs to employ a larger courier fleet to fulfill the demand. The
high marginal cost (see Figure 10) deters the platform from serving more customers, which results in a sluggish market: charging stations are under-utilized in this regime. At a higher charging station density, i.e., $K > K^*_N$, charging stations are congested and all stakeholders are worse off: fewer EV owners adopt valet charging, fewer couriers are hired, and the platform suffers a profit decline.

The above discussion discloses that the interests of customers, couriers, and the platform are not aligned. As the delivery time is counted twice in (6), compared to couriers, customers prefer a slightly higher charging station density, which shortens the time wasted on the road while does not result in long charging queues. Hence, it can decrease the generalized cost of using valet charging services. On the other hand, the platform prefers a much higher charging station density as it can reduce the marginal cost. After employing dedicated coordinators to handle on-site operations, the platform becomes less sensitive to charging congestion and tends to expand the market to compensate for the fixed cost. This is an important observation since it indicates the charging infrastructure should be deployed to cohere with the goals of city planners. In future work, multi-objective optimization can be employed to explore the Pareto frontier of the optimal charging infrastructure planning strategy.

Another important finding is obtained from the market outcomes in $[K^*_N, K^*_\lambda]$, where increasing $K$ leads to a downsized courier fleet and an increased valet charging demand. This is surprising as it reveals that the platform can serve more customers with fewer couriers. We show that this regime always exists regardless of model parameters. For ease of notation, we denote the courier supply model by $w(N)$ in place of $N(w)$ hereinafter. The conclusion can be formally summarized as below:

**Proposition 2.** Assume that (10) has a unique solution. For any pickup time model $t_p(N_I)$ following the square root law in (1) and any supply model $w(N)$ such that $Nw(N)$ is convex, we always have $K^*_N < K^*_\lambda$.

The proof can be found in Appendix D. The uniqueness of solution is validated numerically, and the convexity of $Nw(N)$ follows the law of diminishing marginal utility [30]. Proposition 2 implies that compared with couriers, customers always prefer charging stations to be denser, i.e., $K^*_N < K^*_\lambda$. To understand the reason behind this result, we first note that the number of couriers should be selected so that the marginal revenue equals the marginal cost for hiring one additional unit of courier. Simple calculus reveals that this is equivalent to:

$$w(N) + Nw'(N) = \frac{\alpha \sqrt{A}}{2} \lambda (N - 2\lambda t_d)^{-\frac{3}{2}}, \tag{17}$$

where the left-hand (right-hand) side of (17) is the marginal cost (revenue) for hiring an extra unit of courier. As we increase the density of charging stations $K$, the delivery time $t_d$ reduces, and the customer arrival rate $\lambda$ changes accordingly. Under the same $N$, this will affect the marginal revenue but does not affect the marginal cost. At $K = K^*_N$, $N$ attains its maximum. If we further increase $K$ marginally, $N$ remains constant. $t_d$ decreases, and thus $\lambda$ must increase. This indicates that the customer arrival rate still increases after $N$ reaches the maximum, which dictates that $K^*_N < K^*_\lambda$. This further proves that the second regime always exists regardless of model parameters: no matter what parameter value we select, there is always a regime where the platform can hire fewer couriers to serve more customers and meanwhile earn a higher profit as the charging station density increases.

---

9The marginal cost here is defined as the marginal increment of labor expense when the platform serves one additional customer at equilibrium and keeps the pickup time unchanged. This is a well-reasoned simplification since $t_p$ does not significantly fluctuate under slightly different $\lambda$ and $N$.

10These two are mathematically equivalent because of the one-to-one mapping between $w$ and $N$.

11As more couriers are employed, hiring an additional courier will yield greater additions to labor costs, which is equivalent to smaller additions to the platform’s utility.

12This is because $\frac{\partial N}{\partial K} = 0$ at $K = K^*_N$. 
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Last but not the least, we observe that the monopoly platform has a strong market power that compromises the efficiency of the market outcomes. As $K$ goes up, the marginal cost rapidly drops, while the price barely changes. This underscores a growing market power, which can be measured by the Lerner Index:

$$L = \frac{p_v - c_m}{p_v},$$

where $c_m$ refers to the marginal cost (Figure 10). The Lerner index $L$ measures the relative distance between the market price and the competitive price, thus the higher $L$ is, the higher market power the platform has [30]. As shown in Figure 12, the platform charges a markup of 38% to the marginal cost at $K^*_\lambda$. For $K \in [K^*_\lambda, K^*_H]$, it enjoys a profit growth even though both demand and supply suffer a loss. Compared with a competitive market, most benefits of increased charging convenience are reaped by the monopolistic platform. In this light, regulatory interventions are in need to weaken the platform’s market power.

5. Taxation Regulation

This section examines a prospective taxation scheme for valet charging market. Based on the numerical example in the last section, the platform’s market power is notably high, e.g., $L(K^*_\lambda) = 38\%$, which motivates the government to regulate the platform.

5.1. Taxation Scheme

One way to mitigate the platform’s market power is to nurture a competitive market by introducing competition among platforms. However, like Uber, Airbnb and other two-sided platforms, the success of the business model crucially depends on the economy of scale. In this case, a competitive but fragmented market will lead to inefficient matching between supply and demand, incurring inferior market outcomes.

In contrast, we argue that the valet charging platform should enjoy a concentrated market, but at the same time be regulated by the government to ensure fairness and efficiency. Inspired by the congestion tax for vehicles that create traffic congestion on the road [31], a prospective policy is to impose a “valet-charging” tax on the platform to penalize the charging congestion caused by this service. Nonetheless, purely taxing may discourage the platform’s willingness to expand the market, which contradicts the objective of promoting EV adoption. To avoid excessive disincentives, the tax revenue is invested in building more public charging stations to accommodate a larger market. To put it another way, the platform is obligated to undertake part of the cost for EV charging infrastructure. This can not only curb the platform’s market power but also bring more EVs into use by providing more charging stations. The government can regulate the platform by determining the tax rate.
Suppose a per-service tax $p_t$ is imposed on the platform for serving each customer. The hourly tax revenue $\lambda p_t$ is in turn put into investing public charging facilities. We denote $c_s$ as the prorated investment cost of each public charger.\textsuperscript{13} Under this taxation scheme, the profit maximization problem is cast as:

$$
\max_{p_v, w} \lambda(p_v - p_t) - Nw - KC
$$

\begin{align}
\lambda &= \tau \lambda_0 F_v (p_v + \alpha t_p + \beta (t_w + 2 t_d)) \\
N &= N_0 F_v(w) \\
M &= M_0 + \frac{\lambda p_t}{c_s} \\
t_p &= \frac{\phi}{\sqrt{(N - 2 \lambda t_d)/A}} \\
t_d &= \theta \sqrt{A/K} \\
t_w &= \frac{t_c K}{M - \lambda t_c} \left( \frac{\lambda t_c}{M} \right)^{2M/K+2-1}
\end{align}

where $M$ is the updated charger supply after the tax revenue is used to expand the public charging infrastructure. Clearly, for the platform, the profit optimization problem (19) depends on the exogenous charging station density $K$ and the tax rate $p_t$.

On top of (19), we introduce a regulatory agency that determines the charging station density $K$ and the tax rate $p_t$ to maximize the EV penetration, i.e., $\lambda$, subject to the the platform’s profit-maximizing decisions in (19). The decision-making process is in line with the Stackelberg game, where the regulatory agency plays as the leader and the platform plays as the follower \cite{32}. To evaluate how the taxation scheme will affect the market, under each exogenous tax rate $p_t$, we first find the market equilibrium at the optimal charging station density $K^*_\lambda(p_t)$ such that the valet charging demand is maximized. We then vary $p_t$ and trace the market outcomes as a function of $p_t$. For notation convenience, we denote by $\lambda^*(p_t)$ the optimal number of customers to (19) under valet charging tax $p_t$, and denote by $p_t^*$ the optimal tax rate at which $\lambda^*(\cdot)$ is maximized. Regarding the cost $c_s$, we have the following proposition:

**Proposition 3.** Assume that (19) has a unique solution. For any decreasing function $F_v(c)$ and increasing function $F_c(w)$, there exist $\hat{c}_{s,1} > 0$ and $\hat{c}_{s,2} > 0$ that satisfy:

1. if $c_s \in (0, \hat{c}_{s,1})$, there exists $\hat{p}_t > p_t^* > 0$ such that $\lambda^*(p_t) > \lambda^*(0)$, $\forall p_t \in (0, \hat{p}_t)$,
2. if $c_s \in [\hat{c}_{s,2}, \infty)$, $p_t^* = 0$, and $\lambda^*(p_t) < \lambda^*(0)$, $\forall p_t > 0$.

Proposition 3 indicates that when installing a charger is inexpensive, i.e., $c_s < \hat{c}_{s,1}$, imposing an appropriate tax $p_t < \hat{p}_t$ can always encourage the platform to serve more customers.\textsuperscript{14} On the other hand, if the cost is too high, i.e., $c_s > \hat{c}_{s,2}$, the tax revenue cannot assume adequate chargers to accommodate the market expansion. In this case, the tax burden will always reduce the EV adoption, and therefore $p_t^* = 0$. Note that it is possible that $\hat{c}_{s,1} = \hat{c}_{s,2}$. The proof can be found in Appendix E.

\textsuperscript{13}The cost includes (a) equipment price and installation fee, and (b) maintenance cost. As the former is sunk, we split it into a daily expense over a long period and combine it with the latter to derive a per-time cost of each charger.

\textsuperscript{14}This does not necessarily mean that the taxation scheme will benefit the platform in terms of its profit. Instead, it means that the increase of charging facilities can partly relieve the tax penalty imposed on the platform. In other words, the platform can mitigate the tax burden by serving more customers.
5.2. Numerical Example

This subsection presents a numerical example that solves the platform’s optimal decision-making problem under the proposed taxation scheme, and traces the market outcomes as we perturb the tax rate $p_t$. The model parameters are consistent with those in Section 4.2. In addition, we set $c_s = \text{HK}\$20/\text{hr}$. To assess the taxation scheme, we define the social welfare as the sum of the tax revenue, platform’s profit, customer surplus, and courier surplus:

$$\Pi_{sw} = \lambda p_v - Nw - KC + \tau \lambda_0 \int_{c_v}^{+\infty} F_v(x) \, dx + Nw - N_0 \int_0^w F_c(y) \, dy. \quad (21)$$

Here $\lambda p_v - Nw - KC$ is the combination of the platform’s profit and the tax revenue$^{15}$, $\tau \lambda_0 \int_{c_v}^{+\infty} F_v(x) \, dx$ is the customer surplus, and $Nw - N_0 \int_0^w F_c(y) \, dy$ is the courier surplus. Please note that we consider the fixed cost $KC$ as sunk and assume the platform would always enter the industry as long as $\lambda(p_v - p_t) - Nw > 0$. Numerical results are reported in Figure 13-21. Key findings are summarized as below.

- The tax burden primarily falls on the platform instead of customers. When $p_t = \text{HK}\$15$, compared with the case of no regulation, i.e., $p_t = 0$, the price slightly rises by 0.7% (from HK$74.77$ to HK$75.26$). As opposed to customers, the platform suffers a dramatic profit decline of 33.3% (from HK$11018.9$/hr to HK$7354.5$/hr), which reveals that the platform is more vulnerable than customers under the taxation scheme.

- The markup reduces by 16.4%. For one thing, imposing a valet charging tax is equivalent to directly increasing the marginal cost by $p_t$. For another, the demand elasticity keeps the platform from raising the price proportionally.$^{16}$ This leads to the weaker market power.

- The proposed taxation scheme can facilitate transportation electrification and benefit social welfare. Based on Proposition 3, we identify that in this study $c_s < \hat{c}_s$ such that $\lambda^*(p_t) \leq \lambda^*(0)$ for $p_t$ within a particular range. The number of customers peaks at $p_t^* = \text{HK}\$30$, where the customer demand increases by 15.3% and the tax revenue contributes 882 additional public chargers. The social welfare also increases and is maximized at $p_t^{**} = \text{HK}\$22$. It implies the taxation scheme will enforce the platform to share part of its profit to provide more charging facilities, which reduces the deadweight loss associated with monopoly pricing. The difference between $p_t^*$ and $p_t^{**}$ suggests a trade-off between environmental and economic concerns. A city planner may decide different tax rates according to her objective.

- After implementing the proposed regulation, governments need to jointly replan charging infrastructure to achieve higher EV adoption. According to Figure 17, $K^*_\lambda$ is increasing in $p_t$. Intuitively, the platform will be reluctant to serve more consumers under a higher tax rate due to the unprofitably high marginal cost, which can be directly reflected by the decreasing charger occupancy. The effect of $p_t$ on the occupancy $\rho$ is given by

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial p_t} = \frac{t_c}{M} \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial p_t} - \frac{\lambda}{t_c M^2} \frac{\partial M}{\partial p_t} < 0, \quad (22)$$

where the first item captures the effect on customer demand, and the second item captures the effect on charging facility supply. Hence, as illustrated in Figure 21, $\rho$ goes down in response to an

---

$^{15}$The term $\lambda p_t$ is canceled out.

$^{16}$Elasticity of demand equals the reciprocal of the Lerner Index: $E_d = -\frac{1}{L} = \frac{p_v}{c_m - p_v}$. 
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increasing $p_t$. In contrast to the platform, the city planner aims to promote EV adoption. To this end, an effective solution is increasing charging station density to reduce the marginal cost (recall Figure 10), which induces the platform to serve more customers so as to mitigate the profit decline. This explains why $c_m(p_t) - c_m(0) < p_t$ when $p_t > 0$ (see Figure 18): denser charging stations partly offset the marginal cost increase associated with the valet charging tax.

- The courier fleet size reduces as the tax rate increases, because under a more stringent tax rate, the
regulatory agency tends to build a denser network of charging stations, which decreases the delivery time, as shown in Figure 24. This enables the platform to recruit fewer couriers but serve more customers. Therefore, the proposed taxation scheme can facilitate EV penetration at the expense of the platform’s profit loss and a smaller courier fleet.

6. Conclusion

To conclude, this paper explores on-demand valet charging for EVs, an innovative business model that offers an affordable and convenient EV charging solution for those who do not have a private charger. Valet charging facilitates EV adoption by unleashing the potential of public charging infrastructure. A queuing network is developed to capture the stochastic matching between customers, couriers, and charging stations. A market equilibrium model is formulated to predict the market outcome. Based on the mathematical model, we present two case studies to examine how public policies will affect the valet charging market.

At first, we focus on charging infrastructure planning. Numerical results reveal that the optimal charging densities for different stakeholders are not consistent. Couriers prefer a lower charging station density to shorten their idle time and improve their income. The platform prefers a higher density to reduce marginal cost and increase its profit. While customers prefer a density in-between that trades off charging convenience and congestion. We also find that the market power associated with monopoly pricing results in an inefficient market outcome, which calls for government interventions.

Second, to regulate the platform and weaken its market power, we propose a taxation scheme that imposes a per-charging tax on the platform and then invests the tax revenue in public charging facilities. We show that enforcing a proper tax can squeeze the market power and meanwhile prompt the platform to serve more EVs as the profit decline can be partly alleviated by the market expansion. Moreover, to sustain the effectiveness of the proposed regulation, the city planner should redeploy a denser charging station network.

This paper also opens avenues that merit further research. Future studies may consider the spatial heterogeneity of customers, time-variant charging demand, courier relocation, spatiotemporal pricing, etc. Another direction lies in the intersection of EV charging and power system. Possible topics include integrating V2G into valet charging, adaptive charging scheduling under stochastic arrival and departure, joint planning of charging and electric infrastructure, etc.
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Appendix A. Evaluation of the Approximation Performance

Using the mean waiting time given by (4) as the ground truth, we assess the approximation performance of (5) at different occupancy rates ($\rho$) and service capacity ($S$). The results are reported in Figure A.25.

![Figure A.25: Mean waiting time derived by two different methods at different service capacity.](image)

It can be directly observed from Figure A.25 that (5) approximates the ground truth remarkably well in different scenarios. The error is negligible over a wide range of $S$ and $\rho$. The percentage of error is slightly higher in light traffic (e.g., $\rho < 0.7$). This is because the ground truth of the expected waiting time is very close to zero. We argue that this would not affect the results derived in the simulation as the absolute value of approximation error is less than 1 minute. Thus, (5) is sufficient to accurately approximate the mean waiting time without causing analytical mistakes.

Appendix B. Model Parameters Setting

We use Hong Kong as the prototype of this study. Most of the parameters are selected according to official data and parameters in previous studies. Specifically, we set $A = 1000\text{km}^2$, $\lambda_0 = 600000$, and $M_0 = 3000$ based on the square area of Hong Kong [33], the current private vehicle stock [34], and the number of public chargers [35], respectively. The number of potential couriers is specified as 25% of taxi drivers in Hong Kong, i.e., $N_0 = 10000$ [36]. The percentage of charging demand over all EVs $\tau = 1\%$ is derived by assuming that each EV charges every 5 days. The average charging time is $t_c = 5$ hour since over 80% of the existing public chargers in Hong Kong are standard or medium level.$^{17}$

We assume that valet charging customers are less sensitive to the pickup time than ride-hailing customers and consequently tune $\alpha$ to be 50% of the value of time (VOT) in [37], i.e., $\alpha = \text{HK}\$60/hour. Further, the VOT assigned to $t_w$ and $t_d$ is set as $\beta = \alpha/6 = \text{HK}\$10/hour. As couriers pick up EVs by public transit, bicycle, or scooter, the pickup time of valet charging services is typically longer than that of ride-hailing services. In this light, $\phi$ is set to be 25% of that in ride-hailing service, i.e., $\phi = 0.04$ [37]. The parameter $\theta = 0.06$ in (3) is obtained by Monte-Carlo experiment. The procedure is as follows.

- Consider the charging station locates at the middle of each zone. For each exogenous $K$, calculate the coordinate of charging station:

$$ (x_c, y_c) = \left( 0.5\sqrt{A/K}, 0.5\sqrt{A/K} \right). $$

$^{17}$Standard charger means a charger employing a household type 13A socket. Medium charger means a charger with rated power of or below 20kW [35].
• Randomly generate a group of customer coordinates \((x_i, y_i)\) that are evenly distributed in the zone.

• Sum up the Manhattan distance between the charging station and customers:

\[
D = \sum_{i=1}^{N} |x_i - x_c| + |y_i - y_c|.
\]

• Calculate the average travel time by \(\bar{t}_d^K = \frac{D}{v}\), where \(v\) is the speed and set to be 10km/hr. Store data pair \((\sqrt{A/K}, \bar{t}_d^K)\).

• Vary \(K\) and repeat the above steps.

• Perform linear regression over \(\sqrt{A/K}\) and \(\bar{t}_d^K\). The value of \(\theta\) is the slope.

Parameters in (16) are set as \(w_0 = \text{HK}\$110\) and \(\eta = 0.1\) such that the average wage of couriers is close to that of taxi drivers. Likewise, parameters in (15) are set as \(c_0 = \text{HK}\$70\) and \(\epsilon = 0.1\) such that the occupancy of public chargers maintains around 80\%. The fixed cost \(C\) is assumed to be close to the wage of couriers.

Appendix C. Proof of Proposition 1

Proof. The constraints of (10) can be rewritten as:

\[
\begin{align*}
\lambda &= \tau \lambda_0 F_v \left( p_v + \alpha \frac{\phi \sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{N_0 F_c(w) - 2 M_d}} + \beta \left( t_w(\lambda) + 2 t_d \right) \right) \\
0 &< F_c(w) \leq 1,
\end{align*}
\]

where (C.1a) is derived by substituting (9) into (7) and representing \(t_w\) as a function of \(\lambda\), and (C.1b) is equivalent to \(N \in (0, N_0]\). The proof is divided in two steps.

• We at first fix \(p_v = 0\).

The first condition in Proposition 1 means that when \(p_v = 0\) and \(N = N_0\), we have:

\[
\lim_{\lambda \to 0} F_v(c) > 0.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (C.2)

The second condition guarantees that when \(\lambda\) approaches \(M_0/t_c\), the platform can still maintain a positive number of idle couriers, i.e., \(N_I = N_0 - 2\lambda t_d > 0\), by recruiting all potential couriers. In this case, the charging queue has an infinite waiting time:

\[
\lim_{\lambda \to M_0/t_c} t_w(\lambda) = \infty,
\]  \hspace{1cm} (C.3)

and therefore the cost of valet charging becomes infinity, which drives away all customers:

\[
\lim_{\lambda \to M_0/t_c} F_v(c) = F_v(\infty) = 0.
\]  \hspace{1cm} (C.4)

Note the left-hand side of (C.1a) is increasing in \(\lambda\) while the right hand side is decreasing. It suffices to show the existence of positive \(w, N, \lambda,\) and \(p_v = 0\) that constitute a market equilibrium.
We next relax $p_v$ to any arbitrary value. For any $N < N_0$ such that

$$\lambda = \tau \lambda_0 F_v \left( \alpha \frac{\phi \sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{N - 2\lambda t_d}} + \beta (t_w(\lambda) + 2t_d) \right) ,$$  

(C.5)

there always exist $p_v > 0$ and $N < N' < N_0$ also satisfying

$$\lambda = \tau \lambda_0 F_v \left( p_v + \alpha \frac{\phi \sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{N' - 2\lambda t_d}} + \beta (t_w(\lambda) + 2t_d) \right)$$  

(C.6)

as long as

$$p_v = \frac{\phi \sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{N - 2\lambda t_d}} - \frac{\phi \sqrt{A}}{\sqrt{N' - 2\lambda t_d}},$$  

(C.7)

since $t_p(\cdot)$ is a strictly decreasing function.

This completes the proof. \[\square\]

Appendix D. Proof of Proposition 2

Proof. Given any $K > 0$, the first order condition of (10) reads as follows.

$$\frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial p_v} = \lambda + p_v \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial p_v} = 0$$  

(D.1a)

$$\frac{\partial \Pi}{\partial N} = p_v \frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial N} - w - Nw' = 0$$  

(D.1b)

where $w' = \frac{dw}{dN} > 0$. Applying implicit function theorem on demand model (7) yields

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial p_v} = \frac{\frac{d\lambda}{dc}}{1 - \left( \alpha \frac{\partial t_p}{\partial \lambda} + \beta \frac{\partial t_w}{\partial \lambda} \right) \frac{d\lambda}{dc}} < 0$$  

(D.2a)

$$\frac{\partial \lambda}{\partial N} = \frac{\frac{\alpha \frac{\partial t_p}{\partial \lambda} \frac{d\lambda}{dc}}{1 - \left( \alpha \frac{\partial t_p}{\partial \lambda} + \beta \frac{\partial t_w}{\partial \lambda} \right) \frac{d\lambda}{dc}}} > 0,$$  

(D.2b)

where $\frac{d\lambda}{dc} = \tau \lambda_0 F_v'(c) < 0$, $\frac{\partial t_p}{\partial \lambda} > 0$, $\frac{\partial t_p}{\partial N} < 0$, $\frac{\partial t_w}{\partial \lambda} > 0$. Equating the ratio of $\frac{\partial \lambda_v}{\partial p_v}$ and $\frac{\partial \lambda_v}{\partial N}$ using (D.2) and (D.1) gives rise to

$$w + Nw' = -\alpha \frac{\partial t_p}{\partial N}.$$  

(D.3)

Further plugging in the expression of $\frac{\partial t_p}{\partial N}$, we have

$$w + Nw' = \frac{\alpha \phi \sqrt{A}}{2} \lambda (N - 2\lambda t_d)^{-\frac{3}{2}}.$$  

(D.4)
Note that the left-hand side of (D.4) is monotonically increasing in $N$ as $Nw(N)$ is convex. The right-hand side is decreasing in $N$ and $K$ but increasing in $\lambda$. Let $\nabla_+ N(K)$ and $\nabla_+ \lambda(K)$ denote the right-hand derivative of $N$ and $\lambda$ with respect to $K$. As $N$ is maximized at $K = K^*_N$, clearly we have

$$\nabla_+ N(K^*_N) = 0.$$  \hfill (D.5)

Nevertheless, since $t_d$ is a strictly decreasing function of $K$, $\lambda$ must increase to guarantee the equality of (D.4), i.e.,

$$\nabla_+ \lambda(K^*_N) > 0,$$  \hfill (D.6)

This implies that $\lambda$ remains increasing at $K = K^*_N$, which suffices to show $K^*_\lambda > K^*_N$.

This completes the proof. 

\[\Box\]

### Appendix E. Proof of Proposition 3

**Proof.** Let $r_m$ denote the marginal revenue and it can be given by:

$$r_m = \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} (\lambda(p_v - pt)) = (p_v - pt) \left[ 1 + \frac{d\lambda}{dc} \left( \frac{\partial t_p}{\partial \lambda} + \frac{\partial t_w}{\partial \lambda} \right) \right].$$  \hfill (E.1)

Clearly, under any $pt > 0$, the installation cost $c_s$ affects the marginal revenue $r_m$ in terms of $t_w$. Moreover, according to the discussion in Section 5.2, imposing the tax $pt$ increases the marginal cost by $\Delta c_m(pt) = c_m(pt) - c_m(0) < pt$. As shown in Figure E.26, this is equivalent to moving upward the curve of marginal cost (from the solid blue line to the dashed blue line). In this sense, the market equilibrium under the proposed taxation scheme depends on the change of marginal revenue: (a) if $\Delta c_m(pt) > \Delta r_m(pt)$, the equilibrium moves up left and $\lambda^*(pt) < \lambda^*(0)$; (b) if $\Delta c_m(pt) = \Delta r_m(pt)$, the equilibrium moves upward and $\lambda^*(pt) = \lambda^*(0)$; and (c) if $\Delta c_m(pt) < \Delta r_m(pt)$, the equilibrium moves up right and $\lambda^*(pt) > \lambda^*(0)$.

![Equilibrium analysis under the taxation scheme.](image)

We then show the existence of $\hat{c}_s$ by analyzing two extreme cases:

- When $c_s$ approaches to 0, we have $\lim_{c_s \to 0} M_0 + \lambda pt / c_s = +\infty$ and therefore $\lim_{c_s \to 0} t_w = 0$. In this case, the proposed taxation scheme increases the marginal revenue by

$$\Delta r_m(pt) = -(p_v - pt) \frac{d\lambda}{dc} \frac{\partial t_w}{\partial \lambda}.$$
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Since $\frac{d\lambda}{dc} < 0$ and $\frac{\partial t_w}{\partial \lambda} > 0$, $\Delta r_m(p_t)$ is a decreasing function of $p_t$. Note that $\Delta c_m(p_t)$ is an increasing function of $p_t$. Further because $\Delta r_m(0^+) > \Delta c_m(0^+) = 0$ and $\Delta r_m(p_v) = 0 < \Delta c_m(p_v)$, there must exist a $\hat{p}_t > 0$ that satisfies $\Delta r_m(\hat{p}_t) = \Delta c_m(\hat{p}_t)$. For any $p_t \in (0, \hat{p}_t)$, the increase of marginal revenue is greater than that of marginal cost, i.e., $\Delta r_m(p_t) > \Delta c_m(p_t)$, and the market equilibrium moves up right, i.e., $\lambda^*(p_t) > \lambda^*(0)$.

• When $c_s$ approaches to $+\infty$, we have $\lim_{c_s \to 0} M_0 + \lambda p_t / c_s = M_0$ and therefore $t_w$ remains unchanged. In this case, $\Delta r_m(p_t) = 0 < \Delta c_m(p_t)$ for any $p_t > 0$, indicating that the increase of marginal revenue is always smaller than that of marginal cost, and the market equilibrium moves up left, i.e., $\lambda^*(p_t) < \lambda^*(0)$.

Due to continuity, these two cases suffice to show the existence of $\hat{c}_{s,1} \in (0, +\infty)$ and $\hat{c}_{s,2} \in (0, +\infty)$ satisfying Proposition 3, which completes the proof. \qed