

FLP-XR: Future Location Prediction on Extreme Scale Maritime Data in Real-time

George S. Theodoropoulos
Dept. of Informatics
University of Piraeus
Piraeus, Greece
gstheo@unipi.gr

Andreas Patakis
Dept. of Informatics
University of Piraeus
Piraeus, Greece
patakisa@unipi.gr

Andreas Tritsarolis
Dept. of Informatics
University of Piraeus
Piraeus, Greece
andrewt@unipi.gr

Yannis Theodoridis
Dept. of Informatics
University of Piraeus
Piraeus, Greece
ytheod@unipi.gr

Abstract—Movements of maritime vessels are inherently complex and challenging to model due to the dynamic and often unpredictable nature of maritime operations. Even within structured maritime environments, such as shipping lanes and port approaches, where vessels adhere to navigational rules and predefined sea routes, uncovering underlying patterns is far from trivial. The necessity for accurate modeling of the mobility of maritime vessels arises from the numerous applications it serves, including risk assessment for collision avoidance, optimization of shipping routes, and efficient port management. This paper introduces FLP-XR, a model that leverages maritime mobility data to construct a robust framework that offers precise predictions while ensuring extremely fast training and inference capabilities. We demonstrate the efficiency of our approach through an extensive experimental study using three real-world AIS datasets. According to the experimental results, FLP-XR outperforms the current state-of-the-art in many cases, whereas it performs 2-3 orders of magnitude faster in terms of training and inference.

Index Terms—Future Location Prediction, Gradient Boosting, Mobility Data Analytics, Maritime Data, Edge Computing

I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, the number of smart devices, such as smartphones, wearable devices, has increased significantly [10]. The widespread presence and convenience of these GPS-enabled devices have led to a growing reliance on them for decision-making, thereby making human life increasingly data-driven. A relevant paradigm is observed in the transport and logistic industries, where maritime vessels, airplanes, and trucks are continuously monitored. The data generated from these monitoring activities are utilized to assess current situations and play a critical role in both short-term and long-term strategic planning for companies.

As the volume of data generated per second has grown exponentially, the architectures developed to manage this data have also evolved to meet the real-time demands of modern applications. In this context, edge computing [13] has emerged as a new paradigm, supplementing or even replacing cloud computing in scenarios where data sources are distributed across multiple locations, and low latency is essential. Traditional cloud-based data processing often falls short of meeting these requirements. However, a significant limitation of edge computing is that edge nodes possess more limited storage and processing capacities compared to centralized cloud systems,

potentially constraining performance in highly data-intensive applications.

Predicting the evolution in time of a vessel’s trajectory [21] is a critical task in the field of maritime data analytics [1], as it serves as a foundational element in various applications, including maritime route modeling [22], future collision risk assessment [14] and awareness [7], anomaly detection [9], and many more. In essence, Future Location Prediction (FLP) aims to forecast the anticipated future positions of a moving object (a vessel for the scope of this paper) by analyzing both its individual movement history and broader patterns observed in the movement data of similar objects [20]. In essence, FLP seeks to determine the object’s coordinate position at the specified future time horizon. A visual example of an FLP task is illustrated in Figure 1.

Since the FLP problem can be framed as a time series regression prediction task, approaches including Auto-Regressive Integrated Moving Average (ARIMA) and Markov-based models were originally proposed as candidate solutions [6]. However, as the authors in [3] point out, these conventional approaches struggle to handle the non-linear characteristics of mobility data and the complex, long-term spatial and temporal dependencies inherent to such datasets.

Nowadays, the majority of approaches in the literature have leveraged various Recurrent Neural Networks (RNN) variants to address the task. By applying these networks in combination with carefully designed preprocessing strategies, state-of-the-art performance can be achieved [16] [3]. However, these models require extensive training on large datasets and are highly computationally intensive, resulting in slow processing speeds during both training and inference, at least in more resource-constrained environments. Specifically, Rezk et al. [12] examines the deployment of RNNs on embedded systems and addresses the challenges of optimising these networks within the constraints, and discusses the trade-offs between performance and flexibility. The results of this study highlight the necessity to create more efficient methods tailored for low-resource settings.

Given this context, the requirements for a FLP method in today’s demanding environment are straightforward yet highly challenging: it must be both fast and accurate. Although much of the research emphasizes enhancing the latter, the critical




Fig. 1. Predicting the future location of vessel O_i for three distinct horizon values after t_n .

importance of speed is often overlooked. A future-proof FLP method would prioritize both training and inference speed, ensuring rapid processing throughout its lifecycle. It would maintain high-quality performance while being lightweight and adaptable, seamlessly integrating into resource-constrained edge computing units and diverse devices.

To address these challenges and adapt to the new era of large-scale mobility analytics, this paper proposes FLP-XR, a highly efficient FLP solution based on the eXtreme Gradient Boosting (XGBoost) model [2], able to process eXtreme scale maritime (AIS) data in Real-time. We demonstrate that, in many cases, it is (the lightweight) FLP-XR that outperforms the (resource-demanding) state-of-the-art, while at the same time achieving exceptional efficiency in both training and inference times. Additionally, due to its low training resource requirements, the proposed model can adapt to changes in data efficiently, making it robust even as use-case characteristics evolve. In essence, we propose a forward-thinking approach to mobility prediction, one that is not only grounded in current needs but also anticipates future developments in the edge / fog / cloud Computing Continuum (CC) field.

In summary, the main contributions of this work are as follows:

- We propose a novel lightweight XGBoost-based approach for future location prediction in the maritime domain, specifically designed for resource-constrained computing environments.
- Our method achieves training speeds that are on average 300x faster and inference speeds that are 3000x faster than the state of the art, while maintaining competitive prediction accuracy, outperforming a state-of-the-art model in many cases.
- The proposed model's efficiency and compact design enable deployment on edge devices, making it a practical solution for real-time maritime applications where computational resources are limited.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: Section II discusses related work. Section III formulates the problem at hand and presents our approach for efficient resource-constrained FLP. Section IV presents our experimental study over three real-world datasets (namely, Brest, Piraeus, and Aegean) and different hardware settings (from a powerful GPU cluster to a limited resource edge device), assessing the quality and efficiency of our approach. Finally, Section V concludes the paper, also providing suggestions for future work.

II. RELATED WORK

As already mentioned, the earlier approaches in the field tried to handle the FLP problem as a stochastic process, with Markov models employed to address the prediction challenge. For instance, Liu et al. [6] introduce L-VTP for predicting the long-term trajectories of ocean vessels. More specifically, they separate a given sea area into a grid and the algorithm leverages multiple sailing-related parameters and a K-order multivariate Markov Chain to build state-transition matrices for trajectory prediction. They use conditional entropy to evaluate their model and perform grid search to identify the best K-order and the most useful sailing parameters.

In a more recent work, Zygouras et al. [24] introduce EnvClus*, an enhanced version of their previous research [23], where a data-driven framework is developed for vessel trajectory forecasting. This method defines the space in which vessels navigate by creating envelopes and corridors, which represent the potential areas of movement. Forecasting is then performed using mobility graphs that model the vessels' most probable future movements, offering a more accurate and structured approach to trajectory prediction.

Another common approach for addressing FLP is by using RNNs like Long-Short Term Memory (LSTM) and Gated Recurrent Unit (GRU) networks that are tailored to sequential data classification and regression. Nguyen et al. [8] propose a method to predict vessels' destination ports and estimated arrival times using a sequence-to-sequence architecture with LSTM backbone that employs a grid, where each cell is coded to record the sequence of moves. The authors perform beam-search to find not only the most probable trajectory but also alternatives, ranked by their perplexities. The model predicts future vessel movements using a distributed architecture and load balancing for high performance and scalability. Wang et al. [17] propose an LSTM-based framework to predict user trajectories, particularly focusing on multi-user and multi-step prediction scenarios relevant to 5G networks. To address limitations in user-specific models, they introduce a region-oriented, Seq2Seq learning approach to improve generalization and reduce error accumulation. Li et al. [4], explore the use of a novel hybrid methodology, combining a Graph Attention network (GAT) and an LSTM. The proposed GAT-LSTM model aims to improve the accuracy and robustness of trajectory prediction by considering both spatial and temporal features.

Chondrodima et al. [3] present a framework for predicting the locations of vessels up to 60 minutes ahead, even for those not previously recorded. This framework is based on LSTM to address challenges in maritime tracking, such as variable sampling rates, sparse trajectories, and noisy GPS data. A key feature of the framework is its trajectory data augmentation method, which enhances predictive accuracy. Extending this work, Tritsarolis et al. [16] propose a new system for predicting the location of vessels based on AIS data. The system, called Nautilus, utilizes LSTM neural networks and outperforms existing methods for short-term prediction. The paper also explores the application of federated learning

(FL) to the system, resulting in a new architecture called Fed-Nautilus. In this paper, we consider the (centralized) Nautilus model as the state-of-the-art (SotA) model, which we compare our proposal with.

In resource-constrained environments, Liang et al. [5] presents a novel GPU-accelerated method, for compressing and visualizing large-scale vessel trajectories derived from AIS data within Maritime Internet of Things (IoT) systems. The algorithm enhances traditional Kernel Density Estimation (KDE) and by incorporating GPU acceleration significantly speeds up processing, enabling real-time visualization. Experiments using multiple datasets demonstrate the superior performance and efficiency of the GPU-implementations compared to traditional KDE-based methods [18]. To the best of our knowledge, there is no existing work that specifically addresses the FLP problem within IoT and resource-constrained environments in the maritime domain.

III. FLP-XR: OUR APPROACH FOR EFFICIENT RESOURCE-CONSTRAINED FLP

A. Problem Formulation

Given a stream of records $[p(1), \dots, p(t)]$ generated by N vessels V_i , where each record $V_i(t)$ contains the vessel's unique identifier (ID), coordinates $(lon(t), lat(t))$ and the timestamp (t_i), the problem at hand is to train a Machine Learning (ML) model able to estimate the record $V_i(t + \Delta t)$, corresponding to Δt time horizon in the future:

$$V_i(t + \Delta t) = [p_{lon}(t + \Delta t), p_{lat}(t + \Delta t)] \quad (1)$$

It is obvious that the time horizon Δt clearly plays a significant role in the accuracy of the model's predictions. In our experimental study (Section IV), we examine Δt at intervals of 10 minutes, up to a prediction horizon of 60 minutes.

B. The proposed architecture

As the backbone of our prediction mechanism, we employ XGBoost [2], a powerful ML algorithm based on the gradient boosting framework. The algorithm works by building multiple decision trees sequentially, where each new tree aims to correct the mistakes of the previous ones. It starts by making a single tree to predict the data, then analyzes where it went wrong, focusing particularly on instances it predicted poorly. Gradient descent is used to optimize the corrections made by each tree, minimizing errors in a way that adds up to a highly accurate model over many trees. Also, it is particularly effective in handling large datasets, missing values, and complex data patterns due to its regularization techniques, which reduce overfitting, and its parallelized implementation, which speeds up training.

Let us recall that the primary objective of our FLP-XR model is to optimize adaptability and performance, in other words create a prediction model capable of delivering accurate predictions across multiple time horizons using a single model instance. This removes the need to deploy multiple

separately trained models, as it is the case in e.g., [3], [16], thus improving computational efficiency and ease of use. To achieve this, we define the "target" prediction for each record as the coordinates of the vessel at a future time point, denoted as Δt minutes in the future, where Δt is the prediction horizon value. Additionally, by using multiple horizon values for each record, we gain the flexibility to predict positions across a range of future intervals. Because XGBoost operates exclusively on tabular data, we reformulate the prediction task so that each pair of known coordinates at time t maps to the subsequent pair of predicted coordinates at time $t + \Delta t$. In summary, our proposed methodology, illustrated in Figure 2, begins by receiving the vessel's trajectory in terms of coordinates and timestamps. We then apply various preprocessing and augmentation procedures (to be detailed in Section III-C), including data deduplication, outlier and stationarity detection, resampling, segmentation, and feature extraction. Subsequently, an XGBoost model is employed to predict the vessel's incremental changes in longitude and latitude (Δlon , Δlat), which are added to the most recent known position to obtain the vessel's future location.

C. Preprocessing & Feature Engineering

Transforming the available data sources into usable and feature-rich datasets that can be then fed into our model is a very important step of our proposed workflow. AIS data are inherently noisy, meaning that many of the existing features, like speed or bearing, that might come alongside the coordinates of a moving vessel might not be always trustworthy. For this reason, the main source of information that we built upon is the coordinated pair of each vessel at a specific timestamp. Based on these three values, i.e. $\langle lat(t), lon(t), t \rangle$, we implement the following workflow in order to clean and augment the underlying dataset.

1) *Deduplication*: We remove duplicate records that indicate that a single moving vessel appears in multiple places at identical timestamps; actually, the first one is kept the rest are discarded.

2) *Speed and Bearing Calculation*: Afterwards, we calculate the speed (in knots) and bearing (in degrees) of each vessel at timestamp t_n using its coordinates at t_{n-1} and t_n .

TABLE I
MODEL FEATURES

Feature name	Description
v_type	vessel type
$coords$ (lon, lat)	vessel location coordinates
sp	vessel speed calculated at a given timestamp
br	vessel bearing calculated at a given timestamp
$extrap_diff$ (lon, lat)	difference between the latest coordinates and future coordinates assuming linear extrapolation (Δt amount of time later)
$last_diff$ (lon, lat)	difference between the latest coordinates and past coordinates (Δt amount of time earlier)
$origin$	the POI closest to the starting point of a given vessel's trip
$orig_dist$	distance between the latest location and the starting point of a given vessel's trip
Δt	prediction time horizon




Fig. 2. The proposed FLP-XR methodology.

3) *Outlier Detection and Removal:* Data points that deviate significantly from the expected distribution can introduce noise and bias in model training leading to overfitting or underfitting and thereby impairing the model’s predictive performance. In our case, we focus on detecting and discarding speed-based outliers, by utilizing a predefined threshold (s_{max}). Applying more complex outlier detection methods that exist in the literature is beyond the scope of this work.

4) *Stationarity Detection and Removal:* Based on the calculated speed, we are also able to perform stationarity detection using a predefined speed threshold (s_{min}). By detecting and discarding records of stationary vessels we result in saving on memory and improving performance.

5) *Trip Segmentation:* Splitting the overall series of recorded locations of a vessel into smaller and more meaningful segments corresponding to trips is a key part of our preprocessing workflow. There are two criteria for trip segmentation, a temporal and spatial one. The temporal one relates to the fact that trying to estimate the future location of a vessel that has not transmitted its location for long time is risky. As such, we set a temporal threshold, gap_{max} , between the timestamps of two consecutive points, and when detected, these temporal gaps signal the completion of a trip and the beginning of a new one. On the other hand, the spatial criterion segments trajectories when a vessel stops (i.e., its calculated speed is less than s_{min}). After the segmentation, a trip is considered insignificant and is removed if it consists of less than $length_{min}$ points. For the remaining trips, we perform the following context augmentation: if the first point of the trip is within a threshold distance, d_{min} , of a Point of Interest (POI), the unique ID of that POI is assigned as the trip’s origin.

6) *Fixed Resampling:* In the mobility domain, a variable sampling rate of the recorded locations of moving objects poses significant challenges to ML models, especially in RNN architectures like LSTM. As discussed in [3] [19], irregular sampling can lead to inconsistent temporal intervals, making it difficult for the network to learn temporal dependencies accurately and thus greatly affecting the model’s predictive ability. In our model, in order to ensure consistency in the overall sampling rate of the dataset, we employ linear resampling using a given *rate* value.

7) *Feature Selection:* To maintain efficiency, we emphasize feature simplicity, selecting features that provide strong

predictive power while minimizing computational overhead. By avoiding complex transformations or feature engineering steps that would slow down preprocessing, we ensure the model’s suitability for real-time applications, optimizing both the latency and accuracy that are essential for FLP. Based on the aforementioned preprocessing steps, for each incoming triple $\langle lat(t), lon(t), t \rangle$ we extract 12 features, as they are listed in Table I.

Finally, we prepare our model to handle different prediction horizons, $\Delta t, \Delta t', \Delta t'',$ etc., by constructing the required source–target coordinate pairs (see Section III-B). Specifically, for each triple $\langle lat(t), lon(t), t \rangle$, we create different variations, $\langle lat(t + \Delta t), lon(t + \Delta t), t + \Delta t \rangle$, $\langle lat(t + \Delta t'), lon(t + \Delta t'), t + \Delta t' \rangle$, $\langle lat(t + \Delta t''), lon(t + \Delta t''), t + \Delta t'' \rangle$, etc., corresponding to the respective prediction horizons we aim to support.

IV. EXPERIMENTAL STUDY

In this section, we evaluate the performance of our FLP-XR model on a variety of hardware, from high-performance computational systems to resource-constrained devices, using three real-world maritime mobility datasets, and present our experimental results.

A. Experimental Setup, Datasets and Preprocessing

In this experimental study, we utilize two popular open AIS datasets, namely “Brest”¹, “Piraeus”² as well as one closed dataset called “Aegean”³.

The Brest dataset [11] is a collection of vessel movements that spans a six-month period from October 1st, 2015, to March 31st, 2016, and includes vessel positions over the Celtic Sea, the North Atlantic Ocean, the English Channel, and the Bay of Biscay. The dataset is structured into four categories: navigation data, vessel-oriented data, geographic data, and environmental data. In our study, we utilise the entire 6-months dataset, consisting of 19,035,631 AIS records, alongside port and vessel type information.

The Piraeus dataset [15], is a rich repository of maritime data, encompassing over 244 million AIS records collected over a period of more than two and a half years, from May

¹The dataset is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.1167595>

²The dataset is available at <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.6323416>

³The dataset has been kindly provided by Kpler for research purposes, in the context of the EU project MobiSpaces at <https://mobispaces.eu>




Fig. 3. Snapshots of datasets used in our experimental study: (a) Brest; (b) Piraeus; (c) Aegean.

TABLE II
STATISTICS OF THE PROCESSED DATASETS FOR THE PURPOSES OF MODEL TRAINING.

Dataset	Statistics	Model input for prediction horizon (Δt)					
		10min.	20min.	30min.	40min.	50min.	60min.
Brest	#Vessels	1644	1541	1453	1388	1300	1187
	#Trips	8966	7750	6828	6214	5389	4360
	#Points	746255	604482	490523	408163	325414	257079
Piraeus	#Vessels	2568	2205	1833	1563	1097	674
	#Trips	17676	12034	7587	5507	3159	1634
	#Points	743637	423124	230021	138307	73809	41054
Aegean	#Vessels	2918	2908	2900	2891	2879	2853
	#Trips	9657	9196	8860	8562	8062	7432
	#Points	2155218	2044590	1943762	1862383	1773266	1692399

9th, 2017, to December 26th, 2019. This dataset includes not only (anonymized) vessel positions but also correlated data, such as weather conditions, offering a valuable resource for research and analysis in maritime logistics, traffic patterns, and safety studies. In our study, we utilise an 1-year subset of the dataset (from January 1st to December 31st, 2019), 92,534,304 records in total, alongside port and vessel type information.

Finally, the Aegean dataset is a collection of vessel movements across the Aegean sea, spanning the single-month period of November of 2018, consisting of 7,352,408 records, alongside port of vessel type information. Figure 3 illustrates these datasets on the map.

In accordance with the preprocessing pipeline outlined in Section III-C, all datasets underwent a comprehensive cleaning and preparation process, by applying the following parameter values: $s_{min} = 1$ knot, $s_{max} = 50$ knots, $gap_{max} = 45$ minutes, $length_{min} = 30$ points, and $d_{min} = 1$ nautical mile. As for the resampling step, we experimented with different sampling rate values, from 30 to 150 seconds, and we selected $rate = 90$ sec for the final adjustment of the trajectories, as this configuration produced the best results. A detailed account of these experiments is provided in Tables VI, VII and VIII. Statistics of the processed datasets, ready to train our model for six different prediction horizons, from 10 minutes to 60 minutes, are presented in Table II.

In the section that follows, we provide the experimental results of our study, comparing the prediction performed by our XGBoost based model with the current SotA [16]. To evaluate the quality of the predictions, we will calculate the displacement error between predicted and target points at

identical timestamps. Given that we require this error to be interpretable in real-world terms and that our datasets are provided in the EPSG:4326 coordinate system (latitude and longitude), for the purpose of error calculation we utilize the Haversine distance (in meters).

The entire preprocessing pipeline (see Section III-C) was implemented in Rust; the justification of this decision will be discussed in Section IV-D. The FLP-XR model was implemented in Python using the XGBoost⁴ library. Our FLP-XR model running times were calculated on three different hardware environments: (i) a computing cluster featuring an Intel Xeon x86 CPU, a single Nvidia A100 GPU and 1TB of RAM (ii) an Intel NUC with an i7 x86 CPU and 16 GB of RAM, and (iii) a Raspberry Pi 4 (RPi 4) with an ARM CPU and 8 GB of RAM. On the other hand, the SotA model [16] was performed in hardware setting (i) above, since it is not transferable to resource-constrained environments, such as (ii) and (iii) above. For reproducibility purposes, the source code used in our experimental study is publicly available at GitHub⁵.

B. XGBoost hyperparameter tuning

Given our objective to construct a highly accurate and computationally efficient FLP model, the selection of appropriate hyperparameters is of critical importance. The key hyperparameters selected for tuning include *tree_method*, *max_depth*, *learning_rate*, and *n_estimators*. To optimize the performance

⁴Python library utilized for model implementation <https://xgboost.readthedocs.io>

⁵<https://github.com/DataStories-UniPi/FLP-XR>

TABLE III
PREDICTION ERROR ($\mu \pm \sigma$) OF FLP-XR VS. NAUTILUS PER DATASET (LESS IS BETTER).

Dataset	Model	Prediction horizon (Δt)					
		10min.	20min.	30min.	40min.	50min.	60min.
Brest	FLP-XR	429 \pm 544	1066 \pm 1178	1749 \pm 1796	2364 \pm 2470	3119 \pm 3215	3935 \pm 3986
	Nautilus [16]	509 \pm 806	988 \pm 1379	2112 \pm 2489	2197 \pm 2349	2798 \pm 2705	3912 \pm 3770
Piraeus	FLP-XR	339 \pm 369	838 \pm 811	1374 \pm 1281	1874 \pm 1759	2598 \pm 2378	3334 \pm 2852
	Nautilus [16]	234 \pm 501	492 \pm 1078	442 \pm 1104	831 \pm 2020	1475 \pm 3283	3818 \pm 5668
Aegean	FLP-XR	176 \pm 615	460 \pm 1040	809 \pm 1508	1123 \pm 1914	1543 \pm 2488	2003 \pm 3027
	Nautilus [16]	264 \pm 392	615 \pm 607	1205 \pm 1720	1563 \pm 1795	3246 \pm 4022	1978 \pm 1566

of the XGBoost model, a grid search was conducted to identify the best hyperparameter values. The optimal values were selected based on the configuration that yielded the highest performance according to the chosen evaluation metric, ensuring the model achieved a good balance between accuracy and generalizability (see Tables VI, VII and VIII). In particular, the *tree_method* parameter was set to "hist" which is a variant that constructs histograms for fast and memory-efficient training, particularly beneficial for large datasets. The *max_depth* parameter, set to 12, controls the maximum depth of each tree within the ensemble model. By setting this depth, the model captures complex patterns in the data while helping to prevent overfitting by limiting the extent of feature interaction. A *learning_rate* of 0.01 was chosen to regulate the step size during each update, balancing between model convergence speed and generalization. Finally, we set *n_estimators* to 750, which specifies the number of boosting rounds or trees the model builds iteratively.

C. Performance Comparison with SotA

Before presenting our experimental results, it is important to highlight a key difference in how the two models—our proposed model and the SotA [16]—handle prediction horizons. Specifically, our model can generate predictions at exact horizon time (after precisely Δt minutes), whereas the Nautilus [16] model can only produce predictions at the level of horizon intervals (e.g., after (5, 10) minutes), as it does not rely on a dataset with a fixed sampling rate. To ensure a fair comparison, Nautilus predictions reported for horizon Δt correspond to the average of two values: the prediction at horizon interval $(\Delta t - k]$ and the prediction at horizon interval $(\Delta t + k]$, where $k = 5$ min. is the step of the prediction horizons. For instance, to get the prediction error of Nautilus that corresponds to horizon $\Delta t = 10$ of FLP-XR, we take the average of prediction buckets (5,10] and (10,15]. The only exception is the final prediction (60 minutes), where Nautilus prediction corresponds to bucket (55, 60], since no subsequent predictions exist.

Each of the processed datasets (see Table II) was partitioned into 80% training and 20% testing sets. Given the time-dependent nature of the data, this splitting was conducted in chronological order, according to the timestamps associated with the vessel locations.

For quality evaluation, Table III details the displacement error, in meters, across various prediction horizons, from 10

to 60 minutes, providing a comparative analysis between our FLP-XR model and Nautilus [16]. FLP-XR demonstrates superior performance over Nautilus for certain prediction horizons, while underperforming in others. On the Brest dataset, FLP-XR reduces the error by around 15% with respect to SotA for 10 and 30-minute horizons, while errors for other horizons remain closely aligned, with SotA slightly outperforming our proposal by 1% - 10%. Notably, the error progression of FLP-XR is more stable across all horizons, increasing linearly with the prediction interval. In contrast, Nautilus displays inconsistent error progression, with pronounced fluctuations, such as a sharp increase in the [30, 40] minute range. These irregularities in Nautilus may stem from limitations in the bucket sizes used for prediction, potentially due to insufficient training data in certain ranges. On the Piraeus dataset, FLP-XR shows inferior performance, except for the 60-minute horizon where it outperforms Nautilus by 13%. As with the Brest dataset, FLP-XR maintains a linear increase in prediction error with the horizon, while Nautilus exhibits error fluctuations. For example, the Nautilus error reported at the 30-minute horizon violates the linear increase trend that one might expect to see; this may be attributed to data sparsity in these prediction buckets. On the Aegean dataset, FLP-XR outperforms the SotA model in all horizons except for the 60-minute prediction interval. Consistent with observations from the other datasets, FLP-XR shows a linear trend in error progression across horizons. In contrast, Nautilus demonstrates irregular increases and decreases in error, coupled with very high standard deviations in certain cases, such as the 50-minute horizon. These claims are further supported by examining the standard deviation of errors: FLP-XR consistently exhibits standard deviations close to the mean, while Nautilus shows significantly higher standard deviations, up to double or triple in some cases, indicating less predictable and less consistent predictions. Overall, these patterns highlight the robustness and stability of FLP-XR in comparison to the SotA model, particularly in handling datasets characterized by high variability.

Beyond the error metrics, performance in both training and inference times is another critical aspect of our model's value proposition. As illustrated in Table IV, FLP-XR demonstrates significant speed advantages over SotA, with training and inference time improvements being at the level of two and three orders of magnitude, respectively, calculated at the same (Xeon+A100) hardware environment; compare the first and the

TABLE IV
COMPARISON OF TRAINING AND INFERENCE(PER AIS MESSAGE) TIMES
BETWEEN FLP-XR AND RELATED WORK (LESS IS BETTER).

Dataset	Model	Training(sec)	Inference(μ sec)
Brest	FLP-XR(Xeon+A100)	69	0.56
	FLP-XR(NUC-i7)	186	12
	FLP-XR(RPi 4)	1119	118
	Nautilus(Xeon+A100) [16]	35909	1345
Piraeus	FLP-XR(Xeon+A100)	60	0.61
	FLP-XR(NUC-i7)	123	14
	FLP-XR(RPi 4)	811	121
	Nautilus(Xeon+A100) [16]	13161	1327
Aegean	FLP-XR(Xeon+A100)	86	0.28
	FLP-XR(NUC-i7)	643	10
	FLP-XR(RPi 4)	4020	105
	Nautilus(Xeon+A100) [16]	14637	1410

fourth row in Table IV. Specifically, training time improvement achieved by FLP-XR ranges from 170x (Aegean) to 520x (Brest). Similar improvements are observed in inference times, where FLP-XR achieves substantial speedups, ranging from 2175x (Piraeus) to 5035x (Aegean). This remarkable difference in runtime translates into the conclusion that FLP-XR is able to perform over 1000 predictions per second, in contrast to SotA’s capability of generating on the average less than 1 prediction within the same time frame.

D. Performance in Resource-Constrained Environments

By leveraging an efficient ML algorithm (XGBoost) and adopting a scalable tabular data model rather than the most common time-series-based approach, we have developed a resource-efficient solution that can be readily adapted for diverse cloud computing environments, including Edge and Fog platforms. Current state-of-the-art solutions, which often rely on RNN architectures [3], [4], [16], demand significant computational resources and are largely impractical for deployment in environments with limited hardware capabilities. These architectures typically require long inference times and extensive training on powerful GPU clusters, limiting their feasibility in real-time, edge-based applications. In response to these challenges, we developed an XGBoost-based solution tailored for CC environments, ensuring it meets strict performance and resource requirements while maintaining or exceeding the accuracy of existing solutions.

To validate our claims, we conducted a series of experiments to evaluate the efficiency of the proposed FLP-XR in resource-constrained environments. As we observe in Table IV, our proposed model achieves groundbreaking results, setting new benchmarks in both training and inference speeds. Remarkably, the model’s training process on edge devices is approximately 12x faster than the state-of-the-art solution trained on a powerful computing cluster environment. This achievement underscores the efficiency of our approach in drastically reducing the computational and time overheads typically required for model development. Furthermore, the inference speed on edge devices is 24x faster compared to the SotA running inference on GPU, demonstrating the

TABLE V
FLP-XR AVERAGE THROUGHPUT.

Dataset	Hardware	Batch size (#records)	Preprocessing per record (μ sec)	Inference per record (μ sec)	Throughput per batch (sec)
Brest	Xeon+ A100	10K	5.69	9.97	0.16
		100K	4.37	1.17	0.55
	NUC-i7	10K	1.02	9.11	0.10
		100K	0.80	9.01	0.98
	RPi 4	10K	4.96	102.04	1.07
		100K	3.83	95.03	9.88
Piraeus	Xeon+ A100	10K	2.65	14.41	0.17
		100K	2.98	1.35	0.43
	NUC-i7	10K	0.50	9.38	0.10
		100K	0.51	9.17	0.97
	RPi 4	10K	2.02	74.52	0.77
		100K	2.05	71.77	7.38
Aegean	Xeon+ A100	10K	100.52	16.41	1.17
		100K	110.71	1.89	11.26
	NUC-i7	10K	24.03	8.29	0.32
		100K	26.04	8.08	3.41
	RPi 4	10K	132.70	84.11	2.17
		100K	144.64	74.96	21.96

unparalleled efficiency and suitability of our model for real-time applications in resource-constrained environments.

Finally, to optimize the performance of our architecture, as we mentioned earlier we implemented the entire preprocessing pipeline in Rust, selected for its strong performance across a wide range of computing environments. In order to demonstrate it, we perform the following experiment: for each combination of dataset and hardware environment and having already processed the half of the dataset (for fairness purposes, in order to avoid cold start issues), we feed FLP-XR (see Figure 2) with a batch of records (in two alternative sizes, either 10K or 100K records per batch) and we calculate the time required per record for the preprocessing and the inference step. In Table V, apart from the respective times required for each of the two steps per record (in microseconds), we calculate the end-to-end throughput of our pipeline for the entire batch (in seconds), as the sum of the preprocessing and inference times multiplied by the number of records in the batch. It is clear from these figures that the proposed architecture is able to support a fleet of order 100K (see Xeon+A100 and NUC-i7 rows) or 10K (see RPi 4 rows) vessels in usually less than one or at most few seconds per batch. To put this outcome into a real use-case perspective, in a cloud environment, an AIS monitoring system with worldwide coverage tracks approximately 270K vessels concurrently⁶, which transmit their position every few seconds while underway⁷, whereas in an edge environment, an AIS antenna located in a busy port could potentially track around 2K

⁶Indicatively, see the statistics of the MarineTraffic platform (<https://www.marinetraffic.com>).

⁷The current AIS protocol guidelines define a 2 to 10 seconds transmission rate of Class A AIS positions while a vessel is underway (and every 3 minutes while at anchor); source: <https://www.navcen.uscg.gov/ais-class-a-reports>.

vessels⁸. As it turns out from the findings of Table V, with the appropriate selection of hardware settings, our methodology is expected to be capable of providing real-time support under all these specs in the Computing Continuum.

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we introduced FLP-XR, a lightweight and efficient XGBoost-based model for future location prediction in the maritime domain, specifically targeting resource-constrained computing environments. While the model's prediction accuracy is slightly below the SotA in some cases, it demonstrates competitive performance and surpasses it in certain scenarios. Most importantly, it offers unprecedented advantages in terms of computational efficiency, achieving training speeds that are 300x faster and inference speeds that are 3000x faster than existing solutions.

The proposed model's lightweight nature and ability to function seamlessly in CC environments validate its suitability for real-world applications, particularly in scenarios where computational resources are limited, and low-latency predictions are critical. This work highlights the potential of non-RNN approaches in solving complex prediction tasks in resource-constrained domains, providing a new perspective on efficient, scalable, and deployable ML solutions.

Future work includes further feature engineering to enhance accuracy while retaining efficiency and conducting extensive evaluations on more and diverse maritime datasets to ensure robustness. We additionally aim to explore the adaptation of the model to the aviation domain, utilizing the ADS-B aircraft position broadcasting protocol, where similar resource-constrained environments and low-latency requirements exist.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported in part by the Horizon Framework Programme of the European Union under grant agreement No. 101070279 (MobiSpaces; <https://mobispaces.eu>). In this work, Kpler provided the Aegean AIS dataset and the requirements of the business case.

REFERENCES

- [1] Alexander Artikis and Dimitris Zissis, editors. *Guide to Maritime Informatics*. Springer, 2021.
- [2] Tianqi Chen and Carlos Guestrin. Xgboost: A scalable tree boosting system. In *Proceedings of the 22nd ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*, KDD '16, page 785–794, 2016.
- [3] Eva Chondrodima, Nikos Pelekis, Aggelos Pikrakis, and Yannis Theodoridis. An efficient lstm neural network-based framework for vessel location forecasting. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 24(5):4872–4888, 2023.
- [4] Yuhao Li, Qing Yu, and Zhisen Yang. Vessel trajectory prediction for enhanced maritime navigation safety: A novel hybrid methodology. *Journal of Marine Science and Engineering*, 12(8), 2024.
- [5] Maohan Liang, Kezhong Liu, Ruobin Gao, and Yan Li. Integrating gpu-accelerated for fast large-scale vessel trajectories visualization in maritime iot systems. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, pages 1–18, 2025.

- [6] Chao Liu, Shuai Guo, Yuan Feng, Feng Hong, Haiguang Huang, and Zhongwen Guo. L-vtp: Long-term vessel trajectory prediction based on multi-source data analysis. *Sensors*, 19(20), 2019.
- [7] Patrik Thomas Michalski, Niko Preuß, Matthias Renz, Andreas Tritsarolis, Yannis Theodoridis, and Nikos Pelekis. Collision-risk-aware ship routing. In *Proceedings of the 32nd ACM International Conference on Advances in Geographic Information Systems*, SIGSPATIAL '24, page 545–548, 2024.
- [8] Duc-Duy Nguyen, Chan Le Van, and Muhammad Intizar Ali. Vessel destination and arrival time prediction with sequence-to-sequence models over spatial grid. In *Proceedings of the 12th ACM International Conference on Distributed and Event-Based Systems*, DEBS '18, page 217–220, 2018.
- [9] Giuliana Pallotta, Michele Vespe, and Karna Bryan. Vessel pattern knowledge discovery from ais data: A framework for anomaly detection and route prediction. *Entropy*, 15(6):2218–2245, 2013.
- [10] Bharti Rana, Yashwant Singh, and Pradeep Singh. A systematic survey on internet of things: Energy efficiency and interoperability perspective. *Transactions on Emerging Telecommunications Technologies*, 32, 8, 2021.
- [11] Cyril Ray, Richard Dréo, Elena Camossi, Anne-Laure Joussetme, and Clément Iphar. Heterogeneous integrated dataset for maritime intelligence, surveillance, and reconnaissance. *Data in Brief*, 25:104141, 2019.
- [12] Nesma M. Rezk, Madhura Purnaprajna, Tomas Nordström, and Zain Ul-Abdin. Recurrent neural networks: An embedded computing perspective. *IEEE Access*, 8:57967–57996, 2020.
- [13] Weisong Shi, Jie Cao, Quan Zhang, Youhuizi Li, and Lanyu Xu. Edge computing: Vision and challenges. *IEEE Internet of Things Journal*, 3:637–646, 2016.
- [14] Andreas Tritsarolis, Eva Chondrodima, Nikos Pelekis, and Yannis Theodoridis. Vessel collision risk assessment using AIS data: A machine learning approach. In *23rd IEEE International Conference on Mobile Data Management*, MDM, pages 425–430, 2022.
- [15] Andreas Tritsarolis, Yannis Kontoulis, and Yannis Theodoridis. The piraeus ais dataset for large-scale maritime data analytics. *Data in Brief*, 40:107782, 2022.
- [16] Andreas Tritsarolis, Nikos Pelekis, Konstantina Bereta, Dimitris Zissis, and Yannis Theodoridis. On vessel location forecasting and the effect of federated learning. In *Proceedings of the 25th IEEE International Conference on Mobile Data Management*, MDM, pages 83–92, 2024.
- [17] Chujie Wang, Lin Ma, Rongpeng Li, Tariq S. Durrani, and Honggang Zhang. Exploring trajectory prediction through machine learning methods. *IEEE Access*, 7:101441–101452, 2019.
- [18] Shitong Wang, Jun Wang, and Fu-lai Chung. Kernel density estimation, kernel methods, and fast learning in large data sets. *IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics*, 44(1):1–20, 2014.
- [19] Philip B. Weerakody, Kok Wai Wong, Guanjin Wang, and Wendell Ela. A review of irregular time series data handling with gated recurrent neural networks. *Neurocomputing*, 441:161–178, 2021.
- [20] Ruizhi Wu, Guangchun Luo, Junming Shao, Ling Tian, and Chengzong Peng. Location prediction on trajectory data: A review. *Big Data Mining and Analytics*, 1(2):108–127, 2018.
- [21] Xiaocai Zhang, Xiuju Fu, Zhe Xiao, Haiyan Xu, and Zheng Qin. Vessel trajectory prediction in maritime transportation: Current approaches and beyond. *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 23(11):19980–19998, 2022.
- [22] Dimitris Zissis, Konstantinos Chatzikokolakis, Giannis Spiliopoulos, and Marios Vodas. A distributed spatial method for modeling maritime routes. *IEEE Access*, 8:47556–47568, 2020.
- [23] Nikolas Zygouras, Giannis Spiliopoulos, and Dimitris Zissis. Detecting representative trajectories from global ais datasets. In *Proceedings of the IEEE International Intelligent Transportation Systems Conference ITSC*, pages 2278–2285, 2021.
- [24] Nikolas Zygouras, Alexandros Troupiotis-Kapeliaris, and Dimitris Zissis. Envclus*: Extracting common pathways for effective vessel trajectory forecasting. *IEEE Access*, 12:3860–3873, 2024.

⁸Indicatively, see the statistics about the vessel density in Rotterdam area (<https://www.marinetraffic.com/en/details/areas/areaId:12/>) and Singapore area (<https://www.marinetraffic.com/en/details/areas/areaId:112>).

TABLE VI
 BREST DATASET
 BASE MODEL: SR=90, LR=0.01, MAXDEPTH=12, BOOSTERS=750

Model	SR	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	30	294	0.33	89	481	1091	1732	2415	3143	3937
	60	280	0.52	76	484	1099	1748	2424	3139	3936
	90	270	0.56	69	428	1066	1749	2367	3110	3936
	120	258	0.48	63	491	1103	1767	2479	3216	4022
	150	251	1.01	59	484	1088	1745	2460	3233	4032

Model	Max Depth	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	6	7	0.31	9	512	1252	2032	2696	3516	4439
	9	45	0.30	20	464	1130	1836	2450	3210	4037
	12	270	0.56	69	428	1066	1749	2367	3110	3936
	15	1174	0.99	273	409	1046	1738	2379	3151	4024
	18	3546	3.04	858	404	1055	1771	2422	3205	4097

Model	LR	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	0.001	293	0.51	74	1265	2665	4041	5122	6382	7572
	0.005	301	0.63	74	464	1144	1856	2472	3235	4082
	0.01	270	0.56	69	428	1066	1749	2367	3110	3936
	0.05	216	0.54	54	429	1048	1732	2357	3113	3931
	0.1	207	0.43	53	444	1069	1762	2395	3156	3977

Model	Boosters	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	500	195	0.38	48	440	1094	1788	2404	3157	3995
	625	234	0.58	58	432	1076	1763	2380	3125	3955
	750	270	0.56	69	428	1066	1749	2367	3110	3936
	875	303	0.57	75	428	1061	1744	2362	3106	3928
	1000	339	0.72	84	427	1057	1739	2357	3101	3918

TABLE VII
 PIRAEUS DATASET
 BASE MODEL: SR=90, LR=0.01, MAXDEPTH=12, BOOSTERS=750

Model	SR	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	30	284	0.36	78	394	848	1332	1902	2535	3148
	60	270	0.61	67	390	850	1340	1905	2537	3214
	90	250	0.61	60	339	838	1374	1874	2598	3334
	120	233	0.83	55	385	855	1358	1908	2579	3198
	150	214	2.13	50	384	852	1372	1974	2598	3297

Model	Max Depth	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	6	7	0.20	6	431	1026	1620	2112	2802	3615
	9	44	0.31	15	373	899	1441	1915	2601	3326
	12	250	0.61	60	339	838	1374	1874	2598	3334
	15	969	1.55	225	323	820	1377	1902	2650	3397
	18	2595	3.43	638	318	833	1408	1936	2682	3475

Model	LR	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	0.001	256	0.94	63	1102	2213	3115	3878	4795	5659
	0.005	274	0.93	65	368	889	1436	1930	2647	3426
	0.01	250	0.61	60	339	838	1374	1874	2598	3334
	0.05	189	0.88	47	329	829	1384	1904	2638	3350
	0.1	182	0.82	45	332	840	1411	1934	2671	3400

Model	Boosters	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	500	179	0.60	42	349	857	1396	1891	2612	3363
	625	216	0.64	51	342	844	1380	1878	2601	3341
	750	250	0.61	60	339	838	1374	1874	2598	3334
	875	278	0.99	67	337	835	1372	1875	2600	3332
	1000	305	0.81	74	336	833	1371	1874	2602	3335

TABLE VIII
 AEGEAN DATASET
 BASE MODEL: SR=90, LR=0.01, MAXDEPTH=12, BOOSTERS=750

Model	SR	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	30	289	0.29	146	198	468	794	1149	1545	1994
	60	281	0.27	101	201	473	799	1153	1544	1981
	90	273	0.28	86	176	460	809	1123	1543	2003
	120	264	0.27	79	208	485	813	1174	1570	2009
	150	258	0.29	75	210	484	816	1173	1573	2022

Model	Max Depth	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	6	7	0.12	18	238	535	948	1265	1738	2280
	9	45	0.26	33	193	488	860	1171	1593	2057
	12	273	0.28	86	176	460	809	1123	1543	2003
	15	1224	0.51	310	167	452	799	1133	1566	2044
	18	4141	1.11	1021	170	459	819	1167	1610	2107

Model	LR	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	0.001	302	0.29	96	1423	3126	4888	6209	7955	9700
	0.005	298	0.31	93	196	531	956	1233	1705	2207
	0.01	273	0.28	86	176	460	809	1123	1543	2003
	0.05	219	0.29	73	198	463	802	1127	1552	2025
	0.1	218	0.26	71	211	478	823	1158	1597	2081

Model	Boosters	Model size[mb]	Inference[μ s]	Training[s]	10	20	30	40	50	60
FLP-XR	500	192	0.20	61	177	478	852	1152	1586	2056
	625	232	0.23	73	175	466	821	1133	1554	2017
	750	273	0.28	86	176	460	809	1123	1543	2003
	875	310	0.34	108	180	460	807	1122	1540	1999
	1000	341	0.35	111	183	460	806	1121	1539	1998