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**Rapporteur Notes**

These notes summarise some of the key points raised by the speakers at the ITF Summit side event on Governance Scenarios for Smart Mobility Transitions. They are the interpretations of the rapporteur and do not necessarily represent the views of the speakers or their organisations. They are best read alongside the presentation on scenarios which is available at <https://www.wctrs-society.com/special-interest-groups/topic-area-g-transport-planning-and-policy/>

**Scenarios Exercise**

Greg Marsden and Louise Reardon introduced a governance scenarios exercise which had been conducted with 17 participants from 11 countries. The scenarios had been established with two axes of uncertainty. The first was the extent to which government was ‘hands-on’ or ‘hands-off’, reflecting the debate about whether the state had (or should) take a proactive role in steering transitions. The other axis related to the degree of societal acceptance of ‘smart’ innovations, for example automation and data sharing.

Whilst differences exist in the start conditions for different countries which affect which innovations have strongest appeal, there was a significant degree of consensus amongst respondents as to the scenario outcomes. In general, where there was stronger hands-on government this led to the ability of integrated solutions to flourish as well as providing greater certainty for the role out of EV and AV innovations where pump priming and regulatory developments were still needed. By contrast, hands-off government led to more proprietary innovation and more individualised approaches to the development of solutions. Social acceptance further reinforced these trends, with strong acceptance promoting service integration through data sharing whilst strong resistance led to more niche based development of applications for those willing to partake.

Some of the key governance challenges which arise from the scenarios were summarised by Louise Reardon:

* Governance matters for ensuring equity/ the protection of vulnerable groups
* Public sector involvement is key to ensuring the co-production of social benefits
* Public sector is a key co-ordinator but this is fragmented creating costs and veto points
* (Where) does government have the capacity to pro-actively steer or reactively follow?
* Governance as key to speed and extent of transition
* Public sector remains a key influencer of public opinion/social acceptability
* Implementation contexts are quite different. One set of technologies many transitions.

**Panel Discussion**

Neil Pederson, Executive Director, US Transportation Research Board

Overall, technology has been leading policy, instead of the opposite. Although technologies themselves have timelines and some succeed quicker than others, or not at all, the tech industry generally adapts quicker to the needs of the public and the changes in regulations than the regulations respond to technological change. Most governments do not have the skillsets and capacity to proactively steer technologies but there is still potential for early and effective intervention. Proactive intervention can facilitate integration and complementarity between modes and improved accessibility or inclusiveness of less technologically oriented members of the public. Requiring that Uber and Lyft vehicles are accessible is such an example. It is important that we share lessons learned and experience from the implementation of smart mobility policies, despite the fact that there are, and there will be, different regulations across cities, states and countries.

Michelle Hendy from the National Transport Commission of Australia

Building upon Neil’s reflections, Michelle focused on the long-term implications of current policy choices. She stressed that it is crucial to make good decisions now, as they will determine what the future will look like. Regulations tend to go through periods of long stability and short change and it is now that there is a window of opportunity to shape the next period of regulatory stability. The challenge is that we need to regulate uncertain conditions (such as unknown business models of the tech industry) in order to create a resilient regulatory framework that will continue to be effective in the long term. At the same time, it is important to keep in mind the cost of inaction and the implications of a laissez faire approach. Among the suggestions on how to deliver a resilient regulatory framework, were the importance of consistent national and international regulation for autonomous vehicles and the need for technology neutral regulation.

Mark Robinson, President, ECTRI

Mark talked about the challenges of smart mobility governance from a regulatory point of view. He pointed out that current policy responses are heavily reliant upon technology and stressed the need for better use of academic research and collaboration between agencies. He outlined five major governance challenges. First, the need to focus on the urban environment and deliver the maximum possible benefits for agglomerations. Second the delivery of joint governance of mobility and information and the need for some mandatory information and data sharing. Third, the need for a simpler regulatory system. Fourth, the need for fusion of the public and private governance. Finally, the effective governance of road safety and the combination of safety and insurance standards for autonomous vehicles. Resolving these governance challenges will require a mix of old and new systems, and a strong focus on social inclusion.

Debbie Hopkins, Research Fellow, University of Oxford

Debbie focused on the role of freight in the smart mobility transition. She stated that as it stands, the focus of freight is fragmented and the understanding of the future of freight limited. It is important to discuss what we want to achieve and what we want the solutions to look like. Understanding whether we are currently heading for a paradigm shift or simply the use of new technologies within current systems is a key element of this process. Current industrial strategies are focusing on robotics, artificial intelligence and autonomous vehicles rather than on environmental and social aspects of freight. At the same, little engagement takes place between the industry and policymakers. Therefore, it is important to address the lack of awareness about new technologies across all stakeholders and build acceptability and trust, in order to work together towards understanding what we want to deliver and what are its implications on society, the urban form, the rural areas, the environment and the economy.

Iain Docherty, Professor of Public Policy, University of Glasgow

Iain stressed the importance of thinking critically about the implications of smart mobility regulation and keeping in mind the bigger policy picture. He suggested that smart mobility policies need to be developed while taking into account wider policy objectives, as any policy developed in a silo is bound to be unsuccessful. At the same time, practical issues such as the capacity to govern need to be considered when developing policy aspirations. This involves thinking early on about the day to day implications of smart mobility policies on people’s lives, who the winners and losers of smart mobility policies will be, and whether there is much in the smart mobility system that is actually new.

**Questions and Discussion**

Addressing the need for better quality of life was also stressed by Yoshi Hayashi, President of the World Conference on Transport Research Society. He suggested that quality of life needs to be the primary objective for every smart mobility policy. Other objectives would include inclusiveness and catering for different levels of regulation in different places and for different reasons.

Again, it was highlighted that we need to understand wider the implications of policies over space and time. There may, for example, be governmental competition for investment and innovation. This may produce a lack of consistency in regulation between states in the US for example. Whilst this may open up some opportunities to innovate it risks raising overall costs and of promoting a race to the bottom in terms of standards.

It was suggested that there is a need to build social acceptance for smart innovations over time and that this is a role for the state and private sector in partnership. Some agencies and places will take a leader role and others a follower role. ICT changes happen much faster than infrastructure and fleet changes.

A key question to address is what are the critical signposts that tell us to intervene or not intervene. We also need to find ways of intervening which are more flexible – prescribing regulation around key outcomes perhaps rather than fixed components that might get out dated quickly.

There were concerns raised that the smart mobility transition is in fact promoting more of the same with an emphasis on cheaper and faster. The need to focus on winners and losers of the transition was reinforced.