

INDEX

- Apple (company), 6
- Australia
- AV deployment, 125–127
 - urban planning, 126–127
 - context for interviews with planners of, 127–129
- Australian Design Rules, 58
- Automated vehicles (AV), 11, 20, 22, 52, 66, 70–71, 141
- deployment frame, 124
 - deployment in Australia, 125–127
 - innovations, 43
 - in United Kingdom, 79–80
 - vehicles, 34
- Automating transport in United Kingdom, 70–71
- Automation, 66
- Automobility, 4, 66, 140
- in transport governance, 53–55
- Autonomous vehicles. *See* Automated vehicles (AV)
- ‘B-riders’ implementation, 92–93
- Behavioural change, 96–97
- beneficial, 38
 - national Dutch programme and, 87
 - programmes, 89–90
 - in target groups, 86
- Behaviours, 3, 45
- adaptability and, 60
 - of early innovators, 4
- Beter Benutzen (BB), 87, 89–90
- Biofuels, 37
- BMW, 6, 23, 71
- Brabant region, 92–93
- Burn Fat Not Fuel (BFNF), 87, 90, 91
- Business models, 8, 34, 111, 158
- choice of, 37
 - of most ‘smart’ transport providers, 22
 - and resilience, 37–39
 - of smart mobility companies, 7
- California Public Utilities Commission (CPUC), 110
- Car sharing, 8, 52, 55–57
- Categories, and framing in transport governance, 53–55

- Centre on Connected and Autonomous Vehicles (CCAV), 73
- Commodification of urban mobility, 43
- Congestion, 10, 42–43
pricing, 116
- Connected and Autonomous Vehicle (CAV), 74
- Consumers, 72
protection, 42
- Corporatized governance, 125, 133
- Cruise Automation, 70–71
- Culture, 3
hyper mobile, 26
wars, 29
- Cyberattack, 39
- Cycleways, 53–54
- Decision-making processes, 89
- Demand of mobility services, 20
- Democracy, 69, 80, 161
decentralizing, 118
TM principles, 73
- Democratic institutions, 160
- Department for Business, Energy and Industrial Strategy, 73
- Dependents, 89
- Deviants, 89
- Disruptive potential, 7
- Disruptive transport
businesses and modes, 54
- Disruptive transport technologies, planning for
- AV deployment and urban planning in
Australia, 126–127
fragmentation of effort, 133
government, 130–131
government as facilitator of integrated supply, 131–132
public sector knowledge gaps, 132–133
uncertainty hampering planning, 129–130
- Diversity, TM principles, 73
- Door-to-door
mobility, 37
service, 26
- ‘Drive Me London’
programme, 74–77
- ‘Drive-by-wire’ technologies, 70
- Driverless technologies. *See* Automated vehicles
- Driverless vehicles. *See* Automated vehicles
- Economy, 3, 23, 68
post-Brexit, 71
sharing, 25, 36–37, 52, 110, 111
- Eindhoven (hub for technological innovation), 92
- Electric mobility, 53
- Epistemic experimentation, 54–55, 60
- European MaaS Alliance, 36
- Experimentation, 9, 69–70, 73–74, 162
absence in, 78
epistemic, 54–55, 60
places of, 78

- from the operational and reflexive levels, 79–80
- Facilitator, government as (integrated supply), 131–132
- ‘First and last mile’, 57
- Fiscal re-adjustment, 10
- Footpaths, 53–54, 58
- Fragmentation of effort, 133
- Framing
 - positive, 41
 - in transport governance, 53–55
- Freedom, false promise of, 39–41
- Full MaaS vision, 37
- ‘Future technology adopters’, 78
- General Motors, 126
- Gett taxi, 42
- Global Financial Crisis (GFC), 71
- Global technology companies, 6
- Google, 6
- Governance, 5–6, 124, 127–128
 - capacities, 119
 - capacity transformation, 108–109
 - of governance, 6
 - implications for, 41–44
 - network, 8
 - outcomes, 115–120
 - processes, 67
 - smart mobility and, 6–12
 - urban, 34
 - See also* Transport governance
- Governance challenges in era of ‘smart’ mobility
 - autonomous mobility system, 22–23
 - fork in road, 26–29
 - negative externalities of mass car, 23–24
 - on-demand transport services, 26
 - transport governance, 24–25
 - transport projects, 21–22
- Governmental capacity
 - congestion charging in Stockholm, 112–114
 - disruption in transport sector, 106–108
 - policy success, implementation processes and governance outcomes, 115–120
 - ridesourcing in San Francisco, 109–112
 - transforming governance capacity, 108–109
- Greenhouse gas emissions, 40
- Hands-off
 - approach, 21
 - mentality, 11
 - government, 144, 148
- Hands-on
 - governance, 11
 - government, 144
- Hegemonic automobility, 52
- High-profile technology companies, 113

- House of Lords Science and Technology Select Committee (2017), 81#1
- Implementation processes, 109, 115–120
- Inclusivity, 69, 73, 80
- Incremental politics, Transition Management (TM), 68
- Industrial Strategy Green Paper, 72–73, 78
- Information and communications technologies (ICT), 34, 39, 42
 - ICT-based aggregation services, 35
 - ICT-personal device, 94
 - network, 39
- Infrastructure and Environment (I&M), 90
- Innovations, 8–9
- Institutions, 3
- Integrated supply, government as facilitator of, 131–132
- ‘Intelligent Mobility Fund’ mechanism, 78
- Interconnections, Transition Management (TM) levels, 79–80
- Interdependence of organizations, 5
- International Transport Forum, 22, 141, 163
- Interviewees, 90, 130–131, 132
 - and fragmentation, 133
 - responses of, 89–90
 - and students, 97
- Interviews
 - with Australian planners, 127–129, 134
 - with decision-makers, 89–90
 - with public sector officials, 11
 - semi-structured, 129
- IT-enabled ridesourcing services, 106
- Legacy, 10
- Lisbon example, 141
- Losers, 157–159
- Lyft, 6, 42, 159
- Maastricht, 90–92
- Maastricht Bereikbaar (MB), 91
- Market regulation, 35
- Market-driven approaches, 10
- Market-led scenario, 148
- Meta-governance, 6
- Metropolitan Planning Organizations, 129
- Midland Metro trams, 42
- Mobile customers, 41
- Mobility, 67–68, 142–143
 - aggregators, 27
 - system, 3, 86
- Mobility as a Service (MaaS), 3, 8, 34–35, 40, 41, 42, 52
 - business models and resilience, 37–39
 - complexities and contradictions in, 37

- construction of, 35
 - ecosystem, 43
 - false promise of freedom, 39–41
 - global, 36, 37, 39
 - implications for governance, 41–44
 - innovators, 43
 - MaaS-type model, 24
 - partial, 36
 - ‘pre’ MaaS, 36
 - Scotland, 36
 - sharing economy, 36–37
- Mobility-on-demand, 52
- Modality switchers, 94, 96
- Motor vehicle, 23
- Motorized (electric) personal mobility devices, 52
- Multi-Sided Platform
 - nature of MaaS, 37–38
- Multiple stakeholders, 119
- National Express buses, 42
- New Public Management, 10
- New South Wales, 58, 60
- Nissan, 71
- Nokia, 41
- Non-car user employees
 - working for BB members, 96–97
- Non-car-based modes, 9
- On-demand, 20
 - matching of supply, 20
 - transport services, 26
- Operational governance, 73–78
- Operational phase of Transition Management (TM), 73–78
- Outsourcing innovation, 43
- ‘Ownership’ of vehicles, 3
- ‘Pay-As-You-Go’, 40
- Pedestrian environments,
 - regulating motorized use of, 59
- Pedestrian walks, 58
- Personal mobility devices (PMDs), 57–60
- Personal transport sector, 35
- Policy
 - process, *vs.*, 108–109
 - success, 115–120
 - transport policy world, 108
 - urban policymaking, 118
- Policymakers, 97
- Political infrastructures, 53–54
- Politics, 159–161
- ‘Post-political’ narrative of transport provision, 9
- Principle domain of pedestrians, and regulations, 58
- Private cars, 22
- Private sector, 124–125
- Producers, 72
 - interests, 21, 26
 - producer-led visions, 43
- Public authorities, 41
- Public sector
 - knowledge gaps, 132–133
 - leadership, 115
- Public transport, 4, 8, 42, 147, 148, 158
 - Altamonte Springs, 38
 - fixed public transport systems, 28
 - free access to, 97

- involvement in MaaS, 35
 - providers, 42
 - solutions, 115
- Reflexive governance, 66–67, 78–79
 - and experimentation, 67–70
- Reflexive phase in Transition Management (TM) cycle, 78–79
- Regulated infrastructures, 53–54
- Regulatory frameworks, 53
- Ride-hailing service, 38
- Ridesharing, 115
- Ridesourcing, 106–107, 109, 115–116
 - services, 108
- Roads, 53–54, 58
- Rule-making process, 110
- San Francisco
 - comparison with Stockholm, 115
 - ridesourcing in, 109–112, 115
- Scenario
 - exercise, 144–146
 - outcomes, 147
 - planning, 144
 - results of scenarios
 - exercise, 146–149
- Science and Technology Studies (STS), 86–87, 89
 - and SCPD for studying smart mobility target groups, 87–89
- Segways, 58–59
- “Self-driving” vehicles. *See* Automated vehicles
- “Self-organizing” networks, 5
- Self-reflexive process, 79
- Self-reinforcing system of automobility, 3
- Service
 - aggregators, 6
 - smart mobility, 158
 - types, 34
- Sharing economy, 25, 36–37, 52, 110, 111
- Shipping channels, 53–54
- Smart innovations, 7
- Smart mobility, 2, 2–4, 20, 24, 52, 349
 - automobility, categories, and framing in transport governance, 53–55
 - banner, 36
 - car sharing, 55–57
 - and governance, 6–12
 - innovations, 4
 - PMDs, 57–60
 - services, 158
 - technologies, 87, 107
- Smart mobility policies
 - Brabant, 92–93
 - case studies, 90
 - findings, 93–94, 95
 - Maastricht, 90–92
 - methods, 89–90
 - modality switchers, 94, 96
 - students, 97
 - traffic participants, 98
 - winners and losers, 157–159
- Smart mobility transition, 43, 107
 - congestion charging in Stockholm, 112–114

- disruption in transport sector, 106–108
 - ridesourcing in San Francisco, 109–112
 - transforming governance capacity, 108–109
- Smart technology, 107
- Smart transition, 20–22, 24–28
- Smart transport, 22, 28
- Smartcard-based integrated ticketing systems, 36
- Social and cultural
 - characterizations, 88
- Social Construction and Policy Design (SCPD), 86–87
 - and STS for studying smart mobility target groups, 87–89
- Social Construction of target groups, 93
- Societal system levels, 68
- Socio-technical innovation, 22
- State capacity, 10
- State role, 5, 6
- Steering, 5
- Stockholm
 - congestion charging in, 112–114
 - traffic management, 112
- Strategic management, 44
- Strategic phase in Transition Management (TM) cycle, 72–73
- Strategic priorities, 111
- Students, 97
- Sustainability, 86
 - sustainable urban transport, 37
 - sustained interaction of networks members, 5
 - transitions, 66–67
- Sydney, car sharing in, 55–56
- Tactical measures, 111
- Tactical phase in Transition Management (TM) cycle, 73
- Technological disruption, 53
- Technology, 3
 - global technology companies, 6
 - high-profile technology companies, 113
 - smart, 107
 - smart mobility, 87, 107
- Telecommunications, 39
 - network congestion, 39
- Time, 10
- Top-down mechanisms, 6
- Toyota, 126
- Traffic
 - congestion, 40
 - participants, 98
 - signal, 2
- Traffic in Towns*, 23
- Transition, 140, 141, 156
 - management, 67–70
 - mobility, 66
 - See also* Smart mobility transition
- Transitions Management (TM), 66–67
- Transport, 21, 42
 - direct, 6–7
 - disruption in transport sector, 106–108

- networks, 39
- planning, 127
- policies, 53, 108
- professionals, 37
- sector, 39
- servicing, 115
- systems, 2
- technologies, 37
- Transport governance,
 - 24–25, 52
 - automobility, categories,
 - and framing in,
 - 53–55
 - See also* Governance
- Transport Systems Catapult,
 - 81*n*2
- Transportation network
 - companies (TNCs),
 - 110
- Transportation services, 8
- Uber, 6, 7, 38, 42, 52,
 - 54–55, 159
- Uncertainty, 129–130
- United Kingdom, automating transport in, 70–71
- Urban air pollution, 40
- Urban governance, 34
- Urban logistics services, 34
- Urban planning, 125
 - in Australia, 126–127
 - involvement of urban
 - planning
 - professionals in
 - Stockholm, 119
 - public purpose of, 124
- Urban policymaking, 118
- Urban vision, 119
- ‘Usership’ of vehicles, 3
- Vehicle manufacturers, 71
- Vehicle-sharing service, 36
- Volkswagen, 71
- Volvo, 70
 - ‘Drive Me London’
 - programme,
 - 74–77
- Volvo Research and Educational Foundations (VREF), 121
- Window of opportunity,
 - 156–157
 - capacity to steer, 161–163
 - politics, 159–161