Submission to
Transport Select Committee MaaS inquiry
22 December 2017

Introduction

ITS United Kingdom is a public/private sector membership association financed entirely by members' subscriptions and can therefore independently provide a forum for all organisations concerned with Intelligent Transport Systems (ITS). A list of our Members can be found at the end of this document.

ITS are combinations of IT and communications technologies designed to assist all modes of transport. The Society works to bring the advantages that ITS can offer in terms of economic efficiency, transport safety, and environmental benefits to the United Kingdom and at the same time expand the ITS market. ITS (UK) encourages discussion on issues such as public/private co-operation, standards, legislation, information provision and new technology.

We have a fairly new and very active MaaS Interest Group which has contributed to this submission.

Comments according to the Terms of Reference of the inquiry:

- *Global evidence to date on the effectiveness of integrated, multi-mode MaaS apps in relation to:*
    - *boosting the efficiency of urban public transport systems; and*
    - *managing demand for road use in cities; reducing road congestion; and improving air quality*

1.1 The truth is that there is very little of this, since there has been little implementation. There are a few pilots and one proper scheme running in Helsinki, but the latter is small (a few hundred participants) by global standards. There are examples of shared economy approaches to transport, such as online car sharing platforms, which are relevant to a MaaS discussion and fit well with one of the core MaaS principles, that of providing mobility door-to-door.

1.2 Nonetheless, the scale of interest is significant, with trials in the West Midlands and Manchester. There are also European projects including UbiGo, MaaSiFiE (roadmap), IRIMS (institutional framework), KOMPIS (a new Swedish government initiative), Civitas Eccentric, and two big EU projects (IMOVE and MaaS4EU). So evidence on the effectiveness of integrated, multi-modal MaaS should start to appear in the near future.

1.3 As regards "managing demand for road use in cities; reducing road congestion; and improving air quality" we should bear in mind what Sir Rod Eddington said, in his report to the British Government, "the potential for benefits from a well-designed, large-scale road pricing scheme is unrivalled by any other intervention"(Eddington, 2006). The UK DfT agreed in "Towards a Sustainable Transport System"(DfT (2007), stating: "The Government accepts the Eddington analysis regarding the exceptional case for exploring the potential of road pricing" The relationship between MaaS and road pricing is interesting . where there is road pricing, there would be clear benefits to users in

integrating this into MaaS platforms so that driving becomes another mobility option offered by the MaaS provider.

1.4 The benefits of MaaS components though such as real time information, integrated ticketing, open data etc are already well understood. But a MaaS App on its own is not a magic bullet. It must offer access to high quality, reliable services in order to get people to use it. There are no existing examples of a high quality ticketing system used by a poor quality transport provider leading to increased ridership and there are good reasons for this.

1.5 MaaS as a congestion buster should also not be taken for granted. By integrating different forms of access to cars such as ride sharing, car pooling or traditional car hire, we may end up migrating people from public transport to on-demand cars. This would increase congestion and reduce air quality. It is important to get early evidence on what works in order to avoid negative consequences.

1.6 On the other hand, stand alone car sharing schemes have a poor track record in the UK. Car2Go in Birmingham failed, and we need to understand the lessons learnt from that, to inform any future inclusion of access to cars through a MaaS scheme.

1.7 It is also important to note that internationally, MaaS is of interest to non-traditional transport actors . it is as likely to attract venture capitalists as public sector funders or bus/rail operators.

- **_Overcoming the barriers to implementation_** _of integrated, multi-mode MaaS apps in UK cities, including:_
    - o _current powers, capabilities and resources of local and regional transport authorities;_

2.1 Local transport authorities are reporting a lack of legal and commercial capability to tackle the huge task of negotiating and contractually under-writing all the agreements between the various transport providers (public and private), any MaaS platform provider and themselves as a subsidy provider, including rates of payment and the ownership of risk and liability. Since legal powers cannot be delegated and funds are limited at the front end planning stages, this work cannot easily be carried out by the private sector on behalf of LHAs either.

2.2 We also need to get local transport authorities systems capable of enabling MaaS. For instance, there still isnt 100% RTPI (Real Time Passenger Information) coverage, there are often data inaccuracies and there is a lack of ticketing back offices with APIs (Application Programming Interfaces) to enable MaaS.

2.3 The Bus Services Act certainly intends that bus operators will share their data. It does seem to be anomalous that private sector bus operators will have to do this while for instance Uber will not.

2.4 It must be remembered that private sector operators will participate in a MaaS platform only if it reduces their costs or increases their profits. Legislating to attempt to make them participate will be fruitless.

- o _current commissioning models, including the rail franchising system;_

3.1 Public transport subsidies must not fall, and must be made available to the MaaS operator depending upon the business model. If modal shift to public transport occurs, which is an assumption and aim of MaaS, then subsidy may have to increase. These are questions for central government to answer and to reassure the market.

- o _transport providers' unwillingness to share data, customers and revenue (including car hire companies; innovators in autonomous vehicles; rail, metro, and bus operators; cycle hire schemes; car clubs; and others);_

4.1 The previously made point applies: the Bus Services Act intends that bus operators will share their data. There is not yet any similar legislation for other modes and we have yet to see how

effective this will be. Even where there is genuine willingness to share data, there are often issues with data formats, quality and latency which make data reuse less than straight forward.

- • **The role of central government**, *particularly the Department for Transport, in raising awareness, building the evidence base, and harnessing the potential of MaaS; and*

4.2 How to handle MaaS as a topic for Government depends on how much emphasis we want on having UK-wide services, in which case DfT should take charge of regulation, advice and information for the whole country, and how much on respecting the principle of transport being devolved, in which case it should of course be dealt with by the devolved administrations. The best way forward is probably a devolved approach but with a strong focus on cooperation. Another reason for DfT to lead would be to position the UK globally as a leader in transport innovation including in MaaS.
This is a real challenge with past attempts at service integration such as Total Transport being widely agreed to have failed. Cities and regions do have both practical and institutional differences which work against integrating transport even when there is a political will.

4.3 Modelling has shown that partial use of MaaS while still owning a car increases overall costs for a household (essentially since the marginal cost of PT/taxi/ridehail is more than that of a private car), hence MaaS requires a leap of faith to sell the car. This is where government should assist, funding trials or subsidising MaaS initial uptake, so that car owners can experience MaaS without additional cost or the heavy commitment of selling a car. The Swedish UBIGo project proved the value of this approach, and the Jacobs multi-modal MaaS model is also interesting in this context. Without trials and subsidies, uptake may be very limited.

4.4 Guidance by Government is certainly needed plus a clear stance as a champion of the MaaS concept since it represents a very significant change in how transport users access services and there will be issues of trust for not only users but also transport providers.

- ***Overcoming concerns about digital exclusion**, ensuring mobility remains accessible to all.*

5.1 Some visions of MaaS include high up-front costs in the form of subscriptions / packages paid for in advance. Even if this means cheaper per day costs, this does not help a potential user who does not have the cash to pay in advance. There is a risk that the flexible pricing models for MaaS give the best offers to those who can afford to pay up front or who are identified as high value individuals, ie better to target for advertisers. This would give discounts to those who need them least.

5.2 Digital inclusion meaning having access to a smartphone is probably less of an issue than digital inclusion meaning being prepared to share locations and financial data freely enough to access a MaaS offer. But as we already know very well, citizens are very willing to give up privacy in order to access things they perceive as desirable, such as the use of a mobile phone or a credit card.

5.3 Inclusion for the elderly is potentially an issue as they do use smartphones less than other groups, but this use is increasing and will now quickly become less of an issue as the population which is used to technology ages.

5.4 It will be important to ensure that there is a way to access MaaS services through a phone / app that is suitable for people with impairments, particularly visual impairments.

5.5 Having multiple MaaS providers may seem an excellent opportunity to create a functioning market but it could add even more complexity in determining best value.   Certain MaaS providers may strike deals with certain transport operators so that for instance some bus services are included in the package but those on the same routes but offered by other operators are not.

Foundation Members

AECOM Infrastructure & Environment UK Limited
Amey Infrastructure Services
Atkins Transport Systems
Capita
Cubic Transportation Systems
Dept. for Infrastructure (formerly DRDNI)
Dept for Transport
EGIS
Essex County Council

Glasgow City Council
Highways England Company Ltd
HMI Technologies
Hogia
HORIBA MIRA
IBI Group
Innovate UK
Jacobs U.K. Ltd
Kapsch TrafficCom
Mott MacDonald Ltd
PA Consulting

RedSpeed International
Technolution B.V.
Thales
Transport for London
Transport Scotland
Transport Systems Catapult
TRL
University of Southampton
WSP Group Ltd

Corporate Members

3M United Kingdom (Formerly PIPS Technology Ltd)
AGD Systems Ltd
Aimsun
Ankerbold International Ltd
Arcadis Consulting (UK) Ltd
Arup
Austin Analytics
Axis Communications UK Ltd
BAE Systems Applied Intelligence
Burden Consulting Ltd
Burges Salmon LLP
CGI
CH2M
Chubb Systems
Clearview Intelligence Ltd.
Coeval Ltd
Costain
Coventry University
Crown International Ltd
Dorset County Council
Dynniq (formerly Imtech)
ELGIN
emovis (formerly Sanef Tolling)
FLIR Intelligent Transport Systems
G.E.A.
GEWI
Grid Smarter Cities Ltd
Hampshire County Council (ITS Group)
HERE
Hertfordshire County Council
Home Office CAST
Ian Catling Consultancy
Ian Routledge Consultancy
IDT Ltd

Imperial Civil Enforcement Solutions Ltd
Imperial College
INRIX UK Ltd (formerly ITIS)
ISR Recruitment Ltd
ITO World Ltd
ITS Consult
JENOPTIK Traffic Solutions UK Ltd (formerly Vysionics)
KAM Futures
Kier Services, Highways Division
Mike Schofield & Associates Ltd
Millen Corporation
Mobile Mark (Europe) Ltd
Mobile VMS
Mobius Networks
MVIS Ltd
Neural Mind Ltd
Newcastle University
Nexus Alpha Low Power Systems
Nicander Ltd
Nimbus Journey Information
Norfolk County Council
Nottingham City Council
P. Ducker Systems Ltd (PDS Ltd)
P&D Specialist Services
Peter Brett Associates LLP
Peter White
Q-Free TDC
Redflex Traffic Systems Ltd
Rennicks (UK) Ltd
Satellite Applications Catapult
SEA Ltd
SG Transport Innovation Ltd
Shadow Creek
SICE UK
Siemens Intelligent Traffic Systems

Simulation Systems Ltd
Smart Video & Sensing Ltd (SVS) (formerly Smart CCTV)
Society of Motor Manufacturers & Traders Ltd
Sopra Steria
StarTraq (UK) Ltd
SUPCON
Swarco Traffic Ltd
Systra Ltd
Tamar Bridge & Torpoint Ferry Joint Committee
TAN (Transport Associates Network)
TectumAI Ltd
telent Technology Services
Thomas Mensah (HS2)
Transport for Greater Manchester
Transport for West Midlands (Formerly Centro)
Transport Telematics
Trapeze Group (UK) Ltd
Truvelo (UK) Ltd
TT2 Ltd
University of Leeds
Vaisala Ltd
Variable Message Signs (formerly Techspan Systems
Videalert Ltd
Wavetronix LLC
West of England Joint Authorities Group *(comprises Bristol/Bath&North East Somerset/South Gloucestershire/North Somerset Councils)*
White Willow Consulting
Wyeval Consulting
Zircon Software Ltd

Associate Members

BMF (British Motorcyclists Federation)
Chartered Institution of Highways & Transportation (CIHT)
Highway Electrical Association

NMi Certin BV
PACTS
Royal Institute of Navigation
The British Number Plate Manufacturers Association

Transport Card Forum
Tsinghua University
University of Aberdeen
University of Derby