



BULLETIN

FAL

FACILITATION OF TRANSPORT AND TRADE IN LATIN AMERICA AND THE CARIBBEAN

# Transport Governance: theoretical and policy perspectives

## Background

At the ECLAC High-level Regional Dialogue on the Governance of Natural Resources and Infrastructure, held in November 2016 (the ECLAC Governance week), the ministerial delegations of twenty Latin American and Caribbean countries agreed to promote a shared vision and a systematized and regular regional dialogue on infrastructure governance for the region. Furthermore, they called upon ECLAC to support this dialogue by dedicated research activities which facilitate a substantive discussion on the governance issues.

While the governance of infrastructure may appear as a somewhat, elusive notion, there have been several policy and research initiatives aimed at positing, developing and, in some cases, even measuring the infrastructure governance at the global, regional or national level.<sup>1</sup>

In parallel, or sometimes prior to that, the topic of governance has become a prominent feature in the discussions related to specific infrastructure sectors. Governance of transport, in particular, represents an established field of transport studies and, increasingly, the subject of numerous policy papers and global or regional policy dialogues. For instance, the International Transport Forum, one of the main instances for high level transport policy dialogue, has dedicated its 2017 Annual Ministerial meeting to the Governance of Transport, arriving at a Ministerial Declaration on the topic.<sup>2</sup>

The goal of this Bulletin is to present an overview of the transport governance from theoretical and policy perspectives. To do so, the first two sections will present the main concepts, theories and tools arising from the academic perspective: first, governance studies, and then, the application of governance concepts to transport issues. The third section will analyse a sample of examples of how international policy forums, global and regional, dealt with this subject matter. The concluding section will formulate

This FAL Bulletin presents a theoretical and policy perspective on the issue of transport governance. The document offers a summary of the key concepts related to governance, as such, and then analyses the way in which the issue of governance has been approached in transport studies. It then analyses examples of how international policy forums and initiatives, global and regional, dealt with this subject matter. The concluding section formulates some proposals for the LAC policy dialogue on transport governance.

This issue was written by Azhar Jaimurzina, Head of the Infrastructure Services Unit of the Natural Resources and Infrastructure Division, United Nation Economic Commission for Latin America and the Caribbean.

The views expressed in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect the views of the Organization. For more information, please contact [azhar.jaimurzina@un.org](mailto:azhar.jaimurzina@un.org)

-  Background
-  I. Theoretical perspective on governance: definitions and key elements
-  II. Governance of transport: definitions, approaches and the research agenda
-  III. Transport Governance in policy forums and policy initiatives
-  IV. Conclusions
-  V. Bibliography



UNITED NATIONS

ECLAC



<sup>1</sup> See for instance, the OECD Framework for the governance of infrastructure [online] <http://www.oecd.org/gov/the-oecd-framework-for-the-governance-of-infrastructure.htm> or the Hertie School of Governance's 2016 report on Infrastructure Governance [online] <https://www.hertie-school.org/en/governancereport/govreport-2016/>.

<sup>2</sup> <https://www.itf-oecd.org/sites/default/files/docs/2017-ministerial-declaration-governance-transport.pdf>.

some proposals for the LAC policy dialogue on transport governance, as part of the infrastructure governance dialogue in line with the Ministerial declaration of the ECLAC Governance Week.

## I. Theoretical perspective on governance: definitions and key elements

The concept of governance is notoriously complex, leading many to question how it would be possible or useful to come up with a universal concept, which could be applied to all spheres or areas of policy making. Without providing a complete literature review on governance, as such, this section will, first, identify the ideas and concepts, most frequently associated with governance, as to provide a more general context before analysing how the concept of governance has been applied to the specific issues in the transport related research.

Over the last decades, a large body of academic work, especially in Western Europe, has been dedicated to the issue of governance. The concept is usually associated with the political science, given the latter's focus on the study of political institutions and political theory. However, it is, undeniably, a pluri-disciplinary notion, which draws heavily on many social sciences, from political science (especially, the study of political institutions, international relations, political economy, game theory) and sociology (especially, the organization studies) to economic studies (transaction costs economics, institutional and evolutionary economics).

It is largely recognized and often emphasized that many definitions of governance co-exist and that, depending on their focus (public administration and public policy, international relations, supranational governance, comparative politics, good governance etc.), they have little to nothing in common (Kjaer, 2004 and Treib, Bähr and Falkner, 2007). The level of analysis (be it national, regional or global), as well as sector of interest, dictates, to a large extent, the exact scope and phenomenon that the governance research seeks to address (Krahmann, 2003).

At the same time, scholars have also approached governance as a global phenomenon, seeking to identify the core elements and ideas behind the concept. Two trends of thoughts can be found in the conceptual debate on governance.

A first group of scholars, generally coming from the organizational theory perspective, tends to adopt a broad approach, which understands governance as a contextual notion, which encompasses the complex universe of actors with various degrees of interdependence, rules of interactions and social processes, independently of the

characteristics of these processes. As an example, Jessop (1998), considers that governance can refer to 'any mode of coordination of interdependent activities' or, in his later work, as "the complex art of steering multiple agencies, institutions, and systems which are both operationally autonomous from one another and structurally coupled through various forms of reciprocal interdependence", (Jessop, 2003). Malpas and Wickham (1995) define it as "any attempt to control or manage a known object". Kjaer (2004) distinguishes market, hierarchies and network models of governance, depending on four factors: the basis of relationships, degree of dependence, medium of exchange, means of conflict resolution and coordination and culture. Rosenau (2000) identifies six types of governance, according to the possible combinations of different structure and processes. Finally, Borzel (2007) understands governance as "institutionalized modes of coordination through which collectively binding decisions are adopted and implemented".

An implicit and, sometimes, explicit element in most of these definitions is the absence of the direct use of power. Some authors point out that governance involves "building consensus, or obtaining the consent or acquiescence necessary to carry out a programme, in an arena where many different interests are at play" De Alcantara (1998), or that "the essence of governance (is) its focus on governing mechanisms that do not rest on recourse to the authority and sanctions of government" Stoker (1998). Others see governance as "the intentional regulation of social relationships and the underlying conflicts by reliable and durable means and institutions, instead of the direct use of power and violence" (Jachtenfuchs (2001, p. 24) quoted in Roe (2013)).

The second and larger group tends to directly associate governance with the fragmentation of the power and decision-making processes due, in large part, to the declining role or power of State actors.

For example, seeking to advance in the understanding of governance as a theory, Stoker (1998) puts forward five propositions that define governance. For him, in first place, governance refers to a set of institutions and actors that are drawn from, but also go beyond, government. Second, governance identifies the blurring of boundaries and responsibilities for tackling social and economic issues. Third, governance identifies the power dependence involved in the relationships between institutions involved in collective action. Fourth, governance is about autonomous self-governing networks of actors. Finally, governance recognizes the capacity to get things done which does not rest on the power of government to command or use its authority. In turn, government is seen as able to use new tools and techniques to steer and guide.

Krahmann (2003) also argues that, despite the specificities which arise from a particular sector or level of analysis, governance can be conceived as a global phenomenon, defined as a fragmentation of political authority across seven dimensions: geography, function, resources, interests, norms, decision-making and policy implementations. According to him, governance can be understood as “the structures and processes that enable governmental and nongovernmental actors to coordinate their interdependent needs and interests through the making and implementation of policies in the absence of a unifying political authority”. He contrasts governance (a fragmentation of political authority) with government, which is understood as the centralization of authority within the State and references a spectrum of institutions and policymaking modes on a continuum between governance and government.

Rhodes (2007), in the revision of his largely cited 1997 work on “Understanding Governance”, offers a similar definition applicable to the area of public administration and public policy, which conceives governance, as “governing with and through networks”, faced with the phenomenon of “hollowing out of the state”, i.e. the fact that the growth of governance reduced the ability of the core executive to act effectively, making it less reliant on a command operating code and more reliant on diplomacy.

Pollitt and Bouckaert (2011) define the scope of governance as the transitions and changes in the governmental role, i.e. the apparent shifting role of the State from one of ‘public administration’ of directly provided services,

through an intermediate phase of the ‘(new) public management’ or the coordination of public services provided by a wider range of actors, to that of ensuring the capture of ‘public value’ in contemporary, highly complex and fluid patterns of service provision in all domains. For Mayntz (2003), the concept of Governance provides a tool to deal with changes in the nature of the State, accounting for the changes in the actor constellation, both during the formulation and the implementation of policies, and in the method of political steering. For Mayntz, as well, the inclusion of non-Governmental actors, such as civil society and private sector, marks the difference between governance and government perspectives.

Therefore, in their conceptual review of modes of Governance, Treib, Bähr and Falkner (2007), posited the relationship between State intervention and societal autonomy as a starting point for the concept of governance. According to this review, “different strands of the literature highlight different facets of this continuum” and most of the definitions can be classified according to whether they emphasize the politics (actor constellation and power relations), polity (systems of rules that shape the interaction) or policy (nature of the steering instruments or modes of political steering) dimensions of governance. Following this classification of governance definitions, these authors consider that most of the modes of governance described in the reviewed works on the topic can be grouped in nine groups (see table 1). Besides, they express their concern that “many of the existing schemes in the literature are inherently inconclusive as they mix up different explicit and implicit dimension”.

**Table 1**  
**Governance according to policy, politics or polity**

Dimensions	Spectrum	
	Concentration of power in State	Societal autonomy
Modes of governance in the policy dimension	(1) Legal binding-ness	Soft law
	(2) Rigid implementation	Flexible implementation
	(3) Presence of sanctions	Absence of sanctions
	(4) Material regulation	Procedural regulation
	(5) Fixed norms	Malleable norms
Modes of governance in the politics dimension	(6) Only public actors involved	Only private actors involved
Modes of governance in the polity dimension	(7) Hierarchy versus market	Market
	(8) Central locus of authority	Dispersed loci of authority
	(9) Institutionalized interactions	Non-institutionalized interactions

**Source:** Prepared by the author on the basis of O. Treib, H. Bähr and G. Falkner, “Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification”, *Journal of European Public Policy*, 2007.



The focus on the declining power of State and the empowerment of non-State actors, private and public, leads many of the authors of the second group to draw on the study of networks. This is the case of the Rhodes' definition of governance as "governing with and through networks", cited above and which, in its more detailed version, involves the interplay of several elements:

- Interdependence among organizations: this relates mainly to the extension of the scope beyond formal governmental institutions (hence, different from the concept of Government) to encompass non-State actors;
- Continuing interactions between the actors: caused by the need to exchange resources and negotiate common purposes;
- Game-like interactions, according to a set of agreed rules and requiring a certain level of trust;
- A significant degree of autonomy from the State for the non-State actors or networks.

It is relevant to note that the research on network governance arose, in large part, to understand the behaviour of firms, industries and markets and not so much the State actors. In the general theory of network governance, offered by Jones, Hesterly and Borgatti (1997), network governance involves "a select, persistent and structured set of autonomous firms (as well as non-profit agencies) engaged in creating products or services based on implicit and open-ended contracts to adapt to environmental contingencies and to coordinate and safeguard exchanges" and tends to arise in the industries faced with the situation which combines four main characteristics: asset specificity, demand uncertainty, task complexity and frequency of interactions. At the same time, as pointed out by the scholars of network governance, this term, while being more specific than just governance, still gives rise to many definitions and interpretations. It has been criticized for the lack of theoretical foundations and clear concepts, neglect of the role of power and the absence of clear evaluation criteria. When applied to the State role, in particular, it was criticized for considering governments as just another actor, ignoring their social role (Roe, 2013; Mu and Jong, 2016).

Beyond the mere definitions, the governance debate seeks to relate the effectiveness of policy making or its implementation to the issues of governance—a relationship often seen as the topic of governance failure. The work on governance failure largely refers to a misfit between the particular mode of governance (frequently, the hierarchical one), which is no longer effective due to the changes in the actors' constellations, and the shifts in the balance of power (Rosenau, 2000; Sutherlands and Nichols, 2006) or the particular policy objectives, like ecological concerns (Ruggie, 1993).

The concept of governance failure has been applied at all level of governance, be it local, national, regional/supranational or global (Roe, 2013) and often resulted in calling for a new, improved governance. In contrast, most of the conceptual reviews of governance tend to discard the use of "new governance", as "what is new in one area could be rather old in another field of study, which makes these labels inadequate as analytical categories" (Treib, Bähr and Falkner, 2017). Jessop (1998), relating complexity of governance to governance of complex social systems, concludes that the "growing structural complexity and opacity of the social world" make the governance failure as the rule and not the exception and that "the incompleteness of governance and turbulence in the environment mean that no single governance mechanism can be perfectly adapted to its environment".

Beyond the labels of old and new, the gist of this debate is the process of transition from one mode of governance to the other. These considerations bring about the discussion of the spatial and/or temporal dimensions of governance, something that, perhaps, has not been sufficiently explored. Jessop (2003) considers that governance is inherently spatio-temporal and that the "match between spatial scale and time horizon may be a crucial factor shaping the success or failure of local economic development strategies". He considers that that time and space inevitably serve as external conditions and contexts of action. Thus, they are also key objects and stakes in the organization of governance and "the very processes of governance co-constitute the objects which come to be governed in and through these same processes". In this sense, the author joins Hunt and Wickham (1994) in challenging the premise that objects of governance pre-exist the governance mechanisms.

Another take on the temporal dimension of governance or the transition from one mode to another is offered by Termeer (2008), who distinguishes between first, second and third generation governance in a rather dialectic approach, similar to a learning process. The first generation consists in using tools and instruments of government to change people's behaviour ('carrots, sticks and sermons' or 'legislative, communicative and economic'). Faced

with the shortage of this approach, which are the lack of information, problematic compliance, self-referentiality and its lack of scalability and reflexivity, the second generation shifts from single instruments to instrumental mixtures or policy arrangements, seeking to work through networks to help those involved solve problems themselves. Finally, the third-generation leaves 'behind the idea of a government who knows what kind of behaviour is required from people' and relies more on standing-back, small steps, observing, planning, self-reliance, adaptive management and self-organization. Termeer's view was that all three generations have value but that the third is most appropriate where the environment is complex and dynamic.

In a similar way, Jessop (2003) considers governance as "the Art of Complexity" and posits that governance mechanisms are one way in a complex social world through which this surplus of future possibilities and its resulting social complexity is reduced. However, to do so, any attempt to build effective governance mechanisms should include:

- (a) simplifying models and practices which reduce the complexity of the world and which are congruent with real world processes as well as relevant to the objectives of the actors concerned;
- (b) developing the capacity for dynamic social learning about various causal processes and forms of interdependence, attributions of responsibility and capacity for actions, and possibilities of coordination in a complex, turbulent environment;
- (c) building methods for coordinating actions across different social forces with different identities, interests, and meaning systems, over different spatio-temporal horizons, and over different domains of action; and
- (d) establishing both a common world view for individual action and a system of meta-governance to stabilize key players' orientations, expectations, and rules of conduct".

This perspective on governance as ways to manage complexity and steering transition towards a more desirable future is an important component of the current governance discussion. Docherty Marsden and Anable (2018) summarize such views under the umbrella of a *purposive governance*, i.e. governance that seeks to resolve societal problems, reconciling diverging interests, managing conflicts and protecting the society's long term interests. They refer to several authors, such as Boyte (2011), who defines governance as the "sustained efforts by a mix of people who solve common problems and create things, material or symbolic (to achieve) lasting civic value", or Bryson and others (2014), who consider that the role of the State has evolved to one in which its primary responsibility

is now to act as the guarantor of public values (i.e. overall societal objectives including operational parameters for private firms) agreed collectively through "broadly inclusive dialogue and deliberation". Docherty et al. conclude that the purposive governance is frequently associated with the notion of 'public value', i.e. overall societal objectives, such as climate change, social equality and inclusion, reduction of the negative externalities of economic growth etc.

This very brief introduction of the general debate on governance serves to illustrate the complexity, but also the flexibility of the concept, highlighting the fact that applying the concept of "governance" to a given subject matter is less about mastering a particular notion or a concept, but more about demonstrating methodological discipline in identifying and, then, respecting the particular dimensions of "governance" which are considered of relevance to the field or research question under consideration. The gist of the governance debate is recognizing that to understand how transport policies and decisions are made, it is indispensable to go beyond studying the Government and acknowledge the importance of other networks and interests (public, private, citizen) at various scales as they impact policy choices, policy implementation and policy outcomes.

As the next section will show, the application of the concept of governance to transport research built upon many of the definitions and concepts cited above, but also brought its own flavour to the debate.

## II. Governance of transport: definitions, approaches and the research agenda

Transport governance, in line with the general governance debate, has received increasing attention from scholars in numerous disciplines and with respect to many, if not all, segments of the transportation activities.

Table 2 includes a brief overview of the governance-related publications in the leading transport policy journals in the recent years. For each article, it identifies the exact topic (generally, a transport sub-sector), the research question and their position on or their use of the governance concept. The period spans over eight years (2010-2018) and focuses on the academic research, where the term "governance" has been used in the title and/or the body of the article. While having its limitations, such an approach has been used in transport studies and has proved to be useful in identifying methodological issues or blind spots in the current transport-related research (Zhang and others, 2018; Marsden and Reardon, 2017).

**Table 2**  
**Approaches to transport governance in transport policy journals, 2010-2018**

Year	Journal	Article	Topic	Main research question	Definition/use of governance concept
2010	Journal of Transport Geography	Marsden G, and Rye T, "The governance of transport and climate change"	Transport and climate change	To examine the prospect for deep cuts in CO <sub>2</sub> emissions from transport through an examination of the key policy levers for change and considering the governance issues that surround them.	Use of a "Multi-level governance" as a conceptual approach to studying the development, implementation, effectiveness and accountability of policies. Application of the analytical framework of the multi-level governance and its types to the complex policy goals surpassing geographical, administrative and national/supranational scopes and mandates of action.
2012	Transport Policy	Legacy C. et al, "Is there a good governance model for the delivery of contemporary transport policy and practice? An examination of Melbourne and Perth"	Transport policy and land use	To examine the governance arrangements for land use and transport integration and, particularly, the role of the appropriate organizational structure and the role of governance to deliver this policy integration.	Considering "Governance arrangements" as understanding of the structures and processes of organizations involved in setting and implementing land use policy and transport policy, as well as the relationships established with entities that exist outside of the government bureaucracy. Focus on networked governance and strong regulations as a way of overcoming the silo mentalities and the shortages of a top-down approach. References to good governance.
2013	The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics.	Roe Michael, "Maritime Governance and Policy-Making: the need for Process rather than Form"	Maritime transport	To examine the process in policy-making in the maritime sector and how issues of flexibility, movement, change and the increasing speed of these changes can be accommodated in a new governance framework.	[Maritime] Governance as the overarching structure and relationships that direct, control and influence the [shipping and port] sector. Focus on the maritime governance failure, due to the inadequacy of its current form to the needs and characteristics of the sector.
2013	Journal of Transport Geography	Theo Notteboom, Peter De Langen, Wouter Jacobs, "Institutional plasticity and path dependence in seaports: interactions between institutions, port governance reforms and port authority routines"	Ports	To analyse path dependence and institutional plasticity in seaport governance, focusing on an interplay between institutional environment, governance structure and the dynamics in supply chain and hinterland strategies of landlord port authorities.	References to port governance or governance structures, mainly seen as the management of the ports by State and degree of the decentralization of the State power.
2014	Research in Transportation Economics 48	Wijnand Veeneman, Didier van de Velde, "Developments in public transport governance in the Netherlands: A brief history and recent developments"	Urban transport	To describe developments in the governance of public transport in the Netherlands, focusing on bus, tram, metro and regional train concessions.	No definition of governance, but the paper focuses on the evolving role and strategy of the central government in dealing with transport concession, highlighting the fragmentation and maturing of governance by fine-tuning incentives and cooperation forms between public transport authorities and operators.
2015	Journal of Transport Geography	Jiang et al, (2015), "Analysis of the impacts of different modes of governance on inland waterway transport development on the Pearl River: The Yangtze River Mode vs. the Pearl River Mode"	Inland water transport	To analyse the differences between the two modes of governance applied on the arteries of the Yangtze River and the Pearl River and to explore their different impacts on the development of waterway systems. Evaluating the impact of different institutional structures on the performance of inland navigation at the river basin levels, the authors conclude that a centralized structure is more performant than the system that delegates responsibilities to the local levels.	Governance modes seen as either a Y-mode (central government responsible for inland water transport market supervision) or a P-Mode (central government as largely a coordinator with the local governments managing the river).

Table 2 (continued)

Year	Journal	Article	Topic	Main research question	Definition/use of governance concept
2015	Research in Transportation Economics	Veeneman et al, "Austerity in public transport in Europe: The influence of governance"	Urban public transport	To understand how the organizational context influences those funding decisions and the related outcome in terms of public transport services provided and passengers transported.	Governance as the "system of decision-making" with an output of budget decisions on public transport.
2016	Journal of Transport Geography	Wilmsmeier G. and Monios J., "Institutional structure and agency in the governance of spatial diversification of port system evolution in Latin America"	Ports	To identify how the institutional setting governing the spatial diversification of container port activity has changed as a result of decentralization of port governance and de-concentration of port traffic.	Governance is defined as "the institutions, mechanisms and processes through which economic, political and administrative authority is exercised", but the focus remains on the institutional aspects (structures and agency).
2016	Transportation Research Procedia	Öberg et al., "Governance of major transport corridors involving stakeholders"	Regional transport (corridors)	To examine the governance for developing main transport corridors in the European Union, considering "governance organization", "actors" and "governance in practical implementation process".	Governance is considered to consist of all activities involved in steering, including cooperation and collaboration structures, and processes. Emphasis on a shift towards governance with a broad range of stakeholders involved in planning and financing of transport infrastructure, on involving all the stakeholders in a "collaborative corridor governance".
2016	Case Studies on Transport Policy	Henrike Rau, Michael Hynes, Barbara Heisserer, "Transport policy and governance in turbulent times: Evidence from Ireland"	Transport policy	To investigate how the prevailing governance system in Ireland responded to rapid economic, political, and social changes.	Governance broadly measured by identification of key actors, institutions and discursive trends in the transport sector. Focus on the shift multi-level governance, but also on the evolution in the transport policy goals (transition to a more environmentally sustainable system).
2016	Transport Policy	Rui Mu, Martin de Jong, "A network governance approach to transit-oriented development: Integrating urban transport and land use policies in Urumqi, China"	Urban transport	To study the transit-oriented development, i.e. a greater integration between transport and land use, and the particular governance problems which arise in the implementation of TOD initiatives.	The application of the network governance approach, as the most appropriate to deal with the complex policy process that involves a network of actors with diverse perceptions, goals, resources and strategies. Focus on two aspects: one, the instruments and mechanisms that aim to enhance the alignment of goals, tasks and efforts of networked actors and, second, the deliberate strategies and conscious steering attempts of the actors to influence, facilitate and steer the interaction processes.
2017	Transportation Research, Part A	Marsden G, and Reardon L., "Questions of governance: Rethinking the study of transportation policy"	Transport studies	The paper questions the prevailing technical-rational model approach in studying transportation policy, as evidenced by the choice of topics, research methodologies and scope of transport research articles in the main transport policy journals.	The 'governance' of policy processes and areas as this more diverse and networked decision-making environment. The review of the current transport research concludes that important questions of governance, such as context, power, resources and legitimacy, have been largely ignored and understudied.
2017	Transportation Research, Part A	Sebastian Hoffmann, Johannes Weyer, Jessica Longen, "Discontinuation of the automobility regime? An integrated approach to multi-level governance"	Road transport	To analyse the discontinuation of incumbent socio-technical regimes, in this case, the automobility regimes, by means of deliberate governance.	The concept of multilevel governance, defined as an integrated use of three analytical framework: multilevel perspective, actors networks and governance. The Multilevel Governance analyses the interplay of actors at different, nested levels of decision making. Focus on actor constellations and policy processes.
2017	Research in Transportation Business & Management	Theo Notteboom, Zhongzhen Yang, "Port governance in China since 2004: Institutional layering and the growing impact of broader policies"	Ports	To analyse the evolution of the port governance in China, in reaction to the changes in the global and domestic economic context, changes in China's Government reform and broader public policies.	No specific definition of Governance, but focus on the decentralization of power, i.e. the gradual shift from highly centralized ownership and decision-making to a port governance landscape that offers more room for corporatisation and private sector participation.

Table 2 (continued)

Year	Journal	Article	Topic	Main research question	Definition/use of governance concept
2017	Research in Transportation Business & Management	Jean-Paul Rodrigue, "The governance of intermediacy: The insertion of Panama in the global liner shipping network"	Ports	To analyse the main stages in the evolution of the Governance of Panama's maritime assets, in the light of its emergence as a major intermediary location in the global liner shipping network and the associated governance changes. The goal is to analyse to what extent governance can play a role in attracting, retaining and expanding logistical activities.	No definition but a broad approach to governance, analysing the set of institutions (first colonial, the Panama Canal authority, the national port authority and, then, the Panama Maritime Authority and the current State initiatives) aimed at retaining and enhancing Panama's position in the logistics sector.
2018	Journal of Transport Geography	Tom Rye et al, "The relationship between formal and informal institutions for governance of public transport"	Public transport	To understand the relationship between the formal (governance established in law) and informal institutions (governance not established in law) that underpin the planning, operation and improvement of local and regional public transport.	No definition of governance, but reference to the fragmentation and coordination challenges in public transport governance. Focus mainly on institutional issues.
2018	Research in Transportation Economics	Wijnand Veeneman, "Developments in public transport governance in the Netherlands; the maturing of tendering"	Urban transport	To analyse the lessons learned from the competitive tendering in the Netherlands.	Governance of public transport is considered to consist of the set of institutions providing actors with agency (the power to act) and funding (the means to act), structuring their actions towards a public transport system, with the expected result to attain specific public values. Focus on the dependency within the governance elements and the maturing of the governance.
2018	Transportation Research Part A	Docherty, I et al., "The governance of smart mobility"	Transport in general	To examine the role of governance in managing transition of socio-technological regime to smart mobility, provoked by emerging technologies such as automated vehicles, peer-to-peer sharing applications and the 'internet of things'.	Governance of [smart mobility] involves paying "attention simultaneously to the why (the public policy function), what (the rules of the game), who (the networks of actors and their position, power and objectives) and how (the manner in which the public is involved, and accountability and transparency are maintained) of the governance system".
2018	Progress in Planning	O'Brien P. et al., "Governing the 'ungovernable'? Financialisation in the governance of transport infrastructure in the London 'global city-region'"	Urban transport	To analyse the governance of infrastructure (funding and financing) at the city-region scale, using the example of London, contributing to theoretical debates about the apparent 'ungovernability' of global cities and city-regions.	The concept of governance is used in relation to the evolving role of central authority and the main argument is that "the governance of infrastructure investment in London, a global city-region occupying a dominant position within a highly centralized State, is being continually transformed by a distinct set of international, national and local public and private institutional relationships".
2018	Research in Transportation	Wijnand Veeneman, Corinne Mulley	Public transport	To analyse the literature context of multi-level governance and its	Application of the concept of multi-level governance, i.e. the thesis is that the

预览已结束，完整报告链接和二维码如下：

[https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/reportId=5\\_574](https://www.yunbaogao.cn/report/index/reportId=5_574)

