

How to redefine governance modes to better include users and paratransit operators?

Defining a governance strategy for mobility systems is a prerequisite to any urban mobility planning approach and a key component of urban development plans.

However, these strategies often encounter difficulties in their implementation: there has been little or no change in the methods of regulation, management, administration and organisation of flows (passengers and goods) in relation to urban mobility projects. On the contrary, public policies and policy projects seem to be increasingly standardised (e.g. Sustainable Urban Mobility Plans, the creation of Public Transport Authorities, etc.), replicating models from Western cities and relying on international standards that leave little room for the specificities of urbanisation in cities of the Global South (Sakho & Diongue, 2024).

One of the main specificities of these cities is the presence of different informal and paratransit transport modes, the fragmentation of operators, the associated socio-cultural references and their embeddedness into civic life. It is therefore necessary to take these "informal" modes into account in urban mobility governance mechanisms, whether in terms of transport supply (paratransit operators) or demand (location of precarious neighbourhoods linked to urban growth in the suburbs) (Wood, Kębłowski & Tuvikene, 2020). Very often, the mobility stakeholders most affected (operators and users) are the least represented in consultation and decision-making processes (Witting & Wegner, 2016). This tends to perpetuate or even reinforce situations of inequality and socio-spatial relegation.

As a result, several private and public decision-making (and governance) systems, each with their own objectives, are forced to coexist without any real cooperation, consultation or collaboration.

This opens up several areas for investigation:

- What critical mechanisms are needed to (better) take into account the representation of informal – or at least precarious – actors in urban mobility governance processes?
- What mechanisms can be used to better integrate these informal actors into the planning and implementation of urban mobility policies and projects?
- What modes of cooperation are possible between these different systems, how can we determine a more or less shared governance between them, how can we create synergy between them?