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.[1]

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.[2]

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.

UNITED NATIONS

ECLAC

70 ECLAC

FOR SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT WITH EQUALITY

---

1 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/.

2 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 adopt 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 raise 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

4

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_2 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).

6

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 and 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 Economics	Wijnand Veeneman, Corinne Mulley, "Multi-level governance in public transport: Governmental layering and its influence on public transport service solutions"	Public transport	To analyse the literature context of multi-level governance and its application to public transport provision through the examination of case studies.	Application of the concept of multi-level governance, i.e. the theory is that the national level of government is not necessarily the dominant policy making unit and, depending on situation, policy formulation and implementation more typically take place within 'a system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers'. The focus is on the spread of agency and funding over different levels of government.
2018	Transport Geography	Michael Poku-Boansi, Greg Marsden, "Bus rapid transit systems as a governance reform project"	Urban transport	To analyse the process of bus rapid transit (BRT) introduction as a governance reform, correlating the data on levels of governance maturity across the African sub-continent with the progress in BRT implementation.	Reference to the Treib (2007) definition as the "steering and co-ordination of interdependent (usually collective) actors based on institutionalized rule systems". Identification of three distinct but inter-related areas: first, a set of laws, formal and informal rules and practices; second, the network of actors involved in decision-making; third, development of policies as part of a mode of political steering.

8

Table 2 (concluded)

Year	Journal	Article	Topic	Main research question	Definition/use of governance concept
2018	Transport Policy	Qiang Zhang, Harry Geerlings, Abdel El Makhloufi, Shun Chen, "Who governs and what is governed in port governance: A review study"	Ports	To provide a review of the port governance literature, analysing the shift from the concept of port reform to the concept of port governance. A classification of the existing port governance research to open the "black box" of port governance.	Reference are made to the multi-level governance and the stakeholders mapping, but the governance is also seen as a much more comprehensive area, revolving around four main questions: who governs, what is governed, how is it governed, and for what purpose.

Source: Prepared by the author.

As can be seen from Table 2, governance has been gaining more and more attention from researchers in the recent years. It has been analysed in relation to a large variety of transport topics, from a modal (maritime, port, urban, inland water, road) or multimodal (transport corridors) perspective and in relation to the overarching development goals (climate change, smart mobility) or policy integration challenges (transport and land use).

Governance of transport is often evoked in relation to the growing complexity of the general transport decision-making processes due to several recent and inter-related developments, such as:

- the increased role of non-State actors and/or declining power of State (Roe, 2013, Veneeman, 2018).
- New concerns, such climate change (Marsden and Rye, 2010).
- Cross-sectoral and policy integration challenges (Stead and Meijers, 2009).
- Rapid technological developments and uncertainties and related changes of socio-technological regime (Roe, 2013, Veneeman, 2018, Docherty, Marsden and Anable, 2018).
- Rise of supranational actors, such as the European Union (Hoffmann, Weyer and Longen, 2017).

While this is usually the form or the reason why the concept of governance is brought into the transport studies, there is an unsurprising diversity in the exact dimensions or interpretation of governance, when applied to the transport sector. One can also observe advances in the thinking on transport governance in some particular areas of transport studies.

Port studies, in particular, stand out as a field where the study of governance issues has become a, more or less, recognized line of research. As observed by Debrie, Lavaud-Letilleul and Parola (2013), since the 1990s the focus in port governance studies has been shifted from the concept of port reform to the concept of port governance. In their recent review of more than 70 academic articles, dedicated to the issues of port governance, Zhang and others (2018) conclude that theoretical or base studies are emerging with focus on the basic issues associated with port governance, such as the port governance model, the relationship between port governance model and port performance, the interactions between institutions, port governance reforms and port authority routines and the common characteristics of the port governance reform processes. At the same time, they observe that while "the concept of port governance is widely accepted", "it has been used along or in close relation to similar concepts like port devolution, port privatization", which "may result in the increase of ambiguity concerning the distinction between these concepts, the exact meaning of port governance, and its application in empirical studies", and refer to port governance as yet a "black box".

In a similar way, Roe (2013) in his book on Maritime Governance, points out that the port governance work was stimulated, in part, by the proliferation of privatization and the resulting changes in ownership structure and the process of organizing and administering the port sector. For him, this continued emphasis on the ownership issues relating to governance and the devolution process relates "almost entirely to port responsibilities in relation to types of devolution and the balance achieved between private and public and there is no discussion of the cultural and societal issues nor of the flows of information, power and influence nor of the alternative structures that might develop in jurisdiction and government". In this sense, the port governance research can be considered as a necessary but not quite sufficient foundation for a more general conceptual debate on transport governance.

In a more general way, a large part of the transport governance work stems from the extensive previous research on the role of institutions in the evolution of transport systems, which is an established area of the transport research. There are numerous studies on the extent to which institutional settings affect the implementation of policies. There is empirical evidence that the institutional arrangements at the city level, i.e. differences in the distribution of responsibilities within the governmental sector and between the public and the private sector, have a direct impact on the effective implementation of the policy objectives or, at least, of some policy instruments, such as transport investments (Marsden and May, 2006). The port governance research is quite significantly marked by the

"institutionalist" heritage, arising from the application of the institutional and transaction costs economic approaches to the evolution of the ports systems. However, the impact of institutions has also been analysed in relation to other transport sub-sectors (urban transport, intermodal corridors) and in relation to the increasing complexity of the general transport decision-making processes, due to the increased role of non-State actors, more complex development goals, such as climate change (Marsden and Rye, 2010) or the cross-sectoral and policy integration challenges (Stead and Meijers, 2009).

The legacy of the institutionalist analysis, in addition to empirical data, provides many useful concepts, which could be extended to governance. Excellent examples of that are the discussion on path-dependencies, lock-in and institutional plasticity (Notteboom, De Langen and Jacobs, 2013; Notteboom and Yang, 2017), which have been used to explain situations beyond its original scope. At the same time, it is not always clear what new insights and explanatory power the concept of governance brings to the debate. The institutions and the way in which they are arranged are frequently seen as the explanatory variable or even a variant of governance (Rye and others, 2018; Ng and Palli, 2010, cited in Wilmsmeier and Monios, 2016; Jianga and others, 2018). Even the analysis which defines governance as "the institutions, mechanisms and processes through which economic, political and administrative authority is exercised" tend, in the end, to reproduce a rather classical institutionalist analysis, analysing the institutional structure and agency (Wilmsmeier and Monios, 2016) or the evolution of the State institutions in charge of ports (Rodriguez., 2017). In many of these cases, governance was rather used as a catch-all concept, providing an overall context or even a synonym for successful policy reforms.

The parts of the governance research, which seek to present governance as a new research framework or paradigm offer several concepts or perspectives on governance as particularly useful for the transport sector.

Firstly, it is worth mentioning the multi-level governance perspective, which accounts for the fact that governance activities occur at different levels (local, national, supranational), that "actions at one level change the boundary conditions of actors at other levels, thus generating a hardly controllable dynamic" (Hoffmann, Weyer and Longen, 2017) and that, depending on the situation, policy formulation and implementation more typically take place within "a system of continuous negotiation among nested governments at several territorial tiers" (Marks, 1993, p. 392 cited in Marsden and others, 2014). As summarized by Veeneman and Mulley (2018), the key premise of multi-level governance theory is that the national level of government is not necessarily the dominant policy making unit, that policy

development and implementation is not often clear cut in relation to a single level of government and that, in practice, all levels of government interact with task-specific agencies (non-governmental agencies or bodies set up for a particular task). These task-specific agencies are often referred to as Type II institutions, as opposed to Type I institutions, which relate to the levels of government responsible for many different policy areas, in accordance with the distinction made by Hooghe and Marks (2001). This perspective has been used to explain the possibility of a departure from the socio-technical regime of automobility system (Hoffmann, Weyer and Longen, 2017), to account for changes in port governance (Zhang and others, 2018), to explain the budget decisions on public transport (Veeneman and Mulley, 2018) and to understand climate change policy within the European context (Marsden and Rye, 2010).

One of the insights from the multi-level governance perspective is that, for some policy objectives, such as dealing with climate change, "it is becoming increasingly difficult and artificial to maintain discrete levels of hierarchical decision-making steered by Type I institutions, due to the nature of travel and the spatial distribution of businesses" and that "the profusion of Type II institutions whose functional remit does not map well to the climate change agenda and the presence of strong external industrial lobbies suggests however that further devolution of powers will not necessarily lead to optimal negotiated solutions but may risk further delays and watering down of commitments" (Marsden and Rye, 2010). It is important to note that the multi-level governance perspective, while dealing in many cases with the fragmentation of power across government levels, is not necessarily restricted to State actors, as many of Type II institutions are non-State actors (although, possibly, State-like intergovernmental organizations).

Another popular and quite similar governance perspective is the "network governance", which has been extensively applied to the issues of public and urban transport. Sørensen and Gudmundsson (2010) highlighted the increased importance of the network mode in contemporary public transport governance, which increases the importance of trust, reciprocity and effective information exchange among actors. Poku-Boansi and Marsden (2018) focused on the network of actors involved in decision-making as one of the elements of governance in the introduction of bus rapid transit systems. Legacy, Curtis and Sturup (2012) referred to networked governance and strong regulations as a way to overcome the silo mentalities and deliver policy integration for land use and transport. Mu and Jong (2016) offer the most explicit application of network governance to the same topic, using the case of Urumqi, China. They use the term 'network governance' to describe "the more or less stable patterns of relations

10

between autonomous yet interdependent government, business and civil society actors in processes of urban planning, policy-making and implementation of public policies and programs" and distinguish two aspects of network governance: the instruments and mechanisms that aim to enhance the voluntary or forced alignment of goals, tasks and efforts of networked actors, and, second, the deliberate strategies and conscious steering attempts of the actors within networks aimed at influencing interaction processes, facilitating and guiding the interactions, and changing the features of networks.

One of the most interesting parts of the governance research for policy makers and practitioners is the application of the above-mentioned concept of purposive governance to the development strategies or concerns where the transport sector plays a significant role. In this view, governance is seen as inseparable from the public good or public values that it seeks to promote or achieve.

Examples of this approach is the research on the governance of smart mobility (Docherty Marsden and J. Anable, 2018), climate change (Marsden and Rye, 2010), national policies for a more sustainable public transport (Rau, Hynes and Heisserer, 2016) and, to a lesser extent, but still in the same line, the application of the multilevel governance to the discontinuation of the automotive regimes (Hoffmann, Weyer and Longen, 2017). These authors sought to analyse what changes in the objectives and the modes of governance would be required to capture an increased public value from the shifts in mobility systems towards a smarter mobility, a more sustainable transport or a less car-based socio-technological regime. Quite similar to Jessop's view on governance as managing complexity and multiple possible scenarios, this perspective considers what opportunities and challenges are available to the State or Government, who, despite its diminishing role and influence, as key funder or even as knowledge provider, still retains the task to steer the society towards the socially agreed development or welfare goals. Analysing the case of smart mobility, for example, Docherty et al. contend that "because mobility is a system, many different potential 'Smart Mobility' futures exist, even for any given package of technological innovations" and, in this sense, this perspective is less about "state versus non-state actors" but instead about managing mobility, i.e. "about the role the State takes within these new networks to steer, facilitate and also reject different elements of the mobility system" (Docherty, Marsden and Anable, 2018). A quite extreme take on this issue is the concept of "ungovernability", put forward by authors who consider that some situations, i.e. transport in large metropolitan areas, are increasingly ungovernable, as they are part of the global disjointed and fragmented urban governance, due to the fact that city regions function as complex economic, social and spatial entities (O'Brien, Pike and Tomaney, 2018).

Closely related to this perspective of purposive governance is the research on how governance strategies or modes change over time to achieve more tangible results. For instance, in a series of related publications on managing public transport in the Netherlands, Veneeman W. evaluated how the overall governance has matured from the introduction of tendering in 2001, looking at the process itself rather than outcomes. He identified several stages or elements in this process, as well as the interaction of different governance elements: implementing (in which the governance change towards tendering public transport is introduced), discovering (seeing the downsides of tendering, i.e. fragmentation, poorly understood incentives, contradictory arrangements, inflexibility, blaming culture), countering (arrangements to deal with the challenges) and realigning (with new technologies, demand patterns, market situations, or political priorities, the intricate balance between service delivery and governance system changes) (Veeneman, 2018).

Another good example is given by Mu and de Jong (2016), who developed a cumulative ladder to analyse how (network) governance deals with the rungs of governance: substantive complexity (a situation of policy-making and implementation that involves multiple actors and is characterized by multiple perceptions and contested knowledge), strategic uncertainty (a situation where actors in the networks behave in a reflective way, anticipating strategies of actors, reacting to changes in the environment and making unexpected choices) and institutional deficiency (an environment where the rules of the networks are inadequate, unclear or even conflicting, and coordination mechanisms are lacking for interaction and production of collective actions).

Finally, a strand in the transport governance research addresses the biases and shortcomings in the transport governance research itself. The abovementioned review of port governance work by Zhang and others (2018) concludes that most of the research has been dedicated to the issues of "who governs" and, in a lesser extent to "what is being governed", without sufficiently addressing the issues of "how governed" and "for what purpose". In a similar way, in their paper "Questions on governance: rethinking the study of transportation policy", Marsden and Reardon review 100 papers sampled from the two leading policy-facing journals in the transportation literature, identifying a significant distance between applied transportation policy studies and policy making, and argue that "important questions of governance; such as context, power, resources and legitimacy that are largely being ignored in the literature as it stands" (Marsden and Reardon, 2017).

In conclusion, the transport governance research is a quite diverse field, which is constantly expanding. However, it is still in need to clarify the explanatory power of the concept of governance and gravitate towards a more coherent use of the concept. For instance, there is tension in the transport governance research, which often evokes the governance perspective as the one extending the scope of analysis beyond the State actors, but still remains largely State-centric, focusing more on the distribution of power within the State institutions or between State and the private sector. While some authors justify this by positing that the State remains a unique actor vested with the mandate to maximize public value (Docherty, Marsden and Anable, 2018), there is still an interesting potential in linking the research on governance with the extensive research on the industrial organization within the transport private sector (concentration, vertical or horizontal integration etc.) or in analysing the impact on transport policies of (more) empowered civil society.

There appears to be an increasing convergence on a comprehensive view of governance, as a complex ensemble of "who governs", "what is governed", "how it is governed" and "what for" (Zhang and others, 2018). As Docherty, Marsden and Anable (2018) argue, "in thinking about governance of the 'Smart Mobility' transition, there is a need to pay 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". Traditionally, a lot of transport research has focused on mapping the actors, the distribution of decision-making power and the interaction between the State and non-State actors, the "who", "what" and, to some extent, the "how" aspects of the governance. The purposive governance is a promising concept to address the "what for" dimension of the governance. The "how" aspect remains to be sufficiently studied to effectively account for the question of how policy is made rather than what policy is, bringing the insights from analysing context, power, resources and legitimacy (Marsden and Reardon, 2017).

III. Transport Governance in policy forums and policy initiatives

In contrast to the diversity of perspectives in the academic research, most policy forums and policy initiatives converge in invoking transport governance to promote the "good" practices in the elaboration and implementation of transport polices. The recommendations are generally normatively charged, assuming, in most cases, that more transparency, rule of law, equitable and inclusive policies automatically lead to better and more effective policy decisions. In some cases, indicators are offered to measure the good transport governance.

An example of this is the proposal on Indicators on Transport Governance for Sub-Saharan Africa by the Sub-Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program. The proposal is based on the understanding of governance as an "exercise of authority with discretion and integrity" and, as a corollary, on understanding poor governance as the "abuse of power for inappropriate purposes and often personal gain." Following this premise, the proposal puts forward indicators to measure transport governance in ten dimensions, as presented in the table 3.

Table 3
Proposed indicators on Transport Governance for Sub-Saharan Africa

Governance area	Indicator	Description
1	Institutional mandates and responsibilities	Clarity of and distinction between mandates and responsibilities of key ministries, departments, and agencies in the transport sector
2	Strategic priorities	Coherence of transport sector policy and extent to which its prioritization process is based on objective criteria
3	Budget discipline	Budget allocations based on reliable financial forecasts and aligned to priorities based on objective criteria
4	Program design	Quality and use of key performance and value for money indicators
5	Procurement	Comprehensive and timely public disclosure of transport sector procurement plans (including bidding opportunities, contract awards, and data on resolution of procurement complaints)
6	Delivery	Comprehensive time and cost reports on progress of work for major (top 10) transport sector projects, disclosed to the public in a timely and accessible manner
7	Sustainability	Transport sector agency has established benchmarks for routine and periodic maintenance of assets and allocates the budget accordingly
8	Information dissemination	Transparency and timeliness of annual budget and expenditure disclosures
9	External scrutiny	Rules applied to the membership and appointment process for key transport sector governance boards
10	Accountability	Percentage of recommendations from independent technical and financial auditor reports implemented within one year

Source: A. Christie, D. Smith and K. Conroy, "Transport governance indicators in Sub-Saharan Africa", *Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program (SSATP) Working Paper*, No. 95, Washington, D.C., World Bank, 2003.

12

The OECD Framework for the governance of infrastructure (OECD, 2015) is largely similar in its normative approach, as it identifies the elements of good infrastructure governance, considering that "Poor governance is a major reason why infrastructure projects fail to meet their timeframe, budget and service delivery objectives" and that "infrastructure projects with deficient governance often result in cost overruns, delays, underperformance, underutilisation, accelerated deterioration due to poor maintenance, and, occasionally, in expensive "white elephants" and bridges-to-nowhere."

The OECD defines the governance of infrastructure as "the processes, tools and norms of interaction, decision-making and monitoring used by governmental organizations and their counterparts with respect to making infrastructure services available to the public and the public sector". Infrastructure governance for the OECD relates to the interaction between government institutions internally, as well as their interaction with the private sector, users and citizens, and covers the entire life-cycle of the infrastructure asset.

Based on the analysis of the governance challenges throughout the infrastructure life-cycle, the OECD framework puts forward a package of mutually reinforcing governance dimensions that needs to be in place, regardless of the choice of delivery modality, as these can be available in a multiplicity of organizational and institutional models.

These dimensions or, better said, recommendations, include the following elements:

- A long-term national strategic vision for the use of infrastructure should be in place, which takes into account the multi-dimensionality of the challenges.

- Regulatory frameworks, principles and processes should encourage the sustainable and affordable development, management and renewal of infrastructure.

- The process for managing infrastructure projects over their life-cycle delivery should be user-centric. It should rest on broad based consultations, structured engagement and access to information and have a primary focus on the users' needs.

- Coordination across levels of government and jurisdictions should be frank, regular and performance-oriented. Coordination within levels of government should balance whole of government perspectives and sectoral views.

- The appropriate skills and procedures to ensure rigorous projects assurance, affordability, value for money and transparency should be in place.

- Project assessments should be based on data and a balanced value for money procedure.

- Systems should be in place to ensure a focus on the performance of the asset throughout its life.

- Map corruption entry points at each stage of the public infrastructure project and enhance integrity and anti-corruption mechanisms.

- The choice of the appropriate delivery modality should integrate political, sectoral, and strategic aspects.

Finally, several policy papers by the European Union's institutions addressed the issue of governance. As summarized by Fritz (2010), five main principles of relevance to the transport sector can be derived from the work of the European Union institutions:

- Participation, i.e. ensuring that the maximum number of interested parties has the opportunity to take part in the governance process.

- Accountability, usually equated with traceability and accepted rules of procedure, and which might be reflected in procedures in meetings, the layout, content and language of documents and discussions etc.

- Openness, i.e. transparency (even if complete openness in any policy-making is not always possible for security and confidentiality reasons).

- Effectiveness, i.e. efficient use of resources in the context of the task in hand, based on saliency (if decision-makers have the information they need), credibility (if the information is technically correct) and legitimacy (if the interests of the user are at its heart).

- Coherence, the consistency of the governance process as a coordinated and systematic policy-making process.

Against this background, the 2017 Ministerial Declaration on Governance of Transport by the International Transport Forum offers a different take on the topic, more in line with the above mentioned academic perspective on purposive governance. First, it establishes a clear link between transport performance and the goals of the current global policy agenda, such as the Paris Climate Agreement and the UN Sustainable Development Goals. It also declares that "The challenge today is to ensure that governance of transport —the institutional, legislative, regulatory, and policy frameworks in which transport is designed, implemented and managed— responds to the dynamic and rapid transformations shaping the sector, such as the emergence of connected and automated vehicles, big data in transport and the digital transformation of society and the economy in general". Together with the general reference to good governance, i.e. the decision-making and processes that are transparent, effective and efficient, equitable and inclusive, and follow the rule of law, the Declaration identifies several areas or tasks for transport governance, including: connectivity for a global economy and inclusive society, transport infrastructure for tomorrow's access and mobility needs, responsive regulation to foster innovation,

13

a sound framework for open mobility data and inclusive urban access for better mobility.

In conclusion, the scope of transport governance in policy forums and initiatives remains largely associated to the quality of the policy-making processes, offering a normatively charged framework on how transport policies should be elaborated, implemented and evaluated. Generally, it is assumed that improving the transparency, inclusiveness, coherence and evidence-base of these processes would lead to better policies and decisions, a more effective implementation and more tangible results. In this sense, the general focus is on processes associated with governing, and on governmental institutions and processes, seeking to find ways to help governments make more effective use of spending and to enact programmes that are more likely to deliver goals.

IV. Conclusions

Based on this brief overview of the academic and policy perspectives, a series of preliminary suggestions can be made as to the scope of ECLAC research and technical assistance on transport governance.

Furthermore, the existing academic and policy discussion on transport governance provides enough elements for a working definition of transport governance for the purpose of ECLAC activities and a possible ECLAC framework on transport.

As proposed by Treib, Bähr and Falkner (2007), the relationship between State intervention and societal autonomy in the transport sector can be considered as a starting point for the concept of transport governance. The evolving role of the State remains the central issue, but the governance should seek to address the entire complexity of this relationship, as it applies to transport. In more concrete terms, the governance framework should seek to address the four dimensions of transport governance: who governs, what is governed, how it is governed and for what purpose.

As these four dimensions are closely inter-related and are in constant interaction, influencing each other, studying them entails an iterative and back-and-forward process between each and every one of them. However, it is proposed that, instead of the traditional focus on "who", "how" and "what", the starting point should be the "what for" dimension in line with the concept of purposive governance. The linkage of the transport issues to the overall development goals and concerns should be an underlying premise of the analysis. The governance of transport should, thus, be analysed in terms of its positive or negative impact on the State's and society's development goals and ambitions, seeking to identify what changes in governance would lead to maximizing the transport sector's approach to sustainable development. Answering the "what for" question would influence the scope of the analysis in the remaining three dimensions, as a broader "what for" perspective would, most likely, expand the range of the actors, the scope of the subject matter and the views on the nature and characteristics of the processes and interactions.

The "who governs" dimension should map the transport stakeholders (State and non-State), accounting for their increased number and diversity, different degrees of power and influence, as well as their interdependence and mutual influence. The central point here will remain the State or the Government, but a better analysis of the non-State actors would add clear value to the debate.

The "what is governed" dimension implies the spatial and temporal characteristics of the transport governance, as only by analysing concrete circumstances and cases can a meaningful analysis and useful recommendations be identified. As Jessop (2003) puts it, governance is inherently spatio-temporal, with time and space inevitably serving as external conditions and contexts of action, and with social relations representing key objects and stakes in the organization of governance. In this sense, the transport governance framework could and should be used at any level of policy making or related to any transport sector —or thematic or cross-cutting challenges.

The "how it is governed" is the dimension where most of the added value could be gained. The governance should be analysed as a dynamic and learning process, as the governance capacities of the actors involved change and, hopefully, improve with time and iterations. At the same time, it will be essential to unpack the "how" questions, going beyond mere normative statements and wishful thinking to analyse the current governance processes and features, to seek explanations and reasons behind the existing situation, and to be able to identify what needs to be changed for the governance to evolve.

Finally, it is suggested that advances in the transport governance applied research are promoted by means of a case-study approach, focusing on the particular features of the transport governance today as they help or hinder the progress towards the societal objectives and development goals, reflected in the agenda of the Latin American and the Caribbean region. This work could draw on the approaches and findings of the academic research that sought to explain how governance and its modes impact the effectiveness of climate change policies, the changes of the established socio-technological regimes or maximizing public value of the smart mobility.

V. Bibliography

Boyte, H. (2011), "Constructive politics as public work: organizing the literature", *Political Theory*, vol. 39, No. 5.

Bryson, J., B. Crosby and L. Bloomberg (2014), "Public value governance: Moving beyond traditional public administration and the new public management", *Public Administration Review*, vol. 74, No. 4.

Borzel, T. A. (2007), "European Governance—Negotiation and Competition in the Shadow of Hierarchy", paper prepared for the European Union Studies Association Meeting, Montreal, 17-20 May.

Christie, A., D. Smith and K. Conroy (2003), "Transport governance indicators in Sub-Saharan Africa", *Saharan Africa Transport Policy Program (SSATP) Working Paper*, No. 95, Washington, D.C., World Bank.

Debrie, J., V. Lavaud-Letilleul y F. Parola (2013), "Shaping port governance: the territorial trajectories of reform", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 27.

Docherty. I., G. Marsden and J. Anable (2018), "The governance of smart mobility", Transportation Research Part A, in press.

Fritz, J. (2010), "Towards a 'new form of governance' in science-policy relations in the European Maritime Policy", *Marine Policy*, vol. 34, No. 1.

Hoffmann S., J. Weyer and L. Longen (2017), "Discontinuation of the automobility regime? An integrated approach to multi-level governance", *Transportation Research Part A*, vol. 103.

Hooghe, L. and M. Gary (2001), "Types of multi-level governance", *European Integration online Papers (EIoP)*, vol. 5, No. 11, 12 October.

Hunt, A. and G. Wickham (1994), *Foucault and Law: Towards a Sociology of Governance*, London, Pluto Press.

Jessop, B. (2003), "The governance of complexity and the complexity of governance: preliminary remarks on some problems and limits of economic guidance", Lancaster University [online] http://www.lancaster.ac.uk/fass/resources/sociology-online-papers/papers/jessop-governance-of-complexity.pdf.

___(1998), "The rise of governance and the risk of failure: the case of economic development", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 50, No. 155.

Jianga, Y. and others (2018), "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", *Journal of Transport Geography*.

Jones, C., W. S. Hesterly and S. P. Borgatti (1997), "A general theory of network governance: Exchange conditions and social mechanisms", *Academy of Management Review*, vol. 4.

Kjaer, A. M. (2004), *Governance*, Cambridge, Polity Press.

Krahmann, E. (2003), "National, regional and global governance: One phenomenon or many?", *Global Governance*, vol. 9.

Legacy, C., C. Curtis and S. Sturup (2012), "Is there a good governance model for the delivery of contemporary transport policy and practice? An examination of Melbourne and Perth", *Transport Policy*, vol. 19.

Malpas, J. and G. Wickham, (1995), "Governance and failure: on the limits of sociology", *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Sociology*, vol. 31, No. 3.

Malpezzi, S. and N. Wijmenga (2015), "Austerity in public transport in Europe: The influence of governance", *Research in Transportation Economics*, vol. 51.

Marks, G. (1993), "Structural policy and multilevel governance in the EC", *The state of the European Community: The Maastricht debates and beyond*, vol. 2, A. Cafruny and G. Rosenthal (eds.), Boulder, Lynne Rienner.

Marsden, G. and L. Reardon (2017), "Questions of governance: rethinking the study of transportation policy", *Transportation Research*, Part A 101.

Marsden, G. and T. Rye (2010), "The governance of transport and climate change", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 18, No. 6.

Marsden, G. and A. May (2006) "Do institutional arrangements make a difference to transport policy and implementation? Lessons for Britain", *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, vol. 24.

Marsden, G., G. Lyons and J. Anable (2010), "Opportunities and options for transport policy", Universities' Transport Study Group, unpublished.

Marsden, G. and others (2014), "Muddling through with climate change targets: a multi-level governance perspective on the transport sector", *Climate Policy*, vol. 14.

May A. (2015), "Encouraging good practice in the development of sustainable urban mobility plans", *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, vol. 3.

Mayntz, R. (2003), "New challenges to governance theory", *Governance as Social and Political Communication*, Henrik P. Bang (ed.), Manchester, Manchester University Press.

Mu, R. and M. de Jong (2016), "A network governance approach to transit-oriented development: Integrating urban transport and land use policies in Urumqi, China", *Transport Policy*, vol. 52.

Notteboom, T. and Z. Yang (2017), "Port governance in China since 2004: Institutional layering and the growing impact of broader policies", *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, vol. 22.

Notteboom, T., P. De Langen and W. Jacobs (2013), "Institutional plasticity and path dependence in seaports: interactions between institutions, port governance reforms and port authority routines", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 27.

Öberg M., K. Nilsson and C. Johansson (2016), "Governance of major transport corridors involving stakeholders", *Transportation Research Procedia*, vol. 14.

O'Brien, P., A. Pike and J. Tomaney (2018), "Governing the 'ungovernable'? Financialisation and the governance of transport infrastructure in the London 'global city-region'", *Progress in Planning*, in press.

OECD (Organization for Economic Cooperation and Developm 015), *Towards a Framework for the Governance of Infrastructure*, Paris.

Pollitt, C. and G. Bouckaert, (2011), *Public Management Reform: A Comparative Analysis*, Oxford University Press.

Poku-Boansi, M. and G. Marsden (2018), "Bus rapid transit systems as a governance reform project", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 70.

Rau, H., M. Hynes and B. Heisserer (2016), "Transport policy and governance in turbulent times: Evidence from Ireland", *Case Studies on Transport Policy*, vol. 4.

Rhodes, R.A.W. (2007), "Understanding governance: 10 years on", *Organization Studies*, vol. 28, No. 8.

Rodríguez, J-P. (2017), "The governance of intermediacy: The insertion of Panama in the global liner shipping network", *Research in Transportation Business & Management*, vol. 22.

Roe, M. (2013), "Maritime governance and policy-making: the need for process rather than form", *The Asian Journal of Shipping and Logistics*, vol. 29/2.

Rosenau, J. N (2000), "The governance of fragmegration: Neither a world republic nor a global interstate system", Quebec, Congress of the International Political Sciences Association.

Ruggie, J. G. (1993), "Territoriality and beyond: Problematizing modernity in international relations", *International Organization*, vol. 47, No. 1.

Rye, T. and others (2018), "The relationship between formal and informal institutions for governance of public transport", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 69.

Sørensen, C. and H. Gudmundsson (2010), "The impact of governance modes on sustainable transport – the case of bus transport in Greater Manchester", *UK, World Review of Intermodal Transportation Research*, vol. 3, No. 1/2.

Stead, D. and E. Meijers (2009), "Spatial planning and policy integration: concepts, facilitators and inhibitors", *Planning Theory & Practice*, vol. 10, No. 3.

Stoker, G. (1998), "Governance as theory: Five propositions", *International Social Science Journal*, vol. 50, No. 155.

Sutherland, M. and S. Nichols (2006), "Issues in the governance of marine spaces", *Administering Marine Spaces: International issues*, M. Sutherland (ed.), Copenhagen, International Federation of Surveyors.

Termeer, K. (2008), "Third generation governance", *Dies Natalis Symposium*, Netherlands, Wageningen University.

Treib, O., H. Bähr and G. Falkner (2007), "Modes of governance: towards a conceptual clarification", *Journal of European Public Policy*, vol. 14.

Veeneman, W. (2018), "Developments in public transport governance in the Netherlands; the maturing of tendering", *Research in Transportation Economics*.

Veeneman, W. and C. Mulley (2018), "Multi-level governance in public transport: governmental layering and its influence on public transport service solutions", *Research in Transportation Economics*, in press.

Veeneman, W. and D. van de Velde (2014), "Developments in public transport governance in the Netherlands: A brief history and recent developments", *Research in Transportation Economics*, vol. 48.

Wilmsmeier, G. and J. Monios (2016), "Institutional structure and agency in the governance of spatial diversification of port system evolution in Latin America", *Journal of Transport Geography*, vol. 51.

Zhang Q. and others (2018), "Who governs and what is governed in port governance: A review study", *Transport Policy*, vol. 64.