

Shared Automated Vehicles: Review of Business Models







Adam Stocker and Susan Shaheen, PhD TSRC, UC Berkeley



UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA Berkeley Transportation Sustainability RESEARCH CENTER

Overview

- Introduction
- Current Shared Mobility Business Models
- Shared Mobility + Automation Developments
- Potential SAV Business Models (w/ high/full automation)
- Potential SAV Service Models (w/ high/full automation)
- Possible SAV Impacts
- Conclusion
- Acknowledgements

Introduction

- Over 30 companies worldwide developing AV technology
- Highly automated vehicles are coming, not an "if" but "when" and "how"
- Shared + Automated Vehicles (SAV) concept gaining traction
- What SAV business models might emerge?
- Review of existing shared mobility services



Current Shared Mobility Business Models

Peer-to-Peer

Service

Models (P₂P)

P2P Carsharing

Business-to-Consumer (B2C)

- Carsharing
- Bikesharing
- Scooter Sharing
- Microtransit

• Hybrid P2P-Traditional Carsharing

- Fractional Ownership
- P₂P Marketplace
- Ridesharing

Models Ridesourcing/

For-Hire

Service

- Ridesourcing/ TNCs
- Taxis/E-Hail
- Courier Network
 Services (CNS)

Business-to-Consumer (B₂C) Service Models

Carsharing:

Allows access to vehicles owned by carsharing companies as part of a shared fleet on an as-needed basis. Includes roundtrip and one-way carsharing.



© UC Berkeley, 2016

Business-to-Consumer (B₂C) Service Models

Microtransit:

Service that employs shuttles or vans to pick up passengers with fixed route/schedule or flexible route/schedule, depending on the service



Peer-to-peer (P2P) Service Models

P2P Carsharing

Service that employs privately-owned vehicles made available for shared use by an individual or member of a P2P carsharing company



Peer-to-peer (P2P) Service Models

Fractional Ownership

Multiple individuals lease a vehicle, and each pay a portion of the expenses for access to the shared vehicle





Peer-to-peer (P2P) Service Models

Ridesharing

Service that facilitates shared rides between drivers and passengers with similar origins and/or destinations





For-Hire Service Models

Ridesourcing/TNCs:

Service that allows passengers to connect with and pay drivers who use their personal vehicles for trips facilitated through a mobile application





Shared Mobility + Automation Developments

- SAV pilots are small-scale at present
- Uber in Pittsburgh
- nuTonomy in Singapore
- EasyMile, CityMobil2, Olli





Shared Mobility + Automation Developments



Bloomberg, 2016



Potential SAV Business Models (w/ high/full automation)

- Putting futurist glasses on...
- Assumptions:
 - Level 4 or higher AVs
 - ODD = most public roads in a given city or metro area
 - Can legally operate unmanned



Shared Mobility Lines Begin to Blur

Non-automated shared mobility business models



Highly/fully-automated SAV business models

- For-Hire service model blurs into B2C/P2P assuming high/full automation (no longer "hire" someone)
- Carsharing vs. pooling considering automation

Potential SAV Business Models (w/ high/full automation)

• Two main aspects define SAV business models:

1) Vehicle Ownership

- Business/Entity (B2C)
- Individuals (P2P)
- Hybrid Business/Individuals (B2C/P2P)



2) Network Operator

- Network operator controls fleet-level decisions
- Same entity owns and operates or not



Potential SAV Business Models (w/ high/full automation)

Vehicle Ownership	Business (B2C)	Individuals (P2P)	Hybrid Business/ Individuals (B2C/P2P)
Network Operations	 Same entity owns and operates Different entity owns and operates 	 Third-party entity operates Decentralized peer-to-peer operations 	 Same entity that owns (some) vehicles operates Third-party entity operates

B2C with Single Owner-Operator

Vehicle Ownership: Business/Entity (B₂C) **Network Operator:** Same entity owns and operates

SAV fleet that is both owned and operated by the same organization

Example: B2C carsharing



B2C with Different Entities Owning and Operating

Vehicle Ownership: Business/Entity (B₂C) **Network Operator:** Different entity owns than operates

 SAV fleet with different owner than operator where two or more companies partner to provide services

Example: GM-Lyft partnership



P2P with Third-Party Operator

Vehicle Ownership: Individually-owned (P2P) **Network Operator:** Third-party entity operates

- Individually-owned SAV network, with a third-party entity controlling network operations
- Example: 'Tesla Network,' P2P carsharing



P₂P with Decentralized Operations

Vehicle Ownership: Individually-owned (P₂P) **Network Operator:** Decentralized peer-to-peer operations

 Individually-owned SAV(s) where operational aspects are not controlled by any one centralized third party and are instead decided upon by groups of individual owners

Example: Arcade City, fractional ownership



Hybrid Ownership with Same Entity Operating

Vehicle Ownership: Hybrid Business/Individuals (B2C/P2P) **Network Operator:** Same entity that owns (some) vehicles operates

 Entity-owned SAV fleet that also may comprise of individually-owned AVs that join the network as-needed

Example: Ridesourcing/TNC mixed-ownership fleet



Hybrid Ownership with Third-Party Operator

Vehicle Ownership: Hybrid Business/Individuals (B₂C/P₂P) **Network Operator:** Third-party entity operates

 Third-party that does not own SAVs themselves comprised of both individually-owned and entity-owned AVs on a shared network of vehicles which they operate

Example: Getaround/City CarShare recent partnership in Bay Area



Potential SAV Service Models (w/ high/full automation)



- SAV Business Models Partially Influence Service Models via Vehicle Types Available
- "Micro-sized" (1 or 2 pax) vehicles could become more commonplace



SAV Framework Limitations

- Many business/service models might emerge even in a single city or metro area
- Transition period of mixed SAV/non-AV fleets
- Some business/service models may become more dominant than others
- Depends on many factors, including: automation price and availability, regulation, land-use context, etc.



Possible SAV Impacts: Opportunities

- Increase vehicle occupancies
- Reduce per mile cost (over privately-owned vehicles)
- Unlock urban space dedicated to parking
- Downsize number of privately-owned household vehicles
- Reduce GHG emissions





Possible SAV Impacts: Challenges

- Increased VMT / induced demand
- Will people give up private ownership?
- Increased urban sprawl
- Congestion solved?





Conclusion

- SAVs have the potential to fundamentally change the transportation industry
- SAV impacts are uncertain at this time
- Business models, travel behavior preferences, and public policy are key components to SAV development



Acknowledgements

- Carlin Liao, Adam Cohen, and Elliot Martin, TSRC, UC Berkeley
- Tom Voege of ITF-OECD for providing valuable feedback on the roundtable paper
- Special thanks to the worldwide shared mobility operators and experts who make our research possible



<u>www.tsrc.berkeley.edu</u> <u>www.imr.berkeley.edu</u>