

COMMENTARY

Fairness and the Sufficiency Turn in Urban Transport

Philipp Rode, *London School of Economics and Political Science, London, United Kingdom*

ABSTRACT: This commentary considers the research and policy implications of applying the sufficiency principle to urban transport. It explores “enoughness” against a backdrop of increasing carbon emissions in the transport sector, inevitable ceilings for resource intense movement, and the essential requirement of providing access to opportunities in cities. Given the relative lack of progress, increasingly polarizing political debate and urgent requirement for change, this commentary advocates for a more direct and open engagement with a sufficiency turn in urban transport. Most importantly, fundamental questions about a fair distribution of remaining emissions and finite street space within the transport sector must be considered. This engagement can build on the emerging field of transport equity while joining up social justice perspectives of the here and now with sustainability justice recognizing global society, future generations, and nature. While acknowledging the political risks of embracing sufficiency in urban transport, this commentary builds on this rationale and directly engages with the idea of establishing budgets for transport-related carbon emissions and space consumption. It encourages further exploration and presents critical questions for future research and policy practice based on [Martens et al.'s \(2019\)](#) three transport equity components of considering mobility benefits and burdens, considering the disaggregation of social groups, and determining the distribution principle.

KEYWORDS: accessibility; cities; consumption corridors; just transitions; mobility budgets; transport equity

SUMMARY FOR POLICYMAKERS

- Global Green House Gas (GHG) emissions from transport continue to increase and even high-income countries with ambitious climate goals are struggling with a transition toward sustainable transport.
- The excessive space consumption of conventional car use is incompatible with good urbanism with only a minority of trips that can be accommodated by private vehicles in scarce urban street space.

- Direct acknowledgement and open communication of scarcity and consumption limits in transport can be politically toxic but are helped by a clearer analysis of available carbon emissions and space consumption budgets for urban mobility.
- Applying the sufficiency principle to urban transport necessitates to centrally consider fairness and equity aspects as part of policy interventions. In turn, this requires differentiating between process, absolute fairness, and distributional fairness, as well as the three transport equity components of benefits and burdens, social groups, and distribution principles.
- Public policy needs to directly target advancing urban accessibility and access to opportunities as integral parts of a sufficiency turn in urban transport and communicate that it is increasing, not restricting, urban access.
- Embracing the sufficiency turn in urban transport leads to critical research and policy questions, which city practitioners and the research community can jointly address with bold experiments and policy labs.

Introduction

Despite far-reaching global commitments and efforts, climate change is advancing at an unprecedented pace. It is increasingly becoming clear that the next decade may well be the last opportunity to avoid tipping points of climate change that could make a “hothouse earth” unavoidable (Lenton et al., 2019). A dedicated policy focus is particularly pressing for the urban transport sector. Prior to the pandemic, transport-related emissions were not only stubbornly high but had started to rise again in several countries where they had been reduced (International Energy Agency [IEA], 2021). For the European Union (EU), the International Council on Clean Transport warns that transport could consume the EU’s entire carbon budget (Buysse & Miller, 2021). For some time, transport emissions were growing more rapidly than in any other sector and were projected to increase by 50% by 2035 and almost double by 2050 under a business-as-usual scenario (Sims, 2014). Carbon emissions from road and urban transport are increasing as a result of ongoing motorization, increasing shares of sport utility vehicles (SUVs) and other heavier, carbon-intensive vehicles offsetting any GHG reductions from rapid growth in the sales of electric vehicles (IEA, 2021; Popovich & Lu, 2019).

But contemporary urban transport suffers from a second, arguably even greater tension on the ground: the degree to which conventional car-based mobility at scale is incompatible with fundamental ideals for good cities. Congestion, road crashes, and community severance are all indications that the equation between available space, urban space use, vehicle size, speed, and space requirements is fundamentally broken. At 30 km/h, the provision of mobility in scarce urban street space requires 2 m² per person for light rail or up to 75 m² per person for cars (Rode & Gipp, 2001). This difference becomes even greater for higher speeds and jumps in order of magnitude when incorporating parking requirements. Yet,

urban environments that are highly desirable for living, working, and visiting are precisely those that combine high densities of people and activities with clear limits for street space availability.

What both of these challenges share is that they are confronted with conditions of scarcity and finitude. In the first case it is the available carbon emissions limited as a result of globally agreed targets to prevent climate breakdown, and in the second instance it is the available street space constrained as a result of valued urban morphologies that evolved over time. While the case for an urban transport transition that recognizes the above has been established decades ago, direct acknowledgement and open communication of scarcity remains politically toxic. At the same time, [Millonig et al. \(2022\)](#) argue that the efficiency and consistency principle of sustainability has so far not produced the outcomes that are urgently needed. This elevates the importance of embracing the third sustainability principle of sufficiency or, simply put, the recognition of “enoughness” ([Jungell-Michelsson & Heikkurinen, 2022](#)). Here, sufficiency refers to an end state as well as the means of adjusting resource use levels to environmental limits ([Jungell-Michelsson & Heikkurinen, 2022](#)). Given the relative lack of progress, increasingly polarizing political debate and urgent requirement for change, this commentary considers implications of more directly and openly engaging with a sufficiency turn in urban transport. Most importantly, a sufficiency approach leads to fundamental questions about a fair distribution of permitted emissions and finite street space within the transport sector.

To date, sufficiency has remained an implied and rarely referenced concept in urban transport ([Waygood et al., 2019](#); [Zell-Ziegler et al., 2021](#)). However, it features prominently as an underlying category of the well-established “avoid-shift-improve” approach for sustainable urban transport ([TUMI, 2019](#)). Here, the “avoid” component targets the reduction of the need to travel by advancing compact and mixed-use urban development. Similarly, the 15-min city approach engages with transport sufficiency by advocating for actions that increase opportunities within a short walk or cycle ride. Furthermore, low traffic neighbourhoods (LTNs) improve non-motorized mobility by filtering out through traffic while aiming for “traffic evaporation,” which implies sufficiency for the latter. Even road pricing, congestion charging, and low emission zones directly targeting the negative externalities of transport include aspects of a sufficiency lens. In turn, this lens is confronted with uncomfortable questions about excess travel and driving, about how much transport is too much and what type of mobility should be encouraged or discouraged.

There are few policy domains where a suspected sufficiency perspective creates stronger reactions and outright rage than transport. Even in the absence of concrete measures, the mere suspicion of being limited, restricted, or constrained in car use becomes a trigger for strong responses and a fierce battle not limited to social media. Fundamental concerns about personal freedoms, individual self-determination and state overreach blend with status anxiety and loss aversion. Within an instance, transport sufficiency becomes part of a culture war where car use is threatened by a “tyranny of proximity” or even “climate lockdowns” ([Reuters, 2022](#)). When motivated by naked self-interest, these arguments even ignore the basic libertarian principle that individual freedoms must not violate the rights

of others. Whatever the motivation, the polarizing effect of transport sufficiency is real and becomes even greater when it can be framed as unfair, as harming disadvantaged groups or as an attack on opportunities in cities.

In this regard, it is fundamentally important that a sufficiency turn in urban transport is not equated with a reduction in accessibility or opportunities. In fact, a sufficiency approach for car travel in inner city areas is usually advanced precisely to increase levels of accessibility. Above all, access to opportunities in cities often does not require travel over long distances and behavioural adjustments toward a lower degree of travel intensity is possible. Most cities already offer viable alternatives to conventional, high-carbon car use such as public transport, shared mobility, walking, and cycling. Such opportunities create co-benefits far beyond climate change mitigation by helping to reduce the enormous societal costs of car-based mobility. A recent study for Germany estimated these costs to be around €5,000 per car and year (Gössling et al., 2022) underscoring the vast societal benefit of reducing car ownership and use. Lastly, the electrification of road transport is supported by a higher density of charging stations and the potential for sharing more expensive electric vehicles.

For operationalizing a more open approach to transport sufficiency, globally agreed carbon emission caps, nationally determined contributions, and city-level climate reduction plans are translated to emission budgets, which can also be expressed in kilometres by transport mode. Similarly, available street space can be translated to space use budgets for specific areas, which will vary significantly from one to another transport mode. Both can then be introduced as ceilings into the sphere of accessibility (the broader urban transport domain). There, they become part of mobility resources that must be fairly distributed within that sphere. In other words, while equity concerns linked to mobility resources may want to centrally consider the definition and guarantee of group-specific minimum standards for accessing opportunities (floors), carbon emissions, and space consumption have clearly defined aggregate maximums (ceilings). The ceilings for mobility resources (and indirectly for accessibility) are thus derived at indirectly through the constraints of carbon emissions and space consumption.

Millonig et al. (2022) argue that greater transparency of overusing resources has a considerable potential to be both an acceptable and an effective trigger for behaviour change. However, in the first instance this requires the creation of awareness of resource-intensive behaviour for which overall emission reduction targets at the national level and aggregate street space constraints are too abstract for appreciating a sense of personal responsibility and agency. Second, viable alternatives for behaviour change must exist. The urban transport sector is particularly well suited to ensure both, with tangible and easy to communicate carbon and space consumption budgets and often readily available options for changing mobility behaviour. By addressing the personal sphere of action based on a principle of ambitious goal setting in the transport sector, these budgets for the urban transport field may in turn establish the experimental ground for implementing sustainable consumption corridors¹ across sectors and policy domains.

This commentary builds on this rationale for engaging with budgets for transport-related carbon emissions and space consumption. Its focus is on the

fairness dimension of transport sufficiency. It first reviews the shifting focus of transport justice to then establish the boundaries of a justice domain for transport sufficiency. It reviews broader justice models that may have to be utilized for that and touches on some initial aspects and questions for future research. It is based on the working paper “Enabling Sufficiency: Towards an Actionable Concept of Fairness in Mobility and Accessibility” prepared for the European research project “MyFairShare—Individual Mobility Budgets as a Foundation for Social and Ethical Carbon Reduction.” Employing the concept of carbon allowances translated to the transport sector as mobility budgets, the project targets the development of policy tool kits and guidelines to support the introduction of socially acceptable carbon budgets for mobility. The broader context of the MyFairShare project is a shift toward sufficiency as part of sustainable mobility.

The shifting focus of transport justice

Established concerns about fairness in transport

Modernist transport policy and planning, particularly during the post-war period, was predominantly concerned with addressing congestion and lacking capacities in transport systems. It did not explicitly engage with questions of equity and fairness. Instead, its paradigmatic underpinning was to establish the conditions for effective and efficient movement of both people and goods based on existing transport demand (Goodwin et al., 1991). Martens (2016) suggests that traditional transport planning operates with a distributive principle of demand rather than one of equality.

Banister (2018) notes that of a wide range of equity, fairness, and justice concerns and definitions that are part of today’s transport policy debate and practice, there were only two which featured more frequently in the past. The first relates to questions about how to pay for providing transport infrastructure and services and the degree to which different users and non-users would have to contribute. The second refers to a basic needs perspective that for some time has been and continues to be central for the provision of public transport. It is this second perspective which has also informed the Sustainable Development Goals’ Target 11.2 “to, by 2030, provide access to safe, affordable, accessible and sustainable transport systems for all” (United Nations, 2015). Still, most of these issues were not mainstream concerns of transport professionals in the past.

While traditional transport planning may not operate with a clear ethical and distributional principle as a point of departure, it cannot escape an ex-post distributional reality with considerable fairness implications. Martens (2016) identifies two faces of fairness in traditional transport planning: a progressive and a regressive face. The first relates to an egalitarian tendency which treats transport not unlike the universal access ambition prevalent in engineering for the case of water, sanitation, and electricity provision. With resource constraints in the past not as prevalent as today, this ideal could be summarized as “everybody is to receive unhindered travel speed on the transportation network of her choice”

(Martens, 2016, p. 25). The progressive nature of this face of fairness stems from the same transport access being provided independently from an individual's socio-economic characteristics and residential location.

The regressive face in traditional transport planning is revealed when considering accessibility as the ultimate end of mobility. Because of an equality of speed, accessibility can be highly unequal between urban centres and peripheries. Furthermore, the central role of forecasting in transport planning is based on existing, often highly unequal mobility patterns and then reproduces existing differences. This “suggests an implicit assumption that demand constitutes the just principle upon which the distribution of new transport facilities is to be based” (Martens, 2016, p. 29). Finally, the widespread reliance of transport infrastructure decisions based on cost-benefit analysis (CBA) tends to reproduce existing inequalities. CBA operates with a monetization of travel time savings which are typically based on income levels of different existing and potential users of a transport system. As a result, transport investments benefitting higher income groups, certain modes and types of travel will perform better in a CBA. In addition, Martens (2016) argues that strong population groups with greater levels of mobility intensities benefit disproportionately from CBA-based decisions and their focus on aggregate travel time savings.

To summarize the traditional perspective, it is worth noting that the politics of transport over the last century always maintained a framing of “travel as freedom” from which a basic right to travel can be extracted, in turn enabling a freer choice of where to live and self-development (Banister, 2018). Once again, this connects directly with the universal access perspective and its egalitarian lens.

Contemporary framings of transport equity

By contrast, contemporary discourses and policy engagement related to transport equity tend to be most concerned with various forms of discrimination and an unequal distribution of transport resources (Banister, 2018; Martens, 2012; Nordbakke & Schwanen, 2014; Sustainable Development Commission [SDC], 2011; Van Wee & Geurs, 2011). It is informed by a new awareness of mobility needs and constraints of groups that were marginalized in modernist transport planning: women, children and young people, older individuals, people with lower incomes, ethnic minorities, people with disabilities, and other disadvantaged groups. Aligned with a more inclusive transport perspective is the recognition of trip purposes other than commuting and business travel: reaching services and care facilities, educational institutions, retail, and recreational travel.

A major focus of contemporary transport fairness deliberations focus on questions of urban accessibility, above all travel times and costs (Martens, 2016; Nello-Deakin, 2019). For policymaking, these usually translate to concerns about the equity implications of large-scale transport infrastructure investments and land use planning. Hananel and Berechman (2016) highlight three elements as part of a new standard approach to inequality in transport: affordability, accessibility, and personal/group mobility characteristics.

A further contemporary dimension of transport equity engages with the distribution of negative socio-economic and local environmental externalities from transport. For these, common transport burdens include various health impacts; noise and air pollution; congestion; compromised urban amenities, open and green space; community severance as well as safety and security (Banister, 2018). A particularly important perspective on a fair distribution of transport burdens highlights that it is often those groups in society that benefit the least from contemporary transport systems that are at the same time exposed to their greatest negative impacts.

The UK's Sustainable Development Commission's report on Fairness in a Car Dependent Society (2011) refers to the "less-travelled" being the "travelled-upon" (p. 5). This may lead to a form of triple injustice as these groups often have fewer opportunities to complain about their situation and to be heard, in addition to having limited access to mobility resources and suffering from negative externalities. Gössling (2016) concludes that transport injustices are interrelated and compound each other with adversarial consequences for those disadvantaged and bearing the costs of contemporary transport.

New frontiers of mobility justice

Over the last decade and based on these concerns and interests, transport justice has been a rapidly growing field of academic inquiry. Beyond the issues above, there are several new frontiers of mobility justice that a sufficiency turn in urban transport will have to engage with: implications of sustainability justice, a needs-based perspective of mobility and access, the speed and distance bias of transport policy, intrinsic values of mobility, and the justice of public (street) space use.

To date, transport and mobility justice has been mainly concerned with the justice of the "here and now" and to a lesser extent with broader inter- and intra-generational justice of sustainability. While most transport justice scholars acknowledge planetary limits and environmental sustainability, few incorporate these directly as part of their justice analysis. One exception is Banister (2018) who, in his book *Inequality in Transport*, refers to obligations to future generations as part of securing their freedoms.

Directly related is a new requirement to better define the consumption of mobility by distinguishing between necessities and luxuries. Such engagement can build on broader theories of human needs and concepts for consumption corridors, identifying floors and ceilings for consumption patterns (Gough, 2020). For the transport and mobility sector, this shifts the focus from the supply of transport resources to the need for mobility. Banister (2018) notes that, to date, inequality perspectives in transport have been focusing mostly on accessibility and affordability rather than a concept of needs.

More recent justice considerations also challenge another deeply embedded bias of transport policy: First, the prioritization of longer trips—macro-accessibility is frequently considered more important than micro-accessibility. Second, the importance given to higher speeds—the requirements of faster travelling vehicles still dictate urban street design and faster moving vehicles are often given priority at

intersections over non-motorized mobility. Both the environmental sustainability perspective as well as good urbanism inverse that logic.

The increasing recognition of intrinsic values of mobility and transport (Niblett & Beuret, 2021a) rather than a “means-to-an-end” understanding linked to accessibility results in particularly complex implications for mobility justice. Considering the joy of travel, status benefits of vehicle ownership, or intrinsic preferences for certain means of travel are even harder to qualify and require a high granularity of considering individual cases.

A new framing of transport justice also re-emphasizes the local scale and how street space is being distributed (Creutzig et al., 2020). This moves the focus away from the distribution of large-scale transport resources linked to major investments, travel time, and metropolitan access and instead to the local use of a street. Nello-Deakin (2019) argues that this allocation question once belonged almost exclusively to the technocratic domain of transport engineers and modellers supported by transitional cost benefit analyses. Once again, this so far implied a focus on the movement function of faster moving traffic rather than slow mobility and place functions of streets. A further expansion of the use of public space and a fair distribution thereof requires a fuller account of space consumption over time based on “time-space” (Rode & Gipp, 2001).

Finally, it is important to recognize three viewpoints that establish the transport sector as a relevant and separate domain for both climate action and fairness considerations: governance, climate, and justice perspectives. Clearly, transport while highly interdependent, dynamic and complex, is a concrete arena within which policymaking operates and for which specific expertise, clear criteria, and indicators as well as budgets have been established (Randal et al., 2020; Rode et al., 2017; Rode, 2018). As briefly outlined in the introduction, the transport domain also plays a unique role in addressing the climate emergency. From a fairness perspective, Martens (2016) utilizes Walzer’s Spheres of Justice (1983) for a compelling perspective. He settles on accessibility—the capacity to access places—as the ultimate social meaning of the transport good and as an appropriate distributive sphere observing that injustices within the accessibility domain cannot be simply compensated by intervening in other domains.

Utilizing justice models for urban accessibility

For clarifying the normative fairness perspective that underpins transport justice and transport sufficiency, it is helpful to go back to fundamental justice models. Of the broader spectrum of social justice approaches presented, the social-liberal justice ideals of Mill, Rawls, Dworkin, and Sen are most relevant. This section briefly presents the case of Rawls’s egalitarianism and the capabilities approach (Sen and Nussbaum) and how these social justice models relate to the domain of transport. In addition, the overview presents environmental and sustainability justice as an expansion of the justice models of a here and now. This perspective is relevant for incorporating a climate change lens because it establishes the justice baseline for carbon as well as mobility budgeting.

Social justice models

A particularly prominent social justice perspective adopted by transport scholars is Rawls's egalitarianism (Lewis et al., 2021; Martens, 2016). This is hardly surprising as John Rawls's *A Theory of Justice* (1971) is widely considered a cornerstone of contemporary political philosophy. His theory evolves around defining a fair distribution of primary social goods for which two sequential principles are proposed: First, the principle of greatest equal liberty, which holds that basic rights need to apply equally to everyone and should be maximized as long as they do not compromise the freedom of others. Second, social and economic inequalities can only be acceptable if at the same time (a) they are a result of a fair equality of opportunity and (b) they benefit the most disadvantaged members of society which is referred to as the difference principle (Rawls, 1971).

Rawls's original list of five primary social goods has been repeatedly tested regarding the possibility of accommodating transport or accessibility related goods (Martens, 2016). The five initial social goods are (a) basic rights and liberties, (b) freedom of movement and free choice of occupation, (c) powers and prerogatives of office and positions of responsibility, (d) income and wealth, and (e) the social bases of self-respect (Rawls, 1971). One perspective of accommodating transport as part of these social goods is to consider transport as part of freedom of movement and to understand when this freedom violates the freedom of others (Banister, 2018). Alternatively, it has been proposed to treat accessibility as an additional primary good to which the difference principle would have to be applied (Martens, 2016; Pereira et al., 2017; Van Wee & Geurs, 2011). However, Martens (2016) warns that this approach is confronted with the problem of interpersonal comparison and (paternalistic) value judgments as different primary goods would have to be weighed against each other.

In an applied research and policy context, Rawls's egalitarianism is commonly interpreted as a fairness rationale for interventions benefiting the most vulnerable and disadvantaged. In transport policy, most commonly, children, the elderly, and disabled people are singled out. When introducing accessibility as a primary social good, unequal impacts of policy interventions such as transport infrastructure, land use regulation and transport service provision can then only be justified if they improve access for the most disadvantaged. The Rawlsian justice perspective also has highlighted the importance of minimum levels of primary goods to cater for basic needs for which governments would be responsible—above these minimum levels allocation may be the role of regulated markets (Pereira et al., 2017). Based on their assessment of how fairness principles can be accommodated in the transport sector, Lewis et al. (2021) warn that a common, simple adoption of egalitarianism leads to many imprecisions and should be avoided.

Developed by Sen and Nussbaum, the capability approach builds on Rawls's difference principle and argues for a shift in focus from primary goods to human capabilities (Robeyns, 2021). These capabilities are defined as the “activities we are able to undertake (‘doings’) and the kinds of persons we are able to be (‘beings’)” (Robeyns, 2021, s2.1). A shift toward capabilities implies moving away from a focus on “means” such as resources and goods to the “ends” of what people can

do or become. In other words, it is not so much a primary good that matters but a person's capacity to convert resources into a meaningful outcome. This shift acknowledges individual choices and agency as protection against paternalism and cultural imposition, as well as broader abilities that may determine ends. Sen's capabilities also go beyond differentiating just and unjust by adding a comparative perspective between different societal states and their relative level of justice (Robeyns, 2021; Sen, 1999).

A particular advantage of the capabilities approach for the context of the transport and mobility policy is that, unlike broader approaches such as egalitarianism, it can be more easily applied to specific sectors (Lewis et al., 2021). Pereira et al. (2017) argue that accessibility rather than mobility should be positioned as a capability. Furthermore, critical for adopting a capability approach for the transport sector is Sen's prioritization of securing basic capability equality through committing to context and culture specific minimum levels. Based on this, Banister (2018) suggests that minimum levels of access to essential destinations would need to be set but warns that this may be problematic. Pereira et al. (2017) note that the identification of minimum accessibility thresholds remains unresolved. They also identify a second challenge linked to accessibility being a capability combining personal abilities with complex transport system-land use interactions. This would require bringing together a transport studies' understanding and measurement of accessibility linked to location and the capability approach's concern about freedoms of individuals.

Environmental and sustainability justice

Environmental and sustainability justice expands the notion of fairness beyond current members of a society and their main political space. Environmental justice is a well established concept with a strong social movement connotation and a particular concern for environmental harms affecting disadvantaged and marginalized communities (Sze & London, 2008). From a political science view, the justice in environmental justice has been referred to as the

equity in the distribution of environmental risk, recognition of the diversity of the participants and experiences in affected communities, and participation in the political processes which create and manage environmental policy. (Schlosberg, 2004, p. 517)

By contrast, sustainability justice is an evolving justice lens and requires further explanation. First, sustainability is itself already a more integrative concept combining concerns of environmental degradation and the depletion of natural capital with those of human poverty and prosperity. It therefore includes both mutually reinforcing concerns and trade-offs (Waas et al., 2011). Second, sustainability expands the unit of analysis and intervention from the common political space of a society (e.g., nation state) to that of a global society. The resulting intra-generational justice claims can build on international and environmental

justice approaches (Schlosberg, 2004, p. 517; Blake & Smith, 2021). Third, and most importantly, sustainability justice combines claims across three different relations, the relations between contemporary members of global society, with future generations, and with nature (Stumpf et al., 2015). These three sustainability relations also create the most distinct difference with traditional political philosophy, which have been described as the ethics of the “here and now” (Jonas, 1985, p. 5).

Alongside, the principle of sufficiency with a definition of “what is enough” has been associated with sustainability justice (Stumpf et al., 2015). In the context of transport and a fair allocation of finite street space, Creutzig et al. (2020) refer to global environmental efficacy, which considers the two global problems of climate and land use change. Low GHG emissions and efficient space use (avoiding urban sprawl) become the specific ethical interpretation of sustainability in the transport and land use space. Here, the link to wider public goods (via environmental and natural capital) from the local to planetary scale is introduced. But sustainability also dictates that environmental damage needs to be balanced against other social allocation approaches and ethical concerns—some of these have recently been considered under the broader well-being framework.

Fairness and sufficiency in urban transport as a research agenda

This final section introduces important points for future research that could inform policy-relevant insights and perspectives for a better understanding of the potential role of fairness and sufficiency in urban transport. When considering sufficiency as a point of departure for transport policy, a coherent domain-level application of a justice lens is fundamental. Unsurprisingly, most work of integrating ethical perspectives in the transport context is not operating with environmental or sustainability justice. In a study of more than a dozen publications on transport justice, only one incorporated some environmental aspects (Lewis et al., 2021). A tangible implication for any justice claims following the sustainability perspective is the recognition of finitude and relatively clearly defined limits of the natural world (Hayward, 2001). In other words, environmental justice essentially establishes sufficiency upfront and fairness of subsequently distributing transport resources can focus on the justice of the here and now.

It is likely that research on transport sufficiency will connect fairness in mobility with opportunities and externalities of mobility-induced accessibility. In other words, the main accessibility inputs under consideration are transport resources rather than land use changes. Negative externalities that occur in other justice domains, particularly related to the environment and planetary health may not directly be considered as part of fair burden sharing (i.e., a fair distribution of climate change risks) but instead are translated to the limited availability of transport resources expressed by mobility-related carbon and space use budgets.

Building on the broader ethical principles above, future research will have to clarify the more specific and applied components of fairness that will underpin

the respective contribution. Differentiating the following three aspects of fairness may be helpful:

- *Procedural fairness* involves the “proper adherence to the rules” of a decision-making situation (e.g., legitimacy and representation).
- *Absolute fairness* is established independently from a comparative perspective and can be judged at the level of individual experiences (e.g., minimum standards or basic needs).
- *Distributional fairness* embraces a comparative lens and can range from full equality “everyone the same” to proportional fairness considering efforts or “price being paid.”

While research on procedural fairness is more or less domain agnostic, work on absolute or distributive fairness in the accessibility domain can be structured by [Martens et al.'s \(2019\)](#) approach. Their framework operates with three key components: (a) the definition of benefits and burdens, (b) the social characteristics to be differentiated, and (c) the allocation principle. Below follows the identification of future research opportunities for each of these components applied to the specific case of a sufficiency approach in transport.

Mobility benefits and burdens

- What are the key metrics and indicators that need to be considered when positioning mobility benefits as accessibility benefits (i.e., the opportunity to reach destinations in space)?
- How should a sufficiency approach to mobility benefits incorporate non-passenger travel? To what degree should other accessibility characteristics (e.g., digital connectivity, land use, be considered)?
- Which mobility benefits other than accessibility related ones need to be considered? How can the value of intrinsically motivated travel, for example, for pleasure and status ([Niblett & Beuret, 2021b](#)) be measured?
- To what extent should and could mobility budgeting include mobility burdens other than those that directly help to define the ceiling (e.g., carbon emissions or space consumption)?
- Does the mobility burden of space consumption in cities (taking space away from others) require a different consideration compared to other negative externalities as it is directly connected to the mobility benefit of having a certain amount of private space for travel?

Social characteristics

- What level of disaggregation of population groups should be considered for mobility budgeting?
- Which specific population groups should be differentiated as part of the allocation of mobility budgets?

- Should (residential) location and therefore the level of access provided by public and non-motorized transport be considered a core characteristic of population groups?
- Besides disadvantage (age, income, wealth, gender, impairment, ethnicity, etc.), should there be other criteria for differentiating population groups?
- Which proxies for these social groups are readily available for transport policy practice (e.g., vehicle size or value, number of cars per household)?
- How can data requirements and availability for relevant social characteristics be reconciled?

Allocation principle

- Which allocation principle derived from the range of different justice models introduced earlier should be utilized for transport sufficiency?
- How does transport sufficiency relate to relevant end-state-oriented allocation (e.g., proportional equality, maximum gap standard, minimum standard, principle of need) or an intervention-oriented allocation (e.g., equalization or market-based allocation based on tradable certificates)?
- How could different allocation principles be combined as part of first-, second-, and third- order allocation approaches of mobility related carbon and space use budgets?
- What would be a consistent approach to ordering allocation principles (e.g., 1 [*minimum standards*], 2 [*principle of need*], 3 [*proportional equality*])?
- How can minimum standards for mobility resources and accessibility levels be identified? Which group-specific characteristics would have to be considered based on a principle of needs?

To explore some of the questions raised earlier, five urban-level living labs of the MyFairShare project in Vienna (Austria), Berlin (Germany), London (United Kingdom), Sarpsborg (Norway), and Jelgava (Latvia) and one country-level lab (Austria/Latvia) are planned for 2023 and 2024. These will also test the general approach for establishing mobility budgets as outlined in [Figure 1](#).

Conclusion

This commentary introduces the point of departure, conceptual aspects, and concrete questions for operationalizing a fairness perspective in the context of a sufficiency turn in urban transport. The most fundamental equity considerations concern the choice of procedural fairness (how the decision on choosing any distribution of transport resources is made) or directly considering outcome fairness. For the first case, the focus is establishing a decision-making process that reflects a legitimate and democratic approach to reaching any conclusions about how a more open and direct engagement with sufficiency could be approached. In the second case, researchers, and at some point, policymakers need to consider the questions above as part of an iterative process building on existing theoretical and policy frameworks, past research findings, and the expertise of relevant knowledge partners.

MyFairShare—Operationalization Establishing Mobility Budgets




Figure 1: A general framework for establishing fair mobility budgets. Source: Author.

Given the divisive nature and polarizing effect of sufficiency measures in the urban transport and mobility domain, critical questions about political narratives and communication need to be addressed alongside the above. The required stories will have to be able to much better connect with the norms and values that underpin people’s reactions. Besides identifying language that connects proposed interventions with such values, this is also about the units that may underpin sufficiency measures, which should focus on indisputable “bads” and the recognition of access to opportunities as the public good that is being protected at the local level.

Note

1. These corridors are defined by floors (e.g., minimum standards or basic needs) and ceilings (e.g., resource or emission limits) of consumption patterns.

Author information

Philipp Rode, PhD, is Executive Director of LSE Cities and Associate Professorial Lecturer at the School of Public Policy. He is Co-Director of the LSE Executive MSc in Cities and Visiting Professor at University of St Gallen's Institute for Mobility. Dr Rode has been leading interdisciplinary programmes in urban development and transport, sustainable urbanism and climate change, and city policy and governance at the LSE since 2003. Across his work, he is interested in multi dimensional aspects of global urbanization sustainability and urban change.

Acknowledgements

This commentary was prepared as part of the project “MyFairShare—Individual Mobility Budgets as a Foundation for Social and Ethical Carbon Reduction” supported by the Joint Program Initiative (JPI) Urban Europe, European Research Area Network Cofund Urban Accessibility and Connectivity (ENUAC). For the LSE as UK partner, MyFairShare is funded by the Economic and Social Research Council (ESRC). The author would like to thank all project consortium partners. Special thanks to the MyFairShare London advisors Mike Savage, Francisco H. G. Ferreira, and Ben Plowden as well as Karen Lucas, David Banister, and Paul Dolan for their general guidance.

References

- Banister, D. (2018). *Inequality in transport*. Alexandrine Press.
- Blake, M., & Smith, P. T. (2021). International distributive justice. In *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved February 1, 2023, from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2021/entries/international-justice/>
- Buysse, C., & Miller, J. (2021, April 9). *Transport could burn up the EU's entire carbon budget*. The International Council on Clean Transportation. <https://theicct.org/transport-could-burn-up-the-eus-entire-carbon-budget/>.
- Creutzig, F., Javaid, A., Soomaroo, Z., et al. (2020). Fair street space allocation: ethical principles and empirical insights. *Transport Reviews*, 40(6), 711–733. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2020.1762795>
- Goodwin, P., Hallett, S., Kenny, F., & Stokes, G. (1991). *Transport, the new realism*. Transport Studies Unit, Oxford University. <https://www.tsu.ox.ac.uk/pubs/1062-goodwin-hallett-kenny-stokes.pdf>
- Gössling, S. (2016). Urban transport justice. *Journal of transport Geography*, 54, 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtrangeo.2016.05.002>
- Gössling, S., Kees, J., & Litman, T. (2022). The lifetime cost of driving a car. *Ecological Economics*, 194, 107335. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2021.107335>

Gough, I. (2020). Defining floors and ceilings: the contribution of human needs theory. *Sustainability: Science, Practice and Policy*, 16(1), 208–219. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15487733.2020.1814033>

Hananel, R. & Berechman, J. (2016). Justice and transportation decision-making: The capabilities approach. *Transport Policy*, 49, 78–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tranpol.2016.04.005>

Hayward, T. (2001). Political theory and ecological values. *Environmental Values*, 10(1), 135–136.

International Energy Agency. (2021). *Global energy review: CO₂ emissions in 2020*. <https://iea.blob.core.windows.net/assets/c3086240-732b-4f6a-89d7-db01be018f5e/GlobalEnergyReviewCO2Emissionsin2021.pdf>

Jonas, H. (1985). *The imperative of responsibility: In search of an ethics for the technological age*. University of Chicago Press.

Jungell-Michelsson, J., & Heikkurinen, P. (2022). Sufficiency: A systematic literature review. *Ecological Economics*, 195, 107380. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2022.107380>

Lenton, T. M., Rockström, J., Gaffney, O., et al. (2019). *Climate tipping points—too risky to bet against*. Nature Publishing Group.

Martens, K. (2012). Justice in transport as justice in accessibility: Applying Walzer's "Spheres of Justice" to the transport sector. *Transportation*, 39(6), 1035–1053. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11116-012-9388-7>

Martens, K. (2016). *Transport justice: Designing fair transportation systems*. Routledge.

Martens, K., Bastiaanssen, J., & Lucas, K. (2019). *Measuring transport equity: Key components, framings and metrics*. Elsevier.

Millonig, A., Rudloff, C., Richter, G., et al. (2022). Fair mobility budgets: A concept for achieving climate neutrality and transport equity. *Transportation Research Part D: Transport and Environment*, 103, 103165. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trd.2021.103165>

Nello-Deakin, S. (2019). Is there such a thing as a "fair" distribution of road space? *Journal of Urban Design*, 24(5), 698–714. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13574809.2019.1592664>

Niblett, M., & Beuret, K. (2021a). Why travel? An introduction. In M. Niblett & K. Beuret (Eds.), *Why travel?: Understanding our need to move and how it shapes our lives* (pp. 1–12). Bristol University Press.

Niblett, M., & Beuret, K. (2021b). *Why travel?: Understanding our need to move and how it shapes our lives*. Policy Press.

Nordbakke, S., & Schwanen, T. (2014). Well-being and mobility: A theoretical framework and literature review focusing on older people. *Mobilities*, 9(1), 104–129. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17450101.2013.784542>

O'Callaghan Lewis, E., MacKenzie, D., & Kaminsky, J. (2021). Exploring equity: How equity norms have been applied implicitly and explicitly in transportation research and practice.

Transportation Research Interdisciplinary Perspectives, 9, 100332. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trip.2021.100332>

Pereira, R. H., Schwanen, T., & Banister, D. (2017). Distributive justice and equity in transportation. *Transport reviews*, 37(2), 170–191. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01441647.2016.1257660>

Popovich, N., & Lu, D. (2019, 10 October). The most detailed map of auto emissions in America. *The New York Times*. <https://www.nytimes.com/interactive/2019/10/10/climate/driving-emissions-map.html>

Randal, E., Shaw, C., Woodward, A., et al. (2020). Fairness in transport policy: A new approach to applying distributive justice theories. *Sustainability*, 12(23), 10102. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su122310102>

Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Reuters. (2022, December 13). *Fact Check—Oxfordshire County Council to trial congestion-reducing traffic filters, not a “climate lockdown” that stops residents leaving neighbourhoods*. Reuters Fact Check. Retrieved from <https://www.reuters.com/article/factcheck-oxford-climate-idUSL1N3331OK>

Robeyns, I., & Fibieger Byskov, M. (2021). The capability approach. *The Stanford encyclopedia of philosophy*. Retrieved 1 Feb. 2023 from <https://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2021/entries/capability-approach/>.

Rode, P. (2018). *Governing compact cities: How to connect planning, design and transport*. Edward Elgar.

Rode, P., Floater, G., Thomopoulos, N., et al. (2017). Accessibility in cities: Transport and urban form. In G. Meyer & S. Shaheen (Eds.), *Disrupting mobility: Impacts of sharing economy and innovative transportation on cities* (pp. 239–273). Springer International Publishing.

Rode, P., & Gipp, C. (2001). *Dynamische Raeume: Die Nutzungsflexibilisierung urbaner Mobilitaetsraeume am Beispiel der Berliner Innenstadt*. Technical University Berlin.

Schlosberg, D. (2004). Reconceiving environmental justice: Global movements and political theories. *Environmental Politics*, 13(3), 517–540. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0964401042000229025>

Sustainable Development Commission. (2011). *Fairness in a car-dependent society*. https://www.sd-commission.org.uk/data/files/publications/fairness_car_dependant.pdf

Sen, A. (1999). Development as freedom (1999). In J. Timmons Roberts, A. Bellon Hite, & N. Chorev (Eds.), *The globalization and development reader: Perspectives on development and global change* (pp. 525–548). Wiley Blackwell.

Shams, D. (2022). Transport Justice: A systematic bibliometric analysis

Sims R., Schaeffer, R., Creutzig, F., et al. (2014). Transport. In O. Edenhofer, R. Pichs-Madruga, Y. Sokona, et al. (Eds.), *Climate Change 2014: Mitigation of climate change*.

Contribution of Working Group III to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (pp. 599–670). Cambridge University Press.

Stumpf, K. H., Baumgärtner, S., Becker, C. U., & Sievers-Glotzbach, S. (2015). The justice dimension of sustainability: A systematic and general conceptual framework. *Sustainability* 7(6), 7438–7472. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su7067438>

Sze, J., & London, J. K. (2008). Environmental Justice at the Crossroads. *Sociology Compass* 2(4), 1331–1354. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1751-9020.2008.00131.x>

Transformative Urban Mobility Initiative. (2019). Sustainable urban transport: Avoid-shift-improve (A-S-I). https://www.transformative-mobility.org/assets/publications/ASI_TUMI_SUTP_iNUA_No-9_April-2019.pdf

United Nations. (2015). *Sustainable development goals*. <https://sdgs.un.org/goals>

Van Wee, B., & Geurs, K. (2011). Discussing equity and social exclusion in accessibility evaluations. *European journal of transport and infrastructure research*, 11(4).

Vasconcellos, E. (2004). The use of streets: a reassessment and tribute to Donald Appleyard. *Journal of Urban Design*, 9(1), 3–22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1357480042000187686>

Waas, T., Hugé, J., Verbruggen, A., & Wright, T. (2011). Sustainable development: A bird's eye view. *Sustainability*, 3(10), 1637–1661. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su3101637>

Walzer, M. (1983). *Spheres of justice: A defense of pluralism and equality*. Basic Books.

Waygood, E. O., Sun, Y., & Schmöcker, J.-D. (2019). Transport sufficiency: Introduction & case study. *Travel Behaviour and Society*, 15, 54–62. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tbs.2018.12.002>

Zell-Ziegler, C., Best, B., Thema, J., & Wiese, F. (2021). Sufficiency in transport policy—An analysis of EU countries' national energy and climate plans and long-term strategies. Retrieved February 1, 2023, from https://www.oeko.de/fileadmin/oekodoc/6-109-21_eceee_Zell-Ziegler.pdf