BOOK REVIEW

Davide Arcidiacono and Mike Duggan (2019), Sharing Mobilities. Questioning Our Right to the City in the Collaborative Economy

Monica Bernardi
Milano-Bicocca University

In this book, Davide Arcidiacono and Mike Duggan attempt to examine contemporary urban sharing mobility, retracing its social and economic evolution and substantiating it with a rich case history. The authors are both experts on digital transformation: Arcidiacono has a background in economic sociology and works on sharing and platform economy; Duggan has a cultural geography education and analyses the intersections between everyday life and digital technology.

The book opens with a foreword by Juliet Schor, an expert in the sharing economy field, active in the study and analysis of the phenomenon since the beginning. From the foreword the reader perceives the scope of the book and the effort of the authors to place the phenomenon into the broader picture, with the aim of reflecting on the importance of mobility in our current society and on the great potential that the sharing mobility could have if properly governed. To develop their reasoning, the authors move step by step through a rich discussion that progresses in six chapters, starting with the general framework of the sharing economy, and reaching the notion of mobility justice and the relational dimension of the sharing mobility. As reviewer I will follow the authors' steps to rebuild and account for their argument.

A premise. As stressed by the authors themselves, a sociological approach in the study of the sharing mobility is now necessary more than ever. For a long time now, scientific analysis of the sharing mobility has focused mainly on two dimensions: 1. emerging technologies and service design (see for example Agatz et al., 2012; Furuhata et al., 2013), 2. traffic and environmental impacts (Chan and Shaheen, 2012; Ferguson, 1997; Global e-Sustainability Initiatives, 2008). The socio-economic impacts of the sharing mobility have been less investigated, and the focus has been mainly on the well-known Silicon Valley companies, forgetting the existing broader spectrum of sharing mobilities. In this book, on the contrary, there is a precise attempt to examine, interpret and evaluate the sharing mobility as a socio-economic and socio-technical phenomenon, looking at its plurality. This is particularly important when it is recognized, as the authors do, that mobility is

a central component of well-being (Boltanski and Chiappello, 1999), like food, education and housing. It represents a crucial policy area in urban planning (Fainstein, 2001), especially if we consider cities' struggles to solve problems related to extensive urban sprawl, growing motorization and traffic congestion, high pollution, inadequate public transport system, lack of proper infrastructures for pedestrians and cyclists and also transport-related social inequalities (Pojani and Stead, 2017). Sharing mobility services in particular are changing employment practices, and reproducing some issues of social exclusion (Schor and Fitzmaurice, 2015): they are not accessible, affordable, or inclusive for all citizens as the main narratives tell us. For this reason, the authors, expanding on the concepts of Lefebvre (1968), question how contemporary sharing mobilities are affecting people's 'right to the city'.

The first section, Welcome to the age of sharing, spotlights this dimension of unexpected limited access, limited inclusion and limited affordability related to the sharing economy. A decade ago, when the phenomenon appeared, it was accompanied by a highly enthusiastic narrative that described it as a model able to increase efficiency, access and income, to reduce environmental footprints, to bring strangers together and above all to foster social cohesion and social inclusion. Today, criticisms of the sharing economy have emerged reversing this perception: in fact the 'platform model' has created a new form of highly profit oriented capitalism (Srnicek, 2016) based on the so-called unicorns[1], while the socially minded entities committed to public welfare have failed to scale up, gaining little ground. This gap between expectations and reality is also evident in the transport system: commercial ride-hailing dominates the sector, undermining vital public transport systems and generating a series of negative outcomes, while ridesharing is just a small segment of the sector.

In section two, Success and failure of shared urban mobility, the authors re-affirm the importance of considering the socio-economic dimension of mobility, tracing its evolution from mass motorization to the current age of the so-called "post-automobility" or "de-motorisation" (Cohen, 2012). A fundamental starting point in the book is that the transport/mobility sector is undergoing a profound transformation. Private mobility indeed has become a global emergency – as testified by several reports and much research reported by the authors (from IEA (2009, 2012), OECD (2009), World Bank (2009) and so on), – and highlighted by the rise of movements such as Friday for Future; while the public transport in many cities around the world is still inadequate, unsafe, inefficient and unaffordable. The mobility sector today is less oriented towards production and more oriented towards the provision of integrated mobility services. This transformation inevitably affects our productive, social and economic systems, but I agree with the authors that the transformation should take place within a bigger paradigm shift of our general conception of mobility, to overcome the classic public-private dichotomy and adopt a more sustainable approach.

The analysis proposed by the authors is particularly extensive: they trace the historical evolution of carsharing, carpooling and bike-sharing underlining how powerful the advent of ICTs and technologies has been in consolidating these practices, and how they will impact their future evolution. For its flexible, scalable and sustainable nature sharing mobility is perceived as an innovative solution able to reply to the urban challenges, as well as a future business to invest in. It is no coincidence, for example, that Uber has long been one of startups most highly funded by venture capital, and that in the top ten of the so-called decacorn[2], the most highly funded companies for business development all operate within the field of mobility or shared

---

[1] A unicorn is a startup with a valuation of at least $1 billion.
[2] A decacorn is a startup company which has a current valuation of over $10 billion.

mobility. The book reports data about the growth of the sector, in terms of users, operators, revenue and main countries, confirming the greater expansion of these services in Asia and USA.

Beside the historical evolution, the authors propose a very detailed taxonomy to differentiate the various services of sharing mobility. They distinguish between operators that provide vehicle sharing and solutions that offer ride sharing; they also suggest a distinction between the vertical services delivery system (vehicles are provided by a company that set the price) and collaborative delivery systems (based on peer-to-peer transactions). Vehicle sharing can be station-based or free-floating, and varies according to the type of use (roundtrip vehicles sharing; one-way sharing and fractional ownership). In the vertical system the hallmark is that no user is the exclusive owner of the vehicle and only the owning company obtains real economic benefits from the transaction; this is the "negative reciprocity" mentioned by Bardhi and Eckardt (2012) and recalled by the authors. By contrast there is a "positive reciprocity" in peer-to-peer car sharing, which appeared in the early 2000s, and is based on the establishment of a relationship between driver and passenger (that starts online), on the collaboration between the two to share costs and means of transport, and on advantages for both (time and cost reduction) with a reduction of traffic congestion and pollution. Ridesharing has a longer history in the USA with the pre-arranged carpooling of the 1970s; with the advent of the Internet and GPS systems it has evolved into dynamic or flexible carpooling (such as the well-known BlaBlaCar). This type of system guarantees instantaneous and automated matching, and makes users even more independent and autonomous, providing a real disintermediation (see Agatz et al., 2012; Amey et al., 2011). Nevertheless, the evolution of this system has brought to the exponential growth of big companies such as Uber and Lyft, and has also inspired a process of innovation in traditional taxi services (through e-hailing apps) and in collective transport, as well as the hybridization between the collaborative and market services of the new Courier Network Services.

The plurality of sharing mobility practices (what authors call Fifteen shades of sharing), reflects the same plurality we can find in the general mobility sector. As Urry (2004) claimed, the "system of mobility" is becoming a system of mobilities: multiple practices, forms and models of mobility "in which sharing becomes a major dimension of connecting people, places, organizations and events" (Kesselring et al. 2020, p. 1).

But what economic and environmental sustainability does this process of transformation have? The authors warn of the risk that economic sustainability could overcome environmental and social sustainability. In their investigation they look analytically at the main issues that carsharing, ridesharing and bike-sharing have to face, highlighting uncertainties for the future development of sharing mobility. Even if some companies are trying to collaborate, combining their services and optimising their efforts to survive, carsharing still attracts a niche of consumers; ridesharing has the higher market performance in terms of users and attracting high investment but is not always successful; and bike-sharing has also run into problems despite its growth.

In terms of environmental sustainability, drawing from the main literature, the authors show that the motivation for the adoption of sharing mobility services is rarely linked to environment; more frequently it is related to flexibility, convenience or economic advantage (Arcidiacono and Pais, 2018; Wilhelms et al., 2016). About the effect of ridesharing there is no agreement: some research demonstrates vehicle traffic reduction (amongst others: Price et al., 2006; Martin and Shaheen, 2016) and private car owning reduction (Stocker et al., 2016), while others suggest an increase in cars (especially in the Asian market where people want to become drivers for capital gain), or an increase in congestion or pollution (MAPC, 2018; Clewlow and Mishra, 2017). Carpooling seems to lead to an increase in the number of car occupants, but also to an increase of inter-modality since the main passenger pickup points are usually located at public transport spots.

The social dimension of the sharing mobility is examined more deeply in the third section, offering the real turning point in the book. The authors in fact discuss sharing mobility posing it in the context of mobility justice, recalling scholars who have widely demonstrated how our experience of mobility is influenced by socio-demographic factors as well as by capital, services and knowledge (amongst others: Sheller, 2018; Daconto, 2017; Sheller and Urry, 2006). Thus, the authors try to understand if the sharing mobility, in its plurality, is reinforcing or not the existing inequalities that affect the so-called mobile poor (Sheller, 2018) and if it is a real solution, socially and environmentally, to urban mobility. Building on the "right to the city" concept they therefore question the right(s) to sharing mobility in the city. The academic debate has failed to connect the Lefebvre's concept to urban mobilities (Verlinghieria and Venturini, 2018); the authors instead investigate "who has the right to the sharing mobility in the city and where those rights can and cannot be exercised through different forms of shared mobility" (p.43).

The questions arise because of what Belk (2014) has called "pseudo-sharing mobility"; a form of mobility which, whilst leveraging a narrative based on community and sharing, in reality mainly aims at profit, thus reproducing old socio-economic exclusion schemes instead of promoting mobility justice. The authors go through sharing mobility services analysing the main active companies, and referring to reports and literature. They highlight the fact that, despite these services promising sustainable, socially responsible and technological solutions to tackle congestion, pollution and solo-drivers, in the end they largely embody for-profit models mainly available for those that already have access to them, can afford them and know how to use them. They mostly attract high spending consumers with intensive mobility needs (included the so-called kinetic elite); and are marked by a high urban-centricity, leading to the reproduction of forms of mobility injustice, social exclusion and participation divide. In terms of users' motivations, as happens in the sharing economy in general, the economic lever is always stronger than environmental sustainability. While additional issues related to safety and insurance are not always considered.

In order to achieve the right to the city in the ongoing path (Harvey, 2013) of urban mobilities, it is thus necessary to free up space for more communitarian solutions. The technological dimension, in the authors' opinion, remains crucial, but needs to be rethought, focussing on users, reducing the current frictions and halting its tendency to reinforce market individualism. They quote examples of entities using a completely new approach that moves in the direction of commoning mobility (SafeMoto in Kigali, COOP in Seoul, RideAustin in Austin), even if scaling up is difficult. We come back to the need for placing mobility changes within a bigger paradigm shift with a cultural imprint, necessarily involving government and citizens. The authors, while considering the obvious difficulties of this transformation, seem optimistic, signalling campaigns (#DeleteUber) and exemplary co-operative carsharing experiments. Quoting the book "the right to sharing mobility must be socially, materially, and environmentally conscious, which means taking into account the relations between these factors" (p. 51), and the localised spatial nature of mobility practices.

Section four addresses the regulation landscape, highlighting a high level of fragmentation and giving a worldwide panoramic view. General debate charges the regulatory interventions of impeding innovation in the sector; the authors disagree, arguing that the only innovation to be prevented by regulation is that defined by capitalism. The added value of the book is the proposal of an alternative regulatory approach that considers the relational impacts of shared mobility, built on six issues/threads supported by a rich case history.

First, they consider the fragmentation of the sharing mobility and how it is defined; the term "shared mobility" describes a wide spectrum of diverse mobility services, echoing the vagueness that cloaks the sharing economy (Frenken and Schor, 2017). But, how to regulate something that has no unique or fixed definition? The problem is mainly related to the scale: identical regulation for big platforms and small entities makes it

impossible to consider their differences; while the adoption of different regulations means contributing to a fragmented regulatory landscape; at the same time, not considering scale, business model and motivation can lead to the application of the same regulation for both non-profit and for-profit entities.

The second thread is related to the city authorities' difficulties in regulating at a local level, services provided by platforms with a global dimension and networked users. A universal regulation is totally impossible due to the geographical, geopolitical and historical differences amongst countries; in addition, there are other several complexities (market disruption, labour rights, data, algorithms…) illustrated by the authors through specific examples of practices. For the ridesharing they quote the "creative destruction" process typical of the Silicon Valley tech companies, the increasingly common lobbying practices, and even the tensions that can eventually emerge amongst regulatory bodies. Carpooling has less regulatory issues since it works in a different way and it is not perceived as intrusive by the taxi market; while for bike-sharing and scooter-sharing the problems that regulators should mitigate are different (littering, obstruction, maintenance and damage).

A third thread is related to labour rights in light of the changes in labour created by the new mobility practices (Schor and Attwood-Charles, 2017; Sundararajan, 2016); especially for services that have created the equivalent of full-time employment, but without protections and guarantees, generating hot disputes in terms of employment status, pay, driver/rider rating and "surge-pricing". Uber is the best example, presented through the literature and analysed through an ethnographic research carried out in London by the authors. Uber indeed purports to provide extra income opportunities and flexibility, whilst creating algorithmically manipulated conditions for the drivers work (Calo and Rosenblat, 2017); it considers drivers as self-employees and doesn't provide conventional full-time employment contracts (Chan, 2019); nobody knows how rating are calculated (Rosenblat et al., 2016) opening issues in terms of gender, race (Ibid.) and labour surveillance and pushing drivers to find tips to game the app (to maintain a high rate). The opacity of the algorithm is demonstrated also by the dynamic pricing (surge-pricing[3]): cost of trips, duration, price oscillation are managed by algorithm and A.I. unveiling the most extracting form of shared mobility that looks for real-time surplus value in the form of revenues and data; the justice dimension is completely absent, while the pricing strategies disproportionally create market disruption.

Data regulation is the fourth element for reflection: plenty of data is accumulated through users of sharing mobility and the access to this data is essential for city planning and for shaping the future of mobility practices; nevertheless, platforms rarely share this data, so little that regulators recently started to ask for access as a condition of companies operating within their jurisdiction. At the same time some shared mobility services are starting to promote data sharing to encourage "public-private partnerships" with city authorities (Susha et al., 2017). A good sign? Certainly, it is a shift towards a more collaborative model but, as the authors claim, it could hide a tactic to keep these services in the city against a minor change; especially when the data shared is too broad to bring really meaningful insights. Other good signals testify to an open conversation about data: the EU GDPR - General Data Protection Regulation, a first important step towards the common good; the public MaaS[4] initiatives and the commoning open-data (Bingham-Hall, 2016), a useful testbed in the direction

---

[3] "*Surge pricing is when the cost of ridesharing for passengers rises for a period of time when the demand for riders exceeds available drivers in a geographically defined area*". This system is used "*to produce temporary markets for maximum value extraction*" (p. 65).

[4] Mobility as a Service initiatives

of mobility justice. But authors suggest that the regulators keep a close eye on the technological processes subtended to these services, as well as the sociological impacts of these systems.

Self-regulation is promoted by platforms as the better way to offer safe/sustainable transport solutions maintaining innovation and economic growth (Witt et al., 2015). What the platforms don't say is that all the burden and responsibility of measures for self-regulation are borne by drivers. Alternative solutions can be models of transparent and shared-regulation (Balaram, 2016), anticipatory regulation (Armstrong et al., 2019), and data-led regulation (Johal and Zon, 2015; Steenhoven et al., 2016). These solutions promise to include diverse stakeholders, to adopt iterative measures and recursive approaches (Armstrong et al., 2019) and to use data in decision making (Kitchin et al., 2017). Despite the strength of their argument, the authors push for a different approach stressing the importance of realising the potential of the sharing mobility with the direct goal of developing mobility justice. This means moving from a regulatory model that addresses transportation and economic concerns to one that primarily addresses the social and environmental dimensions of the sharing mobility.

Therefore, they propose an innovative approach, based on the networks of relations of shared mobility, and built on the notion of (im)mobility as a relational issue as proposed by Sheller (2018) and Nikolaeva et al (2019). The relational regulation suggested by the authors should be created by mapping all the actors involved in the sector and all the needs at stake, looking at their reciprocal relations. If a regulation ensures a fair wage to drivers, letting the platform pay for these costs and re-using the fees for sustainable transport schemes, then it has a mobility justice approach. Labour rights, traffic congestion, vehicles pollution, as well as digital processes (data, algorithms) should enter in the regulation considering their relational effects. Authors call for collaboration between independent regulatory bodies and social scientists involved in the study of the impacts of these systems; as well as for collaboration with digital platforms in order to develop an auditing culture. Far from being naïve, they are aware of potential limitations of the relational approach and of its poor appeal: it requires a radical shift in regulatory practices and policy, as well as a cultural shift of our understanding of sharing mobility impacts. In the authors' opinion, platforms, policymakers and users should be educated about how the sector impacts on wider networks of relations, adopting more stringent practices of social responsibility. The risk of green-washing can be avoided by adopting specific certification schemes. An example is the Fairwork Foundation's proposal of a certification based on the match with requirements such as fair pay, fair working conditions, fair contracts, fair management and fair representation, thus really applying a relational approach to certification. Certainly, we are still at an early stage and a period of experimentation will be required to evaluate the effectiveness of these solutions, since regulation is and will remain a complex issue. The authors' proposal has the added value of reversing the mainstream analysis of the sharing mobility, bringing an alternative regulative approach that considers interests and relations of all the stakeholders (companies, citizens, workers, municipalities), as well as the open technology as a data provider.

Before concluding, the authors reflect on the dimension of sociability of the sharing mobility: how to empower relations, collaboration and community in this field? Starting from the idea that mobility is a relational phenomenon (Rubin, 2015; Urry, 2000), they further develop the typology that Pais and Provasi (2015) elaborated from the Polany taxonomy (market, redistribution and reciprocity to which the two scholars added collaboration and common pooling). Considering the research presented (on Car2go, BlaBlaCar and Uber) (among the others: Rosenblat et al., 2016; Farajallah et al., 2016; Setiffi and Lazzer, 2018), it seems that peer-to-peer sharing mobility intrinsically possesses the same social value of collaboration and common pooling (even when the exchange is mediated by money), while vehicle sharing services are more market oriented. For instance, market-based car/bike-sharing have an individual fruition, based on impersonal relations; the level of collaboration/common pooling between users is low and sociality is limited to the

necessary market interactions necessary to use the service or complain. Carpooling, on the contrary, has always relied on trust as a way to mitigate potential risks, and reveals a higher propensity to develop social relations; nevertheless, sociality and inclination to use carpooling are influenced by the "carpooler status" (related to one's experience as a driver), profile and network homophily. Ridesharing has a less central social dimension and the mechanism of interaction, utilitarianism and sociality takes a more hybrid form closer to the idea of collaboration. Users are motivated by the convenience of the service, and drivers by the economic aspects, rather than sociality. But for the authors there is still a strong social component typical of jobs that in some way entail a relation with clients.

The authors pay particular attention to trust and community in relation to digital reputation systems. In the sharing economy, trust is the transactions' enabler among strangers and it is valued through the reputational capital of the platforms (Srnicek, 2016). Put simply: without trust the service can't grow and the platform dies, hence creating a solid and growing trusting user base is crucial for every platform. There are some strategies that companies can use to build community trust[5], as well as specific digital reputational tools that act as socio-technical intermediaries between users and platforms. Unfortunately, these systems are based on algorithms that, as already seen, are often opaque (Pasquale, 2015), and hence cannot be considered neutral nor transparent. These systems, by rewarding users considered more reliable with higher reputational ratings, create privileged status for some workers by making them easier to contact, and an unfavourable position for others. In addition, the algorithm opacity reinforces the sense of individualism (Hearn, 2016).

Considering community, as anticipated, is a notion that mainly relates to peer-to-peer carsharing and carpooling systems; but the authors want to understand the type of community they generate. They identify six characteristics: on-life community (relations between ride-sharers, extended outside the platform); openness (open coopetition and integration between different groups and communities); algorithmic rules (that govern behaviours and practices); pragmatic (community exists in order to respond to mutual and specific mobility needs); alone/together (relations are occasional and dispersed so the community is more fluid); on sale (community commodification). In addition, from the authors' analysis emerges the fact that sharing mobility communities are socially homogeneous, mainly composed of young, well-educated and affluent people that share interests and common motivations and interact both online and offline (hybrid communities). They can also be considered both brand communities and communities of practices, as is the case with BlaBlaCar, which embodies what Ardvisson (2018) called "coming community" with an unrealised potential. More often mobility platforms tend to co-opt and commodify the community.

In this regard, a movement to offer alternatives to this scenario is that of platform cooperativism (Scholz and Schneider, 2017). The basic idea is to build cooperative platforms owned by the users/workers, based on open source technologies, on the redistribution of value and profit and on fair working conditions. The authors present the more interesting cases on the move highlighting that all these initiatives are marked by localism but also by the desire to scale up in a fairer way. In this case the communities generated are more than "imagined or potential communities"; they are living communities sharing values and strategies for urban well-being through their everyday practices of sharing mobility. It seems that this model is attracting the attention of even the big players such as Uber and Airbnb, confirming their tendency to cannibalise any antagonistic

---

[5] BlaBlaCar is a good example of building trust among users thanks to the verification system called D.R.E.A.M.S., a framework and toolset based on six principles: Declared (create a user profile to use the service); Rated (each users is rated by feedbacks); Engaged (online prepayment); Active (information on the user's activity level are provide by the platform); Moderated (contact information is verified); Social (the platforms allows linking social networks).

models. To date platform cooperativism has had difficulties in scaling up, not because it doesn't work, but because platforms adopting this model lack significant financial support, are perceived as competitors of the dominant model and need a bigger and highly cohesive community.

In the closing section the authors highlight that neither of the two models, platform capitalism and platform cooperativism, can represent a complete solution for the pressing needs of urban mobility; one is too highly oriented towards value extraction, and the other is unable to scale up. Having analysed the rich panorama of initiatives in the world, presented all the main research and examined all the literature on the topic, the authors tend to suggest a "model of plurality in which public and private services focus on developing synergies and sensible integration in a logic of coopetition" (p.101). A plurality of service can help in integrating and balancing the aims of the different models. How to ease this integration? The concrete suggestions given by the authors are: adopting multimodal payment systems that include all the sharing mobility services; cross-platform promotions and joint marketing programmes that inform about the advantages of complementary services; open data collaborations; and tax innovations.

As a good starting point for decision makers committed to developing sharing mobility in terms of social justice and sustainability, the book refers to the guidelines Shared Mobility Principles for Liveable Cities[6], based on ten principles: 1. Plan city and mobility together (integrated approach or joined-up thinking); 2. Prioritise the movement of people over vehicles; 3. Support the efficient use of space and shared vehicles; 4. Engage stakeholders through the transition to shared mobility; 5. Design equitable services considering digital literacy, inclusive representational practices, spatial distribution of services, fair pricing in non-central areas, subsidised pricing and new rating; 6. Transition towards zero emissions; 7. Seek fair user fees; 8. Deliver public benefits via open data; 9. Promote integration and seamless connectivity; 10. Foresee the sharing of automated vehicles to prevent the reproduction of old inequalities. The ten principles, although considered authoritative, are not legally binding or enforceable by law. For this reason, a radical rethinking of the current shared mobility sector as a right and not as a market is even more necessary; and in this regard the book closes with concrete suggestions (p. 107):

1. "designing shared mobility as a public service integrated into existing public transit system"
2. "lobbying central and local governments to enshrine these principles in law"
3. "creating effective public-private partnerships"
4. "creating independent regulatory bodies made of a diverse group of stakeholders ((im)mobility researchers, community members, and platform workers as well as urban planners, policymakers, and platform designers)".

While having a proactive approach to the topic, the authors demonstrate a high awareness of the limitations and challenges posed by the current sharing mobility as well as by the innovative solutions that they themselves propose/develop. This is an extensive work, reporting a rich case history for every aspect analyzed and referring to a large body of literature, in order to support their idea that changes are possible if based on a social and political attitude shift. A shift that puts mobility justice and relational thinking at its core. The author's reflections recall the Agyeman et al. (2003) notion of just sustainabilities and invite the rethinking of urban shared mobility with this novel approach. They drive the reader into the discovery of the social and sociological dimensions of sharing mobility, offering insights, classifications and suggestions, that constitute an excellent starting point for further exploration. In particular the authors signal four areas for future investigation: the analysis of non-western contexts; the analysis of the diversity of public values held by shared

---

[6] https://www.sharedmobilityprinciples.org/

mobility users and non-users; the examination of the potential of social and environmental scoring schemes; and the development of multi-level educational programmes on the impacts and potential of sharing mobility.

The current situation due to the Covid-19 outbreak, makes the authors' proposal even more critical. There is a concrete opportunity to reshape sharing mobility considering its social impact and relational dimension, fine-tuning it according to current needs. It's time to embrace the Beck notion of "emancipatory catastrophism" (2017): instead of concentrating on the negative effects of the crisis, seize this opportunity to work on its potential positive effects; mobility needs to be rethought according to the new conditions posed by the virus' spread, so it is a good opportunity to push the transformation towards a more just and fair mobility, within the framework of mobility justice and mobility as commons, avoiding the reinforcement of old or new social discriminations; it is the ideal opportunity to bring about the paradigm shift yearned for by the authors.

References

Agatz N., Erera A., Savelsbergh M. and Wang X. (2012), "Optimization for dynamic ride-sharing: A review", *European Journal of Operational Research*, 223: 295-303.

Agyeman J., Bullard R. and Evans B. (eds) (2003), *Just Sustainabilities: Development in an Unequal World*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press.

Amey A.M., Attanucci J. and Mishalani R. (2011), "Real-time ridesharing: Opportunities and challenges in using mobile phone technology to improve rideshare services", *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board*, 2217: 103-110.

Arcidiacono D. and Pais I. (2018), "Think mobility over: A survey on Car2go users in Milan", in Bruglieri M. (ed.), *Multi-disciplinary Design of Sharing Services*, London: Springer, pp. 143-159.

Armstrong H., Gorst C. and Rae J. (2019), *Renewing Regulation: Anticipatory Regulation in an Age of Disruption*, London: Nesta.

Arvidsson A. (2018), "Value and virtue in the sharing economy", *The Sociological Review*, 66(2): 289-301.

Balaram B. (2016), *Fair Share: Reclaiming Power in the Sharing Economy*, London: RSA.

Bardhi F. and Eckhardt G.M. (2012), "Access-based consumption: The case of car sharing", *Journal of Consumer Research,* 39(4): 881-898

Beck U. (2017), *La metamorfosi del mondo*, Bari-Roma: Laterza.

Belk R. (2014), "Sharing versus pseudo-sharing in Web 2.0", *Anthropologist*, 18(1): 7-23.

Bingham-Hall J. (2016), *Future of Cities: Commoning and Collective Approaches to Urban Space*, London: Government Office for Science.

Boltanski L. and Chiappello E. (1999), *Le nouvel esprit du capitalism*, Paris: Gallimard.

Calo R. and Rosenblat A. (2017), "The taking economy: Uber, information, and power", *Columbia Law Review*, 117: 1623-1690.

Chan N.K. (2019), "The rating game: The discipline of Uber's user-generated ratings", *Surveillance & Society*, 17(1/2): 183-190

Chan N.D. and Shaheen S.A. (2012), "Ridesharing in North America: Past, present, and future", *Transport Reviews*, 32(1): 93-112.

Clewlow R. and Mishra G., (2017), *Disruptive Transportation: The Adoption, Utilization, and Impacts of Ride-Hailing in the United States*. Berkeley: Institute of Transportation Studies, University of California, Research Report UCD- ITS-RR-17-07.

Cohen M.J. (2012), "The future of automobile society: A socio-technical transitions perspective", *Technology Analysis and Strategic Management*, 24(4): 377-390.

Daconto L. (2017), "Mobilità quotidiana e inclusione nel lavoro: sfida dell'accessibilità e politiche urbane", in D. Bidussa D. E. Polizzi (eds.), *Agenda Milano. Ricerche e pratiche per una città inclusiva*, Milano: Fondazione Feltrinelli EPub.

Fainstein S. (2001), "Competitiveness, cohesion and governance: Their implications for social justice", *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research*, 25: 884-888.

Farajallah M., Hammond R.G. and Pénard T. (2016), "What drives pricing behavior in peer-to-peer markets? Evidence from the Carsharing Platform BlaBlaCar. Evidence from the Carsharing Platform Blablacar", *Economics Working Paper Archive (University of Rennes 1 & University of Caen) from Center for Research in Economics and Management (CREM)*, available at: https://econpapers.repec.org/paper/tutcremwp/2016-12.htm.

Ferguson E. (1997), "The rise and fall of the American carpool: 1970–1990", *Transportation*, 24(4): 349-376.

Frenken K. and Schor J. (2017), "Putting the sharing economy into perspective", *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions,* 23: 3-10.

Furuhata M., Dessouky M. Ordóñez F., Brunet M.E., Wang X., and Koenig S., (2013), "Ridesharing: The state-of-the-art and future directions", *Transportation Research* 57: 28-46.

Global e-Sustainability Initiative (2008), *SMART 2020: Enabling the Low Carbon Economy in the Information Age*, Washington: United States Report.

Harvey D. (2013), *Rebel Cities: from the Right to the City to Urban Revolution*, London: Verso.

Hearn A. (2016), "Structuring feeling: Web 2.0, online ranking and rating, and the digital "reputation" economy", *Ephemera. Theory & Politics in Organization*, 10(3/4): 421-438.

IEA (2009), *Transport, Energy and CO2. Moving Toward Sustainability*, Paris: International Energy Agency.

IEA (2012), *Energy Technology Perspectives 2012. Pathways to a Clean Energy System*, Paris: International Energy Agency.

Johal S. and Zon N. (2015), *Policymaking for the Sharing Economy: Beyond Whack-a-Mole*, Toronto: Mowat Centre.

Kesselring S., Freudendal-Pedersen M. and Zuev D. (2020), "Sharing Mobilities and the Mobile Risk Society. An Introduction", in S. Kesselring, M. Freudendal-Pedersen, D. Zuev (eds.), *Sharing Mobilities: New Perspectives for the Mobile Risk Society*, London, Routledge, pp. 1-16.

Kitchin R., Lauriault T.P. and McArdle G. (2017), *Data and the City*, Abingdon: Routledge.

Lefebvre H. (1968), *Le droit á la ville*, Paris: Anthropos.

MAPC (2018), *Fare Choices. A Survey of Ride-Hailing Passengers in Metro-Boston*, available at: www.mapc.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/02/ Fare-Choices-MAPC.pdf.

Martin E.W. and Shaheen S.A., (2011), "Greenhouse gas emission impacts of carsharing in North America", *IEEE Transactions on Intelligent Transportation Systems*, 12(4): 1074-1086.

McLaren D. and Agyeman J. (2015), *Sharing cities: a case for truly smart and sustainable cities*, Boston: MIT Press.

Nikolaeva A., Adey P., Cresswell T., Lee J.Y., Nóvoa A. and Temenos C. (2019), "Commoning mobility: Towards a new politics of mobility transitions", *Transactions for the Institute of British Geographers*.

OECD (2006), *Decoupling the Environmental Impacts from Transport from Economic Growth*, Paris: OECD.

Pais I. and Provasi G. (2015), "Sharing economy: A step towards "re-embedding" the economy?", *Stato e Mercato*, 105(3): 347-377.

Pasquale F. (2015), *The Black Box Society: The Secret Algorithms that Control Money and Information*, Boston: Harvard University Press.

Pojani D. and Stead D. (2017), "The urban transport crisis in emerging economies: An Introduction", in D. Pojani and D. Stead (eds.), *The urban transport crisis in emerging economies*, Cham, Switzerland: Springer International Publishing, pp. 1-10.

Price J., DeMaio P. and Hamilton C. (2006). *Arlington Carshare Program: 2006 Report*.

Rosenblat A. (2018), *Uberland: How Algorithms Are Rewriting the Rules of Work*, Berkley: University of California Press.

Rosenblat A., Levy K., Barocas S. and Hwang T. (2016), "Discriminating tastes: Uber's customer ratings as vehicles for workplace discrimination", *Policy and Internet*, 9(3): 256-279.

Rubin O. (2015), "Contact between parents and adult children: The role of time constraints, commuting and automobility", *Journal of Transport Geography*, 49: 76-84.

Scholz T. and Schneider N. (eds.) (2017), *Ours to Hack and to Own: The Rise of Platform Cooperativism, a New Vision for the Future of Work and a Fairer Internet*, New York: OR books.

Schor J.B., Attwood-Charles W., Cansoy M., Ladegaard I. and Wengronowitz R. (2018), *Dependence and Precarity in the Sharing Economy*, available at: https://cirhr.library.utoronto.ca/sites/cirhr-edit.library.utoronto.ca/files/ sefton_lectures/seftonwilliamslecture_4th_2018_schor.pdf.

Schor J. and Fitzmaurice C. (2015), "Collaborating and connecting: The emergence of the sharing economy", in L. Reisch and J. Thøgersen (eds.), *Handbook of Research on Sustainable Consumption*, Cheltenham, UK: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd, pp. 410-425.

Setiffi F. and Lazzer G.P. (2018), "Riding free riders? A study of the phenomenon of BlaBlaCar in Italy", in I. Cruz, R. Ganga and S. Wahlen (eds.), *Contemporary Collaborative Consumption. Trust and Reciprocity Revisited*, Verlag: Springer.

Sheller M. (2018), *Mobility Justice: The Politics of Movement in an Age of Extremes*, London: Verso.

Sheller M. and Urry J. (2006), "The new mobilities paradigm", *Environment and Planning A: Economy and Space*, 38(2): 207-226.

Srnicek N. (2016), *Platform Capitalism*, London: Polity Press.

Steenhoven J., Burale I., Toye V. and Buré C. (2016), *Shifting Perspectives: Redesigning Regulation for the Sharing Economy*, Toronto: MaRS Solution Lab.

Stocker A., Lazarus J., Becker D. and Shaheen S. (2016), "Effects on vehicle use and ownership, travel behavior, quality of life, and environmental impacts", *Berkeley's Transportation Sustainability Research Center (TSRC)*, available at: http://innovativemobility.org/wp-content/uploads/ Zipcar-College-Market-Study-2015.pdf

Sundararajan A. (2016), *The Sharing Economy: The End of Employment and the Rise of Crowd-Based Capitalism*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press.

Susha I., Janssen M. and Verhulst S. (2017), "Data collaboratives as a new frontier of cross-sector partnerships in the age of open data: Taxonomy development", *Proceedings of the 50th Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences*, in Waikoloa, Hawaii, pp. 2691-2700.

Urry J. (2000), *Sociology beyond Society, Mobilities for the 21st Century*, London: Routledge.

Urry J. (2004), "The 'System' of Automobility", *Theory, Culture & Society*, 21 (4-5): 25-39.

Verlinghieria E. and Venturini F. (2018), "Exploring the right to mobility through the 2013 mobilizations in Rio de Janeiro", *Journal of Transport Geography*, 67: 126-136.

Wilhelms M., Henkel S. and Falk T. (2016), "To earn is not enough: A means end analysis to uncover peer-providers' participation motives in peer-to- peer car-sharing", *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 125: 38-47.

Witt A., Suzor N.P. and Patrik W. (2015), "Regulating ridesharing in the peer economy", *Communication Research & Practice*, 1(2): 174-190.

World Bank (2014), *Supporting Reports II – Urban China*, Washington, DC.