“Sharing is the new paradigm of urban mobility. Tomorrow, you will judge a city according to what it is adding to sharing. The more that we have people sharing transportation modes, public space, information and new services, the more attractive the city will be.” Gilles Vesco [@Moss:2015vk] (the idea of a new paradigm)

The number of cars entering the city has fallen by 20% over the past decade, without even a congestion-charging scheme [@Moss:2015vk] (he prove it right when introduced the Vélo’v bike-sharing scheme)

London, which has pioneered congestion charging and has a well-integrated system of public transport, has led the move away from cars over the past decade, during which time 9% of car commuters have switched to other forms of transport [@Moss:2015vk] (pointing out the idea could be moving into a different thing once you have it , so it is not only detrrance of buying but deterrence of usage)

Though the population has risen by 45,000, the number of cars owned by people in the area has fallen by 3,000. These are trends that urban planners elsewhere would kill for. [@Moss:2015vk] (perhaps for the conclusion, as a way to highlight the desperate need of Singapore to change the paradigm)

Jason Torrance, policy director at sustainable transport group Sustrans. “We’ve seen a huge change over the past five years around an ownership model. You now have Spotify and other on-demand services. My entire record collection is in the loft. We have everything on iTunes and Spotify and my son, who is six, only vaguely knows what a CD is.” [@Moss:2015vk] (about the change in the ownership model to the collaborative one)

Stephen Bayley, who has written several books on car design, is convinced the age of the car is coming to an end. “It’s five minutes to midnight for the private car,” [@Moss:2015vk] (pointing the end of an era)

Roland in his 1957 book Mythologies says “I believe that the automobile is, today, the almost exact equivalent of the great Gothic cathedrals,” [@Moss:2015vk] (pointing the end of an era)

BMW executive Glenn Schmidt, “a shift from ownership to accessing mobility” ,” [@Moss:2015vk] (change in the paradigm)

Jean-Philippe Hermine, vice-president of strategic environmental planning at Renault, “The relationship with the car is changing… we are to some extent selling mobility and mileage more than a product.” [@Moss:2015vk] (change in the paradigm)

Richard Brown, manager of Ford’s advanced product group, “and the car is clearly going to be part of the [internet of things](http://www.theguardian.com/technology/internet-of-things)” .” [@Moss:2015vk] (change in the paradigm)

Google and its dirveless cars Project [@Google:ve]

WHY a bmw??

The most crucial assumption in the model (choice preference) is that people derive utility from having a good self-image, or identity, and that they therefore, behave and interpret reality so as to maintain or improve such an image. This model is then tested by utilizing an anonymous survey where a representative sample of Swedes were asked how much a variety of characteristics, including status value and environmental performance, would matter when they themselves, as well as others, are about to buy a car. [@JohanssonStenman:2006jw, p.130]

To measure the strength of preferences regarding the car’s characteristics, in which we included safety, environmental friendliness, look, motor power, comfort, space, fuel consumption and reliability, we used a four level scale taking on the ordinal levels of very important, fairly important, fairly unimportant and not important at all. We frame the questions regarding the characteristics of a car both in terms of how they would value these attributes if they were about to buy a car for themselves as well as how they believed others would value the same attributes. [@JohanssonStenman:2006jw, p.135]

From the results it appears to follow that status value is by far the least important of all attributes. (of why would you buy). To test the hypothesis of biased self-reported perceptions, we asked half of the sample how much they believed that *others in their neighbourhood* would value, on average, the same characteristics. As we see in Table 2, the average concern for status is clearly larger here, while concern for the environment and safety are considerably lower. The other half was asked to judge how the average Swede (“average-Svensson”) would value these char- acteristics. Here we see an even larger concern for status and a lower concern for safety. [@JohanssonStenman:2006jw, p.136]

The present research addresses this convergence of hedonic forecasts (how would it feell like) and memories and their dissociation from actual hedonic experience. (memories could come by represenations of others) [@Xu:2006wa] (we based the rpesent in things that we barealy remember and with that we predict the future (there is a gap between tis two, but never or usually never is based on evidence)

In addition, a large body of research into affective forecasts shows that people’s predictions are usually more extreme than their experiences. Known as the “focusing illusion” (Schkade and Kahneman 1998), this bias derives from a focus on core attributes of the activity at the expense of other information. [@Xu:2006wa]

The richest 1% now have more wealth than the rest of the world combined. In 2015, just 62 individuals had the same wealth as 3.6 billion people. This figure is down from 388 individuals as recently as 2010. The average annual income of the poorest 10% of people in the world has risen by less than a single dollar cent every year in the last 15 years. [@OXFAM:2016tc]

**Elementary textbooks bristle with substitution examples about butter and margarine, rather than about shoes and ships, as though the authors believed that there was something intrinsic to butter and margarine that made them good substitutes and about automobiles and gasoline that made them somehow intrinsically complementary.** [@Lancaster:1966kf, p.132]

**The chief technical novelty lies in breaking away from the traditional approach that goods are the direct ob- jects of utility and, instead, supposing that it is the properties or characteristics of the goods from which utility is derived. We assume that consumption is an ac- tivity in which goods, singly or in com- bination, are inputs and in which the output is a collection of characteristics. Utility or preference orderings are assumed to rank collections of characteristics and only to rank collections of goods indirectly through the characteristics that they possess. A meal (treated as a single good) possesses nutritional characteristics but it also possesses aesthetic characteristic**

**1. The good, per se, does not give util- ity to the consumer; it possesses charac- teristics, and these characteristics give rise to utility.**

**2. In general, a good will possess more than one characteristic, and many char- acteristics will be shared by more than one good.**

**3. Goods in combination may possess characteristics different from those per- taining to the goods separately.** [@Lancaster:1966kf, p.133] (the last three pints are the summary of the new approach)

Transport Minister Khaw Boon Wan “Changes will be incremental but over 15 years, we shall collectively experience a quantum leap. Private cars will likely start to go the way of horse carriages, if not in 15 years, definitely in 20 or 25 years’ time”. [@Anonymous:2016vo]

“Our current car-dominant transport model is not sustainable given our land constraints. It needs to be replaced by one that has as its foundation an excellent public transport system which is reliable, convenient and smart.” [@Anonymous:2016vo] (the same guy)

He noted that there were four “major drivers” behind transport’s evolution in Singapore: the emergence of new technology like driverless vehicles; the introduction of new business models like mobile apps Uber and Grab; the continued ageing population and the growing need to be environment-friendly. [@Anonymous:2016vo]

MRT Services Pte. Ltd. (SMRT Services) and 2 Getthere Holding B.V. (2getthere) today announced a Joint Venture (JV) to market, supply and operate 2getthere’s Automated Vehicle systems in the Asia-Pacific region. In anticipation of the growing demand in the Asia-Pacific region for Automated Vehicles, SMRT Services and 2getthere are also working to deepen our strategic relationship with the view to better support the latter’s development and growth. [@SMRT:2016ut]

2getthere, the Dutch maker of the pods, and Singaporean transportation operator SMRT on Wednesday announced they will be building 24-passenger cars that are slated to run commercially by the end of the year [@Ho:2016ul]

Prospect theory distinguishes between gains and losses from a situation-specific reference point. The agent evaluates gains and losses differently and exhibits first-order risk aversion locally around the reference point. Utility depends on a reference point that partitions outcomes into gains and losses. [@Pesendorfer:2006fy, p.1]

the utility that subjects associate to the different available alternatives often depends on a reference point that subjects compare the available options with in order to make a choice. That is, the preferences of the individual do not appear to be a fixed ordering irrespective of the environment in which she operates…The entire such literature has focused only on two very specific types of reference-point: the case in which the reference point is the agent’s past choice, or her status quo, however there is a third additional element that seems to be playing an important role: the behavior of others. For example, one could argue that a consumer who receives 10 is ‘happier’ about it if this takes place when everybody else also receives 10, than she would be if she received 10 when everybody else received 1000. This seems to be due to some form of reference-dependence – but where the reference point is the choice of others. As opposed to other applications of prospect theory, however, we assume that the agent’s reference-point is the average choice of the rest of the society [@Bogliacino:2013jr, p.1]