

Comparison of Standard and Electric Car Sharing Processes and IT-Infrastructures

Bachelorarbeit

zur Erlangung des akademischen Grades „Bachelor of Science (B.Sc.)“ im Studiengang
Wirtschaftswissenschaft der Wirtschaftswissenschaftlichen Fakultät der Leibniz Universität
Hannover

vorgelegt von

Name: Isermann Vorname

e: Jan



Prüfer: Prof. Dr. Michael H. Breitner Matrikelnr.:

2652190

Ort, den Hannover, 13.11.2013

Contents

List of Abbreviations.....	ii
List of Figures	ii
1 Introduction	1
2 Car sharing: A distinction.....	3
3 Car sharing-relevant intelligent transportation systems and technologies	5
3.1 Technologies and functions.....	7
3.1.1 Reservation	7
3.1.2 Vehicle access	9
3.1.3 Vehicle data acquisition and supervision	11
3.1.4 Vehicle navigation and in-vehicle messaging	12
3.1.5 Simulation and relocation.....	13
3.2 Integrated systems infrastructure.....	14
3.2.1 Trip registration and return system.....	15
3.2.2 Vehicle system	18
3.2.3 Management system.....	20
4 Comparison of car sharing vs. e-car sharing business processes	24
4.1 Relocation.....	25
4.2 Distribution.....	27
4.3 Simulation and evaluation	30
4.4 Infrastructural differences	32
4.5 Incentives and billing	34
5 Concluding reflections	36
5.1 Critical acclaim.....	36
5.2 Conclusion.....	38
Bibliography	40
Appendix A: Trip registration system.....	44
Appendix B: Vehicle system.....	47
Appendix C: Management system	51
Ehrenwörtliche Erklärung	56

1 Introduction

In the last decades, car sharing, which describes "[...] a distinct business process wherein CSOs [car sharing operators] typically provide their members with short-term vehicle access [...]" (Stillwater et al. 2008, p. 1), became increasingly popular as an alternative for mobility transportation. Car sharing providers around the world recorded impressively rising numbers of active members. Within a period of five years, between 2006 and 2010, the worldwide number of registered members almost tripled to a total of about 1.25 million, whereas the fleet-size almost doubled to 31,000 vehicles in 2010 (cf. Shaheen & Cohen 2013, p. 7). This development may mainly be accredited to an increasing environmental consciousness and sense of responsibility of car users towards nature, as well as financial factors (cf. Buchinger & Braet 2013, S. 7p.; Shaheen & Cohen 2013, p. 6p.). Including economic uncertainty, rising energy and private auto ownership costs, as well as efforts for increasing vehicle efficiency in order to reduce greenhouse gas emissions, those factors are encouraging drivers to actively seek alternatives to a regular vehicle ownership. Therefore, as one of these alternatives, car sharing allows individuals to remain mobile and flexible, thus gaining the advantages of a private automobile, while avoiding responsibilities and costs that result from owning a private car (cf. Shaheen & Cohen 2013, p. 5; Markel 2010, p. 1; Stillwater et al. 2008, p. 4; Katzev 2002, p. 2). Furthermore, research has shown that car sharing also actively contributes to reduce one's greenhouse gas-emissions by 55 percent, while also helping to avoid other negative side-effects of an increased traffic density, for instance unsolicited congestions or air pollution in cities (cf. Shaheen & Cohen 2013, p. 8; Lee et al. 2012, p. 89; Parent & Gallais 2002, p. 827).

As worldwide greenhouse gas emissions grow nonetheless due to a continuous increase in overall transportation, the interest in so-called smart or innovative mobility solutions like electric vehicles (EV) and respective car sharing concepts has grown even further (cf. Alli et al. 2012, p. 1; Barth et al. 2003, p. 2; Figueiredo et al. 2002, p. 1206). Therefore, since electric vehicles (EV) produce little to none emissions at all, car sharing companies have deployed electric vehicles worldwide in order to test their applicability and economic viability in real environments (cf. Shaheen & Cohen 2013, p. 9; Alli et al. 2012, p. 1).

However, the electric vehicle industry and e-car sharing providers are facing various obstacles in penetrating the market (cf. Buchinger & Braet 2013, p. 7). Besides economical and organisational challenges, EVs are critically renowned by customers as a result of their short

driving ranges, the extensive charging times, or their high acquisition costs (cf. Buchinger & Braet 2013, p. 7). Likewise, car sharing companies are facing issues incorporating electric vehicles in their services, since they supposedly require adjusted IT-infrastructures and Intelligent Transportation Technologies, which in turn allow for a maximisation of returns by fully exploiting the vehicles resources and the companies capacities. This is especially important for both conventional and, moreover, e-car sharing companies, considering that they have to think and act economically in the first place (cf. Buchinger & Braet 2013, p. 7; Markel 2010, p. 2). Furthermore, as EVs are comparably expensive in their acquisition, they consequently reach their amortisation point later than conventional cars and thus, require a frequent utilisation by customers, which can only be guaranteed by adjusting and optimising the car sharing companies IT infrastructure and associated business processes (cf. Allie et al. 2012, p. 1). Yet, since any intrusions, changes, and additions to IT systems used also have an impact on the underlying business processes, the applicable sub processes presumably have to be adapted to the new structures as well.

Despite this urgent need, research has confined itself to mostly analysing and describing essential information technologies and respective car sharing systems, subsequently creating a research gap. In order to fill this gap, this paper tries to analyse the common conventional and e-car sharing infrastructures, based on which the business processes will be modeled and compared. Therefore, after the introduction and the description of the purpose and value of this paper in chapter one, the differences between casual car rental and car sharing, as well as a brief distinction of the common car sharing systems will be provided in chapter two. The first section of the third chapter, however, deals with specific intelligent transportation technologies that are typically being deployed in car sharing systems and the motives for their utilisation, thus allowing for a more universal comprehension regarding the structure of these initiatives. The consecutive section builds on these previous findings and relates the individual technologies with one another, thus establishing a general IT-infrastructure, based on which the modeling of the business processes will be conducted, although due to their extent, the respective results will be presented in the appendix of this paper. In the fifth and second to last chapter, the actual comparison of the business processes of conventional and e-car sharing systems will be conducted, therefore giving answers to the initial research question, whereas the last chapter provides both a critical acclaim concerning the results of the paper and a final conclusion.

demand from hot spots (stations of high demand), to cold spots (stations of low demand), therefore improving the overall distribution of vehicles.

5 Concluding reflections

After the initial introduction of the common ITS technologies, the respective car sharing infrastructure as well as the modeling of the generic business processes and its comparison between conventional and e-car sharing systems, this chapter deals with a critical acclaim regarding the approach and the results of this paper. Furthermore, after this critical acclaim, the overall findings will be summarised in form of a conclusion, which will end with a small outlook.

5.1 Critical acclaim

The main issue throughout this analysis was to provide an appropriate degree of detail concerning the depiction of the business processes, while also illustrating a rather universal process that would constitute and be comprised of most of the characteristics and systems of the various car sharing programmes. At first, it was intended to outline both conventional and e-car sharing processes separately, based upon which a comparison would have been delineated, wherein the differences would have been discussed in greater detail. However, while consulting the various case studies, it became apparent that the infrastructure and systems of both types of car sharing systems did not differ notably and therefore, could have been used almost interchangeably. Nevertheless, a choice had to be made regarding whether the detail of the pertaining business processes to be modeled should have been increased, thus allowing a graphical comparison, or if the latter should be conducted in writing. Yet, as the differences are quite minor and located in underlying processes such as vehicle distribution, relocation, and simulation, their holistic depiction would have meant such a severe increase in detail that the illustration of both processes would have scarcely fit in this paper. Furthermore, some differences are so minor (e.g. slightly varying variables) that their graphical depiction would have been unnecessary, but nonetheless tedious. Therefore, the choice fell on modeling a universal process, while subsequently discussing the various disparities in the following chapter. However, reducing the complexity of the overall processes consequently means lowering its explanatory contribution and value.

This lack of detail constitutes a problem and it would, nonetheless, still be of peculiar interest and importance for researchers, practitioners, and car sharing operators alike to graphically model the respective business processes in greatest illustrative detail. Therefore, future papers could venture deeper and focus on individual tasks. By specialising in, for instance, relocation processes, it would become viable not only to completely model a representative process, but also to compare it visually to both analogous conventional car sharing procedures, as well as alternative practices being applied in e-car sharing systems.

Another issue of this paper might be the choice of studies that were examined in the course of the paper. Since the initial research was solely limited to German and English research papers, the existence of further relevant studies cannot be ruled out. This could bias the results of this paper, as the studies were conducted in well-developed industrial countries, where the infrastructure of both the road network and electrical grid are highly advanced. As follows, other countries with a less developed infrastructure could require adjustments regarding the infrastructure of the car sharing system itself, as well as respective business processes. Hence, future researchers focusing on car sharing business processes should resolve this issue by either evaluating the additional challenges in these environments, or by comparing car sharing initiatives of industrial with less developed countries.

Furthermore, not only the choice of studies might have biased the depiction of the business process, but also that solely scientific papers, which focused on rather experimental car sharing systems and initiatives, were observed. As business processes highly relate to and have a foundation in reality, examining the car sharing initiatives from a customer's perspective could have provided further insights towards an integrated business process. This is especially true when it comes to subsidiary processes that are relatively unimportant in scientific evaluations, but, nevertheless, have a high relevance for car sharing operators and customers alike. One of those examples could be the billing process, as in the research papers, it was - if ever - merely described. In most cases, the respective description was reduced to the reference that customers are obliged to pay monthly, as well as fixed fees per mile and minute. Therefore, further information on common and potential pricing mechanisms and corresponding incentives were omitted, since they were not deemed important in the first place. As for the business process, by going through an actual rental and billing process of an established car sharing provider, further knowledge could be contributed.

5.2 Conclusion

As the business processes of both conventional car sharing companies and their e-car counterparts have probably never been illustrated holistically, the purpose of this paper was, on the one hand, to examine respective and common car sharing infrastructures, their systems in-use, and finally, on the other hand, to model and compare the associated business processes. Therefore, after the definition of terms and distinction of the various forms of car sharing programmes in the first and second chapter, the diverse intelligent transportation technologies and reasons for their implementation in car sharing initiatives were discussed. This was accomplished by including the findings of car sharing concepts being described in a variety of assorted case studies that encompassed both e-car and normal car sharing programmes. Thereupon, it has been shown that applying intelligent transportation technologies is highly advisable and very common, since it not only strongly impacts the economic viability of car sharing initiatives through an increased efficiency, but also improves the customers' convenience and satisfaction thereof.

Furthermore, as the potential of these technologies cannot fully be realized when being utilised individually, they usually are integrated as technology bundles into bigger systems. Generally, these systems would be separated as per their functions and the localisation of the processes being supported by them. Thus, in most studies the car sharing operators applied trip registration, vehicle, and management systems. The vehicle system usually provided data being used by the management system, supported the customer's trip by enabling navigational aids and means of communication, and partly managed vehicle access. Moreover, the management system comprised of the most processes, also constituted as the prime processes, thus being the heart of the car sharing infrastructure, since it facilitated the general fleet management, as well as vehicle access, billing, and evaluation of the car sharing system itself. Last but not least, the trip registration system, which is localised in either car sharing stations or modern smartphone apps, was found to support processes that generally could be handled by the management system itself, but in some cases is conducted by the former due to certain advantages. Based-upon these systems, their infrastructure, and functions, the underlying business processes were derived in the second part of the third chapter. However, as it was found during the examination of case studies that both types of car sharing programmes tend to apply the systems and technologies, these associated business processes were designed to fit both settings.

Anyhow, the initial purpose of this paper was to conduct a comparison between the business processes of both car sharing systems. However, as their differences were so minute and therefore hardly representable, the comparison was conducted not graphically but written in chapter four. These differences mainly concerned the structure of the sub processes, such as the choice and setup of mathematical models and respective algorithms concerning the relocation and distribution of vehicles and the evaluation of the car sharing system itself. Notably, one should refrain from generalising the discussed findings, as the setup and choice of systems still depends strongly on both contextual and environmental factors, as well as preferences of the car sharing providers and the general purpose of the system. Nonetheless, this paper contributes to a general understanding of what characterises car sharing programmes and which systems and functions might be necessary to operate them sustainably and user-friendly.