# Target Interviewees[[1]](#footnote-1)

1. Local Policy-makers: authors (or gatekeepers) of policy documents (or from team that ‘owns’ them)
2. Intermediaries for participatory exercises referred to in documents (either that have already happened or are yet to happen) – community, user groups, business representatives?
3. Sources of knowledge in documents – academia, transport ‘professionals’
4. Suppliers / operators of policy interventions – focus on relevant e-modes
5. National policy makers: civil servants with local responsibility – national perspective on urban (e-) mobility policy

***Intro***: Thank you for agreeing to participate in this interview and giving us about 45 minutes of your time. We will start by exploring your role as well as different aspects of a just or inclusive transition to electric mobility. We will then ask you to describe the process of [insert area of expertise] and what these policies mean for an inclusive transition to electric mobility in Bristol. The latter part of the interview will include questions about the lessons learnt from these processes and in what ways it might (or might not) be considered a success and why. Finally, we will ask you to list your top priorities for the transition going forward and to suggest anyone else we should speak to or points to consider.

***Q1:*** Please tell me how you came to in your current role and a bit about your responsibilities there.

* Prompt to understand how became involved in / aware of EM policy, projects, views on…

***Q2:*** When we discuss how the [insert depending on type of interviewee] sector works, very briefly, what initially comes to mind as an important consideration for the transition to electric mobility?

***Q3***: Now, can you tell us which of these aspects of an inclusive transition to electric mobility are seen as important to people working in your sector? *Show slide of bullet points.*

* **Spatially more even uptake and access to electric mobility options by diverse individuals or groups.**
* **Participation in the policy development and design of the electric mobility options.**
* **Fairness of approach to balancing costs and benefits for different groups / places.**
* **Diversity of electric mobility options suitable to meet different needs of different groups**
* **Understanding of how electric mobility fits into wider mobility rights, experiences, needs, and values of citizens**

Our research is focused on an inclusive transition, so we are considering all of these aspects.

***Process – Q4:*** Can you talk me through the process of [insert area of expertise, policy document, project, mode] (*In no particular order, use some of the below prompt questions developed from bullets in matrix.)*

* Setting spatial / social target places / groups (and evidence):
* Policy approach / priorities?
* Politics, who represent?
* Timing? how priorities have changed?
* Managing partners, stakeholders – what about public (customers), politicians?
* Process re interacting with other roles?

***Q5:*** In what ways were considerations of inclusivity and social justice part of the process you’ve described?

* Choice, prioritisation, distribution of interventions
* Participation in x ways?
* EM becomes more affordable / acceptable / appeal of EM to different groups

***Evaluation:*** We will now reflect on the process you’ve just described and how it might be evaluated.

***Q6:*** Let’s start with any formal evaluation processes you have. Do you consider questions of inclusivity and social justice as you develop KPIs for [insert project, programme, policy doc]? If so, how do you do that?

* Targets, metrics, KPIs – what are they? How are they measured?
* Public feedback
* Central government or legal requirements

***Q7:*** To what extent and in what ways is [EM area of expertise or infrastructure or policy] a success so far? Or not?

* Environmentally; Economically – by what metrics? e.g. jobs, affordability…
* Equity; Participation (when and at what level); Acceptability (aims / outcomes?)
* Delivery of procurement, interventions
* Politically? New appreciation (knowledge) of diverse needs, values experiences

***Q8:*** What could or should have been done differently in this process? Or what was missing, or was included or discarded during the process that should not have been? Why?

* Policy interventions included, evidence, knowledge, involvement
* Groups / places included in policy interventions

Why?

* Regulatory constraints / legal duties / Resource constraints
* Public feedback or complaints / political support, timing
* Action or inaction by other actors

***Conclusion – Q9:*** How inclusive do you think the transition to EM in your city is up this point? Why? (*Show statements again if useful as prompt.*)

If you think about an inclusive transition, is there anything else that you feel should be considered that is not included in these statements?

***Q10:*** What would your top three priorities for EM be in Bristol going forward?

* Do more for / in x groups / places of x infrastructure / service types / modes
* More co-production of policy interventions
* Integration of policy areas (e.g. climate)

***Q11:*** Who else should we speak to?

***Q12:*** Is there anything else you would like to mention that we have not already addressed?

Thank you very much for your time. We will be in touch as we proceed to the next stage of the project, when we will organise a workshop to discuss or you can look for updates on [www.ITEMresearch.org](http://www.ITEMresearch.org).

1. Note that the private sector and charity interviewees could fall into type 2 if they are representing needs, experiences, values of a particular group, or type 3 if they are producing research / evidence to support policy [↑](#footnote-ref-1)