

*Review*

## **Renewable, ethical? Assessing the energy justice potential of renewable electricity**

**Aparajita Banerjee, Emily Prehoda, Roman Sidortsov and Chelsea Schelly \***

Department of Social Sciences, Environmental and Energy Policy Program, Michigan Technological University, 1400 Townsend Drive, Houghton MI 49930, USA

\* **Correspondence:** Email: [cschelly@mtu.edu](mailto:cschelly@mtu.edu).

**Abstract:** Energy justice is increasingly being used as a framework to conceptualize the impacts of energy decision making in more holistic ways and to consider the social implications in terms of existing ethical values. Similarly, renewable energy technologies are increasingly being promoted for their environmental and social benefits. However, little work has been done to systematically examine the extent to which, in what ways and in what contexts, renewable energy technologies can contribute to achieving energy justice. This paper assesses the potential of renewable electricity technologies to address energy justice in various global contexts via a systematic review of existing studies analyzed in terms of the principles and dimensions of energy justice. Based on publications including peer reviewed academic literature, books, and in some cases reports by government or international organizations, we assess renewable electricity technologies in both grid integrated and off-grid use contexts. We conduct our investigation through the rubric of the affirmative and prohibitive principles of energy justice and in terms of its temporal, geographic, socio-political, economic, and technological dimensions. Renewable electricity technology development has and continue to have different impacts in different social contexts, and by considering the different impacts explicitly across global contexts, including differences between rural and urban contexts, this paper contributes to identifying and understanding how, in what ways, and in what particular conditions and circumstances renewable electricity technologies may correspond with or work to promote energy justice.

**Keywords:** energy justice; renewable energy; intergenerational justice; energy poverty socioeconomic justice

---

## 1. Introduction

Whereas the global economy runs on oil, it is electricity that powers it. Electricity pervades the residential, commercial, and industrial sectors providing lighting, heating, and cooling services whilst ensuring that assembly lines are moving and metros deliver their passengers on time. As a source of energy, electricity can be easily used, accessed, and demand-adjusted [1]. Historically, hydrocarbon and nuclear resources, especially coal, were used in electricity production propelling the developed countries towards prosperity [2]. However, this prosperity came at the high environmental, social, and political costs associated with extraction, transportation, and combustion of fossil fuels [1]. Additionally, the intensive use has limited easy to access and economically competitive non-renewable fossil fuel reserves [2,3]. It is thus essential to look for alternatives to continue electricity production to meet future energy demands.

Whilst hydro has served as an affordable and reliable renewable source since the dawn of electrification, other renewable energy resources, solar and wind, in particular, have emerged as economically viable options to meet current and future energy needs with significantly lower environmental, social, and political impacts. Globally, investments in renewable resource-based electricity (RE) have been made at an unprecedented rate [4]. This has led to a momentous worldwide increase in the number of RE facilities and the overall capacity including 1064 gigawatts (GW) of hydropower, 433 GW of wind power, and 231 GW of solar power in 2015 [5]. The scale of RE operation required to significantly reduce societal dependence on fossil-fuel energy can be imagined as colossal [6,7,8].

The transition of electricity production from fossil fuel to non-fossil fuel energy sources is fundamentally changing how energy is produced around the world. The proliferation of new RE technologies not only alters supply chains and energy infrastructure – RE projects change social and political structures in the nations, regions, and communities in which they are implemented. Such new developments also open a floodgate of positive and negative externalities affecting people with the ills or benefits of RE projects. Thus, the impacts of RE externalities have been subject of research specifically to examine these effects. In some cases, new RE projects affect the connections people have with the place where they live [9–12], leading to societal acceptance [13,14], rejection [15], or other mixed responses towards RE projects [16]. These reactions can be based on actual or perceived injustices of the negative externalities resultant from RE development that can impact social life [17]. The burdens resulting from RE development may also be unequally distributed within societal groups, affecting different groups differently [18,19]. Apart from the impact of the socio-physical realities of new RE developments, other issues may also arise related to the capability of RE in mitigating energy poverty from access and affordability constraints [20,21,22].

In order to envisage the emergent RE sector as an integral part of a sustainable future, it is critical to avoid and if not possible, minimize negative externalities that give rise to injustices associated with energy development while transitioning to a low-carbon future. Therefore, at the current juncture when traditional ways of producing energy are increasingly being replaced by new RE, there is a need to take stock of the interlinkages among RE and energy justice. Recent scholarship tends to highlight the energy justice potential of renewable sources (for example, [17,19,23,24,25]). Also, there is a line of scholarship targeting qualitative assessment and effective measurement tools for energy-related injustices (mainly fossil fuel and nuclear) [1,26,27]. However, there is perhaps no existing work where an energy-justice related framework is used to

assess the justice and injustice potential of RE projects.

A sustainable energy future calls for energy systems to be guided by principles of justice. This requires the inclusion of justice goals in RE planning and development and necessitates understanding how RE projects can adhere to principles of energy justice. Given this development, the goal of this paper is to assess existing research to find out to what extent the literature on RE development worldwide addresses energy justice considerations. We use the energy justice assessment framework proposed by Sovacool et al. [1]. In this work, the scholars use the framework to mainly discuss energy justice related to fossil fuels and nuclear energy. We use this framework to assess the energy justice of RE development, identifying dimensions of energy justice in RE development discussed in current literature, noting the tradeoffs and challenges ensuring energy justice and pointing out the future research needs.

This paper focuses specifically on electricity generation technologies based on the three leading forms of RE worldwide, according to recent data, i.e. wind, solar, and hydro [5]. We selected these three forms of renewable resources given their global scope of operation. Further, wind, water, and solar technologies can be scaled up or down to address electricity demands without substantial changes in technologies or to operationalizing its use. Additionally, wind, solar hydro, and hydro resources can potentially provide energy to the transportation sector with required technological and infrastructural development. We conduct our review via systematic appraisal of existing original research analyzed in terms of the dimensions and principles of energy justice. In the following sections, we first introduce the conceptual framework regarding energy justice used in our analysis. Then, taking note of RE development in both highly centralized electrically and electrically dispersed contexts, we review the literature and analyze it in terms of geographic, temporal, technological, economic, and sociopolitical dimensions and based on the affirmative and prohibitive principles of energy justice.

## 2. The Analytical Framework

Justice is a highly contested concept with diverse meanings. One definition of energy justice is “a global energy system that fairly disseminates both the benefits and costs of energy services, and one that has representative and impartial decision-making” ([27], p. 436). In the fair dissemination of benefits and costs, future generations should also be represented so that they do not bear the burdens resulting from current energy consumption [28]. However, when considering low-carbon energy transition, researchers have recognized energy poverty, fuel poverty, energy insecurity, energy deprivation, and other problems of associated with lack of access and affordability of energy [29,30]. Therefore, energy justice should also be defined to consider that all people need energy to meet necessities and thus should be able to access and afford energy. McCauley et al. [31] summarizes these aspects in their work proposing energy justice should be based on three central tenets: distributive justice (where ills and benefits are justly distributed), procedural justice (where procedures equitably allow the participation of all stakeholders), and recognition justice (inclusion of the needs of the energy poor, the people opposing power plants in their communities etc. in decision making).

Energy justice is an emerging field of study, and there are many ways in which energy justice is being theorized (notably [31,32,33]). However, what lacks in most of this work is how we can use the tenets and put them in practice to evaluate research emerging on RE developments. In their work,

Sovacool et al. [1] developed a framework to highlight how current and future development of energy systems (relying on traditional sources) have a tendency to interfere with populations ability to meet basic needs and obtain basic goods. Critiquing fossil fuel and nuclear resource-based energy projects in this work, Sovacool et al. [1] establish that: (i) energy justice can be explained using two principles, affirmative and prohibitive; and (ii) energy injustices can be categorized as occurring in often overlapping geographic, temporal, technological, economic, and sociopolitical dimensions.

The philosophical underpinning of understanding energy justice foundational to Sovacool et al. [1] aligns with the philosophical conceptions of justice as reviewed in Sovacool and Dworkin [33]. In this work, the authors apply six philosophical concepts found in justice theory: (1) human rights, (2) procedure, (3) welfare and happiness, (4) freedom, (5) posterity, and (6) fairness, responsibility, and capacity when studying energy developments. The prohibitive and the affirmative principles proposed by Sovacool et al. [1], by their definition, directly or indirectly encompass justice principles. The prohibitive principle states that “energy systems must be designed and constructed in such a way that they do not unduly interfere with the ability of people to acquire those basic goods to which they are justly entitled” ([1], p. 3). The affirmative principle asserts that “if any of the basic goods to which people are justly entitled can only be secured using energy services, then, in that case, there is also a derivative entitlement to the energy services” ([1], p. 3). As energy services help people attain essential access to goods and other services for human flourishing, a just energy system should ensure that everyone has access to energy sources (affirmative principle) and the ills and benefits of an energy system does not unduly affect anyone in such a way that they lose access to other goods (prohibitive principle).

We utilize this framework to consider renewable energy projects to operationalize energy justice in evaluating RE developments. As justice is a highly debated concept, we use the prohibitive and affirmative principles to frame justice simply as equity and equality of distribution of burdens and benefits and then explore how existing RE scholarship addresses these tenets via five dimensions – geographic, temporal, technological, economic, and sociopolitical. However, going beyond the anthropocentric definition of energy justice, while conducting our research we broaden the scope of energy justice by adding inter-species impacts of RE systems, proposing that a just energy system is also one that also does not endanger species critical for ecological systems to survive, which is important in itself and extremely useful in supporting human life.

The geographic dimension focuses on the spatial allocation of energy services and the costs and benefits associated with them. Uneven energy development that affects one place more than others also involves changes to the ecological and environmental conditions in the area, impacting local communities in ways that can even lead to degradation or even displacement. This section considers RE in terms of the affirmative and prohibitive energy justice principles. In which a just energy system would include characteristics that lessen the uneven geographic impacts associated with energy development projects and improve access to energy to obtain basic needs.

The temporal dimension of energy justice stresses energy systems as an intergenerational issue, where the negative externalities of energy production and use of current generation continue to impact future generations (hence capturing intergenerational ethical obligations). Therefore, this section considers how just RE systems can elicit externalities that prevent or hinder future generation’s abilities to obtain their basic goods, either through the provision of fuels or access to energy to satisfy basic goods. Therefore, a just energy system should have characteristics that lead to reduced or negligible impacts on future generations and the ways and means essential for maintained

quality of life. Temporal dimensions explore intergenerational and also inter-species energy justice issues, where energy injustices will affect the generations to come who will be impacted by climate change, degraded landscapes, biodiversity loss, air pollution and associated health implications in the future stemming from current energy use.

The technological dimension explores inherent ethical deficiencies of energy systems in relation to their safety, efficiency, reliability, and vulnerability to external security threats. This section considers whether the technical components of the energy system itself have the capacity to reconcile with these principles. A just technical energy system would provide non-interference, reliable, safe, and non-vulnerability with the provision of basic goods. The economic dimension of energy justice mainly concerns the social distribution of energy services and the costs and benefits associated with them. Sovacool et al. [1] point out that energy services should be distributed in such a way that people across social groups can have access to energy that is affordable enough to cover at least the basic requirements to maintain a dignified life. Often the lack of physical access or the costs of energy services prohibits people from accessing its benefits. Therefore, a just energy system addresses both principles by considering RE projects that do not elicit negative economic impacts or cause an imbalance to different economic groups. The sociopolitical dimension of the energy system is closely tied with the economic dimension. A just energy system from the sociopolitical viewpoint would uphold the principles of human rights, democracy, and political process devoid of any dysfunctional nexus between energy producers and the government. A just energy system should also ensure that no social groups are marginalized from or given access to energy based solely on their social status.

### **3. RE Through the Lenses of Energy Justice**

We organize the results in terms of their closest relevance to the geographic, temporal, technological, economic, and sociopolitical dimensions of energy justice. Each subsection below first highlights the major trends that emerged from our review. The review was compiled based on a systematic search for peer reviewed literature, books, and in some cases reports by government or international organizations reporting empirical research findings on the impacts of RE technology. The Google Scholar database was used and articles published between 2010 and 2017 were included. Initial search terms were based on the dimensions of energy justice used to organize the analysis; additional search terms developed based on the preliminary trends resulting from this initial search. For example, to assess the geographical dimension of RE projects, we targeted articles and reports specifically related to developing nations, with a special focus on the sub-Saharan Africa, Asia, and in other rural areas of the Global South. Articles were searched utilizing key terms such as “RE and developing nations,” “rural electrification,” “energy poverty,” “energy access,” “Africa,” “India,” and “developed versus developing.” To search the literature for the technical dimension keywords like “water impacts of solar/wind/hydro power,” “mining impact of renewable energy” and “ecological impacts of renewable energy” was used. After identifying the trends, specific key words like “wind power impacts on bats” or “water use of Concentrated Solar Power” were used. A similar method was employed when searching for articles in the technological dimension. Keywords in this search included “RE and technology,” “fossil fuel impacts, and health.” For economic dimension, search terms were mainly like “energy poverty and renewable energy” and “renewable energy and energy poverty in developing countries.” Similarly, for sociopolitical dimensions search terms were

based on the key themes like “land acquisition renewable energy,” “green lobby and renewable energy”, “public participation in renewable energy decision making” were used.

As the main purpose of this work is to develop an understanding of how RE development is conceptualized in terms of the range of energy justice impacts, the sampling frame focused on sampling for diversity, finding a range of perspectives and trends, rather than a quantitative count of content. Given that we were more interested in finding the range of emerging trends of RE related to energy justice and injustice rather than the number of papers that reported on a thematic area, use of a single database sufficed this purpose, as we could find a broad range of issues covered in the articles selected for review. Delimiting our search between 2010–2017 (even though, for example, lifecycle analysis-based articles of RE technologies have been published since the 1990s) had two purposes. This date range helped focus the review on the impacts of current technology used rather than on older technologies. Moreover, understanding of the impacts of RE have also evolved with time as prices of technologies have fallen, the scale of operation has enlarged, and penetration of RE has made it more or less contested due to socio-political reasons in recent years. In some cases, when recent articles were not available, search periods were extended. Thousands of articles came up in these searches, and articles were selected that reported original research that narrowed down to 20–30 articles for each dimension and numerous articles that address multiple dimensions with a total inclusion of over 200 studies in this review. Each article was analyzed to assess whether RE development aids or attenuates the affirmative and/or prohibitive principles. Articles were also distinguished based on the types of RE systems, either centralized or distributed, where scale plays a role in aiding or attenuating energy justice. Where possible and when possible depending on the availability of literature, we also tried to separate the impacts of decentralized energy systems from the impacts of centralized energy systems. However, it was always not possible due to lack of clarity in the reported research.

### *3.1. Geographic dimension of justice in renewable electricity*

A basic requirement of development is access to energy. As mentioned above, energy is instrumental for human flourishing. Energy influences many quality of life indicators, including access to drinking water, life expectancy, mortality, education, and poverty reduction [34]. A key for improving these indicators is electrification [35]. Currently, 1.2 billion people (about 17%) live without access to electricity whereas 2.7 billion cook by using the traditional biomass, which results in 3.5 million deaths due to indoor air pollution [36]. Lack of electricity has adverse impacts on socioeconomic conditions in developing countries and rural regions of developed countries highlighting the inequitable geographic distribution of energy services [37].

As mentioned above, energy poverty is intertwined with the lack of access to energy and energy services. Populations that are said to live in energy poverty are unable to maintain daily activities that require energy use. Many rural regions and developing nations live in energy poverty due to a lack of affordable energy services, lack of energy infrastructure, or both [26]. Most populations (about 95%) experiencing energy poverty live in sub-Saharan Africa and Asia, with about 80% living in rural regions [36].

Adverse impacts of living in energy poverty include health issues. Many households in developing nations and rural regions rely on renewable energy sources (i.e. biomass) for cooking, which, as noted above, has severe health implications. Problems such as respiratory infections, lung

cancer, asthma, and many others arise out the indoor biomass combustion. Many developing nations and rural regions lack access to electrification, which negatively impacts education as many children who attend primary school in these communities do not have access to electricity. Finally, energy poverty can be linked to lackluster development in these communities. Electricity is instrumental for having running water and modern sanitation, which in turn are keys to overall improved health care, high life expectancy, lower mortality, and poverty reduction. It is important to note that traditionally, overall energy consumption was directly linked to economic development. While the direct link has been refuted in relation to developed nations, there is still overwhelming evidence such a connection exists in developing nations where it further linked to reducing overall poverty level [38].

The issue of energy poverty as a function of energy access has been in the purview of several international organizations, including the United Nations, World Health Organization, and International Energy Agency. In addition, various private and public-private partnerships have been contributing to resolving the energy poverty problem. While some studies have suggested large-scale RE installations for electrification in these areas, they may not be suitable for all rural areas and developing regions hindered by a lack of electricity access [39,40,41]. A more pragmatic approach suggests utilizing RE powered mini-grids to provide lighting, heating, clean cooking, and other energy needs of local communities [42,43,44]. Smaller, decentralized RE grids can provide the optimal option for increasing energy access [45,46,47], and many feasibility studies have analyzed the use of RE systems to increase energy access and subsequent well-being in developing nations and rural regions including studies projections for future energy access [48,49,50].

Seventy percent of India's population lives in rural areas, making up twenty-five percent of the world's poor population [51]. Therefore, India serves as a preliminary case study and a major driver for energy access studies, in light of the affirmative energy justice principle [52,53]. Similar studies have been conducted in sub-Saharan African nations [54,55,56]. Additionally, several studies have been conducted assessing the progress and success of energy access initiatives in rural regions in India [57], with a majority of projects focused on solar PV RE technologies [52,58,59]. These studies provide continuing evidence in support of decentralized RE powered micro-grid systems versus large-scale RE utility projects. Specifically, rural electrification in India provides many benefits, including improved education, increased employment, improved health, and an overall reduction in poverty [60]. In studies in the African context, most researchers address optimal ways to increase energy access, through international development funds, clean energy programs, and rural electrification initiatives [48,49,61]. Within the geographical dimension, common topics include addressing energy poverty in terms of health, education, drinking water, and overall poverty.

This review found a dearth of information surrounding RE projects in the context of the geographical dimension of justice through the prohibitive principle lens. Rural communities are especially impacted by conventional energy systems, and energy planning and policy must balance the inequitable distribution of impacts and access across geographical scales. Large-scale standalone RE projects may not have the capacity to solve all rural energy scarcity problems (other than basic lighting services), as appliances and methods of heating and cooking differ from urban and rural areas, especially in energy poor remote communities [62,63,64]. Therefore, large-scale RE may have limited scope in mitigating energy poverty-related justice issues in rural and remote communities. However, smaller decentralized RE powered microgrid systems maybe provide a more appropriate solution. In addition, such projects can aid in developing communication infrastructure, commerce, health, education, and mobility in rural areas [65–72]. The affirmative principle is also addressed.

Most articles focus on rural regions in developing nations of sub-Saharan Africa and India. Researchers acknowledge RE technology's capacity to improve existing conditions of energy poverty in these regions, using indicators such as better drinking water, education, health, and reduced poverty levels. In terms of the global geography of poverty, RE development offers a key tool for addressing energy injustice by both providing energy access and mitigate the environmental harms associated with energy provision. There is a lack of research surrounding energy poverty issues and rural regions in developed nations. While this problem may not be as prominent compared to some least developed regions, it is still important to acknowledge access and affordability to energy in these regions as well.

### *3.2. Temporal dimension of justice in renewable electricity*

The prohibitive principle illustrates how transitioning to RE is justified in the face of climate change from greenhouse gas emissions, resource scarcity, pollution, increasing water stress, and how the impact on other species all of which is essential for current and future generations ability to acquire basic goods. Based on the affirmative principle, our review also included articles on the scope of RE to be able to provide for essential electricity needs for the future generations. Applying the prohibitive and affirmative principles of RE justice involved reviewing existing literature and examining the designs and structures of RE systems that can unduly interfere with future generations ability to acquire essential goods and access to energy services. It is important to recognize here that conclusive results on the capabilities or restrictions of RE to provide future generations with essential goods and services cannot be determined entirely at present time as such impacts can only be evaluated at a future date; currently we can only predict some of the temporal impacts with much certainty. Elaborating further, the current dominant energy system, which utilizes fossil fuels can negatively impact future generations' ability to obtain basic goods and services, particularly under changed climate conditions as a result of GHG emissions and depleted natural resources leading to intergenerational injustices [73,74,75]. Therefore, shifting energy production to renewable resources can significantly decrease the climate-impacting GHG emissions from power generation [76], saving future generations from the increased likelihood of catastrophic climate events. Other positive externalities of RE include the positive impacts on public health from reduced atmospheric pollution levels [77,78]. As a result of this shift, future generations can benefit from clean water and air required which are two of the essential life sustaining basic good. By reducing the climate impacts of fossil fuels, RE can significantly further energy justice potential based on prohibitive principle. When compared with fossil fuels, RE systems can be comparatively low on emissions, yet RE systems are structural realities that are becoming increasingly common; like any other system of production, RE development entails the use of nature as a source and a sink. Therefore, the energy justice potential of RE in its temporal dimension must thus be explored holistically. The cumulative effect of a large RE sector on some environmental goods and services critical to human welfare can limit future generations' ability to access basic goods. Like other energy technologies, the proliferation of RE to meet future energy demands will have GHG emissions in manufacturing, installation and operation and differ in terms of materials used in manufacturing and construction, technology, location, and climate conditions, yet such emissions are less when compared with fossil fuels.

Expansion of RE will likely increase the demand for mineral resources including gold, copper, aluminum, lithium and other metals used for manufacturing RE systems components [79–82]. The growth of the RE industry can stress readily available metal ore deposits, making metal extraction costly and energy intensive [80,83] potentially impacting the availability and affordability of these resources for other purposes in the future. Additionally, metal mining comes with a host of negative environmental externalities, which is likely to have negative intergenerational justice consequences. These impacts are less clearly defined by the scale of RE development (either large-scale centralized RE projects or a large number of decentralized RE projects) than by the material used in a specific technology and the source of that material [83].

Many energy projects require significant water resources [84]. Climate change will severely stress water resources in many parts of the world, leading to water scarcity for many communities [85,86]. This will also impact some forms of RE production as well, specifically HE [87,88]. Water use in RE projects is technology specific [89,90]. In the case of SE, water is used for cleaning dust from solar installations [91] and suppressing dust in the area surrounding a facility [89].

Water use is particularly high in certain technologies like concentrated solar power plants that require water for cooling. If wet cooling or hybrid cooling methods are used, the quantity of water utilized is often higher than in thermal coal and natural gas power plants [92–95]. However, results differ when dry-cooling technologies or synthetic nitrate in place of mined nitrates salts are used, and studies suggest that SE saves water [78,96]. Therefore, to assess the water needs of SE, the particular form and scale of the technology used are of critical consideration, with water impacts lessened in large-scale centralized projects with dry-cooling alternative methods or decentralized grid connected systems.

WE, on the other hand, has limited water needs and has a significant edge in water use when compared with conventional hydrocarbon-based electricity production. Therefore, WE can mitigate water scarcity-related problems in water-stressed areas [97–100]. HE also has a high water footprint due to the water consumed or evaporated during electricity production [101,102,103]. However, the footprint differs based on local climate differences and structural specifications of the HE facilities [104] and the ecosystem benefits of reservoir water serving multiple purposes [105].

RE developments interact with other drivers of the global environment to have intergenerational effects on water resources that are critical to sustaining human life and on landscape-level impacts such as biodiversity. Preserving biodiversity for future generations is critical due to its known and as of yet unknown benefits arising out of having a healthy and diverse gene stock [106]. Research suggests that RE developments have mixed impacts on biodiversity [107–112]. Several studies report WE projects' adverse impacts on birds and bat populations as they collide with the blades of the wind turbine [107,113–120]. Bats provide critical ecosystem services [121,122] and have a very slow rate of reproduction that limits their population recovery [123]. Some studies have suggested that offshore WE installations may be detrimental to marine ecosystems [124,125], yet further research is required for a definitive conclusion [126]. Although limited in definitive and conclusive results, some studies have also evaluated the impacts of displacement of other species from suitable habitats due to land acquisition for WE, raising concerns regarding large scale WE development [110,111,127–130].

The biodiversity impacts of SE have not been studied rigorously enough to come to definitive conclusions [110]. Yet many researchers have pointed to the environmental impacts of solar energy like altered microclimates over SE projects and land fragmentation creating barriers for free

movement of wildlife [110,131–134]. Others point to the impacts of transmission lines on biodiversity [135,136]. SE also offers opportunities for mixed land use through agro voltaic development, where land is used for both energy and agricultural purposes [137].

In the case of HE, river flows are critical to ecosystems [138], and any alterations of the river flow can impact aquatic ecosystems [139]. Like other forms of RE, studies have identified different negative biodiversity impacts of large HE projects [140–143]. Therefore, the scale of the dams and their impacts on local ecosystems being prominent elements for consideration of the justice dimensions of HE development [144,145,146]. On the other hand, small HE projects can be operated without large dams and their subsequent negative ecological impacts, yet considerable research is required to understand the true ecological impacts of a large number of small HE projects required to meet energy demands adequately [147,148].

To explore the affirmative principle of energy justice in the temporal dimension, we analyzed how RE can meet essential electricity requirements of the future generation. In 2030, the projected end-use energy demand worldwide would be 17 trillion watts (TW) [149]. Researchers project that the large-scale expansion of wind, hydro, and solar energy technologies required to meet the future energy demand worldwide is possible economically and technologically but would require social and political impetus [6,7,8].

Therefore, our review and analysis regarding whether the RE projects aid or attenuate the prohibitive principle of energy justice in the temporal dimension found RE has many positive externalities furthers the prohibitive principle., i.e. RE on in the temporal dimension has the potential to drastically reduce the negative impacts currently experienced by conventional energy systems. This will allow populations to obtain goods and services with decreased harm caused by shifting to RE systems. However, the overall beneficial effect is partially offset by a few major negative externalities. Although these negative externalities may be of less consequence when compared with the impacts of negative externalities of fossil fuels, exploring alternative options to reduce these negative externalities should be a priority for socially just RE transition. Not surprisingly, recent research has moved in this direction, aiming to find technological options that can counterbalance some of the negative impacts. For example, constructing solar PV modules on agricultural land where shade adapted crops are cultivated can maximize land use and reduce competition for land [150,151,152]. In addition, covering HE reservoirs with floating photovoltaic (PV) arrays reduces water loss from evaporation and overheating of the PV cells [153]. Through the affirmative principle lens, RE projects increase access to energy based on the nature of these systems: utilizing renewable resources. Future generations must have the ability to obtain basic goods and services. Through a continued reliance on non-renewable resources, these future generations ability to obtain goods and services may be jeopardized. Research also suggests that altering wind turbine speed with marginal annual power loss can have significant impact in reducing bat mortality in nighttime operations [154,155]. Other researchers have found that altering colors of the wind turbine [156], type of turbine used, the location of the wind farm [157] matter in increasing the negative impacts of WE on ecological systems. At best, the energy justice potential of RE in temporal dimensions is work-in-progress and coming to definitive conclusions requires further research and many of negative externalities can be solved with proper planning, implementation, and management.

### 3.3. Technological dimension of justice in renewable electricity

The technological dimension of energy justice highlights inequities stemming from safety, reliability, security, and vulnerability shortcomings ingrained in certain energy technologies. Significant technological innovations are constantly advancing to allow for further exploration, mining, and extraction of existing energy sources to meet growing energy demands. The quest for meeting these demands resulted in the creation of the largest machine, the U.S. electrical grid [158]. This is a centralized fossil fuel-powered system that aims to provide affordable and reliable energy. This system also produces many negative externalities, including but not limited to pollution, land degradation, health effects, and climate change impacts [159,160], impacting its safety and reliability. Most national economies rely on the centralized fossil fuel-based electrical grid to provide essential energy services. Therefore due to its interconnected nature, an electrical grid failure has the potential to impair economic and social functions in the event of a power outage [161,162,163]. Therefore, secure and reliable electricity supply is called into question. This section focuses on how existing studies and projects utilizing RE technologies have addressed the safety, security, reliability, and vulnerability of RE technologies using the prohibitive and affirmative energy justice lens.

As mentioned above, a significant negative externality associated with traditional energy technologies comes in the form of GHG emissions. While fossil fuel power plants produce GHG emissions throughout the entire lifecycle of the technology (extraction of resource to combustion of fuel), emissions related to RE technology are limited to the manufacturing, installation, and maintenance stages [164]. Additionally, externalities differ for each RE technology. For example, HE results in habitat disruption and microclimate changes. WE include noise pollution, land aesthetic impacts, and avian and bat mortality. SE can require a significant amount of land. However, most negative externalities associated with RE technologies can be mitigated [165]. Alternatively, RE technology benefits tend to outweigh the burdens. RE technologies generally do not produce emissions through operation and use, resulting in overall decreased GHG emissions. Global welfare and increased employment are found to correlate with increased adoption of RE technologies. Some studies have shown that the RE development has a more significant positive effect when the technology is produced locally [166].

Scholars and technical experts agree that the continued use of fossil fuel energy technologies is no longer necessary to meet society's electrical needs because of advances in renewable energy source technologies [42,167,168]. Most RE technologies produce no emissions during use and have a well-established ecological balance sheet [169–171]. The technical community also supports a direct solution to address the technical vulnerability of the electrical grid: distributed generation and microgrids [172,173,174]. Based on this, this review aims to determine how RE technology addresses emission reduction (safety), reliability and efficient energy operations, and decreased vulnerabilities to energy generation.

Many technical and feasibility studies have analyzed the use of RE technologies that can replace fossil fuels through the prohibitive justice lens. Several articles review a decentralized RE system approach [175,176,177]. These reviews consider utilizing RE technology as a cost-competitive alternative to centralized generation technologies through off-grid or micro-grid systems power by renewables, yet there is often no mention of utilizing a decentralized RE technology as a security and reliability measure. Most original research articles gear towards RE technology development design and measure optimal RE technology installations that function to reduce costs along with decrease

emissions as a matter of public health [178,179]. Therefore, the safety component is addressed. However, the majority of research focused on the context of core nations considers RE technologies at a centralized, the utility scale, to ultimately shift away from traditional fossil fuel based energy sources but not to change the scale of energy technology development [180,181]. Some research uses applications and models to project and understand how policies work in conjunction with advancing technologies to influence the diffusion of renewables at the centralized level [41,182–185]. Few look at RE technology applications in both the centralized and decentralized designs [186,187], yet these findings conclude that decentralized RE technology designs can be integrated into the grid with optimal policies and communication systems.

While both fossil fuel based and RE technologies produce GHG emissions in their lifecycle, RE technology and infrastructure can decrease GHG emissions and consequential adverse health impacts, and some existing studies do examine the technological dimensions of RE that contribute to its energy justice contribution through the prohibitive justice lens [39,41,175,186,188,189]. These researchers acknowledge the detrimental impacts of current energy technologies on the environment and human health and that RE technologies pose a viable solution to address mitigation and reduction in harm to health from fossil fuel based energy technologies.

This analysis suggests that there is currently a narrow discussion and study of RE technologies through the prohibitive lens in existing research and policy scholarship; i.e. the ability of RE to provide safe, efficient, reliable and non-vulnerable electricity. Only a handful of articles mention RE technology through prohibitive energy justice lens, and those that do acknowledge RE technology's capacity to provide safe power: reduced GHG emission that present harm to humans. This suggests an area for further research into other technological dimensions of RE that relate to energy justice, including the capacity of RE to change the influence of vulnerability on the existing electrical grid, the impacts on land use through the prohibitive lens, and to ultimately provide an understanding of RE technologies viability as an efficient, safe, and reliable energy source. The affirmative principle potential of current RE technological remains inconclusive. Authors address RE technological systems as they relate climate related impacts through GHG and in terms of issues of scale. However, there is much room left for discussing issues of safety, security, vulnerability, and reliability as they relate to RE technological capacity in providing access to energy.

### *3.4. Economic dimension of justice in renewable electricity*

Cheap and abundant energy generated from fossil fuel resources is often linked to the rapid increase of economic prosperity witnessed in the last three centuries [190,191]. Energy is necessary for human beings to access goods and services to which they are justly entitled. Yet in many parts of the world including developed nations and more so globally peripheral countries, energy deprivation arising out of affordability and access inequalities challenges human flourishing [192,193,194]. Energy poverty can contribute to or aggravate income poverty, time poverty, and can curtail social progress [195,196,197]. Moreover, energy generation and distribution fall under the primary economic activities of a nation and most fossil fuel energy production systems are owned and operated by a small number of citizens in any country who disproportionately enjoy most of the profits of the sector [1]. To assess how RE projects follow the prohibitive and affirmative principle in the economic dimension, this section focuses on assessing existing scholarship regarding how RE development has addressed and can address energy poverty and deprivation issues resulting from

expensive electricity prices and how diversifying energy portfolios has affected energy affordability.

Energy poverty arises when people are unable to maintain or sustain their socially and materially essential and customary daily activities due to lack of energy [30]. This can occur due to a lack of affordable energy (fuel poverty) or access to energy infrastructure (energy poverty) [30], or a combination of both [26]. One way of solving energy poverty problems is through large-scale RE projects to diversify national energy portfolios so that energy infrastructure is accessible to all. One way of doing so is to construct large-scale RE projects must be in areas that would benefit from low-cost access to the grid or low initial costs of construction, transmission, and distribution. Historically, to be cost-competitive with conventional forms of electricity production, such projects were made possible by government subsidies, making them hard to implement in poor countries [39,40,62,198,199]. However, some studies have pointed out that large-scale stand-alone RE projects may not have the capacity to solve all rural energy scarcity problems (other than basic lighting services) as appliances and methods of heating and cooking differ from urban and rural communities [62–65]. This problem can be solved to a large extent by household, community-level, and other distributed RE projects in such a way that energy services are delivered to fulfill local needs [65–70,200].

Many technical and feasibility studies have analyzed cost-competitiveness (vis-à-vis centralized systems) of decentralized WE [40,200], SE [59,200,201], micro HE [59,202], and hybrid renewable energy systems [47,203,204,205]. Several studies identified numerous obstacles in enabling RE to solve energy poverty. Some suggest that the cost of RE systems is the principal impediment to adoption at the household or community-levels [206,207]. Others suggest lack of awareness, change-adverse consumer behavior, market failures, technical and institutional problems and regulatory support as the main barriers [22,207–215]. Community characteristics and the entrepreneurial abilities of community members can also slow down RE uptake where richer and more well-connected communities can opt for renewable energy technologies than poorer communities [216–219]. These limiting factors may not be inherent in the technology itself, but demonstrate that considering technologies in terms of their justice impacts requires attention to the social and situational contexts in which technologies are developed.

Apart from addressing energy poverty related to physical access, RE should also be assessed in terms of its impact on electricity prices or fuel poverty, which determine the extent to which a person can access energy services. Some authors have pointed out that currently producing electricity from RE resources is not always cost effective and in some cases it raises electricity prices, making energy access unaffordable to the economically marginalized [220–225]. This, in turn, affects the rate of RE adoption [210], as well as the preferences for adopting particular RE technologies [226]. The cost of RE is often disproportionately borne by residential, commercial, and small-scale industrial consumers rather than energy-intensive industries [227] as the former are often unable to retrofit with energy efficient appliances [228]. In addition, several studies also have shown that people with higher income are willing to pay more for RE [229,230,231]. Therefore, fuel poverty arising from affordability-related issues remains a concern worldwide, as large income inequalities exist both in developed and peripheral nations [231]. Others have refuted the claim that RE development results in electricity price increases [232] or have proposed that greater policy involvement is required to align demand and supply, hence stabilizing prices [233,234]. Therefore, there is considerable debate in how switching to RE affects energy affordability issues in the short and long run and policy contexts matter in recognizing the energy needs of different segments of society.

This analysis suggests that although there are multiple opportunities in RE development to attain energy justice potential in the economic dimension, much attention is needed to develop the social, political, and economic contexts in which these technologies are embedded to develop economically just RE systems. Some authors address the prohibitive principle by considering RE system pricing impacts on adoption levels. Additionally, researchers address the potential for disproportionate RE adoption to impact pricing for other consumers negatively. However, there is still room to explore the negative economic impacts of RE systems fully. The affirmative principle is highly prevalent as many authors discuss energy and fuel poverty. While RE is seen as a solution to mitigating these issues that are currently experienced due to fossil fuel powered energy systems, there is still need to explore how RE may function to perpetuate energy and fuel poverty issues. The potential for RE to increase access to energy services depends on the political, technological, and geographical elements involved in development, and the potential for RE to increase economic affordability of energy services is largely depended on the existing economic and policy contexts that shape the organization of energy systems and resultant energy pricing [235,236]. In other words, RE technology may not inherently cause an increase in energy prices making energy unaffordable; rather it is largely about the how the energy market operates. Therefore, without significant changes in the social and political setup within which energy markets operate, the energy justice potential of RE in facilitating energy access and affordability in the economic dimensions remains inconclusive.

### *3.5. Sociopolitical dimension of justice in renewable electricity*

The growth of the RE sector is contingent upon the construction of associated infrastructure. RE also requires significant research and development investment. Energy infrastructure development is a high-cost enterprise, making it susceptible to a variety of risks [1]. Profit maximization motives underlining such significant investments require being protected from shocks external to the system like sociopolitical upheavals based on resistance to such developments. Such resistances can result in political suppression and persecution, as well as human rights abuses. Just energy systems can create avenues where such problems are minimized—when inclusive processes or procedural justice enable democratic participation resulting in coexistence of profit maximization and equitable distribution of benefits. Therefore, this review examines existing research to assess how RE systems are addressing or failing to address the prohibitive and affirmative principle in the sociopolitical dimension of energy justice.

Scholars have pointed out that transitioning from high energy density fossil fuels to low energy density RE technologies requires a lot of land, which may result in struggles for land rights [237,238,239]. Using case studies, some scholars point out that such property transfers to often large and foreign investors for utility scale RE development deliver no or little benefit to local communities [198,199,240]. Meanwhile, these communities have strong cultural, economic and environmental ties to their land. The distribution of benefits from RE development based solely on the socio-politics of land ownership and access can even lead to social and economic marginalization [240,241,242]. Such impacts can unjustly restrict people from acquiring goods and services falling under their rightful entitlements. Popular discourses of environmental benefits of RE can snub the voices of the rural periphery where land is cheap for constructing RE projects [241]. Several marine renewable energy projects have also limited the access rights of coastal and indigenous communities in different countries dependent on the marine resources [243]. There are

also instances where renewable industry lobbies have strongly impacted energy policies [244], which may not always favor all stakeholders [245]. Therefore, these cases show that if not properly implemented, RE projects can create injustices based on the prohibitive principles at times working at the interest of large corporations.

However, some studies have found that alternative models like community-based RE projects can mitigate these concerns and, thus, help to facilitate just energy transitions. It is possible where organizational structures allow for non-constrained participation of local community members in RE projects and who can enjoy all the benefits of the projects whilst navigating the risks with the use of local knowledge [246,247]. Community scale RE projects has wider local sociopolitical support and participation. This attributed to local distribution of project benefits, more stringent protection of local natural resources, as well as elevated community spirit and community identity and stakeholder agreeing to projects that are inclusive and follow democratic decision-making processes [230,248–255]. Though these results are encouraging, the existing institutional and organizational barriers continue to pose concern regarding the increase in public participation in RE projects [256–260]. These studies show that community owned and operated energy generation by default may not ensure community participation and how energy projects construction and design can prohibit people's ability to access basic goods and services may largely depend on how the projects are organized and developed.

What emerges from the above discussion is that although large-scale RE projects can lead to sociopolitical injustices especially regarding land rights, smaller-scale RE development such as community energy projects can further the prohibitive principle by virtue of inclusive participation, collective ownership, and community empowerment. In other words, the prohibitive principle is addressed to the extent that RE systems potentially cause negative sociopolitical impacts through land use disputes. The affirmative principle is not discussed in this dimension. This dimension leaves space for further exploration into how RE can either improve or decline the quality of participation, ownership, social stratification, and community empowerment. These represent only a handful of factors surrounding RE ability to impact access to basic goods and services. Therefore, the scale of development matters significantly more than the particular technology for promoting sociopolitical energy justice. The advantage of RE technology is the ability to develop projects at local scales and to shift ownership models to promote participation and community benefit sharing. These benefits are themselves based on the technological aspects of RE, which allow for such flexibility in the scales of development [261].

#### **4. Conclusion**

Ethical issues of justice are central to understanding energy choices and energy impacts. The current generation of humans living on the earth arguably has an obligation to overhaul ways and means of producing energy to alternative low-carbon emitting resources to benefit future generations who do not yet exist [28]. Further, social and economic systems are based on energy systems, and renewable electricity can create new opportunities but also jeopardizes existing stabilized systems. Yet these ethical considerations fail to provide a systematic lens for conceptualizing and evaluating the justice components of energy systems in terms of decision making, access, and impacts; these are the purview of energy justice.

Review of existing work on renewable electricity technology development illustrates that

energy injustices spanning temporal, economic, sociopolitical, geographic, and technological dimensions are all apparent in the context RE development and use. However, despite the numerous studies that point to dimensions of energy justice in RE development, very few of these studies are explicitly framed in terms of energy justice. Yet studies often offer evaluative conclusions including recommendations for policy or future research. This work would arguably benefit from an explicit grounding in energy justice concepts and systematic use of an energy justice framework to frame analysis and anchor recommendations. There are multiple tradeoffs to consider when ensuring justice, but in general terms, energy system planning and policies can be formulated to aid in solving persistent problems like social inequality, marginalization, and environmental damage rather than perpetuating them. This review aims to identify how the dimensions of energy justice are discussed in terms of RE; future research must grapple with the tradeoffs among impacts across dimensions.

Further, the review illustrates that some components of RE development that are arguably essential to realizing its justice potential are relatively absent in the literature. Specifically, in the technological dimension, the safety and reliability benefit of distributed RE technology is overlooked, indicating a possible avenue for a productive research agenda in the future. Utilization of an energy justice framework can help identify gaps in the literature and potential research silos in which key questions are not yet being asked, and significant impacts of RE development are not yet being explored.

Review of existing scholarship RE demonstrates that, apart from the intergenerational climate change benefits, other dimensions of energy justice are not inherent to RE. Rather than being inherent in the technology itself, many of the justice implications of RE technology development are related to choices regarding the technology, including choices regarding scale, locational siting, and organization of ownership. In general, RE development that involve distributed rather than centralized technologies, are sited to avoid ecologically or culturally significant landscapes, and are designed with community involvement is more likely to have positive implications for energy justice. One specific consideration is the impact of electricity technology on water resources; water is extremely vital, given the inevitable future of water scarcity due to climate change, so water intensive RE development is likely to create temporal injustice.

The energy justice framework used herein provides a valuable tool for assessing the justice implications of electricity choices. One potential weakness in the use of dimensions as an organizational tool is that they necessarily involve some overlap and some ambiguity in demarcation; the dimensions are not isolated in reality and thus cannot be entirely isolated in conceptualization and application. However, areas of overlap can provide for fruitful consideration of intersecting impacts or social intersectionalities across dimensions that deserve particular attention. While there are certainly other ways of conceptualizing energy justice [262,263], the framework used here provides a concrete tool for assessing both the energy justice potentials of technology and the avenues available for future research given gaps in how these potentials are articulated in the literature. As this review demonstrates, particular technological choices do not inherently align with specific justice implications and there is still more work to be done to understand regarding the energy justice potential of renewable energy technologies.

### **Conflict of Interest**

All of the authors declare no conflicts of interest in this paper.

## References

1. Sovacool BK, Sidortsov RV, Jones BR (2014) Energy security, equality and justice. Oxon, New York: Routledge.
2. Andres RJ, Fielding DJ, Marland G, et al. (1999) Carbon dioxide emissions from fossil - fuel use, 1751–1950. *Tellus B* 51: 759-765.
3. Höök M, Tang X (2013) Depletion of fossil fuels and anthropogenic climate change—A review. *Energy Policy* 52: 797-809.
4. BNEF (2016) New Energy Outlook 2016: Powering a Changing World. Available from: <https://www.bloomberg.com/company/new-energy-outlook/#overview>
5. REN21 (2016) Renewables 2016 Global Status Report, Paris: REN21 Secretariat.
6. Delucchi MA, Jacobson MZ (2011) Providing all global energy with wind, water, and solar power, Part II: Reliability, system and transmission costs, and policies. *Energy Policy* 39: 1170-1190.
7. Jacobson MZ, Delucchi MA (2011) Providing all global energy with wind, water, and solar power, Part I: Technologies, energy resources, quantities and areas of infrastructure, and materials. *Energy Policy* 39: 1154-1169.
8. Rockström J, Gaffney O, Rogelj J, et al. (2017) A roadmap for rapid decarbonization. *Science* 355(6331): 1269-1271.
9. Devine - Wright P (2005) Beyond NIMBYism: towards an integrated framework for understanding public perceptions of wind energy. *Wind Energy* 8(2): 125-139.
10. Wüstenhagen R, Wolsink M, Bürer MJ (2007) Social acceptance of renewable energy innovation: An introduction to the concept. *Energy Policy* 35(5): 2683-2691.
11. Pasqualetti MJ (2004) Wind power: obstacles and opportunities. *Environ Sci Policy Sust Dev* 46(7): 22-38.
12. Banerjee A, Schelly C, Halvorsen KE (2017) Understanding public perceptions of wood-based electricity production in Wisconsin, United States: the place-based dynamics of social representations. *Environ Soc*, 1-13.
13. Bertsch V, Hall M, Weinhardt C, et al. (2016) Public acceptance and preferences related to renewable energy and grid expansion policy: Empirical insights for Germany. *Energy* 114: 465-477.
14. Ansolabehere S, Konisky DM (2009) Public attitudes toward construction of new power plants. *Public Opin Q* 73(3): 566-577.
15. McRobert D, Tennent-Riddell J, Walker C (2016) Ontario's Green Economy and Green Energy Act: Why a Well-Intentioned Law is Mired in Controversy and Opposed by Rural Communities. *Renew Energ Law Policy Rev* 7(2): 91.
16. Batel S, Devine-Wright P, Tangeland T (2013) Social acceptance of low carbon energy and associated infrastructures: A critical discussion. *Energy Policy* 58: 1-5.
17. Gross C (2007) Community perspectives of wind energy in Australia: The application of a justice and community fairness framework to increase social acceptance. *Energy Policy* 35(5): 2727-2736.
18. Brady MJ, Monani S (2012) Wind power! Marketing renewable energy on tribal lands and the struggle for just sustainability. *Local Env* 17(2): 147-166.

19. Cowell R, Bristow G, Munday M (2011) Acceptance, acceptability and environmental justice: the role of community benefits in wind energy development. *J Environ Plan Manage* 54(4): 539-557.
20. Cecelski E, Unit AAE (2000) Enabling equitable access to rural electrification: current thinking and major activities in energy, poverty and gender. *World Dev Rep* 1: 2-3.
21. Urpelainen J (2016) Energy poverty and perceptions of solar power in marginalized communities: Survey evidence from Uttar Pradesh, India. *Renew Energy* 85: 534-539.
22. Yadoo A, Cruickshank H (2012) The role for low carbon electrification technologies in poverty reduction and climate change strategies: A focus on renewable energy mini-grids with case studies in Nepal, Peru and Kenya. *Energy Policy* 42: 591-602.
23. Hess CEE, Ribeiro WC (2016) Energy and Environmental Justice: Closing the Gap. *Environ Justice* 9(5):153-158.
24. Yenneti K, Day R (2015) Procedural (in) justice in the implementation of solar energy: The case of Charanaka solar park, Gujarat, India. *Energy Policy* 86: 664-673.
25. Wolsink M (2013) Fair distribution of power generating capacity: justice, microgrids and utilizing the common pool of renewable energy. In K. Bickerstaff, G. Walker, & H. Bulkeley (Eds.), *Energy justice in a changing climate: social equity and low carbon energy*. (Just sustainabilities: policy, planning and practice; No. 2). London: Zed Books, 116-138.
26. Day R, Walker G, Simcock N (2016) Conceptualising energy use and energy poverty using a capabilities framework. *Energy Policy* 93: 255-264.
27. Sovacool BK, Dworkin MH (2015) Energy justice: Conceptual insights and practical applications. *Appl Energy* 142: 435-444.
28. Van der Horst D (2014) Climate policy and the siting of renewable energy projects: towards common but differentiated responsibility at the community level. *People Place Policy* 8(3): 222-234.
29. Walker G, Day R (2012) Fuel poverty as injustice: Integrating distribution, recognition and procedure in the struggle for affordable warmth. *Energy Policy* 49: 69-75.
30. Bouzarovski S, Petrova S (2015) A global perspective on domestic energy deprivation: Overcoming the energy poverty–fuel poverty binary. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 10: 31-40.
31. McCauley DA, Heffron RJ, Stephan H, et al. (2013) Advancing energy justice: The triumvirate of tenets. *Int Energy Law Rev* 32(3): 107-110.
32. Heffron RJ, McCauley D (2014) Achieving sustainable supply chains through energy justice. *Appl Energy* 123: 435-437.
33. Sovacool BK, Dworkin MH (2014) *Global Energy Justice*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
34. Kanagawa M, Nakata T (2007) Analysis of the energy access improvement and its socio-economic impacts in rural areas of developing countries. *Ecol Econ* 62(2): 319-329.
35. Pasten C, Santamarina JC (2012) Energy and quality of life. *Energy Policy* 49: 468-476.
36. <https://www.iea.org/topics/energypoverty/>
37. Davis SJ, Caldeira K, Matthews HD (2010) Future CO2 emissions and climate change from existing energy infrastructure. *Science* 329(5997): 1330-1333.
38. Jorgenson DW, Daniel TS (2004) Measuring social welfare in the US national accounts. In *Measuring Economic Sustainability and Progress*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 43-88.

39. Mondal MAH, Kamp LM, Pachova NI (2010) Drivers, barriers, and strategies for implementation of renewable energy technologies in rural areas in Bangladesh—An innovation system analysis. *Energy Policy* 38(8): 4626-4634.
40. Deichmann U, Meisner C, Murray S, et al. (2011) The economics of renewable energy expansion in rural Sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy Policy* 39(1): 215-227.
41. Shen YC, Lin GT, Li KP, et al. (2010) An assessment of exploiting renewable energy sources with concerns of policy and technology. *Energy Policy* 38(8): 4604-4616.
42. Pearce JM (2002) Photovoltaics—a path to sustainable futures. *Futures* 34(7): 663-674.
43. Zelenika I, Pearce JM (2011) Barriers to appropriate technology growth in sustainable development. *J Sust Dev* 4(6): 12.
44. Schelly C, Banerjee A (2016) Soft Energy Paths Revisited: Politics and Practice in Energy Technology Transitions. *Challenges* 7(2): 16.
45. Khandker SR, Samad HA, Ali R, et al. (2012) Who benefits most from rural electrification? Evidence in India. Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington, USA.
46. Dinkelman T (2011) The effects of rural electrification on employment: New evidence from South Africa. *Am Econ Rev* 101(7): 3078-3108.
47. Kanase-Patil AB, Saini RP, Sharma MP (2010) Integrated renewable energy systems for off grid rural electrification of remote area. *Renew Energy* 35(6): 1342-1349.
48. Brew-Hammond A (2010) Energy access in Africa: Challenges ahead. *Energy Policy* 38(5): 2291-2301.
49. Sokona Y, Mulugetta Y, Gujba H (2012) Widening energy access in Africa: Towards energy transition. *Energy Policy* 47: 3-10.
50. Bazilian M, Nussbaumer P, Rogner HH, et al. (2012). Energy access scenarios to 2030 for the power sector in sub-Saharan Africa. *Utilities Policy* 20(1): 1-16.
51. Cust J, Singh A, Neuhoff K (2007) Rural electrification in India: Economic and institutional aspects of renewables. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.17863/CAM.5167>
52. Chaurey A, Kandpal TC (2010) Assessment and evaluation of PV based decentralized rural electrification: An overview. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 14(8): 2266-2278.
53. Palit D, Chaurey A (2011) Off-grid rural electrification experiences from South Asia: Status and best practices. *Energy Sust Dev* 15(3): 266-276.
54. Dasappa S (2011) Potential of biomass energy for electricity generation in sub-Saharan Africa. *Energy Sust Dev* 15(3): 203-213.
55. Bazilian M, Sagar A, Detchon R, et al. (2010) More heat and light. *Energy Policy* 38(10): 5409-5412.
56. Suberu MY, Mustafa MW, Bashir N, et al. (2013) Power sector renewable energy integration for expanding access to electricity in sub-Saharan Africa. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 25: 630-642.
57. Bhattacharyya SC (2013) Financing energy access and off-grid electrification: A review of status, options and challenges. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 20: 462-472.
58. Palit D (2013) Solar energy programs for rural electrification: Experiences and lessons from South Asia. *Energy Sust Dev* 17(3): 270-279.
59. Kamalapur GD, Udaykumar RY (2011) Rural electrification in India and feasibility of photovoltaic solar home systems. *Int J Elect Power Energy Syst* 33(3): 594-599.

60. Khandker SR, Samad HA, Ali R, et al. (2012) Who benefits most from rural electrification? Evidence in India. Paper prepared for presentation at the Agricultural & Applied Economics Association Annual Meeting, Seattle, Washington.
61. Pegels A (2010) Renewable energy in South Africa: Potentials, barriers and options for support. *Energy Policy* 38(9): 4945-4954.
62. Tucho GT, Weesie PD, Nonhebel S (2014) Assessment of renewable energy resources potential for large scale and standalone applications in Ethiopia. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 40: 422-431.
63. Szabó S, Bódis K, Huld T, et al. (2013) Sustainable energy planning: Leapfrogging the energy poverty gap in Africa. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 28: 500-509.
64. Katsoulakos N (2011) Combating energy poverty in mountainous areas through energy-saving interventions: Insights from Metsovo, Greece. *Mt Res Dev* 31(4): 284-292.
65. Borhanazad H, Mekhilef S, Saidur R, et al. (2013) Potential application of renewable energy for rural electrification in Malaysia. *Renew Energy* 59: 210-219.
66. Walker G, Cass N (2007) Carbon reduction, “the public” and renewable energy: engaging with socio - technical configurations. *Area* 39(4): 458-469.
67. Alanne K, Saari A (2006) Distributed energy generation and sustainable development. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 10(6): 539-558.
68. Bull SR (2001) Renewable energy today and tomorrow. *P IEEE* 89(8): 1216-1226.
69. Cabraal RA, Barnes DF, Agarwal SG (2005) Productive uses of energy for rural development. *Annu Rev Environ Resour* 30: 117-144.
70. Kaygusuz K (2011) Energy services and energy poverty for sustainable rural development. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 15(2): 936-947.
71. Nguyen KQ (2007) Alternatives to grid extension for rural electrification: Decentralized renewable energy technologies in Vietnam. *Energy Policy* 35(4): 2579-2589.
72. Martinot E, Chaurey A, Lew D, et al. (2002) Renewable energy markets in developing countries. *Ann Rev Ener Eenvt* 27(1): 309-348.
73. Page E (1999) Intergenerational justice and climate change. *Polit Stud* 47(1): 53-66.
74. Hansen J, Kharecha P, Sato M, et al. (2013) Assessing “dangerous climate change”: required reduction of carbon emissions to protect young people, future generations and nature. *PloS one* 8(12): e81648.
75. Fischer G, Shah MM, Van Velthuisen HT (2002) *Climate change and agricultural vulnerability*. International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis (IIASA), Laxenburg, Austria.
76. Intergovernmental Panel for climate Change (2011) IPCC special report on renewable energy sources and climate change mitigation. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
77. McCubbin D, Sovacool BK (2013) Quantifying the health and environmental benefits of wind power to natural gas. *Energy Policy* 53: 429-441.
78. Wisser R, Barbose G, Heeter J, et al. (2016) A retrospective analysis of the benefits and impacts of US renewable portfolio standards. Report No: LBNL-1003961.
79. Gong J, Darling SB, You F (2015). Perovskite photovoltaics: life-cycle assessment of energy and environmental impacts. *Energy Environ Sci* 8(7): 1953-1968.
80. Kleijn R, Van der Voet E (2010) Resource constraints in a hydrogen economy based on renewable energy sources: An exploration. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 14(9): 2784-2795.
81. Kleijn R, Van der Voet E, Kramer GJ, et al. (2011) Metal requirements of low-carbon power generation. *Energy* 36(9): 5640-5648.

82. Schleisner L (2000) Life cycle assessment of a wind farm and related externalities. *Renew Energy* 20(3): 279-288.
83. Harmsen JHM, Roes AL, Patel MK (2013) The impact of copper scarcity on the efficiency of 2050 global renewable energy scenarios. *Energy* 50: 62-73.
84. Carrillo AMR, Frei C (2009) Water: A key resource in energy production. *Energy Policy* 37(11): 4303-4312.
85. Alcamo J, Flörke M, Märker M (2007) Future long-term changes in global water resources driven by socio-economic and climatic changes. *Hydrolog Sci J* 52(2): 247-275.
86. Arnell N, Liu C (2001) Hydrology and water resources. In: *Climate Change 2001, Impacts, Adaptation, and Vulnerability*. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
87. Barnett T, Malone R, Pennell W, et al. (2004) The effects of climate change on water resources in the west: introduction and overview. *Clim Change* 62(1): 1-11.
88. Vicuna S, Dracup JA (2007) The evolution of climate change impact studies on hydrology and water resources in California. *Clim Change* 82(3): 327-350.
89. Fthenakis V, Kim HC (2010) Life-cycle uses of water in U.S. electricity generation. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 14(7): 2039-2048.
90. Hernandez RR, Easter SB, Murphy-Mariscal ML, et al. (2014) Environmental impacts of utility-scale solar energy. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 29: 766-779.
91. Mani M, Pillai R (2010) Impact of dust on solar photovoltaic (PV) performance: Research status, challenges and recommendations. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 14(9): 3124-3131.
92. Bracken N, Macknick J, Tovar-Hastings A, et al. (2015) Concentrating solar power and water issues in the u.s. southwest. (Report No. NREL/TP-6A50-61376). National Renewable Energy Laboratory (NREL), Golden.
93. Bukhary S, Chen C, Ahmad S (2016) Analysis of Water Availability and Use for Solar Power Production in Nevada. In: *World Environ Water Resour Congress*, 164-173.
94. Carter NT, Campbell RJ (2009) *Water issues of concentrating solar power (CSP) electricity in the US Southwest*. Congressional Research Service, Library of Congress.
95. Schwartz C (2011) Concentrated thermal solar power and the value of water for electricity. In: Kennedy DS, Wilkinson R, editors. *The water-energy nexus in the American West*. Massachusetts, USA: Edward Elgar Publishing: 71-83.
96. Burkhardt III JJ, Heath GA, Turchi CS (2011) Life cycle assessment of a parabolic trough concentrating solar power plant and the impacts of key design alternatives. *Environ Sci Technol* 45(6): 2457-2464
97. Clarke S (2003) Electricity generation using small wind turbines at your home or farm. Queen's Printer for Ontario.
98. NDRC (the National Development and Reform Commission). Available from: [http://en.ndrc.gov.cn/newsrelease/t20090521\\_280382.htm](http://en.ndrc.gov.cn/newsrelease/t20090521_280382.htm); May 2009.
99. Ma Z, Xue B, Geng Y, et al. (2013) Co-benefits analysis on climate change and environmental effects of wind-power: A case study from Xinjiang, China. *Renew Energy* 57: 35-42.
100. Li X, Feng K, Siu YL, et al. (2012) Energy-water nexus of wind power in China: the balancing act between CO<sub>2</sub> emissions and water consumption. *Energy Policy* 45: 440-448.

101. Gerbens-Leenes PW, Hoekstra AY, Van der Meer T (2009) The water footprint of energy from biomass: A quantitative assessment and consequences of an increasing share of bio-energy in energy supply. *Ecol Econ* 68(4): 1052-1060.
102. Mekonnen MM, Hoekstra AY (2012) The blue water footprint of electricity from hydropower. *Hydrol Earth Syst Sc* 16: 179-187.
103. Liu J, Zhao D, Gerbens-Leenes PW, et al. (2015) China's rising hydropower demand challenges water sector. *Sci Rep* 5. Available from: <https://www.nature.com/articles/srep11446>
104. Herath I, Deurer M, Horne D, et al. (2011) The water footprint of hydroelectricity: a methodological comparison from a case study in New Zealand. *J Clean Prod* 19(14): 1582-1589.
105. Zhao D, Liu J (2015) A new approach to assessing the water footprint of hydroelectric power based on allocation of water footprints among reservoir ecosystem services. *Phys Chem Earth Parts A/B/C* 79: 40-46.
106. Tacconi L, Bennett J (1995) Economic implications of intergenerational equity for biodiversity conservation. *Ecol Econ* 12(3): 209-223.
107. Arnett EB, Brown WK, Erickson WP, et al. (2008) Patterns of bat fatalities at wind energy facilities in North America. *J Wildl Manag* 72(1): 61-78.
108. Arnett EB, Baerwald EF (2013) Impacts of wind energy development on bats: implications for conservation. In: *Bat evolution, ecology, and conservation*, New York: Springer, 453-456.
109. Kiesecker JM, Evans JS, Fargione J, et al. (2011) Win-win for wind and wildlife: a vision to facilitate sustainable development. *PLoS One* 6(4): e17566.
110. Lovich JE, Ennen JR (2011) Wildlife conservation and solar energy development in the desert southwest, United States. *BioScience* 61(12): 982-992.
111. Pearce-Higgins JW, Stephen L, Douse A, et al. (2012) Greater impacts of wind farms on bird populations during construction than subsequent operation: results of a multi - site and multi - species analysis. *J Appl Ecol* 49(2): 386-394.
112. Santangeli A, Di Minin E, Toivonen T, et al. (2016) Synergies and trade - offs between renewable energy expansion and biodiversity conservation - a cross - national multi - factor analysis. *GCB Bioenergy* 8(6): 1191-1200.
113. Barclay RM, Baerwald EF, Gruver JC (2007) Variation in bat and bird fatalities at wind energy facilities: assessing the effects of rotor size and tower height. *Can J Zool* 85(3): 381-387.
114. Kunz TH, Arnett EB, Erickson WP, et al. (2007) Ecological impacts of wind energy development on bats: questions, research needs, and hypotheses. *Front Ecol Environ* 5(6): 315-324.
115. Baerwald EF, Barclay RM (2009) Geographic variation in activity and fatality of migratory bats at wind energy facilities. *J Mammal* 90(6): 1341-1349.
116. Hayes MA (2013) Bats killed in large numbers at United States wind energy facilities. *BioScience* 63(12): 975-979.
117. Kerns J, Kerlinger P (2004) A study of bird and bat collision fatalities at the Mountaineer Wind Energy Center, Tucker County, West Virginia: Annual report for 2003. *A report Prepared for FPL Energy and Mountaineer Wind Energy Center Technical Review Committee* 39.
118. Kuvlesky Jr. WP, Brennan LA, Morrison ML, et al. (2007) Wind energy development and wildlife conservation: challenges and opportunities. *J Wildl Manage* 71(8): 2487-2498.

119. Rydell J, Bach L, Dubourg-Savage MJ, et al. (2010) Bat mortality at wind turbines in northwestern Europe. *Acta Chiropterologica* 12(2): 261-274.
120. Loss SR, Will T, Marra PP (2013) Estimates of bird collision mortality at wind facilities in the contiguous United States. *Biol Conserv* 168: 201-209.
121. Kunz TH, Braun de Torrez E, Bauer D, et al. (2011) Ecosystem services provided by bats. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 1223(1): 1-38.
122. Boyles JG, Cryan PM, McCracken GF, et al. (2011) Economic importance of bats in agriculture. *Science* 332(6025): 41-42.
123. Barclay RM, Harder LD (2003) Life histories of bats: life in the slow lane. *Bat Ecology*, 209-253.
124. Thomsen F, Lüdemann K, Kafemann R, et al. (2006) Effects of offshore wind farm noise on marine mammals and fish. *Biola, Hamburg, Germany on behalf of COWRIE Ltd*, 62.
125. Wilson B, Batty RS, Daunt F, et al. (2006) Collision risks between marine renewable energy devices and mammals, fish and diving birds. Report to the Scottish Executive. Scottish Association for Marine Science, Oban, Scotland, PA37 1QA. Available from: <http://nora.nerc.ac.uk/504110/1/N504110CR.pdf>
126. Thomson MS (2007) Placing the wild in the city: "Thinking with" Melbourne's bats. *Soc Anim* 15(1): 79-95.
127. Carrete M, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Ben fez JR, et al. (2009). Large scale risk-assessment of wind-farms on population viability of a globally endangered long-lived raptor. *Biol Conserv* 142(12): 2954-2961.
128. Dahl EL, Bevanger K, Nygård T, et al. (2012) Reduced breeding success in white-tailed eagles at Smøla windfarm, western Norway, is caused by mortality and displacement. *Biol Conserv* 145(1): 79-85.
129. Bakken TH, Aase AG, Hagen D, et al. (2014) Demonstrating a new framework for the comparison of environmental impacts from small-and large-scale hydropower and wind power projects. *J Environ Manage* 140: 93-101.
130. McNew LB, Hunt LM, Gregory AJ, et al. (2014) Effects of wind energy development on nesting ecology of greater prairie - chickens in fragmented grasslands. *Conserv Biol* 28(4): 1089-1099.
131. Abbasi SA, Abbasi N (2000) The likely adverse environmental impacts of renewable energy sources. *Appl Energy* 65(1): 121-144.
132. Tsoutsos T, Frantzeskaki N, Gekas V (2005) Environmental impacts from the solar energy technologies. *Energy Policy* 33(3): 289-296.
133. Bergmann A, Hanley N, Wright R (2006) Valuing the attributes of renewable energy investments. *Energy Policy* 34(9): 1004-1014.
134. Bezdek RH (1993) The environmental, health, and safety implications of solar energy in central station power production. *Energy* 18(6): 681-685.
135. Anderson SH, Mann K, Shugart Jr HH (1977) The effect of transmission-line corridors on bird populations. *Am Midl Nat*, 216-221.
136. Lathrop EW, Archbold EF (1980) Plant response to utility right of way construction in the Mojave Desert. *Environ Manage* 4(3): 215-226.

137. Trommsdorff M (2016) *An economic analysis of agrophotovoltaics: Opportunities, risks and strategies towards a more efficient land use* (Report No. 03-2016). Constitutional Economics Network Working Papers. Available from: <https://www.econstor.eu/handle/10419/150976>
138. Power ME, Sun A, Parker G, et al. (1995) Hydraulic food-chain models. *BioScience* 45(3): 159-167.
139. Bunn SE, Arthington AH (2002) Basic principles and ecological consequences of altered flow regimes for aquatic biodiversity. *Environ Manage* 30(4): 492-507.
140. Aristi I, Arroita M, Larrañaga A, et al. (2014) Flow regulation by dams affects ecosystem metabolism in Mediterranean rivers. *Freshwater Biol* 59(9): 1816-1829.
141. Panwar S, Agrawal DK, Negi GC, et al. (2010). Impact assessment of a hydroelectric project on the flora in the Western Himalayan region based on vegetation analysis and socio-economic studies. *J Environ Plan Manage* 53(7): 907-923.
142. Pelicice FM, Pompeu PS, Agostinho AA (2015) Large reservoirs as ecological barriers to downstream movements of Neotropical migratory fish. *Fish Fish* 6(4): 697-715.
143. Ittekkot V, Humborg C, Schäfer P (2000) Hydrological Alterations and Marine Biogeochemistry: A Silicate Issue? Silicate retention in reservoirs behind dams affects ecosystem structure in coastal seas. *BioScience* 50(9): 776-782.
144. Ziv G, Baran E, Nam S, et al. (2012) Trading-off fish biodiversity, food security, and hydropower in the Mekong River Basin. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 109(15): 5609-5614.
145. Winemiller KO, McIntyre PB, Castello L, et al. (2016). Balancing hydropower and biodiversity in the Amazon, Congo, and Mekong. *Science* 351(6269): 128-129.
146. Tullos D, Foster-Moore E, Magee D, et al. (2013) Biophysical, socioeconomic, and geopolitical vulnerabilities to hydropower development on the Nu River, China. *Ecol Soc* 18(3): 261-272.
147. Benejam L, Saura-Mas S, Bardina M, et al. (2014) Ecological impacts of small hydropower plants on headwater stream fish: from individual to community effects. *Ecol Freshw Fish* 25(2): 295-306.
148. Mueller M, Pander J, Geist J (2011) The effects of weirs on structural stream habitat and biological communities. *J Appl Ecology* 48(6):1450-1461.
149. Energy Information Administration (EIA), 2008a. International Energy Outlook 2008, DOE/EIA-0484(2008). U.S. Department of Energy, Washington, D.C. Available from: <http://www.eia.doe.gov/oiaf/ieo/index.html>
150. Dahlin K, Anderegg W, Hernandez RR, et al. (2011) Prospects for integrating utility-scale solar photovoltaics and industrial agriculture in the US. In: *AGU Fall Meeting Abstracts* 1: 0419.
151. Dupraz C, Marrou H, Talbot G, et al. (2011) Combining solar photovoltaic panels and food crops for optimising land use: towards new agrivoltaic schemes. *Renew Energy* 36(10): 2725-2732.
152. Marrou H, Wéry J, Dufour L, et al. (2013) Productivity and radiation use efficiency of lettuces grown in the partial shade of photovoltaic panels. *Eur J Agron* 44: 54-66.
153. Ferrer-Gisbert C, Ferrán-Gozálvez JJ, Redón-Santafé M, et al. (2013) A new photovoltaic floating cover system for water reservoirs. *Renew Energy* 60: 63-70.
154. Arnett EB, Huso MM, Schirmacher MR, et al. (2011) Altering turbine speed reduces bat mortality at wind - energy facilities. *Front Ecol Environ* 9(4): 209-214.
155. Cryan PM, Gorresen PM, Hein CD, et al. (2014) Behavior of bats at wind turbines. *P Natl Acad Sci* 111(42):15126-15131.

156. Long CV, Flint JA, Lepper PA (2011) Insect attraction to wind turbines: does colour play a role? *Eur J Wildl Res* 57(2): 323-331.
157. Carrete M, Sánchez-Zapata JA, Ben fez JR, et al. (2012) Mortality at wind-farms is positively related to large-scale distribution and aggregation in griffon vultures. *Biol Conserv* 145(1):102-108.
158. Chen G, Dong ZY, Hill DJ, et al. (2010) Attack structural vulnerability of power grids: A hybrid approach based on complex networks. *Phys A* 389(3): 595-603.
159. Epstein PR, Buonocore JJ, Eckerle K, et al. (2011) Full cost accounting for the life cycle of coal. *Ann NY Acad Sci* 1219(1): 73-98.
160. Yim SH, Barrett SR (2012) Public health impacts of combustion emissions in the United Kingdom. *Environ Sci Technol* 46(8): 4291-4296.
161. Johansson J, Jonsson H, Johansson H (2007) Analysing the vulnerability of electric distribution systems: a step towards incorporating the societal consequences of disruptions. *Int J Emerg Manage* 4(1): 4-17.
162. Amin M (2005) Energy infrastructure defense systems. *P IEEE* 93(5): 861-875.
163. Amin M (2008) Challenges in reliability, security, efficiency, and resilience of energy infrastructure: Toward smart self-healing electric power grid. In: *Power and Energy Society General Meeting-Conversion and Delivery of Electrical Energy in the 21st Century, 2008 IEEE* (pp. 1-5). IEEE.
164. Owen AD (2006) Renewable energy: Externality costs as market barriers. *Energy Policy* 34(5): 632-642.
165. Timmons D, Harris JM, Roach B (2014) The Economics of Renewable Energy. *Global Development And Environment Institute, Tufts University, Medford, MA, 52.*
166. IRENA (2016) REmap: Roadmap for a Renewable Energy Future, 2016 Edition. International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA), Abu Dhabi. Available from: [http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/Publications/IRENA\\_REmap\\_2016\\_edition\\_report.pdf](http://www.irena.org/DocumentDownloads/Publications/IRENA_REmap_2016_edition_report.pdf)
167. Sims RE, Rogner HH, Gregory K (2003) Carbon emission and mitigation cost comparisons between fossil fuel, nuclear and renewable energy resources for electricity generation. *Energy Policy* 31(13): 1315-1326.
168. Weisser D (2007) A guide to life-cycle greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions from electric supply technologies. *Energy* 32(9): 1543-1559.
169. Fthenakis VM, Kim HC, Alsema E (2008) Emissions from photovoltaic life cycles. *Environ Sci Technol* 42(6): 2168-2174.
170. Evans A, Strezov V, Evans TJ (2009) Assessment of sustainability indicators for renewable energy technologies. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 13(5): 1082-1088.
171. Fthenakis, V. M., & Kim, H. C. (2011). Photovoltaics: Life-cycle analyses. *Solar Energy* 85(8): 1609-1628.
172. Colson CM, Nehrir MH, Gunderson RW (2011) Distributed multi-agent microgrids: a decentralized approach to resilient power system self-healing. In: *Resilient Control Systems (ISRCs), 2011 4th International Symposium on* (pp. 83-88). IEEE.
173. Shahidehpour M, Khodayar M (2013) Cutting campus energy costs with hierarchical control: The economical and reliable operation of a microgrid. *IEEE Electrification Mag* 1(1): 40-56.

174. Che L, Shahidehpour M (2014) DC microgrids: Economic operation and enhancement of resilience by hierarchical control. *IEEE Trans Smart Grid* 5(5): 2517-2526.
175. Panwar NL, Kaushik SC, Kothari S (2011) Role of renewable energy sources in environmental protection: a review. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 15(3): 1513-1524.
176. Amer M, Daim TU (2010) Application of technology roadmaps for renewable energy sector. *Technol Forecast Soc Change* 77(8): 1355-1370.
177. Liserre M, Sauter T, Hung JY (2010) Future energy systems: Integrating renewable energy sources into the smart power grid through industrial electronics. *IEEE Ind Elect Mag* 4(1): 18-37.
178. Walker G, Devine-Wright P, Hunter S, et al. (2010) Trust and community: Exploring the meanings, contexts and dynamics of community renewable energy. *Energy Policy* 38(6): 2655-2663.
179. Hafez O, Bhattacharya K (2012) Optimal planning and design of a renewable energy based supply system for microgrids. *Renew Energy* 45: 7-15.
180. Rao KU, Kishore VVN (2010) A review of technology diffusion models with special reference to renewable energy technologies. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 14(3): 1070-1078.
181. Evans A, Strezov V, Evans TJ (2012) Assessment of utility energy storage options for increased renewable energy penetration. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 16(6): 4141-4147.
182. Johnstone N, Hašič I, Popp D (2010) Renewable energy policies and technological innovation: evidence based on patent counts. *Environ Resour Econ* 45(1): 133-155.
183. Popp D, Hascic I, Medhi N (2011) Technology and the diffusion of renewable energy. *Energy Econ* 33(4): 648-662.
184. Johnstone CM, Pratt D, Clarke JA, et al. (2013) A techno-economic analysis of tidal energy technology. *Renew Energy* 49: 101-106.
185. Islam MR, Rahim NA, Solangi KH, et al. (2012) Assessing wind energy potentiality for selected sites in Malaysia. *Energy Education Sci Technol A-Energy Sci Res* 29(1): 611-626.
186. Ellabban O, Abu-Rub H, Blaabjerg F (2014) Renewable energy resources: Current status, future prospects and their enabling technology. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 39: 748-764.
187. Yu FR, Zhang P, Xiao W, et al. (2011) Communication systems for grid integration of renewable energy resources. *IEEE Network* 25(5).
188. Mathiesen B V, Lund H, Karlsson K (2011) 100% Renewable energy systems, climate mitigation and economic growth. *Appl Energy* 88(2): 488-501.
189. Apergis N, Payne JE, Menyah K, et al. (2010) On the causal dynamics between emissions, nuclear energy, renewable energy, and economic growth. *Ecol Econ* 69(11): 2255-2260.
190. White LA (1943) Energy and the evolution of culture. *Am Anthropol* 45(3): 335-356.
191. Sorensen B (2013) *A history of energy: Northern Europe from the Stone Age to the present day*. Oxon: Routledge. Earthscan.
192. Birol F (2007) Energy economics: a place for energy poverty in the agenda? *Energy J* 28(3): 1-6.
193. Dubois U, Meier H (2016) Energy affordability and energy inequality in Europe: implications for policymaking. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 18: 21-35.
194. Walker R, Liddell C, McKenzie P, et al. (2014) Fuel poverty in Northern Ireland: Humanizing the plight of vulnerable households. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 4: 89-99.
195. Bouzarovski S, Petrova S, Sarlamanov R (2012) Energy poverty policies in the EU: A critical perspective. *Energy Policy* 49: 76-82.

196. Bazilian M, Nakhooda S, Van de Graaf T (2014) Energy governance and poverty. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 1: 217-225.
197. Sadath AC, Acharya RH (2017) Assessing the extent and intensity of energy poverty using Multidimensional Energy Poverty Index: Empirical evidence from households in India. *Energy Policy* 102: 540-548.
198. Khalid A, Junaidi H (2013) Study of economic viability of photovoltaic electric power for Quetta–Pakistan. *Renew Energy* 50: 253-258.
199. Sadati SS, Qureshi FU, Baker D (2015) Energetic and economic performance analyses of photovoltaic, parabolic trough collector and wind energy systems for Multan, Pakistan. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 47: 844-855.
200. Sovacool BK, Drupady IM (2016) *Energy access, poverty, and development: the governance of small-scale renewable energy in developing Asia*. Oxon: Routledge.
201. Silveira JL, Tuna CE, de Queiroz Lamas W (2013) The need of subsidy for the implementation of photovoltaic solar energy as supporting of decentralized electrical power generation in Brazil. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 20: 133-141.
202. Alfaro J, Miller S (2014) Satisfying the rural residential demand in Liberia with decentralized renewable energy schemes. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 30: 903-911.
203. Ataei A, Biglari M, Nedaei M, et al. (2015) Techno - economic feasibility study of autonomous hybrid wind and solar power systems for rural areas in Iran, A case study in Moheydar village. *Environ Prog Sustain Energy* 34(5): 1521-1527.
204. Notton G, Diaf S, Stoyanov L (2011) Hybrid photovoltaic/wind energy systems for remote locations. *Energy Procedia* 6: 666-677.
205. Sen R, Bhattacharyya SC (2014) Off-grid electricity generation with renewable energy technologies in India: An application of HOMER. *Renew Energy* 62: 388-398.
206. Finney KN, Sharifi VN, Swithenbank J (2012) The negative impacts of the global economic downturn on funding decentralised energy in the UK. *Energy Policy* 51: 290-300.
207. Yaqoot M, Diwan P, Kandpal TC (2016) Review of barriers to the dissemination of decentralized renewable energy systems. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 58: 477-490.
208. Komendantova N, Patt A, Barras L, et al. (2012) Perception of risks in renewable energy projects: The case of concentrated solar power in North Africa. *Energy Policy* 40: 103-109.
209. Ahlborg H, Hammar L (2014) Drivers and barriers to rural electrification in Tanzania and Mozambique—Grid-extension, off-grid, and renewable energy technologies. *Renew Energy* 61: 117-124.
210. Scarpa R, Willis K (2010) Willingness-to-pay for renewable energy: Primary and discretionary choice of British households' for micro-generation technologies. *Ener Econ* 32(1): 129-136.
211. Sardianou E, Genoudi P (2013) Which factors affect the willingness of consumers to adopt renewable energies? *Renew Energy* 57: 1-4.
212. Hecher M, Hatzl S, Knoeri C, et al. (2017) The trigger matters: The decision-making process for heating systems in the residential building sector. *Energy Policy* 102: 288-306.
213. Chmutina K, Goodier CI (2014) Alternative future energy pathways: Assessment of the potential of innovative decentralised energy systems in the UK. *Energy Policy* 66: 62-72.
214. Balcombe P, Rigby D, Azapagic A (2013) Motivations and barriers associated with adopting microgeneration energy technologies in the UK. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 22: 655-666.

215. Sommerfeld J, Buys L, Vine D (2017) Residential consumers' experiences in the adoption and use of solar PV. *Energy Policy* 105: 10-16.
216. Süsser D, Döring M, Ratter BM (2017) Harvesting energy: Place and local entrepreneurship in community-based renewable energy transition. *Energy Policy* 101: 332-341.
217. Holstenkamp L, Kahla F (2016) What are community energy companies trying to accomplish? An empirical investigation of investment motives in the German case. *Energy Policy* 97: 112-122.
218. Catney P, MacGregor S, Dobson A, et al. (2014). Big society, little justice? Community renewable energy and the politics of localism. *Local Env* 19(7): 715-730.
219. Ikejemba EC, Mpuan PB, Schuur PC, et al. (2017) The empirical reality & sustainable management failures of renewable energy projects in Sub-Saharan Africa (part 1 of 2). *Renew Energy* 102: 234-240.
220. Aatola P, Ollikainen M, Toppinen A (2013) Impact of the carbon price on the integrating European electricity market. *Energy Policy* 61: 1236-1251.
221. Fischer C (2010) Renewable portfolio standards: when do they lower energy prices? *Ener J* 31(1): 101-120.
222. Frondel M, Ritter N, Schmidt CM, et al. (2010) Economic impacts from the promotion of renewable energy technologies: The German experience. *Energy Policy* 38(8): 4048-4056.
223. Adom PK, Insaadoo M, Minlah MK, et al. (2017) Does renewable energy concentration increase the variance/uncertainty in electricity prices in Africa? *Renew Energy* 107: 81-100.
224. Bouzarovski S, Tirado Herrero S (2015) The energy divide: Integrating energy transitions, regional inequalities and poverty trends in the European Union. *Eur Urban Reg Stud* 24(1): 69-86.
225. Oppenheim J (2016) The United States regulatory compact and energy poverty. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 18: 96-108.
226. Kim HC, Fthenakis V, Choi JK, et al. (2012) Life cycle greenhouse gas emissions of thin - film photovoltaic electricity generation. *J Ind Ecol* 16(s1): S110-S121.
227. Cludius J, Hermann H, Matthes FC, et al. (2014) The merit order effect of wind and photovoltaic electricity generation in Germany 2008–2016: Estimation and distributional implications. *Energ Econ* 44: 302-313.
228. Heindl P (2015) Measuring fuel poverty: General considerations and application to German household data. *Finanz Archiv: Public Finance Analysis* 71(2): 178-215.
229. Zografakis N, Sifaki E, Pagalou M, et al. (2010) Assessment of public acceptance and willingness to pay for renewable energy sources in Crete. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 14(3): 1088-1095.
230. Liu W, Wang C, Mol AP (2013) Rural public acceptance of renewable energy deployment: The case of Shandong in China. *Appl Energy* 102: 1187-1196.
231. Sardianou E, Genoudi P (2013) Which factors affect the willingness of consumers to adopt renewable energies? *Renew Energy* 57: 1-4.
232. OECD (2011) *Divided We Stand: When Inequality Keeps Rising*. Paris: OECD Publishing.
233. Dillig M, Jung M, Karl J (2016) The impact of renewables on electricity prices in Germany—An estimation based on historic spot prices in the years 2011–2013. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 57: 7-15.

234. Auer BR (2016) How does Germany's green energy policy affect electricity market volatility? An application of conditional autoregressive range models. *Energy Policy* 98: 621-628.
235. Hirth L, Ueckerdt F (2013) Redistribution effects of energy and climate policy: The electricity market. *Energy Policy* 62: 934-947.
236. Fund MI, BNEF (2014) Climatescope 2014: Mapping the Global Frontier for Clean Energy Investment. Available from: <https://publications.iadb.org/handle/11319/7272>
237. Scheidel A, Sorman AH (2012) Energy transitions and the global land rush: Ultimate drivers and persistent consequences. *Glob Environl Chang* 22(3): 588-595.
238. McCarthy J, Thatcher J (2017) Visualizing new political ecologies: A critical data studies analysis of the World Bank's renewable energy resource mapping initiative. *Geoforum* [In Press].
239. Cooper C, Sovacool BK (2013) Miracle or mirage? The promise and peril of desert energy part 2. *Renew Energy* 50: 820-825.
240. Pasqualetti MJ (2011) Opposing wind energy landscapes: a search for common cause. *Ann Assoc Am Geographers* 101(4):907-917.
241. Rignall KE (2016) Solar power, state power, and the politics of energy transition in pre-Saharan Morocco. *Env Plan A* 48(3):540-557.
242. Yenneti K, Day R, Golubchikov O (2016) Spatial justice and the land politics of renewables: Dispossessing vulnerable communities through solar energy mega-projects. *Geoforum* 76: 90-99.
243. Kerr S, Colton J, Johnson K, et al. (2015) Rights and ownership in sea country: implications of marine renewable energy for indigenous and local communities. *Mar Policy* 52: 108-115.
244. Sühlsen K, Hisschemöller M (2014) Lobbying the 'Energiewende'. Assessing the effectiveness of strategies to promote the renewable energy business in Germany. *Energy Policy* 69: 316-325.
245. Fischer W, Hake JF, Kuckshinrichs W, et al. (2016) German energy policy and the way to sustainability: Five controversial issues in the debate on the "Energiewende". *Energy* 115: 1580-1591.
246. Boon FP, Dieperink C (2014) Local civil society based renewable energy organisations in the Netherlands: Exploring the factors that stimulate their emergence and development. *Energy Policy* 69: 297-307.
247. Kalkbrenner BJ, Roosen J (2016) Citizens' willingness to participate in local renewable energy projects: The role of community and trust in Germany. *Energy Res Soc Sci* 13: 60-70.
248. Seyfang G, Haxeltine A (2012) Growing grassroots innovations: exploring the role of community-based initiatives in governing sustainable energy transitions. *Environ Plann C* 30: 381-400.
249. Rogers JC, Simmons EA, Convery I, et al. (2008) Public perceptions of opportunities for community-based renewable energy projects. *Energy Policy* 36(11): 4217-4226.
250. Zoellner J, Schweizer-Ries P, Wemheuer C (2008) Public acceptance of renewable energies: Results from case studies in Germany. *Energy Policy* 36(11): 4136-4141.
251. Bauwens T, Eyre N (2017) Exploring the links between community-based governance and sustainable energy use: Quantitative evidence from Flanders. *Ecol Econ* 137: 163-172.
252. Dóci G, Vasileiadou E (2015) "Let's do it ourselves" Individual motivations for investing in renewables at community level. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 49: 41-50.

253. Van Der Schoor T, Scholtens B (2015) Power to the people: Local community initiatives and the transition to sustainable energy. *Renew Sust Energy Rev* 43: 666-675.
254. Hoffman SM, High-Pippert A (2010) From private lives to collective action: Recruitment and participation incentives for a community energy program. *Energy Policy* 38(12): 7567-7574.
255. Dáz P, Adler C, Patt A (2017) Do stakeholders' perspectives on renewable energy infrastructure pose a risk to energy policy implementation? A case of a hydropower plant in Switzerland. *Energy Policy* 108: 21-28.
256. Booth S (2013) Here Come the Sun: How Securities Regulations Cast a Shadow on the Growth of Community Solar in the United States. *UCLA L Rev* 61: 760.
257. Simcock N (2014) Exploring how stakeholders in two community wind projects use a "those affected" principle to evaluate the fairness of each project's spatial boundary. *Local Environ* 19(3):241-58.
258. Simcock N (2016) Procedural justice and the implementation of community wind energy projects: A case study from South Yorkshire, UK. *Land Use Policy* 59: 467-477.
259. Forman A (2017) Energy justice at the end of the wire: Enacting community energy and equity in Wales. *Energy Policy* 107: 649-657.
260. Catney P, MacGregor S, Dobson A, et al. (2014) Big society, little justice? Community renewable energy and the politics of localism. *Local Environ* 19(7): 715-730.
261. Schelly C, Banerjee A (2016) Soft Energy Paths Revisited: Politics and Practice in Energy Technology Transitions. *Challenges* 7(2): 16.
262. Heffron RJ, McCauley D (2017) The concept of energy justice across the disciplines. *Energy Policy* 105: 658-667.
263. Sovacool BK, Jansen JC, Welle AJ (2017) The energy services dimension of energy security. *Policy Studies* 2016: 2015.



AIMS Press

© 2017 Chelsea Schelly, et al., licensee AIMS Press. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0>)