

Deliverable 4.1:

Methodological framework for best practice selection & analysis

Date: 25.05.18

Version 1

| | | | | |
|-----------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--------------|--|
| WP | 4 | Name of the WP: Social acceptance analyses in target regions/communities | | |
| Dissemination level: | Public | Due delivery date: | 31 May 2018 | |
| Nature: | Report | Actual delivery date: | 25. May 2018 | |
| Lead beneficiary: | FFU-FUB | | | |
| Contributing beneficiaries: | | | | |
| Authors: | Michael Krug, Maria Rosaria Di Nucci | | | |

| Document history | | | | | |
|------------------|----------|------------------|---------|------------------------------|-------------|
| Version | Date | Submitted by | Partner | Reviewed/Approved by/Partner | Date |
| V0 | 11.05.18 | Rosaria Di Nucci | FFU-FUB | Ivars Kundrenickis | 22.May 2018 |
| V 1 | 25.05.18 | Rosaria Di Nucci | FFU-FUB | Executive Board | 25 May 2018 |



WinWind has received funding from European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement N° 764717. The sole responsibility for any errors or omissions made lies with the consortium. The content does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Commission. The European Commission is also not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Abstract

Work package 4 develops transferable best practice cases which can serve as guidance and take into account the specific needs of the WinWind target regions. In this work package, an in-depth assessment of best practice cases based on a pre-selection of cases by the project consortium will be carried out and a Best Practice Portfolio will be prepared. Methods applied include primary and secondary literature analysis, desk research and semi-structured, qualitative interviews with relevant stakeholders, and, where relevant, focus groups.

This Deliverable 4.1 includes the methodological framework for good/best practice selection and provides the foundation for characterisation, analysis and assessment of the good/best practice cases. Efforts are directed to build a coherent framework for structuring the case-studies.

Deliverable 4.1 is designed as follows: After the description of the background and purpose of this methodological framework, introductory remarks on the identification, analysis and elaboration of good practices will be provided. This includes a description of what is meant with good practice. Section 3 focuses on a guidance for best practice selection and analysis and contains selection criteria. It is suggested to define best practice as a proven or innovative corporate or policy measure, preferably implemented in a WinWind model region, target region or any other region of the WinWind partner countries, or third countries. The criteria are to be applied to screen good practice measures and select the “best ones”:

In the following steps, on the basis of the common methodology elaborated by FFU-FUB in this document, the WinWind partners identify (within Task 4.2) measures that can serve as good/best practice case studies enhancing social acceptance, possibly 4-5 for each participating country- The most relevant measures will then be selected for in-depth investigation. The final selection will also consider suggestions of the stakeholder desks (Work package 3) and new potential cases to be included in the “Best practice” portfolio (Deliverable 4.2).

Content

| | |
|---|----|
| Abstract | 0 |
| Content..... | 1 |
| List of Tables..... | 1 |
| 1 Introduction..... | 2 |
| 1.1 Purpose and structure of this document | 2 |
| 1.2 Background and aim of the methodological framework | 3 |
| 2 Identification, analysis and elaboration of good practices | 4 |
| 2.1 What do we mean with good/best practice?..... | 4 |
| 2.2 Identification of good practices..... | 5 |
| 2.3 Good practice criteria..... | 5 |
| 2.4 Analysis and elaboration of good practice portraits | 12 |
| 2.5 Template for elaboration of good practice portraits | 12 |
| 3 Guidance for best practice selection and analysis | 14 |
| 3.1 Selection of best practice cases | 14 |
| 3.2 Selection criteria..... | 14 |
| 3.3 Self-evaluation Matrix | 15 |
| 4 In-depth analysis of best practice cases..... | 16 |
| Annexes | 18 |
| Annex 1: Example for a good practice portrait: Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia | 18 |
| Annex 2: Example for a good practice portrait: Quality label “Partner for Fair Wind Energy” | 20 |

List of Tables

| | |
|---|----|
| Table 1: General criteria to determine a good practice template | 5 |
| Table 2: Check list to determine good practices | 6 |
| Table 3: Preselection of potential good/best practices | 7 |
| Table 4: Typology of measures addressing social acceptance barriers..... | 8 |
| Table 5: Illustrative examples of potential good practice measures (not exhaustive) | 10 |
| Table 6: Template for Good practice portraits..... | 13 |
| Table 7: Self-evaluation matrix..... | 15 |
| Table 8: Proposed structure for best practice reports..... | 17 |
| Table A 1: Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia | 18 |
| Table A 2: Quality label “Partner for Fair Wind Energy” for project developers in Thuringia | 20 |

1 Introduction

The development of wind energy – more specifically, the debates surrounding projects in the field – has shown that social acceptance is a topic that needs to be better understood through the involvement of the stakeholders and a better consideration of local socio-cultural, economic and environmental factors, if the European policy targets for renewable energy deployment are to be met. In most of the WinWind wind energy scarce regions, opposition has often generated interest conflicts and mutual suspicion. This must be addressed and overcome through an inclusive approach that takes into account differing needs and expectations of the stakeholders as well as the regional or local processes and cultures.

1.1 Purpose and structure of this document

Successful examples from other contexts or similar situations are both arguably important ingredients on which to ground an effective strategy. There are a number of studies and examples that show how potential and real barriers to the market uptake of wind energy in general and social acceptance in particular could be overcome and how measures to enhance the fair and socially acceptable uptake of wind energy could be implemented. These provide a potential portfolio of optimal cases that might be potentially adapted and replicated under specific conditions or through modification of certain variables.

This deliverable aims to provide a common methodological framework for the selection of such good practices. It provides the foundation for characterisation, analysis and assessment of the selected good/best practice cases. Efforts are directed to build a coherent framework for good practices identification, data gathering, analysis and portraiting followed by selection criteria to identify best practices and providing a structure for reporting on the best case-studies.

Deliverable 4.1 is structured as follows. After the description of the background and purpose of this methodological framework, introductory remarks on the identification, analysis and elaboration of good practices will be provided. This includes a description of what it is meant with good practice. Section 3 focuses on a guidance for best practice selection and analysis and contains selection criteria. It is suggested to define best practice as a proven or innovative corporate or policy measure, preferably implemented in a WinWind model region, target region or any other region of the WinWind partner countries, or third countries. The selection criteria are to be applied to screen good practice measures and select the “best ones”.

In the following steps, on the basis of the common methodology elaborated by FFU-FUB in this deliverable, the WinWind partners identify (within Task 4.2) measures that can serve as good/best practice case studies enhancing social acceptance, possibly 4-5 for each participating country. The most relevant measures will then be selected for in-depth investigation (within Task 4.3). However, the final selection needs to be flexible enough to consider suggestions of the stakeholder desks (Work package 3) and new potential cases. Deliverable 4.2 will provide a “best practice” portfolio.

1.2 Background and aim of the methodological framework

This guidance document has been prepared by FUB-FFU and refers to Work package 4 (Best practice cases including novel socially inclusive governance forms and mechanisms). WP 4 develops transferable best practice cases, which can serve as a benchmark for the WinWind target regions. This methodological framework aims to guide the selection of the best practice cases and their analysis. The selection and analysis of best practice cases in WinWind is going to be based on a stepwise approach:

1. Identification, analysis and elaboration of good practices
2. Elaboration of brief good practice portraits
3. Selection of best practice cases
4. In-depth analysis of best practice cases
5. Portfolio of best practice cases
6. Synthesis and comparative assessment of best practice cases.

This methodological framework integrates the following steps:

- Guidance for identification, analysis and elaboration of good practices and
- Guidance for best practice selection and analysis.

It provides the foundation for characterization, analysis and assessment of the cases based on a coherent framework for data gathering and analysis and providing a common structure for the case-studies.

2 Identification, analysis and elaboration of good practices

The first step consists of the identification and preparation of good practices (and potential best practices) by all partners. So far, we have not specified the minimum number of good/best practices to be elaborated. We suggest to develop in total at least 25 good practice portraits (approximately 4-5 per country desk) of which we select at least 10 best practices which will be analyzed in-depth.

2.1 What do we mean with good/best practice?

In the context of the WinWind project, “Good practice” refers to measures either taken by the wind industry (project developers/planners, operators, investors) or by public/policy actors to enhance social acceptance and to address social acceptance barriers. Hence, WP 4 builds directly upon WP 2 and the analysis of social acceptance barriers and drivers. Good practice therefore encompasses the process of carrying out a task using recommended methods. Documentation of procedural manuals, guidelines and codes of practice are often required when implementing good practices. According to the Food and Agriculture Organisation (FAO) of the United Nations a good practice is “not only a practice that is good, but a practice that has been proven to work well and produce good results, and is therefore recommended as a model. It is a successful experience, which has been tested and validated, in the broad sense, which has been repeated and deserves to be shared so that a greater number of people can adopt it.”¹

Best practices are considered to be superior to good practices because they require innovative, testable, and replicable approaches which contribute to the improved performance of a project or policy, usually recognised as best by peer organisations. This approach focuses on developing improvements and promoting continuous learning – good practices are considered more static and procedure-based.²

Best practices are means to provide guidance. Through trial and error, best practices provide the framework to help guiding policies and measures to be implemented. The Merriam Webster defines best practice as “a procedure that has been shown by research and experience to produce optimal results and that is established or proposed as a standard suitable for widespread adoption”.³ According to the business dictionary best practice is a “a method or technique that has consistently shown results superior to those achieved with other means, and that is used as a benchmark”.⁴ Best practice cases can be proposed for widespread adoption.

¹ Cf. - www.fao.org/capacitydevelopment/goodpractices/gphome/en/

²Cf. Rumohr-Voskuil, Gretchen (2010). Best Practice: Past, Present, and Personal, Language Arts Journal of Michigan: Vol. 25: Iss. 2, Article 6.

³ Cf. <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/best%20practice>

⁴ Cf. <http://www.businessdictionary.com/definition/best-practice.html>

2.2 Identification of good practices

The good practice measures might come from our target regions, model regions, other regions in WinWind partner countries, or any other country. The measures might include both proven/implemented, promising novel/innovative measures, or planned measures. Policy measures can be further differentiated according to the level of government/administration (national, federal state, regional, local).

It is important to emphasize that the identification of good/best practices within the WinWind project does not primarily focus on technical measures and technologies, but especially on non-technical measures, initiatives and activities that may enhance social acceptance of wind energy.

2.3 Good practice criteria

Following general criteria developed by the Food and Agricultural Organisation of the United Nations can be used to screen whether a practice is a genuine “good practice” or is rather a promising practice.

Table 1: General criteria to determine a good practice template

| | Innovation, experience | Promising practices | Good practices | Policy, principles, norms |
|---|--|--|---|---|
| Level of evidence | Minimal objective evidence, inferences from parallel experiences and contexts. Lessons learned need to be drawn. | Unproven in multiple settings, anecdotal evidence, testimonials, articles, reports. Existing lessons learned that need to be further elaborated. | Evidence of impact from multiple settings, several evaluations, meta-analysis, expert review, cost-efficiency analysis, good practice criteria. Lessons learned integrated. | Proven in multiple settings, replication studies, quantitative and scientific evidence. |
| Replicability potential and applicability | New idea, no previous experience, highest risk. | High risk, but potential for further investigation. | Demonstrated replicability, limited risk for replicability. | Consistently replicable, widely applicable. |

Source: FAO, *Good Practice template*, 2016

Once it is clear that the measure or activity under scrutiny is more than a promising practice, a further check (following the prompts in the table below) can be performed.

Table 2: Check list to determine good practices

| |
|---|
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Technically and administrative feasible: Is the measure/activity under scrutiny demonstrated to be technically feasible and easy to learn and to implement (administrative feasibility)? |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Effective and successful: Has the activity/measure under scrutiny demonstrated its relevance as the most effective way in achieving its specific objective? |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Environmentally, economically and socially sustainable: Has the measure/activity under scrutiny met current needs, without compromising the ability to address future needs. |
| <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Replicable and adaptable: Has the measure/activity under scrutiny demonstrated its potential for replication and to be adapted to other contexts? |

Source: adapted from FAO (2014, op.cit)

Another important question is how participatory these practices are. The question asked is: has the measure/activity under scrutiny demonstrated a participatory approach, which is key to support a joint sense of ownership of decisions and actions?

Further guidance can be found in the **Grant Agreement**, which specifies the good/best practice cases. WinWind is going to focus on:

- Novel participatory models and mechanisms in planning and permitting procedures,
- Direct and indirect financial participation of communities and citizens,
- Measures promoting regional co-benefits,
- Measures to reduce environmental impacts of wind energy
- Effective communication strategies.

The **Grant Agreement** also contains a pre-selection of **potential good/best practices** to be considered in each country:

Table 3: Preselection of potential good/best practices

| | |
|-----------|---|
| DE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Informal procedural community participation in spatial planning (Schleswig-Holstein)</i> • <i>Direct financial participation/community wind energy (Schleswig-Holstein/North Frisia)</i> • <i>Indirect financial participation through compensations and other benefits (Brandenburg)</i> • <i>Legal obligation for developers to share equity (Mecklenburg-Vorpommern);</i> • <i>Intermediary organisations, e.g. regional wind energy service unit (District of Steinfurt)</i> • <i>Voluntary agreements between public authorities and project developers (Brandenburg);</i> • <i>State-led labelling/certification schemes for developers (Thuringia);</i> • <i>Community energy guidelines</i> |
| IT | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The regions of Apulia and Sardinia provide best practice cases.</i> • <i>At least 2 case studies at various governance levels (regional, national) will be carried out. The focus will be on procedural participation as a means to social acceptance.</i> |
| LV | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>The case studies will focus on Northern Kurzeme and pro-active spatial planning for WE in the Northern Vidzeme Biosphere Reserve.</i> |
| PL | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Case study on the community of Kisielice</i> |
| NO | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Case study on the region of Fosen</i> |
| SP | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Case study on Isla del Hierro (Canary Island) + at least 2 case studies from other regions.</i> |

Source: WinWind Grant Agreement

However, in some countries (PL, NO, SP) we have so far identified only regions/ municipalities rather than specific measures addressing social acceptance barriers. We would like to emphasize that our focus and starting point are measures addressing social acceptance barriers. So, the primary focus of our good practices are rather specific corporate (i.e. taken /adopted by industry) and policy measures than administrative entities or individual wind energy projects. Of course, the latter can be used to exemplify and illustrate concrete measures.

The final selection of good practice measures shall also consider actual corporate/business developments and policy developments as well as suggestions from the stakeholder desks.

As outlined in the Grant Agreement a special focus of our good/best practices will be on citizen/community engagement measures. In this context, we have a distinctive (but not exclusive) focus on three categories of acceptance measures: **(informal) procedural participation, direct financial participation, and indirect financial participation.**

The following tables provide guidance and can be used as a checklist to identify potential good practice measures addressing social acceptance barriers. Table 4 provides a typology of measures addressing social acceptance barriers subdivided according to different acceptance barriers. Measures are subdivided into corporate measures (i.e. measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations) and policy measures and measures by public actors.

Table 5 provides non-exhaustive illustrative examples of potential good practice measures.

Table 4: Typology of measures addressing social acceptance barriers

| Acceptance barrier | Specification of measures | Corporate measures (i.e. measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations) | Policy measures, measures by public actors |
|--|---|---|--|
| Individual factors | Measures affecting, environmental attitudes, attitude towards climate change, energy policy, perception of social norms | | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Socio-cultural factors | Measures addressing cultural identities, place attachment, (i.e. affective bonds between people and project site) | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | |
| Health, well-being, quality of life | Measures addressing health and well-being of people incl. technical measures addressing design and operation of the plant (e.g. acoustic emissions, infrasound, shadow flicker etc.) | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Visual impact, impact on landscape | Measures addressing the visibility of the plants and impact on landscape including technical measures addressing design and operation of the plant | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Environmental impact | Measures addressing the environmental impact of the plants (particularly on biodiversity, avifauna, local environment etc.) | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Factors related to the planning and permitting process (including procedural justice) | Transparency and openness of information disclosure Formal participation of citizens/ communities in planning/permitting (including Environmental Impact Assessment) Informal participation of citizens/ communities in planning/permitting (i.e. voluntary measures going beyond the formal statutory participation) | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |

| Acceptance barrier | Specification of measures | Corporate measures (i.e. measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations) | Policy measures, measures by public actors |
|---|--|---|--|
| Trust in key actors and planning process | Measures addressing credibility of and trust in key actors of the planning/ permitting process | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Economic factors (e.g. costs and benefits of wind turbines, perceived distributional justice, i.e. distribution of costs and benefits between actors within a community, between different regions; ownership of land/plants, positive/negative spillover effects) | Direct financial participation (citizens as co-owners) Indirect financial participation of communities and citizens Other financial compensation measures Creation of local added value and co-benefits, including quantitative and qualitative employment and gender issues. | Measures adopted by industry, e.g. project developers, industry associations | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Factors related to governance and regulatory framework (e.g. perceived stringency, plausibility, fairness, consistency, coherence of strategies, policies and programmes; perception of the quality of national/local energy policy discourses) | Measures addressing governance and regulatory framework | N/A | <u>National level</u> <u>Regional level</u> <u>Local level</u> |
| Other factors | | | |

Table 5: Illustrative examples of potential good practice measures (not exhaustive)

| Acceptance factor | Corporate measures | Policy measures |
|--|--|---|
| Health, well-being, quality of life | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Voluntary technical measures (e.g. design, operational regime, use of needs-based lighting systems during night times) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Regulations that prescribe or incentivize needs-based lighting of WT during night times Permitting: Restrictive noise emission standards Spatial planning: Minimum setback distances of wind turbines from residential areas when designating suitability/priority zones Expert hearings on wind turbine and infrasound |
| Visual impact, impact on landscape | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Visualization measures in the planning phase Design, technical measures (e.g. color, size, number of wind turbines, operational regime of wind turbines) Use of needs-based lighting systems | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Spatial planning: Minimum setback distances between wind turbines and protected areas when designating suitability/priority zones |
| Environmental Impact | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Sensitive siting of wind turbines Voluntary technical measures (e.g. temporary off times to reduce collision risks for birds/bats during critical phases) Voluntary Environmental Impact Assessments (EIA) Voluntary nature protection measures (beyond what is legally required) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Institution & Capacity Building including establishment of dedicated competence centres and dialogue structures, e.g. <i>Kompetenzzentrum Naturschutz und Energiewende</i>, <i>Dialogforum Erneuerbare Energien und Naturschutz Baden-Württemberg</i> Spatial planning: No go areas/buffer zones when designating suitability/priority zones Compensation measures Special purpose/dedicated nature protection funds set up by public authorities reinvesting Involvement of „neutral“ intermediary organisations, conflict mediators (e.g. <i>Kompetenzzentrum Naturschutz und Energiewende</i>) |
| Factors related to the planning and permitting process (including procedural justice) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal procedural participation complementing statutory participation Voluntary public information events, citizens' workshops etc. Informal working groups comprising stakeholders in spatial planning | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Informal stakeholder consultations in the context of spatial planning and designation of priority zones (e.g. in Schleswig-Holstein) Informal working groups comprising multiple stakeholders in spatial planning (e.g. Saxony: Upper Elbe Valley/East Ore Mountains) Informal procedural participation complementing statutory participation (public information events) Citizens' juries/appraisals/workshops |

| Acceptance factor | Corporate measures | Policy measures |
|---|---|--|
| <p>Trust in key actors and processes</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Voluntary self-commitments by industry/market actors, corporate codes of conduct • Purely industry-led voluntary labelling/certification schemes of project developers and/or wind turbines (e.g. label for fair wind energy developers in Schleswig-Holstein) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Institution/capacity building (e.g. setting up advisory bodies, e.g. Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia; advisory units in Baden-Württemberg, Rhineland-Palatinate) • Unbiased information and advice for communities, municipalities, developers, technical assistance provided by advisory bodies • Citizens’ Forum (e.g. Bürgerforum Energieland Hesse) • Involvement of „neutral“ intermediary organisations, conflict mediators • Voluntary agreements between public actors and industry (might be combined with labeling/certification scheme; e.g. criteria/label for fair wind energy developers in Thuringia) |
| <p>Distributional justice (i.e. fair distribution of costs and benefits)</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Land lease pooling arrangements fairly considering all land owners directly and indirectly affected by wind project land owners (e.g. Schlalach/Brandenburg; Neuenkirchen/Dithmarschen) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mandatory financial participation of citizens/municipalities as shareholders (e.g. DE: Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) • Financial incentives for community energy in RES support schemes (e.g. DE: Renewable Energy Sources Act) • Guidelines on community ownership of wind turbines • Financial incentives (e.g. seed-money, tax incentives) for community energy development • Capacity-building for community energy (e.g. support for community energy networks) • Tax incentives for local communities (e.g. allocation of revenues from excise taxes in Germany: 70%-100% transferred to the community where the project is located, 0-30% to the communities where the operators are registered) • Municipal solidarity concepts (if several municipalities are affected) • Compensation measures (e.g. setting up special purpose foundations, citizen foundations) • Other economic benefits (e.g. reduced electricity tariffs for affected communities) • Other financial compensations or benefits for communities |
| <p>Factors related to governance and regulatory framework</p> | | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Policy target setting (social acceptance of wind energy has been included as a political priority of the regional energy strategy 2030) (e.g. Brandenburg) |
| <p>Country specific socio-cultural factors/Others</p> | | |

2.4 Analysis and elaboration of good practice portraits

The elaboration of good practice portraits should follow the template contained in Table 6. The portraits should be brief and focused. The portraits should not exceed 1-1.5 pages for each good practice case.

2.5 Template for elaboration of good practice portraits

Table 6 includes a template to elaborate good practice portraits. In the Annex we present two examples for portraits of good practice in Germany, elaborated on the basis of this template

Table 6: Template for Good practice portraits

| | |
|---|---|
| Title of measure | |
| Type of measure | <p><i>Please, specify if it is a measure adopted by industry stakeholders (corporate measure) or by government/other public actors (policy measure)</i></p> <p><i>Please try to further specify the type of measure (e.g. capacity building, institution building, regulative measures (i.e. “command and control measure”), financial incentive, planning measure, information/advise, voluntary self-commitments)</i></p> |
| Country | |
| Administrative level | <i>This applies only to policy measures. Please, specify the level of government/administration (National/federal state/regional/local)</i> |
| Brief description of the measure | <i>Please, briefly describe the measure, its key functioning mechanisms and how social acceptance of wind energy is being influenced</i> |
| Motivation/rationale behind the measure | <i>Please, briefly describe the background leading to this measure</i> |
| Social acceptance barrier(s) addressed | <i>Please, specify the social acceptance barriers which are addressed by the measure</i> |
| Type of region | <i>Please, specify the type of region related to WinWind (target region, model region, other region in WinWind country, third country)</i> |
| Key actors and stakeholders involved | <i>Please, briefly describe the key actors responsible for implementing the measure</i> |
| Target group | <i>Please, briefly describe the key target group(s) of the measure</i> |
| Time frame | <i>Please, briefly describe when the measure has been implemented, whether the measure has been successfully concluded or is still ongoing</i> |
| Drivers and success factors | <i>Please, briefly describe key strengths of the measure</i> |
| Transferability Transfer initiatives | <i>Please, indicate the extent to which the measure as a whole or elements of it can be transferred. Afterwards briefly describe if any transfer initiatives/measures are taking place. Try to assess the transfer potential and under which conditions the measure might be transferable to other regions/countries</i> |
| Model character for other regions | <i>Please, briefly describe to what extent the measure can serve as a model for other wind energy scarce regions</i> |
| Further information/ references | |

The elaboration of the good practice portraits should be accompanied by a self-evaluation matrix referring to best practice selection criteria (more information and guidance see next section) The self-evaluation shall help us to facilitate the selection of the best practices i.e. most relevant ones).

3 Guidance for best practice selection and analysis

3.1 Selection of best practice cases

The finalised good practice portraits will be evaluated according to a set of criteria taking particularly into account the transferability of the measures, with the primary aim of selecting the best practice cases. Evaluation is partly based on a self-evaluation exercise to be performed by the partners for each good practice portrait. Therefore, a specific self-evaluation matrix has been developed (cf. below Table 7). The selected best practice cases will then be analysed and elaborated in more depth than the good practice portraits (we suggest 5-10 pages for each best practice case study).

3.2 Selection criteria

We suggest to define best practice as a **proven** or **innovative corporate** or **policy measure**, preferably implemented in a WinWind model region, target region or any other region of the WinWind partner countries, or third countries. The following criteria shall be applied to screen good practice measures and select the “best ones”:

- **Effectiveness** (to what extent does the measure contribute to enhance social acceptance/to address and overcome social acceptance barriers?)
- **Feasibility** (to what extent can the measure be implemented in a smooth and cost-efficient way?)
- **Innovativeness** (to what extent is the measure itself innovative or does encourage innovative measures/practices?)
- **Transferability** (to what extent and under what conditions can the measure be transferred as a whole or in part to other regions of the same country or regions in other countries and has a high replicability, particularly in wind energy scarce regions?)
- **Model character/relevance** (to what extent is the measure relevant/a model for wind energy scarce regions, including WinWind target regions or any other regions/countries?).

In order to streamline the process of selecting best practices we suggest a three-step approach:

1. Self-evaluation of the good practices, preferably in co-operation with the respective country desks based on the corresponding self-evaluation matrix to be submitted together with the good practice portraits (**Fehler! Verweisquelle konnte nicht gefunden werden.** below)
2. Development and fine-tuning of a “Top 10” list.
3. Final selection taking into account the feedback received.

3.3 Self-evaluation Matrix

The following self-evaluation matrix provides the grounds for the evaluation of potential good practice cases on a scale ranging between 0 and 5 according to the following selection criteria: effectiveness, feasibility, innovativeness, model character for wind energy scarce regions, transferability as well as relevance/model character for other WinWind partner countries. Guiding questions are formulated to help assess the degree of importance of the selection criteria. This matrix has to be complemented for each good practice case and has to be included in the respective good practice portrait.

Table 7: Self-evaluation matrix

| Selection criterion | Guiding Question | Evaluation | Comments |
|--|---|-------------------|-----------------|
| Effectiveness | <i>To what extent does the measure contribute to enhance social acceptance/to address and overcome social acceptance barriers?</i> | 0-5 | |
| Feasibility | <i>To what extent can the measure be implemented in a smooth and cost-efficient way?</i> | 0-5 | |
| Innovativeness | <i>To what extent is the measure itself innovative or does trigger innovative measures/practices?</i> | 0-5 | |
| Model character for wind energy scarce regions | <i>To what extent is the measure particularly suitable for wind energy scarce regions including our target regions?</i> | 0-5 | |
| Transferability | <i>To what extent could the measure as a whole or elements of the measure be transferred to other regions of the same country or regions in other countries, particularly wind energy scarce regions?</i> | 0-5 | |
| Relevance/model character for other WinWind partner countries | <i>To what extent is the measure particularly relevant/suitable for other WinWind countries or third countries?</i> | 0-5 | |

4 In-depth analysis of best practice cases

This section describes how the selected best practice cases should be assessed and elaborated in more detail and designed. According to the Grant Agreement, the analyses will entail matters of geography/spatiality, e.g. concepts of centre/periphery and scale (local, regional, national), stakeholder mappings, type of participation and engagement measure, distributional justice, procedural justice and trust, creation of local value and co-benefits, including quantitative and qualitative employment and gender issues. Further issues include drivers and success factors, lessons learnt, and replication and transfer potential. Collected data will be integrated in individual case study reports.

The possible methods to be applied for the in-depth analysis include primary and secondary literature analysis, desk research and semi-structured, qualitative interviews and focus groups. Depending on the measure, consulting stakeholders and market actors or even public/online surveys could be taken also into consideration.

The in-depth analysis should generally follow the design and structure of the good practice portraits, but needs to be elaborated more comprehensively (5-10 pages). Several additional issues may need to be considered vis-à-vis the good practice portraits (as of template in Table 6: **Template for Good practice portraits**) e.g. a longer explanation on the reasons why this measure has a model character for other regions in that country or even third countries, etc. Thus an explanation is deemed necessary concerning why and in which way the measures or activities that show best practice character have been successful. The identification of the factors of success is paramount for the success of the transfer of such a measure or activity. In addition a section on the lessons learnt should be included and address a reflection on how to replicate these proposed practices in other contexts.

Table 8: Proposed structure for best practice reports

| |
|---|
| Title of measure |
| Type of measure |
| Administrative level |
| Detailed description of the measure |
| Contextual factors including policies/programmes |
| Motivation/rationale behind the measure |
| Social acceptance barrier(s) addressed including those related to procedural justice, distributional justice and trust |
| Target group of the measure |
| Key actors and stakeholders (including actor mappings) |
| Time frame |
| Drivers and success factors |
| Effectiveness |
| Feasibility (including cost efficiency) |
| Innovativeness |
| Transferability |
| Model character for other regions/countries |
| Lessons learnt |

Additionally also issues concerning the question on what methodology or procedures led to a successful outcome and finally to the best practice and whether the process was a participatory process should be addressed. Finally a description of the key messages and lessons learned should be provided. The final question concerns the possibilities of extending the best practice to other contexts by analysing the prerequisites and conditions for replication of the practice and upscaling on a larger scale (national, regional, international).

The best practice cases will be compiled in a best practice portfolio. Furthermore, they will be further assessed and presented in a synthesis report (Deliverable 4.3) which clusters the best practice cases according to different categories, provides a comparative analysis of success factors (and failures) and extracts lessons that can have an overall validity. The report will provide an inventory of practical community engagement measures and a discussion of their strengths, weaknesses and uncertainties related to the implementation in real circumstances. This deliverable will safeguard the anonymity of the participants by anonymising quotations and descriptions.

Annexes

Annex 1: Example for a good practice portrait: Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia

Table A 1: Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia

| Title of measure | Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia |
|--|--|
| Type and specification of measure | Policy measure (regional level) Institution building, Organisational + advise |
| Country | Germany |
| Administrative level of implementation | Federal state level |
| Brief description of the measure | <p>The Service Unit has been set up in 2015 under the head of the Thuringian Energy and GreenTech Agency inspired by the example of a similar service unit established in the rural district of Steinfurt (federal state of North-Rhine-Westphalia) already in 2011. The Service Unit in Thuringia provides comprehensive, independent, free advisory and technical assistance services for citizens, municipalities and developers. These include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Initial consultation on possibilities for municipalities to act • Support for elected politicians and local city counsellors • Consultation of land and forest owners on land lease arrangements • Information about community/citizen participation models • Organisation of regional Stakeholder dialogues • Initiation and support for interest groups/associations of land owners • Support in case of local conflicts, moderation, mediation • Issue of a quality label for wind energy developers “Fair wind energy developer” (cf. separate good practice example) |
| Motivation/rationale behind the measure | <p>Only 10 % of the companies operating renewable energy plants in Thuringia are local companies (based in Thuringia). Hence, profits and taxes often do not stay in the municipalities. Furthermore, often land owners are not local ones. Regional value creation has been limited so far. Another problem is that there is a knowledge gap between professional wind energy developers on the one hand and municipal decision-makers and citizens on the other. Hence, setting up the service unit also helped to create a level playing field between developers and municipalities who often face time, informational and staff constraints.</p> |

| Title of measure | Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia |
|---|--|
| Social acceptance barrier(s) addressed | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Comprehensive, integrated approach addressing procedural/distributional “injustices” • Transparent information • Procedural engagement of local communities • Financial participation of communities/citizens to achieve a more balanced distribution of costs and benefits • Strengthening local value creation • Ensuring a level playing field • Trust building measure |
| Type of region | Thuringia is one of the WinWind target regions. |
| Key actors involved | The Service Unit Wind Energy has been set up by the federal state government of Thuringia under the Thuringian Energy and GreenTech Agency. Funding is provided from the Thuringian Ministry of Environment, Energy and Nature Protection and the European Regional Development Fund. |
| Key target group(s) | Multiple (e.g. citizens, municipalities, policy makers, project planners/developers) |
| Time frame | The Service Unit Wind Energy started its operation in May 2015. |
| Drivers and success factors | The Service Unit has gained broad attention and recognition even beyond Thuringia. Other regions in Germany aim to follow the example of Thuringia by transferring/adapting the Thuringian model (e.g. Brandenburg, Saxony). This wide appreciation is the result of the strong commitment of the service unit’s leadership and management. The Label for fair wind energy issued by the service unit – compared to other more regulative/prescriptive approaches (e.g. mandatory financial participation of communities in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern) – enjoys the support from the industry (separate good practice example). |
| Model character for other regions | The measure has a model character for other regions. |
| Transfer potential Transfer initiatives/ | The transfer potential is good (4). Other regions in Germany aim to follow the example of Thuringia by transferring/adapting the Thuringian model (e.g. Brandenburg, Saxony). |
| Further information/ references | https://www.thega.de/projekte/wind-gewinnt/start/ |

Annex 2: Example for a good practice portrait: Quality label “Partner for Fair Wind Energy” for project developers in Thuringia

Table A 2: Quality label “Partner for Fair Wind Energy” for project developers in Thuringia

| | |
|---|---|
| Title of measure | Quality label “Partner for Fair Wind Energy” for project developers in Thuringia |
| Type and specification of measure | Policy measure (regional level) Voluntary agreement between public and private actors (voluntary self-commitment of project planners/developers based on quality criteria developed by the Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia) |
| Country | Germany |
| Administrative level of implementation | Federal state level |
| Brief description of the measure |  <p>Since 2015, the Service Unit Wind Energy in Thuringia provides comprehensive, independent, free advisory and technical assistance services for citizens, municipalities and developers (cf. separate Good Practice Example 1). In 2016 the Service Unit started to award a quality label (certificate) for wind energy project developers committing themselves to adhere to certain quality/transparency/participation standards. Hence, the measure can be categorized as a voluntary agreement between the service unit and project developers. The corresponding criteria/guidelines include:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Involvement of all interest groups in the vicinity of a planned wind farm during the entire planning phase 2. Transparent handling of project-related information on-site, provision of assistance and informational services 3. Fair participation of all persons affected and residents, including those not directly benefiting as land owners 4. Involvement of regional energy supply companies and financing institutions 5. Development of direct financial participation opportunities for citizens, enterprises and municipalities in Thuringia. <p>The Service Units arranges individual contracts with the developers on a voluntary base. Developers are granted the “Fair partner” label for a period of twelve months. To date, 48 project developers have been granted the label.</p> |

| Title of measure | Quality label “Partner for Fair Wind Energy” for project developers in Thuringia |
|--|--|
| Motivation/rationale behind the measure | Only 10 % of the companies operating renewable energy plants in Thuringia are local companies (based in Thuringia). Hence, profits and taxes often do not remain in the municipalities. Furthermore, often land owners are not local ones. Regional value creation has been limited so far. Another problem is that there is a knowledge gap between professional wind energy developers on the one hand and municipal decision-makers and citizens on the other side. The label was introduced in combination with the comprehensive support and advisory services provided by the Service Unit, to abate existing barriers concerning planning procedures including participation and uneven distribution of costs and benefits hence strengthening procedural and distributional justice, to increase credibility of planners/developers and to build trust. It also should help to create a level playing field between developers and municipalities who often face time, informational and staff constraints. |
| Social acceptance barrier(s) addressed | The quality label is an integral part of a comprehensive, integrated approach addressing procedural and distributional justice and trust. It contributes to increase transparency of planning processes, credibility of developers, procedural and financial participation of citizens and local communities, and to achieve a more balanced distribution of costs and benefits, local value creation and to build trust. |
| Type of region (target region, model region, other) | Thuringia is one of the WinWind target regions. |
| Key actors involved | The Service Unit Wind Energy under the Thuringian Energy and GreenTech Agency jointly with the project developers |
| Key target group(s) | Project planners and developers |
| Time frame | Issuance of the label started in 2015. Developers are awarded the “Fair partner” label for a period of twelve months. Then contracts have to be re-negotiated. |
| Drivers and success factors | The Service Unit and its activities have gained broad attention and recognition, even beyond Thuringia. Reportedly, transparency of wind energy planning processes has increased, measures to increase local added value have been initiated and several pilot projects have been successfully launched. Furthermore, it has become almost impossible for project developers to do business in Thuringia without having the label. Compared to other more prescriptive approaches (mandatory in Mecklenburg-Vorpommern), this voluntary measure is also appreciated by industry. Actors in other regions/federal states started to adopt/transfer the “Thuringian model”. In April 2018, a similar label/certificate for project developers has been launched in the federal state of Schleswig-Holstein. The label goes back to a joint initiative of both wind industry and the state government. The label has been developed by WETI (Wind Energy Technology Institute, Flensburg University of Applied Sciences) in co-operation with an expert advisory board. The label is based on an independent certification under private law. Also other regions in Germany have manifested interest to follow the example of Thuringia by transferring/adapting the Thuringian model (e.g. Brandenburg, Saxony). |
| Transfer potential (Transfer initiatives) | Other regions in Germany aim to follow the example of Thuringia by transferring/adapting the Thuringian model (e.g. Brandenburg, Saxony). Transfer potential is modest to good (<i>text to be complemented</i>) |

www.winwind-project.eu
info-winwind@PolSoz.FU-Berlin.de
 @winwind_eu  inWind project

Project Partners



WinWind has received funding from European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Grant Agreement N° 764717. The sole responsibility for any errors or omissions made lies with the consortium. The content does not necessarily reflect the opinion of the European Commission. The European Commission is also not responsible for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.