



Deliverable 6.4:

POLICY INPUT PAPER

Date: 30.10.19

Version 3

Summary

WP	Name of the WP: Policy Lessons and Guiding Principles and Criteria for Fair and Acceptable Wind Energy		
Dissemination level:	Public	Due delivery date:	31 October 2019
Nature:	Report	Actual delivery date:	30 October 2019
Lead beneficiary:	FUB-FFU		
Contributing beneficiaries:	ICLEI		
Authors:	Michael Krug (FUB-FFU)		

Document history					
Version	Date	Submitted by	Partner	Reviewed/Approved by/Partner	Date
V1	11.06.2019	Michael Krug	FUB-FFU	Giorgia Rambelli, Arthur Hinsch	13.06.2019
V2	22.07.2019	Michael Krug	FUB-FFU	Giorgia Rambelli, Arthur Hinsch	23.07.2019
V3	22.10.2019	Michael Krug	FUB-FFU	Arthur Hinsch Rosaria Di Nucci	24.10.2019 30.10.2019



Abstract

The overall objective of WinWind is to enhance the socially inclusive deployment of wind energy by increasing social acceptance of, and support for, onshore wind energy in ‘wind energy scarce regions’ (WESR). The WinWind target regions are: Saxony and Thuringia in Germany, Latium and Abruzzo in Italy, Latvia as a whole, Mid-Norway, the Warmian-Masurian Voivodeship in Poland and the Balearic Islands in Spain.

This paper was prepared in the frame of the project’s Work Package 6 “Policy Lessons and Guiding Principles and Criteria for Fair and Acceptable Wind Energy”. Its main purpose was to provide input to the EU Policy Roundtable, which was organized by the WinWind consortium on 17 June 2019 in Brussels during the European Sustainable Energy Week. The Policy Roundtable “Knowledge Transfer of Innovative Mechanisms for Socially-Inclusive Wind Energy across Europe” was held at the premises of the Representation of the Region of Umbria. The event focused on discussing and providing responses to how to ensure a more socially fair energy transition, by facilitating democratic approaches to wind energy deployment in particular.

The paper is structured as follows: firstly, it summarizes selected findings and messages of the WinWind project, secondly, it briefly reviews relevant and actual policy developments at EU level in the light of those findings, and thirdly it formulates a set of questions guiding the discussions during the EU Policy Roundtable. A special focus of this paper is on renewable energy communities and community driven wind energy projects.



Contents

Summary.....	1
Abstract.....	1
1 Background and purpose of this paper	3
2 Selected findings of the WinWind project	4
3 Monitoring EU policy developments in the frame of WinWind	7
4 Guiding questions for the EU Policy Roundtable.....	11
5 References	12
6 Annex: Guidelines for Fair Wind Energy in Thuringia developed by the Thuringian Wind Energy Service Unit	14



“The deep transformation of the economy needs to be managed well to avoid social and regional disparities. The clean energy transition must be fair and socially acceptable to all. This is at the core of the European Social Model and is a clear priority of the Clean energy for all Europeans package.

(European Commission, 2019)

1 Background and purpose of this paper

The European Commission recently emphasized that the clean energy transition must be fair and socially acceptable to all (European Commission, 2019). The new EU energy policy framework calls for more bottom-up initiatives and “energy democracy”. It acknowledges that local citizen participation in renewable energy projects has resulted in substantial added value in terms of local acceptance of RES and access to additional private capital. Article 22 of the revised Renewable Energy Directive (RED II) includes new provisions on renewable energy communities to empower them to participate in the RES market.

The overall objective of WinWind is to enhance the socially inclusive deployment of wind energy by increasing social acceptance of, and support for, onshore wind energy in ‘wind energy scarce regions’ (WESR). The WinWind target regions are: Saxony and Thuringia in Germany, Latium and Abruzzo in Italy, Latvia as a whole, Mid-Norway, the Warmian-Masurian Voivodeship in Poland and the Balearic Islands in Spain.

This paper was prepared in the frame of the project’s Work Package 6 “Policy Lessons and Guiding Principles and Criteria for Fair and Acceptable Wind Energy”. Its main purpose was to provide input to the EU Policy Roundtable, which was organized by the WinWind consortium on 17 June 2019 in Brussels during the European Sustainable Energy Week. The Policy Roundtable “Knowledge Transfer of Innovative Mechanisms for Socially-Inclusive Wind Energy across Europe” was held at the premises of the Representation of the Region of Umbria. The event focused on discussing and providing responses to how to ensure a more socially fair energy transition, by facilitating democratic approaches to wind energy deployment in particular. A preliminary version of the paper provided the basis for the roundtable discussions.

The paper is structured as follows: firstly, it summarizes selected findings and messages of the WinWind project, secondly, it briefly reviews relevant and actual policy developments at EU level in the light of those findings, and thirdly it formulates a set of questions guiding the discussions during the EU Policy Roundtable. A special focus of this paper is on renewable energy communities (RECs) and community driven wind energy projects given the increased attention dedicated to RECs in the recast Renewable Energy Directive.

Acceptance research shows that renewable energy communities and community (co-)ownership of renewable energy projects, particularly wind energy can be a main driver of community acceptance (cf. Jobert et al., 2007, Ruggiero et al., 2014; Warren and McFadyen, 2010; Zoellner et al., 2008; McLaren Loring, 2007; Sonnberger and Ruddat, 2017, Liebe et al., 2017; Wirth et al., 2018). Such evidence is also provided by the Best practice case studies recently developed in the WinWind project (Maleki-Dizaji et al., 2019).



Estimates suggest that by 2030, renewable energy communities could own some 17% of installed wind capacity and 21% of solar capacity (European Commission 2016, p.79). A study conducted by the Institute of Decentralized Energy Technologies in Kassel (Germany) showed that local added value generated by community owned wind farms can be eight times higher than by wind farms owned by “external”, international developers (Institut dezentrale Energietechnologien, 2016).

2 Selected findings of the WinWind project

Different contexts require different strategies to enhance acceptance

- Social acceptance is very context-specific. There is a need to understand and disentangle the different reasons for opposition in each country, region and community. This helps to understand what kind of instruments may affect social acceptance.
- Enhancing social acceptance is a multi-level governance problem, which needs consistent, and mutually reinforcing strategies, policies and measures on all levels of government including European, national, regional and local level.
- Wind energy projects comprise a broad variety of ownership structures, legal forms and business models. Community ownership is widespread in several states and regions of West Germany. However, in the other WinWind countries Italy, Latvia, Norway, Poland and Spain, but also in East Germany (former GDR), community wind energy is much less developed or non-existing with commercial developers and utility companies dominating the market. These are often not rooted locally. Hence, acceptance strategies need to be developed both for contexts with high shares of community ownership and those where commercial developers dominate the market.

Community wind energy

- Besides Denmark, Germany can be regarded a pioneer regarding community wind farms. Community ownership of wind farms has successfully developed in parts of Schleswig-Holstein, Lower Saxony or North Rhine Westphalia, but also in several other European countries, although with different design (e.g. Austria, Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, Sweden, UK and The Netherlands).
- One of the most important drivers of community acceptance is trust: trust in the key actors, trust in institutions and decision-making procedures and processes. Trust is closely related to the credibility, competence and reputation of actors and their orientation towards the Common Good (*Gemeinwohl*). Community energy can enhance local acceptance, but is not a guarantee. Acceptance building strategies have therefore to be combined with trust building strategies.
- Community wind farms usually enjoy higher levels of trust due to the local embeddedness of the project initiators. However, our research also showed that even community projects might face opposition, particularly if the initiators are not trusted, the distribution of costs and benefits is perceived as being unfair or if other issues such as health, visual impact, nature and species protection are not properly taken into account.



- Diffusion and transferability of the concept of community wind depends very much on the context, legal framework, ownership of land, income levels, institutional settings, actors, their interests, strategies, commitment, resources and interactions with other actors. It is essential to support the development of renewable energy communities (RECs) through awareness raising, information, capacity building, training on the benefits of community wind farms, but also financial support. This includes dissemination of good practices and study visits.

Procedural fairness

- Early, open and transparent information and communication about a project is essential for building trust and acceptability. Procedural participation of the host communities and citizens throughout all phases, from the designation of wind energy suitable sites in spatial planning, to project planning, permitting, implementation, construction and operation, can enhance trust and acceptance.
- With regards to authorization/permitting, there are considerable differences between the countries concerning point of time, scope, intensity and duration of formal engagement procedures. In most countries, formal public engagement procedures are only mandatory if an Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA) needs to be carried out. This means that formal public engagement might start rather late, if there is any public engagement procedure envisaged at all. Therefore, informal participation going beyond formal statutory requirements is essential to build trust and acceptance.
- There are significant differences between the countries regarding the scope and intensity by which social impacts are assessed in the frame of EIAs. Often, social impact assessments are not very systematic. They concentrate on physical impacts (e.g. health effects). Other concerns (e.g. impact on property prices, costs/benefits for the community, well-being, recreation) are not or only superficially addressed. This can lead to frustration and opposition. However, we identified also some promising elements in the WinWind countries. In the case of Latvia, EIA regulations prescribe the performance of public opinion surveys to assess the attitudes of host communities. In Norway, EIAs are usually accompanied by societal resp. thematic conflict assessments.

Distributional fairness and benefit sharing

- Host community residents often bear a disproportionate share of negative project impacts. A fair distribution of the costs/risks and benefits/opportunities of a project can help to enhance local acceptance.
- Local communities should have a clear benefit from a local wind energy project. The local benefits and added value generated by a project must be communicated. Communities should be informed of their options to take part in it, whether through being able to directly invest, or by benefiting indirectly from the revenues that a project generates. It must also be clearly and broadly emphasized that citizens and communities can benefit from wind energy without becoming an investor/shareholder.
- Active financial participation of citizens, communities and host municipalities can help to increase community acceptance. However, in many countries community (co-)ownership models are underdeveloped or citizens are not always able or willing to invest in renewable



energy projects. Therefore, there is a need to develop alternative/complementary benefit sharing mechanisms.

- The WinWind good and best practice showcases comprise a number of promising benefit sharing measures which contribute to securing/enhancing local acceptance (e.g. royalties, special levies to be paid by developers as a percentage of their annual revenues, voluntary compensation payments, establishment of community foundations/trusts or non-profit community associations, land lease pooling models, donations and in kind benefits, special electricity tariffs, local contracting, tax revenues etc.). Such indirect benefit sharing mechanisms can be particularly appropriate where active financial participation of citizens turns out difficult due to financial constraints or reluctance to invest, and where commercial developers dominate the market.
- However, compensation payments and the provision of community benefits do not automatically translate into community acceptance. Such measures can sometimes also be interpreted as bribery, particularly if initiated by commercial developers on a discretionary basis. Acceptability of such measures seems to be higher if such compensations are mandatory or prescribed by public actors (see also Walker et al., 2017).

Trust in actors, institutions and procedures

- The reasons for local mistrust and opposition can vary from region to region and community to community. These reasons may include project ownership by external commercial developers, which are not rooted in the region, non-transparent planning and decision-making processes, poor communication, aggressive land securing practices by developers, or poor possibilities to influence the outcome of the planning/authorization processes. Biased decision-making and conflicts of interest of local decision-makers (e.g. local councillors as owners of land or shareholders of the plant) can increase mistrust and discontent.
- Early information and communication, transparency in the planning and siting processes, credible orientation towards the Common Good, voluntary measures (e.g. use of larger minimum setback distances than legally required, voluntary compensations, and voluntary self-commitments) can help to increase trust.
- The WinWind showcases illustrate that advisory organizations providing neutral information to local communities, municipalities and citizens can also play a key role to build trust. Working with organisations that provide neutral advice and assistance can reduce conflicts, being an effective tool for mediating between different stakeholders at an early stage.
- Voluntary labelling schemes as those launched in Thuringia (cf. annex of this paper) in Germany based on specific principles and criteria for fair wind energy can also help to build trust among municipalities and host communities, provided the respective criteria are based on certain level of ambition.
- In some countries the wind industry has launched voluntary self-commitments, e.g. via codes of conduct (e.g. Finland, Ireland, Sweden) or has concluded covenants or voluntary agreements with public authorities or agencies (Brandenburg in Germany, Regione



Abruzzo in Italy). These could provide guidance for other Member states or even the European level.

- Further trust building measures include the voluntary performance of Environmental Impact Assessment including formal public engagement or the development and publication of an audited Common Good Balance Sheet by the companies operating wind farms (cf. WinWind best practice showcase on community wind farms in Schleswig-Holstein).

3 Monitoring EU policy developments – findings and conclusions

Although the focus of WinWind is on the local and regional level, one of the continuous tasks performed in the frame of the project is to monitor and review EU strategic priorities and relevant policy developments at the European level. The purpose of this task is to assess how social acceptance issues and community engagement are considered in EU policies and finally to provide proposals how these issues might be better integrated. Selected findings of this monitoring task have been published in 2018 in a WinWind Policy Brief (Di Nocchi & Krug, 2018). Below we will summarize additional findings.

The revised Renewable Energy Directive: Promising steps to support renewable energy communities, but further guidance and complementary strategies are needed

In 2015, the European Commission unfolded its vision of an Energy Union with citizens at its core, where citizens take ownership of the energy transition, benefit from new technologies to reduce their bills, participate actively in the market, and where vulnerable consumers are protected. (European Commission, 2015).

On 22 May 2019, the Council of Ministers of the EU formally concluded the remaining elements of the “Clean energy for all Europeans” package. This represents a major step towards completing the Energy Union, delivering on the priorities of the Juncker Commission. The Clean Energy package consists of eight legislative acts and is based on the Commission’s proposals published in November 2016. Most important for the purposes of WinWind are the revised Renewable Energy Directive (EU 2018/2001) and the Governance Regulation (EU 2018/1999).

In the revised Renewable Energy Directive (RED II) which entered into force in December 2018, the European Union acknowledged that the participation of local citizens and local authorities in renewable energy projects through renewable energy communities (RECs) has resulted in substantial added value in terms of local acceptance of renewable energy and greater participation by citizens in the energy transition.

The RED II defines a renewable energy community as a legal entity:

- which, according to applicable national law, is based on open and voluntary participation, is autonomous, and is effectively controlled by shareholders or members that are located in the proximity of the renewable energy projects owned and developed by that community;
- whose shareholders or members are natural persons, local authorities, including municipalities, or SMEs;



- whose primary purpose is to provide environmental, economic or social community benefits for its members or the local areas where it operates rather than financial profits.

The Directive obliges Member States to provide enabling frameworks that can ensure that there are no unjustified regulatory barriers to community energy, that distribution system operators cooperate with energy communities, that participation is accessible to all consumers, and that regulatory and capacity-building support is provided to public authorities in enabling and setting up renewable energy communities. Member States will also need to minimise barriers to cross-border communities, and ensure that they take the specificities of renewable energy communities into account when designing support schemes.

In line with the Commission's Guidelines on State Aid for Environmental Protection and Energy 2014-2020 (2014/C 200/01) and the RED II Member states increasingly change their support schemes to competitive bidding and auctioning systems. The EU acknowledged that the specific characteristics of RECs in terms of size, ownership structure and the number of projects can hamper their competition on an equal footing with large-scale players, namely competitors with larger projects or portfolios. Therefore, the RED II requires Member states to take the specificities of RECs into account when they are developing support schemes.

Several Member States already started to integrate provisions and privileges for renewable energy communities and community led approaches in their auction systems (e.g. France, Germany) or plan to so (e.g. Ireland). Tenders should be modified to favor a diversity of actors and community-driven renewable energy projects through the use of corresponding tendering design options. Community engagement and orientation towards the Common Good might be established as part of prequalification criteria. Alternatively, the evaluation and selection of bids might be based on a multi-criteria assessment, which in contrast to price only systems takes into account broader considerations, such as the social and environmental benefits of community wind power. Respective assessment criteria might encompass the extent of community control or co-ownership or the number of partnerships with local organisations and businesses. Furthermore, such assessments might also consider benefit-sharing mechanisms, including payments to a community benefit fund or contributions for public education and awareness-raising campaigns.

The EU Commission might consider providing further guidance and Good practices to Member States how to develop enabling frameworks for RECs. It also might consider providing guidance and Best Practices to Member States how support schemes including auctioning systems might be modified to favour a diversity of actors and community-driven renewable energy projects through the use of corresponding tendering design options. The RED II includes strong provisions on RECs. However, there are Member States where community ownership of RES is underdeveloped and where commercial developers dominate the market. Hence, the EU Commission might consider providing complementary guidance and Good practices how to strengthen community acceptance through passive financial participation of citizens and other benefits sharing mechanisms.



Draft National Energy and Climate Plans

According to the Governance Regulation, which entered into force on 24 December 2018, EU countries are required to

- develop integrated National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs) that cover the five dimensions of the Energy Union for the period 2021 to 2030 (and every subsequent ten year period) based on a common template,
- submit a draft NECP by 31 December 2018 and be ready to submit the final plans by 31 December 2019 to the European Commission,
- report on the progress they make in implementing their NECPs, mostly on a biannual basis.

According to the General Framework for Integrated National Energy and Climate Plans (NECPs) contained in Annex I of the Governance Regulation, Member States are required to provide in their NECPs a summary of the policies and measures to promote and facilitate the development of self-consumption and renewable energy communities (RECs). Furthermore, Member States are encouraged (but not required), to communicate national objectives for the growth of renewable energy communities.

However, a brief assessment of the draft NECPs delivered by those Member states represented in the WinWind consortium (Germany, Italy, Latvia, Poland and Spain) revealed that political commitment to match the requirements was modest at best and there is still much room for improvements. So far, none of the countries did formulate any specific quantitative target for the development of RECs. The draft NECPs of Italy, Poland, and Spain acknowledge the role of RECs, but remain rather vague regarding the proposed policies and measures to be developed. Germany, so far one of the pioneers regarding the development of community energy in Europe, completely neglected the role of RECs in its draft NECP and Latvia only briefly mentions its intent to establish a framework for RECs.

A comprehensive in-depth assessment published by Friends of the Earth, RESCOOP.EU and Europa-Universität Viadrina covering the draft NECPs of all 28 Member states concludes that most Member states positively acknowledge RECs in their NECPs. However, in most cases, this acknowledgement is not matched with concrete policies or measures (Friends of the Earth Europe et al., 2019). Only a small group of Member States stood out in demonstrating their commitment to support RECs (e.g. Greece). Their draft NECPs could be regarded as detailed, precise and concrete, both in terms of objectives and policies and measures.

Cohesion Policy

Cohesion policy is the EU's main investment policy, representing about one third of the EU budget - close to EUR 352 billion for the 2014-2020 period. The policy is delivered through three main funds: the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), the Cohesion Fund (CF) and the European Social Fund (ESF). All EU Member States and regions can profit from these funds, with the bulk concentrated on the less developed regions.

The European Union supports the transition to sustainable energy use through the European Structural and Investment Funds (ESIFs), particularly the European Regional Development Fund



(ERDF), under Investment Priority 4, ‘supporting the shift towards a low-carbon economy in all sectors’ and the Cohesion Fund.

Table 1. Allocations from ERDF and CF to investments in renewables in the EU, in mln. EUR

Renewable technology	Programme period		Total	%
	2007-2013	2014-2020		
Wind	541	431	972	11 %
Solar	1,064	1,804	2,868	33 %
Biomass	1,267	1, 576	2,843	33 %
Other RES	851	1,195	2,046	23%
Total	3,723	5,006	8,729	100%

Source: European Court of Auditors 2019, based on Commission data, extracted on 9.4.2019

The EU’s cohesion policy framework is currently under revision for the new financing period 2021-2027. One of the five specific objectives of the future ERDF and the Cohesion Fund is 'a greener, low-carbon Europe by promoting clean and fair energy transition, green and blue investment, the circular economy, climate adaptation and risk prevention and management ('PO 2'). This shall be achieved by, a bundle of seven measures, including the promotion renewable energy (European Commission 2018). In the Annex to its proposal for a regulation on the ERDF and on the Cohesion Fund (COM(2018) 372final), the European Commission has specified a number of output and result indicators including the Regional Policy Common Output Indicator (RCO) 97 which represents “the number of energy communities and renewable energy communities supported”

The EU Commission should consider to strengthen the role or RECs and encourage their development in the future Cohesion and Structural Policies and disseminate European Best Practice policies and measures in this field. Furthermore, it might consider to strengthen the LEADER initiative and the LEADER regions which due to their bottom up approach and active citizen engagement are perfectly suited to support RECs as well as informal dialogue and citizen participation formats in the frame of renewable energy projects which can help to enhance local acceptance. European funding programmes should scale up their support for investments into decentralized energy infrastructure by providing adequate resources and capacity, and by fostering innovation. This also includes support to set up regional advisory bodies and one-stop shops offering information services and technical support related to wind energy development.

The need to strengthen Social Impact Assessments at European level

In all countries under investigation authorization/permitting of wind turbines/farms is accompanied by Environmental Impact Assessments (EIAs). EIAs are integral components of the authorization procedure and are regulated in the EIA Directive (85/337/EEC) and national legislation. The EIA Directive applies to a wide range of defined public and private projects, which are defined in Annexes I and II. Projects listed in Annex I are considered as having significant effects on the environment and require an EIA (e.g. long-distance railway lines, motorways). For projects in Annex II (which also includes installations for the harnessing of wind power for energy production



(wind farms), Member States have discretion to decide in which cases an EIA is necessary. This is done by the "screening procedure", which determines the effects of projects on the basis of thresholds/criteria or on a case by case examination. However, the national authorities must take into account the criteria laid down in Annex III.

According to the EIA Directive the Environmental Impact Report has to some extent also assess social impacts. According to Article 3(1) of the EIA Directive, the EIA shall identify, describe and assess in an appropriate manner, in the light of each individual case, the direct and indirect significant effects of a project on various environmental assets, but also on population and human health as well as on material assets, cultural heritage and the landscape. Annex IV of the Directive specifies the information contained in the Environmental Impact Assessment report. It requires a description of the factors specified in Article 3(1) likely to be significantly affected by the project including population, human health, material assets, cultural heritage, including architectural and archaeological aspects, and landscape.

A comparative analysis of policy and planning frameworks performed in the WinWind project (Giuffreda et al., 2019) suggests, that social impacts and the effects on the population are not always analysed in a comprehensive manner. The EIA Directive and national legislation do not provide sufficient guidance on Social Impact Assessments. However, the report also showed few promising examples from the WinWind countries (e.g. mandatory public opinion surveys in host communities in Latvia, thematic conflict assessments in Norway).

4 Guiding questions for the EU Policy Roundtable

Taking into account the previous sections of this paper, we propose a number of guiding questions to be discussed during the EU Policy Roundtable:

- Are the measures in the Clean Energy Package sufficient to unlock the potential of renewable energy communities?
- How can the European Union ensure that empowering citizens and giving them ownership of the energy transition do not remain only "rhetorical exercise" or "slogans", but translate into effective policies and measures?
- What else should the European Union do to achieve a fair and socially acceptable energy transition, particularly in the area of wind energy?
- How should Member states take the specificities of renewable energy communities into account when they are developing support schemes resp. auctioning systems?
- Taking into account the European Union's ambition that the clean energy transition must be fair and socially acceptable to all, is there a need to develop principles and criteria for fair renewable energy, including wind energy, on a European scale?
- Taking into account the transition to competitive bidding and auctioning systems across Europe, is there a need for minimum criteria for fair wind energy on a European level? If yes, how could such "principles and criteria" on European level look like? How could they be integrated into European and national policy frameworks?
- What should the European Union do to empower renewable energy communities in its future cohesion policy, particularly via the ERDF and Cohesion Fund? Should financial



support be made conditional on the fulfilment of certain minimum criteria for community ownership?

- How can cohesion policy in the future help to promote socio-political acceptance for RES in general and community acceptance in particular?

5 References

- Di Nucci, M.R. & Krug, M. (2018): The Clean Energy Package and its Implications for Renewable Energy Communities, WinWind Policy Brief 1, retrieved from: http://winwind-project.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Resources/Policy_Brief_1_Final.pdf
- European Commission (2014): Communication from the Commission. Guidelines on State aid for environmental protection and energy 2014-2020 (2014/C 200/01)
- European Commission (2015): Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank. A Framework Strategy for a Resilient Energy Union with a Forward-Looking Climate Change Policy (COM/2015/080 final)
- European Commission (2016): Commission Staff Working Document. Impact Assessment. Accompanying the document Proposal for a Directive of the European Parliament and of the Council on the promotion of the use of energy from renewable sources (recast) {COM(2016) 767 final} {SWD(2016) 419 final}.
- European Commission (2018): Proposal for a Regulation of the European Parliament and of the Council on the European Regional Development Fund and on the Cohesion Fund. COM(2018) 372 final, retrieved from <https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/EN/TXT/?uri=COM%3A2018%3A372%3AFIN>
- European Commission (2019): Clean Energy for all Europeans. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union; retrieved from <https://ec.europa.eu/energy/en/topics/energy-strategy-and-energy-union/clean-energy-all-europeans>
- European Court of Auditors (2019): Special Report Wind and solar power for electricity generation: significant action needed if EU targets to be met. Report No. 8 (pursuant to Article 287(4), second subparagraph, TFEU); retrieved from https://www.eca.europa.eu/Lists/ECADocuments/SR19_08/SR_PHOTOVOLTAIC_EN.pdf
- Friends of the Earth Europe, RESCOOP.EU, & Europa-Universität Viadrina (2019): Energy communities in the draft National Energy and Climate Plans: encouraging but room for improvements; retrieved from <https://www.rescoop.eu/blog/necps?categoryId=381>
- Giuffrida, L.G. et al. (2019): Screening of Technical and Non-technical Regulations, Guidelines and Recommendations. WinWind Deliverable 6.1., to be published under <http://winwind-project.eu/resources/outputs/>
- Institut dezentrale Energietechnologien (2016): Regionale Wertschöpfung in der Windindustrie am Beispiel Nordhessen. Kassel. Mai 2016; retrieved from https://www.uni-kassel.de/fb07/fileadmin/datas/fb07/5-Institute/IVWL/Wetzel/Regionale_Wertschöpfung_in_der_Windindustrie.pdf
- Jobert, A., Laborgne, P., & Mimler, S. (2007): Local acceptance of wind energy: Factors of success identified in French and German case studies. *Energy Policy* 35 (5): 2751–2760.



- Liebe, U., Bartczak, A., & Meyerhoff, J. (2017): A turbine is not only a turbine: The role of social context and fairness characteristics for the local acceptance of wind power. *Energy Policy*, 107: 300–308
- Maleki-Dizaji, P. et al. (2019): Synthesis & Comparative Analysis of Best Practice Case Studies for Promoting the Social Acceptance of Wind Energy. WinWind project report. Deliverable 4.3.; retrieved from http://winwind-project.eu/fileadmin/user_upload/Resources/Deliverables/Del_4.3.pdf
- McLaren Loring, J. (2007): Wind energy planning in England, Wales and Denmark. Factors influencing project success, *Energy Policy*, 35 (4), 2648–2660.
- Ruggiero, S., Onkila, T., & Kuittinen, V. (2014): Realizing the social acceptance of community renewable energy: A process-outcome analysis of stakeholder influence. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 4, 53 – 63.
- Sonnberger, M., Ruddat, M. (2017): Local and socio-political acceptance of wind farms in Germany. *Technology in Society* 51 (November): 56–65.
- Walker, B.J.A., Russel, D. & Kurz, T. (2017): Community benefits or community bribes? An experimental analysis of strategies for managing community perceptions of bribery surrounding the siting of renewable energy projects, *Environment and Behaviour*, 2017, Vol.49(1), p. 59-83.
- Warren, C.R., McFadyen, M. (2010): Does community ownership affect public attitudes to wind energy? A case study from South-West Scotland, *Land Use Policy* 27(2), 204-213, April 2010, DOI: 10.1016/j.landusepol.2008.12.010
- Wirth, S., (2014): Communities matter: Institutional preconditions for community renewable energy. *Energy Policy*, 70, 236-246.
- 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, November 2008, DOI: 10.1016/j.enpol.2008.06.026



6 Annex: Guidelines for Fair Wind Energy in Thuringia developed by the Thuringian Wind Energy Service Unit

Principles	Criteria
1. Involvement of all interest groups in the vicinity of a planned wind farm during the entire planning phase	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The mayor resp. the municipal council must be informed and involved before the start of land securing. • In addition, landowners, residents, farmers, foresters and agricultural enterprises, citizens, municipal institutions, etc. shall be involved.
2. Transparent handling of project-related information on-site; provision of assistance and informational services	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Make use of property use contracts which provide for an extraordinary possibility of termination by the property owner after expiry of five years from the conclusion of the contract in the event that no permit pursuant to the Federal Pollution Control Act for the construction and operation of the wind energy plant(s) covered by the contract has been obtained by this time. • The beneficiaries may additionally agree that they may avert the termination of the property owner up to three times and thereby extend the period by 1 year if they pay an appropriate reservation fee - in each individual case to be quantified in the property use contract. The period after the expiry of which the property owner is entitled to extraordinary termination due to non-implementation of the project may therefore be set in the property use contract at a maximum of 8 years from the conclusion of the contract, whereby a reservation fee is to be paid for the last 3 years. • Fair handling of easements and reservations (...) • Implementation of information and transparency measures on the ground. These include, for instance: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Information events in the local vicinity of the planned projects (also events addressing municipal council or landowners) - Media elucidation on site - Opinion surveys/voting - Possibly renewed information event in case of planning changes - Possible insights into simulations <p>The exact requirements are determined by the service unit in each individual case in consultation with its contractual partners.</p>
3. Fair participation of all affected parties and local residents, including land owners who are not directly profiting through	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The binding offer of land lease pool models (optional after consultation site pool models) for a fair distribution of land lease payments among the land owners concerned <u>and</u> • Registration of the office of the operating company in the host municipality (...) and maintenance of this location during the operation of the turbines <u>or</u> • Serious efforts to conclude an agreement on the distribution of trade tax in accordance with § 33 Para. 2 GewStG, according to which at least 90% of the due trade tax payments accrues to the host municipality <p>Proposals for suitable measures to compensate or replace interventions in nature and landscape associated with the wind energy project, on site, on the area of the affected municipality.</p>
4. Involvement of regional energy supply companies and financing institutions	<p>The project developing/planning company offers one or more regional energy suppliers and regional credit institutions (consortium financing possible) to participate in the project as a marketing and/or financing partner.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The regional credit institution should be given the opportunity, for example, to design a savings bond model or another indirect participation model for interested parties and/or to participate directly financially in the wind farm.



	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The regional energy supplier should be given the opportunity to design a local electricity tariff or an electricity price reduction and/or to participate directly financially in the wind farm. <p>Special note: Regional energy supply companies (EVU) are all local energy supply companies in the proximity of the wind energy area. Alternatively, Thüringer Energie AG (TEAG) or Windkraft Thüringen GmbH (WKT) can also be contacted. Regional credit institutions are all local credit institutions in the vicinity of the wind area. Alternatively, the DKB branches in Thuringia can also be contacted.</p>
5. Creation of a direct financial participation possibility for citizens, enterprises and municipalities in Thuringia.	The entitled parties undertake to carry out an "expression of interest procedure" through which the citizens, companies and municipalities within a radius of 5 km of the wind farm can announce their interest in a possible participation in the project company and the types of participation preferred for this purpose (fund/limited partnership models, energy cooperative, savings bond, crowd investment, profit sharing rights, etc.). The exact implementation of the procedure is determined by the service unit in each individual case in consultation with its contractual partners.



www.winwind-project.eu
info-winwind@PoISoz.FU-Berlin.de
 [@winwind_eu](https://twitter.com/winwind_eu)  [WinWind project](https://www.linkedin.com/company/winwind-project)

Project Partners

