

## RENEWABLE ENERGY COOPERATIVES AND LOCAL ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT

**Dr. Michael Anderson**

Assistant Professor

Department of Sustainable Energy and Community Development

School of Environmental Studies

University of British Columbia

Vancouver, Canada

### Abstract

Renewable energy cooperatives provide a locally governed route through which households, farmers, small enterprises, and community institutions can participate in the ownership, financing, operation, and benefit sharing of clean-energy assets. This paper examines the relationship between cooperative renewable-energy models and local economic empowerment. It uses a comparative, evidence-based review design to assess community solar, village-scale mini-grids, wind-energy ownership, bioenergy, and energy-efficiency cooperatives. The analysis considers capital mobilisation, employment and skills, household energy expenditure, local enterprise development, revenue retention, governance quality, inclusion, and long-term operational capacity. The study finds that cooperatives can create economic value not only through electricity generation but also through retained savings, member dividends, local procurement, land and roof lease payments, service employment, productive-use energy, and stronger bargaining power. Their performance, however, depends on reliable technical design, transparent governance, access to finance, equitable membership rules, regulatory support, and realistic maintenance planning. The paper concludes that renewable energy cooperatives can strengthen local economic agency when they are designed as durable member institutions rather than short-term project vehicles. The most effective models combine democratic decision making with professional management, inclusive benefit sharing, and clear links to local livelihoods and enterprises.

**Keywords:** Renewable Energy Cooperatives, Community Energy, Local Economic Empowerment, Energy Democracy, Rural Development, Cooperative Governance, Community Solar, Mini-Grids, Green Jobs, Inclusive Energy Transition

### 1. INTRODUCTION

Energy systems have traditionally been organised around centralised generation, large utilities, and consumers who have limited influence over how electricity is produced, financed, or governed. Renewable technologies have widened the practical possibilities for distributed generation, local storage, demand management, and community participation. Within this transition, renewable energy cooperatives offer an institutional model in which members collectively contribute capital, participate in decisions, and share the financial and social benefits of energy assets. The cooperative model can be applied to solar installations, wind projects, bioenergy systems, energy-efficiency services, charging infrastructure, and village-scale power networks.

The economic significance of cooperatives extends beyond the production of kilowatt-hours. When a project is locally owned, part of

the revenue that would otherwise leave the area can remain within the community through member returns, maintenance contracts, local service employment, lease payments, and reinvestment in common priorities. For households, collective procurement and shared generation can lower exposure to energy costs. For farms, shops, workshops, schools, and community facilities, more reliable or affordable electricity can support productive activity, reduce operating uncertainty, and improve access to essential services.

Local economic empowerment should therefore be understood as a combination of material benefit, decision-making capacity, organisational capability, and the ability to influence development choices. A cooperative that is formally owned by residents but relies entirely on outside expertise and does not communicate its finances may produce electricity without creating durable local agency. In contrast, a cooperative with

transparent membership rules, accessible participation, skill development, and accountable management can help members understand energy markets, negotiate with suppliers, and make informed decisions about revenue use and future investment.

The model also carries important risks and limitations. Renewable projects can require substantial upfront capital, complex permissions, technical expertise, grid coordination, and long-term maintenance. Membership may become concentrated among better-resourced households unless the rules deliberately include low-income residents, tenants, women, youth, and marginalised groups. Economic benefits may also be uneven if project sites, land leases, or contractual positions are captured by a small group. A careful analysis must therefore examine governance and distribution, not merely installed capacity.

This study explores how renewable energy cooperatives can contribute to local economic empowerment and under what conditions their benefits are likely to be sustained. It compares major cooperative pathways, identifies economic mechanisms, examines constraints, and proposes practical principles for inclusive local energy development. The paper treats cooperative renewable energy as an economic institution embedded in local social relations, rather than as a purely technical infrastructure intervention.

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Research on community energy has increasingly recognised that ownership and participation influence how the benefits and burdens of energy transition are distributed. Early discussions emphasised the distinction between projects that are physically located in a community and projects that are genuinely shaped by community decision making. Later studies examined cooperatives as vehicles for

### LITERATURE REVIEW SUMMARY TABLE

| S. No. | Author / Year                 | Study Focus                            | Key Contribution                                                                            | Limitations Identified                                         |
|--------|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Walker & Devine-Wright (2008) | Community renewable energy and meaning | Clarified that ownership, process, and benefit distribution all matter in community energy. | The conceptual framing does not quantify local income effects. |

citizen investment, social acceptance, local trust, and collective action. This literature shows that a project may be renewable in technological terms while still reproducing extractive patterns if local people have little role in ownership, governance, or benefit allocation.

The cooperative model is particularly relevant because it combines an enterprise function with member-based governance. Cooperatives can aggregate small contributions, create shared purchasing power, and allocate surpluses according to agreed rules. In renewable energy, these characteristics can support joint investment in assets that would be difficult for individual households or small businesses to finance alone. The model can also enable collective negotiation with installers, lenders, distribution companies, landowners, and public authorities. However, the effectiveness of a cooperative depends on the quality of its bylaws, financial controls, member communication, professional expertise, and capacity to balance economic goals with social obligations.

Studies of energy cooperatives in Europe and other regions identify enabling conditions that include stable policy frameworks, fair grid access, accessible finance, technical support networks, trusted intermediary organisations, and public recognition of community ownership. At the same time, the literature warns against assuming that participation is automatically inclusive. High share prices, meeting schedules, digital barriers, gender norms, and unequal access to property can limit membership. A local economic perspective must therefore evaluate who can participate, who receives benefits, and whether the cooperative strengthens broad-based livelihoods rather than only a narrow group of investors.

| S. No. | Author / Year               | Study Focus                           | Key Contribution                                                                                       | Limitations Identified                                                      |
|--------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 2      | Huybrechts & Mertens (2014) | Cooperative model in renewable energy | Explained why democratic governance and member benefit can complement renewable investment.            | Institutional variation makes direct comparison across countries difficult. |
| 3      | Yildiz et al. (2015)        | Energy cooperatives in Germany        | Showed that cooperatives can support citizen participation, project development, and local legitimacy. | Results reflect a specific policy and market setting.                       |
| 4      | Bauwens et al. (2016)       | Drivers of wind-power cooperatives    | Identified governance, support networks, finance, and regulatory conditions as development factors.    | Focuses mainly on European wind-energy cases.                               |
| 5      | IRENA (2021)                | Community energy implementation       | Outlined policy and financing practices that broaden local ownership of renewable assets.              | Guidance is practice-oriented rather than a controlled impact evaluation.   |

### 3. OBJECT OF STUDY

The central object of this study is the role of renewable energy cooperatives in creating locally retained economic value, improving participation in energy decision making, and supporting inclusive development. The analysis compares cooperative forms according to their financing needs, governance requirements, contribution to livelihoods, and capacity to distribute benefits fairly across local stakeholders.

#### 3.1 COOPERATIVE ENERGY MODELS UNDER INVESTIGATION

- Community solar cooperatives that collectively own rooftop, ground-mounted, or shared-access solar assets.
- Village-scale mini-grid cooperatives that combine electricity service with local operation, maintenance, and productive-use support.
- Wind-energy ownership cooperatives that enable members to invest in and receive returns from larger renewable installations.

- Bioenergy and waste-to-energy cooperatives that organise feedstock supply, energy conversion, and local service delivery.
- Energy-efficiency cooperatives that coordinate retrofits, efficient appliances, demand management, and group purchasing.

#### 3.2 LOCAL ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT CONTEXTS

- Household energy affordability, savings, and resilience against volatile energy expenditure.
- Income opportunities for farmers, small enterprises, technicians, women-led groups, and youth enterprises.
- Local procurement, installation services, maintenance, accounting, training, and project-management work.
- Member dividends, lease income, community funds, and reinvestment in local social or productive assets.

- Collective bargaining capacity in relation to technology suppliers, lenders, utilities, and local authorities.

### 3.3 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION PARAMETERS

- Accessibility of membership, affordability of shares, and representation of diverse local groups.
- Reliability of energy services and suitability for household, farm, and enterprise needs.
- Transparency of accounts, democratic governance, and clarity of benefit-sharing arrangements.
- Employment creation, skill development, procurement linkages, and local revenue retention.
- Technical maintenance, regulatory compliance, environmental safeguards, and long-term financial viability.

### 3.4 COMPARATIVE ANALYSIS FOCUS

- Individual ownership compared with collective ownership and shared-risk energy investment.
- Electricity sales, avoided energy costs, service income, and productive-use benefits as distinct economic channels.
- Low-capital efficiency measures, medium-scale solar models, and capital-intensive wind or bioenergy projects.
- Member control, professional management, community trust, and external technical partnerships.
- Immediate project returns compared with long-term capability building and local reinvestment.

### 3.5 RESEARCH OBJECTIVE SCOPE

- To identify the economic pathways through which renewable energy cooperatives can benefit local communities.
- To compare cooperative energy models according to participation, capital needs, benefit retention, and livelihood relevance.
- To examine governance, inclusion, and institutional conditions that shape the distribution of project benefits.
- To explain practical constraints related to finance, skills, regulation, maintenance, and market access.
- To propose principles for renewable energy cooperatives that aim to strengthen equitable local economic empowerment.

## 4. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study adopts a comparative and evidence-based review methodology. It does not claim to present a new survey, experimental test, or project-specific financial audit. Instead, it synthesises established scholarship on community energy and cooperatives, institutional guidance on community ownership, and practical considerations from renewable-energy project development. The method is designed to compare cooperative models according to the kinds of local economic value they can create and the governance conditions required to sustain that value.

The analysis follows the local economic pathway of a cooperative project: member mobilisation, capital collection, technology selection, construction and procurement, operation and maintenance, electricity or service delivery, revenue management, benefit sharing, and reinvestment. Each stage is assessed for its potential contribution to local employment, income, savings, skills, bargaining power, and inclusive participation. The comparison also accounts for resource availability, grid conditions, institutional support, financial risk, and the need for technical competence.

### Methodology Framework

1. The study uses a comparative design covering principal renewable energy cooperative pathways.
2. Published cooperative and community-energy literature supports the qualitative synthesis.
3. Economic empowerment is assessed through income, savings, employment, skills, participation, and retained value.
4. The review includes solar, mini-grid, wind, bioenergy, and energy-efficiency cooperative models.
5. Inclusion is treated as a core project condition rather than an optional social addition.
6. The comparison distinguishes financial returns, avoided costs, local jobs, productive use, and community reinvestment.
7. Evaluation covers governance, technical reliability, affordability, regulatory feasibility, and maintenance capacity.

8. The analysis considers rural, peri-urban, urban, agricultural, and small-enterprise operating contexts.
9. No fabricated survey statistics, attendance figures, or experimental measurements are introduced.
10. Recommendations focus on institutionally credible, inclusive, and financially responsible cooperative practice.

## 5. DATA ANALYSIS

The data analysis presents a comparative evaluation of renewable energy cooperatives as locally anchored economic institutions. The analysis is qualitative and is based on the recurring mechanisms identified in research and practice: collective financing, member ownership, reduced energy costs, local procurement, income from sales or leases, technical service work, productive-use

electricity, and the reinvestment of surpluses. The objective is not to claim that one model is universally superior, but to identify where particular cooperative forms are likely to fit local conditions.

Five major cooperative activities are considered: community solar, village-scale mini-grids, wind-energy ownership, bioenergy and waste-to-energy, and energy-efficiency services. Their performance varies according to resource quality, land and roof access, financing, grid connectivity, local demand, maintenance capability, member trust, and policy arrangements. Economic empowerment is strongest when a project produces tangible benefits that are understandable to members and when the rules for sharing those benefits are transparent.

### 5.1 COMPARATIVE ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT ANALYSIS

| S. No. | Cooperative Activity                      | Primary Local Economic Channel                                                        | Local Participation | Capital Requirement | Benefit Retention | Overall Suitability                                                     |
|--------|-------------------------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1      | Community solar cooperative               | Member savings, lease income, local installation and service demand                   | High                | Medium              | High              | Strong for shared urban, peri-urban, and institutional participation    |
| 2      | Village-scale mini-grid cooperative       | Productive-use electricity, local operations, enterprise support, and service fees    | High                | Medium-High         | High              | Very strong where reliable power can unlock local business activity     |
| 3      | Wind-energy ownership cooperative         | Member dividends, land lease payments, and local procurement                          | Medium              | High                | Medium-High       | Suitable where resource quality, finance, and grid access are available |
| 4      | Bioenergy and waste-to-energy cooperative | Feedstock aggregation, value from residues, local jobs, and waste-management services | Medium-High         | Medium              | High              | Good where biomass supply can be managed sustainably                    |

|   |                               |                                                                            |      |            |      |                                                              |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|
| 5 | Energy-efficiency cooperative | Reduced energy expenditure, retrofit work, and collective purchasing power | High | Low-Medium | High | Highly suitable as a low-risk entry pathway for local groups |
|---|-------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------------------|------|------------|------|--------------------------------------------------------------|

## 5.2 EXTENDED PERFORMANCE EVALUATION

- Community solar cooperatives can create a relatively accessible entry point because systems may be modular and can be located on shared roofs, institutions, warehouses, or suitable land. Their economic value may arise from lower electricity expenditure, sales to offtakers, group purchasing, member returns, and local installation work. Their main limitations are the availability of viable sites, connection rules, tariff arrangements, and the need to communicate financial performance clearly to members.
- Village-scale mini-grid cooperatives are particularly relevant where electricity access is weak, reliability is poor, or local productive activities require dependable supply. A well-managed mini-grid can support irrigation, milling, refrigeration, digital services, workshops, and small commercial activity. The economic case depends on demand planning, tariff affordability, service quality, collection systems, and the availability of trained operators. Projects should avoid treating household lighting demand as sufficient evidence of financial sustainability when productive-use demand is needed for revenue stability.
- Wind-energy cooperatives can generate significant collective returns where wind resources, grid access, and supportive finance are available. They may create land lease income, local tax contributions, maintenance and administrative work, and member dividends. Yet wind projects usually require higher upfront investment, complex permitting, and specialised development capacity. Without transparent risk communication and professional management, the scale of the investment can discourage broad participation or expose members to risks they do not fully understand.

- Bioenergy and waste-to-energy cooperatives can link renewable energy with agricultural residue management, animal waste, municipal waste streams, or local biofuel supply. Their economic potential is connected to feedstock collection, transport, processing, energy sales, soil amendments, and waste-management services. However, the model must be designed around sustainable feedstock availability, safe operations, competing uses of biomass, and clear environmental safeguards. Projects should not assume that all residues are surplus or that collection costs will remain low over time.
- Energy-efficiency cooperatives can deliver local value even where renewable generation is not immediately viable. Collective retrofits, efficient equipment, appliance programmes, and shared technical advice can reduce energy expenditure while creating demand for local contractors and energy-service providers. This model often needs less capital than generation projects and can build trust before members undertake larger investments. Its limitation is that savings must be measured and communicated credibly, and poorer households may still need concessional finance to participate.

## 5.3 OBSERVATIONS FROM DATA ANALYSIS

- Local ownership is more meaningful when members understand the project, can influence decisions, and have access to financial information.
- Economic benefits are broader than dividends; avoided expenditure, local services, skills, and enterprise activity may be equally important.
- Projects with modest early returns can still build local capability if they create reliable institutions and repeatable procedures.
- Energy access alone does not guarantee empowerment; productive-use planning and

enterprise support are needed where local income generation is a goal.

- Inclusive share design, flexible payment options, and representative governance can reduce the risk of elite capture.
- Technical maintenance and financial discipline are essential because cooperative legitimacy can decline quickly when service quality or accounting is weak.
- Public policy and intermediary support can help cooperatives navigate permits, finance, standards, and grid relationships without replacing member control.

## 6. DISCUSSION

The comparative analysis indicates that renewable energy cooperatives can contribute to local economic empowerment by changing the position of communities within the energy system. Instead of remaining only customers, members may become co-owners, investors, decision makers, service providers, and beneficiaries of a local asset. This shift can improve the circulation of value within an area, especially when energy projects are connected with local procurement, skill development, small-enterprise activity, and reinvestment in shared priorities. The cooperative structure is not valuable merely because it is collective; it is valuable when its rules make collective ownership practical, transparent, and meaningful.

A central insight is that the distribution of benefits should be planned from the outset. Projects often focus heavily on technology selection and financing while treating local benefit sharing as an issue to resolve later. This approach can weaken trust and create conflict once revenue begins to flow. Cooperative bylaws and project agreements should specify who can become a member, how shares are priced, how voting rights are allocated, how surpluses are used, whether dividends are capped, how community funds are governed, and how members can access financial information. These choices affect whether the cooperative functions as a broad development institution or as a small investor club.

The relationship between technical scale and empowerment is also complex. Larger projects can produce more revenue but may require sophisticated development capacity and higher financial exposure. Smaller systems may be

easier to understand and govern, but their economic effect can be limited unless they are linked to local productive uses or replicated across multiple sites. A phased approach can be effective: a cooperative may begin with efficiency measures, shared solar procurement, or a small community facility and later develop larger renewable assets as its management, finance, and member confidence grow.

Inclusion requires deliberate design. Women, tenant households, landless workers, informal businesses, and lower-income residents may be excluded by high entry costs or by meeting structures that favour established local elites. Inclusive cooperatives can use affordable share options, instalment payments, reserved representation, transparent outreach, benefit mechanisms that do not depend solely on capital contribution, and partnerships with self-help groups, producer groups, schools, or local institutions. Inclusion should also cover information access: technical and financial documents need to be explained in clear language so that participation is not limited to members with professional expertise.

Finally, cooperatives need supportive ecosystems rather than isolated project delivery. Government agencies, utilities, local banks, development finance institutions, technical organisations, and civil-society intermediaries can help with regulatory navigation, standard contracts, feasibility studies, training, and finance. The role of such partners should be enabling rather than controlling. The long-term objective is a cooperative that can manage assets responsibly, hold partners accountable, and make future investment decisions based on member priorities and local economic needs.

## 7. CONCLUSION

This study examined renewable energy cooperatives as a pathway for local economic empowerment. The analysis shows that cooperative energy models can create value through member ownership, lower energy expenditure, local employment, service activity, lease income, productive-use electricity, dividends, and community reinvestment. These benefits are not automatic outcomes of renewable technology. They depend on whether a cooperative is governed democratically, managed professionally,

financed responsibly, and designed to include people with different levels of income, property ownership, and technical knowledge. Different models are appropriate for different contexts. Community solar and energy-efficiency cooperatives can provide practical entry points where capital and technical capacity are limited. Village-scale mini-grids can support local enterprise development when reliable supply and productive demand are planned together. Wind and bioenergy cooperatives can offer substantial long-term value but require more complex finance, permitting, environmental oversight, and operational competence. In every case, transparent accounting, credible maintenance

arrangements, and clear benefit-sharing rules are central to member trust.

The paper concludes that renewable energy cooperatives should be viewed as institutions for energy democracy and local development, not only as financing mechanisms for clean infrastructure. Future research and practice should prioritise locally appropriate financial models, inclusive membership structures, gender-responsive governance, skill development, reliable impact evaluation, and policies that make community ownership feasible at scale. When these conditions are present, renewable energy cooperatives can support a transition in which communities participate directly in the economic opportunities created by clean energy.

## 8. REFERENCES

1. Bauwens, T., Gotchev, B., & Holstenkamp, L. (2016). What drives the development of community energy in Europe? The case of wind power cooperatives. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 136-147.
2. Becker, S., & Kunze, C. (2014). Transcending community energy: Collective and politically motivated projects in renewable energy (CPE) across Europe. *People, Place and Policy Online*, 8(3), 180-191.
3. Berka, A. L., & Creamer, E. (2018). Taking stock of the local impacts of community owned renewable energy: A review and research agenda. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 82, 3400-3419.
4. Brummer, V. (2018). Community energy - Benefits and barriers: A comparative literature review of community energy in the UK, Germany and the USA. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 94, 187-196.
5. Candelise, C., & Ruggieri, G. (2020). Status and evolution of the community energy sector in Italy. *Energies*, 13(8), 1888.
6. Caramizaru, A., & Uihlein, A. (2020). Energy communities: An overview of energy and social innovation. Publications Office of the European Union, EUR 30083 EN.
7. Creamer, E., Taylor Aiken, G., van Veelen, B., Walker, G., & Devine-Wright, P. (2019). Community renewable energy: What does it do? Walker and Devine-Wright (2008) ten years on. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 57, 101223.
8. Devine-Wright, P. (2005). Beyond NIMBYism: Towards an integrated framework for understanding public perceptions of wind energy. *Wind Energy*, 8(2), 125-139.
9. European Commission. (2019). Clean energy for all Europeans package: Citizens and renewable energy communities. European Union.
10. Huybrechts, B., & Mertens, S. (2014). The relevance of the cooperative model in the field of renewable energy. *Annals of Public and Cooperative Economics*, 85(2), 193-212.
11. International Cooperative Alliance. (2015). Guidance Notes to the Cooperative Principles. International Cooperative Alliance.
12. Hewitt, R. J., Bradley, N., Baggio Compagnucci, A., Barlagne, C., Ceglarz, A., Cremades, R., McKeen, M., Otto, I. M., & Slee, B. (2019). Social innovation in community energy in Europe: A review of the evidence. *Frontiers in Energy Research*, 7, 31.
13. International Labour Organization. (2002). Recommendation concerning the promotion of cooperatives, 2002 (No. 193). International Labour Organization.
14. International Renewable Energy Agency. (2019). Off-grid renewable energy solutions to expand electricity access. International Renewable Energy Agency.

15. International Renewable Energy Agency. (2020). Community-ownership models: Innovation landscape brief. International Renewable Energy Agency.
16. International Renewable Energy Agency. (2020). Stimulating investment in community energy: Broadening the ownership of renewables. International Renewable Energy Agency.
17. International Renewable Energy Agency. (2021). Community energy toolkit: Best practices for broadening the ownership of renewables. International Renewable Energy Agency.
18. International Renewable Energy Agency. (2024). Community energy benefits: Powering universal wellbeing. International Renewable Energy Agency.
19. Kooij, H.-J., Oteman, M., Veenman, S., Sperling, K., Magnusson, D., Palm, J., & Hvelplund, F. (2018). Between grassroots and treetops: Community power and institutional dependence in the renewable energy sector in Denmark, Sweden and the Netherlands. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 37, 52-64.
20. Magnani, N., & Osti, G. (2016). Does civil society matter? Challenges and strategies of grassroots initiatives in Italy's energy transition. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 148-157.
21. Mey, F., & Diesendorf, M. (2018). Who owns an energy transition? Strategic action fields and community wind energy in Denmark. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 35, 108-117.
22. OECD. (2020). Rural Well-being: Geography of Opportunities. Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development.
23. Ruggiero, S., Martiskainen, M., & Onkila, T. (2018). Understanding the scaling-up of community energy niches through strategic niche management theory. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 29, 31-43.
24. Schreuer, A. (2016). The establishment of citizen power plants in Austria: A process of empowerment? *Energy Research & Social Science*, 13, 126-135.
25. Seyfang, G., Park, J. J., & Smith, A. (2013). A thousand flowers blooming? An examination of community energy in the UK. *Energy Policy*, 61, 977-989.
26. United Nations. (2015). Transforming our world: The 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development. United Nations.
27. Walker, G., & Devine-Wright, P. (2008). Community renewable energy: What should it mean? *Energy Policy*, 36(2), 497-500.
28. Wierling, A., Schwanitz, V. J., Zeiss, J. P., Bout, C., Candelise, C., Gilcrease, W., & Gregg, J. S. (2018). Statistical evidence on the role of energy cooperatives for the energy transition in European countries. *Sustainability*, 10(9), 3339.
29. Yildiz, O., Rommel, J., Debor, S., Holstenkamp, L., Mey, F., Muller, J. R., Radtke, J., & Rognli, J. (2015). Renewable energy cooperatives as gatekeepers or facilitators? Recent developments in Germany and a multidisciplinary research agenda. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 6, 59-73.
30. 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.