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Chapter 1: Introduction

The development of wind energy in Ireland\(^1\) can be seen as a microcosm that embodies a myriad of characteristics that the European Union (EU) makes great efforts to pursue. The commonly heard mantra of jobs, growth and sustainability all unequivocally applying. It is widely accepted that these characteristics are desirable and furthermore, that the EU can be helpful in improving on these broad concepts within member states. Yet the burning question of ‘how can the EU actually be observed to pursue these various interests and ideals?’ remains duly difficult answer. This question is difficult across many areas of European level influence, and not least for the axiomatically complex area of wind energy in Ireland, where there are many overlapping influences. When some of the specific trajectories of influence - those that can be seen to make up part of a veritable endless spectrum of influences - are difficult to observe, it can be assumed that the interaction with them might not be as efficient as it could be, given a better understanding of them in the first place. To that end, this thesis therefore identifies three trajectories of influence before assessing how they are being influential.

The central aim of this paper is to discuss and therefore better understand, how is the EU influencing, in Ireland, in the specific sector of wind power development, according to these three mechanisms of change. These channels have been developed out the existing literature on Europeanisation and offer a systematic way by which to begin weighing up the influence of the EU on Ireland’s wind development, something which has not been specifically looked at in this context before. As the development of wind power in Ireland is an expectantly complex and multifaceted area for research, no one research paper can be expected to comprehensively explain the sector, its history and the entirety of factors that shape its nature. Likewise, this paper will use just one theoretical approach, Europeanisation, and apply it to the subject area, so that it can be observed and questioned under a specific light. This analysis allows the thesis to discusses and conclude with considerations on the important role of the national level in this process as well as the aspect of social and community engagement as a common and crucial thread that arises throughout the study.

Readers might well be aware that the EU has no formal competence in spatial planning, yet much can be observed on the ways in which the planning approach of the EU is impacting, directly and indirectly, on spatial planning in member states, and in this case on the development of wind power in Ireland. Ravesteyn and Evers have stated that an introverted approach to national spatial planning ‘without regard to the growing influence of Brussels will doom it to failure’ (2004: 8), and so the pursuit of greater knowledge appears very much warranted. When looking at this relation, certain questions become important such as: How close is the goodness of fit between the different levels of policy making? For each of the channels, is the influence of the EU constant or capricious, increasing

\(^1\) Ireland refers to the Republic of Ireland only unless otherwise specified
or decreasing? And ultimately can we objectively question what type of traction this has gained on the ground?

Despite this lack of a formal competence, the EU does possess a large array of options for exercising its abilities to influence spatial developments in different member states and this is one reason for the observable growth of interest in Europe’s formulation of spatial strategies for territorial development. Of high importance for the growing interest is the coordination role that the wider European Spatial Planning Frameworks plays: bridging overarching EU aims, with regulatory approaches to land-use and sectors, that ultimately impact on the local level, in this case relevant to specifically wind power. The 2020 Climate and Energy Package being a centre piece of the EU’s framework on emissions and energy for the current period. Understanding this complex and ever-changing relationship for wind in Ireland may give a greater understanding as to why the industry has developed in the way it has, as well as how better engagement between different levels of government, industry and the public may be fostered in the future. It may also allow for considerations on what type of development is desired in the future; not just in the sense of reaching targets, but in how those targets ought to be met.

As of late, organisations such as the European Commission are now putting a greater emphasis on measuring the results of their efforts, while the member states continue to have some doubts on the effectiveness of EU spending and influence. The recent European parliament elections results are testament to this wider trend.

This thesis, which is derived from overarching approaches to spatial planning in the EU, with the specific topic of wind power in Ireland, brings together a number these current and crucial aims of the EU and its member states. Analysing the Europeanisation of Ireland’s wind development through three trajectories is an area of research that may bring much fruitful insight, one that should be of interest to those working within the local level right up to European, and potentially the even global, so as to better understand and improve governance. This thesis has chosen wind power in Ireland as abating climate change through a better understanding of renewable energy development is duly becoming increasingly sought after as a lacklustre political performance slowly gives way to the irrefutable scientific evidence.

This paper seeks to research the recent developments of Europeanisation as it applies to wind energy in Ireland by historically unpacking, categorising and assessing the intensity of different trajectories through which the EU exerts its influence.

Accordingly, the thesis will explore the following areas: firstly, the thesis objectives and related questions will be developed. Secondly, the social and scientific relevance of the paper will be given before a discussion on the different meanings of planning. After which a brief

---

2 This emerging field of research is often known as capitalisation, focusing on measuring outputs, results and impacts.
history will be given on Ireland’s recent efforts to expand wind development (this mainly relates to onshore wind because it has been easier to develop from a technical standpoint but offshore will become an increasingly larger share of the future energy mix). The paper then takes a turn to look at the wider middle-range theoretical framework/approach of Europeanisation, taking from it so that it can be applied to analysing wind power in Ireland for the purpose of this paper. Following on from this the methodology chapter will explain how the three trajectories will be analysed. The papers’ assessment of the key channels of influence then gets underway on a) Discourses, b) Directives and c) Finances. Sixteen carefully selected expert interviews are then distilled and discussed in relation to each of the three channels of influences. The following discussion looks at the data collectively and discusses the strong goodness of fit seen at the normative and national level and a countering reflection is given on what can be inferred from the observed overall lower degree of a rational goodness of fit, drawing attention to the aspect of social and community engagement that arose throughout the study. This latter observation was unintended when undertaking the research and rather resulted out of the scientific approach employed. The conclusion looks at the some of the broader implications of the results found as well as options for further research.

1.1. Aims and Objectives

As European Spatial planning is concerned with ‘the coordination of the spatial impacts of sectoral policy’ (Dühr et al 2009:29) (impasses added), this thesis seeks to gain a fundamentally better understanding of how these sectoral and discursive relations from the EU correlate, influence and impact on the development of wind power in Ireland. Furthermore, this paper asks to what extent can these influences be seen to be strong or weak, direct or indirect; ‘seen or unseen’ to use the words of Ravesteyn and Evers (2004).

The phrase not everything that counts can be counted, and not everything that can be counted counts makes the researcher mindful of the restraints in trying to account a full story. Notwithstanding, this thesis endeavours to shed light on such an ‘opaque’ area of research (Flynn 2005: 110), by applying a systematic way by which to answer the research objectives and offer meaningful insights.

Following the structure of the paper this paper seeks to question, better understand and trace the connection between the EU and Ireland’s wind development in the three specific areas of:
   a) Discourses
   b) Directives
   c) Finances

Following this is an assessment of the level of intensity by which these are influencing.
The uptake of wind has been very differentiated across Europe, let alone globally. Previous mechanisms such as the feed-in tariff (guaranteeing kilowatt hour prices to target suppliers) have proved to be very successful in Denmark, Germany and Spain, yet have not had the same effect in other countries such as France (Szarka 2007). Many approaches to increasing wind power focus specifically on technical aspects, which are undoubtedly of great importance, however this paper seeks to analysis the greater European influence it has with Ireland and how well-aligned these goals are, the goodness of fit of this relationship.

During the time that this thesis is being carried out, the EC has announced how it is changing its opinion away from feed-in tariffs towards feed-in premiums (Ragwitz et al 2012). These changes have enormous knock-on effects and this thesis works to raise awareness and greater clarity about these important developments, as well as where they originate. Indeed, as the scene is set now, there is much confusion, and back-stepping, with Ireland having announced, during the writing of this these thesis of its inability to work on a HVDC interconnector with England, delivering a massive blow to industry confidence. The country has also produced ad hoc methods for recalculating GHG emissions in light of an understanding that certain targets will not be met. The future for Ireland’s wind power development is far from certain.

This paper wants to show how the EU is not a distant, irrelevant, expert-only or uninteresting arena for research but in fact, can be the very opposite. This paper hopes to raise the overall awareness for how crucial the EU is if Ireland wants to attain and outdo its current ambitions in relation to wind power production. And furthermore, without making overstretched generalisations, to show that if the EU is of great importance for wind, a sector for which is does not have direct authority on, it will also be of great importance to other areas.

The research aims to aid discussion and therefore contribute to a better understanding of the issue of Ireland’s uptake of wind energy, when at a broader environmental level ‘there is a need for more academic inquiry to understand the motives and circumstances within member states that influence adoption of new forms of environmental governance implied by the EU directives’ (Unalan and Cowell 2009:35). Likewise, a better understanding of what is not being effective is also crucial, such as the aspect of social and community engagement for wind development which is repeatedly shown to underperform in this sector. This is despite some sustainable economists being of the view that renewable energy co-operatives, and similar other structures, have enormous untapped potential at the moment (Nash 2014). Moreover, there is limited amount of land area in Ireland for developing wind power (R. Meade PC3 2014, C. Doyle PC 2014) and this paper also aims to highlight possible alternative

---

3 PC stands for personal communication, most often meaning a recorded interview for this paper which can be accessed via CD-ROM.
arrangements for organising development as soon as possible while this usable land space diminishes.

This paper also addresses the inconsistency of studies that tend to address what might be, instead of what has been. There has been an observed ‘general lack of ex post assessments’ of the costs of complying with environmental regulation by government departments and regulators (Baily et al 2002: 255). It is expected that by tracing many of the steps in Ireland’s path towards increased wind power, it will counterbalance the lack of research in this area by taking stock of what has happened to date.

This paper comes at the timely realisation of the pressing importance of addressing Europe’s – and to an even greater extent Ireland’s – reliance and dependency on foreign fuel. Europe spends €421 billion every year on coal, oil and gas imports, costing each European citizen the equivalent of more than €2 a day (EWEA 2013). For Ireland it is €6.5 billion per year on such imports (Motherway 2014).

This was described as no less than the ‘Achilles heel’ of the EU during an early discussion with Johannes Hahn, Commissioner for Regional Development, as part of this thesis, and before that a video lecture by Declan Murphy on Ireland’s Future Energy Security, where he uses the same term. This paper hopes to contribute information at a time when it is greatly needed. Irish wind energy experienced the highest growth again in 2007, of 21%, while fossil fuels also increased by 1.4% in 2007 accounting for 96% of all energy used in Ireland in 2007 (EHLG 2010:13). This paper hopes to gain knowledge that may contrite towards ameliorating this unfavourable fuel mix.

![Figure 1 Gross Electricity Consumption by Fuel Source 1990 – 2012 SEAI (2014: 22)](image)

Ultimately, the overall aim of this paper is to offer meaningful insights and reflections for both Ireland and/or the EU regards their ongoing efforts to work more effectively together, especially in the area of wind power. What this paper does not want to do is promulgate the notion that wind is Ireland’s home-run solution to its energy and environmental difficulties. It is only one part of a piece in a much larger puzzle and this thesis is intended to be an impartial analysis on the subject matter.
1.2. Research Questions

The most fundamental question at the outset of this thesis is how is the EU level influencing the development of the Irish wind sector? There are a number of ways one can go about answering this question. This paper has taken one approach, and sought to explore what are the fundamental channels by which one might ought to look at first, as they can be seen to hold importance.

Ergo, the first sub-question asks how can the role of the EU level be conceptualised in terms of influencing the development of the Irish wind sector? This is broken down into two separate questions. What are the channels of influence to assess? And then, how should they be assessed? The literature on Europeanisation was employed to achieve this, giving the researcher the three aforementioned channels, or trajectories as the paper often refers to them. They are by no means set in stone outside this paper, as other channels could have been chosen for this area of research. If other studies choose to look at different area of EU level influences, it may also be apparent that a variation of the channels may be appropriate.

The follow on sub-question from this is: how does the EU level framework influence the development of Irish wind power through these channels of influences? This is applied to each of the channels of influences. In order to place some value on the extent or degree of influence - admittedly subjective terms - the paper looks at each of the channels, first at the level of rhetoric or common agreement and then at the level of reality or practise (i.e. is there an observable follow-through). In the terms of the literature drawn on they have been previously referred to as normative and rational (Diamond 2009), which have been kept to keep clear the lines or origin and logic in this paper.

For each, both the normative and rational sense, the three mechanisms and the observed results will be given a weighting of high, medium and low, so as to give the study a conciseness without over-simplification, so that it may enhance the transferability of what has been learnt in this research. The weighting is given after the mechanisms are assessed based on the literature, the data sets available, as well as the sixteen interviews conducted. Furthermore the author is convinced that giving an observable result to these questions could be useful to further research that may want to do similar research and thus make across the board comparisons.

Following on from this the paper comes to, an originally unintended question, which becomes a central question at the heart of this paper, which is as follows: Can an explanatory hypothesis be given to the observed results? It appears that there is a significant sticking point in movement of influence from the EU to Ireland, with an observable high performance in the normative sense, and an observable low performance in the rational sense. In this way the paper seeks to observe not only one level

---

4 In this paper the following terms are all interchangeable: mechanisms of change, channels of influence or trajectories of influence.
of government (i.e. the national) and in line with Szarka seeks to investigate what patterns of governance are encouraging ‘bottom up’ societal engagement as a result of the ‘top-down’ technocratic management (2007:196).

1.3. Social and Scientific Relevance

It is difficult to even write about wind without the social and scientific relevance becoming very apparent; the enormous costs of fossils fuels, be it a specific monetary price or a priceless environmental one. It is the judgment of this paper that the influence of the EU is now fundamental to Ireland’s wind development, as was aforementioned by Ravesteyn and Evers (2004). A well-understood and well-planned growth in Ireland’s wind energy relies heavily on this relation and is of great importance to Ireland’s future energy security of supply and its price stability.

The reason for choosing Ireland and wind power is that it poses a very interesting and quickly developing area for research. Ireland’s wind capacity has ‘more than doubled since 2005’ and ‘this points to a greater urgency for solutions to be found for Ireland than elsewhere in Europe’ (Foley et al 2012: 693). While this paper does not explicitly focus on the technical issues for Ireland’s wind energy, it does aim to gain a better understanding of why the level of wind power has increased the way it has, and what levels of activity can be related to such developments.

Studying the relationship of Ireland and Europe is of particular importance. To date, the combined global efforts have been nothing short of dismal. Kyoto for Ireland meant an actual allowance for an increase in emissions of +13%, through the selection of the 1990 levels that were used
This offered little impetus for change and is as a result of the policy not having the necessary tailored fit to different historical levels of GHG emissions. The EU policy level process and Ireland offers a much more pertinent and workable scale—in the current global political situation—at which to investigate Ireland’s wind development, as will be shown throughout the paper. Likewise studying Ireland’s wind development without acknowledging the EU influences would be of less value. The only time Ireland operated its own energy and environmental policy was before it joined the European Economic Community (EEC) in 1973, and at that stage it was characterized by ‘a somewhat minimalist and British-influenced corpus of environmental regulation’ (Flynn 2005). The author of this paper is of the view that to know wind power in Ireland, it is a sine qua non to have a clear understanding of the EU’s influence.

More importantly in the years further ahead, for both Ireland and at the wider global level are the impacts of climate change, and the overwhelming negative global impacts this has in almost every aspect of life. It is in this regard that the author is convinced any study that contributes in some small way to overcoming this dilemma is of great social and scientific relevance.

1.4. The Meaning of Spatial Planning

The first man who, having enclosed a piece of ground, bethought himself of saying This is mine, and found people simple enough to believe him, was the real founder of civil society. ... you are undone if you once forget that the fruits of the earth belong to us all, and the earth itself to nobody.

Jean-Jacques Rousseau (1754) Discourse on Inequality

Before embarking on this paper, the author considers it necessary to cover what ‘spatial planning’ can be understood to mean, in Ireland vis-à-vis continental Europe. This section is more specifically addressed to people approaching this paper from a background in Irish planning but may be informative to people more familiar with other backgrounds too.

In 1973 Aaron Wildavsky wryly titled his article with ‘If planning is everything, maybe it’s nothing’. The precocious paper went on to elaborate, claiming, ‘The problems they (planners) have with the word mirror their problems with the world’ (Ibid: 128). Today as well, Spatial Planning remains a tricky term that defies a short explanation. Yet, accepting that it comes to means many different things is not a wise point of departure and the term can be seen to carry different, yet distinctive, overall meanings depending on where and what it is being used in relation to; in this case between the Irish and the EU, where the leading proponents of the spatial planning concept are generally perceived as the Dutch, French and Germans (Faludi 2010).

It is necessary to put some semantic sense to the various terms so as to introduce the reader as to its usage in this paper. ‘Planning’, ‘Spatial Planning’, ‘A Spatial Planning Approach’, ‘European Spatial Planning’ are
all terms that can have a significant different array of meanings depending on the person or the topic of discussion it is being used in relation to. A brief clarification of the usage of these terms, in this paper, is therefore a much required point of departure.

The usage of the term spatial planning can be separated into two broad meanings for the purpose of this paper, between ‘land use planning’ (statutory planning practice) and ‘spatial planning’ (non-statutory planning strategies), as Tewdwr-Jones et al have also distinguished with regard to the UK (2000, p. 658). The Irish planning system was born out of a British model and still bears close resemblance today. From these two points of comparison, comes a third, European Spatial Planning.

The first, and one that will most commonly be familiar to Irish readers—whether or not they are professionally involved in the planning system—denotes a system by which physical development is managed; the emphasis being on the permitted use of space, most often through the form of an allowed, or not allowed, form or activity. The EU Compendium of planning systems gave an individual separation to this approach, labelling it ‘land use management’ (CEC 1997: 37) as is seen presently in Ireland. The second term, is more broadly associated with continental Europe, and here we see a different meaning, although a few in particular have contributed more than others to the final notion of European spatial planning, which borrows much from this use of non-statutory planning strategies. From France the notion of aménagement du territoire is ‘concerned with the regional economic planning of the territory at the broadest level’ and is inextricably linked to the administrative and political traditions of the country (CEC1997: 23). In the Netherlands the term ruimtelijke is closely tied to the ‘important traditions of managing a scarce land resource, and has connotations of major public sector activity in the development process which has been the norm’ in the country (Ibid). In Germany, it is used to describe a federal system, again, a system of division not familiar to many in Ireland.

In addition to these are the Mediterranean planning models, which can be seen to have a greater degree of focus on design at the urban level, but these are not of great relevance for European spatial planning.

This third term, or usage, that of European Spatial Planning, has been promulgated from the European level and is used in a different, albeit a not necessarily initially apparent context. In this EU community setting it describes and encompasses an evolving coordination debate. ‘It represents crucial but complex link between spatial planning and land use planning, paving the way for a conception of European spatial planning’ (Tewdwr-Jones and Williams, 2001, pp. 164-167 in ESPON 2007: 71). More specifically, it can be said to describe ‘the coordination of spatial impacts of sectoral policies such as transport, regional policy and agriculture’ (Dühr 2010: 29). Used in this ‘EU sense’ it comes to mean the confluence

---

5 Here the word community can be another misunderstanding, used to describe the European Community, as opposed to the idea of a local community as it is most commonly associated to land use planning in Ireland
of a number of different origins for spatial planning, notably from those countries which take a greater lead in the debate. These nation states share similar approaches in planning and when certain traits, such as a greater use of setting targets, appear on the European planning stage they can be less familiar to their counterparts from the British Isles.

Here the paper would like to draw attention to one important implication of the broadly accepted meaning of European spatial planning. Firstly, the word ‘impacts’, in the earlier reference, highlights the importance of using the case study example of wind development in Ireland relevant to Europeanisation. Without such a physical benchmark to discuss the continental approach it is felt by the author that the paper would fall short of engaging substantially and comprehensively with the topic.

Planning can be seen as one of the fundamental origins of how people progress, this paper discusses one complex relationship, between the EU and Ireland and its wind development, so that it may be better understood and managed. The paper shows how as the heart of planning, despite the differences between the EU level and the national level in Ireland there is always the central dilemma of ‘conflict resolution’ to use the words of Peter Marcuse where situations are not always ‘win-win’ but rather ‘win-lose’ and that is how we ought to think of them (2008).

Chapter 2: The Irish wind sector

It is repeatedly confirmed that Ireland has one of the best wind resources in Europe; second best in Europe and best in the EU (C. Doyle PC 2014). However, depending on the way statistics are shown, one can be easily led to have different perceptions on to what extent wind energy is being of benefit to the people of Ireland; both financially and environmentally.

The possibility for misrepresentation is indeed true for many aspects of the wind sector in general, such as the very important difference between how much electricity a wind turbine actually produces (its capacity factor), compared to how much it would produce if it operated at full nameplate capacity\(^6\) 100% of the time; which does not happen, yet is often given in promotional material (see Dublin Array 2014 and London Array 2014 websites).

Notwithstanding, Ireland’s capacity factor is very high with the average wind power output (capacity factor) in Ireland being 32%, compared to 20% in Germany (Dudurych 2006)\(^7\).

In addition to these differences on the point of reference, annual variation in wind strength, market conditions, social barriers, technological constraints and share of energy supply and demand all make comparisons across time and location more difficult, and easier to distort. This chapter

\(^6\) Nameplate capacity can also be known as the rated capacity, nominal capacity, maximum effect or installed capacity.

\(^7\) The reader should keep in consideration that by the end of 2013, despite a capacity factor, Germany produced 33,730 MW while Ireland only produced 2,037 MW (EWEA 2014: 4); put another way, only 6.04%.
will attempt to show an unbiased and brief picture of the Irish wind sector over the last three decades since its inception. This chapter will show a few different categories of Ireland’s wind before going through a timeline of its development.

2.1. Geographically
First and foremost is how Ireland fares geographically. The island is exceptionally well situated concerning wind. Located in the NW of Europe, it has a very steady supply of wind as a result of the North Atlantic Gulf Stream. This is why a wind turbine in Ireland is able to produce double the electricity as the same wind turbine installed in Germany according to Reiche and Bechberger (2004).

Geo-economically, another important aspect of Ireland’s location is its proximity to neighbouring countries, this allows Ireland to buy and sell electricity to neighbouring countries, if interconnectors exist. This is a very advantageous position as Ireland often gets the first and strongest winds as they travel across NW Europe, and this trade of energy compensates for the intermittent nature of its supply. Recently it has become voiced that with increased wind energy, Ireland has the capability of producing excess electricity and becoming a renewable energy exporter (DCERN 2012a).

2.2. Wind energy and other renewables
Looking at the basic energy dependency of all products, Ireland was in 2010, the fourth most dependent of the 28 EU member states on foreign fuel (EP 2014). And in terms of energy production, it ranked the 5th lowest for the same year in terms of million tonnes of oil (Ibid). These statistics reflect the poor selection of Ireland’s fossil fuels and renewables to choose from; such as the geothermal found in Bulgaria or the tidal tapes in Norway. It does however have an abundance of strong wind that is increasingly becoming the backbone of Ireland’s sustainable energy transition.

Figure 3 Total Primary Energy Requirement (SEAI 2011)
The total Primary Energy Requirement is defined as the total amount of energy used within Ireland in any given year. The TPER for Ireland was 14,763 ktoe in 2010 and the amount of wind energy that fed into this was 242 ktoe (SEAI 2011: 15). Put into percentages, we can calculate that wind therefore only makes up 1.64% of Ireland’s TPER, a modicum of what is needed. From the literature covered in this thesis, it can be said that this reality has not been clearly shown in policy documents, let alone actively communicated to the public. It is a figure that, while daunting, is nonetheless consistent with the previous reference of a desire to export energy, yet it highlights the convoluting possibilities when looking at facts and figures for wind.

This chapter will divide the progress of Ireland’s wind development into five phases. While other others have given different periods–three periods are used in the publication by the International Renewable Energy Agency (IRENA 2014) while a very different three are used by (O’Mahoney et al 2013) – this paper uses five as it is thought it better distinguishes the development path to date.

2.2.1. PHASE 1 – Demonstration
1970’s - 1993
Going back to the absolute beginning, the first known record of a windmill in Ireland dates from 1281 (Kilsclonon, Co. Wexford) and prior to steam power and electricity by 1840 there was 250 windmills on the Island (SEI 2014). Interestingly, this is more than the current number of wind farms, being 179 (IWEA 2014). After a lengthy plateau, the true first phase of Irish wind power can be observed and in the early nineteen eighties there were several demonstration wind machines, which as a result of the ‘adolescent nature of the technology’ were not very successful in terms of performance (Staudt 2000).

The idea that Ireland could supply its electricity grid with a significant proportion of its energy needs was beginning to take route in academia, with one paper envisaging up to 25% (Gibbons et. al 1979 in Haslett and Raftery 1989). At this time there was little ability to record the power of wind in Ireland, let alone give accurate predictions on the ability to harness its energies, hence why this underestimated figure was so low.

At the outset, we see the EU’s involvement in the first significant detailed investigation of the wind resource for the purposes of wind energy in Ireland. The survey was carried out by Hurley-Staudt Associates in a co-financed VALOREN funded project of the EC (Hurley Staudt Associates 1988 in Staudt 2000). Not alone can the first study be partly attributed to EU help but so can the first significant wind energy installation of 21 wind turbines at Bellacorrick (Staudt 2000). At this time, Ireland was very heavily depended on oil, and following this gas; not very unlike today. However, what was very different was how this energy was controlled through ‘what was essentially a monopoly of the Electrical Supply Board (ESB), the state-owned electrical utility’ (IRENA 2000). The complex evolution and splitting up of the ESB will be shown in the following Phases.
2.2.2. PHASE 2 – The Alternative Energy Requirements I and II (AER’s)
1993 – 2000
- AER I – 1994 (to deliver 30 MW wind capacity–of a total 75 MW–by 1997)
- AER III – 1997 – 2000 (initially to deliver 90 MW wind capacity by 1999)

The AER’s were Ireland’s earliest energy targets. In 1993 the AER was first announced, and by 1994 it was the official market support mechanism for wind, as well as other alternative energies. It had similarities with the United Kingdom’s Non-Fossil Fuel Obligation and Frances EOLE 2005 Programme, which were both deployed as competitive tendering systems (Ó Gallachóir et al 2010). The first round received many proposals (totalling 73MW for wind) but only 45.8 MW was commissioned in by the end (DCERN 2005 in IRENA 2014).

Between AER I and AER III (1997-2000), the funding mechanism changed substantially from a Power Purchase Agreement (PPA) whereby the national utility company (ESB) had to purchase the produced electricity, to awarding projects bases on the price support per Kwh, not at grant level (IRENA 2014). This third scheme was also not without its difficulties and was troubled by planning issues, such as site restriction, and many of the proposals failed to receive permission to build.

In 1996 the government carried out a substantial review of **Renewable Energy - A Strategy for the Future**. This contained wind energy targets up to the year 2010 with the basic target of 30MW of installed capacity per year between 2000 and 2010. This policy was partly driving by the growing awareness that ‘without development of renewable, particularly wind ... the proportion of native fuels used to generate electricity will drop from 43% in 1994 to 8% by the year 2001, primarily due to a) the depletion of native natural gas, b) the depletion of our peat resource and c) the general increase in electricity demand’ (Staudt 2000: 3).

The ESBI study mainstreamed the idea that ‘wind power could generate around 345TWh/y or around 19 times the current electricity production of the ESB system’ (ESBI-ETSU 1997). Following on from this and just before the turn of the century in 1999, Ireland had 19 wind farms with a combined installed capacity in Ireland of 117 MW. The market interest had grown and there was now sixteen times this amount of energy been shown in expressions of interest in AER III, and a further amount of 499 MW at various stages within the Irish planning application process (Ó Gallachóir et al 2010: 199).

Collectively this marks the end of PHASE II as an important milestone in wind power development where Ireland is faced with the opportunity to maximise on this momentum. At the time Staudt (2000) stressed how the ‘AER process has brought forward wind energy development, however it

---

8 AER II was solely for biomass and waste as an energy source
is not resulting in significant Irish involvement in the industry, and the resulting lack of active public support may hinder future development.’

2.2.3. PHASE 3 – Market Liberalisation
1999 -2005

Ó Gallachóir et al label the period from 2000 to 2005 as one characterized by ‘increased ambition’ (2010: 113). A large part of this ambition can be attributed to the introduction of the Green Paper on Sustainable Energy (Department of Public Enterprise 1999), which set a target of an additional 500MW to be achieved in the period of 2000 – 2005. In tandem with this, a Renewable Energy Strategy Group (RSEG) was set up to produce a report by mid 2000 that would lay out a comprehensive analysis of all the obstacles to further renewable development, with a particular emphasis on the ‘economic costs, the planning process and grid connection’ (ibid). They covered much ground, and from the combination of professionals with different backgrounds who took part in the report, a number of important obstacles to the development of wind in Ireland were highlighted. These issues were of mostly national concern, focusing on the planning process as well as technical constraints to integrating the electricity grid. The targets set to be achieved by 2010 in the 1996 strategy were reviewed upwards by the Renewable Energy Development Group, which was set up in 2004 by the minister who had a particular focus on wind energy in relation to renewable energies.

As ‘in line with the requirements of EU electricity and Competition Directive’ (DEHLG 2006: 4) The Electricity Regulation Act 1999 (Government of Ireland 1999) made substantial headway in its allowance for third-party access to sell electricity from wind straight to consumers. ‘The key aspect of relevance is that the total electricity market is now open to wind electricity suppliers while only a portion of the market is open to those generating electricity from fossil fuels’ (RESG 2000: 14). This gave the ‘green suppliers’ an advantage over the ‘brown suppliers’ who were only allowed to sell to large companies. The Green Suppliers had the added benefit within this arrangement that they could sell to commercial and residential buyers, who on average paid more for their electricity. The Electricity Regulation Act 1999 also carried with it the establishment of the Commission for Energy Regulation (CER), the responsibilities of this organisation being two fold. Firstly the CER regulates the natural gas and electricity sectors; and as of recent, Ireland’s water sector since charges were introduced in late 2013. Secondly, it introduced increased competition for electricity. It is in charge of regulating the level of revenue that EirGrid and ESB can recover from the Transmission Use of System (TUoS) charges levied on all electricity customers.

To clarify the roles post market-liberalisation, EirGrid is the monopolistic electricity Transmission System Operator (TSO), while the ESB is the monopolistic Transmission Asset Owner (TAO). The TSO is then responsible for the planning, operation and development of the transmission network (Irish Statute Book, 2000 in Ackermann 2012), while the TAO is the dominant supply company.
In addition to these changes between players, a tax relief incentive was introduced under Section 62 of the 1998 Irish Finance Act. When combined, these steps led way to 16MW of wind capacity by 2000, that grew to ‘a staggering 338 MW by the end of 2006’ (Ó Gallachóir et al 2010: 118). In a counter balance to this growth however, it should be noted that at this stage it was still believed that the policy area of the environment was still one that was not of paramount interest in Ireland (Flynn 2005). This could be seen from the EU level where Ireland was accounting for 1 per cent of the EU’s population but 10 per cent of all the environmental complaints submitted to the Commission (Coffey 2002 in Ibid).

2.2.4. PHASE 4 – Feed-in tariffs, Regulation and Ownership
2006 – 2010

In 2006, the REFIT (renewable energy feed-in tariff) replaced the AER scheme, or competitive tendering scheme. The ‘scheme provided a transparent fixed floor for 15 years for certain technologies with a formula to allow for different technologies and consumer price increases’ (Ackermann 2012: 626). In addition, the national target for electricity from renewable energy was raised from 13.2 per cent to 15 per cent of gross electricity consumption by 2010 (Department of Communications, Marine and Natural Resources 2006c in Ó Gallachóir 2010)

The Republic of Ireland and Northern Ireland were at this point two separate jurisdictions but shared a synchronous power system, the All Island Grid (AIG). In November 2007, a single electricity market (SEM) was introduced (Foley et al 2012 693)

The CER jointly regulates the wholesale electricity market, or SEM – the Single Electricity Market - for the island of Ireland, along with the separate jurisdictional counterpart in Belfast, the Utility Regulator. The operation of the SEM is different from the aforementioned regulation. The SEM is operated by SEMO. SEMO stands for the Single Electricity Market Operator and is a joint-venture between EirGrid and SONI, the transmission system operators in Ireland and Northern Ireland respectively (CER 2011). While this division of responsibility is very complex, it can now be said that electricity market liberalisation has become common practice internationally (O’Mahoney et al 2013).

In 2002 Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland was established as Ireland’s national energy authority under the Sustainable Energy Act 2002 (SEAI 2011: 2). They quickly encountered problems. In 2003, the negative effects of week scenario forecasting can be seen. The TSO was forced to secure a moratorium on new grid connection agreements that effectively lasted for an eighteen-month period. This was as a result of not allocating sufficient resources to prepare for a significant increase in wind farms, not carrying out system modelling to assess the impact of wind farms and, the lack of adequate models from wind-turbine manufacturers (Ó Gallachóir 2010). The Department of Environment’s Wind Energy Development
Guidelines (DoELG2006) arrived four years late in June 2006 and the sluggishness of the 127 local authorities to proceed without these guidelines was noticeable (Ibid).

In recognition of the findings in the All Island Grid Study in 2008 from the DCENR and DETI, the Irish Government increased the target for renewable generated electricity to 40% for 2020 while Northern Ireland followed in 2010 by setting a 40% goal for electricity from renewable sources by 2020 (Ackermann 2012: 630). The two government bodies had shown that increasing the renewable electricity consumption to 42% would be possible and beneficial as long as certain assumptions were allowed. It acknowledged certain gaps in the study, such as uncertainly over the final cost of electricity to SME’s, yet painted a proactive picture on the whole. The Pöyry report (2014) points out that these targets of 40% are part of its obligation under the EU Renewable Energy Directive in 2009 (28/EC) to source 16% of all energy consumed in the country from renewable sources.

Even with these steps, in 2007 Ireland still supplied 96% of the total energy demand with fossil fuels (7% domestic and 89% imported) and only 3% from renewable energy (Connolly et al 2011). Notwithstanding, it should be made clear that ‘the integration of the two electricity markets in Ireland has been a success’ (Conlon 2013: 07) and the growth seen in the graph below is testament to that.

![Renewable electricity growth to 2010 (DCERN 2012:31, and DCENRa 2012:10 in their first progress report to the commission and Strategy for Renewable energy 2012 – 2020)](image)

**2.2.5. PHASE 5 – Growing awareness and growing uncertainty**

2011 Onwards

Looking to Ireland’s current progress towards reaching its share of energy from renewable sources (in % of gross final energy consumption), latest figures show that Ireland has a 7.2% share for 2012. This is still a long way off the target of 16% for 2020 but also a great improvement since 2004 when it was only 2.4% (Eurostat 2014).
In the most recent of developments the EU has introduced new guidelines that come into force on the first of July that replace Feed-in Tariffs with Feed-in Premium (ECa 2014). This introduces more competitiveness into the RE electricity sector, which may bring more efficiency and lower costs, however, it introduces much uncertainty, potentially stymying investment. Looking at Europe Couture et al., in a paper for NREL (the national laboratory of the U.S. Department of Energy), they conclude, with regard to Europe, that ‘the greater investor risk, compounded by the greater uncertainty over the policy costs for society, are likely to make premium FIT policies a costlier policy design choice’ (2010: 62). Ireland has also just announced that a previous MOU that showed strong intentions for 2,300 turbines to supply UK energy by 2020 has now been called off as of April 2014 (DCENR 2014).

Medium term estimates (to 2018) expect variable renewable energy shares for electricity generation to be (30%) for Ireland, where wind makes up the greatest part of this figure (IEA 2014). Nimby’ism, and increasingly Bananna’ism (build absolutely nothing anywhere near anyone), for lack of another term, has been on the rise and possesses a major obstacle to rolling out wind energy in Ireland. The paper discusses these often-misunderstood terms at the end of the paper and offers further direction for study.

As a point of departure about Ireland’s Europeanisation experience, it can be stated that ‘Ireland was uniquely susceptible to Europeanisation effects because of the nation-wide consensus of opinion in favour of EU membership’ (Ashead 2005:162). Furthermore this initial enthusiasm for EU integration combined with Ireland’s small country profile led to unique negotiation techniques that favoured a great willingness to accept the bulk of the EU’s requirements and desires. This tactful approach, of picking negotiations carefully so as to not appear contrary to the EU trajectory on the whole, was pioneered by Gareth Fitzgerald. It enabled Ireland to have more of a voice when communicating opposing views, meaning that the small nation state uncontested and adopted much of what was instigated in Brussels.

Overleaf is a list of the more recent policy documents for those looking for greater detail on these developments:
### List of the main Policy documents in Ireland

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>National Climate Change Strategy 2007-2012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EIRGRID (2010 -2014) All Island Renewable Connection Report’s - 36 Month Forecast</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 List of the main policy documents in Ireland

### Chapter 3: Theoretical Approach: Europeanisation

Many different avenues were investigated in choosing a suitable theoretical framework. Europeanisation was chosen for this paper as it was deemed the most suitable. It is an approach that can be applied to many fields, with noticeable frequency in legal, economic and social studies. Across these fields it has been analysed to be most useful as a ‘directing device and a starting point for further exploration’ (Olsen 2002: 921), which is the way in which it is used in this thesis.

It is known that the integration of Europe takes place in myriad ways. The emergence of the single European market and European Union (EU) sectoral policies are two prominent examples of fundamental economic and political integration. In the immense complexity of the integration of the European Union as a whole, middle-range theories such as Europeanisation are created to conceptually analyze aspects of how the EU and its member states, shape each other, and in turn, redefine the EU and its subsequent course of direction. For this paper the ‘grand theories’ were ruled out early on as Dühr et al have shown that these macro level lenses, such as neo-functionalism and intergovernmentalism, ‘cannot provide detailed explanations for how the multi-level governance system in the EU works and how policy and decisions are made’ (2010; 101). Instead the middle range theories have the ability to deal with ‘the impacts of EU policy-making and decision-making on the member states and regions’ (ibid), which is in line with the very subject matter of this paper.

For clarification, and also realism, Nugent has articulated how the term ‘theoretical approaches’ is a often a more suitable wording than theoretical framework, as they ‘arguably have greater descriptive than explanatory uses and powers, and have only a very limited predictive capacity’ (2006: 572). Indeed this paper does not give a future trajectory for Irish wind
power but rather reflections that may be useful consideration going forward.

Since the 1990’s, Europeanisation studies have seen significant academic attention being channelled towards discussions on cross-border, interregional and transnational cooperation and how these activities relate to the EU’s influence on the member states spatial planning systems; their principles, policies and practices. The Europeanisation of spatial planning is a theoretical tool that can be used to contribute to an understanding of the processes of influence associated with change in spatial planning and impacts in this area of wind from the EU.

Many different definitions have been given to the term Europeanisation. This author uses Europeanisation as an umbrella concept. Radaelli, in his astute introduction to the term, raises the valid objection that ‘If everything is Europeanized to a certain degree, what is not Europeanized?’ (2000: 9); a line that bears resemblance of the earlier quote by given by Wildavsky in relation to planning. The term is more generally used as an attempt to encapsulate the diffusion of ideas relevant to spatial planning in Europe. At a basic level it can be described as ‘a new rationality for organising European space’ (Jensen and Richardson, 2004 in. Lähteenmäki-Smith et al. 2005: 11). Where the new rational is a different conceptualization for achieving greater spatial justice, and in this paper also environmental justice. The ideas of, and behind, planning are subject to being reshaped, contested and interpreted in different ways. They may also be rejected at national, regional or local level; Europeanisation is not a one way street. It should not be assumed that all influences that permeate through systems are given due or absolute consideration. Moreover, the transfer of ideas and standards takes place on the stage of a complex multi-level and multi-sectoral environment of governance. This combined, explains the difficulty in pinning down Europeanisation as a term, hence why this paper adopts it as an umbrella concept. As the concept can cover so much, the remit of this author is to decide what channels it can extract most appropriately for the subject matter.

Europeanisation is ‘closely linked to concepts such as policy transfer, learning and lesson-drawing’ (in Dühr et al 2007: 295). The term Europeanisation is not considered to be synonymous to the convergence of planning approaches, or specifically, the convergence of wind power approaches. Indeed the diversity of spatial development challenges is apparent from the varying institutional contexts and governance cultures; each with their own legal and administrative systems. The implications of such diversity ‘makes it difficult to talk of policy convergence’ (Allin and Walsh 2010:30). This is one of the reasons why the Danish wind power success has been more of a lesson in policy learning, instead of read-made transferable policy (Ackermann 2012). The definition offered by Radelli (2004) gives a suitable overarching summary of what the term encompasses:

---

9 ‘If planning is everything, maybe it’s nothing’ (Wildavsky 1973)
Europeanisation consists of processes of a) construction, b) diffusion and c) institutionalisation of formal and informal rules, procedures, policy paradigms, styles, 'ways of doing things' and shared beliefs and norms which are first defined and consolidated in the EU policy process and then incorporated in the logic of domestic (national and subnational) discourse, political structures and public policies.

Lenschow (2006 in Dühr et al 2010: 298) uses the concept of Europeanisation to analyse the EU influences four major ways:

1. ↓ top down (from the EU level to the national)
2. ↑ bottom up (uploading of ideas at the national level to the EU)
3. ⇆ horizontal (transfer between EU member states)
4. ↰ circular (from the national level to the EU and back to the national level, explicitly in the case of EU Directives and more subtly in initiatives as will be shown)

There is a frequent tendency for literature to form conceptualisations based on the first category, depicting European integration as being top-down in nature. For Central Eastern European member states ‘Peripherality, combined with small country status has further encouraged a top-down mode of Europeanization’ (Goetz 2006:16). Indeed this can also be seen to be relevant for Ireland to a certain degree. Ireland’s successful emergence onto the European stage has now been understood as being precisely dependant on the way it used its small country status to the best of its ability. These tactics have even led to the recent coining of the term the ‘Garret Fitzgerald guiding principles’ (Halligan, 2013), for the way in which small countries can function strategically to ensure their own interests. Nonetheless, the observable dominance of a top down relationship persists.

The tendency to emphasise this top down processes is increased for myriad reasons amongst which is the paradigm that ‘Western planning thought has become legitimized and is presented … as a culturally and socially superior model’ (Jaakson 2000: 565 in Stead and Nadin 2012) and is based on the assumption that a movement towards market economics should be accompanied by a likewise movement towards planning models. Interviews conducted early on confirmed this view, and the respondents stressed the need to proactively question the EU’s views at a time when there is a large amount of quick transfer of discourse and legislation (A. Culhane PC 2014, J. Nix and I. Lumly PC 2014, J. Reilly PC 2014 ). The role of planners has certainly changed; ‘The age when urban developers and planners could simply concern themselves with one spatial, geographical reality—and could produce planning or design proposals for them in a logical sequence of operations—seems to have come to the end’ (Dutch Spatial Planning Agency 2000 in Jenson 2002: 119) and undoubtedly the EU has also become a massive ‘transfer platform’ (Radaelli 2000: 9) for facilitating knowledge transfer and this, to a limited extent, gives a certain justification to this tendency. The resources and
cumulative input to EU decisions gives it a certain legitimacy that weighs into its perceived favour and authority on a given area of expertise.

This paper has taken the meaning of European spatial planning where in ‘its broadest sense ... describes the impacts of the EU on national policies and politics, on the one hand, and the influence of national discourses on the development of governance at the European level through the process of “uploading”, on the other’ (Dühr et al 2010) and adapted it to the aims of this paper. The different categorisations for analysing influence in this paper can be linked to the methods put forward in the discussion on Europeanisation. Wishlade et al have made clear how ‘conceptualisations have varied widely in both their approach and application, leading some authors to warn against the perils of conceptual, ‘stretching’, and calling for a greater emphasis on theoretical clarity and analytical rigour (2003: 3).

At the same time, it must be appreciated that Europeanisation ‘does not provide any simple fix to theoretical or empirical problems. Quite the opposite, it can deliver if approached as a set of puzzles’ (Radelli 2004), to paraphrase Gualini, the task is to see the term Europeanisation as a problem in search of explanation, not the as the explanation itself (2003).

Further still Larsson and Emmelin have stated how ‘Wind power development can be analysed from many angles such as energy policy, economics, sustainability (and) implementation dilemma’ (2009: 2) and so much attention has been given to appropriately dovetail the theoretical approach with the methodology.

This paper attempts to give strong analytical rigour to the often fuzzy concept of Europeanisation through selecting appropriate channels of analysis, drawn from the wider discussion on Europeanisation, and focusing the thrust of the paper on the top down incorporation in the logic of domestic discourse, political structures and public policies as Radelli (2004) defines the process.

Looking first to the top down. Wishlade et al (2003) gives two early descriptions of this conceptual route; namely Ladrech (1994) who described it as an ‘incremental process reorienting the direction and shape of politics to the degree that EC political and economic dynamics become part of the organizational logic of national and policy-making’ and Borzel who wrote about it as ‘a process through which domestic arenas become increasingly subject to European policy making’. For this author, these statements highlight two things. Firstly, it shows how the theoretical approach of Europeanisation was initially formed under a much more tenuous connection between member states and the EU, whereas now it can be seen that connections certainly do exist but it is rather the nature of these connections that warrant attention. And secondly, how the topic of Europeanisation is quite well established, with careful word play attributing more or lesser degrees to the acuteness of influence and the rate at which this can be observed to increase or decrease. Indeed looking at the two statements, the former bears arguably more accuracy than the later, paying more attention to the soft nature of the process, where it should not be assumed that member states will always follow suit as intended.
3.1. The ‘Mechanisms of change’

Wishlade et al write how Knill and Lehmkul were the first to arrive at the crux of the Europeanisation approach clarifying the specific ‘mechanisms of change’, which is ‘an important task for the study of Europeanization’. These mechanisms are not ‘mutually exclusive’ as Dühr et al (2010: 104) have pointed out and therefore need careful consideration when applying them to the trajectories used in this paper.

a) The first mechanism involves the ‘the imposition or prescription’ of an EU model where there is ‘limited discretion at the national level’ (Dühr 2010; 104 and Wishlade et al 2003: 3) or also where ‘domestic arrangements have to be adjusted’ (Dühr et al Ibid). Here, the author of this paper has chosen to assign EU Directives, as they embody these characteristics.

b) The second mechanism consists of altering the rules of the game, or put another way ‘changing domestic opportunity structures and a corresponding redistribution of resources and power’ (Dühr 2010; 104 and Wishlade et al 2003: 3). This can be taken and associate with the influence of Finances, which has been chosen for this paper.

c) The third mechanism, which is seen as the weakest, ‘relates to altering the beliefs and expectations of the domestic actors, following a cognitive logic’ (Dühr 2010; 104 and wishlade et al 2003: 4). In this case, Discourses provides a suitable trajectory by which to assess.

Each of these mechanisms must in turn be looked at to see the variation in the domestic integration from EU pressures. From a top-down perspective this means that the mechanisms of Europeanisation are independent variables while the resulting change is the dependent variable. In reality the process consists of numerous stages, each having enormous or minute altering abilities.

The three mechanisms are assessed as shown above as a, b, c as this gives the best systematic understanding of the influences, working from the large open discourses, down to the specific legislation and onto the ways in which is can be observed to be influenced financially\(^\text{10}\). The other

---

\(^{10}\) In the literature they are given as c, a, b as explained above.
ways in which Europeanisation occurs are given by Lenschow (2006) as motioned earlier. This paper will comment on these other ways (directions) as they can be seen to arise but the main focus will be on the top down processes, as is in line with the classical understanding of Europeanisation, as well as the diminutive role the other ways play compared to the top down considering Ireland’s small state status and other characterises (Wishlade et al 2003).

The factor that will be used to give an explanation of the domestic adaptation in Ireland to EU influences is the ‘goodness of fit’. It is in a way, a straightforward concept where there is a focus on looking at the downwards adaptational pressure and seeing how much change may have brought about. It encompasses the amount of change (at a sub European level) necessary to meet the given requirements (usually in reference to the EU level, as in this case, but can also be aligned to the standard of other member states). Risse et al (2001) describes it as thus ‘the degree of adaptation pressure generated by Europeanization depends on the ‘fit’ or ‘misfit’ between European institutions and domestic structures’. So for example, if a country’s specific stance is already in line with EU aspirations, before pressure is exerted, then the goodness of fit is very high, whereas if a country is vehemently opposed to oncoming EU standards, then the goodness of fit will be assumedly low. The methodology section will go into further detail on how this paper will distinguish the level of goodness of fit ascribed to each of the three trajectories.

The second factor applied to each of the mechanisms in the literature concerns the domestic institutional structure, such as ‘unitary or federal territorial designs, the mix of public and private actors in the economy, political or organisational cultures, patterns of party competition’ (Wishlade et al 2003). As this paper looks at one nation state, this will not be discussed for each section to avoid repetition and maintain succinctness. Instead it will be discussed at the end, alongside Lenschows mechanisms. It should not be misinterpreted as an unimportant aspect, as if this approach was to be applied to other nation states, it could provide an interesting point of comparison.
Chapter 4: Methodology

“Good social science is problem driven and not methodology driven in the sense that it employs those methods that for a given problematic, best help answer the research questions at hand.”

Flyvbjerg 2006: 242

The methods used in this research is for studying the single case of wind power development in Ireland, where the goal is to gain insight into the interdependency between the case of wind power development and its context, that draws on qualitative (but also quantitative) research methods in order to gain contextual wealth of the phenomenon, and where there is a close interdependency between the researcher and the research-object, with a necessary amount of interpretation (Madureira lecture 2013).

4.1. Research Strategy

This thesis uses a deductive case study strategy, taking wind in Ireland as the case study. As a case study methodology can have many meanings, I will use it in the sense distinguished by Gerring that the research investigates the properties of a single case (2004: 342). As Stake succinctly expresses ‘the real business of case study is particularization, not generalisation. We take a particular case when we come to know it well, not primarily as to how it is different from others but what it is, what it does. There is emphasis on uniqueness’ (1995: 8). However, this does not excuse the reader from reflecting on the ‘process-tracing’ (George and Bennett 2004) carried out in this paper, so that considerations can be made of on the processes of Europeanisation for wind power in other countries. In the words of Gorman and Clayton, an in-depth investigation has ‘the assumption that it is possible to derive knowledge of the wider phenomenon from intensive investigation of a specific instance or case’ (2005 p. 47), or in the words of Flyvbjerg, through ‘the force of example’ which ‘is underestimated’ (2006: 228).

In order to apply the theoretical approach, which covers such a large area, the case study and the research questions are deduced. As Saunders explains, ‘With research into a topic that is new, is exciting much debate, and on which there is little existing literature, it may be more appropriate to generate data and analyse and reflect on what theoretical themes the data are suggesting’ (Saunders et al. 2003 p. 90). This is precisely what this thesis does and this approach has had the effect of generating the core research finding of an investigating the social and community component in addition to seeing an implementation gap at the national level, ‘which Ireland is famous for’ (J. Moore PC 2014). Much of the data associated with wind power can be quantitative, number of wind turbines, power output, the period of time and the goals that need to be hit. However, this thesis also sets about collecting much qualitative data, by interviewing carefully chosen experts to reflect on the meaning associated with these numerical trends and test there significant in light of EU influences.
4.2. Research Methods

As this research starts off with a broad question, and breaks it down, there was a likewise necessity to find a structure by which to divide the research into a number stages. Maxwell’s phases model was selected as being suitable for achieving a comprehensive research structure, as it is an iterative process and a holistic approach (2005). In line with Maxwell, the research outline was broken down into five stages, each of which describes the order of the actions in which they were taken.

![Maxwell's Interactive Model for Research Design](image)

**Phase I** undertook a significant literature review. This covered both papers found on the history of wind development in Ireland to date as well as theoretical literature. The old adage of ‘Those who don't know history are destined to repeat it’ by Irish statesman in the seventeen hundreds highlights the enduring importance of such a point of departure for this study. Indeed many of the traits of past drawbacks remain, such as the enduring difficulties associated with a lack of social and community integration appear perpetually uncontested in any meaningful way.

Initially the subject was tested to see the most appropriate way of conceptualising it. For this the literature of Europeanisation was heavily drawn on, talks with four professors further confirmed this suitability, as well as two fortunate conversations, that took place near the outset of the thesis with Johannes Hahn the European Commissioner for Regional Policy and Michael Schneider, President of the EPP Group in the Committee of the Regions. This first stage was exploratory in nature and gave the paper the three mechanisms of change to asses. The literature review was conducted through all stages of the research but was more
extensive during the beginning phases. Peer-reviewed journal articles were accessed through GoogleScholar as well as BTH’s Summons@BTH online database which includes databases such as Web of Knowledge and ScienceDirect. Radboud’s RUQUEST and University College Dublin’s @UCD library was also used, together with Summons@BTH, in order to gain access to the widest amount of available literature, both Irish and international.

**Phase II** embarked on the research methods required to collect the necessary data, of which a semi-structured interview process was chosen. The interview questions were outlined, based on investigating the three mechanisms of change. The questions can be seen annexed to the end of the paper.

**Phase III** involved the collection of the data where 12 primary interviews, with an average length of 42 minutes took place\(^{11}\), these were in addition to the four primary interviews, excluding discussions with professors. During this time, each of the three mechanisms of change were being assessed primarily from experts in academia, government and the private sector. Online interviews, speeches and articles were also used.

**Phase IV** was the systematic transcription of the data and assorting the relevant information for each of the mechanisms of change. In essence this involved testing if the responses were in line with the literature and what could be added or contested. In addition the semi-structured interviews were feeding into the concluding discussion that was continuously emerging.

For **Phase IV**, the collective information was interpreted and hypothesized upon to provide critical reflection on what the data was suggesting. The written transcripts were also reviewed comprehensively to investigate what might have been overlooked in earlier stages.

**4.3. Data collection**

**Interviews**

A semi-structured approach was employed to allow the comparison of the qualitative data without hampering the emergence of natural dialogue (Maxwell 2012). Also in line with a semi-structured methodology, the interviewers were given the freedom to ask questions without particular order (ibid) and also elaborate on points that they held specialist or particular in-depth knowledge of. In this way answers to one question often happened to provide answers to some of the other questions. This was especially true for the end-of-interview question that related to community and social engagement where it was important not to trigger any response or push the interviewee in a given direction. It was important that the interviewer maintained their uninfluenced response regards this particular issue.

\(^{11}\) (507 minutes / 12 interviews = 42.25)
All interviews were conducted on-line through Skype as they were based in Ireland and it was not possible to do face-to-face interviews. While the quality of the sound did vary, it did not affect the delivery of the content. The majority of the interviews went uninterrupted, and the hand-free nature of Skype allowed for what appeared to be casual and open discussions, that always lasted or exceeded the original estimations of time for the interviews.

The Sample
Two sets of interviews were carried out; four exploratory and twelve primary interviews. The first four interviews focused on testing the ground for the suitability of the application of the theoretical framework. The interviewers with Johannes Hahn the European Commissioner for Regional Policy and Michael Schneider, President of the EPP Group in the Committee of the Regions were very beneficial. The combination of these two interviews showed that the three mechanisms of change were seen to be the most important aspects of the EU influence, as perceived by the very high-ranking practitioners in European affairs. In this way, their comments gave great credence to what was established through the theoretical framework.

The other exploratory interview with Franziska Dettner who works with An Tásice on carrying out submissions and comments on wind farm development across Ireland alerted the potential quagmire of the time that could be lost in interviewing lower levels of government and practitioners as she was concerned solely with the national guidelines and the EU influence was not apparent for her. While this interview was not very fruitful, it did serve the very important function of guiding the selection of primary interviews. Another interview with Paul Kenny from the Tipperary Energy association was an early warning sign of the difficulty in trying to get many private market interviews with people who were simple too busy working. He was still helpful and sent documentation that was useful for the research.

The focus of the primary interviews was to collect data to answer the pre-defined research question ‘How does the EU level framework influence Irish wind power development through the three channels of influences?’ the three channels were often introduced as ‘Rules, resources and ideas’, as Healey (1992) has labelled them according to his work, as it was felt this offered a clear introduction. After this they were elaborated on as they are presented in the paper, with the second half of the primary interviews also receiving the actual protocol questions and the authors own prism graph to help with delivering a clearer mental picture. A full interview outline is available in the annex.

Experts and practitioners in the wind power development in Ireland were approached regarding participating in interviews. Requests were sent to more than quadruple the number of interviews conducted but many stated that they did not have time to take part in the interviews. Other calls were made to organizations that would be expected to have good knowledge on the subject matter but some proved otherwise. These were not included in the list as there was no real contribution. Notwithstanding,
a wide distribution of experts and practitioners were contacted; across the
market, the government and civil society, some of which fell between the
lines of these distinctions. This distribution of interview participants in
itself is a form of data triangulation to account for potential bias amongst a
given grouping.

**Analysis of information**

The interviews were translated verbatim, not in their entirety - as often the
discussion moved into conversation, as it to be expected with such a
controversial subject area – but rather for the proportion of the interview
that bared a significant relevance, which by and large included the greater
majority of the time spent interviewing. The interview transcripts attached
to the CD-ROM is roughly 25,000 words, and contains the important parts
of the interviews.

http://otranscribe.com/ was a programme used to slow down the
interviews in order to allow for more accurate transcription, after the
recorded interview had taken place.

Causal conversational pieces were encouraged by the interviewer as
these proved useful in building a rapport with the subject being
interviewed, it was often not until after this point of comfort was built that
many of the interviewees began to speak more openly and fluidly about
their own perceptions and experiences on wind development in Ireland.
The information gathered was taken as a series of observations and
interpreted according to the goodness of fit relevant to each of the channels
of change. After the interviews had taken place, stand out quotes were
organized and given a preliminary place in the paper. At a later date when
all interviews had taken place, and all transcriptions had been completed,
the material was once again systematically processed and relevant pieces
of information were divided amongst the relevant sections of the paper, as
well as for the concluding discussion, by which point, issues had emerged
prominently.

In order to filter all of the data into two levels, with each level receiving a
low, medium or high categorization, a certain level of flexibility was
required as they could not be assessed in exactly the same way. Discourses
and Directives proved to be quite straight forward to select appropriate
weighting and current direction but Finances was the odd one out, so to
speak, showing very different levels of influence depending on how the
researcher chose to approach it. This is explained in the assessment, and
why the specific weightings and direction were given. As a result of this
difficulty, it is an interesting area for future research and how it could be
more specially looked at, with regard to wind power in Ireland and also for
the study of Europeanisation on the whole. This was not considered a real
drawback for this paper, but clarifications and a common system would
have to be agreed upon for conducting cross country comparisons.
4.4. Research Limitations

This paper would like to clarify some of the possible limitations of undertaking this study. While the author is convinced that none of them jeopardise the study itself, it is still beneficial to point them out so it can be known that they were given consideration.

This paper will not be able to establish a definite cause – effect relationship between EU policy and spatial developments in Ireland’s wind sector as it is not possible within a thesis study, there are simply too many variables. However observations will be made out of a combination of an historical review of the development of Ireland’s wind power, as well as covering the existing literature, conducting semi-structured expert interviews and going through documentation received. Together these will be used to infer how developments have come under influence up until the present moment in time.

Each of the methods for analysis could be criticised as being narrow in its own right (e.g. there may be a bias in the interviews, the literature is new and therefore limited, and often by industry or government who have conflicting interests in their reports) however when coordinated and cross checked through triangulation, this author is convinced that together the process produces a paper that is of strong academic rigour. This is to compensate, for what has been described as the ‘obvious limits to (understanding) the reach of Brussels-based policy leadership in Ireland, given the difficult and often opaque politics of implementation in Ireland’ (Flynn 2005: 110).

Due to the variation in the use of spatial planning from one member state to another, this paper looks into the relation between specifically Ireland and the EU, and not other member states; except when necessary to elaborate or back-up a specific point. While a balanced investigation into more than one nation states experience of their wind development with the EU would indeed be very interesting and insightful, due to the time and research restraints of this paper, it was felt that it would ultimately outweigh the level of comprehensive investigation that could otherwise be achieved by looking at one specific case study. As stated earlier this does not exclude ‘the force of example’ (Flyvbjerg 2006: 228).
Chapter 5: The Three Mechanisms of Change: Discourses, Directives and Finances

5.1. Discourses

There is a whole environmental narrative that comes from Brussels, and has done for years, and is probably the biggest driver of environmental policy in general.

A. Culhane PC 2014

I think there's been a relatively symbiotic relationship between the Irish policy elites, the departments, the policy making community and the direction that the EU has wanted to go.

J. Curtin PC 2014

My overall take on it is that there's a policy making level, EU departments and the industry, who are plugged into the discourses but more broadly we're not.

R. Meade PC 2014

The EU is axiomatically encouraging a drive for greater renewable energy in Ireland. This leads to a *de facto* push for increased development of wind power, as the goals for renewable energy in Ireland can only be met with wind aid. The ways in which the multiple routes of EU influence, that cross a wide range of discourses, can be seen to be effective for specifically wind is difficult to trace.

The Environmental Policy Integration (EPI) theory can be useful for understanding the way in which wind fits into wider discussions, such as energy, and from there in wider discourses again on the likes of jobs and growth, which are rarely left without mention as the level of European discourse. EPI has been defined as the ‘inclusion of environmental concerns in processes and decisions of public policy making that are predominantly charged with issues other than the environment’ (Hertin & Berkhout, 2003, p. 40 in Diamond 2009).

Here this chapter seeks to see how well-integrated the European discourse on the deployment of renewable energy has become interwoven with the discourse in Ireland. In other words, to assess the goodness of fit. The paper seeks to understand the goodness of fit on whole, both the horizontally integration (across different sectors) and vertically (down the lines of government from national to local) as each axis can be observed to be intergraded to varying extents.

The discourse on EPI has no agreement on a method of analysis (Diamond 2009) and this paper therefore chooses to employ Persons approach of distinguishing between the two concepts of EPI as normative or rational (2004). Following on from this two questions are derived from EPI: ‘First, it judges whether integration of environmental policy exists at all. Secondly, it considers the strength of the integration’ (Diamond 2009). This can essentially be seen as a dual level separation questioning the goodness of fit, as it is known in the Europeanisation literature. When focusing on the initial normative question, it can be answered rather
affirmatively looking to the national level - as a purely normative test - but a deeper, more complex investigation and justification is required for assigning an answer to the second.

The response of the former Taoiseach (Prime Minister equivalent) of Ireland Bertie Ahern highlights the importance of both questions. In 2004 he was asked if his definition of ‘sustainable development was development that had to be sustained’? He replied confidently with ‘exactly!’ (Nix and McDonald 2005) highlighting how the same term can lead to polar opposite interpretations; normatively it is in line, rationally it is not. This has led one author to come to the opinion that ‘as Ireland has experienced record levels of economic growth in the last decade, the ability of the EU to encourage a shift towards sustainable development appears to be limited’ (Flynn 2005: 109). In this sense, the national focus has been on growth, and coupling this with sustainable development as defined in the Bruntland report has not been an easy dovetail.

‘Sustainable development is development that meets the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own need’
(Bruntland, G. H. 1987)

Rhinard et al make it apparent that the EU is an important, even an ‘influential’ actor in international environmental negotiations (2006). Writing about Europe and wind Szarka (2007: 62) is of the view that ‘The development of wind power in the recent period has displayed signs of both success and fragility. Its expansion has not been the result of a market-led dynamic nor of a societal-driven process (except to an extent in Denmark and Germany). On the contrary, its deployment has been the result of political process, since its development has required supportive public policy initiatives’.

For wind, the effects of the EU can be seen in different ways. Many authors have commented on Ireland having adopted much of the language of the EU. Major policy documents such as Ireland’s National Spatial Strategy are heavily influenced by EU initiatives such as the ESDP, but that the interpretations and applications can lack consistency (Moylan 2011). More specifically it has been documented that the Irish government formulate policy in ‘Anticipating the future trajectory of European energy policy’ (Ackermann 2012: 630). Or in some cases with regard to environmental policy Irish negotiators even ‘appear to see the EU’s role as one of providing ready-made policy solutions, “off the shelf” as it were’(Flynn 2004: 111).

The country has taken significant steps recently to encourage wind farm development at the national level. The wind power development guidelines can be seen as a very important publication. Encouraging overall openness to wind power as well as attempting to shed light on specific land use dilemmas. These revised DEHLG Wind farm Planning Guidelines were issued in August 2004, with final guidelines published in 2006. Power and Cowell highlight the many difficulties there are with attempts to create policy harmonisation for land use and the setting of wind turbines in their chapter on ‘Wind Power and Spatial Planning in the UK’ (in Szarka et al
2012). This all points to a strong normative influence of discourse but does not tell us how well it has been rationally digested by inhabitants, who ultimately play a very significant role in the planning process and wind powers ultimate deployment.

Assessing the rational dimension, the author turns to the EU Eurobarometers surveys which offer an overall view of the Irish perception of the EU’s involvement in environment and energy. The myriad results show a complex pattern of views on behalf of the Irish, mostly shown in relation to rest of Europe. It can be said that the Irish population certainly looks favourably upon the role of the EU helping tackle environmental problems\(^\text{12,13}\) and also that Irish people perceive climate change problems with high importance, especially with regard to other EU countries. Yet these statistics only tells the surface of the story.

At the same time, Ireland shows signs of a misfit in terms of how these interests are being brought together with the EU’s aims due to a high importance assigned to the national level\(^\text{14}\) for Irish people, as opposed to the EU. The Irish people also have a relatively less favourable stance on the use of targets\(^\text{15}\) compared to other Europeans, as well as an overall growing distrust of the EU\(^\text{16,17}\). These characteristics may serve to undermine Ireland’s strong pro European involvement in the environmental issues position. However, it should be made clear that this anti-EU stance is not nearly to the same extent as the UK\(^\text{18}\) which is a common misconception. A comment from the interview with C. Doyle reaffirms this: ‘I think, having experienced living in Ireland and the UK, Ireland is far more inclined to tow Brussels’ line, there is much more of an up take of the European idea in Ireland, and I think that goes for everything across the board, and not just energy’(PC 2014).

\(^\text{12}\) EC Public Opinion (2014a) From 2003 – 2006, ‘And in your opinion, does the European Union tend to play a positive role or negative role or neither positive nor negative role regarding the protection of the environment?’ Consistent response rate of 56% to 70% over the time period
\(^\text{13}\) EC Public Opinion (2014d) ‘Some people expect the European union to become (even) more active than now in certain areas’ For the protection of the environment do you consider it a priority or not? 54% responded with ‘Should give priority’ while 5% responded with ‘should not take action’.
\(^\text{14}\) EC special EuroBarometer (2014: 59) How important do you think it is that the (OUR NATIONALITY) government provides support for improving energy efficiency (for example, by encouraging people to insulate their home or purchase low energy light bulbs) by 2030? Responding to this question, Ireland was the 3\(^\text{rd}\) Highest in the EU for their degree of the importance given to the national government.
\(^\text{15}\) EC special EuroBarometer (2014: 55) How important do you think it is that the (OUR NATIONALITY) government sets targets to increase the amount of renewable energy used, such as wind or solar power, by 2030?’ Ireland drops to 8\(^\text{th}\) in the degree of importance associated to targets when compared with other European countries.
\(^\text{17}\) EC Public Opinion (2014c) ‘How much trust do you have in certain institutions. For each of the following institutions, please tell me if you tend to trust it or tend not to trust it?’ From 2005 – 2013, growing distrust 2008 onwards
\(^\text{18}\) EC Public Opinion (2014b) Levels of disagreement with the statement that ‘(OUR COUNTRY) could better face the future outside of the EU’ by member state (%) – autumn 2013
A Flash Eurobaramoter survey in 2007 gives a milestone prior to this growing scepticism, at which point Ireland scored number one in terms of support for a minimum percentage for the share of renewable energy in Member States (EC Flash Eurobaramoter 2007: 18).

The general stance now, as observed through public surveys, has Ireland strongly opposed to decisions being ‘decided mainly at the European Union level’ with a slight tendency for a ‘mainly national approach’ increasingly out weighing a joint decision sharing operation between Europe and the national level on protection of the environment (EC Public Opinion 2014e). This is still an overall improvement from an earlier low support that could be observed in the 1990’s (Flynn 2005).

Taken together, the people of Ireland are statistically showing signs of wariness towards the EU, yet none the less appear very pro-renewables, that indicates a close goodness of fit in the rational sense. However, there is more to current trend than these statistics reveal. The question remains, of why if people at a national survey are so pro-renewables, is there such opposition on the ground?

One facet of this is in the news and media of Ireland, where there is a poor tendency to bring these issues forward. The Audience Council recently produced a report that found over a two year period how just one in 10 of the 285 news reports on Ireland’s evening national news channel that could have mentioned climate change actually did and furthermore that ‘even when it was mentioned, it was constantly framed as an ‘international’ story of little relevance to Ireland’ (Culliane and Watson 2014). Furthermore, British news is often read in Ireland and the higher prices and greater difficulties for wind power that the UK faces are often believed to exist in Ireland, even though this is not the case (J. Reilly PC 2014). These can be seen as contributing factors as to why Ireland agrees with renewables per se but is not actively engaged with them with it comes to them being implemented.

Indeed NGO’s have sought to redress this imbalance. NGO’s in Ireland have become much more vocal drawing on Europeanisation influences with two groups standing out for ‘their formidable European contacts and track record of long-standing activism’; An Taisce -The Irish National Trust- and Birdwatch Ireland (Flynn 2005 118). ‘Irish environmentalists are eager to complain to the Commission, petition the European Parliament, and use Irish courts as springboards to attempt to score environmental victories based on some point of European environmental law’ (Galligan 2000 in Ibid). Despite national steps taken in line with EU discourse, and the targets which relate. Ireland has been showing signs of unrest in the wind sector of recent, which matches the trends mentioned in public perception just covered. Recent statements by the minister for energy have been causing much worry for environmentalists: ‘Midlands Energy Export Project will not go ahead – Rabbitte’ was the title of the press release coming from the Irish government during the writing of this paper. This was as a result of a self stated failure ‘to conclude an Inter-Governmental Agreement to facilitate Green Energy Export from the
Midlands within the EU’s 2020 timeframe’ (DCENR 2014). This in turn has caused a cancellation of the signed memorandum of understanding between governments last year, ‘which would have seen 2,300 wind turbines being built across the midlands between now and 2020’ (Smyth 2014). These developments showing signs of great difficulty for the Europeanisation of wind, both vertically (EU/Ireland) and horizontally, in the sense of between Ireland and the UK. One of the interviewees stated how the UK ultimately ‘wouldn’t come to the (negotiation) table’ and that the EU did not have any guidance to offer in terms of how the agreement could be achieved technically (Simon Nuggent 2014, Special Advisor to the Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources). Also within Ireland, horizontal integration is facing serious problems. Agriculture’s emissions are set to rise as a result of the quotas on dairy being lifted from the EU, sparking an expected surge in cattle herds that produce methane, an even more potent GHG than CO².

Wolsink (2000) brings up an interesting logic that is relevant to this discussion on the perception and penetration of wind farms in the mentality of people. Aforementioned is Ireland’s stance on the wider environmental concerns facing Ireland and Wolsink observes how the vast majority of people in Europe are in favour of wind, yet seemingly paradoxically, it is difficult due to local opposition that almost spontaneously manifests alongside proposed developments. He therefore presents an alternative viewpoint, more nuanced than nimbyism, and is the following: The NIMBY concept is often considered as common sense, but it actually represents a specific ‘social dilemma or game-situation ... and opposition against generally useful facilities has been defined as a multi-person prisoner’s dilemma’ the most widely known game-theoretical situation (Ibid).

The author comes to the conclusion that ‘A collaborative style in sitting renewable energy infrastructure ... will probably be more effective than top–down planning’ (Ibid). Here Healy is drawn on, stating three dimensions by which to better categorise tendencies: knowledge resources, relational resources, and the capacity for mobilisation (Healy 1998). Wüstenhagen et al (2007) state how bad communication can be caused by the way in which decision making is framed. By acknowledging ‘collaboration as the key to overcoming public reluctance’ achieving the necessary planning objectives for wind farms could become more attainable (Diamond 2009). Irish academics have come to similar observations and ‘argue that unfolding policy developments aimed at creating European Union-led smart grids are likely to accentuate and add further planning dilemmas’ if crucial issues such as ‘the insensitive decision-making processes’ and ‘Issues over perceived or actual ownership’ are not addressed properly (Scott and O’Neill 2013: 418). This was further confirmed again in the interviews for this thesis with R. Meade (PC 2014) from the Green Party in Ireland who stated that Irish people don’t see wind power or its infrastructure as benefiting them, but rather larger companies and potentially the UK.

For Ireland, it may be more fruitful way to observe Europeanisation, asking not whether the view of national populations are becoming more
synchronous on a broad level, at which they can be seen to be, but rather, to what extent is the process of discussion that leads to the development of wind becoming more open and inclusive, as is pioneered by other countries in the EU, such as Scotland and Denmark. To ask, if there is an observable planning method of Europeanisation accruing for wind, a comprehensive answer is not within the scope of this thesis but tentative thoughts can be put forward. EIA’s can be said to create more transparency and communication in the planning process, even if they often do consists of large volumes of esoteric scientific information, not always of high readability to lay people. On the down side, it provides a de jure communication effort that fails to thoroughly engaging a wide range of people or an in-depth discussion. The breakup of monopolies, as was covered in the historical introduction, does allow for more companies to compete in vying for construction and therefore puts more pressure on openness, as people have different sources of industry to turn to and receive their offers and interest.

Taken together, in giving a weighting to the rational sense, it is very negative, as far as perceptions of local wind farm development are on the ground in Ireland. This is a point that was repeatedly confirmed throughout all interviews. J. Curtin stating that ‘There was always an awareness that (engagement) was going to be an issue, but there was never really anything done about it, and now it has kind of blown up in our faces’ (PC 2014). And as Ireland has a highly sparse population settlement pattern, this is extremely important. It also appears to be a stance becoming more deeply engrained as politicians have begun to take the popular stance against wind turbine and electricity transmission deployment.

The signs of a positive goodness of fit of Europeanisation (the EIA’s, the NGO’s availing of EU law) are not counterbalancing the observed local opposition. This points to a weak and latent process of discursive Europeanisation as a full admittance to strong reliance on the EU is not always a popular stance to take. A very recent announcement of the minister Phil Hogen 2014 would appear to confirm this: ‘I reject completely any criticism that we failed to meet targets. We have signed up to binding EU targets and we have no need to reiterate them’ (McGee 2014). A National Economic And Social Council report elaborates on this, ‘Commitments … tend to lack ambition for some, and be brittle for others; both inadequate, as regards climate change, and lacking credibility’ (NESC 2012:18). In addition other authors have pointed out that there is ‘policy uncertainty in Europe’ (van der Hoeven 2014), as is stated in her report on wind power the IEA. Perhaps contributing to the ‘primary problem (for achieving low carbon development) of securing horizontal coordination and action across Government’ which has not happened in Ireland (J. Curtin PC 2014). For these reasons, it is the assessment of this paper, that Ireland’s goodness of fit is medium and declining regards the rational sense. In contrast to the normative sense, in which it remains high as there is an observed ‘Europeanisation of elites’ across the discourses, to use the words of J. Curtin (PC 2014). Here the paper does not assign ‘low’
as the strong overall pro-renewable stance does need to be taken into account. The ‘declining’ direction it is given represents the current on the ground malaise for wind power deployment.

5.2. Directives

*Ireland originally had a 33% renewable electricity target under its own nationally policy in 2007 ... when we came to the end of the 202020 target setting, which actually happened a year later, Ireland had to increase its proportion up to 42% as a result of the very, very ambitious targets being set by the EU*  

J. Reilly PC 2004

We operate in that target based framework, the regulatory system, the grid system, the policy making system, the REFIT system, are all focused on delivering on that target, and as effectively as possible

S. Nuggent PC 2014

*It would have taken a horrible bit of governance for Ireland to miss its targets because we had quite a low target, for the amount of resource we had and our ability to meet the targets*

C. Doyle PC 2014

When analysing Directives that can be seen to impact on wind power in Ireland, it is important to select the most pertinent pieces of EU legislation. In order to do that this paper will assess two different areas of important legislation; namely Land Use legislation and Energy legislation. While the former has significant implications for the planning process, such as where wind farms may be located, the later focuses more on targets that must be achieved. Together they function as a body of law that holds great significant for Ireland’s wind power.

This section will go through each of them highlighting the most salient provisions and constraints so that a collective summary can outline the goodness of fit associated with EU legislation, in so far as it is related to Irish wind power development.

To be clear, a whole host of other directives are important and they often have varying degrees of indirect impact that can be of strong influence, albeit not always in equally apparent ways.

The four key pieces of EU Land Use legislation are the Birds Directive, the Habitats Directive, the EIA Directive and the SEA Directive. On the other hand the main provisions for renewable energy is the ‘Promotion of
the use of energy from renewable sources’ Directive which feeds into a set of binding legislation known as the 2020 Climate and Energy Package. Different authors give varying responses as to the most important pieces of legislation (J. Nix PC 2014, Hansen 2011), yet this paper would put forward all five for consideration.

Within EU law there is Regulations, Directives, Decisions, Recommendations and Opinions. Following from first to last, they generally represent an increasing flexibility for member states and decreasing control on behalf of the EU level. For this thesis, directives happen to be the most important, in which they give national governments a target to reach but the flexibility to achieve it in manner which they deem suitable. This may indeed change over time, as Regulations may need to be brought into certain areas of environmental importance if directives are not working, this is assuming member states agree to this.

5.2.1. Land Use Legislation

The Birds Directive 79/409/EEC and the Habitats Directive 92/43/EEC are focused on biodiversity protection through measures that seek to conserve flora and fauna and their habitats. They are important for wind farms in the sense that protected areas are strongly discouraged to allow development, on, or adjacent to the site. The two directives are very much linked to each other, appearing one after another and together that give extensive areas to Natura 2000. Proposed and adopted in the 1970s and 1980s, these two directives showed some unintended consequences for different member states and as a result, the following two directives can be seen to have been approached much more warily (Fairbrass and Jordan 2004).

While the two previous Directives are focused on biodiversity protection, the Environmental Impact Assessment (EIA - 85/337/EEC Directive) and the Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA - 2001/42/EC Directive) can be seen to be another sub-area of EU Environmental policy. Again the two directives can be seen as a pair that work together and are directives which extend from the Aarhus Directive in 1998 on Access to Environmental Information and Public participation.\(^\text{19}\)

The EIA is a tool for evaluating the impacts of proposed developments such as a road or power station. In the case of wind power, due to the large structures, an EIA is almost always required. Hansen writes about the significance of this for wind as ‘the process is rather comprehensive, lengthy and costly, and is one of major tasks in applying for approval of a new wind energy installation’ (2011: 5).

The SEA on the other hand is directed at larger infrastructure projects and is therefore of lesser relevance to specific wind farm sites but of greater significance to the transmission lines that connect them and make

---

\(^{19}\) Another important piece of legislation linked to the Aarhus Directive is the Freedom of Information act that enables citizens with the right to obtain government documents that relate to environmental protection. This has given the public much greater insight into the workings of government bodies.
up the national grid system. In Ireland is has been considered that a SEA ‘is the only way in which some government departments are examining their environmental effects: although some sectors use sustainability appraisal’ (EPA 2012: 14). The SEA is a more strict and binding, and addresses a greater spectrum of environmental issues than sustainability appraisal. In some instances such as for the Clare Wind Energy Strategy it was the SEA process that avoided development in an environmentally sensitive area (Ibid) and so can be seen to have a significant influence as this is not an unusual occurrence.

5.2.2. Energy Legislation

The origins of EU energy legislation can be traced back to the well known UN Framework Convention on Climate Change (UNFCCC) in 1992. While this puts countries under an obligation to make greenhouse gas inventories it was legislation that did not include explicit reduction commitments. The Kyoto Protocol of 1997 sought to remedy that. With the EU taking a major role in the Kyoto Protocol, a binding European wide target on a 20% reduction in greenhouse gas emissions by 2020 compared with 1990 was set in 2007.

The most well known energy directive is the RES Directive or Renewable Energy Directive (2001/77/EC). This contained the goal of a 20% share of energy from renewable sources by 2020 for Europe. The targets reflect Member States potential for increasing renewable production in relation to their specific starting point. They range from 10% in Malta to 49% in Sweden (EC 2014c) For Ireland it translated into 16%. Each of the targets for renewable energy in electricity (RES-E), renewable energy in transport (RES-T) and renewable energy for heat and cooling (RES-H) are different. For Ireland, the contribution of renewable to gross electricity consumption is 15% by 2010 and 40% by 2020 (SEAI 2014). The Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC) is responsible for requiring Ireland to submit its National Renewable Energy Action Plan (NREAP) which according to Article 4, sets out in detail Ireland’s overall position for progressing on renewable energy.

In addition, countries are ‘obliged to encourage production and consumption of renewable energy’ to gave citizens and enterprises the ability to choose ‘green electricity, and be sure that the electricity is “real green”’ (Hansen 2011: 9). At this point it is important to reiterate what was mentioned in the historical introduction of how this gave wind energy a real competitive advantage against fossil fuels, allowing them to get a higher market price. In addition, it brought in mandatory requirements for member states to introduce ‘priority dispatch’ which gives renewable sources guaranteed access when they want to connect to the power system, where the system operator must also formally report to the relevant competent authority on the dispatching of renewable resources and also ‘to the EC Commission on a biennial basis’ (Ackermann 2012: 629). The target for Directive (2009/28/EC) is not currently binding and a method for calculating the national targets has not been finalised by the European
This does not mean that it is without incentives: ‘There may be financial penalties imposed by the EU Commission on member states for failing to meet their 2020 renewable target. Although no formal infringement penalties have been associated with missing the targets, a recent referral of RoI to the European Court of Justice for failing to fully transpose into Irish law the Renewable Energy Directive could be an indicator of further penalties to come’ (Pöyry 2014:39). At the time of its inception the directive 2001/77/EC effectively established a new target for renewable energy in Ireland, toward the achievement of 13.2 per cent of gross electricity consumption from renewable energy sources by 2010’ (Ó Gallachóir 2010). By 2010 Ireland had achieved 14.8% RES-E (NREAP First Progress Report 2012: 30), as is apparent in the opening quotes of this chapter, some see this achievement being commendable, while others view it as almost inevitable.

At this moment in time, the targets are being shifted upwards for the future. Europe aims to reduce its primary energy use by 20% by 2020, although again, the target is not legally binding. The policies and measures taken to achieve this target will continue to deliver beyond 2020 helping to reduce emissions by approximately 40% by 2050 according to the current energy roadmap.

In assessing the goodness of fit for these directives it is first important to consider a few aspects of how they relate to Ireland. Firstly, it can be observed how they can change dramatically from their initial concept. The degree of uncertainty faced by the various stakeholders and the potential for unintended outcomes in directives can be seen as they mutate ‘from their original drafts, through negotiations, to adoption and especially during implementation’ (Fairbrass and Jordan 2004: 151). Furthermore, it is the conclusion of previous research that the predicted costs of compliance with environmental regulations often exceed actual costs’ (Haq et al., 2001 in Baily et al 2002:245). These should also be taken into account when assessing the goodness of fit, where directives can appear harder to reach than they are, once a search for solutions has begun. This in part also sheds light on why Ireland’s previous targets for wind were so small in hindsight and also why they are often increased at a later date. The targets are also not static, often changing significantly. For the 2010 target, 36 GW additional capacity was revised to upwards of 60 GW, from the baseline of 12GW in 2000 (ECOTEC 2002). At the same time it has been acknowledged and recent efforts to reduce the perception of EU environmental policy as chaotic and unpredictable have been carried out by the EU with earlier publication of its work programmes (Adelle et al 2012).

Again, as with the section on Discourses, the Directives are rather straightforward in assessing the normative goodness of fit. Ireland has a very high rate of signing in many Directives, including Land use and Energy legislation. In addition to this, government departments have built up a larger amount of people who have good experience with working with the EU level process (A. Culhan PC 2014) furthering the goodness of fit.
This is combined with NGO’s who are using EU decisions to exert influence on the government, thus reinforcing the strong normative Europeanisation. It has also been observed that the government is taking the targets more seriously than in the past (S. Nuggent PC 2014 and J. Curtin PC 2014).

However, while Ireland can be seen to have the highest rate for signing in Directives it has the poorest record for compliance (Nix and McDonald 2005). As aforementioned, the method for calculating the national targets has not been finalised by the European Commission (SEAI 2014). In Ireland we now see this leading to last minute and unorthodox methods of reaching targets. Organizations such as the National Trust have expressed much dissatisfaction with the new plan to include various grasslands into offsetting grossly missed targets (Lynch 2014). Other recent example of failing to comply include the Renewable Energy Directive (2009/28/EC) (EC 2014d) and the Electricity Directive (2009/72/EC) (EC 2014e) where on both cases the Commission refers Ireland to Court for failing to transpose EU law. For directives related to renewable it has also been said that they were set too low in the first place.

__There was one decision I guess which we would have to regret now, which is that targets for renewable energy were not adequate, not strong enough._

R. Meade PC 2014

– Involved in setting the targets as part of the Green Party who were in government at that time

In summary, regards the normative goodness of fit, Ireland is considered to have a high labelling. Furthermore, it is observably increasing as Ireland becomes more accustomed to work with the EU level policy process.

However there is still much work to be done in making up for the ‘implementation gap that we are famous for’ in Ireland (J. Moore PC 2014). J. Reilly from Bord na Móna, one of the largest energy producers in Ireland with a large wind portfolio, elaborate on this point. It can be seen that within the directives there is significant conflicts. Speaking affirmatively he states that ‘one thing that is for sure, is that the imposition of all of these directives are making it more and more difficult to achieve planning infrastructure, for energy infrastructure, and yet our renewable energy targets, are totally dependent on being able to deploy that renewable energy infrastructure, totally dependent’ (J. Reilly PC 2014). This interesting point raises the potential indirect conflict of directives that must be solved at the national level, albeit originating in Brussels.

For this these reasons the rational goodness of fit is given a ‘low’ goodness of fit, but one that is increasing. As A. Culhane (PC 2014) points out, ‘breaches in European law, which are being worked down progressively ... were up in the twenties but are not down to single digits’.
Table 3 Goodness of Fit for Directives.

5.3. Finances

“When we talk about projects like the ESB moving to an almost 100% renewable in the next twenty years, when we talk about Bord na Móna deciding that they want to be largest wind producer in the country, when we talk about the roll out of pumped hydro storage in Ireland, which is a key component of making wind efficient and practical, when we talk about the Spirit of Ireland project, all of them have one major Achilles heel, and that’s the funding source”

Declan Murphy lecture on Ireland’s Future Energy Security (2010)

there is no technical limit on wind penetration feasible, but instead costs are the limiting factor.

Connolly et al 2011

At least 20% of the entire EU budget for 2014-2020 will be climate-related spending

Connie Hedegaard, EU Commissioner for Climate Action 2013

While the financing of wind presents a very specialist area of research, we can see form these extracts above that it is undoubtedly of great importance, and for this reason, combined with a mindful consistency in the application of the theoretical approach and methodology, it is taken into account in this paper.

For this section, the paper divides the financing into two distinctions. Firstly, is the influence the EU has on Ireland regards the overall financial approach Ireland takes to wind. And secondly, it looks at the specific nominal contribution from the EU, and assesses how different levels of society can tap into it. Between these two sections there is potential overlap in the future, with the possible introduction of equity share in Ireland, at the moment this is just a consideration and no plans are in place. For this reason it is dealt with in the Discussion chapter, under social and community engagement and not here. For this chapter, the overall influence will be taken as the normative aspect, while the rational will look at the availability of finance to fund wind power development, be it on actual wind farm projects, both on and offshore, but also for grid infrastructure and connections.

In the historical section of this paper, it was shown how the overall financial system has changed many times over; with five different AER’s before moving into a feed-in tariff based system, of which there has been
three. Furthermore, it is expected that a fourth Feed in Tariff will be soon underway. For the future, the possibility of switching to a market-based mechanism with market premiums has been considered, and Germany is one such member state that is increasing the debate on this approach at a European policy process level, claiming that it would better integrate the sector - economically and operationally (Brown 2013).

However, it is still generally accepted that ‘well-adapted feed in tariff’ regimes are generally the most efficient and effective support schemes for promoting renewable electricity’ (EC 2008: 3). This was confined by a number of interviews. M. Kennedy from the Sustainable Energy Auttority of Ireland – SEAI - (PC 2014) saying it had worked very well and Andrew Culhane from Bank of Ireland went so far as to say it is even known in his circle as ‘The Golden Covenant’ (2014). While the Feed-in Tariff has proven successful, it is not overly dominant on a European scale as can be seen below.

![Support schemes for electricity from renewable energy sources in the EU](image)

**Figure 7** Support schemes for electricity from renewables. Fraunhofer et al (2012)

Part of the reason for this is that while a Feed-in Tariff system works very well for wind, and also for an island such as Ireland - where it does not support many transnational interconnectors - it does not work as well in member states that trade a lot of electricity transnational, or produce renewable energy from many different sources, such as photovoltaic’s in the south or hydro and dam technology in the north.

*The main day-to-day effect that the commission has on the renewable strategy in Ireland is oversight of the state aid regime, the REFIT schemes. And interaction between the department and the commission on such schemes is, probably correctly, quite complex and detailed, and any variation to the schemes is something that requires a lot of interaction.*

S. Nuggent PC 2014

Taken together the EU’s influence on Ireland’s choice of financial mechanism to support wind is not absolute, but is significantly well integrated, and increasingly so as Ireland works together more and more with the EU in taking future steps together. This is from a point of drawing
on European expertise, as much as it is obliged to its established commitments such as NREAP (The National Renewable Energy Action Plan since the 2009/28/EC directive). Collectively this brings the normative integration of the financial mechanism of change for wind to be considered medium, and increasing.

Moving on to the rational goodness of fit. Calculating a direct sum of costs associated to the many fold ways in which the EU can be seen to contribute funding to Ireland’s wind growth is not feasible to due to the spectrum across which financing ranges from direct (capital costs for purchasing turbines), to partial (financing high level education, wind survey analysis, transnational programs), to indirect (financing environmental advocacy groups abroad that have influence within Ireland, financing greater energy efficiency which increases the impact of wind power). Furthermore, wind makes up components of different major funding schemes such as Horizon 2020 – most frequently stated, Cohesion funds and Connecting Europe Facility. Within these funds rules can be stipulated such as that for the 1st Horizon 2020 draft energy work programme, where the share of the EU contribution benefitting one single technology area cannot exceed 25% of the budget. In the FP7 wind will be 24.2% for example (Villanueva-Monzón 2013). The amount from the European Wind Initiative is 6 billion (EC SET-Plan 2010). However these are all spread out across the EU. The Commission expects wind energy to be one of the main electricity generating technologies of the 2050 Energy Roadmap, providing between 31% and 48% of electricity production in the EU. ‘Yet in budgetary terms’, Radvilaitė (2013) from the EWEA talks about how with Horizon 2020 ‘it’s still very difficult to see what money the sector will receive’.

So while on the one hand a given restriction for wind expansion in Ireland may be the ‘Limited work ... completed on operating reserve requirements (for) electricity storage technologies’ (Gonzalez et al. 2004 in Ó Gallachóir) and the EU wide funding can help all countries, including Ireland through an effort to research on large scale electricity storage which it is currently doing (J. Hahn PC 2014). Confronting these common difficulties to wind may have very tangible benefits down the line for Ireland; although it is not measurable in a country specific way for the purpose of this thesis.

The aim of this section of the paper is therefore not to assess EU’s contribution to wind throughout its member states but to more specifically to trace the funding which Ireland itself has received to date and how this has changed over time, numerically and structurally. Greater sums of money, and a closer-knit structure for transfer could thus be inferred at an observation of greater Europeanisation. The goodness of fit will then assess the extent by which this is performing well in Ireland as the greater the amount of financing available for wind development in Ireland, it can likewise be expected to encourage adaptational pressure though the ability to finance.
Throughout the history of Irish wind power development the EU has given large sums of money, both for the actual wind farm expansion such as in the Valoren programme mentioned in the historical section of this paper – with a total amount 25 million euro (IRENA 2014: 95) – but also in terms of supporting the poorer NUTS regions of Ireland, where Ireland’s wind happens to be at its most powerful, which brought more money towards critical grid infrastructure.

At this moment in time, there is unquestionably a shortage in money. C. Doyle (PC 2014) stating that ‘a lack of public funding would be the main one’, referring to Ireland missing its 2013 target for offshore wind. This is also true for large grid infrastructure improvements (S. Nuggent PC 2014) but also down to the local level where M. Kennedy, from the Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland (SEAI), explained the stance that ‘people can barely afford their mortgages in Ireland, they’re not going to be able to start pursuing community ownership’ (PC 2014). Taken together, this in part explain why Ireland is ‘not awash with transactions’ for wind farm construction at the moment according to A. Cullen from Bank or Ireland who oversaw the financial arrangements for wind farms throughout a lengthy period (PC 2014).

In Ireland the large-scale industrial companies such as Bord na Móna and Mainstream work closely with government (M. Kennedy PC 2014, R. Meade PC 2014, T. Carter PC 2014, J. Nix PC and I. Lumly PC 2014) and that is where most of the financial movement can be seen. This is observable in EU funding too, such as recently when Mainstream Renewable Power was ’awarded funding of €1.4 million by the European Commission to cover half the costs of conducting a survey of the seabed in the Irish Sea’ as a Project of Common Interest (PCI) (Mainstream Renewable Power: 2013). At the moment, there is steps being taken at local, national and European level to change this, The EU is moving towards increasing seed-funding and venture capital in wind (J. Hahn PC 2014), while at the national level the government is looking to stimulate more money at the local level - although much uncertainty surrounds how this will be done (J. Moore PC 2014) – and at the local level itself, as costs for the technology fall and experiences is gained, there is relatively more capital flexibility. In summary, the rational Europeanisation of wind is considered low, as the EU is not currently having a significant influence in the financial capital available, yet is considered to be increasing, albeit against a wall of mounting opposition to the wind turbines and infrastructure required itself.

Table 4 Goodness of fit for Finances.
Chapter 6: Discussion

Now that the three mechanisms of change have been individually covered, the purpose of this chapter is to discuss and present the salient findings that have arisen throughout the collective study. Considering how the EU and Ireland are constantly evolving, both individually and in relation to each other, this research represents a snapshot in time of the influencing affects of Europeanisation for wind power development in Ireland.

6.1. The difficulty with horizontal Europeanisation
First is an issue that became quite apparent during the selection of the theoretical framework. At the outset the author was aware of the difficulties in assessing the horizontal processes of Europeanisation for wind. The real difficulty lies in separating the influence of member states versus a non-member state. The horizontal influences are not necessarily born out of the EU, even if they can assumed to be encouraged by it, for example through a common currency or similar state aid rules but many of the horizontal influences are just part of the more globalised world in which we live, where horizontal influences could be in spite of the existence of the EU, as much as they are encouraged by it.

Interviews such as with C. Doyle confirmed that there is an element of ‘keeping up with the Joneses’, to use a colloquial term, and A. Culhane who is currently working on the planning guidelines for wind furthered this by stating that ‘By all means ... we are always looking to international best practice’ but that it is not limited to the EU (PC 2014). The market leaders close by to Ireland do happen to be part of the EU such as Denmark and Sweden, yet Norway is an example of a big nation player in wind energy who has significant influence on neighbouring states without being a part of the EU.

Assessing these adaptational pressures, which did not pay strict attention to national borders, also came hand-in-hand with the observation that Ireland was in a way, uniquely-similar (this may seem like an oxymoronic description) but assessing the goodness of fit for the Europeanisation of wind power development in Ireland displays specific Irish characteristic that affect the uptake of wind, that while based on Irish uniqueness, (for example, how the sparse settlement pattern causes problems for wind turbine and transmission location) it does not necessarily mean that other countries are not experiencing the same issues. For this reason, it can be expected that common issues may be shared amongst different states based upon different causes. This makes the idea of sharing ‘best practices’ very difficult, as for what is best for one country, might often not be for another. Notwithstanding, this does not prohibit nation states from learning from each other’s experiences.

This characteristic has been commented on before in relation to environmental policy in general with Jordan stating Ireland is not alone in the implementation difficulties, widely seen as being problematic across the EU (Jordan 1999). In this thesis, the context based difficulties manifest specifically in relation to wind in the areas of: site location, creating an uptake of discourse, creating financial opportunities, creating international
transmission connections and enabling practical support from local public authorities, all being prominent.

6.2. National Level Targets

Another reoccurring observation is the focus on targets. As the three mechanisms of change overlap amongst each other this is in relation to the wider discourse as well as for the energy directives themselves. S. Nuggent, Special Adviser to Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources (PC 2014) confirmed this when questioned during an interview with: ‘When you say framework, are you talking about targets?’ responded: ‘Mainly the targets. The targets define the framework in the general public perception. Most people looking at whether Ireland is complying with its renewables, they toe-drag whether Ireland is complying with its renewables targets, rather than worrying about security of supply, the generation of indigenous electricity, the value for money of one type of source of energy versus another. All of those subjects are vastly subordinate to the issue of whether or not we're matching up to our EU targets.’

And yet, on the topic of targets there is a wide variance of opinion when it comes to whether they were set high enough so as to act as an appropriate incentive. C. Doyle (PC 2014) already pointed out as commenting that: ‘It would have taken a horrible bit of governance for Ireland to miss its targets because the country has quite a low target for the amount of resource to meet those targets.’ R. Meade who was in government at the time the targets were being set, concurs, saying a regret was that they were ‘simply set too low’. Environmental groups likewise calling for higher targets at the time (J. Nix and I. Lumly PC 2014). Challenging this is J. Reilly (PC 2014) from Bord na Móna, who adamantly stated that there was ‘no way!’ we would have stimulated that level of growth in the wind sector without those targets. And likewise M. Kennedy, Senior Energy Technology and Climate Change Expert at Sustainable Energy, shared this view with great certainty (PC 2014). One academic takes a central line writing that 2020 target, ‘is deemed achievable but ambitious’ (Ó Gallachóir 2010: 130).

To write that goals are achievable but ambitious is very politically correct, and difficult to rebuke, but the bottom line shown in the research of this paper is that there is not a common understanding on how effective the targets are or how appropriately they have been set. Notwithstanding, there is consensus that they form the main point of focus in the mindsets of how the EU is influencing. This ambiguity over the appropriateness of targets juxtaposes with their strong imagery as a EU influences for adaptational pressure, and raises the necessity for a clarification on this issue. One that future research could devote more time to.

This apparent discord can be approached differently from the point of view of this research. In one sense, it is unquestionably clear the targets have had a deep and significant influence, even if only from the point of view that there has evidently been a large amount of discussion surrounding them. A focused discussion on goals, is in itself, a good thing even if there is not wide agreement.
Perhaps it is conflicting experiences behind the interviewees in relation to wind of that is causing much of the disagreement. Taking stock again, on the one hand it can be seen that the interviewees involved more closely with the industry, i.e. Bord na Móna who is the industry itself, or SEAI who, despite being government funded, only have a team of 50 people and thus ‘rely heavily on industry’ for the work they do, have a more favorable view on the targets. Ireland has seen a significant amount of wind growth and it has also been led by this industry with close ties to policy makers and thus they are greatest positioned to see the type and amount of progress to date. R. Meade pointed out the stance of the industry quite clearly during his interview, seen below:

They’re (the government) focused on saying we have people who want to build wind farms, those wind farms will help us reach our target, and if we don't support the developers in every way, we won't meet our targets.  
R. Meade PC 2014

This turns the discussion to the question of whether a somewhat dogmatic pursuance of targets has possibly been to the detriment of a more holistic engagement with a broader range of actors. Targets are a convenient way to frame future development, as long as adaptational pressure is contained largely amongst high-level politicians and large industry, which this research underpins that it is. Targets bear much less relevance for local communities, and local politicians, who are not going to individually be able to bring up national numbers with one small wind farm. In this way, the adaptation pressure of Europeanisation fails to reach them.

In some cases even working to counter positive trends, as can be seen with one of the latest development that marks the end an original Memorandum of understanding (MOU). S. Nuggent (PC 2014) remarked that ‘as soon as that announcement went up, there was a land race between two different private sector developers, both who sought to move quite swiftly and expansively in the midland counties to secure option agreements for development … So a huge amount of concern was ramped up’. This had the effect of making people fearful of mass wind development, instead of fostering local support. In the end of the MOU was cancelled and so this can be seen as one unhelpful case of an upper level target pursuit with negative lower level connotations.

At this point is should be made clear that the paper acknowledges how the EU does offer many links of support to lower levels of society, this was shown in the chapter on finance.

A small case study conducted as part of this thesis also confirmed this. Templederry is Ireland’s first owned community wind farm and one of the leading ‘success’ stories of local level input that led to a finalised project. The development shows the nature of EU funding for wind farm projects that are in a demonstration phase. The Community Development Plan

20 The equivalent is STEM in Sweden or Agency NL in the Netherlands who have a staff of over 1000 people.
21 For an overview of the project stages involved see Tipperary Energy Agency case study document on the project (TEA 2012).
produced in 1999 was in fact funded by the Tipperary LEADER Group, which on their website can be seen to part of The European Agricultural Fund for Regional Development (NTLP 2014). From the outset of the project, the direct influence of the EU is evident as the Tipperary Energy Agency had produced a wind resource map for Co. Tipperary as part of an EU Funded project which allowed for the identification of 20 potential sites (Hoyne 2000). Further funding was needed to connect to the main grid, this was again covered by an Enercon loan and LEADER grant, each to the amount of €200,000. It has been read in documents sent from P. Kenny B.E, the Chief Executive Officer of TEA that ‘Without this funding, the project could not have gone ahead’ (PC Kenny 2014). However, the common denominator with this and other community projects is that they avail of demonstration and pilot funding which tends to be very case specific and not easily replicated by other communities.

6.3. Social and Community Engagement

What we’re lacking here is that community involvement and it’s really costing us in terms of nasty atmospheres and nasty relations building up at the local

J. Nix PC 2014

It seems clear to the policy maker that this needs to be done for the best interest of Europe and for Ireland but when that percolates down to action on the ground, this overall level of agreement hasn't really been communicated, you often hear that from community groups, that they feel there's been no communication of the overall strategy, there's been no communication of the alternative, when in fact there was, all of these things were consulted very widely, there may not have been awareness of it. However, you can’t avoid the conclusion that there is something of a disconnect there between the central strategic objectives and what happening on the ground, and a willingness to go down that road.

J. Curtin PC 2014

The central crux of this paper that has emerged throughout the research is of social and community engagement as a sticking point for the influence of the EU level political process on wind development in Ireland. It also represents the strata of society at which there is the biggest discord with wind power development, or put another way, the goodness of fit in relation to Ireland’s pursuance of the EU policy framework on renewable energy, as was shown in three chapters on the mechanisms of change.

It is an issue that has been around since the origins of wind turbines, as seen in the historical introduction, but as of late it has become much more deep routed. This thesis raises the question of whether the government is really committed to tackling this problem, or are they searching with confusion while their response could be being seen as increasingly platitudinous, as it a phenomena that continues to endure as industry takes stake of increasingly limited land resources for wind.

what happened in Ireland during 2012 but really during 2013, is that common cause accumulated between lots of different protest groups who were essentially 'not in my back yard' protest groups but the range of pylon plans, wind turbine
plans and speculation about wind export created a critical mass of momentum of different ‘not in my back yard’ groups so that they could coordinate their action online and that in turn got the added momentum of the local and European elections of 2014 which provided an invitation for candidates to try and piggy back on this growing sense of concern, frustration, anxiety.

S. Nuggent (PC 2014)

At the moment in Ireland ‘limited attention has been given to the localities and communities that will be “hosting” these new major wind turbine developments’ (Scott and O’Neill 2013: 420). The benefits to the community in their vicinity are not easily observed. Speaking with J. Reilly who has extensive experience with the finances of wind power development gives the following account: ‘I’ve seen some roads improve. In terms of the spend it would be nearly parochial type negotiations in some respects. Most of the ones that I’ve seen the landowners can be a little greedy in terms of what they get and upfront money, but in terms of the local community, no, there wouldn't be anything that I've come across where the local village or town would benefit to the extent of x, y or z’ (PC 2014).

In literally all of the primary interviews for this research, social and community engagement was seen as lacking meaningfulness in Ireland. Industry too raises the issue where they believe ‘It will be essential to improve community awareness and acceptance of the benefits of transmission to ensure that the grid can be delivered in a timely fashion’ (Deloitte and Touche 2009:36). J. Curtin relates the problem of the growing anti-wind sentiment back to the targets: ‘particularly in the last 6 months, but really it's been simmering beneath the surface for the last 5-6 years, the pylons issues, and the wind energy has been dragged into the pylons debate very significantly, and that has created a very serious problem in terms of meeting our 2020 targets. But essentially, this is more of a ground swell of public opinion, as opposed to well say, the elite policy making community’

This paper would like to point out the difference between social and community a) awareness, b) engagement and c) ownership. It is a distinction that has not been explicitly made in the material covered or that has been put forward by government or industry, one that ought to be. It would appear that calls for the first two categories might be inadequate considering the veritable ‘militant or strong views’ observed (A. Cullen PC 2014). Future efforts might consider giving these terms greater distinctions and a like-wise differentiated approach in facing up to them.

In the interview with R. Meade it appeared that targets would still inherently have lent to increasing aspects of social and community engagement: ‘So in retrospect, that's the point (introducing higher targets) at which we needed to start generating the discourse in the country that would allow to people to understand what was in it for them, why we were signing up, the pros and cons.’ In this sense, it seems that the logic falls back on the same mentality that failed to facilitate social and community engagement in the first place, that if the people only understood the issue well enough, then everyone would be on board. However, assuming in-depth knowledge on behalf of the people (something which would be very
hard to achieve in itself), this author is of the view that it would still not lead to a large change of opinion on whether people would favorably look upon wind power development in the local area. The lynchpin of social and community engagement that needs to be addressed is that the people of the local area have to understand that there is something in it for them and not that they need to understand that it is good for the wider nation. This is increasingly true in this current period of financial difficulty. We know that people agree with renewable per se, this was covered earlier in the chapter on discourses; it is that they do not like the benefits intruding on the local, for the benefit of the distant, and especially if the distant is overseas. It has been shown that local communities do not benefit from wind turbines, expect for maybe ‘an improved road’ or the ‘greedy’ site owner (A. Cullen PC 2014). The government should not focus its efforts changing mind sets but instead focus on how actions speak louder than words, and start putting in place a system by which local communities are rewarded, with for example the 20% equity for local communities that Denmark has opted for. It is the in the interest of industry to maintain the status quo approach, as is more cost effective to try and have a community accept the idea of wind, rather than have to accept that the community must take a share of the financial benefits.

T. Carter who works with many different local groups around the country has seen firsthand how there does not seem to be much change in this direction ‘There's a lot of government thinking on how we're meant to get government community acceptance but there's actually no on-the-ground public participation methods being applied, they actually don't even seem to have an idea of how to do that’ (PC 2014).

6.4. The opportunities for social and community engagement

I very much put that (completion) down to the fact that the landowners are real owners of the wind farm with me (Blount in Van Waarden 2012) on the social and community ownership aspect of his story of wind power development

As part of the hypothesis on giving reason to the observed difficulties in the ability of EU level influences to percolate down through the levels of government, this paper puts forward that despite being seen to be persistent over time and across the three mechanisms of change, it is not permanent. In fact there is much scope for ground to be made. This is very promising.

In some regards, now is a good time to face the issue. The distrust is palpable and thus, governments have ample reason to devote time, effort and resources. Furthermore, the view can be seen as good from the influencing perspective of the EU, where interviewees have responded favorably on the EU level to promote knowledge sharing, though its ‘soft powers’ (J. Curtin PC 2014). While the community and social dimension has manifested for energy efficiency, it has not done so for renewable (J. Nix PC 2014), yet it supports the idea that it can. A. Cullen expressing this quite directly saying that there is ‘a role for horizontal communication in terms of best practices, approach, that have been successful’ (PC 2014). However at this stage, no such horizontal initiatives are in place for social
and community engagement dimension require, J. Moore, who is working on the paper ‘NESC Wind Energy: The Challenge of Community Engagement and Social Acceptance’ says that one can only ‘follow their nose’ in looking abroad (PC 2014). This paper may give the impression of work being done in the area, but there is little work that surrounds it, and for the moment remains the only real bastion on the topic in Ireland, its results being eagerly awaited by many (J. Nix PC 2014 T. Carter 2014) and yet played down by the author in the interview stating its difficulties.

While only tentative remarks can be made on what form social and community engagement may take. It is crucial that it is integrated across the other mechanisms of change where ‘local governments are likely to regard new directives more as a burden than an opportunity—unless, that is, additional EU funding comes attached’ (Flynn 2005: 118) and when ‘People don’t see this as being built for them but more as a response to EU rules’ (R. Meade 2014: 1). In this way it is important to attempt to bridge the awareness of the discourse, with the engagement of the challenge to source funds that build projects on the ground.

The scarcity of money is not only limited to local communities in Ireland but also at a national level for grid infrastructure. The eighteen-month moratorium, which was seen in the historical section, could be a reality again. However, interview participants stated that this is not a sentiment widely understood amongst the public. C. Doyle (PC 2014) and A. Culhane (PC 2014: 1) remarking that a lack of power failures in recent time perhaps being part of this mentality; M. Kennedy making lighthearted reference to the lights going out during the American Super bowl of 2013 perhaps being what is required in Ireland at the moment.

Chapter 7: Conclusion

The aims and associated research questions for this paper have been sequentially dealt with. The opening question of ‘how is the EU level influencing the development of the Irish wind sector?’ is appreciated as being axiomatically complex and is approached through three selected channels of influence. They have proved to be insightful in revealing some of the ways in which the EU policy process relates to the Irish wind sector. In assessing the three channels, they have each shown individual and characteristic ways of the EU as it is connected to Ireland for wind power, as well as highlighting some of the challenges of using such a methodological approach, where a certain degree of inference is needed in bringing together the different data.
It is a well underpinned conclusion from this research that the ability of how the EU level can influence wind power development in Ireland is limited by a lack of social and community engagement. Furthermore this is indicative of how the top down Europeanisation of Irish wind power loses momentum as it travels from the EU level policy process upon reaching the national level, at which point it is largely conceptualized as targets, and that this is resulting in its relevance being extended mainly to industry, whom the policy making level is closely tied to.

It is natural for a paper in following the lines of influence to come across many of the barriers, and yet, the paper also shows the potentially prodigious ability to improve the amount of renewable energy generated in Ireland in the years ahead. These are often to do with the innate qualities that Ireland posses, often misunderstood, or not fully appreciated. The wind capacity installed on the island of Ireland as of the 10 March 2014 was 2632MW, meeting around 18% of the SEM demand (Pöyry 2014) and to this date only offers a marginal increase on the cost of electricity to consumers in Ireland (Kennedy 2014).

The paper has brought up a number of areas for further research. While there is no end to what can be researched in such a developing sector of technology, as well as a developing area of governance, it goes almost without saying that this paper puts forward the pressing need to better face up to the issues of social and community awareness, engagement and ownership. This is for both within Ireland, and its local communities as between member states, where the EU is seen to be very capable at working its soft powers amongst interviewees.

The issue of community ownership, in particular, highlights the importance for further research in financing options in Ireland. This is a very specialist area of knowledge and again, much can be learn from looking out of the isle, even if “best practises” should not be expected to be found, but rather, a greater understanding within Ireland from experiences abroad. Ireland must be wary of relying too heavily on input from large-scale industry and must make due effort to make sure it has a balanced with input from other representative groups.
In assessing the goodness of fit across the three channels, in addition to the importance of the social and community aspect, the dominance of the national government became apparent. It has already been said that Ireland is ‘an essentially pragmatic taker of environmental policy within the EU process, although national environmental policy has certainly been strengthened as a result’ (Flynn 2004: 109). It has been observed in this research that Ireland has become better accustomed to dealing with the EU over the years of its engagement. This research confirms other work in that it remains clear that the national government has an influence over the process that is ‘pre-eminent’ to use the words of (Jordan 2001: 647) when writing about environmental policy in other European countries. This is a tendency that is reinforced by Ireland’s centralist planning system, and represents both opportunities and difficulties. It has been shown how the state pursuing targets despite strong nimbyism in Ireland can add fuel to the fire of discontent, when an attempted push by government leads to a responding pull on behalf of its citizens (i.e. the MOU). The assumption, that must not be leaped to, and one that is shown clearly in the summary of findings, is that a high normative goodness of fit by no mean pre-destines a high rational goodness of fit. Likewise, the lasting power associated with national level should also assuage fears of the EU over imposing itself on national issues, for this reason the principle of subsidiary seems to be very well intact.

This paper and its subject also offers reflection on not just the principles associated with European spatial planning but also with the very ideas of planning itself, which was covered in the earlier chapters of this thesis. It highlights a fundamental issue of how one ought to conceptualize the direction planning to take for wind power. Taking another line from Wildavsky, who was mentioned earlier, he wrote: ‘If planning is designed to make goals consistent on paper, one would judge it quite differently than if its purpose is actually to achieve social goals in the future’ (Wildavsky 1973: 128). Indeed this must remain at the forefront on the planners mind, and bears outstanding relevance to the dilemma raised in this paper of reaching targets with a lagging social and community engagement.

Ultimately a fundamental issue remains at the heart of this paper and one that an interviewee spoke of is the EU’s ‘two horse chariot’ (Lumly 2014); on the one hand promoting growth and the other sustainability. This is very much a global paradox at the moment, where a desire for endless growth cannot be seen to be environmentally durable. Often, decisions to confront this show the reality that, what is politically possible, is not environmentally sensible and what is environmentally sensible is not yet seen to be economically viable. The inconvenient reality is that while the political process struggles listlessly to deal with this, the science of a global climate spiralling out of control becomes ever more apparent.

Early on the thesis gave a quote from Rousseau’s 1754 Discourse on Inequality. It captures much of what is at heart in this paper in terms of the winds of Ireland carrying the analogy of ‘the fruits of the earth’. Currently the local opposition demonstrates that they are not satisfied with how they
perceive the fruits to be of benefit to them. The need for an energy source in Ireland that is environmentally sustainable, price competitive and secure in supply highlights the need to make better progress from the EU level policy process all the way down to the local community level in Ireland. It is the work of this thesis that attempts to contribute to its own logic that a better understanding of what is having affect, allows for a better ability to take effect.
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**ANNEX**

**List of Interviews**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name, Title, Date, Length of Interview</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Johannes Hahn</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Michael Schneider</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Franziska Dettner</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Paul Kenny</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Aidan Culhane</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>James Nix and Ian Lumly</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Joseph Curtin</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date of Interview</th>
<th>Interview Length</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Andrew Cullen</td>
<td>Head of Credit Strategy Policy &amp; Delivery. Small Business &amp; Agri. Bank of Ireland. Previously: Head of the financing for wind energy in Bank of Ireland, working on wind power project for 15 years</td>
<td>8th May 2014</td>
<td>24 minutes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ciaran Doyle</td>
<td>Business Intelligence Consultant at Bedford Consulting for wind farm development and wind farm mergers.</td>
<td>12th May 2014</td>
<td>26:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jeanne Moore</td>
<td>Policy Analyst at National Economic and Social Council (Currently researching on the paper: ‘NESC Wind Energy: The Challenge of Community Engagement and Social Acceptance’)</td>
<td>15th May 2014</td>
<td>34:52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simon Nuggent</td>
<td>Special Adviser to Minister for Communications, Energy and Natural Resources, Pat Rabbitte T.D</td>
<td>16th May 2014</td>
<td>26:28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>John Reilly</td>
<td>Head of PowerGen, Bord na Mona</td>
<td>19th May 2014</td>
<td>30:30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ryan Meade</td>
<td>Public Policy and Communications Consultant. Previous: Department of the Environment, Heritage and Local Government, Green Party of Ireland, Dublin City Council.</td>
<td>27th May 2014</td>
<td>31:09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Theresa Carter</td>
<td>Head of LEAF. An organisation which aims to network, promote and support sustainable development for a socially just, environmentally sound and resilient County Laois. Also part of ‘The People Energy Charter Organisation’</td>
<td>1st June 2014</td>
<td>6:17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew Kennedy</td>
<td>Senior Energy Technology and Climate Change Expert at Sustainable Energy Authority of Ireland</td>
<td>2nd June 2014</td>
<td>40 minutes (not recorded as was requested by Matthew)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Common themes:

- Enthusiasm for study
- About the threat of unsecure energy
- The difference nature of Ireland’s wind power
- Discourses
- Directives and Regulations
- Finances
- Social and Community Engagement
- The Threat of breaching Directives
- The overlap in the mechanisms of change
- This period in time as important
- Opportunities going forward

Interview Protocol

Pre-interview preparation:
- Run a background check of the person
- Edit questions based on current work place or previous experiences
- Forecast interview scenario and the level of appropriate ‘friendliness’ versus strict questioning
- Prepare short introduction on the research, with level of detail corresponding to the expected understanding. This was most often done via email.

In-interview guide:

- Say thank you for taking the time to accept my call
- Ask for permission to record the interview
- Ask for permission to use the person’s name
- Give introduction to thesis

Questions:

1. (Optional) Could you tell me a little about your role and background?

2. (Compulsory opening question) What’s the most important/stand out ways in which you see the EU level wind farms?

3. Discourses
   a. What would you see at the most influencing discourses from the EU level?
   b. How do you view the discourses effecting down from the national level, through to industry and down to people on the ground.

4. Directive / Regulations
a. How do you view the directives / regulations coming in from the EU to be influential?
   i. For Land use Directives (Birds, Habitats, EIA, SEA)
   ii. For Energy Directives
b. To what extent do you find the renewable energy targets given by the EU to be useful to the Irish planning system?
c. How useful do you find EIA’s in making sure wind farm development is suitable and social inclusive?

5. Finances
a. What are the major ways in which you see the EU offering financial support?
   i. Do you see Europe influencing much through state aid oversight (i.e. The Feed-in Tariff system versus a more market based approach)
   ii. Do you see Europe influencing much in direct financing (e.g. Through the European investment Bank, structural Funds, interreg projects)

6. Do you feel the structures of government have changed much in Ireland in response to EU level influences?

7. Would you welcome more involvement from the EU? And if so, in what way?
   a. Spur on Question: And would you prefer this involvement to be more nationally orientated, or maybe through more on-the-ground participatory or bottom-up.

8. (Revised question that featured more prominently towards latter interviews) How do you view the current level of Community and Social Engagement on wind farm development?
   a. Does the EU level process have much to offer in this regard?
   b. How would you imagine this beneficial influence taking form?

Post interview guide:

- Do you know of other people who would be useful to talk to?
- Thank you for taking the time and feel free to email on anything that might cross your mind as being appropriate for the research