Decentralization of energy systems is happening.

Drivers:
- Grid stabilisation
- Local economic development
- Falling costs of wind and solar
- Decarbonisation
- Community building, participation and cohesion
- A redistribution of control and profits
Decentralization is happening. And it’s political.

**The Koch Brothers’ Dirty War on Solar Power**

All over the country, the Kochs and utilities have been blocking solar initiatives

*By Tim Dickinson  
February 11, 2016*

**OCEANS**

Influence stretches far and wide in the world of Oceans. Power is devolved, competing interests are accommodated and compromise is king. Economic productivity surges on a huge wave of reforms, yet social cohesion is sometimes eroded and politics destabilised.
1. Is political power shifting?

2. What do these power shifts look like?

3. What will the consequences be?
Powershifts: A Study of Conflict Over Electricity Grid Access and Use

- 3 in-depth case studies: Netherlands; UK; Ontario, Canada
- 60 in-person interviews
- 35 country OECD survey
- 175 survey responses from policy makers
The POWERSHIFTS Framework

Theory on:
- Political power
- Policy processes
- Institutional theory (logics, historical institutionalism)
- Sustainability transitions
A (reductive) checklist of queries to assess shifting political power

1. Evidence of policy success by different actors
2. Differences in resource capacities
3. Structural justifications for policy decisions (i.e. market distribution, jobs, proportion of GDP)
4. Access to politicians and the policy process (including influence on problem framing)
5. Production and use of knowledge for policy processes
6. Interest alignment between groups
7. Character of the political discourse (e.g., political system organization, dominant decision-maker logics.)
Preliminary Results for Case Comparisons
1. Who wins?

Dutch Climate Agreement
All new renewable energy installations to be 50% community-owned

July 10, 2018 · News
2. Who has resources? How has this changed?
3. Who controls jobs? What’s the energy mix? What’s coming?

Ontario Planning Outlook - IESO

UK

Netherlands

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Generation</td>
<td>114.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which gas</td>
<td>46%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which coal</td>
<td>35%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which wind</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which biomass/gas</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Of which nuclear</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other generation</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Consumption (TWh)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Who can talk to decision-makers?
5. Who creates the knowledge and makes the rules?
6. New political friends in the new energy world

How Net Metering Can Work For Municipalities, FCPC 2018
7. What role for political structures, and current issues and debate?
1. Is political power shifting?
   • Yes, but…. 

2. In what ways is political power shifting?
   • Different energy policies (NL)
   • New partnerships
   • Increasing capacity
   • Increasing public and public sector support

3. What does this mean for the future?
   • NL – big changes
   • Canada, UK – jurisdiction hopping
• How can decentralized energy movements address equity issues over resource ownership?
  • …and how is it different from current ownership patterns?

• With many new players, how can policy makers know who to talk to and where to get their information from?

• How to cope, analytically, with the pace of change in policy processes?
For More Information on POWERSHIFTS...

m.c.brisbois@sussex.ac.uk; www.power-shifts.com; @powershifts1
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Focus Areas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>First</strong></td>
<td>1. Influence or control over outcomes (e.g., Lukes, 2005)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Overt coercion or manipulation (e.g., Geels et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Imbalances in resource capacities (e.g., financial, institutional, lobbying) (e.g., Fuchs, 2007; Geels et al., 2016; Lukes, 2005; Patterson et al., 2016; Smink et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Second</strong></td>
<td>4. Influence on agenda setting (e.g., Shove and Walker, 2007; Smink et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Inclusion or exclusion of actor groups from the policy process (e.g., Avelino and Wittmayer, 2016; Meadowcroft, 2009)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6. Access to, and influence on knowledge production and system rules (e.g., industry self-monitoring, private rule-setting) (e.g., Berlo et al., 2016; Lockwood et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Elite access to policy makers (e.g., Berlo et al., 2016; Geels et al., 2016; Hess, 2016; Lockwood et al., 2016; Smink et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Justification for political decisions (e.g., market shares, job distribution, proportion of GDP) (e.g., Christiansen et al., 2010; Farrell, 2011; Fuenfschilling and Truffer, 2014; Geels et al., 2016; Johnstone and Newell, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Third</strong></td>
<td>9. Influence over discursive tools such as media (e.g., Geels et al., 2016; Smink et al., 2015)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10. Nature and evolution of competing socioeconomic and political discourse (e.g., dominant policy-maker logics) (e.g., Avelino, 2017; Fuenfschilling and Truffer, 2014; Johnstone and Newell, 2017; Lockwood et al., 2016; Raven et al., 2016)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11. Discursive alignment between groups that enables the creation of interest-based coalitions (e.g., Bosman et al., 2014; Hess, 2016, 2014; Sabatier and Weible, 2016)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Brisbois, forthcoming in *Energy Research and Social Science*)