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- Renewables facing scrutiny in public spheres
- Geothermal energy - efficiency, cost, potential sources
- Social acceptance and community acceptance
- The (potential) role of SIA
Worldwide mapping of geothermal energy installed capacity, image extracted from Lund et al. (2015) p. 82
“SIA is the process of analyzing (predicting, evaluating and reflecting) and managing the intended and unintended consequences on the human environment of planned interventions (policies, programs, plans, projects) and any social change processes invoked by those interventions so as to bring about a more sustainable and equitable biophysical and human environment”. - (Becker & Vanclay, 2003, p. 2)
Case studies

- Ethiopia, Indonesia, Kenya
- Varying capacities
- Different consultants
- ESIA reports
Evaluation criteria

1. Are all stakeholders of the project/proposed action clearly identified?
2. Are project objectives consistent with the needs, interests and capacity of community members and stakeholders including the most vulnerable/most affected groups?
3. Are all social and cultural factors which may affect the ability of stakeholders to participate or benefit from the proposed policy or project included in the report/consultation process?
4. Has there been a thorough public participation process that includes at least 3 of the engagement activities mentioned earlier spanning all phases of project development and SIA process?
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1. Stakeholder Identification</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya report:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| "There were no well-defined stakeholders groups."
  \(\text{(GDC, n.d., p. 19)}\)              |
| **2. Objectives, needs, interests, capacities** |
| No mention of project objectives that address the needs/ interests/ capacities of community members and stakeholders (all 3) |
| **3. Social/ Cultural context**              |
| No specific mention of social/ cultural factors (except for Kenya) but participatory approaches were emphasized |
| **4. Public participation process**          |
| All reports stated that stakeholder engagement/ public participation activities were conducted |
5. What institutional arrangements are needed for participation and project delivery?

6. Are there plans to build capacity at appropriate levels?

7. Have the impacts of the project or program on the various stakeholders, especially women and vulnerable groups been identified and addressed?

8. Are there plans to mitigate adverse impacts and has local knowledge been accounted for in the mitigation plans?
## Findings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Institutional arrangements were not strictly mentioned but plans for improving basic infrastructure were included</td>
<td>Highlighted across all 3 reports to varying degrees (from basic training courses to building a training institute)</td>
<td>Impacts were generally identified but not specific stakeholder groups</td>
<td>Generic mitigation measures identified and do not incorporate local knowledge</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
“This ESIA concludes that while the … project has potential adverse social and environmental impacts, they are few in number, site-specific, largely reversible, and readily addressed through mitigation measures.” (ESC, 2012, p. i)
Conclusion and limitations

- Ambiguity and uncertainty
- Standard operating procedure
- Divide between interdisciplinary research and practice
- Access to information
- The role of SIA in the energy transition
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