

Highlights

Philosophical views of justice and their implications in energy systems modelling

Oskar Vågerö, Tor Håkon Jackson Inderberg, Marianne Zeyringer

- Energy system models increasingly focus on aspects such as distributional justice
- Widening the perspective of justice lead to different energy system design
- Normative assumptions needs to be explicit and ideally discussed

Philosophical views of justice and their implications in energy systems modelling

Oskar Vågerö^{a,*}, Tor Håkon Jackson Inderberg^{a,b} and Marianne Zeyringer^a

^aDepartment of Technology Systems, University of Oslo, Gunnar Randers vei 19, Kjeller, N-2007, Norway

^bFridtjof Nansen Institute, Fridtjof Nansens vei 17, Lysaker, N-1326, Norway

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Energy systems modelling
Energy justice
Distributional equity
Justice principles
Near-optimal feasible spaces

ABSTRACT

What constitutes socially just or unjust energy systems or transitions can be derived from the philosophy and theories of justice. Assessments of justice and utilising them in modelling lead to great differences based on which justice principles are applied. From the limited research so far published in the intersection between energy systems modelling and justice, we find that comparisons between the two principles of utilitarianism and egalitarianism dominate in assessments of distributive justice, with the latter most often considered representing a 'just energy system'. The lack of recognition of alternative and equally valid principles of justice, resting on e.g. capabilities, responsibilities and/or opportunities, leads to a narrow understanding of justice that fails to align with the views of different individuals, stakeholders and societies. More importantly, it can lead to the unjust design of future energy systems and energy systems analysis.

In this work, we contribute to the growing amount of research on justice in energy systems modelling by assessing the implications of different philosophical views on justice on modelling results. Through a modelling exercise with a power system model for Europe (highRES), we explore different designs of a future net-zero European energy system, and its distributional implications based on the application of different justice principles. In addition to the utilitarian and egalitarian approach, we include, among others, principles of 'polluters pay' and 'ability-to-pay', which take historical contributions of greenhouse gas emissions and the socio-economic conditions of a region into account.

We find that socially just energy systems look significantly different depending on the justice principles applied. The results may stimulate a greater discussion among researchers and policymakers on the implications of different constructions of justice in modelling, expansion of approaches, and demonstrate the importance of transparency and assumptions when communicating such results.

1. Introduction

Limiting global temperature increase and climate change require rapid and deep decarbonisation of our economies and energy systems. Such profound changes are not merely techno-economic, but also include socio-cultural changes and challenges [1]. In addition to efforts of transitioning to low-carbon energy systems, the importance of just transitions which equitably distributes benefits and addresses potential injustices has received increased attention both in academic literature [2, 3], and in policy discussions [4, 5]. The concept of just transitions acknowledges that the shift towards low-carbon energy systems may create new inequalities or amplify existing ones, affecting different communities in diverse ways. When studying energy transitions, there is a need to include a wide range of justice aspects.

Energy systems optimisation modelling (ESOM) provides a tool to analyse energy system transitions and future energy systems. It is often used to advise policymakers and planners on how to best design energy systems in line with policy goals such as the European Union Green Deal, which aims to transform the European Union society to be climate neutral AND just by 2050. While ESOMs are strong tools to support the first objective focusing on techno-economic aspects, they often overlook socio-cultural aspects [6] required to analyse just energy systems. However, the state-of-the-art is developing, and more attention is devoted to the inclusion of various socio-cultural aspects [6, 7, 8] such as socio-political acceptance of energy infrastructure [9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14], behaviour and lifestyle changes [15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20], and spatial distribution of benefits and burdens [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28].

*Corresponding author

✉ oskar.vagero@its.uio.no (O. Vågerö); thinderberg@fni.no (T.H.J. Inderberg); marianne.zeyringer@its.uio.no (M. Zeyringer)

ORCID(s): 0000-0002-0806-0329 (O. Vågerö); 0000-0002-1838-3834 (T.H.J. Inderberg)

Optimisation modellers have as such sought new tools and techniques to attend to non-technical aspects of energy systems, often driven by the wish to include political feasibility and fairness of the system. One of these techniques, Modelling to Generate Alternatives (MGA), allows modellers to investigate the structural uncertainty and solutions which are near-optimal through an iterative modelling-process [29]. Previous studies applying MGA have explored alternative energy system designs that are slightly more costly, but tend to other objectives. For example, Sasse & Trutnevyte looked at the trade-offs between cost-efficiency and a just distribution of energy infrastructure in Switzerland [22], Lombardi et al. mapped out spatially and technologically diverse system configurations for Italy [30] and Chen, Kirkerud & Bolkesjø analysed alternative designs for a Northern European energy system with attention to reduced land-use conflicts [26].

Throughout these and other examples of optimisation modelling studies, there is generally a narrow interpretation and limited discussion of what entails a just distribution, which in turn may result in equally narrow policy recommendations [31]. In fact, this issue persists beyond modelling and Van Uffelen et al. [32] have found that research applying the energy justice framework most often does not explicitly support normative claims or recommendations and that implicit principles of justice are a source of normative uncertainty.

Furthermore, utilitarianism and neoclassical economics exclusively dominate the field of ESOM, leading to depictions of ‘non-normative’ (cost-optimal) versus approaches that account for different aspects of justice or fair distribution. This, however, disregards the fact that also the conventional cost-optimal approach comes with significant justice implications. Following the frequently quoted expanded aphorism “all models are wrong, but some are useful” [33], modelling is often concerned with non-epistemic values such as usefulness [34]. As such cost-optimal modelling is indeed normative and basing, for example, policy recommendations on it implicitly include the (normative) assumption that inequities within the system are unimportant (or at least that efficient redistribution will adjust the inequities). Sgouridis et al. extends the saying to “all models are subjective, but few acknowledge it” [35], highlighting that implicit assumptions create blind spots in models impacting the results and in extension potentially also energy policy.

Other than Pedersen et al., who expand the number of justice interpretations when studying effort-sharing and the distribution of CO₂ abatement cost in a European power system [27], modelling analyses are generally limited to compare a cost-optimal baseline to some variant of equal distribution based on population or consumption patterns [21, 22, 25]. The aim of this work is to show how applying different justice principles radically influences electricity system designs, and thereby emphasise the need to explicitly state assumptions and subjectivity when presenting modelling results. To study this, we use MGA as a technique to sample the near-optimal decision space for the design of a European electricity system in 2050, which we then analyse quantitatively based on differently defined Gini coefficients as a proxy for the distributional justice of a system configuration. While our work is confined to the field of energy systems modelling, the analysis is likely to be applicable also for other settings where justice or distribution needs to be defined.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows: Section 2 presents the conceptual framework of the work, focusing on different principles of justice and methods of allocating benefits and burdens. Section 3 outlines the methodology, including a brief description of the linear optimisation electricity system model highRES, the quantification of justice through the Gini coefficient and the MGA technique applied. Section 4 contains the results of the modelling exercise, which are further discussed in section 5.

2. Principles and methods of just allocation

We apply seven diverging justice principles for just distribution in energy infrastructure. These seven approaches to justice are necessarily quite stylised in their presentational form. This is because of the need for brevity given the purpose of being applicable in the modelling, and while we have provided some links to their origin and links to the literature, we have emphasised concrete presentations. Nor is the list exhaustive, and alternatives could have been included, based on, for example, bio- or ecocentrism. However, these seven approaches include key interpretations which can be found in scientific literature and at the heart of political philosophy (see e.g. Kverndokk and Rose [36] or Zhou and Wang [37]).

2.1. Efficiency-based justice

Efficiency-based distribution is commonly the core principle in energy modelling. Also known as utilitarianism, it has a basis in ethical theory, often traced back to Jeremy Bentham [38] and John Stuart Mill [39]. In its simplest

definition, utilitarianism claims that we should seek to maximise human welfare, or utility, for members of society [40]. Traditionally, utility has been defined in terms of happiness, pleasure, or the absence of pain, but the interpretation can be context-specific. In the context of electricity systems planning, utility can be understood as access to energy-related services, which in turn relies on efficient resource allocation to ensure supply meets or exceeds demand, ultimately leading to the largest monetary surplus for society as a whole. However, the pursuit of maximising overall utility, sometimes through pareto optimisation, often still leads to unequal distributions of utility among different members of society, leading to perceptions of unjust distributions at individual, group, or geographic levels.

The debate over whether utilitarianism justifies treating people as mere means to an end, such as sacrificing the weak for the sake of the majority, remains a frequent criticism. While utilitarianism was originally viewed as progressive and reform-oriented, it is now often considered preserving the status quo [40].

2.2. Equality-based justice

Equality, or egalitarianism, on the contrary, is based on the fundamental principle that all people should have equal rights, opportunities and treatment, irrespective of their background, social status or other characteristics. This includes not only equal access to resources but also the fair and just distribution of benefits and burdens among individuals. A variant of this was posited by John Rawls, inequalities should only be accepted if cases where the worst-off groups will be better off than they were under an equal distribution [41, 42]. With equal treatment of individuals, the distribution of benefits and burdens scale with population, meaning that, for example, a more populous country or region should bear a larger share of both the benefits and burdens.

Moreover, it is important to distinguish between equality of opportunity and equality of outcome within the framework of egalitarianism. Equality of opportunity holds that inequalities may be acceptable if everyone has the same opportunities and any resulting inequality is a consequence of individual choices rather than societal circumstances [40]. On the other hand, equality of outcome focuses on the resulting distribution itself, irrespective of the choices or processes leading to it, where perceived fairness of how costs and rewards are distributed across groups and group members [43]. In the context of electricity systems planning, it is natural to focus on equality of outcome, given that we are examining a static system rather than its development over time.

2.3. Capability-based allocations

A different aspect on achieving a fair and just distribution of benefits and burdens is recognising that while individuals deserve equal rights, their opportunities and starting points may differ significantly [44, 45]. Consequently, it becomes necessary to consider individuals' capabilities, or 'ability to pay' when distributing benefits, burdens and responsibilities, taking into account the varying circumstances people find themselves in. For instance, individuals or communities with lower economic capabilities may require a different allocation of benefits to address their disadvantaged position in society, and similarly have a lower responsibility to act, compared to groups with higher capabilities.

While there are multiple ways to define capabilities, one commonly used approach at the country-level is based on economic indicators, such as the evaluation of gross domestic product (GDP) or purchasing power parity (PPP)-adjusted GDP [36, 37, 46, 47]. However, it is important to note that economic capability is just one dimension among many that need to be considered in a comprehensive assessment of individuals' capabilities.

2.4. Historic responsibility as justice

Incorporating a temporal dimension is justice seen as historic responsibility. This perspective argues that previous actions and cumulative CO₂ emissions should serve as the basis for distribution [48]. It recognises that certain individuals, communities or countries have historically made larger contributions to the accumulation of greenhouse gas emissions, resulting in the current climate crisis.

While there are counterarguments, this view represents an argument that the distribution of responsibility, benefits and burdens should be adjusted to account for different levels of responsibility for climate change [49, 50]. It suggests that those who have significantly contributed to carbon emissions have a greater obligation to bear the burdens and take responsibility for rectifying the environmental damage caused. Consequently, countries with higher historical emissions might be required to make more substantial efforts in terms of emission reductions, mitigation strategies and financial contributions.

Responsibility can be allocated based on either production-based or consumption-based emissions, where the former is the common basis within the UNFCCC and the Paris Agreement [47, 49]. Production-based emissions refer

to greenhouse gas emissions produced within a specific geographical area, and resulting activities within that defined boundary. On the other hand, consumption-based emissions stem from consumption of goods or services associated with greenhouse gas emissions. This approach encompasses the entire lifecycle emissions and assigns them to the geographical area consuming the goods or services.

Furthermore, the system boundary may cover different parts of the economy, such as only the energy or electricity sector, leading to different outcomes.

2.5. The self-sufficiency principle

The principle of equality, which asserts that individuals should have equal access to resources, can be further nuanced through acknowledging the differences in energy needs for different geographical areas. Areas with more extreme temperatures, whether hot or cold, generally has different energy consumption needs compared to other areas. This can justify a larger claim to energy resources. To account for this, we can apply the concept of regional self-sufficiency, whereby countries or regions strive to produce as much energy as they consume [51]. This self-sufficiency principle, particularly in electricity systems, has practical implications and can be motivated by factors such as ensuring security of energy supply or pursuing energy autarky [25, 52].

2.6. Land burden as justice principle

Distribution based on land area is a method of allocating resources based on the geographic size of a region and has its origin in land-use conflicts, particularly for renewables [26, 53, 54]. There are important counter-arguments to this approach. For example, a distribution solely based on land area does not account for factors like population density, natural resource availability, or economic productivity. A country with a vast land area but a small population might not require the same level of resources as a densely populated area with smaller land area. Similarly, regions with abundant natural resources or high agricultural productivity might not need additional resources simply due to their land area.

Moreover, when considering the burden of developing additional energy infrastructure, along with recognising the equal right to a natural environment for everyone, it becomes apparent that larger territories might bear the potential of sacrificing more land area, given its abundant nature.

Distributing resources based on land area can be reasonable due to the principle of territorial integrity. Countries or regions with larger land areas usually require more resources to maintain infrastructure and government services, and allocating resources in proportion to land area could be seen as a way to ensure that larger territories have the means to meet the needs of their population.

2.7. The grandfathering principle

Grandfathering refers to a practice that allows certain individuals or entities to be exempted from new rules, regulations or requirements based on their pre-existing status or conditions [55]. Essentially, it grants certain privileges, rights or exemptions to those who were already engaged in a particular activity or possessed certain qualifications before the new rules or requirements came into effect. According to the principle, past efforts and developments should be continued and valued, resembling a conservative approach. The principle is often considered in real-life climate negotiations, such as that of the Kyoto Protocol and the EU ETS [56]. It suggests that past emissions, to some extent, entitle entities to further emissions. This principle aligns with the aim of maintaining established economic and social activities, and argues that sudden and radical transitions would be socially unjust. In contrast, it can be seen as opposing the concept of historic responsibility.

Being an oft-applied justice principle in practice, grandfathering is important in that it values current economic activities, and recognises that undermining of these is unjust, or can have detrimental effects on citizens in some regions. While it runs the risk of conserving unfavourable economic activities and can lead to the continuation of existing advantages for certain stakeholders, it is an important valuation of economic value based on established positions; maintaining the status quo.

3. Research design

3.1. highRES modelling framework

For this modelling exercise, we use the open-source high spatial and temporal Resolution Electricity System model for Europe (highRES) [57]. With highRES we generate snapshots of different electricity system designs for an

interconnected European electricity system in 2050. The model version which we apply in this case consists of 28 nodes, each representing one of the EU27 (excluding Cyprus and Malta) + Norway, The United Kingdom and Switzerland. The model is a hybrid greenfield model, which does not consider existing infrastructure, except for hydropower reservoirs and capacities, which remain fixed at the current state of the system. A detailed overview of core model assumptions can be found in the associated GitHub repository¹ together with the model formulation, data necessary to replicate both modelling and analysis, as well as major changes from previously published versions [57, 58].

3.2. Modelling to Generate Alternatives (MGA)

The MGA technique is applied to sample alternative system configurations that are near-optimal in the sense that they only deviate from the cost-optimal model solution within a tolerable degree, while optimising for a new objective. Specifically, we utilise the ‘One-At-a-Time (OAT) approach [59, 60], and the process can be summarised as follows:

1. A baseline model scenario is generated by running the model in its normal function, minimising the total system cost, resulting in a cost-optimal objective value $f(x^*)$.
2. An allowable cost-increase ϵ (slack) to the cost-optimal total system cost is introduced, which forms a new constraint, allowing the total system cost of subsequent model runs to be $f(x) = f(x^*) \cdot (1 + \epsilon)$.
3. For each MGA scenario, a new objective is introduced, which for this OAT approach revolve around minimising and maximising the installed capacity of various electricity generation technologies, for each country node individually as well as aggregated. We have chosen to limit ourselves to only onshore- and offshore wind, solar and nuclear, as e.g. hydropower is not expandable and gas is heavily constrained by emission limits.

With the OAT approach, we sample only the extreme points at the vertices of the solution space, meaning that there are interior points which may be equally valid system configurations, but which we overlook, see e.g. Neumann and Brown [59, Fig. 1] for a simplified graphical illustration of the multidimensional near-optimal feasible space. Although there are more sophisticated methods of sampling the near-optimal feasible space (see e.g. [61, 30, 62]), it is not our ambition to acquire a full representation from our sampling, as the purpose of our work is to illustrate the central point around different interpretations and definitions of justice. Furthermore, the OAT approach is useful to understand the structure of the decision space [59]. However, it also generates system configurations which are nonsensical from a practical point of view. In our sample, this is particularly true when the model is tasked to maximise the installed capacity of some technology, as it often install capacity which is then not used to generate electricity (as that is not an objective of the model).

It is important to state that MGA is not the only technique one could apply for this type of analysis, as imposing equity related constraints [25] or multi-objective optimisation [21] have proven useful. However, given that MGA has acquired traction in energy systems analysis [31, 63] we decided that utilising this method makes results easier to compare to the main body of scientific literature in this field.

3.3. Gini-coefficient

The Gini index or Gini coefficient is a statistical indicator for studying the variability of objects. In the original publication, the Gini coefficient is defined as: "the mean difference from all observed quantities" [64]. It is most commonly applied as a way to measure income inequality, but has been applied as a statistical indicator in a wide range of fields, such as energy systems analysis [22, 23, 59] epidemiology [65] and variation in grain yield [66].

One way of mathematically defining the Gini coefficient, G is:

$$G = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |x_i - x_j|}{2 \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n x_j} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n |x_i - x_j|}{2n^2 \bar{x}}, \quad (1)$$

where x_i is the studied factor (to be distributed) of study object i and there are n study objects. x_j represents a different study object compared to the focal one (i), and \bar{x} is the arithmetic mean value of x_i . Applied to an electricity system model, the studied factor (x) could be e.g. installed generation capacity or electricity generated in a country or region (i). Assigning each country or region the same weight largely skews the results given that the population, land-area available and electricity consumption widely differs between the studied objects. As such, it is possible to

¹<https://github.com/OskarVagero/MENOFs>

weigh the studied factor by instead considering e.g. installed generation capacity per capita, consumption or land area (see section 3.4).

Since the relationship between the different variables in equation 1 are non-linear, we are unable to include these calculations within our linear optimisation model. As such, we use modelling to generate alternatives (MGA) (previously described in section 3.2) to sample the near-optimal feasible solution space, and calculate the Gini coefficients as part of the post-processing.

3.4. Justice definitions

In addition to describing the theories supporting the principles of distribution (introduced in section 2) and defining the Gini coefficient used to evaluate the equity of a system, we need to operationally define the justice principles. The contribution of different regions changes with the definition of the burden or benefit distributed (x_i). Additional to determining the appropriate definition of subject of moral worth (i.e. who deserves moral consideration), one also needs to consider what Sasse & Trutnevte [22] call equity factors (EF), and what it is that should be equally distributed. Previous modelling studies have considered, among other things, the distribution of electricity generation infrastructure (e.g. wind turbines or solar panels) [21], emission-rights [27] or energy-associated economic impacts (e.g. job opportunities) [23].

For the efficiency principle, we conform to conventional cost-optimising modelling, which simply requires designing the system while minimising the total system cost. As such, we do not calculate a Gini coefficient for this principle.

Operationalising the equality, capability, and historical responsibility principles all follow similar patterns. We consider installed capacity of electricity generating infrastructure to be the equity factor that should be distributed. The studied factor (x_i) is then the fraction of the installed capacity, weighted by population, purchasing power parity (PPP) adjusted GDP or cumulative historic emissions, which is presented in equation 2 through 4:

$$x_i = \frac{P_i}{\rho_i}, \forall i \in C \quad (2)$$

$$x_i = \frac{P_i}{E_i}, \forall i \in C \quad (3)$$

$$x_i = \frac{P_i}{CC_i}, \forall i \in C \quad (4)$$

with:

P_i	installed capacity
ρ_i	population
E_i	PPP adjusted GDP
CC_i	cumulative CO ₂ e emitted between 1900-2021
C	Set of countries

For the self-sufficiency principle, the installed capacity is less relevant than the amount of electricity generated, and we as such change the equity factor to be total electricity generated in a year, which is weighted by the annual electricity demand, as seen in equation 5:

$$x_i = \frac{G_i}{D_i}, \forall i \in C \quad (5)$$

where, G_i is total annual electricity generation and D_i is the annual electricity demand.

The land burden principle focuses on the land-use conflicts that electricity generation infrastructure can have with non-modelled aspects, such as agricultural or recreational land, or other alternative uses. It connects societal and ecological burden from electricity generation infrastructure to land area occupied and population density through the indicator burden level, originally described by Christ et al. [67] and presented in modified form in equation 6:

$$x_i = \frac{A_{occupied,i}}{A_{avail,i}}, \forall i \in C \quad (6)$$

where $A_{occupied,i}$ is the area occupied by energy generating technologies, $A_{avail,i}$ is the area available. Installed capacity of electricity generating infrastructure is implicitly considered, but also weighed based on how much area is occupied by different technologies. We base the area factors on Chen et al. [26, Tbl. A6], where solar PV and onshore wind occupy a considerably larger area than any other technology. As such, a system is just when the same share of a country's buildable area, is occupied by electricity generation infrastructure. This does not result in the same area available for everyone, only that everyone 'sacrifices' the same share of their available resources.

Lastly, for the grandfathering principle, we assess the change from status quo, meaning that if each country keep the same share of the total installed capacity, the system will be perfectly equitable. The equity factor is as such:

$$x_i = \frac{P_i}{P_{old}}, \forall i \in C \quad (7)$$

where $P_{old,i}$, is the installed capacity already built in 2022. As such, an equitable system should strive to reduce the impact on already established value-chains, maintaining the same shares of capacities as the current electricity system.

Table 1
Overview of justice principles

Principle	Description	Example of Equity factor(s)	Denominators
Efficiency	Distribute to minimise total system cost	None	None
Equality	Distribute equally	Installed capacity / investment costs / emissions	Population
Self-sufficiency	Distribute for national independence	Generation	Demand
Capability	Distribute based on socio-economic capacity	Installed capacity / investment costs / emissions	PPP adjusted GDP
Historic responsibility	Distribute so that historical beneficiaries do more	Installed capacity / investment costs / emissions	Per capita CO2 emitted since 1900
Land burden	Distribute for an equal share of available area	Occupied area	Available area
Grandfathering	Distribute to reduce the impact on established value-chains	Installed capacity / investment costs / emissions	Current system capacities

The denominators used in the calculation of the Gini coefficient are based on a mix of descriptive statistics (population, GDP, emissions and currently installed capacity [68, 50, 69, 70]) and modelling assumptions (available land area and electricity demand). An overview of the spatial distribution is presented in figure 1.

4. Results

Before we explore the alternative system configurations generated with the MGA technique, we can look at distributional aspects of the 2022 version of the real European electricity system as well as the cost-optimal model scenario generated with highRES. Data for the system in 2022 is sampled from ENTSO-E [70].

Figure 2 shows the performance of each individual country according to five of the different justice principles outlined in section 2. The grandfathering principle is excluded in this figure, as it is only applicable in the MGA scenarios. Here we can easily see that the performance of countries, relative to one another, changes based on what quantitative measure is used in the assessment. Luxembourg (LU), a small country which currently relies on imported electricity from neighbouring countries to supply about 80% of its electricity demand [70], performs poorly according to the first four assessments, with either the lowest or second-lowest value. However, when it comes to land area, Luxembourg uses a high share of its available land area relative to other countries. For Norway (NO) the situation is reversed, with high scores in all measures, except for when one assesses the share of land area occupied, due to its low population density.




Figure 1: Spatial distribution of relevant denominators

Table 2

Resulting Gini coefficients. Values close to 0 indicate high equity, whereas values close to 1 indicate high inequity.

	Self-sufficiency	Equality	Capability	Responsibility	Land burden
Current system	0.079	0.185	0.147	0.269	0.483
Cost-optimal	0.097	0.218	0.216	0.378	0.552

The same can also be shown from calculating the Gini coefficient (see section 3.3) as an assessment of the distributional equity for the system as a whole. According to the self-sufficiency principle, the system has a rather high distributional equity ($G = 0.079$ and 0.097), but a high inequity for the land-burden principle ($G = 0.483$ and 0.552), both for the current system and the cost-optimal scenario. The other principles lie somewhere in between, as can be seen in Table 2. Notably, the Gini coefficient is also higher in the cost-optimal scenario than in the current system, for all five justice principles which can be compared.

4.1. Gini coefficients of future electricity systems

Furthermore, in figure 4, we can see the distribution of the Gini coefficient for each definition of distributional equity. The statistical dispersion of the Gini coefficients is summarised in table 3. From figure 4 and table 3, we can draw some general conclusions around the dispersion, such as that the self-sufficiency principle has the least dispersion (in terms of range and standard deviation). For the other principles, the dispersion is greater, although in various ways. The responsibility principle has a relatively large range between the highest and the lowest value, but a lower IQR than the remaining three principles. However, as in the case of the cost-optimal scenario and the current system, the different definitions render quite different Gini coefficients.

Philosophical views of justice and their implications in energy systems modelling




Figure 2: x_i values for each country i , according to different justice principles, based on the electricity system in 2022. NO and LU in colour, for illustrative purposes




Figure 3: Lorenz curve | Resulting Gini coefficients for the cost-optimal scenario. Values close to 0 indicate high equity, whereas values close to 1 indicate high inequity. Dots are individual data points.

We can further identify the MGA scenarios with the best (lowest) Gini coefficient according to each justice principle, as is illustrated in figure 5. As such, out of all MGA scenarios, maximising the installed capacity of solar power in Germany, with a 10% slack, results in the least inequity, according to the self-sufficiency principle. However, if equity is expressed through the capability principle, maximising onshore wind power in Germany with a slack of 5% results in the least inequity. Furthermore, the trade-off between cost-efficiency and improving equity is different for the different justice principles. For example, with the capability principle, we find an improvement by 21% (4.6 ppt) at a 15% total system cost increase and for the land-burden principle a 14% (7.1 ppt) for the same cost increase.




Figure 4: Box plot of the resulting 4254 Gini coefficients for the scenarios as well as individual points for the cost-optimal scenario and system in 2022. Whiskers represent $1.5 \times \text{IQR}$, and outliers are not shown in the figure.




Figure 5: Gini coefficients of the top performing MGA scenarios, for each justice principle. The colour of the x-axis label illustrates which principle each scenario is a top performer for.

Looking more in-depth at the system design for the top performing MGA scenarios, we can study how the model decides to allocate electricity generating infrastructure, as illustrated in figure 6. Naturally, the optimisation objective of each specific MGA scenario plays a big role in the allocation, but it is not the only aspect which changes. For example, in DEMAXSOL10 there is an additional 122 GW of installed onshore wind capacity across the system, and 16 GW less natural gas to facilitate more solar capacity. In DEMAXON15, the system invests in 262 GW of additional solar capacity (and 128 GW less offshore wind) in addition to changes in onshore wind.




Figure 6: Allocation of electricity infrastructure in the top performing MGA scenarios.

5. Discussion

First and foremost, we show that the application of different justice principles in energy system modelling is feasible and that the traditional approach - maximisation of efficient distribution of energy technology at the lowest cost possible - is one among a number of alternatives. As such, this is an important finding, as this key for distribution has a close to paradigmatic standing in economic analyses and techno-economic modelling. At the same time, we show that it is far from value-neutral. This makes investigating alternatives important in and of itself, so justice-related outcomes can be made more transparent.

Furthermore, the results clearly indicate that the distributive outcomes of the different models are sufficiently different to be regarded as important outputs for further discussion. Already from studying the electricity system as it is today, we find that the evaluation of distributional equity changes with the application of different justice principles, both in terms of internal ranking of countries and the overall resulting Gini coefficient.

Overall, our results show the anticipated spread of Gini coefficients, with the best (lowest) value ranging from 0.064 to 0.386, based on the different definitions we have applied. The design of the “justice-optimal” energy system varies considerably, on the basis of how justice is interpreted. The results also show that the self-sufficiency- and equality principles, which have been applied most frequently in earlier works [31], are also the ones with the lowest Gini coefficient, both in the cost-optimal model run and for the top-performing MGA scenarios. Analysing specifically

these justice principles may as such result in more modest assessments of how just/unjust an electricity system is perceived to be, as well as the potential for improvement.

Similar to previous research [25], we find that the cost-optimal future electricity system tends to lead to higher levels of inequity, not only when defined in terms of self-sufficiency, but also for the distribution of electricity generation capacities per inhabitant, economic capability, cumulative historic emissions and land-area availability. Noticeably, for the capacity and responsibility principles, neither of the scenarios show a lower inequity (Gini coefficient) than the system in 2022, even with up to a 15 percent cost-increase. This reflects how modelling results often deviate from existing electricity systems. As is known from real-life political situations, uncritically applying cost-optimised ideal results may therefore be politically difficult, and compensations or adjustments can be expected in actual energy system application [71].

Exploring alternative system configurations based on different principles for application of justice concerns allows for the identification of more equitable electricity systems, exploring the trade-off between cost-efficiency and distributional equity changes with how equity is defined. While the results of Sasse & Trutnevyte [22] showed a similar trade-off for both the equality and self-sufficiency principle for a 2035 Swiss electricity system, including a wider interpretation of justice leads to a larger spread in the results. The equity improvement of the top performing scenarios relative to the cost-optimal scenario range from 2.4 to 7.1%pt., and 14.4 to 27.5%. Previous studies have also shown how the spatial allocation changes between a cost-optimal scenario and more equitable system designs. Both Drechsler [21] and Sasse & Trutnevyte [22] noticed a shift from onshore wind to open-field solar PV in the more equitable electricity system (based on a self-sufficiency and/or equality principle) for Germany and Switzerland, respectively. Neumann and Brown [59] showed that transmission network expansion can lead to increased inequity (when considering equality-based justice), while investing in storage can increase equity somewhat (although not in a zero-emission system). Our continental-scale results do not indicate that specific technologies are required for more equitable electricity systems, as it depends more on the interpretation of justice principle applied. This could, however, be impacted by aspects such as our sampling of the near-optimal feasible space, spatial- and temporal resolution of the modelling setup and assumptions of e.g. land-use intensity of technologies.

Justice is getting more political traction also when thinking of the necessary speed of energy transitions [72], with social opposition due to perceived inequities being a major hindrance [73]. Utilising model results for policy and decision-making further elevates the need for openness and explicit assumptions, as this research represents an initial step in the direction of. It is important to ensure that model results are not used for legitimating ‘hidden morality’ political and clearly justice related decisions under the auspices of being value-free or neutral. Additionally, open modelling builds trust and legitimacy in results and processes [74, 75], which is important for the acceptance and adoption of energy policy. However, it is not necessarily only a matter of providing open data, open source-code and publishing open access, but modelling practices may need adaptations too, if the results are to be perceived as truly accessible.

The wide diversity of distributional inequity shown in our results, which are limited to six different justice principles, further indicates that selecting a single principle may not be justifiable. This aligns with, for example, Drechsler et al. [21] who combined efficiency and equity principles to address fair allocation of renewable energy power plants. The combination of principles and clearly showing the implications of the alternatives are in our view likely to lead to a better-informed menu of options for decision-makers, to make important choices on behalf of energy system developments and implications for groups in society. This is currently not the state of things. It is also possible to involve stakeholders and decision-makers in several phases of the modelling process [76], with different justice principles co-defined from early on, or by providing a set of model results that stakeholders can engage with and select between [77]. In essence, insufficient consideration of definitions and related assumptions in modelling can lead to results with false social justice claims, which nevertheless hold hidden consequences for particular societal groups.

While previous studies have contributed with valuable insights around the nature of distributional inequity, and proven its relevance in energy systems, we demonstrate the importance of being explicit about equity definitions and justice principles in modelling. However, these are to be considered examples, and we do not claim that the definitions applied in this work are exhaustive or representative of interpretations of equitable distributions. As such, these results only highlight differences, and are only intended to illuminate challenges with narrow interpretations of often implicit justice claims in modelling and beyond. A further limitation is that the Gini coefficient only measures equity of a system as a whole, and not the distribution of inequity within systems.

Finally, this study, along with a significant amount of research combining energy systems analysis and justice, almost exclusively focuses on the distributional end-state of the system and not on the processes and institutional

context leading us there [31]. Young, for example [78, Ch. 1], challenges and criticises the so-called distributive paradigm in philosophical theories of justice. While distribution is clearly important, there is a need for considering “[...] a wider context that also includes actions, decisions about action, and provision of the means to develop and exercise capacities” [78, p. 16]. More recently, we can relate this to the energy justice framework [79] and the dimensions of the framework relating to procedural and recognition aspects of justice, as well as restorative justice that addresses remediation of previous injustices. This could for example cater to meaningful participation and inclusion in decision processes, or co-decisions in licensing of large energy infrastructure.

6. Conclusion

In this article, we argue that justice perspectives are grossly under-addressed in energy modelling studies and practices. To take some initial steps to address this, we have determined six applicable justice principles to apply to energy modelling, to shed light on the differences yielded in modelling results when using alternatives to the standard approach, which is cost-optimal efficient distribution. To apply this in modelling, we have used an energy system optimisation model (ESOM) and the modelling to generate alternatives (MGA) technique to illuminate the implications of applying different definitions of justice (i.e. justice principles) to the assessment of distributional equity in future European electricity systems. We generated 709 different electricity system designs and evaluated their distributional equity from the perspective of six different justice principles.

From our analysis, we found that the assessment of justice in electricity systems is highly dependent on how justice is perceived and framed. This is important, as recent policy initiatives such as the European Green Deal not only focus on transforming future energy systems to be net-zero but also just. It is thus crucial to discuss how the choice of justice definition affects the model results and subsequent policy decisions.

While previous research has introduced questions of just energy systems particularly concerning distributional aspects to the academic literature, this work shows that applying a significantly wider scope of justice principles is needed. While our included justice principles are far from exhaustive, this work represents some key initial steps for this research literature, within modelling and beyond. We therefore emphasise the need for further and explicit discussions on normative uncertainty and how assumptions may impact results, conclusions and policy recommendation, particularly within scholarly modelling practices.

We should remind ourselves that justice in energy systems and energy transitions are not limited to the distributional end-state of a system. While material distribution is fundamental, processes of decision-making and involvement as well as recognition of different needs, views, and epistemologies may be considered equally important. Through processes of collaboration and involvement, there may also be ways to better manage normative uncertainty and the processes of attributing justice within energy system scenarios and decision-making. In the context of energy systems modelling, participatory processes is one option with the potential to ameliorate several of the limitations stated, by providing study-specific context to the construction and justification of justice principles.

A. Descriptive statistics of model results

Table 3

Descriptive statistics of the Gini coefficients of each definition of justice

	Max	Min	Range	Mean	Median	σ	IQR
Self-sufficiency	0.140	0.064	0.076	0.085	0.077	0.015	0.012
Capability	0.513	0.172	0.367	0.228	0.218	0.035	0.012
Equality	0.506	0.148	0.358	0.212	0.203	0.036	0.012
Land-burden	0.730	0.386	0.344	0.517	0.508	0.045	0.050
Responsibility	0.618	0.309	0.349	0.381	0.374	0.030	0.004
Grandfathering	0.502	0.188	0.313	0.250	0.242	0.032	0.010

CRedit authorship contribution statement

Oskar Vågerö: Conceptualisation, Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation Methodology, Validation, Visualisation, Writing - original draft . **Tor Håkon Jackson Inderberg:** Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing - original draft . **Marianne Zeyringer:** Conceptualisation, Methodology, Supervision, Writing - original draft .

Acknowledgement

The results of this project are derived from Include – Research centre for socially inclusive energy transitions, funded by the Research Council of Norway, project no 294687. The funding institution had no involvement in any part of the study’s design, and the responsibility of the work lies with the authors.

References

- [1] G. Perlaviciute, L. Steg, B. K. Sovacool, A perspective on the human dimensions of a transition to net-zero energy systems, *Energy and Climate Change* 2 (2021) 100042. doi:10.1016/j.egycc.2021.100042.
- [2] D. McCauley, R. Heffron, Just transition: Integrating climate, energy and environmental justice, *Energy Policy* 119 (2018) 1–7. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2018.04.014.
- [3] S. Carley, D. M. Konisky, The justice and equity implications of the clean energy transition, *Nature Energy* 5 (2020) 569–577. doi:10.1038/s41560-020-0641-6.
- [4] European Commission, The European Green Deal, Technical Report, 2019.
- [5] A. D.-N.-. Rep. Ocasio-Cortez, Text - H.Res.109 - 116th Congress (2019-2020): Recognizing the duty of the Federal Government to create a Green New Deal., <https://www.congress.gov/bill/116th-congress/house-resolution/109/text>, 2019.
- [6] A. Krumm, D. Süsler, P. Blechinger, Modelling social aspects of the energy transition: What is the current representation of social factors in energy models?, *Energy* 239 (2022) 121706. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.121706.
- [7] L. F. Hirt, G. Schell, M. Sahakian, E. Trutnevyte, A review of linking models and socio-technical transitions theories for energy and climate solutions, *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 35 (2020) 162–179. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2020.03.002.
- [8] S. Pfenninger, A. Hawkes, J. Keirstead, Energy systems modeling for twenty-first century energy challenges, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 33 (2014) 74–86. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2014.02.003.
- [9] S. Bolwig, T. F. Bolkesjø, A. Klitkou, P. D. Lund, C. Bergaentzlé, K. Borch, O. J. Olsen, J. G. Kirkerud, Y.-k. Chen, P. A. Gunkel, K. Skytte, Climate-friendly but socially rejected energy-transition pathways: The integration of techno-economic and socio-technical approaches in the Nordic-Baltic region, *Energy Research & Social Science* 67 (2020) 101559. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2020.101559.
- [10] F. Flachsbarth, M. Wingenbach, M. Koch, Addressing the Effect of Social Acceptance on the Distribution of Wind Energy Plants and the Transmission Grid in Germany, *Energies* 14 (2021) 4824. doi:10.3390/en14164824.
- [11] K. Grimsrud, C. Hagem, K. Haaskjold, H. Lindhjem, M. Nowell, Spatial Trade-Offs in National Land-Based Wind Power Production in Times of Biodiversity and Climate Crises, *Environ Resource Econ* (2023). doi:10.1007/s10640-023-00764-8.
- [12] M. T. Koecklin, G. Longoria, D. Z. Fitiwi, J. F. DeCarolis, J. Curtis, Public acceptance of renewable electricity generation and transmission network developments: Insights from Ireland, *Energy Policy* 151 (2021) 112185. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2021.112185.
- [13] J. M. Weinand, R. McKenna, M. Kleinebrahm, F. Scheller, W. Fichtner, The impact of public acceptance on cost efficiency and environmental sustainability in decentralized energy systems, *Patterns* 2 (2021) 100301. doi:10.1016/j.patter.2021.100301.
- [14] J. Price, K. Mainzer, S. Petrović, M. Zeyringer, R. McKenna, The Implications of Landscape Visual Impact on Future Highly Renewable Power Systems: A Case Study for Great Britain, *IEEE Transactions on Power Systems* 37 (2022) 3311–3320. doi:10.1109/TPWRS.2020.2992061.
- [15] L. Lawrenz, B. Xiong, L. Lorenz, A. Krumm, H. Hosenfeld, T. Burandt, K. Löffler, P.-Y. Oei, C. Von Hirschhausen, Exploring Energy Pathways for the Low-Carbon Transformation in India—A Model-Based Analysis, *Energies* 11 (2018) 3001. doi:10.3390/en11113001.
- [16] F. Lombardi, M. V. Rocco, E. Colombo, A multi-layer energy modelling methodology to assess the impact of heat-electricity integration strategies: The case of the residential cooking sector in Italy, *Energy* 170 (2019) 1249–1260. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2019.01.004.
- [17] H.-K. Bartholdsen, A. Eidens, K. Löffler, F. Seehaus, F. Wejda, T. Burandt, P.-Y. Oei, C. Kemfert, C. von Hirschhausen, Pathways for Germany’s Low-Carbon Energy Transformation Towards 2050, *Energies* 12 (2019) 2988. doi:10.3390/en12152988.
- [18] T. Burandt, B. Xiong, K. Löffler, P.-Y. Oei, Decarbonizing China’s energy system – Modeling the transformation of the electricity, transportation, heat, and industrial sectors, *Applied Energy* 255 (2019) 113820. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113820.
- [19] H. Auer, P. Crespo del Granado, P.-Y. Oei, K. Hainsch, K. Löffler, T. Burandt, D. Huppmann, I. Grabaak, Development and modelling of different decarbonization scenarios of the European energy system until 2050 as a contribution to achieving the ambitious 1.5 °C climate target—establishment of open source/data modelling in the European H2020 project openENTRANCE, *Elektrotech. Inftech.* 137 (2020) 346–358. doi:10.1007/s00502-020-00832-7.
- [20] T. Perger, L. Wachter, A. Fleischhacker, H. Auer, PV sharing in local communities: Peer-to-peer trading under consideration of the prosumers’ willingness-to-pay, *Sustainable Cities and Society* 66 (2021) 102634. doi:10.1016/j.scs.2020.102634.
- [21] M. Drechsler, J. Egerer, M. Lange, F. Masurowski, J. Meyerhoff, M. Oehlmann, Efficient and equitable spatial allocation of renewable power plants at the country scale, *Nature Energy* 2 (2017) 1–9. doi:10.1038/nenergy.2017.124.
- [22] J.-P. Sasse, E. Trutnevyte, Distributional trade-offs between regionally equitable and cost-efficient allocation of renewable electricity generation, *Applied Energy* 254 (2019) 113724. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2019.113724.
- [23] J.-P. Sasse, E. Trutnevyte, Regional impacts of electricity system transition in Central Europe until 2035, *Nature Communications* 11 (2020) 4972. doi:10.1038/s41467-020-18812-y.

- [24] M. J. Fell, S. Pye, I. Hamilton, Capturing the distributional impacts of long-term low-carbon transitions, *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions* 35 (2020) 346–356. doi:10.1016/j.eist.2019.01.007.
- [25] F. Neumann, Costs of regional equity and autarky in a renewable European power system, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 35 (2021) 100652. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2021.100652.
- [26] Y.-k. Chen, J. G. Kirkerud, T. F. Bolkesjø, Balancing GHG mitigation and land-use conflicts: Alternative Northern European energy system scenarios, *Applied Energy* 310 (2022) 118557. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2022.118557.
- [27] T. T. Pedersen, M. S. Andersen, M. Victoria, G. B. Andresen, Using Modeling All Alternatives to explore 55% decarbonization scenarios of the European electricity sector, *iScience* 26 (2023) 106677. doi:10.1016/j.isci.2023.106677.
- [28] J.-P. Sasse, E. Trutnevyte, A low-carbon electricity sector in Europe risks sustaining regional inequalities in benefits and vulnerabilities, *Nat Commun* 14 (2023) 2205. doi:10.1038/s41467-023-37946-3.
- [29] J. F. DeCarolis, Using modeling to generate alternatives (MGA) to expand our thinking on energy futures, *Energy Economics* 33 (2011) 145–152. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2010.05.002.
- [30] F. Lombardi, B. Pickering, E. Colombo, S. Pfenninger, Policy Decision Support for Renewables Deployment through Spatially Explicit Practically Optimal Alternatives, *Joule* 4 (2020) 2185–2207. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2020.08.002.
- [31] O. Vågerö, M. Zeyringer, Can we optimise for justice? Reviewing the inclusion of energy justice in energy system optimisation models, *Energy Research & Social Science* 95 (2023) 102913. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2022.102913.
- [32] N. Van Uffelen, B. Taebi, U. Pesch, Revisiting the energy justice framework: Doing justice to normative uncertainties, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 189 (2024) 113974. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2023.113974.
- [33] G. E. P. Box, Science and Statistics, *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 71 (1976) 791–799. doi:10.1080/01621459.1976.10480949.
- [34] A. Silvast, E. Laes, S. Abram, G. Bombaerts, What do energy modellers know? An ethnography of epistemic values and knowledge models, *Energy Research & Social Science* 66 (2020) 101495. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2020.101495.
- [35] S. Sgouridis, C. Kimmich, J. Solé, M. Černý, M.-H. Ehlers, C. Kerschner, Visions before models: The ethos of energy modeling in an era of transition, *Energy Research & Social Science* 88 (2022) 102497. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2022.102497.
- [36] S. Kverndokk, A. Rose, Equity and Justice in Global Warming Policy, SSRN Scholarly Paper ID 1273003, Social Science Research Network, Rochester, NY, 2008. doi:10.2139/ssrn.1273003.
- [37] P. Zhou, M. Wang, Carbon dioxide emissions allocation: A review, *Ecological Economics* 125 (2016) 47–59. doi:10.1016/j.ecolecon.2016.03.001.
- [38] J. Bentham, *An Introduction to the Principles of Morals and Legislation*, London, 1789.
- [39] J. Mill, *Utilitarianism*, Parker, Son, and Bourn, London, 1863.
- [40] W. Kymlicka, *Contemporary Political Philosophy: An Introduction*, 2nd ed ed., Oxford University Press, Oxford ; New York, 2002.
- [41] J. Rawls, *The Principles of Justice*, in: *A Theory of Justice*, Original Edition, Harvard University Press, 1971, pp. 54–117. doi:10.2307/j.ctvjf9zv6v.6. arXiv:j.ctvjf9zv6v.6.
- [42] J. Rawls, *Justice as Fairness: A Restatement*, Harvard University Press, 2001. doi:10.2307/j.ctv31xf5v0. arXiv:j.ctv31xf5v0.
- [43] D. R. Forsyth, *Conflict*, in: *Group Dynamics*, 5. ed. ed., Wadsworth, Cengage Learning, Belmont, Calif., 2010, pp. 388–389.
- [44] A. Sen, *Equality of What?*, in: *Tanner Lectures on Human Values*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979, pp. 197–220.
- [45] A. Sen, *Issues in the Measurement of Poverty*, *The Scandinavian Journal of Economics* 81 (1979) 285–307. doi:10.2307/3439966. arXiv:3439966.
- [46] S. Kverndokk, Climate Policies, Distributional Effects and Transfers Between Rich and Poor Countries, *IRERE* 12 (2018) 129–176. doi:10.1561/101.00000100.
- [47] J. R. Stephenson, B. K. Sovacool, T. H. J. Inderberg, Energy cultures and national decarbonisation pathways, *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews* 137 (2021) 110592. doi:10.1016/j.rser.2020.110592.
- [48] H. Shue, Historical Responsibility, Harm Prohibition, and Preservation Requirement: Core Practical Convergence on Climate Change, *Moral Philosophy and Politics* 2 (2015) 7–31. doi:10.1515/mopp-2013-0009.
- [49] M. W. Jones, G. P. Peters, T. Gasser, R. M. Andrew, C. Schwingshackl, J. Gütschow, R. A. Houghton, P. Friedlingstein, J. Pongratz, C. Le Quéré, National contributions to climate change due to historical emissions of carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide since 1850, *Sci Data* 10 (2023) 155. doi:10.1038/s41597-023-02041-1.
- [50] P. Friedlingstein, M. O’Sullivan, M. W. Jones, R. M. Andrew, L. Gregor, J. Hauck, C. Le Quéré, I. T. Lujckx, A. Olsen, G. P. Peters, W. Peters, J. Pongratz, C. Schwingshackl, S. Sitch, J. G. Canadell, P. Ciais, R. B. Jackson, S. R. Alin, R. Alkama, A. Arneeth, V. K. Arora, N. R. Bates, M. Becker, N. Bellouin, H. C. Bittig, L. Bopp, F. Chevallier, L. P. Chini, M. Cronin, W. Evans, S. Falk, R. A. Feely, T. Gasser, M. Gehlen, T. Gkritzalis, L. Gloege, G. Grassi, N. Gruber, Ö. Gürses, I. Harris, M. Hefner, R. A. Houghton, G. C. Hurtt, Y. Iida, T. Ilyina, A. K. Jain, A. Jersild, K. Kadono, E. Kato, D. Kennedy, K. Klein Goldewijk, J. Knauer, J. I. Korsbakken, P. Landschützer, N. Lefèvre, K. Lindsay, J. Liu, Z. Liu, G. Marland, N. Mayot, M. J. McGrath, N. Metz, N. M. Monacci, D. R. Munro, S.-I. Nakaoka, Y. Niwa, K. O’Brien, T. Ono, P. I. Palmer, N. Pan, D. Pierrot, K. Pockock, B. Poulter, L. Resplandy, E. Robertson, C. Rödenbeck, C. Rodriguez, T. M. Rosan, J. Schwinger, R. Séférian, J. D. Shutler, I. Skjelvan, T. Steinhoff, Q. Sun, A. J. Sutton, C. Sweeney, S. Takao, T. Tanhua, P. P. Tans, X. Tian, H. Tian, B. Tilbrook, H. Tsjunjo, F. Tubiello, G. R. van der Werf, A. P. Walker, R. Wanninkhof, C. Whitehead, A. Willstrand Wranne, R. Wright, W. Yuan, C. Yue, X. Yue, S. Zaehle, J. Zeng, B. Zheng, *Global Carbon Budget 2022*, *Earth System Science Data* 14 (2022) 4811–4900. doi:10.5194/essd-14-4811-2022.
- [51] P. Mongsawad, The philosophy of the sufficiency economy: A contribution to the theory of development, *Asia-Pacific Development Journal* 17 (2010) 123–143. doi:10.18356/02bd5fb3-en.
- [52] T. Tröndle, J. Lilliestam, S. Marelli, S. Pfenninger, Trade-Offs between Geographic Scale, Cost, and Infrastructure Requirements for Fully Renewable Electricity in Europe, *Joule* 4 (2020) 1929–1948. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2020.07.018.

- [53] A. Scheidel, A. H. Sorman, Energy transitions and the global land rush: Ultimate drivers and persistent consequences, *Global Environmental Change* 22 (2012) 588–595. doi:10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2011.12.005.
- [54] R. Ioannidis, D. Koutsoyiannis, A review of land use, visibility and public perception of renewable energy in the context of landscape impact, *Applied Energy* 276 (2020) 115367. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2020.115367.
- [55] M. Damon, D. H. Cole, E. Ostrom, T. Sterner, Grandfathering: Environmental Uses and Impacts, *Review of Environmental Economics and Policy* 13 (2019) 23–42. doi:10.1093/reep/rey017.
- [56] C. Knight, What is grandfathering?, *Environmental Politics* 22 (2013) 410–427. doi:10.1080/09644016.2012.740937.
- [57] J. Price, M. Zeyringer, highRES-Europe: The high spatial and temporal Resolution Electricity System model for Europe, *SoftwareX* 17 (2022) 101003. doi:10.1016/j.softx.2022.101003.
- [58] J. Price, I. Keppo, P. E. Dodds, The role of new nuclear power in the UK’s net-zero emissions energy system, *Energy* 262 (2023) 125450. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2022.125450.
- [59] F. Neumann, T. Brown, The near-optimal feasible space of a renewable power system model, *Electric Power Systems Research* 190 (2021) 106690. doi:10.1016/j.epsr.2020.106690.
- [60] F. Neumann, T. Brown, Broad ranges of investment configurations for renewable power systems, robust to cost uncertainty and near-optimality, *iScience* 26 (2023) 106702. doi:10.1016/j.isci.2023.106702.
- [61] T. T. Pedersen, M. Victoria, M. G. Rasmussen, G. B. Andresen, Modeling all alternative solutions for highly renewable energy systems, *Energy* 234 (2021) 121294. doi:10.1016/j.energy.2021.121294.
- [62] A. Grochowicz, K. van Greevenbroek, F. E. Benth, M. Zeyringer, Intersecting near-optimal spaces: European power systems with more resilience to weather variability, *Energy Economics* 118 (2023) 106496. doi:10.1016/j.eneco.2022.106496.
- [63] F. Lombardi, B. Pickering, S. Pfenninger, What is redundant and what is not? Computational trade-offs in modelling to generate alternatives for energy infrastructure deployment, *Applied Energy* 339 (2023) 121002. doi:10.1016/j.apenergy.2023.121002.
- [64] L. Ceriani, P. Verme, The origins of the Gini index: Extracts from *Variabilità e Mutabilità* (1912) by Corrado Gini, *J Econ Inequal* 10 (2012) 421–443. doi:10.1007/s10888-011-9188-x.
- [65] J. Abeles, D. J. Conway, The Gini coefficient as a useful measure of malaria inequality among populations, *Malaria Journal* 19 (2020) 444. doi:10.1186/s12936-020-03489-x.
- [66] V. Sadras, R. Bongiovanni, Use of Lorenz curves and Gini coefficients to assess yield inequality within paddocks, *Field Crops Research* 90 (2004) 303–310. doi:10.1016/j.fcr.2004.04.003.
- [67] M. Christ, M. Soethe, M. Degel, C. Wingenbach, Wind Energy Scenarios for the Simulation of the German Power System Until 2050: The Effect of Social and Ecological Factors, in: V. Wohlgemuth, F. Fuchs-Kittowski, J. Wittmann (Eds.), *Advances and New Trends in Environmental Informatics*, Progress in IS, Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2017, pp. 167–180. doi:10.1007/978-3-319-44711-7_14.
- [68] Eurostat, Population change - Demographic balance and crude rates at national level, 2022.
- [69] World Bank, GDP, PPP (current international \$), <https://data.worldbank.org>, 2023.
- [70] ENTSO-E, ENTSO-E Transparency Platform, <https://transparency.entsoe.eu/dashboard/show>, 2022.
- [71] T. H. J. Inderberg, H. A. Nykamp, V. Oikkonen, E. Rosenberg, K. K. Taranger, Identifying and analysing important model assumptions: Combining techno-economic and political feasibility of deep decarbonisation pathways in Norway, *Energy Research & Social Science* 112 (2024) 103496. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2024.103496.
- [72] P. J. Newell, F. W. Geels, B. K. Sovacool, Navigating tensions between rapid and just low-carbon transitions, *Environ. Res. Lett.* 17 (2022) 041006. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ac622a.
- [73] P. O. Eikeland, K. K. Taranger, T. H. J. Inderberg, L. H. Gulbrandsen, A wind of change in Norway: Explaining shifts in municipal stances on wind power by policy feedback and energy justice, *Energy Research & Social Science* 104 (2023) 103231. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2023.103231.
- [74] D. Süsser, A. Ceglaz, H. Gaschnig, V. Stavrakas, A. Flamos, G. Giannakidis, J. Lilliestam, Model-based policymaking or policy-based modelling? How energy models and energy policy interact, *Energy Research & Social Science* 75 (2021) 101984. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2021.101984.
- [75] S. Pfenninger, J. DeCarolis, L. Hirth, S. Quoilin, I. Staffell, The importance of open data and software: Is energy research lagging behind?, *Energy Policy* 101 (2017) 211–215. doi:10.1016/j.enpol.2016.11.046.
- [76] C. McGookin, D. Süsser, G. Xexakis, E. Trutnevyte, W. McDowall, A. Nikas, K. Koasidis, S. Few, P. D. Andersen, C. Demski, P. Fortes, S. G. Simoes, C. Bishop, F. Rogan, B. Ó Gallachóir, Advancing participatory energy systems modelling, *Energy Strategy Reviews* 52 (2024) 101319. doi:10.1016/j.esr.2024.101319.
- [77] B. Pickering, F. Lombardi, S. Pfenninger, Diversity of options to eliminate fossil fuels and reach carbon neutrality across the entire European energy system, *Joule* 6 (2022) 1253–1276. doi:10.1016/j.joule.2022.05.009.
- [78] I. M. Young, *Justice and the Politics of Difference*, paperback reissue ed., Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J., 2011.
- [79] K. Jenkins, D. McCauley, R. Heffron, H. Stephan, R. Rehner, Energy justice: A conceptual review, *Energy Research & Social Science* 11 (2016) 174–182. doi:10.1016/j.erss.2015.10.004.