

Original citation:

Dahlmann, Frederik, Kolk, A. and Lindeque, J.. (2016) Emerging energy geographies : scaling and spatial divergence in EUropean electricity generation capacity. European Urban and Regional Studies. doi: 10.1177/0969776416663808

Permanent WRAP URL:

<http://wrap.warwick.ac.uk/81990>

Copyright and reuse:

The Warwick Research Archive Portal (WRAP) makes this work by researchers of the University of Warwick available open access under the following conditions. Copyright © and all moral rights to the version of the paper presented here belong to the individual author(s) and/or other copyright owners. To the extent reasonable and practicable the material made available in WRAP has been checked for eligibility before being made available.

Copies of full items can be used for personal research or study, educational, or not-for profit purposes without prior permission or charge. Provided that the authors, title and full bibliographic details are credited, a hyperlink and/or URL is given for the original metadata page and the content is not changed in any way.

Publisher's statement:

Published version: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0969776416663808>

A note on versions:

The version presented here may differ from the published version or, version of record, if you wish to cite this item you are advised to consult the publisher's version. Please see the 'permanent WRAP url' above for details on accessing the published version and note that access may require a subscription.

For more information, please contact the WRAP Team at: wrap@warwick.ac.uk

**Emerging energy geographies: Scaling and spatial divergence
in EEuropean electricity generation capacity**

This is the 'accepted version' of this paper. The final, definitive
version of this paper will be published in

European Urban and Regional Studies, by SAGE Publications Ltd,
All rights reserved. Please check

[http://eur.sagepub.com/content/early/2016/09/26/0969776416663808.
abstract?papetoc](http://eur.sagepub.com/content/early/2016/09/26/0969776416663808.abstract?papetoc) for the final version and reference.

doi: 10.1177/0969776416663808

© Dahlmann, F.; Lindeque, J. & Kolk, A.

Emerging energy geographies: Scaling and spatial divergence in European electricity generation capacity

Dr Frederik Dahlmann^{a*}, Prof Ans Kolk^b, Dr Johan Lindeque^c

^aAssistant Professor of Global Energy
University of Warwick
Warwick Business School
Scarman Road, Coventry
CV4 7AL, U.K.
+44 (0)24 7652 2311
frederik.dahlmann@wbs.ac.uk
Orchid ID 0000-0003-3076-2834
*Corresponding author

^bProfessor of Sustainable Management
University of Amsterdam
Amsterdam Business School
a.kolk@uva.nl
<http://www.anskolk.nl>

^cAssistant Professor of Strategy
University of Amsterdam
Amsterdam Business School
j.p.lindeque@uva.nl

^cResearch Associate
University of Applied Sciences and Arts Northwestern Switzerland FHNW
School of Business
Institute for Competitiveness and Communication ICC
Riggenbachstrasse 16
4600 Olten, Switzerland
+41 62 957 2804
johan.lindeque@fhnw.ch
Orchid ID 0000-0002-8303-2715

ABSTRACT

This paper evaluates the impact of the related EU internal energy market and renewable energy policies by exploring the (sustainable) energy transition in the European electricity sector and drawing on the emerging literatures on energy geographies. We use evidence aggregated from plant-level data on installed electricity generation capacity in the European electric utilities sector over the period 1990-2013 to demonstrate how the unintended interaction between EU policies on energy market liberalization and climate change have led to new renewable energy entrants and more widely dispersed ownership of total generation capacity. Our empirical results suggest that concepts proposed by Bridge et al. (2013) enable deeper insights into the spatiality of energy transitions. Specifically, we find that territoriality and scaling are key lenses for interpreting the differentiated change processes occurring at European, subregional and national levels. The European energy transition is unlikely to converge onto a single trajectory any time soon, but particularly subregional approaches are argued to offer policy-makers with more spatially cognizant and effective levers.

KEYWORDS

Energy Transition; Energy Geographies; Spatiality; European Union; Internal Energy Market; Renewables; Generation Capacity; Subregions

1. INTRODUCTION

The European electricity generation sector has been subject to several high-profile European Union (EU) policy interventions over the last two decades, aiming to facilitate an energy transition to an integrated and liberalized internal energy market characterized by significant renewable electricity generating capacity. These EU policies have sought to create an (albeit contested) pan-European geo-energy space (Bridge et al., 2013; Mane-Estrada, 2006), which more recently has been reinvented under the auspices of the EU Energy Union (Bouzarovski et al., 2015). Through this Energy Union the European Commission (2015) remains committed to ensuring cost-effective achievement of its 2030 target for the integration of renewables (RES) and achieving a seamless internal energy market (IEM), to benefit citizens and enhance security of supply.

In this paper we seek to contribute to the growing literature on the spatial dimension(s) of sustainability transitions (Coenen et al., 2012), particularly with respect to (renewable) energy development (Bridge et al., 2013; Haas et al., 2008; Verbong and Geels, 2007). This ‘energy geographies’ focus (Calvert, 2016) on the European energy transition in our case specifically emphasises the multiply embedded nature of European electricity generation, e.g., spatially, temporally, physically, institutionally, etc. (Hess, 2004; Goldthau, 2014). Through this economic geography (Coenen et al., 2012) approach our paper responds to calls for research on energy transitions as spatially-constituted phenomena and the need to assess “which geographical futures are being created by the low carbon transition” (Bridge et al., 2013: 332).

Drawing on a database of European power generation assets, we present a longitudinal assessment of the energy transition occurring in the European electricity sector and, in light of the EU policies on the IEM for electricity and the contribution of renewable (RES) technologies, contribute to previous assessments of EU energy policy (e.g., Green, 2006; Held

et al., 2006; Jacobsson et al., 2009; Jamasb and Pollitt, 2005; Joskow, 2008; Newbury, 2005; Percebois, 2008; Verbruggen et al., 2015). Our approach allows an illustration of the emerging energy geographies that result from the interaction between the EU IEM and RES policy initiatives, by tracking the changing ownership structures and investment choices of European electric utilities and other investors at different scales (Bouzarovski, 2010; Bouzarovski and Tirado Herrero, 2015). Specifically, we offer new evidence of changes in power generation asset (ownership) concentration and the dominance of national champions (Domanico, 2007), by exploring the longitudinal trends in capacity ownership in the electricity sector over the period of successive EU energy policy initiatives (Eikeland, 2011; Padgett, 1992; Torriti, 2010). Aggregating data at national, subregional and EU scales allows us to provide a multi-level assessment of the extent to which emerging concepts associated with the geographies of energy transition (Bridge et al., 2013; Calvert, 2016; Coenen et al., 2012) enable new insights into the spatial constitution of the changing European electricity sector.

To achieve this spatial sensitivity we draw on six concepts that Bridge et al. (2013: 339) have suggested as a "basic conceptual tool kit with which to develop richer understandings of space and spatial change than are characteristic of current policy approaches to energy transitions", these are discussed in the next section and presented in table 3. This energy geographies perspective foregrounds spatial difference, relations of position and connection, spatial configuration and scale of organization, and asks what has and has not changed (Bridge et al., 2013).

The resulting exploration of the European energy transition as a multi-scalar, spatially differentiated (Bridge et al., 2013; Charron, 2013) process provides a contribution to 'capturing' the (changing) geographies of European power plant assets ownership over a period of almost two and a half decades (1990-2013) that coincides with the major phases in the European energy transition policy process. The following two sections provide further detail on our

conceptual approach, including Bridge et al.'s (2013) six concepts, before we describe our methodology. We then discuss our findings before concluding with comments on policy implications and future research.

2. GEOGRAPHICAL COMPONENTS OF SUSTAINABILITY (ENERGY) TRANSITIONS

The increasing interest in geographical perspectives on socio-technical (energy) transitions reflects the '(re)surge(nce)' of energy at the heart of geographic research (see Calvert (2016) for an account of the historic role of energy in geography scholarship). However, while the geographies of sustainability (energy) transitions literature is clear in its aim to add a spatial sensitivity to the broader transitions literature (Hansen and Coenen, 2015; Truffer et al., 2015), developing a shared conceptual foundation for studying the (possible future) geographies of sustainability (energy) transitions is ongoing (Bridge et al., 2013; Coenen et al., 2012; Hansen and Coen, 2015; Truffer and Coenen, 2012). Bridge et al. (2013) is referenced as a central contribution in this conceptual agenda (Calvert, 2016; Hansen and Coenen, 2015), that has been welcomed for contributing to establishing such a (shared) vocabulary or conceptual roadmap for clarifying the specificities of a geographical perspective on sustainability (energy) transitions (Calvert, 2016). Specifically, Bridge et al. (2013) suggest six basic concepts that can be used for mapping continuity and change associated with geographies of sustainability (energy) transition(s), and which thus inform choices in the realisation of potential energy futures. They include location; landscape; territoriality; spatial differentiation; scaling; and spatial embeddedness. We define and explore these six concepts in more detail in section 5 of our paper (and summarise them and our findings in table 3). We adopt this approach to provide an interpretive lens for our data analyses, as the concepts are best understood in relation to our emergent findings. Each one of these concepts reflects the acknowledgement that spatiality shapes energy systems and influences their capacity for transformation. In doing so, they

provide a valuable conceptual lexicon for exploring the geographical implications and emerging futures of the EU's and member states' energy policies and investment choices.

3. EUROPEAN UNION ENERGY POLICY-MAKING

The importance and salience of the energy sector within the European project is most directly demonstrated by the fact that two of the three founding treaties focused on the sector (McGowan, 1989). Early initiatives emphasized both security of supply and the establishment of a single market for energy, but the emphasis was on the former rather than the latter until the early 1980s, when the agenda began to change towards a focus on the nascent IEM (McGowan, 1989). Over time EU energy policy has broadly followed changing political paradigms from statism via liberalism towards increased interventionism/dirigisme (Goldthau and Sitter, 2014), by developing a series of related policies for liberalization and integration of the IEM and the promotion of RES generation capacity for electricity. IEM and RES policies for electricity have particularly gathered pace and depth since 2000, with directives seeking to establish a single competitive EU electricity market (EU Directives 1996/92/EC; 2003/54/EC; 2009/72/EC) and the 'greening' of the EU energy sector through the promotion of RES as part of a broader response to climate change (EU Directives 2001/77/EC; 2009/28/EC; European Commission, 2014). In contrast to the IEA's proposal (OECD/IEA, 2013) for significantly more investment, however, the EU's promotion of IEM and RES were pursued without large flows of additional resources, though the latest draft policies (European Commission, 2015) now note the need for access to finance, with the private sector being expected to bear most of the costs of these additional investments. The European electricity sector, therefore, has been and remains subject to the IEM and the promotion of RES as two policy domains that are fundamentally changing its nature. In particular, there is a question over *where* that investment will materialize (Bridge et al., 2013). To understand the low-carbon or sustainability energy

transition, we examine the choices of key industry actors, such as asset investors and owners, and spatiality in shaping the emerging socio-economic, technological and political landscapes.

Early assessments of the EU's energy policies suggested that progress with regard to liberalization was based on a stepwise approach and minimum compliance among the core EU15 countries; moreover, mergers and acquisitions were argued to have led to increasingly high market concentration in the European electricity sector with a handful of national champions expanding their ownership interests in neighbouring countries (Green, 2006; Jamasb and Pollitt, 2005). Over time significant progress has also been made with the promotion of RES electricity generation capacity, largely through the public provision of financial incentives for supply (e.g., renewable energy certificates, feed-in tariffs, etc.), with the effect that today these technologies are increasingly recognized as viable alternatives for investment, explicitly promoted through the EU's climate change commitments within the extended 2030 targets (European Commission, 2014) and lately through the pursuit of an EU 'Energy Union' (European Commission, 2015). Yet the historically parallel but separate development of the IEM and RES directives has raised questions over the mutual impacts of renewables promotion and efforts to increase competition among electric utilities (Szabó and Jäger-Waldau, 2008).

Furthermore, the institutionally and geographically nested nature of energy policy has created gaps between the ideal-type and energy policy as actually applied across the EU and by its member states (Andersen and Sitter, 2009; Pelkmans, 2001; Von Hirschhausen and Waelde, 2001), with the effect that national politics and policy-making often continue to override the processes of Europeanization in the energy domain (Goldthau and Sitter, 2014; Lodge, 2002). In recognition of these findings, there are increasingly calls for governance of energy infrastructure to become more polycentric and multi-level (Goldthau, 2014). The main thrust of this argument is based on the belief that while institutions such as those of the EU can steer

(but also obstruct) radical innovation processes, they do so in spatially differentiated ways (Coenen et al., 2012). This spatial differentiation in energy policy preferences is partly explained by the comparative institutional advantages of EU member states' 'varieties of capitalism' (Hall and Soskice, 2001; Schmidt, 2003, 2009), which continue to exert their influence at the national level, despite some institutional convergence at EU level (European Commission, 2012). Member states' differing degrees of institutional thickness and capacity further contribute to regional divergence rather than convergence in EU energy policy outcomes, particularly in peripheral regions (Charron, 2013; Coenen et al., 2012).

The effects of diverse energy landscapes and associated territoriality at the scale of member states (Bouzarovski and Tirado Herrero, 2015) on the geographies of electricity production have been highlighted (although with other theoretical framings) in work on electric utility internationalization (Kolk et al., 2014), studies of EU member states' policy-making in response to climate change, changing acceptance of fossil fuels and divergent perceptions of a need for the promotion of renewables (Verbruggen et al., 2015) and the spatial inequalities associated with energy transition (Bouzarovski and Tirado Herrero, 2015). Elsewhere, the legacy of the Soviet Union has created clear path dependence for the Baltics and the 'eastern' regions of the EU in terms of shaping their respective energy transition (Bouzarovski et al., 2015; Ürge-Vorsatz et al., 2006; Von Hirschhausen and Waelde, 2001).

For the purposes of our study it is not deemed appropriate or necessary to repeat a detailed account of the differing approaches and degrees to which each EU member state has approached the liberalization of the electricity sector (see: Domanico, 2007; Jamasb and Pollitt, 2005; Padgett, 1992) and promotion of renewables (see: Kitzing et al., 2012; Klessmann et al., 2011; Lipp, 2007; Meyer, 2003; Reiche and Bechberger, 2004). Equally, despite the clear relevance of EU state aid rules to the electricity sector (Cansino, et al., 2010), we do not directly address the new 2014 state aid guidelines as they emerge after the end of our period of study.

We argue that the sensitivity for the specifics of the diverse approaches at the scale of the member states is revealed in the (re)scaling at EU, subregional and national levels in terms of electricity generation asset ownership and technologies and in the resulting geographies of the European power sector (Bialasiewicz et al., 2012). For the purposes of this paper we focus on the emerging geographies of ownership concentration in electricity generation capacity to reflect Europe's "diverse economic and social geography, as well as its leadership role and declarative commitment towards climate change mitigation targets" (Bouzarovski and Tirado Herrero, 2015: 4), its varied natural resource endowments and resulting potentials for renewable energy capacity (Boeters and Koornneef, 2011; Šúri, et al., 2007).

We argue that despite the EU's efforts to drive energy policy harmonization and integration, supported by observed convergence in policy instruments for promoting renewables (Kitzing et al., 2012), the underlying nature of energy flows and assets combined with varying resource endowments and institutional diversity among member states is likely to result in diverging patterns of fuel mixes and capacity ownership across member states and subregions. Identifying and understanding the dynamics leading to such differentiation is vital for informing policy development and decision making among industry stakeholders.

4. METHODS

For our paper we draw on a unique dataset from the Platts 'PowerVision' databaseⁱ, that provides power plant specific data and information on installed and planned generation capacity in the European power sector. The 'PowerVision' database has been developed using detailed granular information collected continuously over ten years by a dedicated product team. This team reviews company reports and releases, official government gazettes and filings, tender postings and local press, as well as making direct enquiries with utilities and developers. This data is cross-referenced to publicly available inventories and benchmarked to

aggregate statistics.

To study trends in investment and ownership of European power generation assets, we use data for installed and operating plants measured in Megawatt (MW) capacity between 1990 and 2013 for our analyses. Geographically, for our sample we draw on data available for 23 European Union (EU) member states plus Norway. This sample is defined by the seven subregions included in the EU Electricity Regional Initiatives (ERI), launched by the European Regulators' Group for Electricity and Gas (ERGEG) in 2006, and which for the purposes of simplicity we refer to as the 'EU24'. By drawing on this particular sample we are able to provide insights into three scales of energy governance, as in addition to the data for the combined EU24 region and individual European countries, we also explore developments at the 'subregional' level (see table 1).

In fact, the ERGEG ERI subregions introduced a new scale of EU energy territorialisation for electricity, by bringing together national regulatory authorities (NRAs), transmission system operators (TSOs) and other stakeholders in a voluntary process for testing cross-border approaches and advancing integration at the subregional level, as a step towards the creation of a well-functioning IEMⁱⁱ. This approach allows us to investigate the potential for and effects of polycentric governance of the kind that Goldthau (2014) identified with the EU IEM to shape future geographies of electricity asset ownership.

Given the strongly spatially embedded nature of energy infrastructure systems, ERIs generally incorporate neighbouring countries, with some countries simultaneously being members of multiple subregions. France and Germany – through their absolute locations – emerge as important for increasing the relative proximity of the ERIs in which they are included, while in contrast, for example, the UK is only part of the most 'dispersed' and somewhat peculiar grouping of the FUI ERI (France-UK-Ireland). Likewise, Norway is included as an integral

member of the highly integrated Nordic regional energy market. We hold the ERI grouping consistent for the entire period under review to offer a new scaling of the energy territoriality of European countries, reflecting their locations, historic relationships and current cooperation. Thus including the pre-2006 data allows changing historic concentration of ownership to be put in context for contemporary subregional scaling of integration processes. The resulting seven subregions and their member countries included in the ERIs are shown in Table 1.

<Tables 1 about here>

Our analyses are based on aggregate data for ‘Operator Main Holding Companies’ in the countries covered. These are the firms that own a diverse portfolio of often limited liability, plant-specific operating units, many of which are known as the widely familiar utilities.

Our analyses of these data are operationalized through the calculation of generation capacity ownership concentration rates, aggregation of plant level data by 'fuel' type and the alignment of cross-sectional data in correspondence to years of significant EU directives. As our research is based on installed generation capacity data we did not evaluate industry changes in terms of the levels of actual electricity supplied. Such more complex analyses require the inclusion of electricity production data, which depend on plant-specific capacity factors and a range of other variables that were not subject of this study, but would offer potentially insightful, alternative insights into the European energy transition. Particularly for renewable technologies the intermittent nature of, for example, photovoltaic and wind electricity generation, as well as ceilings on the load factors of specific renewables installations, result in significantly lower annual production figures than their reported nameplate capacities (e.g., Pepermans et al., 2005). For non-renewable energies, the merit-order ranking of technologies and added carbon prices, conversion losses and maintenance among others determine effective levels of electricity supplied.

Generation capacity ownership concentration rates are calculated according to the Herfindahl–Hirschman Index (HHI), a widely used measure of firms’ size in relation to their industry, here as an indicator of the amount of control exercised by individual firms over the total stock of generation capacity operating in a pre-defined geographical area. The HHI is calculated by summing the squares of generation capacity shares of the 50 largest Operator Main Holding Companies. Generation capacity shares are expressed as percentages of total installed capacity in a particular country or subregion in a given year. Theoretically, the most dispersed distribution of ownership for the HHI50 would be an ownership share of 2% for each firm, represented by a HHI50 score of 200. The higher the HHI50 score the more concentrated the ownership of generation capacity (maximum of 10,000). Importantly, this calculation method means that multiple ownership structures representing different degrees of ownership concentration can result in a higher HHI50 score. For comparison we also provide HHI10 figures based on the largest 10 generators; the results were largely identical.

<Tables 2 about here>

As installed capacities are differentiated in the Platts database by fuel sources, we aggregate plant level data, as shown in table 2, and calculate non-renewable and renewable shares of total installed generation capacity for particular years, countries and subregions. Furthermore, we present cross-sectional data corresponding to years of significant EU directives (1996, 2003, 2009, 2013) for trends in ownership concentration, changing fuel mixes and the dominance of the largest capacity owners in each country and subregion (see table 4). We assess the changing industry structures for the 10 largest firms in each country and subregion at the start and end of the period studied (1996, 2013), see table 5. This approach is adopted to provide indicative insights into policy effects, although no generalizable results are possible. This overall time period includes the year the EU internal electricity market directive was adopted (1996) and ends with 2013, the last full year for which data was available to us. We use all years of data

at the firm level to evaluate the changing ownership concentration rates among the largest electric utilities relative to aggregate renewables operators (see figure 1) and to study subregional trends (see figure 2).

5. EMERGING EUROPEAN GEOGRAPHIES OF ELECTRICITY GENERATION CAPACITY

5.1 The European energy transition

We begin our analyses by highlighting focal observations on the changes in fuel sources and ownership patterns across European energy assets. We match these observations with key concepts identified by Bridge et al. (2013) in an attempt to demonstrate their relevance for illustrating and interpreting the significance of geographical lenses in understanding sustainability energy transitions (see table 3). To do so we provide definitions of the six concepts and summarize our main indicative findings for each concept in table 3. We then assess their relevance to understanding sustainability energy transitions in greater detail through the analysis in this section and the following discussion. This approach adopts an integrative reading of table 3, in light of the density of the analytical section and our intention to emphasize the exploration of the applicability of these concepts.

Despite the financial crisis and the continuing recession in many European countries (and taking into account nuclear shutdowns and retirement of fossil fuelled plants due to age, economics and environmental legislation), we find strong growth in total installed generation capacity (see table 4). In fact, between 1996 and 2013 and across our set of EU24 countries, the total installed capacity increased by 380GW or 60% to a total of 1,008GW. The biggest absolute increase of installed capacity happened in the Central South region, the biggest percentage increases occurring in spatially peripheral Italy, Ireland and Spain. Meanwhile, the isolated Baltic region was the only to register a decline in installed capacity, most of which

took place in Lithuania and Estonia, reflecting significant economic restructuring following the end of communism (Ürge-Vorsatz et al., 2006).

<Tables 3 and 4 about here>

Across our sample of European countries and regions, we also witness increasing rates of renewable energy assets being installed, which are changing the capacity fuel mix in their respective geographies. The EU24 share of non-renewable (fossil and nuclear) to renewable energy capacities has slowly shifted in favour of renewables, from 75:25 to 64:36 between 1996 and 2013. The Central West, Northern and Central South regions witnessed the biggest increases in renewables between 1996 and 2013. Table 4 shows all but the FUI subregion converging to levels of renewables accounting for at least 34% of total installed capacity. There is, however, significant variation at the scale of the member states, for example in the Northern region, which has made the most progress with its sustainable energy transition. Denmark in particular managed to grow its share of renewable energy capacity from 10% in 1996 to 47% in 2013. In Norway renewables still account for almost 100% of capacity compared with Poland's 16%, reflecting these countries' different levels of natural resource endowments and unique domestic energy landscapes and territorialisation (Von Hirschhausen and Waelde, 2001). Germany, Spain, Italy and the UK are the leading countries in this shift towards renewables.

The rates of change obviously vary between countries and subregions, but this widespread growth in renewables across most European countries is consistent with the EU's Directives on climate change and as such suggests that such high-level goals mandated through EU legislation appear to have had a significant effect on member state policies. The multi-scalar territoriality of European energy policy thus suggests collective progress, featured by spatial differentiation across countries (table 3). At the same time, however, we acknowledge the

importance of national energy policies in translating these directives and driving such progress, and which has led to this spatial differentiation of non-renewable and renewable capacities, reflecting the geographical embeddedness of energy investments (table 3).

Our second key finding is that generation capacity ownership concentration rates are falling across all European regions and countries. Based on our HHI50 for the biggest owners of generation capacity in every country and subregion, our results suggest that asset ownership concentration rates are declining, the number of owner-operators is generally increasing and thus asset ownership is increasingly dispersed. Moreover, we find that the ownership concentration of the ten biggest operators in all countries and subregions is declining over time, suggesting some aggregate spatial convergence (table 3), again an indication that increasing levels of plant ownership dispersal at the asset level are slowly gaining traction. This is consistent with the EU IEM's stated objective to achieve increasingly dispersed asset ownership, raising the level of competition and providing grid access to new capacities. While generation capacity ownership concentration rates are largely falling across all subregions and countries, the aggregate changes in the HHI50 for all 24 European countries combined between 1996 and 2013 (683 to 436) mask big variations at the subregional and national scales (table 4).

The aggregate ownership concentration figures are complemented by the data on the high contributions to the total capacity made by the largest capacity owner in each of these countries and regions (see table 4). In 2013 the most dominant national utilities still own as much as 95% (Latvia) of total installed capacity; Estonia, France, Slovenia, Luxembourg, Slovakia and Greece remain firmly in the hands of a single dominant owner of generation capacity. Our data therefore suggest that, since Domanico's (2007) assessment, not much has changed in the sense that there are still 14 European countries in which the three largest suppliers (not including aggregated renewables) still own more than 60% of the installed generation capacity. At the

other end of the spectrum, there was also relatively little change in terms of the countries with the least concentrated ownership of generation capacity, but these rates have been falling nonetheless. This finding of limited (spatial) convergence (table 3) can be compared with earlier research on resource concentration (also measured in terms of HHI) for the EU15+2ⁱⁱⁱ in seven power generation fuel categories (coal, oil, gas, nuclear, hydro, wind, and others), which had fallen from 2,636 in 1990 to 2,253 in 2002 (Jamassb and Pollitt, 2005: 18).

<Table 5 about here>

More importantly, we note that the increasing total number of firms owning generating capacity in each country or subregion plays a crucial role in driving down overall concentration rates, even if the actual calculations for the capacity ownership HHI are based on the top 10 or top 50 firms only. For example (see table 5), by 2013 Italy, Denmark, Spain, the UK and Germany have the most dispersed generation capacity ownership in terms of the total number of asset owners (despite the large numbers of individually-owned solar PV and wind power installations being aggregated into single generators in our source database). Meanwhile, Slovenia, Greece, Latvia, Estonia and Lithuania have notably few different owners of generation assets for their national markets. The installed renewables generation capacity in a country or subregion and the respective total number of operating firms is highly correlated at 0.939 and is significant at 0.01(**), thus it is the contention of the authors that generally greater levels of renewable energies are associated with more firms owning generation capacity in the EU. This is crucial for understanding the changing (re)scaling of EU electricity generation capacity territorialities (table 3).

The speed with which this transition is occurring is debatable, and based on our observation that many European countries still remain dominated by a few large established generators, suggesting spatial embeddedness effects (table 3), we find that since Domanico's (2007)

assessment the progress has often been slow. Of course there are exceptions, such as Germany, Italy, Spain, the Netherlands, and the United Kingdom, representing diverse energy territorialities and landscapes (table 3). From the inception of the IEM project a small number of national electric utilities dominated the major EU electricity markets (Domanico, 2007; Kolk et al., 2014). Reflecting their energy landscapes and territorialities, the French, German and Italian governments were particularly effective at ensuring that former domestic utilities – at times supported through state sponsored mergers – emerged as sufficiently large stand-alone national champions to survive in the nascent IEM (Kolk et al., 2014). Together with leading utilities in Spain and Sweden, these firms went on to become the ‘Seven Brothers’ (Thomas, 2003) (see figure 1). Despite the dominance of these firms, during the almost doubling of total installed generation capacity in just 15 years, the ownership share of their plants’ generation capacity has steadily declined across the EU24, from close to 60% in 1990 to around 40% by 2013.

<Figure 1 about here>

Strikingly, the effective promotion of renewables has simultaneously enabled the emergence of two major decentralized renewable entities, if all independent wind and solar generation assets over 1MW capacity are aggregated (figure 1). Their ownership shares as part of the EU24 have increased from 0% in 1990 to 7.7% for wind and 6.1% for solar by 2013. These investors in renewables benefitted from financial subsidies and ‘guaranteed and priority access’ to the electricity grid and have thus become formidable alternatives to the Seven Brothers. Yet the disaggregated nature of this renewable generation capacity has also fundamentally changed the sector’s generation ownership structure, increasing the total number of firms in the EU24 from 679 to 2,084.

These observations are reflected in the changing compositions of national and regional lists of

the ten biggest capacity owners. The most impressive impact is visible in Germany where the original top ten firms in 1996 were all fossil fuel and nuclear energy based utilities, but by 2013 the aggregate number of solar PV and wind power developers collectively installed capacities reached 16% each, turning them into the two largest ‘owners’ if treated as one company respectively^{iv} (see table 5 and figure 1). Even across the EU24 countries, the aggregate renewables developers are large enough to take up second and fourth spot in the rankings of overall capacity. In a sign of (spatial) convergence (table 3) in the organization of electricity assets, ten of the 24 countries have at least one form of aggregated renewable energies among their top three generation capacity owners. Bar Hungary, Poland and Slovenia, in all countries the largest capacity owners in 1996 witnessed a reduction in asset concentration by 2013, with the most significant changes happening in peripheral Ireland, Greece and Italy.

Yet overall there has not been a significant and geographically widespread revolution in terms of the ascendance of new owners of pan-European generation assets, which would have systematically taken over ownership shares and lowered the overall concentration level of generation capacity. Jamasb and Pollitt (2005: 3) argued for the need of “[...] empirically competitive levels (usually thought to occur when the number of effective competitors in a market is at least five).” Our data suggest that the seven major owners of generation capacity persist across our sample of twenty-four European countries (Thomas, 2003).

Kolk et al. (2014) however show that the Seven Brothers have subregional profiles and have not been able to achieve full regionalization/Europeanization. Equally, we need to point out that, first, Electricité de France stands out as being by far the largest of the ‘brothers’ (in fact being twice as big as the second largest Enel), and second, aggregate sums of wind and solar PV could easily represent two new alternative ‘aggregate firms’ in this ranking if simply counted as one firm by generation technology. Moreover, comparing the seven major firms between 1996 and 2013, we find that except for GDF Suez (since 2015 called Engie) the six

other utilities witnessed reductions in their capacity ownership shares in our EU24 geo-energy space. Partly this is due to their decommissioning of fossil fuel and nuclear plant capacity for political and economic reasons, but also partly because of the significant growth in renewable energy capacities owned by other entities. Consequently, our assessment is that despite a certain degree of enduring dominance by a limited number of very large firms, capacity ownership concentration levels have at least decreased during our period of observation.

Our findings therefore reflect Bouzarovski and Tirado Herrero's (2015: 4) observation that "a single energy transition does not exist across Europe, as the nature of restructuring trends in this sector is contingent upon local and national circumstances", creating spatially differentiated (table 3) patterns of transition to a dispersed ownership of sustainable European electricity generation capacity at different scales and which we explore in more detail in the following sections.

5.2 The potential of subregional (re)scaling of electricity governance

Exploring our results at a subregional scale, we find generally falling capacity ownership concentration rates against a trend of increasing levels of renewable electricity capacity installations across the seven European ERI subregions (figure 2). Across these subregions, renewable generation capacity shares ranged from 22% (FUI) to 46% (Northern), while ownership concentration varies considerably between subgroupings and over time. Within the European energy transition between 1990 and 2013, the sustained and unequal national implementations of market liberalization and renewables promotions have interestingly led to four distinctive patterns of changing capacity ownership concentration and renewables investment and which demonstrate the differing energy geographies among groups of ERIs.

<Figure 2 about here>

First, the smallest Baltic subregion is confirmed as a recognized ‘energy island’ in Europe (Bouzarovski, 2010; Carstei, 2012). It exhibits some reduction in ownership concentration, but its three member states still feature comparatively high degrees of ownership concentration, raising doubts about further market integration (Bradshaw, 2013). Advances in promoting renewables are mixed and are set against the decommissioning of nuclear power plant capacity, but the Baltic subregion as a whole compares well to general progress in Europe with renewables now representing 35% of total installed capacity. While our data do not provide definitive support for specific drivers of these outcomes, both the specific energy landscape and territoriality (table 3) provide an explanation for this pattern. More importantly, the spatial embeddedness as part of the former Soviet Union’s energy system, its geographically peripheral location separating the Baltics to a large extent from the ‘EU mainland’, and the relatively small geographical size continue to create a path dependency (table 3), which is reflected in the spatial divergence from other subregions (Bouzarovski et al., 2015; Ürges-Vorsatz et al., 2006; Von Hirschhausen and Waelde, 2001).

Second, the FUI and South-West subregions have converged on a pattern dominated by a reduction in ownership concentration as the main trend and some progress in renewables investments. Yet change has been limited. The FUI subregion is dominated by France and the UK, the South-West by France and Spain. While France has made some contribution to renewable capacity growth, it is the respective partner state in each subregion that explains the observed trend. In the FUI, the UK’s total capacity has grown by 60% and renewables capacity more than doubled from a very low base. This has reduced ownership concentration to levels comparable to other leading countries. The territoriality of the FUI subregion is complex, as it includes both the liberal UK (Hall and Soskice, 2001) where renewables are subject to the ‘market test’ and statist France (Schmidt, 2003; 2009) supporting a nuclear-based path dependency, which arguably explains mixed progress on ownership dispersal and limited

progress on renewables. In the South West, Spanish capacity grew by 141%, while maintaining a renewables share of around 38% and significantly reducing concentration of ownership. By contrast, ownership concentration remains very high in France, reflecting the national champion status of the incumbent EDF. The territoriality of the South West, including Spain's enabling state combined with a favorable natural location for renewables, provides one important explanation for the observed progress.

Third, the Central-West and Central-South subregions have converged with some progress in reducing their subregional ownership concentration, but France's support for EDF continues to affect both subregions. In the Central South subregion, the diverging paths of Italy and Germany are able to counterbalance the weight of French capacity. Italy's total capacity grew by 145%, while maintaining a renewables ratio of 30%. At the same time, Germany's capacity growth of 74% and renewables capacity ratio of 42% drive the trends in both subregions. The remaining countries have much lower total installed capacity and varying renewables capacity, but both subregions achieve renewables ratios of around 35%. Again the important role of the enabling state in terms of territoriality and not least location-specific factors of the respective energy landscapes, providing significant natural resource endowments for renewables, offer important possible explanations for the observed patterns. The combination of the divergent national approaches in subregions improves outcomes, suggesting support for the calls for more poly-centric governance approaches (Goldthau, 2014) to the European sustainability energy transition.

Finally, despite significant increases in renewables capacity, the Central East and Northern subregions see little further decreases in the already highly dispersed capacity ownership. Germany dominates the Central East subregion with more than four times the installed capacity of the next largest country, Poland. Germany equally dominates the Northern subregion with almost twice the capacity of the next three largest countries by capacity. In both subregions

smaller states contribute to the observed trends, but Germany's progress on renewables is central to explaining progress. The degree of ownership concentration and renewables is mixed amongst the smaller states in the Central East subregion (Ürge-Vorsatz et al., 2006), while in the Northern subregion most states have relatively low levels of ownership concentration and good to excellent renewables ratios. Here the greater similarities in the energy landscapes and territoriality (table 3) of the Nordic countries and Germany explain the dramatic progress of the Northern subregion.

5.3 Emerging electricity generation capacity boundaries

In addition, we identify two fascinating features from the subregional patterns of changing ownership concentration and renewables adoption. First, while the HHI50 asset ownership concentration measure has decreased considerably for the 24 countries studied collectively, both the EU24 and two subregions (Central East and Northern) with the lowest HHI50s have remained at fairly constant levels over the whole period. This suggests the existence of a possible target 'floor' level for the dispersal of capacity ownership that might be achievable for other subregions with still more concentrated ownership patterns.

Second, progress with promoting renewables for all but two of the subregions appears to be difficult beyond a 35% share of total capacity. Is this a structural threshold ('wall') that may require different or new policies? The only two subregions to have significantly surpassed this threshold are Central East and Northern, which both include Germany. The combination of high levels of renewable resource endowments in the Nordic countries and Germany's 'Energiewende' policy to move to renewables, highlights the possibilities and challenges associated with this transition for the EU and elsewhere. Here the territoriality of the German state played a central enabling role to negotiate a societally supported sustainability (energy) transition. It also points at the potential progress to be made by influencing policies in important

core countries that are members of more than one subregion through poly-centric governance approaches (Goldthau, 2014), gaining relative proximity to multiple subregions as a result of their absolute locations in Europe and relative size, and that may help drive wider trends in decreasing electricity generation capacity concentration rates and increasing renewables ratios.

These findings suggest that possible boundary conditions for the emerging future European sustainable energy geographies may already be revealing themselves, reflecting the limits of European natural endowments and current policy effectiveness in seeking to enable the European sustainable electricity transition. Here the concerted role of the German government in enabling the German *Energiewende* that has in combination with the natural endowments of the Nordic region enabled the dramatic progress in the Northern region demonstrates the importance of energy landscapes and territoriality in enabling the transition. Furthermore the institutional thickness of the German policy environment highlights the role of effective policy implementation featured by strong government capacity to enable sustainable energy transitions (Giddens, 2012).

5.4 Interaction effects between climate change and liberalization policies

Finally and significantly, we find that increasing rates of renewable energies are playing a major role in contributing to the energy transition and decreasing asset ownership concentration rates. In the extreme cases, this means that independent renewable energy owners in aggregate are theoretically large enough to exceed a country's biggest utility in terms of installed capacity. But also where new renewable capacities still remain small, their existence drives up the total number of generators and as such gradually influences the industry ownership structure and wider market dynamics. For example, the high level of renewable penetration in Germany often relies on 'loop-flows' through interconnectors with neighbouring grids to relieve its system in times of oversupply – an issue of political and economic contention (Puka

and Szulecki, 2014).

To demonstrate the effect this relationship has on generation capacity ownership concentration over time we correlate the total renewables capacities against the prevailing capacity ownership HHI50 for different countries and regions. The correlation between the two variables is -0.376 and is significant at 0.01(**). This suggests that with increasing levels of total installed renewable energy capacities (regardless of whether this is in a particular country or subregion), we generally observe a decline in plant ownership concentration rates as measured by HHI50. Clearly, the widespread dispersion of renewable capacity ownership has slowly lowered the capacity ownership concentration rates of the biggest utilities. This shows that by encouraging new investors and developers (however small and irrespective of fuel type) to enter the market, policy interaction between IEM and renewables directives over time is effectively reducing the dominance of incumbents as originally intended by the IEM.

We therefore argue that the two different sets of policies with aligned but not explicitly cross-referenced aims and objectives are clearly influencing each other in more or less unintended ways. At least originally, we find no explicit anticipation in the IEM directives that renewable energy firms would one day enter as serious competitors affecting plant ownership concentration levels from a generation perspective. Instead, a commonly-held belief was that liberalization would actually favour traditional fossil fuelled power assets due to lower financing risks, shorter construction times and better supply characteristics (Jamash and Pollitt, 2005). Essentially, this suggests that each Directorate was pursuing its own separate agenda without any explicit consideration of potential unintended consequences.

Over time this has led to a situation in which large amounts of renewables are increasingly competing for capital funds with established utilities (with significant financial implications). Because of their low marginal costs and preferential grid access treatment (afforded to them

through the IEM Directives), renewable energies are now effectively driving far-reaching changes in the industry's ownership structures.

6. POLICY IMPLICATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This paper has responded to calls for research on sustainability energy transitions as spatially-constituted phenomena. Studying the changes in fuel mixes and generation capacity ownership across EU, subregional and country level scales, we find that progress in terms of creating a single energy market while addressing climate change as fostered by EU and member state energy policies remains slow, but significant improvements are happening. More importantly, we find that the energy geography concepts of location, territoriality, landscape and spatial embeddedness are valuable tools in terms of interpreting the emergent features of (re)scaling and spatial differentiation (table 3), and help explain the evolution of energy asset ownership concentration (Bridge et al., 2013). In particular, location-specific natural resource endowments, territoriality reflecting varying levels of institutional thickness and capacity, and embeddedness in specific historical path dependencies and geographical landscapes continue to exert strong forces on energy asset investment, which either align with or counteract EU policies and thus lead to diverging patterns of transition.

Interestingly, by re-scaling to a subregional lens we find that the divergence in findings identified at the national scale and the relative convergence at the European scale resolve into four clear patterns of transition. Although asset ownership concentration levels remain high in many countries, they are significantly lower if re-scaled to a subregional scale. In fact, the most dramatic improvements appear to be happening at a subregional scale. Stated differently, while policy aims and directives may have been specified at EU or national levels, the actual focal point and enabler of these outcomes appears to be the subregional level. Naturally, major differences remain in terms of geographical, economic and political conditions (not least since

subregions contain different numbers of countries of varying sizes, with different economic and political characteristics). In fact, the notion of re-scaling of macro-regional approaches itself is controversial (e.g., Bialasiewicz et al., 2012), but broadly we believe that through regulatory integration at subregional levels greater harmonization is occurring. The diversity in the national territorialities and energy landscapes benefits from a balancing out of the national scale 'extremes' at the subregional scale, leading to greater overall degrees of progress. To that end, our findings extend Jamasb and Pollitt's (2005: 37) prediction that "the most plausible route to a single European market is through [sub]regional markets as an intermediate stage". Since some countries are simultaneously part of several subregions, we surmise it is perhaps exactly this geographical linkage and overlap between different subregional territories, which seems to serve as the key driving force of convergence. The European Commission's (2015) argument that "[sub]regional approaches to market integration are an important part of the move towards a fully integrated EU-wide energy market", is thus to be welcomed as a policy that recognizes the potential for better analysing and addressing energy transition challenges of the EU. At the same time, while the subregional scale reveals the emerging boundaries to the European electricity sector sustainability transition in terms of ownership dispersal and renewables capacity promotion, the role of member states in transposing and facilitating EU legislation remains a critical influence on progress with both dimensions.

This paper also provides empirical evidence of how renewable energies benefitted from the IEM directives by enabling their growth and providing them with access to the market. Our results support the argument that IEM directives have somewhat unwittingly, and climate change directives more or less directly, encouraged and enabled greater numbers of firms that mostly invest in renewable energies for their national and subregional markets. In other words, while IEM directives appear not to have been the key driving force behind falling capacity ownership concentration rates (although they have substantially facilitated this trend),

improvements in general dispersion of ownership on the generation side have resulted from the EU's climate change policies and support for renewable energies in particular. Consequently, increasing levels of renewable energy capacities are not owned by the incumbents and this has led to slowly but broadly decreasing ownership concentration rates.

Of course, such developments are not uniform across all countries and much depends on national legislation to provide dedicated economic and technical support. We argue, though, that changing fuel mixes and greater diversity of ownership at the generation level are interdependent. The potential for unintended outcomes due to policy-making and implementation has long been recognised (Wildavsky, 1979) and thus the initially parallel, largely isolated development of the EU internal energy market and climate change policies explains the central role of renewable electricity technologies in changing the structure of the EU electricity sector. The evolution of the electricity sector is thus argued to be an unintended desirable outcome of policy interaction (Merton, 1936).

Yet our subregional lens does not provide additional insights into the identified unintended interaction of the European IEM and RES policies as implemented at national scale, reflecting the current lack of subregional territoriality with sufficient institutional thickness and capacity to further drive policy implementation lead. This insight suggests greater support for strengthening subregional institutions in the European electricity sector is needed to accelerate the sustainability transition.

Our research is bounded by specific limitations, which offer potential avenues for future development and extension. For example, there are questions about the validity of and insights gained from using the HHI, particularly for predicting market power in the electricity sector (e.g., Borenstein et al., 1999; Swinand et al., 2007). Since we neither attempted to make predictions nor sought to estimate impacts on wholesale prices, we believe this measure

provides a widely accepted and satisfactory assessment of the concentration levels of generation capacity asset ownership and remains in keeping with previous research (e.g., Jamasb and Pollitt, 2005; Percebois, 2008). Future research may however seek to draw on alternative measures of, and data for, asset concentration. As we were interested in changing levels of ownership on the power generation side as well as changes in countries' fuel mixes we did (and could) not assess changes in retail markets. Limitations of our data also do not allow us to investigate changes in vertical integration (e.g., through acquisitions or sale of transmission and distribution assets) or horizontal diversification (e.g., entering gas supply markets). Finally, as explained earlier, future research also should study the effects of the sustainable energy transition by assessing the changes in terms of actual electricity supplied. The highly intermittent nature of increasing amounts of renewable energy capacities is throwing up new operational challenges that demand greater wholesale market pricing flexibility, grid interconnection and regulatory interdependence. All of these aspects may provide further fruitful research opportunities on energy geographies.

To conclude, our research has explored changes in the European electricity sector by drawing on the emerging literatures on energy geographies. Our empirical results suggest that concepts proposed by Bridge et al. (2013) enable deeper insights into the spatiality of energy transitions. Specifically, we find that territoriality and scaling (table 3) are key lenses for interpreting the differentiated change processes occurring at EU, subregional and national levels. The European energy transition is unlikely to converge onto a single trajectory any time soon, but particularly subregional approaches, such as through strengthening the existing ERIs, are argued to offer policy-makers with more spatially cognizant and effective levers.

References

- Andersen, S.S. and Sitter, N. (2009). *The European Union gas market: Differentiated integration and fuzzy liberalisation*. Chapter for the edited volume: in G. Fermann (ed) *Energy and institution-building in Europe*, Berliner Wissenschafts-Verlag, 2009.
- Bialasiewicz, L., Giaccaria, P., Jones, A., and Minca, C. (2013). Re-scaling 'EU'rope: EU macro-regional fantasies in the Mediterranean. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 20(1), 59-76.
- Boeters, S. and Koornneef, J. (2011). Supply of Renewable Energy Sources and the Cost of EU Climate Policy. *Energy Economics*, 33(5), 1024-1034.
- Borenstein, S., Bushnell, J. and Knittel, C.R. (1999). Market Power in Electricity Markets: Beyond Concentration Measures. *Energy Journal*, 20, 65-88.
- Bouzarovski, S. (2010). Post-socialist energy reforms in critical perspective: Entangled boundaries, scales and trajectories of change. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, 17, 167–182.
- Bouzarovski, S., Bradshaw, M., and Wochnik, A. (2015). Making territory through infrastructure: The governance of natural gas transit in Europe. *Geoforum*, 64, 217-228.
- Bouzarovski, S. and Tirado Herrero, S. (2015). The energy divide: Integrating energy transitions, regional inequalities and poverty trends in the European Union. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, forthcoming. DOI: 0969776415596449.
- Bradshaw, M. (2013). *Global Energy Dilemmas*. Polity Press. ISBN: 978-0-7456-5064-7
- Bridge, G., Bouzarovski, S., Bradshaw, M., and Eyre, N. (2013). Geographies of energy transition: Space, place and the low-carbon economy. *Energy Policy*, 53, 331-340.
- Calvert, K. (2016). From 'Energy Geography' to 'Energy Geographies': Perspectives on a Fertile Academic Borderland. *Progress in Human Geography*, 40(1), 105-125.
- Carstei, M. (2012). Issue Brief: Baltic Energy Security - Building a European Energy Future. *Atlantic Council*, February.

- Charron, N. (2013). Diverging Cohesion? Globalisation, state capacity and regional inequalities within and across European Countries. *European Urban and Regional Studies*, forthcoming. DOI: 0969776413512844.
- Coenen, L., Benneworth, P. and Truffer, B. (2012). Towards a Spatial Perspective on Sustainability Transitions. *Research Policy*, 41, 968-979.
- Cansino, J.M., Pablo-Romero, M.D.P., Román, R. and Yñiguez, R. (2010). Tax incentives to promote green electricity: An overview of EU-27 countries. *Energy Policy*, 38(10), 6000-6008.
- Domanico, F. (2007). Concentration in the European electricity industry: The internal market as solution? *Energy Policy*, 35, 5064–76.
- Eikeland, P.O. (2011). The Third Internal Energy Market Package: New Power Relations among Member States, EU Institutions and Non-state Actors? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 49, 243-63.
- European Commission (2012). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: Making the Internal Energy Market Work. *COM(2012) 663 Final, Brussels, 15 November 2012*.
- European Commission (2014). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee and the Committee of the Regions: A Policy Framework for Climate and Energy in the Period from 2020 to 2030. *COM(2014) 15, Brussels, 22 January 2015*.
- European Commission (2015). Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament, the Council, the European Economic and Social Committee, the Committee of the Regions and the European Investment Bank: A Framework Strategy for a Resilient Energy Union with a Forward-Looking Climate Change Policy. *COM(2015) 80 final, Brussels, 25 February 2015*.
- European Parliament and the Council (1996). Directive 96/92/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 19 December 1996 Concerning Common Rules for the Internal Market in Electricity, *Official Journal L 027, 30 January 1997*.

- European Parliament and the Council (2001). Directive 2001/77/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 27 September 2001 On the Promotion of Electricity Produced from Renewable Energy Sources in the Internal Electricity Market, *Official Journal L 283/33*, 27 October 2001.
- European Parliament and the Council (2003). Directive 2003/54/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 26 June 2003 Concerning Common Rules for the Internal Market in Electricity and Repealing Directive 96/92/EC, *Official Journal L 176/37*, 15 July 2003.
- European Parliament and the Council (2009a). Directive 2009/28/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 23 April 2009 On the Promotion of the Use of Energy from Renewable Energy Sources and Subsequently Repealing Directives 2001/77/EC and 2003/30/EC, *Official Journal L 140/16*, 5 June 2009.
- European Parliament and the Council (2009b). Directive 2009/72/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 July 2009 Concerning Common Rules for the Internal Market in Electricity and Repealing Directive 2003/54/EC, *Official Journal L 211/55*, 14 August 2009.
- Giddens, A. (2012). *The Politics of Climate Change*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Goldthau, A. (2014). Rethinking the governance of energy infrastructure: scale, decentralization and polycentrism. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 1, 134-140.
- Goldthau, A. and Sitter, N. (2014). A liberal actor in a realist world? The Commission and the external dimension of the single market for energy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 21(10), 1452-1472. DOI: 10.1080/13501763.2014.912251
- Green, R. (2006). Electricity liberalisation in Europe—how competitive will it be? *Energy Policy*, 34, 2532–2541.
- Haas, R., Nakicenovic, N., Ajanovic, A., Faber, T., Kranzl, L., Müller, A., and Resch, G. (2008). Towards sustainability of energy systems: A primer on how to apply the concept of energy services to identify necessary trends and policies. *Energy Policy*, 36(11), 4012-4021.

- Hall, P. and Soskice, D. (2001). 'Introduction'. In Hall, P. A. and Soskice, D. (Eds), *Varieties of capitalism: the institutional foundations of comparative advantage*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Hansen, T. and Coenen, L. (2015). The Geography of Sustainability Transitions: Review, Synthesis and Reflections on an Emergent Research Field. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 17, 92-109.
- Held, A.; Ragwitz, M. and Haas, R. (2006). On the success of policy strategies for the promotion of electricity from renewable energy sources in the EU. *Energy & Environment*, 17(6): 849-868.
- Hess, M. (2004). 'Spatial' relationships? Towards a reconceptualization of embeddedness. *Progress in Human Geography*, 28(2), 165-186.
- Jacobsson, S.; Bergek, A.; Finon, D.; Lauber, V.; Mitchell, C.; Toke, D. and Verbruggen, A. (2009). EU renewable energy support policy: Faith or facts? *Energy Policy*, 37: 2143–2146.
- Jamasb, T. and Pollitt, M. (2005). Electricity Market Reform in the European Union: Review of Progress toward Liberalization & Integration. *Energy Journal*, 26 (Special Issue), 11-41.
- Joskow, P.L. (2008). Lessons Learned from Electricity Market Liberalization. *Energy Journal*, 29, 9-42.
- Kitzing, L., Mitchell, C. and Morthorst, P.E. (2012). Renewable Energy Policies in Europe: Converging or Diverging? *Energy Policy*, 51, 192-201.
- Klessmann, C., Held, A., Rathmann, M. and Ragwitz, M. (2011). Status and Perspectives of Renewable Energy Policy and Deployment in the European Union - What is Needed to Reach the 2020 Targets? *Energy Policy*, 39(12), 7637-7657.
- Kolk, A., Lindeque, J. and van den Buuse, D. (2014). Regionalization Strategies of EU Electric Utilities. *British Journal of Management*, 25(S1), S77–S99.
- Lipp, J. (2007). Lessons for effective renewable electricity policy from Denmark, Germany and the United Kingdom. *Energy Policy*, 35: 5481–5495.

- Lodge, M. (2002). Varieties of Europeanisation and the national regulatory state. *Public Policy and Administration*, 17(2), 43-67.
- Mane-Estrada, A. (2006). European energy security: Towards the creation of the geo-energy space. *Energy Policy*, 34(18), 3773-3786.
- McGowan, F. (1989). The Single Energy Market and Energy Policy: Conflicting Agendas? *Energy Policy*, 17, 547-53.
- Merton, R.K. (1936). The Unanticipated Consequences of Purposive Social Action. *American Sociological Review*, 1, 894-904.
- Meyer, N.I. (2003). European Schemes for Promoting Renewables in Liberalised Markets. *Energy Policy*, 31(7), 665-676.
- Newbury, D. (2005). Introduction. *Energy Journal*, 26 (Special Issue), 1-10.
- OECD/IEA (2013). *World Energy Outlook 2013*. Paris: OECD.
- Padgett, S. (1992). The Single European Energy Market: The Politics of Realization. *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 30(1), 53-76.
- Pepermans, G.; Driesen, J.; Haeseldonckx, D.; Belmans, R. and D'haeseleer, W. (2005). Distributed generation: definition, benefits and issues. *Energy Policy*, 33: 787-798.
- Pelkmans, J. (2001). Making EU network markets competitive. *Oxford Review of Economic Policy*, 17(3), 432-456.
- Percebois, J. (2008). Electricity liberalization in the European Union: Balancing benefits and risks. *Energy Journal*, 29, 1-19.
- Puka, L., and Szulecki, K. (2014). The politics and economics of cross-border electricity infrastructure: A framework for analysis. *Energy Research & Social Science*, 4, 124-134.
- Reiche, D. and Bechberger, M. (2004). Policy Differences in the Promotion of Renewable Energies in the EU Member States. *Energy Policy*, 32(7), 843-849.
- Schmidt, V. (2003). French Capitalism transformed, yet still a third variety of capitalism. *Economy and Society*, 32, 526-554.

- Schmidt, V. (2009). Putting the political back into political economy by bringing the state back in yet again. *World Politics*, 61, 516-546.
- Šúri, M., Huld, T.A., Dunlop, E.D. and Ossenbrink, H.A. (2007). Potential of Solar Electricity Generation in the European Union Member States and Candidate Countries. *Solar Energy*, 81(10), 1295-1305.
- Swinand, G., Scully, D., Ffoulkes, S. and Kessler, B. (2010). Modelling EU Electricity Market Competition Using the Residual Supply Index. *The Electricity Journal*, 23, 41-50.
- Szabó, S. and Jäger-Waldau, A. (2008). More Competition: Threat or Chance for Financing Renewable Electricity? *Energy Policy*, 36, 1436-47.
- Thomas, S. (2003). Viewpoint: The Seven Brothers. *Energy Policy*, 31, 393-403.
- Torriti, J. (2010). Impact Assessment and the Liberalization of the EU Energy Markets: Evidence-Based Policy-Making or Policy-Based Evidence-Making? *Journal of Common Market Studies*, 48, 1065-81.
- Truffer, B. and Coenen, L. (2012). Environmental Innovation and Sustainability Transitions in Regional Studies. *Regional Studies*, 46, 1-21.
- Truffer, B., Murphy, J.T. and Raven, R. (2015). The geography of sustainability transitions: Contours of an emerging theme. *Environmental Innovation and Societal Transitions*, 17, 63-72.
- Ürge-Vorsatz, D., Miladinova, G., and Paizs, L. (2006). Energy in transition: From the iron curtain to the European Union. *Energy Policy*, 34(15), 2279-2297.
- Verbong, G., and Geels, F. (2007). The ongoing energy transition: lessons from a socio-technical, multi-level analysis of the Dutch electricity system (1960–2004). *Energy Policy*, 35(2), 1025-1037.
- Verbruggen, A., Di Nucci, R., Fishedick, M., Haas, R., Hvelplund, F., Lauber, F., Lorenzoni, A., Mez, L., Nilsson, L.J., del Rio Gonzalez, P., Schleich, J. and Toke, D. (2015) Europe's electricity regime: restoration or thorough transition. *International Journal of Sustainable Energy Planning and Management*, 5, 57-68.

Von Hirschhausen, C. and Waelde, T.W. (2001) The End of Transition: An Institutional Interpretation of Energy Sector Reform in Eastern Europe and the CIS. *MOCT- MOST: Economic Policy in Transitional Economies*, 11, 91-108.

Wildavsky, A. (1979). *The Art and Craft of Policy Analysis*. The MacMillan Press, London.

TABLES & FIGURES

Table 1: EU24 Subregion Member Countries

EU Subregion	EU24 Member Countries
Baltic	Estonia, Latvia, Lithuania
Central-East	Austria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Poland, Slovakia, Slovenia
Central-South	Austria, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Slovenia
Central-West	Belgium, France, Germany, Luxembourg, Netherlands
Northern	Denmark, Finland, Germany, Norway, Poland, Sweden
South-West	France, Portugal, Spain
FUI	France, UK, Ireland

Source: Council of European Energy Regulators (CEER)

Table 2: Fuel classification for generation capacity

Fuel Categories	Generating Technology/Fuel Type
Non-renewable Fuels	Nuclear, Other, Coal/Cogen, Coal, Boiler/Cogen, Steam Boiler, Combustion Turbine/Cogen, Combined Cycle/Cogen, Combined Cycle, Duct Firing, Combustion Turbine, Reciprocating Engine
Renewable Fuels	Geothermal, Hydro, Solar, Wind, Offshore Wind, Waste (includes Biomass), Pumped Storage Hydro

Source: Platts and authors

Table 3 – Overview of key energy geography concepts and indicative findings

ENERGY GEOGRAPHIES	DEFINITION	INDICATIVE FINDINGS
Scaling	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Scale here refers to the material size and areal extent of phenomena. It describes the different geographical forms in which different energy technologies can be deployed— [...]. It can also describe the varying geographical reach of different political structures – such as local, regional and national government; and forms of economic organisation – differentiating, for example, a businesses operating in only one locality from a transnational corporation” (Bridge et al., 2013: 337). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Growth in total installed generation capacity ▪ Increasing number of (new) owner-operators ▪ Changing fuel sources/mixes ▪ Growth in renewable capacity ▪ Trends and variation across EU, subregions and member states
Location	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “‘Location’ here is both an absolute characteristic (latitude and longitude) and a relative one, describing the ‘relational proximity’ of one element in the system to another. While absolute location is fixed and unchanging, relative location can be highly dynamic.” (Bridge et al., 2013: 334) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Role of natural resource endowments ▪ Continuation and disappearance of ‘energy islands’ (Iberia vs. Baltics)
Territoriality	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Territoriality refers to the relationship between social and political power structures and their imposition, organisation and execution over distinct geographical spaces (Brenner et al., 2003). As such territoriality reflects the role, authority and/or commercial power of utilities, municipalities and states in driving the processes behind energy transitions that lead towards greater levels of either centralisation or decentralisation within defined regional spaces (Bridge et al., 2013). ▪ Assessing the territoriality of energy infrastructure in terms of contiguity (dispersion/density); connectivity (Hess, 2004); and centralisation (Bridge et al., 2013) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Falling generation capacity ownership concentration rates (greater dispersion) ▪ Relative decline of Top 10 largest gencap owners ▪ Some MS still dominated by one large gencap owner ▪ Continued dominance of 7 Brothers ▪ No new pan-European utilities ▪ Strong emergence of two new, highly dispersed groups of asset owners ▪ Trends and variation across EU, subregions and member states ▪ Role of subregional regulatory collaboration (ERIs) in shaping trends ▪ Interaction effects between IEM and RES
Spatial differentiation (convergence vs. divergence)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spatial Differentiation reflects the realisation that, despite strong forces of convergence, energy transitions are likely to proceed at varying paces in different spaces. This will inevitably lead to uneven development across continents, countries, regions and urban areas. Understanding such differences will be important for assessing progress overall and developing policy-advice better suited to different localities (Bridge et al., 2013). ▪ “[...] a process of simultaneous equalisation and differentiation” (Bridge et al., 2013: 337). ▪ Emerges from the locations, landscapes and territorialisation that constitute the sustainability (energy) transition (Bridge et al., 2013). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ “Walls” in renewables ratios ▪ “Floors” in asset ownership concentration rates ▪ Emergence of 2 new, highly dispersed groups of asset owners ▪ Some countries still dominated by one large gencap owner ▪ German ‘Energiewende’
Spatial	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Spatial Embeddedness extends the insights of spatial differentiation by recognising the 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Relative decline of Top 10 largest gencap owners

Changing energy geographies

ENERGY GEOGRAPHIES	DEFINITION	INDICATIVE FINDINGS
embeddedness (path dependence)	<p>significant path dependency created by geographical niches and incumbents. Spatial embeddedness relates to the influence of “economic, material and cultural aspects of energy systems” (Bridge et al., 2013: 338) and which significantly shape its location-bound evolution.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ It also” refers to both the sunk costs of capital investment and the place-based cultures (of consumption and production) that surround certain energy technologies” (Bridge et al., 2013: 338). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ No new pan-European utilities ▪ Role of natural resource endowments ▪ Continuation and disappearance of ‘energy islands’ (Iberia vs. Baltics) ▪ German ‘Energiewende’
Landscape	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Landscape "describes the assemblage of natural and cultural features across a broad space and the history of their production and interaction", as well as the "constellation of activities and socio-technical linkages associated with energy capture, conversion, distribution and consumption" (Bridge et al., 2013: 335). 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Continuation and disappearance of ‘energy islands’ (Iberia vs. Baltics) ▪ German ‘Energiewende’

Table 4: EU Subregional and Country Electricity Generation Capacity Fuel Mixes, Major Capacity Owners' Contributions and HHI50

EU Region / Member Country	Total Installed Capacity (MW)				Installed Non-renewable ¹ Capacity (% of total) : Installed Renewable ² Capacity (% of total)				Contribution to Total Generation Capacity by the Largest Capacity Owner per region/country (% of total)				HHI 50			
	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2003	2009	2013
European Union³	628,569	698,615	870,838	1,008,07	75:25	72:28	70:30	64:36	19.2	17.6	15.2	13.5	683	588	483	436
Baltic	11,708	11,800	9,044	9,738	80:20	78:22	69:31	66:34	47.6	49.2	31.0	30.2	3,342	3,389	2,548	2,154
<i>Lithuania</i>	6,340	6,587	3,688	4,580	88:12	85:15	71:29	71:29	87.9	88.1	75.9	64.3	7,790	7,807	5,931	4,352
<i>Latvia</i>	2,063	2,106	2,422	2,638	26:74	26:74	36:64	39:61	99.4	98.0	96.2	95.4	9,884	9,608	9,262	9,097
<i>Estonia</i>	3,305	3,107	2,934	2,422	100:0	100:0	94:6	86:14	97.1	96.8	92.3	87.9	9,427	9,380	8,524	7,747
Central East	185,004	205,535	236,513	293,949	85:15	78:22	70:30	63:37	14.3	12.9	11.3	11.9	626	559	535	534
<i>Austria</i>	16,705	17,144	18,393	21,457	33:67	31:69	29:71	29:71	45.7	43.5	37.2	38.9	2,453	2,243	1,773	1,861
<i>Czech Republic</i>	14,405	16,668	17,233	19,951	86:14	88:12	85:15	77:23	74.2	71.2	67.3	62.9	5,583	5,140	4,611	4,091
<i>Germany</i>	106,601	120,024	147,819	192,212	90:10	79:21	68:32	57:43	24.8	21.3	17.5	16.5	1,470	1,249	1,094	983
<i>Hungary</i>	7,225	8,596	9,032	8,366	99:1	99:1	93:7	87:13	30.3	29.7	34.0	40.1	2,089	1,864	1,846	1,869
<i>Poland</i>	31,051	32,320	34,578	38,593	94:6	94:6	92:8	84:16	33.7	36.1	35.4	33.1	1,776	1,874	1,788	1,548
<i>Slovakia</i>	6,375	7,823	6,219	7,052	63:17	68:32	60:40	55:45	76.0	76.3	82.8	73.6	5,988	5,973	6,896	5,513
<i>Slovenia</i>	2,642	2,960	3,239	3,487	69:31	90:30	66:34	60:40	70.2	72.4	74.7	70.9	5,578	5,758	6,022	5,430
Central South	301,586	329,062	408,965	510,677	77:23	73:27	70:30	64:36	34.0	31.5	27.4	22.6	1,549	1,347	1,062	853
<i>Austria</i>	16,705	17,144	18,393	21,457	33:67	31:69	29:71	29:71	45.7	43.5	37.2	38.9	2,453	2,243	1,773	1,861
<i>France</i>	105,875	107,933	116,515	124,069	75:25	76:24	73:27	70:30	93.7	91.6	85.9	81.1	8,788	8,409	7,410	6,624
<i>Germany</i>	106,601	120,024	147,819	192,212	90:10	79:21	68:32	57:43	24.8	21.3	17.5	16.5	1,470	1,249	1,094	983
<i>Greece</i>	9,026	11,920	14,274	17,074	72:28	71:29	71:29	69:31	99.7	96.9	85.2	70.1	9,938	9,396	7,335	5,196
<i>Italy</i>	60,737	6,9081	108,725	144,783	71:29	71:29	76:24	29:31	58.2	53.1	34.7	27.3	3,746	3,107	1,520	1,083
<i>Slovenia</i>	2,642	2,960	3,239	3,487	69:31	90:30	66:34	60:40	70.2	72.4	74.7	70.9	5,578	5,758	6,022	5,430
Central West	244,467	263,326	307,406	367,268	84:16	79:21	72:28	66:34	41.0	38.1	33.0	28.1	2,125	1,859	1,506	1,223
<i>Belgium</i>	13,383	15,515	19,211	20,690	89:11	90:10	84:16	70:30	86.5	82.2	74.7	61.4	7,554	6,880	5,688	3,957
<i>France</i>	105,875	107,933	116,515	124,069	75:25	76:24	73:27	70:30	93.7	91.6	85.9	81.1	8,788	8,409	7,410	6,624
<i>Germany</i>	106,601	120,024	147,819	192,212	90:10	79:21	68:32	57:43	24.8	21.3	17.5	16.5	1,470	1,249	1,094	983
<i>Luxembourg</i>	1,181	1,600	1,608	1,623	3:97	27:73	27:73	27:73	96.4	71.1	70.8	73.4	9,284	5,548	5,494	5,754
<i>Netherlands</i>	17,427	18,254	22,253	24,210	97:3	93:7	88:12	88:12	26.6	22.6	18.5	21.2	1,863	1,601	1,182	1,228

Changing energy geographies

EU Region / Member Country	Total Installed Capacity (MW)				Installed Non-renewable ¹ Capacity (% of total) : Installed Renewable ² Capacity (% of total)				Contribution to Total Generation Capacity by the Largest Capacity Owner per region/country (% of total)				HHI 50			
	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2003	2009	2013
FUI	185,492	198,682	236,427	257,146	83:17	84:16	82:18	77:23	61.2	57.4	49.1	46.3	3,910	3,438	2,559	2,275
<i>France</i>	105,875	107,933	116,515	124,069	75:25	76:24	73:27	70:30	93.7	91.6	85.9	81.1	8,788	8,409	7,410	6,624
<i>U.K.</i>	75,103	85,045	110,955	119,390	94:6	94:6	91:9	83:17	19.0	17.8	14.4	14.6	1,191	928	710	618
<i>Ireland</i>	4,514	5,704	8,957	10,839	89:11	87:13	77:23	70:30	78.8	71.6	44.2	39.7	6,649	5,459	2,506	2,081
Northern	223,943	243,515	279,182	338,609	71:29	65:35	60:40	54:46	15.5	14.5	12.7	10.7	699	625	578	526
<i>Norway</i> ³	28,044	28,587	31,359	36,394	0:100	0:100	5:95	8:92	36.3	36.2	33.6	30.1	1,586	1,568	1,372	1,125
<i>Sweden</i>	34,121	34,029	35,574	37,854	45:55	43:57	42:58	40:60	53.4	51.4	48.3	45.4	3,352	3,151	2,863	2,602
<i>Finland</i>	14,574	16,251	17,167	19,116	69:31	68:32	66:34	60:40	29.4	26.3	26.7	30.6	1,538	1,344	1,390	1,569
<i>Denmark</i>	9,552	12,304	12,685	12,074	90:10	69:31	67:33	53:47	63.0	48.0	48.4	39.9	4,156	2,876	2,909	2,381
<i>Germany</i>	106,601	120,024	147,819	192,212	90:10	79:21	68:32	57:43	24.8	21.3	17.5	16.5	1,470	1,249	1,094	983
<i>Poland</i>	31,051	32,320	34,578	38,593	94:6	94:6	92:8	84:16	33.7	36.1	35.4	33.1	1,776	1,874	1,788	1,548
South West	164,195	182,990	242,513	264,604	70:30	70:30	67:33	66:34	60.4	54.0	41.3	38.3	3,943	3,217	2,054	1,826
<i>France</i>	105,875	107,933	116,515	124,069	75:25	76:24	73:27	70:30	93.7	91.6	85.9	81.1	8,788	8,409	7,410	6,624
<i>Portugal</i>	8,729	10,903	16,122	16,747	51:49	58:42	53:47	50:50	87.4	70.5	65.1	56.7	7,692	5,214	4,493	3,403
<i>Spain</i>	49,591	64,154	109,876	122,831	63:37	61:39	62:38	61:39	37.3	31.7	21.5	20.3	2,747	2,069	1,322	1,246

Source: Platts PowerVision and authors' calculations

Notes:

- 1) Non-renewable fuels include Nuclear, Other, Coal/Cogen, Coal, Boiler/Cogen, Steam Boiler, Combustion Turbine/Cogen, Combined Cycle/Cogen, Combined Cycle, Duct Firing, Combustion Turbine, Reciprocating Engine.
- 2) Renewable fuels include Geothermal, Hydro, Solar, Wind, Offshore Wind, Waste (includes Biomass), Pumped Storage Hydro.
- 3) This covers the 24 countries that are included in the regional sub-groups: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.
- 4) Norway is included as an integral member of the highly integrated Nordic regional energy market, despite not being an EU member.

Table 5: European¹ Generation Capacity Ownership Concentration Shares for Ten Largest Capacity Owners

EU Region / Member Country	Total Number of Firms				HHI 10 Subregional / National		Generation Capacity Ownership Concentration (%) in Rank Order from Largest to Smallest Concentration by Firm for a Given Year ⁴																			
							Electric Utility 1		Electric Utility 2		Electric Utility 3		Electric Utility 4		Electric Utility 5		Electric Utility 6		Electric Utility 7		Electric Utility 8		Electric Utility 9		Electric Utility 10	
	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2013	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13
European Union²	1033	1511	1893	2084	683³	415³	20	13	10	8~	9	7	7	6*	6	5	4	4	4	4	2	4	2	3	2	2
Baltic	10	14	22	33	3,342	2,15	48	30	27	26	18	23	3	5	2	4	1	2	1	2	0	2	0	1	0	1
<i>Lithuania</i>	4	5	8	15	7,790	4,35	88	64	6	10	3	8	3	5	-	4	-	3	-	2	-	1	-	1	-	1
<i>Latvia</i>	2	4	5	7	9,884	9,09	99	95	1	2	-	1	-	1	-	0	-	0	-	0	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Estonia</i>	4	5	9	14	9,427	7,74	97	88	2	3	0	2	0	2	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	1	-	0
Central East	2189	239	349	403	626	504	14	12*	13	11~	8	9	6	7	6	6	5	5	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3
<i>Austria</i>	24	27	42	45	2,448	1,82	46	39	10	9	9	8	9	8	7	7	4	7~	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
<i>Czech Republic</i>	36	45	73	80	5,583	4,08	74	63	6	9*	4	4	3	4	2	3	2	3	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1
<i>Germany</i>	88	119	161	184	1,461	973	25	16*	22	16~	14	14	9	10	7	9	2	5	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
<i>Hungary</i>	15	19	31	40	2,051	1,85	30	40	26	7	18	7	12	6	4	5	4	5	3	5	1	5	1	3	1	2
<i>Poland</i>	24	27	43	62	1,772	1,53	33	35	18	15	9	8	9	8	8	7	6	5	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
<i>Slovakia</i>	13	14	14	18	5,988	5,51	76	74	14	7*	3	4	2	3	2	2	1	2	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	1
<i>Slovenia</i>	4	4	4	5	5,455	5,43	69	71	25	19	5	6*	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Central South	240	440	595	657	1,549	835	34	23	12	10*	11	8~	8	8	5	6	3	5	3	3	3	3	3	2	2	2
<i>Austria</i>	24	27	42	45	2,448	1,82	46	39	10	9	9	8	9	8	7	7	4	7~	3	3	3	3	3	3	2	3
<i>France</i>	21	71	123	138	8,788	6,68	94	81	3	5~	2	3	1	3	0	2	0	2*	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Germany</i>	88	119	161	184	1,461	973	25	16*	22	16~	14	14	9	10	7	9	2	5	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
<i>Greece</i>	2	2	6	7	9,938	4,95	100	71	0	9~	-	7	-	4	-	4	-	3	-	2	-	-	-	-	-	-
<i>Italy</i>	111	230	280	304	3,745	1,06	58	27	17	10*	7	9	5	8	5	5	1	4	1	3	1	3	0	2	0	2
<i>Slovenia</i>	4	4	4	5	5,455	5,43	69	71	25	19	5	6*	1	4	-	1	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Central West	183	318	421	459	2,125	1,21	41	28	13	11~	11	10*	8	8	7	7	4	6	3	6	1	3	1	3	1	1
<i>Belgium</i>	28	42	55	62	7,554	3,94	86	61	8	9	4	6*	1	5	0	4	0	2	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1
<i>France</i>	21	71	123	138	8,788	6,68	94	81	3	5~	2	3	1	3	0	2	0	2*	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Germany</i>	88	119	161	184	1,461	973	25	16*	22	16~	14	14	9	10	7	9	2	5	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
<i>Luxembourg</i>	22	67	68	68	9,284	5,75	96	73	1	19	1	2	1	1	1	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0

Changing energy geographies


EU Region / Member Country	Total Number of Firms				HHI 10 Subregional / National		Generation Capacity Ownership Concentration (%) in Rank Order from Largest to Smallest Concentration by Firm for a Given Year ⁴																			
							Electric Utility 1		Electric Utility 2		Electric Utility 3		Electric Utility 4		Electric Utility 5		Electric Utility 6		Electric Utility 7		Electric Utility 8		Electric Utility 9		Electric Utility 10	
	1996	2003	2009	2013	1996	2013	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13	'96	'13		
<i>Netherlands</i>	39	47	51	53	1,861	1,22	27	21	21	20	19	14	18	8~	5	7	2	7	1	5	1	3	1	3	1	2
FUI	88	205	338	401	3,910	2,26	61	46	8	5	7	5	5	5	3	3	2	3	2	3~	2	2	2	2	1	2
<i>France</i>	21	71	123	138	8,788	6,68	94	81	3	5~	2	3	1	3	0	2	0	2*	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>United Kingdom</i>	68	122	179	227	1,171	590	19	15	17	10	16	10	12	8	7	6	5	4	5	4	3	4	3	3	3	3
<i>Ireland</i>	3	23	52	53	6,649	2,08	79	40	21	16	0	9	-	8~	-	7	-	5	-	4	-	4	-	2	-	1
Northern	568	653	760	835	699	503	15	11	15	11~	11	10*	6	8	5	8	4	4	4	4	3	3	3	3	3	3
<i>Norway¹</i>	128	139	160	195	1,568	1,09	36	30	9	7	6	5	6	5	6	5	5	4	4	4	2	4	2	3	2	2
<i>Sweden</i>	54	62	74	76	3,346	2,59	53	45	19	19	11	11	4	4~	2	3	1	3	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	1
<i>Finland</i>	83	91	98	100	1,525	1,55	29	31	23	22	7	6	6	6	4	4	3	4	3	3	3	3	2	2	2	2
<i>Denmark</i>	210	235	246	247	4,155	2,38	63	40	11	25~	5	12	5	4	1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0
<i>Germany</i>	88	119	161	184	1,461	973	25	16*	22	16~	14	14	9	10	7	9	2	5	2	5	1	2	1	1	1	1
<i>Poland</i>	24	27	43	62	1,772	1,53	33	35	18	15	9	8	9	8	8	7	6	5	3	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
South West	150	391	383	407	3,943	1,82	60	38	11	10~	11	9	6	9	3	6	3	5	2	4	0	3	0	2*	0	1
<i>France</i>	21	71	123	138	8,788	6,68	94	81	3	5~	2	3	1	3	0	2	0	2*	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Portugal</i>	26	41	54	55	7,692	3,39	87	57	7	7	1	7	1	5	1	5	1	3	0	2	0	2	0	1	0	1
<i>Spain</i>	107	189	222	229	2,747	1,23	37	20	35	18	9	17~	6	12	4	4	1	4	1	3	1	3*	1	3	0	3

Source: Platts PowerVision and authors' calculations.

Notes:

- 1) Norway is included as an integral member of the highly integrated Nordic regional energy market, despite not being an EU member.
- 2) Covers the 24 countries that are included in the regional sub-groups: Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom.
- 3) HHI 50; * denotes aggregated solar photovoltaic power developers; ~ denotes aggregated wind power developers.
- 4) Please note that the data does not refer to specific firms, but rather for either year, the share of capacity owned by the firm with a given rank in that year. The data do not seek to identify the relative ranking of specific European utilities over time, but rather represent the changing market structure at different levels of analysis over time, with an account of the role of aggregated renewable capacity in this process.


Figure 1: European Electric Utilities Capacity Ownership Trends



Installed generation capacity ownership trends for the largest seven European utilities plus aggregated wind and PV developers (%), 1990-2013. Ownership shares based on 24 countries included in the seven subregional electricity initiatives of the European Regulators Group for Electricity and Gas (ERGEG).

Source: Authors' calculations based on Platts PowerVision data.

Figure 2: EU24 Subregional Ownership and Fuel Mix Trends



European Union subregional electricity generation capacity ownership concentration (HHI50) vs. renewable to total installed electricity capacities ratios (%), 1990-2013. Time series start in upper-left positions.
Source: Authors' calculations based on Platts PowerVision data

ENDNOTES

ⁱ For more information, please see: <http://www.platts.com/products/powervision>

ⁱⁱ For further information, please see:

http://www.ceer.eu/portal/page/portal/EER_HOME/EER_ACTIVITIES/EER_INITIATIVES/ERI and
http://www.acer.europa.eu/Electricity/Regional_initiatives/Pages/default.aspx

ⁱⁱⁱ Membership EU15+2: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Ireland, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Sweden and the United Kingdom, plus Norway and Switzerland.

^{iv} These figures do not include renewable assets owned by the major utilities themselves.