



Aalborg Universitet

AALBORG UNIVERSITY
DENMARK

Stimulating sustainable energy innovation through policy learning and joint action

Gregersen, Birgitte; Johnson, Bjørn

Publication date:
2009

Document Version
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Gregersen, B., & Johnson, B. (2009). *Stimulating sustainable energy innovation through policy learning and joint action*. Paper presented at Joint Action on Climate Change Conference, Aalborg, Denmark.

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- ? Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- ? You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- ? You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal ?

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at vbn@aub.aau.dk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Joint Action on Climate Change
Aalborg, June 8-10, 2009

Stimulating sustainable energy innovation through policy learning and joint action

by

Birgitte Gregersen
bg@business.aau.dk

&

Björn Johnson
bj@business.aau.dk

Department of Business Studies
Aalborg University, Denmark

DRAFT 11.05.09

Abstract

Policy learning is together with technological, organisational and institutional learning an integrated part of the learning economy. It implies that policy-making itself is a process of learning and that this process more and more takes learning and competence building in many parts of the economy into account. The Danish Wind Power Innovation System is used as reference case to illustrate the mutual relations between industrial dynamics and policy learning. Focus is on central factors and actors shaping the path of learning and innovation. The paper further discusses opportunities and conditions for applying policy lessons learned from the Danish wind energy case to other renewable technology areas. Although the empirical basis is the specific Danish context, lessons learned are relevant in a broader policy context as well.

Keywords: Innovation, Renewable energy, Policy learning, Denmark

1. INTRODUCTION

Since the late 1970s wind power has played an increasing role in Danish energy production and consumption, and during the same period the Danish wind industry has obtained a leading world market position. The development of the wind energy sector is in many ways an illustrating example of the systemic nature of innovation processes and its dependency on co-evolution and interaction between technological, economic, political, and institutional elements. It is also a clear example on the importance of long-term regulation and determined government energy policy if obtained industrial strongholds are to be maintained.

When the liberal-conservative government in 2001 replaced a social democratic one, it put the renewable energy plans on standby with negative consequences for both the environment and the renewable energy sector. The home market for new wind power installations nearly disappeared, and other emerging growth sectors - for instance solar energy and bio-fuel - simply lost momentum after 2001. However, after nearly eight lean

years for the Danish renewable energy sectors there is hope for entering more progressive times again. Environmental concerns and the quest for sustainable development and long-term energy security have recently partly regained priority by the Government.¹

The revival of political attention to renewable energy and emerging acceptance by policy makers that energy and environmental goals are not necessarily harmful to private business and economic growth, but on the contrary may be beneficial for both, makes it relevant to ask what can be learned from the Danish wind power success - including to what extent these lessons are relevant for stimulating other renewable energy technologies in the current Danish and international context. The purpose of this paper is to take a closer look into these two questions.

We argue that an innovation system approach and a related policy learning perspective can provide essential insights into the elements and relations influencing both the mutual success story of industry growth and energy policy based on wind power and the less constructive story of missing opportunities when renewable energy policies are given less political attention.

Section 2 introduces the policy learning concept where policymaking is described, not as a means-ends, rational choice activity, but as a process of learning. In section 3 the Danish Wind Power Innovation System is used as reference case to illustrate the mutual relations between industrial dynamics and policy learning. Focus is on central factors and actors shaping the path of learning and innovation. In section 4 we discuss opportunities and conditions for applying policy lessons learned from the Danish wind energy case to other new renewable technology areas as solar energy. Section 5 summarizes the main conclusions.

2. POLICY LEARNING

A traditional way to look at economic policymaking is to regard it as *rational decision making in a means-ends context* (Johansen 1977). However, this implies some rather strict requirements:

- A well-defined goal function.
- Well-defined policy instruments and command over a competent bureaucracy with access to the necessary statistical data for preparation and control of policy decisions.
- Given the existence of well-defined means and ends, a model describing the structure, functioning and change of the economy.
- Besides, adequate institutional capability in the form of appropriate laws, rules, regulations, behavioral norms, routines and practices.²

Policymaking is not only a question of calculating the correct use of instruments from the model but also includes the use of much less formal knowledge about how to describe the situation, consult the involved decision-makers, prepare, implement and control the

¹ Various degree of lobbying from the renewable energy sector (not least from the Danish Wind Industry Association) has played an important role as well. Also the upcoming Climate Meeting in Copenhagen 2009 (COP15) has probably motivated the Danish Government to try to regain the reputation of Denmark as a renewable energy progressive country.

² Together these are often described as “good governance”.

decisions, etc. It is a combination of the explicit and tacit parts of different kinds of knowledge. As the economy gets more and more complex the explicit as well as tacit knowledge requirements for “rational” policymaking becomes increasingly demanding. Furthermore, it seems safe to assume, that the explicit as well as implicit value premises for the policymaking also becomes more and more complex. Socially and ecologically sustainable development is a far more complex goal than economic growth, for example.

Thus, if policymaking is to be regarded as a rational choice process in the sphere of politics quite demanding assumptions about values, knowledge and institutions have to be presumed. This may to some extent be justified in the case of a well-established type of economic policy, which has had many years to develop, like macroeconomic stabilization policy. Here could be defined a rather simple goal function, a relatively firm theoretical understanding of the problems (though some economists might not agree on this point) and a well-developed institutional capability.

But this is far from the case for innovation policy or for energy policy and it is certainly not the case for the combination of these two kinds of policies. Neither the institutional capability in this area nor the present knowledge about industrial dynamics justifies a rational choice, decision-theoretical model of policymaking. In this situation it is more relevant to look upon policy making from an evolutionary perspective, as a process of *policy learning*.³

Policy learning implies a shift in perception of policy as a precondition for change in praxis.⁴ Policy learning is to be understood in a broad sense. It ranges from small incremental changes in for example the composition of different energy taxes reflecting concrete experiences from praxis to more fundamental shifts in policy visions aiming at a fossil free national energy system. Sabatier (1993) distinguishes between three types of policy learning:

- *Instrumental learning* refers to technical learning about policy instruments – that is how different policy instruments can be improved to achieve specific goals
- *Conceptual learning or problem learning* means a changed (new) outlook or understanding of a problem. This is often related to adoption of new concepts, principles and images (understanding).
- *Social learning implies* changed (new) shared values, norms, goals and framing of issues/perspectives.

Our application of the policy learning concept includes all three dimensions. Policy learning is together with technological, organisational and institutional learning an integrated part of the learning economy. It implies that policy-making itself is a process of learning and that this process more and more takes learning and competence building in many parts of the economy into account. The goals, the instruments, the models, the data, the competence of the bureaucracy, the organisations and the institutions develop over time

³ For an analysis of the development of a link between innovation theory and policy from the 1970s to the 1990s see Mytelka & Smith 2002. See also Kemp & Weehuizen (2005) for an introduction to the concept of policy learning. The policy learning concept is today an integrated part of EU innovation policy approach, see:

<http://www.proinno-europe.eu/index.cfm?fuseaction=page.display&topicID=49&parentID=49>

⁴ Sabatier (1993, p.19) defines policy learning as ”a relatively enduring alteration of thought or behavioural intentions that are concerned with the attainment (or revision) of the precepts of a policy belief system.”

in interaction with each other. This is done partly as a conscious, and maybe even designed, process in which policy makers, bureaucrats, experts and scholars communicate and develop values, knowledge, competence and institutions over time – what we in the following refer to as *direct policy learning*. It is also done in a less conscious, learning by doing way, or even as learning by accident as when policy makers discover that environmental regulations also in some cases, unexpectedly, increase competitiveness – *indirect policy learning*. It is clear that for instance the Danish wind power policy has never been conducted within a pure rational choice framework. The goals, the instruments, the relevant knowledge and the institutional framework have not been stable but have co-evolved and diversified since the 1970s and 1980s where the Danish wind energy 'adventure' took off. It makes more sense to describe it as a process of both direct and indirect policy learning (Gregersen & Johnson 2008).

Policy learning can take different forms (Gregersen & Johnson 1998, 2008, Edquist et al. 1998, Lundvall & Borrás 1999, 2005, Mytelka & Smith 2002).⁵ However, based on innovation studies and the learning economy as an overall framework we argue that – at least - the following elements should be included in a dynamic innovation policy supporting sustainable development:

(a) *Forming visions* about the learning economy as an environment for innovation and sustainable development and forming the value premises of innovation policy.

(b) *Developing a system of innovation approach* including development of new concepts, data, and theories of innovation and systems of innovation.

(c) *Establishing new practices and routines in the conduct of policies stimulating learning and innovation* including gradually trying, testing, and evaluating new practices and routines.

(d) *Stimulating regional and local experiments* in policy areas in need of reform and developing new methods to evaluate the outcomes of such experiments that take into account learning effects.

(e) *Institution building* that supports the production and reproduction of human and social capital and diffusing international, regional and local 'good practices' in this field.

(f) *Analyzing and comparing systemic features* and critically important indicators in a form for benchmarking across regions, organizations and nations.

(g) *Stimulating democratic participation in the design and implementation of innovation strategies* including forms of ongoing dialogues between employees, unions, researchers and governments.

The concept of policy learning also implies a new perspective on a broad set of policies including social policy, labour market policy, education policy, industrial policy, energy policy, environmental policy and science and technology policy. These policies may be looked upon both as specific areas of policy learning and as activities affecting learning and innovation capabilities in many parts of the economy. Furthermore, policy learning calls for co-ordination across these policy areas.

⁵ There are clear and increasing intellectual similarities to the so-called Transition Management approach mainly developed by a group of Dutch scholars and recently implemented by the Dutch Government (see for instance Kemp 1994, Kemp & Rotmans 2005, Geels & Kemp 2007, Meadowcroft 2007).

In the following we use these seven elements as point of departure for extracting policy lessons from the Danish wind power case in order to discuss their relevance for other renewable energy technologies. The argument requires an understanding of the complex co-evolution of technological, economic, institutional and political factors that shapes innovation. Innovation system analysis is an adequate focusing device for such an understanding.

3. LEARNING AND INNOVATION WITHIN THE DANISH WIND POWER INNOVATION SYSTEM

3.1 Systems of Innovation as an analytical framework

Within the innovation system approach there is a distinction between systems that take a specific sector (Breschi & Malerba 1997, Malerba 2002, 2005) or a specific technology (Carlsson & Stankiewicz 1995, Jacobsen & Bergek 2004) as point of departure, and systems, which build on some kind of geographical proximity - either regional (Cooke 2001, Asheim & Gertler 2005) or national systems of innovation (Freeman 1987, Lundvall 1992, Nelson 1993, Edquist 1997, 2005).

However, the concepts of technology based and territorially based innovation systems are, depending on the analytical context to be regarded as complementary rather than substitutes. All systems of innovation are open systems and the different systems may overlap each other. A specific firm for example may be part of a sectoral, a local and a national system at the same time. The Danish Wind Power Innovation System is an example of such a combination.

The main idea of the concept of innovation systems is that the overall innovation performance of an economy depends not only on how specific organizations like firms and research institutes perform, but also on how they interact with each other and with the government sector in relation to knowledge production and distribution. Innovating firms operate within a common institutional set-up and they jointly depend on, contribute to and utilize a common knowledge infrastructure. It can be thought of as a system that creates and distributes knowledge, utilizes this knowledge by introducing it into the economy in the form of innovations, diffuses it and transforms it into something regarded as valuable, for example, international competitiveness and economic growth (Gregersen and Johnson, 1997).

A system of innovation is a system of actors (firms, organizations, universities, government agencies, consumers, etc.) who interact with each other in ways that influence the innovation performance of the system. The innovation performance is influenced by specific parts of the institutional set-up, the knowledge infrastructure, the specialization pattern, the public and private demand structure (or consumer tastes in the broad sense), and the government policy (Gregersen and Johnson 1997).

This broad definition of a system of innovation should not be interpreted as if innovation performance depends on almost everything. Only some aspects of, for example, the institutional set-up is really important for innovation performance and the trick is to identify these aspects. Likewise, only some of the connections between, for example, the production structure and the institutional set-up really matter. But this broad version of system of innovation provides a perspective - a way of looking at and understanding the

determinants of the innovation performance of an economy. The concept of a system of innovation in the broad sense opens up for the very likely possibility that other types of policy than innovation policy, for example education policy and energy policy, may affect innovation performance even more. It emphasizes the possibility that informal institutions in the form of norms of co-operation, habits of trust, collective and non-monetary incentives, etc., may influence innovations as much as formal institutions like patent rights and R&D-taxation. It provides new perspectives and enlightens new places where to look for the sources of innovation.

Infrastructures, production structures, institutional set-ups, consumer demand structures, and government policies are not independent explanatory factors for innovation performance. They are interdependent and they evolve in interaction with each other. For example, the development of a new industrial sector as for instance the Danish wind turbine sector, is strongly affected by how fast and effectively an institutional supporting system is built up. Special financing institutions may be needed, standards may have to be created, R&D institutions and technological service systems may have to be developed, etc. The gradual strengthening of the new sector, in turn, leads to a firmer institutional support system and so on. The different subsystems could be thought of as *co-evolving*. The match or miss-match between for example institutions and specialization patterns is then an important aspect of the evolution of the system as a whole. In the same way there are important feedback mechanisms between the performance of a system of innovation and its innovation determining factors. For example, a strong innovation performance in a specific sector may stimulate consumer learning and also lead to strengthening of the institutional and infrastructural support, which may lead to even better innovation performance, etc.

Our discussion of the groups of elements in systems of innovation stresses that the boundaries of a system of innovation are not completely defined in terms of finite – for example national - borders. It is an open system. It is also important to acknowledge that systems of innovation may be more or less coherent. They contain many subsystems knitted together into rather loose structures. They have often evolved rather than been designed and the cohesion of the systems changes over time and differs significantly between countries.⁶

3.2 The Danish Wind Power Innovation System as an example of co-evolution of technological, economic, institutional and political factors

The Danish wind power story is well described in several sources (see for instance Dannemand Andersen (1993), Karnøe (1995), Jørgensen & Karnøe (1995), Krohn (1999), Hvelplund (2000), Kamp et al. (2004), Szarka (2006), Lipp (2007)). However, the story is still highly relevant as illustration of a policy learning approach based on co-evolution of technological, economic, institutional and political factors. It also clearly illustrates that pro-active policy matters if a timely transition to renewable energy systems is to be implemented. Let free, privatization and market mechanism will not be able to secure such

⁶ Some approaches specify various functions (or activities) of the system as the main characteristics (see for instance Edquist 2005, Hekkert & Negro 2009). There are various suggestions for what functions should be nominated. Edquist (2005) lists ten functions or activities influencing innovation: Research and development, competence building, formation of new product markets, articulation of user needs, creation and change of organizations, networking around knowledge, creating and changing institutions, incubating activities, financing innovation, and consultancy services.

transition and paradigm shift (Kemp & Rotmans 2005, Jacobsson & Lauber 2006, Smith 2008).

The production structure – from enthusiasts to world leaders

The strong anti nuclear power movement and the energy supply crises in the late 1970s spurred a growing interest in alternative sustainable energy technologies in Denmark. Most wind power projects in the 1970s began as private projects, where technically interested people made experiments with scaled-down versions (10-15 kW) of the Gedser machine (Karnøe 1995, Krohn 1999).⁷

When the more ‘professional’ turbine manufactures entered the scene in the late 1970s and beginning of the 1980s, they mainly came with a background in agricultural machinery (e.g. Vestas, Nordtank, Bonus, Nordex, and later Micon). One company, Wind World, was founded on gearbox and marine technology manufacturing (Krohn 2000).⁸ The wind turbine companies are in that sense an illustrating example of how learning is cumulative and often based in the national production structure.

In the late 1970s there were about 20 Danish manufactures entering the wind turbine market, but the home market was still modest. In the beginning of the 1980s the State of California began a program of support to wind power development and the Danish producers benefited and learned a lot from this expansion. However, when the California wind program ended in 1985-86, a large number of the Danish manufactures went bankrupt or merged. The merger and acquisition process continued within the wind turbine manufactures and today the two companies, Vestas (merged with Micon) and Siemens Wind Power (acquired Bonus Energy in 2004) are the dominating ‘Danish’ players. In many ways the wind turbine industry has followed a traditional industrial maturity path with increasing industrial concentration and capital intensity, growing internationalization of ownership and finance, and increased importance of R&D and patents.


The period from 1987 to 1991 was weak both regarding the domestic and the export market, but since the 1990s the development is characterized by a steady increase in especially the export market. In 2006 exports accounted for 99 per cent of the sales, see Figure 1. The export from the Danish wind industry was in 2006 27 billion DKK and the wind industry employed more than 21.000 people in Denmark. In 2006 the Danish manufactures sold 5.439 MW power, roughly corresponding to 33 per cent of the global market. If turbine wings and other components are included, the Danish wind industry has a market share of 40 per cent on the global market (Danish Wind Industry Association, 2008).⁹

⁷ The use of wind power for electricity generation is more than 100 years old and goes back to the 1890s, where the Danish meteorologist, inventor, and folk high school principal, Poul la Cour, started experiments converting classical windmills to electricity generation.

⁸ While the Danish wind turbine manufactures, mainly had a background in agricultural machinery, the wind power companies in the US, Sweden, and Germany (e.g. Boeing, Lockheed, Westinghouse, MBB, and Siemens) had a strong background in aircraft and generator manufacturing.

⁹ Up-scaling has been a major characteristics of the wind power production. The early machines produced 25 kW and had a 10.6 metre rotor diameter. Today’s turbines produce 2-4 MW with 90 metre rotor diameter placed on 100-150 metre towers. More and more wind power capacity is produced in wind power parks and in the future more of these will be installed offshore.

Figure 1: Wind turbine sales (Danish manufactures) – MW (1996-2006).



Source: Danish Wind Industry Association (2008)

Energy policy and the demand pull effects

In the first Danish energy plan from 1976 wind power was planned to cover 4 per cent of the total Danish electricity consumption. In the second energy plan (Energy Plan 81) the wind power share was expected to increase to 8 per cent in year 2000. Today (2009) about 20 per cent of the Danish electricity production is covered by wind power. The latest Danish long term energy plan (Energy 2025) states that at least 30 per cent of the electricity production in 2025 should be produced by renewable energy sources with the largest part coming from wind power (especially offshore).¹⁰ While the main arguments for increasing the wind power electricity share in the 1970s and the early 1980s were a question of finding alternatives to nuclear power and securing the energy supply, the wind power strategy today gives a significant role to the required CO₂ reduction.

The dominating energy system is linked to the fossil fuels organizations and techniques with sectorized divisions of heating, power and transmission. As was the case earlier with wind energy and later CHP systems the dominating coal and oil energy regime still makes it difficult for alternative technical systems like biomass and solar energy to overcome the barriers to entry (Hvelplund 2000).

A mixed palette of policy instruments has been introduced to stimulate the Danish wind power production, and we only mention a few here. The utility obligation to buy wind power at 85 per cent of the retail price level was crucial for the wide diffusion of wind

¹⁰ This is in fact a reduced ambition compared to the former energy plan (Energy 2001) aiming at 50 per cent of the energy consumption produced by a palette of different renewable energy sources in 2030. A more ambitious scenario developed by Megavind (a public-private partnership with key actors in the wind power sector) has suggested 50 per cent of the energy consumption supplied by wind power alone.

energy. Another important measure was a 30 per cent subsidy of investments in new wind turbines. The investment subsidy was introduced in 1979, but was gradually reduced until it was abandoned ten years later.¹¹ As an integrated part of the early long term energy plans was the mapping of potential wind power sites based on systematic wind analyses. Since 1985 the Danish government has ordered the utilities to install various amount of wind power and recently, relatively high green taxes on all electricity - but with a partial refund for renewable energy including wind power - has made wind power much more attractive for the power companies.

The regulation regime (feed-in tariffs), where buyers of wind turbines receive a fixed price from the electricity companies and a fixed public service payment for CO₂-free electricity production, has motivated the producers to lower their production prices, as they were in a situation where more wind turbines could be sold if the prices decreased (Hvelplund 2000).

Knowledge infrastructure, knowledge sharing, and interactive learning

It is not possible (or the intention) here to give a full description of the knowledge infrastructure that evolved in relation to the Danish Wind power Innovation System. Only a few key-players are mentioned below.

The establishment of the public wind power test station at Risø Research Laboratory in 1978 turned out to be crucial for the development of the Danish wind power activities in relation to the production, distribution, and regulation of wind power knowledge. To receive the public investment grants a wind turbine type approval from the national laboratory was required. This approval process was an important part of the knowledge development and diffusion both among and between the wind turbine manufactures and the investors, and thus stimulated an interactive learning process. The very strict safety and performance requirements put a persistent pressure on manufactures to upgrade their design and manufacturing skills, and today Risø DTU¹² is among the leading international research institutes on wind turbine technology and wind resource assessment.

Most wind turbine owners are organized in the Danish Wind Turbine Owners' Association that publishes a monthly magazine with production figures and notes on technical issues. The statistical database, user groups, and technical consulting services for members have been important instruments to secure a transparent market based on shared knowledge (Krohn 2000).¹³

The manufacturers of wind turbines have their own organization too – the Danish Wind Industry Association. The organization carries out an extensive information work, makes policy analyses, takes part in standardization activities, and is involved in national and international R&D-activities.¹⁴

In 2006 a new Public-Private Partnership, 'Megavind', was formed in order to formulate a coherent strategy for future innovation activities within wind power technologies.

¹¹ During this period, more than 3000 cooperative wind turbines were installed. Typically, a cooperative wind turbine has between 20 and 40 owners. This means that around 1990, there were between 100,000 and 150,000 owners of wind turbines in Denmark (Hvelplund 2000).

¹² In 2007 Risø merged with The Technical University of Denmark, DTU.

¹³ See www.dkvind.dk for more information.

¹⁴ See www.windpower.org for more information.

Members of the partnership network are key players within the wind industry, energy supply companies, universities, and the Danish Energy Agency.

It seems fair to conclude that knowledge sharing and interactive learning among key players have been (and to a certain extent still are) important characteristics of the Danish Wind Power Innovation System. At the beginning of the industrial development, an “open source strategy” seems to have prevailed for the benefit of the whole system, but it is an open question how today’s tendencies towards patenting and other forms of knowledge protection may influence knowledge sharing and innovation activities in the future.

3.3. Main policy lessons learned from the Danish wind power case

Returning to the proposed seven basic ingredients in innovation policy learning, the following synthesizes major lessons learned from the Danish wind power case.

(a) Forming visions. The various national energy plans have been a key policy instrument to help forming and implementing a vision for a national energy supply system with a relatively high share of renewable energy – especially wind power.¹⁵ But this top-down policy would never have been implemented had it not been for the range of local private and public actors and ‘advocacy coalitions’ pushing and lobbying for increasing production and consumption of renewable energy. The policy process can best be characterized as a combination of bottom-up, top-down processes (Hvelplund 2000).

(b) Developing a system of innovation approach. Since most innovations occur as results of interactive learning processes in complex systems, system building, maintaining and coordination are necessary policy tasks. One of the key factors for the success of the Danish wind power sector is the combination of energy and industrial policy right from the beginning.¹⁶ In retrospect the policies may of course seem more coordinated than they actually were at the time, but the mutual interests and collaboration between domestic key actors within the innovation system have clearly paved the way for learning and capability building.

(c) Establishing new practices and routines in the conduct of policies stimulating learning and innovation. The Danish wind power case shows that synergy can be obtained by a strategic combination of different instruments (market and non-market based). Different policy interventions are required (and are effective) in different stages of the product cycle (see for instance Midttun and Gausten 2007). In the early innovative phase where the risk and uncertainty are high, R&D policies and subsidies in the form of feed-in tariffs are relevant. Later niche market policies as for instance quotas (certificate market) may provide further stimulation for commercialization of renewable energy.

(d) Stimulating regional and local experiments. From an evolutionary point of view creating room for variety is crucial for the innovative dynamics. Quite an amount of experimenting with wind power has been supported during the period and different forms of financial and technical support for test-mills has been tried. An interesting case is the small Danish island of Samsø with 4.000 inhabitants. In 1997 the Danish Energy Agency initiated a national competition between the smaller Danish islands where the winner

¹⁵ The exclusion of nuclear power from the overall Danish energy system paved the way for such alternative energy strategies.

¹⁶ A similar holistic view on energy, environment, innovation and industrial policy is seen in Germany in relation to the fast growing solar energy sector spurred by a subsidized home market.

would be expected to convert all its energy consumption to renewable energy within 10 years. Samsø won the competition and today the island is 100 per cent self-sufficient with wind-generated electricity. About 70 per cent of the heating needs of the island are met with renewable energy, and the transportation energy consumption is 100 per cent compensated by the electricity production from the offshore wind turbines.¹⁷

(e) Institution building. Institution building and institutional learning has all the way characterized the policy learning approach within the wind power case. The long-term energy plans, the establishing of the National Research Centre Risø and the various regulations and standards have been key formal institutions supporting learning and innovation. Of crucial importance for the knowledge generation and diffusion are the more informal institutions in the form of tight collaboration and extensive networking between the key actors in the Wind Power Innovation System, for instance the so-called Wind meetings, publication activities, industry associations, NGOs and various Public-Private Partnerships as the relatively new Megavind partnership. Such formal and informal institutions reduce uncertainty and shape the path of innovation.

(f) Analyzing and comparing systemic features. Systematic monitoring and benchmarking of different performance indicators related to wind power production and consumption has since the very beginning of the wind power growth been an integrated part of the technological, organizational, institutional and policy learning activities. At the national level the Wind Industry Association and the Danish Wind Turbine Owners' Association have both played a key role in institutionalizing the data collection and providing and publishing systematic analyses of the results.

(g) Stimulating democratic participation in the design and implementation of innovation strategies. In a way the whole area has been a testing ground for new forms of democratic participation in technical as well as policy development. Non-governmental organizations and publicly financed local energy offices as well as the traditional consumer owned electricity system have played important roles in the process. Compared to most other countries there has been a broad public acceptance of wind turbine installations around the Danish country and coast sites. The broad social acceptance of the many wind turbines in the landscape is clearly related to a participatory planning process combined with the economic incentives that the government policy has provided for the many wind power owners.¹⁸ At the same time as there is a gradual, interactive process of policy learning in the Danish wind power system one can also identify a contradiction between its local and democratic aspects and the development of international electricity markets. The opening-up of the traditionally rather closed Danish systems threatens some of its interactive learning capabilities.

4. LEARNING FROM HINDSIGHT

Context always matters. In that sense there are of course limitations to what extent it is possible to learn from hindsight.

¹⁷ For more information about this 'controlled experiment', see <http://www.energiakademiet.dk>

¹⁸ Local participation and ownership is a key factor for the success of the Samsø project mentioned above.

First, the liberalisation and internationalisation of the energy sector implies that the framework conditions for developing new energy technologies are quite different than when the wind energy industry took off 20-30 years back. Various private actors have entered the energy scene and a prevailing market oriented policy and regulation regime implies that the creation and regulation of the energy markets in general is governed by more short-term economic rationalities.

Second, increasing globalisation implies that companies also within the energy industry (companies developing, producing and selling products and technologies for energy production) today experience more fierce international competition than many small and medium sized companies did 20 years back.

Third, knowledge creation and technology development is becoming more international. Danish companies, for instance, collaborate not only with domestic universities but increasingly also with foreign companies and research institutes, including setting up research centres outside their home country.

Fourth, the institutional setting for knowledge production and knowledge sharing has also changed due to an increasing focus on IPR in private companies and public universities.

Fifth, international policies in the form of EU regulations and international energy, climate and environment policies today play a much more important role as key drivers for the increasing demand for sustainable energy solutions today than 20 years back when energy policy primarily was a national (domestic) matter.

These and related factors mean that the conditions for developing new energy technologies have changed significantly since the wind energy ‘adventure’ started. Despite such changed framework conditions, we argue that important policy insights can be drawn from the Danish wind energy case in order to get a better understanding of what policy initiatives are necessary to stimulate innovation and business opportunities within currently new and emerging renewable energy areas. Seen from a policy perspective there are important similarities between the various renewable energy areas. Despite liberalisation processes, energy is still a highly regulated area, and regardless of growing importance of international policies national energy and innovation policies still matters a lot. New and emerging energy technologies all have to be integrated in an overall energy system and thus compete with prevailing oil and coal regimes. Supplementing the ‘usual suspects’ (firms, research organisations and government) in innovation system analysis, energy technology based innovation systems include a multifaceted group of actors as NGOs, energy companies with different ownership structure, and individual idealists investing and experimenting with different technological solutions. There are some new policy instruments (CO₂ quotas for example) but the basic toolbox including administrative regulation and economic incentives are still intact.¹⁹

In the following we use solar energy as an analogous example to wind energy, but in principle similar “exercises” can be made for biomass, hydrogen, wave energy, etc. - keeping in mind that the dynamics and conditions of innovation are sensitive to the specific technology areas as well as to the market conditions.

Solar energy technology includes thermal Solar Hot Water systems and electricity producing Photovoltaics (PV). Here we focus on the latter. Solar energy still contributes only with a very tiny share of the world energy production. However, the global potential for solar energy is very high. It is estimated that “about one hour sunshine on the surface of

¹⁹ More relevant similarities may be added.

the earth corresponds to the present annual global energy consumption” (Ahm 2007). The price per kWh solar energy is currently relatively high, but is expected to fall in the future and reach a competitive level within the next 8-10years.²⁰

Japan, US and Europe currently constitute the world lead producers and users of solar energy. In a Danish context the solar cells area is only in an emerging stage with relative few actors. The main potential area of application is Building Integrated PV systems (BIPV) and electricity grid connected systems. Currently, the Danish solar energy industry has some strongholds within various niche products, for instance transformers, crystalline silicon for solar cells, BIPV elements and solar energy systems. Danish universities, research institutes and technological institutes are active within especially the so-called 3rd generation solar cells.²¹ Also the Danish electricity sector and electricity consumers show increasing interests for solar energy, but despite the growing public interests and promising export markets (especially to Germany and Japan) solar energy is not given priority in the newest national energy strategy (Borup et al. 2007).

If the Danish society and Danish industry are to realize the energy and business potentials in solar energy it is necessary to initiate a much more proactive and direct policy learning process including:

(a) *Forming visions.* As mentioned above, solar energy is not currently prioritized in the Danish energy strategy (Energy Strategy 2025). However, a policy strategy with clear ambitious and concrete minimum goals for production and diffusion of solar energy is needed. A concrete strategy and long-term plan reduces uncertainty and risk related to the future state of solar energy in the Danish energy production, and thus guides the direction and stimulates private and public investments in developing future solar cell based solutions.

(b) *Developing a system of innovation approach.* A much stronger coordination of energy policy, innovation policy and industrial policy is necessary if a Danish solar energy innovation system is to evolve into an important player in the Danish energy system and economy. Current it is very small and scattered with only a few actors operating in a few niches.

(c) *Establishing new practices and routines in the conduct of policies stimulating learning and innovation.* The domestic application of solar cells in Denmark is very limited. Only very few private and public buildings have solar cells. In the 1990s and early 2000s a few development programmes (SOL-300, SOL-1000) were established in order to ensure strategic learning from application and experiments. The earlier solar energy programmes did initiate creation of new knowledge and innovation within specific areas – especially system design, modules, inverters, BIPV, and architecture. Currently no such programmes exist.

“Apart from the R&D funding there is in practice little policy support and innovation-oriented regulation efforts. A net account system where owners of grid-connected household installations only pay tax for their net consumption of electricity from the grid, has only recently been established permanently – more than 10 years after the first grid

²⁰ The learning curve for solar energy shows a learning rate of 20% meaning a cost reduction of 20% every time the energy production volume is doubled.

²¹ Within the 1st generation (Silicon-based crystalline cells) and 2nd generation (thin-film cells) Denmark has a relative weak international position. Within the 3rd generation (PhotoElectro-Chemical (PEC) and polymer solar cells there are some niche potentials for Danish research and industry.

connected installations. For larger installations, a feed-in tariff system ensures a minimum price for the produced electricity. This is however of little practical importance as the tariff is too small to make a significant difference in the economy of the installations. All in all, the need integration and innovative drive through support of market formation are currently very limited and stand completely in the shadow of the efforts in Germany and other countries. The recently renewed general building code increases the requirements to the energy performance of new buildings. This has led to new innovative activities by architects, amongst them integration of solar cells in some cases.” (Borup et al. 2008)

Special - yet unfolded - opportunities for stimulating learning and innovation is using public technological procurement as a much more active policy tool. For instance if stronger regulations and economic incentives to make experiments with solar cell technologies was demanded in connection to new public buildings (offices and institutions) and renovation of existing (roofs, windows, walls, etc.). Such policy could generate more domestic full-scale demonstration projects and develop “show cases” for potential export concurrently with reduced energy consumption.²²

(d) Stimulation regional and local experiments. Room for variety is crucial for innovation, but today only few local experiments with different technological solutions take place compared to for instance Germany, Japan, and US. A few exceptions exist – for instance initiated by EnergiMidt (consumer owned energy company), a couple of Danish municipalities (e.g. Copenhagen, Herning, Tønder), and Nordic Folkecenter for Renewable Energy. Public programmes opening up for local experiments with different solutions combined with knowledge sharing between users, producers and researchers are needed. It is furthermore important that such programmes have an adequate timeframe and not implemented as stop-go policy.

(e) Institution building. Recently (2008), the Danish PV sector has joint forces in ‘Danish Solar Cell Association’ in order to improve the framework conditions for solar cell research, production and diffusion in Denmark. The vision of the association is that solar cells should count for 5 % of the total Danish energy consumption in 2020. Creation of such formal and informal forums and networks for knowledge sharing (and lobbying) is decisive for learning and innovation. Based on the experiences from the wind power sector, institutions supporting a broader interaction between solar cell producers and public and private ‘consumers’ should be established as well. Today, only few educational programmes incorporate solar energy as an issue. It is thus necessary to strengthen education (on all levels) within solar cell issues.

(f) Analyzing and comparing systemic features. International (not least German) benchmarking initiatives of various solar cell products, systems and techniques already exists and support for connected Danish initiatives would clearly stimulate diffusion of solar cells in a Danish setting as well.

(g) Stimulating democratic participation in the design and implementation of innovation strategies. According to Eurobarometer (2007) 95% of the Danish population is in favour of solar energy although only very few actually have solar cell energy as part of their energy consumption. Within renewable energy including solar energy NGOs play an important role for providing information and initiating debates and local experiments with solar energy.

²² In a very recent public funded ‘renovation package’ for private houses such opportunities are not fully ‘cashed in’. The public support is primarily spent in order to increase short-term employment in the construction sector with only small side effects on the energy technology innovation and consumption.

Summing up, a broad mix of demand-pull and technology-push policies is necessary, *if* solar energy should develop into a ‘serious’ contributor to Danish energy production and at the same time generate future business opportunities for Danish companies.

5. CONCLUSION

The high degree of diversity between different energy technology areas implies that an effectual innovation and energy policy has to take into account these differences. The policy has to reflect the variation in maturity of both markets and technology. In areas like solar cells, where the Danish market is still emerging, qualified demand – for instance in the form of strategic public procurement - is central for the technology to develop further. In other words, new emerging energy technologies and energy systems as for instance solar energy requires public support stimulating both the supply and demand side in order to be competitive with established fossil fuel technologies.

Continued innovation requires variety with room for experimentation and evaluation of alternative solutions to technological, organizational, institutional problems. Creating and utilizing such ‘interactive learning spaces’ (Arocena and Sutz, 2000) is driven by a combination of innovative framework conditions at the system level and entrepreneurial ‘fiery souls’ at the individual level.

Maintaining a long-term, pro-active policy with specific and ambitious targets for implementing renewable energy systems is essential. Development of new energy technologies takes place in a context of high technological and market uncertainty. Such uncertainty can be reduced by a long-term combination of a visionary innovation and energy policy. Stop-and-go finance of for instance R&D projects, demonstrations projects and subsidies are often contra-productive.

In the Danish public policy debate, the Danish wind energy ‘adventure’ has often been highlighted as a success case to follow for other industries. However, the fact, that the Danish wind energy success reflects a long-time co-evolution of technological, economic, political, and institutional elements, makes it a complex matter to draw clear-cut lessons and apply these to other areas. A policy learning approach may be a helpful tool as a starting point.

References

- Ahm, P. (2008), *Photovoltaic Power Systems (IEA-PVPS) National Survey Report of PV Power Applications in Denmark in 2007*, International Energy Agency.
- Arocena, R. and Sutz, J. (2000), "Interactive Learning Spaces and Development Policies in Latin America", *DRUID Working Paper 13/2000*.
- Asheim, B. and Gertler, M. S. (2005), "The Geography of Innovation: Regional Innovation Systems", in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. and Nelson, R. R. (eds) (2005), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford, OUP: 291-317.
- Borup, M., Dannemand Andersen, P., Jacobsson, S. and Atle Midttun, A. (2008), *Nordic energy innovation systems - Patterns of need integration and cooperation*, Nordic Energy Research.
- Borup, M., Gregersen, B. & Madsen, A. N. (2007), "Development dynamics and conditions for new energy technology seen in an innovation system perspective", Paper presented at the DRUID Conference, June 2007.
- Breschi, S. and Malerba, F. (1997), "Sectoral Innovation Systems: Technological Regimes, Schumpeterian Dynamics, and Spatial Boundaries", in Edquist, C. (ed.) (1997), *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*, London: Pinter: 130-56.
- Carlsson, B. and R. Stankiewicz, R. (1995), "On the Nature, Function and Composition of Technological Systems", in Carlsson, B. (ed.) (1995), *Technological Systems and Economic Performance*, Dordrecht, Kluwer.
- Cooke, O. (2001), "Regional Innovation Systems, Clusters, and the Knowledge Economy", *Industrial and Corporate Change*, 10(4):945-74.
- Dannemand Andersen, P. (1993), *En analyse af den teknologiske innovation i Dansk vindmølleindustri – herunder Prøvestationen for Vindmøllers dobbeltrolle som forskningsinstitution og godkendende myndighed*, Samfundslitteratur, Copenhagen.
- Edquist, C. (2005). "Systems of Innovation: Perspectives and Challenges", in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. and Nelson, R. R. (eds) (2005), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford, OUP: 181-208.
- Edquist, C. (ed.) (1997), *Systems of Innovation: Technologies, Institutions and Organizations*, London: Pinter.
- Energistyrelsen (2003), *Solceller - Oplæg til en national strategi for forskning, udvikling og demonstration*.
- Equist, C., Hommen, L., Johnson, B. lemola, T., Malerba, F., Reiss, T. and Smith, K. (2008), "The ISE Policy Statement – The Innovation Policy Implications of the 'Innovation Systems and European Integration' (ISE) Research Project, on Texier, F. (CD-ROM prod.), *ISE- Innovation Systems and European Integration*. ISE (Innovation Systems and European Integration) a research project fundet by the Targeted Socio-Economic Research (TSER) program of the European Commission (DG XII) under the Fourth Framework Program, European Commission (Contract no. SOE1-CT95-1004, DGXII-SOLS)
- Foxon et al. (2005), "UK innovation Systems for new and renewable energy technologies: drivers, barriers and systems failures", *Energy Policy* 33, 2123-2137.
- Freeman, C. (1987), *Technology Policy and Economic Performance: Lessons from Japan*, London, Pinter.
- Geels, F.W and Kemp, R. (2007), "Dynamics in socio-technical systems: Typology of change processes and contrasting case studies", *Technology in Society*, 29(4), 441-55.
- Gregersen, B and Johnson, B. (1998): "European Integration and National Systems of Innovation" on Texier, F. (CD-ROM prod.), *ISE- Innovation Systems and European Integration*. ISE (Innovation Systems and European Integration) a research project fundet by the Targeted Socio-

- Economic Research (TSER) program of the European Commission (DG XII) under the Fourth Framework Program, European Commission (Contract no. SOE1-CT95-1004, DGXII-SOLS)
- Gregersen, B. and Johnson, B. (1997), "Learning Economies, Innovation Systems and European Integration", *Regional Studies*, Vol 31 no 5.
- Gregersen, B. and Johnson, B. (2008), "A Policy Learning Perspective on Developing Sustainable Energy Technologies", Paper presented at the 6th Globelics Conference on "New insights for understanding innovation and competence building for sustainable development and social justice, Mexico City, September 22-24, 2008.
- Hekkert, M.P. and Negro, S.O. (2009), "Functions of innovation systems as a framework to understand sustainable technological change: Empirical evidence for earlier claims", *Technological Forecasting & Social Change*, 76: 584-94.
- Hvelplund, F. (2000), Danish Energy Policy at a Turning Point – Renewable Energy between Innovative Democracy and Oligopolistic "Liberalization", Institute for Development and Planning, Aalborg University.
- Jacobsson, S. and Lauber, V. (2006), "The politics and policy of energy system transformation – explaining the German diffusion of renewable energy technology", *Energy Policy* 34, 256-276.
- Jacobsson, Staffan & Anna Bergek 2004, "Transforming the energy sector, the evolution of technological systems in renewable energy technology", in *Industrial and Corporate Change*, vol. 13, no. 5, pp.815-849.
- Johansen, L. (1977), *Lectures on macroeconomic planning, 1. General aspects*. North Holland.
- Johnson, B. (1997). 'Implications of a system of innovation perspective on innovation policy in Denmark', unpublished paper produced within the *ISE (Innovation Systems and European Integration) research project*, (TSER Programme) coordinated by Charles Edquist.
- Jørgensen, U. and Karnøe, P. (1995), "The Danish wind-turbine story: technical solutions to political visions?" in Rip, A., Misa, T., Schot, J. (Eds.), *Managing Technology in Society; the Approach of Constructive Technology Assessment*, Pinter, London.
- Kamp, L.M. et al. (2004), "Notions on learning applied to wind turbine development in the Netherlands and Denmark", *Energy Policy*, 32, 1625-1637.
- Karnøe, P. (1991), *Dansk vindmølleindustri – en overraskende international succes; om innovationer, industriudvikling og teknologipolitik*, Samfundslitteratur, Copenhagen.
- Kemp, R. (1994), "Technology and the Transition to Environmental Sustainability. The Problem of Technological Regime Shifts", *Futures* 26(10): 1023-46.
- Kemp, R. and Rotmans, J. (2005), "The Management of the Co-Evolution of Technical, Environmental and Social Systems" in Weber, M. & Hemmelskamp, J. (eds.) (2005), *Towards Environmental Innovation Systems*, Springer.
- Kemp, R. and Weehuizen, R. (2005), *Policy Learning: What does it mean and how can we study it?*, PUBLIN project (Innovation in the Public Sector), NIFU STEP, Oslo.
- Krohn, S. (1999), "Danish wind turbines: an industrial success story", Danish Wind Turbine Manufacturers Association.
- Krohn, S. (2000), "The wind turbine market in Denmark", Danish Wind Turbine Manufacturers Association.
- Lipp, J. (2007), "Lessons for effective renewable electricity policy from Denmark, Germany and the United Kingdom", *Energy Policy* 35, 5481-5495.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. (ed.) (1992), *National Systems of Innovation. Towards a Theory of Innovation and Interactive Learning*, London, Pinter.

- Lundvall, B.-Å. and Borràs S. (1999), *The Globalising Learning Economy: Implications for Innovation Policy*, Brussels, DG XII.
- Lundvall, B.-Å. and Borràs, S. (2005), "Science, Technology, and Innovation Policy" in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. and Nelson, R.R. (eds.) (2005), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford University Press.
- Malerba, F. (2002), "Sectoral Systems of Innovation and Production", *Research Policy* 31(2): 247-64.
- Malerba, F. (2005), "Sectoral Systems: How and why innovation differs across sectors", in Fagerberg, J., Mowery, D.C. and Nelson, R. R. (eds) (2005), *The Oxford Handbook of Innovation*, Oxford, OUP: 380-406.
- Meadowcroft, J. (2007), "Planning for sustainable development: insights from the literatures of political science", *European Journal of Political Research* 31: 427-54.
- Midttun, A. and Gautesen, K. (2007), "Feed in or certificates, competition or complementarity? Combining a static efficiency and a dynamic innovation perspective on the greening of the energy industry", *Energy Policy* 35, 1419-1422.
- Mytelka, L. K. and Smith, K. (2002), "Policy learning and innovation theory: an interactive and co-evolving process", *Research Policy*, Vol. 31, 1467-1479.
- Nelson, R. R. (ed.) (1993), *National Systems of Innovation: A Comparative Study*, Oxford, OUP.
- Remmen, A. (1999), *Greening of industry – technical and institutional change*, Aalborg University.
- Sabatier, Paul. A. (1993) Policy Change over a Decade or More, in Paul A. Sabatier and Hank Jenkins-Smith (eds.) *Policy Change and Learning. An Advocacy Coalition Approach*, Boulder: Westview Press, 13-39.
- Smit, T. et al. (2007), "Technological learning in offshore wind energy: Different roles of the government", *Energy Policy* 35, 6431-6444.
- Smith, K. (2008), "The challenge of environmental technology: promoting radical innovation in conditions of lock-in", Report to the Garnaut Commission: Final Draft.
- Szarka, J. (2006), "Wind power, policy learning and paradigm change", *Energy Policy* 34, 3041-3048.