

STAVRIANAKIS, K., NIELSEN, J. and MORRISON, Z. 2023. Public perception and acceptance of CCUS: preliminary findings of a qualitative case study in Greece. *Open research Europe* [online], 3, article number 205, [version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.16663.2>

Public perception and acceptance of CCUS: preliminary findings of a qualitative case study in Greece.

STAVRIANAKIS, K., NIELSEN, J. and MORRISON, Z.

2023



CASE STUDY

REVISED **Public perception and acceptance of CCUS: preliminary findings of a qualitative case study in Greece [version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]**

Kostas Stavrianakis , Jacob Nielsen, Zoe Morrison

ABERDEEN BUSINESS SCHOOL, Robert Gordon University, Aberdeen, Scotland, UK

V2 First published: 21 Nov 2023, 3:205
<https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.16663.1>
 Latest published: 13 Feb 2024, 3:205
<https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.16663.2>

Abstract

The development and implementation of carbon capture, utilisation and storage (CCUS) technologies plays an increasingly important part in European Union (EU) and global decarbonisation policies and strategies that seek to address climate change to achieve the Paris Agreement goals. Several studies have shown the important role social acceptance plays in determining the outcomes of CCUS projects and how social acceptance is shaped by the national and local contexts. Yet most studies on CCUS and social acceptance have focused on countries in northern Europe and North America despite the increasing numbers of CCUS projects in other regions of the world. This study seeks to help address this gap by conducting a case study on how local dynamics shaped people's acceptance and awareness of CCUS in a Greek community. Based on semi-structured interviews with six community members near a CCUS pilot plant, this single case study explores the factors and dynamics that shaped the interviewees' perceptions of CCUS technologies. Our findings indicate that, despite the low level of awareness of CCUS technologies, participants could draw on their situated knowledge to identify potential drawbacks with their application. We identified scepticism regarding the adoption of new technologies and the organisations involved based on past experiences, and a notable lack provision of technology and location-specific information as well public engagement by the project consortium. Our recommendations for future projects and community engagement include the early involvement of the public in project development, location-based transparent information, appropriate channels to facilitate knowledge exchange, and educational initiatives to build communities' capability to influence projects.

Open Peer Review

Approval Status ? X ?

	1	2	3
version 2 (revision) 13 Feb 2024		X view	
version 1 21 Nov 2023	? view	X view	? view

1. **Paul Upham**, University of Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

2. **Christian Oltra**, Centro Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas, Madrid, Spain

3. **Dimitrios Xenias** , Cardiff University, Cardiff, UK

Any reports and responses or comments on the article can be found at the end of the article.

Keywords

Carbon capture, Utilization, Storage, Climate change, Greece, acceptance, public, qualitative, case study



This article is included in the [Horizon 2020](#) gateway.



This article is included in the [Carbon Reduction, \(Re\)use, and Removal Technologies and Practices](#) collection.

Corresponding author: Kostas Stavrianakis (K.STAVRIANAKIS@RGU.AC.UK)

Author roles: **Stavrianakis K:** Conceptualization, Formal Analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project Administration, Visualization, Writing – Original Draft Preparation, Writing – Review & Editing; **Nielsen J:** Methodology, Writing – Review & Editing; **Morrison Z:** Funding Acquisition, Supervision, Writing – Review & Editing

Competing interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Grant information: This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement No 101022484 (CarbOn Neutral cluSters through Electricity-based iNnovations in Capture, Utilisation and Storage [ConsenCUS]).

The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Copyright: © 2024 Stavrianakis K *et al.* This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

How to cite this article: Stavrianakis K, Nielsen J and Morrison Z. **Public perception and acceptance of CCUS: preliminary findings of a qualitative case study in Greece [version 2; peer review: 2 approved with reservations, 1 not approved]** Open Research Europe 2024, 3:205 <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.16663.2>

First published: 21 Nov 2023, 3:205 <https://doi.org/10.12688/openreseurope.16663.1>

REVISED Amendments from Version 1

Based on the reviewers helpful and constructive comments, we have made the following amendments to the manuscript:

In lines 108–112 we have added further information on the proposed pilot project, as well as included a YouTube link for the video discussed in the methods, that is in line 172.

We have added further justification for the small number of interviews and further explanation on the explorative nature of this case study in lines 151–154, 160–165 and we have also added more participants' characteristics as requested by a reviewer, lines 203–206.

We have renamed one of our themes from "Knowledge|" to "Knowledge and concerns" as suggested by one of the reviewers.

As per the suggestion of two of the reviewers we bolstered the role of "trust" and "previous experiences" in our findings section., lines 457–464.

Any further responses from the reviewers can be found at the end of the article

Introduction

Technology development and implementation plays an increasing role in climate change policy and initiatives. Both the United Nations (UN) and the European Union (EU) have emphasized the use of technological advancements for reaching their climate goals. For example, the UN established the "Technology Mechanism" in 2010 with the scope of advancing climate technologies and transferring expertise, and large parts of the EU's flagship research and innovation programme "Horizon 2020" support technological advancements in climate change technologies. Companies and corporations are in the "hunt" for decarbonisation as their products and activities often contribute to the increase of greenhouse gases, contributing to climate change. Alongside governmental organisations, the private sector places emphasis on the deployment of technological advancements to reduce both their environmental and social impacts (Bokka & Lau, 2023; Krzywdzinski, 2019; Seemungal *et al.*, 2021).

Carbon capture, utilisation and storage (CCUS) has received increased support as a decarbonisation solution and climate change mitigation technology. Main greenhouse gas emitters such as the UK, EU, US, and China have put in place a range of policies and schemes that support the development and implementation of CCUS in order to meet their climate targets (Friedmann *et al.*, 2020; Matschoss & Repo, 2018; Yang *et al.*, 2019; Zhang *et al.*, 2016).

In the debates around whether and how to develop and implement CCUS much of the focus has been on the role that scientists, organisations and governments play (Bowen, 2011; Haszeldine, 2009; Mace *et al.*, 2007). However, it is increasingly recognised that it is necessary to take account of social acceptance through the implementation of relevant policies. The focus on social acceptance is partly due to how projects in the past have been cancelled due to community resistance, but it also stems from a concern with preventing adverse outcomes for local communities (Anderson *et al.*, 2012; Reiner *et al.*, 2006; Shackley *et al.*, 2009; Wong-Parodi & Ray, 2009).

Scholars have therefore pointed out that to ensure just and effective outcomes of climate change initiatives it is necessary to understand the dynamics that inform public acceptance and awareness (Upham *et al.*, 2022; Williams *et al.*, 2021).

Social acceptance of new technologies is deeply embedded in social dynamics and influenced by multi-dimensional political, educational, social, economic, cultural, and historical factors. To understand social acceptance, it is therefore necessary to examine it in relation to a complex and changing local context (Bertsch *et al.*, 2016; Krupnik *et al.*, 2022; Sovacool & Ratan, 2012; Wüstenhagen *et al.*, 2007), whilst also recognising that local contexts are shaped by wider national and global dynamics (Burawoy *et al.*, 2000). Despite this, most previous research on social acceptance is based on studies from a limited number of countries mainly located in Northern Europe or North America (Nielsen *et al.*, 2022). This is perhaps not surprising given that many of the initial CCUS projects took place in these regions, however there are increasingly new CCUS projects being implemented in other parts of the world, including in many EU member states in South Europe. Given the importance of the local context and how that context is shaped by national and global factors it is therefore necessary to examine wider sets of experiences to gain a broader and more fine-grained understanding of the dynamics that shape social acceptance of CCUS projects.

Furthermore, it is important to consider the specifics of the technologies and how generic terms like "wind energy" or "CCUS" refer to clusters of diverse technological constellations, constituent parts of which may have different implications for social acceptance (Hmielowski *et al.*, 2019; Lin *et al.*, 2007). Most research on CCUS has so far focused on the social acceptance of specific storage technologies, perhaps because much of the initial resistance to CCUS was centred around storage sites. However, CCUS includes a range of different technologies with different environmental and social implications that could each create different sets of perceptions and reactions from the public. It should not be assumed that resistance to CCUS will only occur in relation to one aspect of the technologies.

To address the above gap concerning the different aspects of CCUS technologies in a location where the social dimensions of CCUS has been inadequately studied, this study is a preliminary exploration of public perceptions and awareness of CCUS technologies within a Greek context, focusing on a rural area where a pilot project has been scheduled to operate through a 4 year long EU funded project. The pilot plant will be adjacent to an industrial plant that operates in the area, and the goal of the pilot is to capture part of the carbon dioxide emitted by the industrial plant. Despite the pilot plant only capturing carbon dioxide, this study expands social acceptance to carbon utilisation and carbon storage as well to include the different societal, environmental, and economical dimensions of CCUS technologies.

Greece is one of the EU member countries that has received little attention regarding public perceptions and CCUS.

Anecdotal evidence suggests that, since the early 2000s, universities and research institutes in Greece have been experimenting with the development of carbon capture and storage (CCS) technologies through EU-funded projects. This may add to confusion locally as terms for CCS and CCUS are often used interchangeably with little explanation. We have identified only limited understanding of public perceptions and social acceptance of CCS/CCUS in Greece. For example, Pietzner *et al.* (2011), Koukouzas *et al.* (2022) and Sprengel *et al.* (2022) have looked at Greece in tandem with other EU citizens, but not as a distinct entity and not in relation to a specific project. There have been studies on social acceptance of technologies such as windfarms and solar panels in Greece (Botetzagias *et al.*, 2015; Kontogianni *et al.*, 2014; Stigka *et al.*, 2014; Tsantopoulos *et al.*, 2014). However, CCUS technologies are often used in different contexts and can be integrated with hard to abate industries. This also means that to understand the dynamics that shape social acceptance of CCUS in Greece it is necessary to examine the specifics of these technologies.

Greece, therefore, makes an important case study for understanding the relationship between the implementation and development of CCUS and social acceptance. For one, given how CCUS are likely to play an increasing role in the Greek decarbonisation strategy it is important to understand the dynamics that shape local Greek social acceptance in relation to CCUS projects. Furthermore, by looking at case studies from understudied areas like Greece we can broaden our general understanding of how local and national dynamics shape social acceptance. Finally, our paper will examine social acceptance in relation to a specific CCUS project where, despite carbon capture being the main focus, to have a complete understanding it is also important to consider the implications carbon capture and utilisation could have in the local community.

Methods

Research design

To get a richer understanding of the phenomenon of CCUS perceptions we followed a single case study design (Creswell, 2013; Yin, 2009) focusing on community experiences, knowledge, and acceptance of CCUS. A single case study design was chosen as it satisfies Yin's (2009) five rationales; 1) theoretical perspective, 2) extreme cases, 3) capturing a revelatory case, 4) access to a previously inaccessible case, and 5) the longitudinal nature of the case. In more detail, this embedded single case study is exploring the phenomenon of social perceptions and acceptance towards CCUS technologies in a rural Greek community (Yin, 2009). As this study is part of a bigger project that aims to inform the European Union on CCUS policy matters, we have employed an instrumental approach to our case study as our inquiry is based on that final product of policy writing (Stake, 1995). We do not seek to generalize to the wider public, but to have a better understanding of the specific subunits we engaged with (Stake, 1995; Yin, 2009).

Case context-phenomenon

The phenomenon explored in this case study is the role of CCUS technologies in addressing industrial emitted carbon dioxide (CO₂) in a small town in a mainly agricultural area of rural Greece. As with all case studies, it is important to define the boundaries of the case study including the sources of data and defining the unit of analysis (Merriam & Tisdell, 2015).

The spatial boundaries where the phenomenon takes place are small town in Greece the surrounding villages. One of the project's industrial partners operates in the area, and a pilot CCUS project will be installed on their premises for demonstrative purposes. The purpose of the pilot project is to demonstrate the capture process of CO₂ from the company's flue gas by testing the project's innovative technologies. Once captured the CO₂ will be released back in the atmosphere, as there are no plans to storage or transport the captured CO₂ at this point of the project. The pseudonym of "Schatz GMBH" has been given to the industrial partner for this study. It is important to note that the area and the regional residents' living there, have been previously disrupted by the operations of an ore mining company, but not the mining company of this project. In the past regional and national protests have taken place to show the public's opposition towards the company's operations due to health and environmental degradation concerns in relation to extraction techniques and natural resources exploitation. For the purposes of this paper, this company is identified as "Ore Extraction Limited".

The industrial partner's commercial activities are in the mining industry and the development of products for use in industries such as iron and steel, nutrition, industrial and manufacturing, as well as mining and metallurgy. The company has been active in the area for more than five decades with a continuous presence in the mining history of the area.

Both the factory and the mining operations of the company are located in a settlement that did not exist prior to the mining activities. The settlement was built around those activities with workers moving from nearby villages closer to the factory by building houses leading to the development of this settlement. Today the local community is well integrated with the mining activities as most of the people living in the area are employed in this facility.

The company takes pride in their sustainability and societal initiatives for which they have received multiple awards and participated in several EU-funded sustainability projects. The current project that the company is a partner of, is another example of the initiatives that the company has taken to promote more environmentally friendly actions within their operations.

A substantial percentage of the company's carbon emissions is a result of the kiln operations that are an essential part of its manufacturing process. For the company to be compliant

with EU and national regulations and directives, including the European Union Emission Trading Scheme¹ (EU ETS), they need to find a solution to decrease their carbon emissions.

Data collection and analysis

When conducting research in a social setting that the researchers are not members of, it is important that the researcher gains the social acceptance of the community and identifies him/her-self (Gillham, 2000). To this end, one of the authors (KS) spent an extended amount of time in the community and throughout this time he established connections and befriended members of the local community. Despite the researcher not being from the area, he had knowledge of prior resistance to industrial activities in the area due to environmental and health concerns associated with the extraction of gold. He is a native speaker of the Greek language, and that allowed him to approach individuals that were more confident discussing CCUS matters in the Greek language, as well as pick nuances in the discussions that were linguistically particular to the Greek language.

Semi-structured interviews

To gain the necessary in-depth description of the phenomenon a series of semi-structured interviews were conducted with members of the local community (Creswell & Clark, 2017; Gillham, 2000). We followed a convenience sampling approach within the spatial boundaries of this case study. We used a semi-ethnographic approach (Van Damme, 2019 #17463) in an effort to immerse ourselves in the community. The author KS, also collaborated with the local school -and this will be discussed in another study, -again in an effort to immerse himself in the local society and learn more from them. Participants were recruited through informal discussions and putting up posters for an upcoming community event in relation to this EU funded project. Data collection spanned from November 2021 to January 2023. During this time the study site was visited three times and interviews were conducted at different times. The purpose of the interviews was to gain an understanding of participants' awareness of CCUS technologies and how they perceived their application in their local context. As this is a case study, the scope of the participants' insights is not to generalize their perspectives to the wider society, but to rather explore their own views and experiences with the proposed Carbon Capture facility (Hammersley *et al.*, 2000 #17449). The purpose of the interviews is to understand why participants have certain opinions and perspectives about

the pilot CCUS facility and how those opinions are shaped (Yin, 2009 #1707(Cobern & Adams, 2020 #17450)9).

Prior to conducting the interviews participants were provided with a study information sheet, explaining the purpose of the study and their role as participants. Additionally, a consent form (both Greek and English versions were available) were provided to the participants to sign confirming their participation and comprehension of the ethical dimensions of their participation. This study has received ethical approval from Aberdeen Business School Research Ethics Committee at Robert Gordon University on the 10th May 2022.

To initiate the discussion, a 3-minute video² was shown to the participants. The video was produced by the communication team of this CCUS project as a communication tool to the wider public, and it was the main mode of communication about the project.

The content of the video covered the aims of this current CCUS project as well as the promotion of CCUS as a decarbonisation strategy to reach net zero. The input of this study's researchers to the video was minimal. To supplement the video the researcher provided some extra context in relation to potentially important issues such as CO₂ transport and usage of resources such as water and energy.

In total five interviews with six members of the public were conducted exploring the role of CCUS as a decarbonisation strategy and the installation of such technologies in their area. All interviews were conducted by the author KS. The interviews had an average duration of 45 minutes and were audio-recorded and later transcribed verbatim. Four of the interviews conducted were one-to-one interviewer and interviewee and one was a dyadic interview (Polak & Green, 2016). Each individual was interviewed only once.

As four of the interviews were conducted in Greek and not all members of the research team spoke and comprehended the Greek language, it was essential that the interviews were translated into English for the analysis. The translation was done by one of the researchers, KS, who is bilingual in both English and Greek. Both Fersch (2013) and Filep (2009) have discussed the complications and necessary strategies in regard to translating interviews for analysis. We followed their recommendations for translating proverbs (Filep, 2009) and considered the implications of our translation in the analysis of the interviews (Fersch, 2013).

The translated transcription text was entered in a qualitative data analysis software, and thematic analysis followed. To conduct the thematic analysis, we followed Braun and Clarke's (2012) six-phase approach including data familiarisation, generation of initial coding, themes identification, themes review, theme naming, and report production. The coding was done both inductively and deductively considering both the data derived from the interviews, as well as from pertinent literature.

¹ It is important to note that the company is registered with the EU ETS. EU ETS refers to an EU wide mechanism that monitors and trades carbon emissions that are a result of industrial activities such as aviation, power stations, oil refineries, cement factories and oil and steel production. The EU ETS operates under a "cap and trade" foundation, where an allowance limit is set on greenhouse emissions per industrial company, and this maximum allowance is then converted to trading emission allowances (Commission, 2021; Teixidó *et al.*, 2019). If companies exceed their emissions allowance, then they can buy additional allowances at a cost that is determined by the carbon market. To abate those emissions and avoid paying for extra allowances, the company needs to find solutions to reduce their carbon emissions, and CCUS is part of that effort.

² <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=Ao5gI1ZNlic&t=9s>

The first author did the initial coding which was later refined with the input of the other two authors. (Burrows & Kendall, 1997).

Results

As the community where this case study took place is small and to protect the interviewees' identities a minimal amount of participants' demographics will be shared. From the sixth people interviewed three were female and three were male. They were all residents in the area working in different sectors of the local economy e.g. education, food and beverage, agriculture, and tourism. Their ages varied from the mid-thirties to late forties. Individual participants will be distinguished below with their pseudonym initials in brackets, i.e. [T] for Tim, [A] for Alex, [P] for Peter, [J] for John, [O] for Olga and [M] for Mariah. We present our findings here within the three themes identified in our data, namely: Knowledge and Concerns, Societal Context, and Technology. It is important to note that although the themes are presented below on an individual basis, the intersections amongst them is the novelty of the paper. As an example, knowledge and concerns cannot be isolated from previous experiences, as discussed within the societal context theme.

Theme 1: Knowledge and concerns

Before being shown the project video, the participants had little awareness of CCUS technologies.

[O]: "I didn't know anything before I saw this particular video and I hadn't heard of it [CCUS] before, I just heard about it at some point, it may be that I saw an advertisement on TV about it".

Once provided with some basic information about CCUS through the video, participants were able to draw on their knowledge to critically examine and identify the local implications the technology could have on natural resources, agriculture, tourism, health, and transport.

There were some concerns about the use of natural resources in connection with the implementation of CCUS, particularly the existential need for water and in terms of supporting the agricultural industry that relied on access to water resources.

[T]: "For the mines that already using water for the mining activity. So, we'll need extra water in order to separate this thing. That means more resources for the mines water, uh, resources of the region will be used... sorry, but the water, what somebody water is the basic, uh, biological need for life. I mean, is the, the, the, the number one thing that people should be concerned in this area to have enough water. Because there is also another mining activity in the west, uh, of the region, Woodend that is, uh, has to do with ores, and on this area that they're doing, the mining activity is practically the resources for the whole water resources".

[J]: "Water in principle is an issue for all of us in the coming years everywhere. If we take our own region,

Woodend, but also by extension and as a reference point that we are talking about Timberville, it is a big gamble in the coming years. Why? Because the edible olive ripens at the very time when we have tourism in the respective region and the corresponding arrivals and visitor numbers. If we would need 1 litre of water when we had no tourists or vice versa for a tree I say it randomly, now we need 3".

To a somewhat lesser extent some of the interview participants raised the issue of where the electricity to power the carbon capture facilities would come from was raised.

[A]: "Do we have enough solar energy in the area to [power the plant]? ... It said [video] that's gonna be powered by renewable energy."

For context, the region has already experienced an increase in solar energy that has displaced some agricultural activities.

Tourism is an important source of employment in the area and there were some considerations about what the implementation of new CCUS technologies would mean for the relationship between the tourism, agriculture, and extraction industries.

[J]: "Of course, and for the tourists that's a concern, but we also have the primary production which is also very close by. As it is a tourist activity, you see hotels at a distance from the flue gas with an example of Timberville and "GMBH", the distance to the nearby hotel is 500 meters in a straight line. It may be 2 km, rather Guest House in a straight line is 1 km, so next-door. And an olive tree grown edible is one meter <laughs ironically>".

Potential health issues were also discussed regarding the use of amines for the capturing process. Despite not using amines in this project, amines are one of the most common absorbers to use in the capturing process and might have potential health impacts (Gentry *et al.*, 2014).

[R]: "Another issue with carbon sequestration is when carbon dioxide is released and we want to capture it, we use chemicals".

[O]: "A" (okay)

[R]: "So, its what chemicals do we use? Because in the past, for example, they used what they call amines and amines can be carcinogenic".

[O]: "So, these are going into the environment? Or to the employees?"

As a rural area with somewhat limited transport infrastructure, there were also concerns that the implementation of CCUS could cause issues.

[T]: "...personally, I would like to see some numbers in the sense the whole process is what we were also saying the other day, the whole process ...the part of the transportation. Do we have any idea, sorry, uh, how many trucks we will be leaving daily from

the place in order to go? Because Woodend doesn't have really roads, big roads, it's very small roads, it's one lane, one lane each, old roads".

The participants also critically identified and analysed issues that were not local. For example, one participant questioned the premise that some industrial CO₂ emissions were unavoidable.

[A]: *"That it's saying, the problem is that for some industrial activities, we cannot avoid producing CO₂. Not even, we cannot avoid reducing the productions. We cannot avoid the production of CO₂. So, we are trying to solve this problem because we are basing the whole idea that this is something that we can't change. Why guys? Is there that we need to do research?"*.

Despite storage not taking place in their location, participants also raised critical questions about the implications of storage part of the CCUS process.

[T]: *"Are we sure that this, uh, CO₂ under sea or underneath on the earth is not damaging the microcosmos of the underground? And because we don't see it on the air, we think we solve the problem. It's like the problems we put under the carpet. Do we know that the microorganisms who live inside there, and I'm sure there are, uh, are not, um, affected by all this? Do we know it? What have we put to see what happens inside there? Did we count the microorganisms inside the caves before and after? Do we know that? Or we just save the atmosphere, and we messed up the earth?"*.

Participants enhanced the conversation with their local knowledge and cultural perspectives that are important elements in public engagement and knowledge production.

Theme 2: Societal context

The participants' perceptions of the CCUS project were understood in relation to past experiences and perceptions of companies and political institutions. The participants voiced concerns related to issues of transparency, trust, and political-economic dynamics.

In all interviews, the company "Ore Extraction Limited" whose activities some years before had led to prolonged protests and conflict was mentioned in some capacity or another. The way the conflicts were handled by the company and the local and national politicians meant that there were concerns about how new initiatives would be handled.

[P]: *"...there was also deception, meaning that they were telling us that the mining process here had been used previously in other places and that was not true. It had only used in preliminary studies and pilot projects, meaning no proper mining was done like that and it will never be done, it is not possible. The production cost of this process is too high, and*

they eventually turned into open cast mining, like we are living in the 1800s".

This in turn led to a hesitant stance on any new initiatives even those that might turn out to be a good thing for the area.

[P]: *"...Of course, I will agree that social acceptance is needed in anything that is new because there is the bad from the past. Meaning that people are cautious in anything that happens, and many times they are cautious in good things".*

The relationship with Schatz GMBH, the company involved in testing the CCUS unit, was also complex. On the one hand, the jobs it created were seen as being integral to the local community. On the other hand, in the past there had been issues with pollution and the decisions not to act up on it, as one participant described.

[T]: *"I see around also my family back in the days used to work for the mines, Okay? That families living from the mines, uh, local, uh, community, most of them, let's say, because it's a small village, work in the mine. And I see that some things that perhaps mining activity is uh, uh, uh, um, getting lower the quality of life, like the dust that we breathe every day from the mines, I see that people put it on the scale and they say, okay, but we have work."*

The EU was brought up by most participants in most interviews, with notable ambivalence. On the one hand, there was the perception that the EU was lacking transparency and supported the interest of the companies at the cost of the environment and society. On the other hand, the EU was also seen to have the potential to ensure social and climate-beneficial outcomes when these new technologies.

[O]: *"...if it's to serve the interests of the industries, which it (EU) potentially does in many cases because lobbying and behind the scenes is everywhere. So, in this case and the way you present it, it seems that the idea of the European Union is what touches the citizens and works for society. So, in that sense it is clear research-wise that these approaches, these storage options are worth to invest money, I now take it differently. Now coming from you, since the European Union is funding these kinds of proposals, is it clear that these options do not degrade the environment?... it should be, because I am thinking about it for the citizens and for their good, but at the same time I am thinking about it. Am I (EU) funding proposals that offend and degrade the environment in which the societies, the European ones, live. There is a bit of an inaccuracy here".*

For some, the EU was seen as important in creating the legislative pressures to push companies to decarbonise.

[J]: *"Because without having, having probably 10–20 years ahead or whatever it is in exploitation, they want at all costs that this is profitable and for it to*

be profitable they have to be okay with the legislation. They have to comply with what the national and possibly European legislation dictates”.

Despite the potential benefits of addressing climate change that EU support for CCUS could have, there was some scepticism about the lack of transparency, especially in terms of who would receive the financial benefits from these projects.

[T]: *“What the European citizen wins, uh, at the end of all this?”*

[A]: *“Take the CO2”.*

[T]: *“So cleaner air?”*

[A]: *“And this project is financed by...”*

[T]: *“Yeah, but some other people will get (money) <laugh>. That’s the funny part. You know, we, we pay some others are gonna be profitable. And with this data, with this lack of data, let’s say, and all this process that it has vague, points, I would say that is another, I don’t, um, I don’t see it in a good, uh, way after all, if I start looking all the details, where they’re gonna go, who’s gonna take the money? Who, who’s gonna do this?”*

In the above statements the participants demonstrated some of their experiences with industrial partners, while expressing their opinions on the role of the EU in decarbonisation.

Theme 3: Technology

Most participants believed that technologies and potentially CCUS could play a role in addressing climate change. They were however critical of the little information they had received about the technologies used in the local CCUS project. To form a proper opinion on the specific technologies used in the project they expressed the need for better communication and education. Interestingly, most participants had a positive attitude towards technologies like CCUS addressing climate change. One participant who was involved with the local commons discussed how the research advances and societal changes have contributed to technology being an important element.

[J]: *“I think the way our society has formed, and the way research has evolved in general, I think technology is a key element that can address these kinds of problems, ... I think it is impossible that something can happen without the intervention of any technological (applications). As the video shows, you are producing this dioxide from an industrial facility, showing that you can have underground storage for example, all of that again gives you the opportunity in finding the solution, but again having a storage, randomly I will say, either above ground or underwater without technology again you can’t actually cope”.*

Another participant discussed the importance of scalability, as well as the complementary role that nature-based solutions and technological innovations should have.

[M]: *“Yes, I think they are complementary (nature and technology), but I think if a technological solution is found it will be more effective, just because of the scale... I “Yes, I think they are complementary (nature and technology), but I think if a technological solution is found it will be more effective, just because of the scale... I think technology can always play a very positive role, as long as it’s used properly”. think technology can always play a very positive role, as long as it’s used properly”.*

Despite this receptivity to technology and generally positive attitude to the potential of CCUS, there was some criticism about the project video.

After the interview, some of the participants were sceptical about the video. The video was described as propaganda, as they thought it oversimplified the CCUS process and was lacking important information. Another participant said that the video did a very good job explaining the CCUS process, but that it could be confusing as important information was not mentioned.

[J]: *“This video is very good as far as I would say in the everyday spoken language that describes it very well so that one can understand where we’re going from here...It is true that this video here combines that, it gives you a picture of what is going on and how the research wants to proceed in a certain way and it has it very nicely written graphically, it just obviously needs other information about maybe where this is going. It shows in here that it will be reused for example in the process. What does reuse mean? Why on the one hand you say I want to have a low carbon footprint and on the other hand you store it and recycle depending on circumstances? What does that mean? Perhaps the person who hears and sees it gets confused?”.*

The participants expressed that better and more educational information was needed, but they differed in terms of who should be responsible for this. One participant suggested that communication about the project should come from the industrial partner involved in the project and the company should start by involving their employees and their families,

[J]: *“I think we first start from the company itself or the companies that are creating the problem inside outside of quotes let’s say and create the production of let’s say carbon dioxide and have a large human resource within the organisation. That workforce means that one employee is at least one family, and we are not even multiplying it. So, I would say that if you put our own region of, where we are, which is a partner and has almost 300 employees, that’s a small community, since it’s basically a thousand. It’s a thousand people who from the company itself can be involved in the whole process. So, I think that the company itself through its own people should be the first to start any information and any dissemination of*

knowledge, so what is going on? what is it? How, are we going to deal with it? what is coming? what are the initiatives that other countries are taking let's say? What is Europe doing?"

Another participant suggested that should not be done only by the industrial partner, but there should also be an independent body.

[M]: *"...what is certain is that it cannot only come from the companies involved. It should also come from someone independent who will also tell them the opposite point of view. Because surely everyone will say what is in their own interest. What I think is a bit subtle is that in this case, let's say, to say to society that it's very important to reduce carbon dioxide emissions and for that, we're going to do, we're going to use some new technologies. You should tell them <laughs wryly> that there is a problem with the carbon dioxide being released, which they may not even be aware of"*.

This opinion was echoed by a participant who suggested that scientists might take on the role of communicating more unbiased information about CCUS.

[O]: *"The one who has the qualifications, the one who yes, maybe not so much communication skills. That's why I'd be pretty buttoned up myself. I agree with you on what you found. That gives it to a company that may know the techniques to approach, but there's a reservation people have towards that. I would agree that a scientist, a research centre, comes in and is more not neutral, and unbiased and that it doesn't lean on vested interests, possibly"*.

As demonstrated above, beliefs on the role of technology are not clear cut, as important information on the proposed technologies were absent from the communication video.

Discussion

The findings from our study indicate that how CCUS was understood and perceived was influenced by interrelated factors including local knowledge and previous experiences, modes of communication, and perceived impacts of the technology on the local area. Although we delineated these dimensions, they were all interrelated.

All the participants knew little about CCUS before the interviews. This aligns with past research that indicates general low public awareness of CCUS technologies (Boyd *et al.*, 2017; Li *et al.*, 2014; Perdan *et al.*, 2017; Whitmarsh *et al.*, 2019). However, we found that when the participants were presented with even very limited information about CCUS they were able to relate it to their own situated knowledge and critically identify both local and wider potential issues with the technology. This resonates with previous studies on climate mitigation and adaptation projects that have shown how people can use their situated knowledge to critically assess new technologies regardless of complexity. Furthermore, the use of local knowledge can also help ensure social and environmentally better

outcomes for these projects (McNamara & Buggy, 2017; Rojas Blanco, 2006).

The societal context, including the history of experiences with companies and the local, national, and supranational political systems, shaped the participants' perception of new technological initiatives in the area. For some interviewees those past experiences were associated with deception and misinformation, often leading them to be sceptical about social acceptance as they were concerned about the information sources as well as the company's motivations. This aligns with extant research that indicates the important role past experiences play in shaping future perceptions and acceptance of new technological developments (Holzinger *et al.*, 2011; Sulaymani *et al.*, 2022). Someone's trust can be determined by their past experiences (Schwerter & Zimmermann, 2020 #17451). Trust between local communities and stakeholders that develop a project, is an important contextual factor for an operational and successful energy project (Walker *et al.*, 2010 #17452)(Liu *et al.*, 2021 #17453). Based on previous experiences, the majority of participants expressed their discontent with previous industrial activities in the region. Some of these participants went on to add that this could impact their trust and support on new technological installations, such as the carbon capture facility. These findings illustrate the importance of contextual factors.

On an abstract level participants were mostly positively inclined towards the role that CCUS could play in addressing climate change. However, when it came to a more specific and in-depth analysis, they raised several questions and concerns, they were uncertain about the exact implications the technologies would have in terms of resource usage, transport, and local economy. As discussed in the methods section, water issues were not mentioned in the communication video, so the researcher added that extra element in the discussion. This allowed for a co-construction of knowledge between the researcher and the participants, with the former using their local knowledge to contextualise CCUS within their community. Furthermore, they were not certain that the technologies would be implemented in a transparent and beneficial way that would benefit the local communities.

This concern about the exact implications of a CCUS project also stemmed from the limited information they had received. In many cases, participants could not form an opinion about CCUS as the information they had was very limited and did not answer their questions. They discussed how some of the information communicated through the video was confusing and, in some cases, misleading. For them to be able to take decisions they wanted to have concrete data that were specific to their location. According to some of the participants, the video presented CCUS technologies as something that is well established, and that scientists are aware of all limitations, but that generated scepticism as to why despite the limitations those technologies were still pursued.

Aligning with participants' perceptions, several researchers have indicated the uncertainties and limitations associated with CCUS technologies (Beddies, 2015; Boyd, 2016; Lane *et al.*, 2021; Lee *et al.*, 2019). Pertinent literature suggests that when risks and uncertainties are not communicated

towards the public, then the public becomes more sceptical of a project (Ashworth *et al.*, 2012), supporting the value of two-way communication when it comes to the development of a carbon capture project (Gough & Mander, 2014).

In Greece, we found that apart from the information and the communication that we provided as researchers, there was no other information or communication from any of the industrial partners or the project managers towards the local community. In addition, some participants reported that the information provided through the video was lacking substance and not adequate to address their questions. The lack of transparency can have a negative impact on the social acceptance of carbon capture projects and often lead to the cancellation of such projects (Beddies, 2015; Brunsting *et al.*, 2011; Oltra *et al.*, 2012). This presented a dilemma in the conduct of this study as there was confidential information regarding the project that we were not at liberty to relay that information to the public, inhibiting fully transparent discussion.

In addition to transparency, concerns over the use of tax-payers money were raised when the role of the EU was discussed. Similarly, to other studies, participants were concerned with potential environmental, health and societal negative impacts associated with CCUS. There was some uncertainty on how and why private companies were financed by tax-payers money to help with finding a solution to a problem that could potentially have serious implications for their ability to operate and be profitable.

Implications, limitations, and future research

Despite the explorative nature of this study, our findings contribute to expanding understanding of public perceptions of CCUS in Greece and similar contexts, enabling policymakers, organisations and institutions to better engage and involve the local communities in future energy projects (Kurath & Gisler, 2009; Perlaviciute & Squintani, 2020). Our future research will expand on these preliminary findings as local implementation of a CCUS demonstration facility continues. Due to the lack of available information and the novelty of the technologies, future research should consider more comprehensive information and dissemination methods to maximise peoples' understanding of CCUS and their implications. As an example, one of the researchers during the interviews brought up the utilisation of water during the capture process and that might have framed CCUS in a negative manner (de Vries *et al.*, 2016; Druckman & Bolsen, 2011). Adding to the above, there is also a time constraint associated with the interviews and the opinions participants form on a new subject can be limited. As discussed by Jones *et al.* (2017), more time and more information could alter peoples' opinions on new technologies. Finally, this study has not explored the involvement of communities during an environmental permitting process, and such research would be important to be considered in the future.

Conclusions

The aim of this study was to explore local perceptions about CCUS in a Greek national context to broaden our understanding about the dynamics that shape awareness and acceptance of

CCUS. This preliminary study shows the importance of examining CCUS and social acceptance in relation to the specific social context of a project. The dynamics that applied to this case study in a small agricultural Greek location with previous experiences and controversies around extraction cannot be directly translated to other social contexts. What it is possible to say is that a place-based approach that can take account of social relationships and dynamics is more likely to give a detailed understanding of the factors that shape people's perception of new technologies in that specific location.

Our findings suggest that despite the low awareness of CCUS amongst the participants, with limited information they were able to critically assess the technology and envision what potential environmental, economic, and social impacts it would have in the local area. Participants expressed some scepticism towards how the technology would be implemented and this was at times enhanced by the social and historical context of the area. Furthermore, the lack of detailed information meant that the participants did not feel they had adequate information to take a stance on any future CCUS project in the area. In our case, participants were asked to discuss something they had little or no knowledge of. Although some information was related to them via the video, that was not adequate for them to form an educated opinion. That brings to the forefront the importance of communication and education that should be taking place within these communities during such projects. Community members should be involved in the process from early on and help shape the project.

Furthermore, the study also indicates that local communities can play an important role in enabling a deeper understanding of the impact CCUS technologies might have in the local area by use their detailed local knowledge to identify and potentially tackle important issues that might only otherwise become evident later in any CCUS project. However, to do that in a more comprehensive way there would need to be more comprehensive educational and communicational provisions that can give the communities the capabilities to understand and shape CCUS projects. Whilst it has been suggested that lack of knowledge is a limitation to public participation in decision-making (Wang *et al.*, 2019), we argue that lack of transparency, and lack of collaboration from organisations, limit public engagement in energy-related projects.

Data availability

Despite our efforts to anonymise the interviews, due to the small geographical location the data were collected, sharing the whole transcripts of the interviews could result in the identification of some of the participants.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the participants that gave their valuable free time to share their knowledge and experience with the researchers and provide important feedback on the project. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and Innovation programme under grant agreement N° 101022484.

References

- Anderson C, Schirmer J, Abjorensen N: **Exploring CCS community acceptance and public participation from a human and social capital perspective.** *Mitig Adapt Strateg Glob Chang.* 2012; **17**: 687–706.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Ashworth P, Bradbury J, Wade S, et al.: **What's in store: Lessons from implementing CCS.** *International Journal of Greenhouse Gas Control.* 2012; **9**: 402–409.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Beddies L: **Towards a Better Understanding of Public Resistance: Carbon Capture and Storage and the Power of the Independent-minded Citizen.** *MaRBL.* 2015; **5**.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Bertsch V, Hall M, Weinhardt C, et al.: **Public acceptance and preferences related to renewable energy and grid expansion policy: Empirical insights for Germany.** *Energy.* 2016; **114**: 465–477.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Bokka HK, Lau HC: **Decarbonising Vietnam's power and industry sectors by carbon capture and storage.** *Energy.* 2023; **262 Part A**: 125361.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Botetzagias I, Malesios C, Kolokotroni A, et al.: **The role of NIMBY in opposing the siting of wind farms: evidence from Greece.** *J Environ Plan Manag.* 2015; **58(2)**: 229–251.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Bowen F: **Carbon capture and storage as a corporate technology strategy challenge.** *Energy Policy.* 2011; **39(5)**: 2256–2264.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Boyd AD: **Risk perceptions of an alleged CO₂ leak at a carbon sequestration site.** *Int J Greenh Gas Con.* 2016; **50**: 231–239.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Boyd AD, Hmielowski JD, David P: **Public perceptions of carbon capture and storage in Canada: Results of a national survey.** *Int J Greenh Gas Con.* 2017; **67**: 1–9.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Braun V, Clarke V: **Thematic analysis.** American Psychological Association, 2012.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Brunsting S, de Best-Waldhober M, Feenstra CY, et al.: **Stakeholder participation practices and onshore CCS: Lessons from the Dutch CCS Case Barendrecht.** *Energy Procedia.* 2011; **4**: 6376–6383.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Burawoy M, Blum JA, George S, et al.: **Global ethnography: Forces, connections, and imaginations in a postmodern world.** Univ of California Press, 2000.
[Reference Source](#)
- Burrows D, Kendall S: **Focus groups: what are they and how can they be used in nursing and health care research?** *Social Sciences in Health.* 1997; **3**: 244–253.
- Cobern W, Adams B: **When interviewing: how many is enough?** *International Journal of Assessment Tools in Education.* 2020; **7(1)**: 73–79.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Creswell JW: **Qualitative inquiry & research design.** (3 ed.). Sage, 2013.
[Reference Source](#)
- Creswell JW, Clark VLP: **Designing and conducting mixed methods research.** Sage publications, 2017.
[Reference Source](#)
- de Vries G, Terwel BW, Ellemers N: **Perceptions of manipulation and judgments of illegitimacy: Pitfalls in the use of emphasis framing when communicating about CO₂ capture and storage.** *Environmental Communication.* 2016; **10(2)**: 206–226.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Druckman JN, Bolsen T: **Framing, motivated reasoning, and opinions about emergent technologies.** *J Commun.* 2011; **61(4)**: 659–688.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- European Commission: **Emissions Trading.** European Union. 2021; Retrieved 6/12/022.
[Reference Source](#)
- Fersch B: **Meaning: lost, found or 'made' in translation? A hermeneutical approach to cross-language interview research.** *Qualitative Studies.* 2013; **4(2)**: 86–99.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Filep B: **Interview and translation strategies: coping with multilingual settings and data.** *Soc Geogr.* 2009; **4(1)**: 59–70.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Friedmann SJ, Ochu ER, Brown JD: **Capturing investment: Policy design to finance CCUS Projects in the US power sector.** NY Columbia SIPA Cent Glob Energy Policy, 2020; Accessed April, 1, 2020.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gentry PR, House-Knight T, Harris A, et al.: **Potential occupational risk of amines in carbon capture for power generation.** *Int Arch Occup Environ Health.* 2014; **87(6)**: 591–606.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Gillham B: **Case study research methods.** Bloomsbury Publishing, 2000.
[Reference Source](#)
- Gough C, Mander S: **Public perceptions of CO₂ transportation in pipelines.** *Energy Policy.* 2014; **70**: 106–114.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hammersley M, Foster P, Gomm R: **Case study and generalisation.** 2000.
[Reference Source](#)
- Haszeldine RS: **Carbon capture and storage: how green can black be?** *Science.* 2009; **325(5948)**: 1647–1652.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Hmielowski JD, Boyd AD, Harvey G, et al.: **The social dimensions of smart meters in the United States: Demographics, privacy, and technology readiness.** *Energy Res Soc Sci.* 2019; **55**: 189–197.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Holzinger A, Searle G, Wernbacher M: **The effect of previous exposure to technology on acceptance and its importance in usability and accessibility engineering.** *Univers Access Inf Soc.* 2011; **10**: 245–260.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Jones CR, Olfe-Kräutlein B, Kaklamanou D: **Lay perceptions of Carbon Dioxide Utilisation technologies in the United Kingdom and Germany: An exploratory qualitative interview study.** *Energy Res Soc Sci.* 2017; **34**: 283–293.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Kontogianni A, Tourkolias C, Skourtos M, et al.: **Planning globally, protesting locally: Patterns in community perceptions towards the installation of wind farms.** *Renew Energy.* 2014; **66**: 170–177.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Koukouzas N, Christopoulou M, Giannakopoulou PP, et al.: **Current CO₂ capture and storage trends in Europe in a view of social knowledge and acceptance. A short review.** *Energies.* 2022; **15(15)**: 5716.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Krupnik S, Wagner A, Koretskaya O, et al.: **Beyond technology: A research agenda for social sciences and humanities research on renewable energy in Europe.** *Energy Res Soc Sci.* 2022; **89**: 102536.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Krzywdzinski M: **Globalisation, decarbonisation and technological change: Challenges for the German and CEE automotive supplier industry. Towards a just transition: coal, cars and the world of work.** Brussels: ETUI, 2019; 2019.
[Reference Source](#)
- Kurath M, Gislser P: **Informing, involving or engaging? Science communication, in the ages of atom-, bio- and nanotechnology.** *Public Underst Sci.* 2009; **18(5)**: 559–573.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Lane J, Greig C, Garnett A: **Uncertain storage prospects create a conundrum for carbon capture and storage ambitions.** *Nat Clim Chang.* 2021; **11(11)**: 925–936.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Lee SY, Lee IB, Han J: **Design under uncertainty of carbon capture, utilization and storage infrastructure considering profit, environmental impact, and risk preference.** *Appl Energy.* 2019; **238**: 34–44.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Li Q, Liu LC, Chen ZA, et al.: **A survey of public perception of CCUS in China.** *Energy Procedia.* 2014; **63**: 7019–7023.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Lin CH, Shih HY, Sher PJ: **Integrating technology readiness into technology acceptance: The TRAM model.** *Psychol Mark.* 2007; **24(7)**: 641–657.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Liu D, Ma J, Cheng M, et al.: **Study on the Effect of CO₂ Leakage on the Basic Water Quality Index of Paddy Field Water.** In: *Proceedings of the 15th Greenhouse Gas Control Technologies Conference.* 2021; 15–18.
[Reference Source](#)
- Mace M, Hendriks C, Coenraads R: **Regulatory challenges to the implementation of carbon capture and geological storage within the European Union under EU and international law.** *Int J Greenh Gas Con.* 2007; **1(2)**: 253–260.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Matschoss K, Repo P: **Governance experiments in climate action: empirical findings from the 28 European Union countries.** *Environ Polit.* 2018; **27(4)**: 598–620.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- McNamara KE, Buggy L: **Community-based climate change adaptation: a review of academic literature.** *Local Environment.* 2017; **22(4)**: 443–460.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Merriam SB, Tisdell EJ: **Qualitative research: A guide to design and implementation.** John Wiley & Sons, 2015.
[Reference Source](#)

- Nielsen JAE, Stavrianakis K, Morrison Z: **Community acceptance and social impacts of carbon capture, utilization and storage projects: A systematic meta-narrative literature review.** *PLoS One.* 2022; **17**(8): e0272409.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#) | [Free Full Text](#)
- Oltra C, Sala R, Boso A: **The influence of information on individuals' reactions to CCS technologies: results from experimental online survey research.** *Greenhouse Gases: Science and Technology.* 2012; **2**(3): 209–215.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Perdan S, Jones CR, Azapagic A: **Public awareness and acceptance of carbon capture and utilisation in the UK.** *Sustain Prod Consum.* 2017; **10**: 74–84.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Perlaviciute G, Squintani L: **Public participation in climate policy making: toward reconciling public preferences and legal frameworks.** *One Earth.* 2020; **2**(4): 341–348.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Pietzner K, Schumann D, Tvedt SD, et al.: **Public awareness and perceptions of carbon dioxide capture and storage (CCS): Insights from surveys administered to representative samples in six European countries.** *Energy Procedia.* 2011; **4**: 6300–6306.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Polak L, Green J: **Using joint interviews to add analytic value.** *Qual Health Res.* 2016; **26**(12): 1638–1648.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Reiner D, Curry T, de Figueiredo M, et al.: **An international comparison of public attitudes towards carbon capture and storage technologies.** NTNU [2006]. 2006.
[Reference Source](#)
- Rojas Blanco AV: **Local initiatives and adaptation to climate change.** *Disasters.* 2006; **30**(1): 140–147.
[PubMed Abstract](#) | [Publisher Full Text](#)
- Schwarter F, Zimmermann F: **Determinants of trust: The role of personal experiences.** *Games Econ Behav.* 2020; **122**: 413–425.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Seemungal L, Arrigoni A, Davies J, et al.: **Decarbonisation of Heavy Duty Vehicle Transport: Zero Emission Heavy Goods Vehicles.** (9276403264). 2021.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Shackley S, Reiner D, Upham P, et al.: **The acceptability of CO₂ capture and storage (CCS) in Europe: An assessment of the key determining factors: Part 2. The social acceptability of CCS and the wider impacts and repercussions of its implementation.** *Int J Greenh Gas Con.* 2009; **3**(3): 344–356.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Sovacool BK, Ratan PL: **Conceptualizing the acceptance of wind and solar electricity.** *Renew Sustain Energy Rev.* 2012; **16**(7): 5268–5279.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Sprenkeling M, Otto D, Peuchen R, et al.: **Improving the Societal Embeddedness of CO₂ Storage Projects with a Human-centered Monitoring System: Case Studies in Norway, The Netherlands, Germany and Greece.** *The Netherlands, Germany and Greece.* 2022. (November 24, 2022)
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Stake RE: **The art of case study research.** sage, 1995.
[Reference Source](#)
- Stigka EK, Paravantis JA, Mihalakakou GK: **Social acceptance of renewable energy sources: A review of contingent valuation applications.** *Renew Sustain Energy Rev.* 2014; **32**: 100–106.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Sulaymani O, Pratama AR, Alshaikh M, et al.: **The effects of previous experience and self efficacy on the acceptance of e-learning platforms among younger students in Saudi Arabia.** *Contemp Educ Technol.* 2022; **14**(2): ep349.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Teixidó J, Verde SF, Nicollì F: **The impact of the EU Emissions Trading System on low-carbon technological change: The empirical evidence.** *Ecological Economics.* 2019; **164**: 106347.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Tsantopoulos G, Arabatzis G, Tampakis S: **Public attitudes towards photovoltaic developments: Case study from Greece.** *Energy Policy.* 2014; **71**: 94–106.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Upham P, Sovacool B, Ghosh B: **Just transitions for industrial decarbonisation: A framework for innovation, participation, and justice.** *Renew Sustain Energy Rev.* 2022; **167**: 112699.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Van Damme E: **When overt research feels covert: Researching women and gangs in a context of silence and fear.** *Journal of Extreme Anthropology.* 2019; **3**(1): 121–134.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Walker G, Devine-Wright P, Hunter S, et al.: **Trust and community: Exploring the meanings, contexts and dynamics of community renewable energy.** *Energy Policy.* 2010; **38**(6): 2655–2663.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Wang S, Wang J, Lin S, et al.: **Public perceptions and acceptance of nuclear energy in China: The role of public knowledge, perceived benefit, perceived risk and public engagement.** *Energy Policy.* 2019; **126**: 352–360.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Whitmarsh L, Xenias D, Jones CR: **Framing effects on public support for carbon capture and storage.** *Palgrave Commun.* 2019; **5**(1): 17.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Williams R, Jack C, Gamboa D, et al.: **Decarbonising steel production using CO₂ Capture and Storage (CCS): Results of focus group discussions in a Welsh steel-making community.** *Int J Greenh Gas Con.* 2021; **104**: 103218.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Wong-Parodi G, Ray I: **Community perceptions of carbon sequestration: insights from California.** *Environ Res Lett.* 2009; **4**(3): 034002.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Wüstenhagen R, Wolsink M, Bürer MJ: **Social acceptance of renewable energy innovation: An introduction to the concept.** *Energy Policy.* 2007; **35**(5): 2683–2691.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Yang L, Xu M, Yang Y, et al.: **Comparison of subsidy schemes for carbon capture utilization and storage (CCUS) investment based on real option approach: Evidence from China.** *Appl Energy.* 2019; **255**: 113828.
[Publisher Full Text](#)
- Yin RK: **Case study research: Design and methods.** sage, 2009; **5**.
[Reference Source](#)
- Zhang X, Chen M, Ye Z: **Investment strategy of CCS for power producer and policy analysis with carbon price floor.** *J Ind Eng Eng Manag.* 2016; **30**(2): 160–165.

Open Peer Review

Current Peer Review Status: ? X ?

Version 2

Reviewer Report 22 April 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/openreseurope.18665.r38151>

© 2024 Oltra C. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Christian Oltra

Centro Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas, Madrid, Spain

I overall think that the lack of a clear research question, the lack of a clear linkage between the collected data and the predefined aspects of the study, the limited number of interviews, the lack of a proper interview protocol and the lack of focus in the discussion undermines the significance of the article.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Risk perception; public attitudes towards energy technology; environmental attitudes

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Version 1

Reviewer Report 02 January 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/openreseurope.17994.r36356>

© 2024 Xenias D. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Dimitrios Xenias 

Cardiff University, Cardiff, Wales, UK

Public perception and acceptance of CCUS: preliminary findings of a qualitative case study in Greece

Thank you for this well-written paper, which I read with interest. The authors explored public perception / acceptance of a novel CCUS scheme in a mining/industrial community in Greece. This was part of a wider EU funded research programme.

It is right and important to explore such topic qualitatively and in depth, as they are usually novel and unprecedented in the areas and communities involved. So it is useful to explore the understanding of such innovations at a local community level, as well as the meanings attributed to each scheme, and any anticipated impacts and expectations from it.

However, doing so on the basis of just five interviews sounds quite minimal and I would hesitate to put much faith on results that are based in such small sample. Although this is a very good preliminary exploratory study, to be followed by a larger sample or replication, I find it too small to be published as a standalone paper as it stands. Does this journal support the publication of small pilot studies?

Could this research be followed up with further interviews? Larger sample? Focus group discussion or similar? Or if the above are not possible, then other types of research and analysis that might complement the picture and add to our understanding of the local history, context and community as well as the company, its activities, and industrial relations. For example, there is mention of past promises and events within the same region with the same industry, and this might need to be exposed further for the benefit of this paper.

Nonetheless, sample size remains my main concern. Perhaps, if there is no room for further sample, replication or another complimentary study, a combination with other samples of this EU project might help bolster the conclusions of this paper? E.g. if other partners of this EU project ran similar community studies elsewhere, then their results could be compared and synthesised? To more specific comments:

p.3 I would be cautious to describe CCUS, CCS, Wind, Solar and others collectively as 'decarbonisation technologies'. Yes they all broadly contribute to decarbonisation targets, but I see a fundamental difference between a system that does not produce any CO₂, to a system that actively sucks CO₂ out of the atmosphere' and is normally part of a nearby larger industrial complex.

P.5 The authors mention that "although the themes are presented below in an individual basis, the intersections amongst them are the novelty of this paper." Please can you clarify what this means?

P.8 The authors discuss the role of contextual factors and I observed a notable exception from the list: the role of trust. This is a common finding in this kind of research and although it was only mentioned once in the summary of Theme 2, therefore I wonder whether the authors were not aware of this or did not think it was important to discuss.

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

No

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Partly

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for teaching or other practitioners?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Environmental Psychology, Climate Change, Behaviour Change

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 02 Feb 2024

KOSTAS STAVRIANAKIS

Dear reviewer, Thank you for your helpful and constructive comments and helping us strengthen our paper. Please see below our response to your comments. The responses are indicated in the line numbers provided below and can be seen in purple text within the updated version.

Reviewer 3: Approved with reservations

Thank you for this well-written paper, which I read with interest. The authors explored public perception / acceptance of a novel CCUS scheme in a mining/industrial community in Greece. This was part of a wider EU funded research programme.

It is right and important to explore such topic qualitatively and in depth, as they are usually novel and unprecedented in the areas and communities involved. So, it is useful to explore the understanding of such innovations at a local community level, as well as the meanings attributed to each scheme, and any anticipated impacts and expectations from it.

However, doing so on the basis of just five interviews sounds quite minimal and I would hesitate to put much faith on results that are based in such small sample. Although this is a very good preliminary exploratory study, to be followed by a larger sample or replication, I find it too small to be published as a standalone paper as it stands. Does this journal support the publication of small pilot studies? Could this research be followed up with further interviews? Larger sample? Focus group discussion or similar? Or if the above are not possible, then other types of research and analysis that might complement the picture and add to our understanding of the local history, context and community as well as the company, its activities, and industrial relations. For example, there is mention of past promises and events within the same region with the same industry, and this might need to be exposed further for the benefit of this paper.

Nonetheless, sample size remains my main concern.

Reply: As we say on lines 55-58 this is a preliminary case study from an early report from a larger international project. Regarding sample size we have strengthened our justification of interviews in lines 160-165. Whilst the method of the study is replicable, the purpose of this study is not to be replicated in the sense that you can generalise the findings if you repeat the study. As discussed on the paper, opinions and perceptions can change depending on different contextual factors, thus expecting to replicate the study with similar results would not be constructive. We have discussed in the manuscript the notion of representation in qualitative studies and included citations exemplifying the importance of the small n number in qualitative research. Perhaps, if there is no room for further sample, replication or another complementary study, a combination with other samples of this EU project might help bolster the conclusions of this paper? E.g. if other partners of this EU project ran similar community studies elsewhere, then their results could be compared and synthesised?

To more specific comments:

p.3 I would be cautious to describe CCUS, CCS, Wind, Solar and others collectively as 'decarbonisation technologies. Yes, they all broadly contribute to decarbonisation targets, but I see a fundamental difference between a system that does not produce any CO₂, to a system that actively sucks CO₂ out of the atmosphere' and is normally part of a nearby larger industrial complex.

Reply: This is an interesting point, and this has been changed to "technologies" in line 72 and rephrased.

P.5 The authors mention that "although the themes are presented below in an individual basis, the intersections amongst them are the novelty of this paper." Please can you clarify what this means?

Reply: We have added further consideration of the thematic intersectionality. Please refer to lines 208-213 and line 438.

P.8 The authors discuss the role of contextual factors, and I observed a notable exception from the list: the role of trust. This is a common finding in this kind of research and although it was only mentioned once in the summary of Theme 2, therefore I wonder whether the authors were not aware of this or did not think it was important to discuss.

Reply: As also per the suggestion of reviewer 2 we have expanded on the role of trust. Please refer to line 457-464.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Report 02 January 2024

<https://doi.org/10.21956/openreseurope.17994.r36354>

© 2024 Oltra C. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

**Christian Oltra**

Centro Investigaciones Energéticas, Medioambientales y Tecnológicas, Madrid, Spain

Introduction

The literature review on public perceptions and acceptance of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) appears limited, lacking depth and breadth. The research justification is weak, with an unclearly articulated problem statement. Moreover, the absence of a defined research question and specific objectives further dilutes the study's foundation. The rationale for conducting research on social acceptance in the context of the CCUS project is not clear, especially given its design - a pilot plant adjacent to an existing industrial plant for partial carbon dioxide capture. The justification for selecting Greece as a unique case study for understanding the interplay between CCUS implementation and social acceptance is not convincingly argued.

Method

The methodological approach, particularly the use of a case study research design as per Yin (2009), is inadequately connected to this study's specific design. Furthermore, the limited number of interviews conducted raises questions about the comprehensiveness of the findings. The ambiguity surrounding the profile of the interviewees, whether they are residents or stakeholders and their sociodemographic details, further weakens the methodological robustness.

Results

The analysis of the data seems disjointed from the study's analytical dimensions. There is a lack of clear linkage between the collected data and the predefined aspects of the study, which hampers the effectiveness of the results section.

Discussion

While the discussion presents some interesting ideas, the overall lack of focus in the article undermines the significance of this section. An example of this is the reference to previous research on the impact of past experiences on perceptions and acceptance of new technologies. This idea, although relevant, is not sufficiently developed or integrated into the broader narrative of the study, resulting in a discussion that lacks relevance and depth.

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Partly

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Partly

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Partly

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Partly

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for teaching or other practitioners?

Partly

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Risk perception; public attitudes towards energy technology; environmental attitudes

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to state that I do not consider it to be of an acceptable scientific standard, for reasons outlined above.

Author Response 02 Feb 2024

KOSTAS STAVRIANAKIS

Dear reviewer, Thank you for your helpful and constructive comments and helping us strengthen our paper. Please see below our response to your comments. The responses are indicated in the line numbers provided below and can be seen in purple text within the provided document.

Reviewer 2: Not approved.

Introduction

The literature review on public perceptions and acceptance of Carbon Capture and Storage (CCS) appears limited, lacking depth and breadth. The research justification is weak, with an unclearly articulated problem statement. Moreover, the absence of a defined research question and specific objectives further dilutes the study's foundation. The rationale for conducting research on social acceptance in the context of the CCUS project is not clear, especially given its design - a pilot plant adjacent to an existing industrial plant for partial carbon dioxide capture. The justification for selecting Greece as a unique case study for understanding the interplay between CCUS implementation and social acceptance is not convincingly argued.

Reply: In lines 31-44 we discuss the importance of examining social acceptance of CCUS in a local context and argue that most previous studies have been in Northern Europe or North America. The rationale and research scope of the study can be seen in lines 54-62 and the justification for Greece is explained in lines 63-83.

Method

The methodological approach, particularly the use of a case study research design as per Yin (2009), is inadequately connected to this study's specific design. Furthermore, the limited number of interviews conducted raises questions about the comprehensiveness of the findings. The ambiguity surrounding the profile of the interviewees, whether they are residents or stakeholders and their sociodemographic details, further weakens the methodological robustness.

Reply: Whilst we do not agree with the critique on our methods, we have added more information in lines 151-154 and 160-164 for the case study design and lines 203-206 for participants' characteristics. We have discussed in the manuscript the notion of representation in qualitative studies and included citations exemplifying the importance of the small n number in qualitative research.

Results

The analysis of the data seems disjointed from the study's analytical dimensions. There is a lack of clear linkage between the collected data and the predefined aspects of the study, which hampers the effectiveness of the results section.

Reply: We are confident that the analysis of the data aligns with the purpose of the study.
Discussion

While the discussion presents some interesting ideas, the overall lack of focus in the article undermines the significance of this section. An example of this is the reference to previous research on the impact of past experiences on perceptions and acceptance of new technologies. This idea, although relevant, is not sufficiently developed or integrated into the broader narrative of the study, resulting in a discussion that lacks relevance and depth.

Reply: As also per the suggestion of reviewer 3, we have expanded on the role of trust and previous experiences. Please see lines 457-464.

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Report 24 November 2023

<https://doi.org/10.21956/openreseurope.17994.r36355>

© 2023 Upham P. This is an open access peer review report distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution License](#), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.



Paul Upham

IREES, ESRIG, University of Groningen, Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands

This paper describes the background, methods and results of a small number of interviews with members of the public living close to a prospective site that will capture and store CCS for reuse (CCUS).

The authors need to provide more information on exactly what the interviewees were told - e.g. via a link to the video referred to and via appending other information conveyed. The authors also need to provide more information on the proposed CCUS development - is carbon storage to be onsite, in what form, how transported out etc.

The paper is generally well-written, analysed and executed. However the number of interviewees

seems very small and the research design justification relating to this is under developed. Did I understand correctly that 5 people were interviewed once each? Or were they each interviewed multiple times? Please clarify this. Either way, I think you also need supplementary justification. If you interviewed each individual multiple times, then this is a longitudinal form of interviewing that would add strength to the empirical part of the case, and more should be made of this.

If you only interviewed 5 people once, then you again need to strengthen the justification for this. You can (i) estimate the fraction of the village that this constitutes; (ii) you can and should give us a little more demographic information on the interviewees, so we know a little about them; (iii) you can and should make a case for in-depth, semi-ethnographic work in which the researcher has embedded themselves in the community (as you seem to have done); (iv) for the benefit of people concerned about representativeness, you can explain a little more about the value of small n qualitative work.

One other thing: theme 1 on Knowledge: although knowledge was involved, I read these comments as being also, or even primarily, about a concern with impacts.

Is the background of the case's history and progression described in sufficient detail?

Yes

Is the work clearly and accurately presented and does it cite the current literature?

Yes

If applicable, is the statistical analysis and its interpretation appropriate?

Not applicable

Are all the source data underlying the results available to ensure full reproducibility?

Yes

Are the conclusions drawn adequately supported by the results?

Yes

Is the case presented with sufficient detail to be useful for teaching or other practitioners?

Yes

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.

Reviewer Expertise: Social acceptance of low carbon energy technology, including CCS.

I confirm that I have read this submission and believe that I have an appropriate level of expertise to confirm that it is of an acceptable scientific standard, however I have significant reservations, as outlined above.

Author Response 02 Feb 2024

KOSTAS STAVRIANAKIS

Thank you for your helpful and constructive comments and helping us strengthen our paper. Please see below our response to your comments. The responses are indicated in the line numbers provided below and can be seen in purple text within the provided document.

Reviewer 1: Approved with reservations.

This paper describes the background, methods and results of a small number of interviews with members of the public living close to a prospective site that will capture and store CCS for reuse (CCUS).

The authors need to provide more information on exactly what the interviewees were told - e.g. via a link to the video referred to and via appending other information conveyed. The authors also need to provide more information on the proposed CCUS development - is carbon storage to be onsite, in what form, how transported out etc.

Reply: We have added further information on the pilot project in line 108-112. There is a link to the video in the manuscript. We have also added the YouTube link as a footnote in line 172.

The paper is generally well-written, analysed and executed. However, the number of interviewees seems very small and the research design justification relating to this is underdeveloped. Did I understand correctly that 5 people were interviewed once each? Or were they each interviewed multiple times? Please clarify this. Either way, I think you also need supplementary justification. If you interviewed each individual multiple times, then this is a longitudinal form of interviewing that would add strength to the empirical part of the case, and more should be made of this.

Reply: Six people were interviewed, and each person was interviewed once. We have adjusted the writing in the manuscript in lines 180 and 185

If you only interviewed 5 people once, then you again need to strengthen the justification for this. You can (i) estimate the fraction of the village that this constitutes; (ii) you can and should give us a little more demographic information on the interviewees, so we know a little about them; (iii) you can and should make a case for in-depth, semi-ethnographic work in which the researcher has embedded themselves in the community (as you seem to have done); (iv) for the benefit of people concerned about representativeness, you can explain a little more about the value of small n qualitative work.

Reply: We have added some participants' characteristics in lines 203-206 and included more context on our semi-ethnographic approach in lines 151-154. We have added some more explanation on the purpose of this case study, and why it is not about representation in lines 160-165. We have discussed in the manuscript the notion of representation in qualitative studies and included citations exemplifying the importance of the small n number in qualitative research.

One other thing: theme 1 on Knowledge: although knowledge was involved, I read these comments as being also, or even primarily, about a concern with impacts.

Reply: This is a helpful observation and we have amended the name of theme from "Knowledge" to "Knowledge and concerns".

Competing Interests: No competing interests were disclosed.
