International Journal of Scientific Research in Computer Science, Engineering and Information Technology

ISSN : 2456-3307 OPEN ACCESS

Available Online at : www.ijsrcseit.com

doi : https://doi.org/10.32628/IJSRCSEIT

A Multi-Stakeholder Governance Model for Decentralized Energy Access in Rural Communities

Mohammed Lawal Giwah[1], Zamathula Sikhakhane Nwokediegwu[2], Emmanuel Augustine Etukudoh[3], Ebimor Yinka Gbabo[4]

[1]Kwara State Government - Ilorin, Nigeria

[2]Independent Researcher, Durban, South Africa

[3]Independent Researcher, Nigeria

[4]Rolls Royce SMR. UK

Corresponding Author: giwahmohammed@yahoo.com

ARTICLEINFO

Article History:

Accepted: 01 April 2023

Published: 12 April 2023

Publication Issue

Volume 10, Issue 2

March-April-2023

Page Number

852-862

ABSTRACT

Decentralized energy systems are increasingly recognized as a viable solution for extending electricity access to rural communities underserved by traditional grid infrastructure. However, their sustainability and scalability are often compromised by fragmented governance, limited community participation, and weak institutional coordination. This paper proposes a comprehensive multi-stakeholder governance model tailored to the complexities of decentralized energy delivery in rural contexts. Grounded in governance theory and stakeholder analysis, the model emphasizes five core principles: inclusivity, transparency, accountability, subsidiarity, and resilience. It clearly delineates the roles of government actors, private sector players, communities, and non-governmental organizations, and establishes mechanisms for collaborative decision-making, financial alignment, and adaptive oversight. The paper also explores policy and implementation considerations, including regulatory harmonization, blended financing strategies, and capacity building for local stakeholders. By addressing the institutional gaps that hinder rural electrification efforts, the proposed model contributes both theoretically to energy governance literature and practically to policy design and implementation. It offers a scalable, equitable framework that embeds trust, coordination, and long-term sustainability into decentralized energy transitions.

Keywords: Decentralized Energy Access, Multi-Stakeholder Governance, Rural Electrification, Institutional Coordination, Participatory Energy Systems, Energy Policy and Regulation

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Access to reliable energy remains a persistent development challenge across rural communities in many low-income and developing regions, particularly in Sub-Saharan Africa and parts of South Asia. According to the International Energy Agency, more than 700 million people globally still lack access to electricity, with the vast majority residing in remote or underserved rural areas [1]. Traditional centralized grid infrastructure often fails to reach these populations due to high transmission costs, low population densities, challenging terrain, and limited political prioritization. As a result, these communities remain locked out of socioeconomic opportunities that are contingent on energy access, such as modern education, healthcare, and productive livelihoods [2, 3].

In response, decentralized energy systems, such as microgrids, solar home systems, and stand-alone renewable installations, have emerged as viable alternatives for expanding electricity access. These technologies are modular, scalable, and increasingly cost-effective due to declining costs in solar photovoltaics, battery storage, and digital monitoring tools [4]. Moreover, they allow for tailored energy solutions that are adapted to the local needs and usage patterns of rural populations. In contrast to large-scale, capital-intensive grid projects, decentralized systems can be deployed incrementally and maintained locally, offering faster returns on investment and higher adaptability [5, 6].

However, the expansion of decentralized energy technologies exposes a deeper issue: the absence of inclusive and coherent governance frameworks. Many existing models are fragmented, donor-driven, or reliant on top-down policymaking, with limited community input or institutional coordination. The result is often duplication of efforts, unsustainable maintenance, or outright failure [7, 8]. Without a structured and collaborative governance model, decentralized systems risk becoming isolated interventions rather than lasting solutions. The need for integrated, multi-stakeholder governance mechanisms has therefore become increasingly urgent, not only to improve implementation but to ensure long-term sustainability and social legitimacy [9, 10].

1.2 Problem Statement and Research Objectives

Despite the technical feasibility and economic appeal of decentralized energy systems, their expansion in rural areas faces considerable institutional and governance challenges. One primary issue is the lack of coordination among the various actors involved, including government agencies, private investors, local communities, and development organizations. These stakeholders often operate with divergent priorities, timelines, and accountability structures. In many cases, energy initiatives are implemented without clear roles, shared responsibilities, or mechanisms for collective decision-making. This fragmentation undermines system reliability, limits stakeholder trust, and weakens the long-term sustainability of energy projects.

Moreover, rural electrification is often treated as a purely technical or economic challenge, neglecting the socio-political dynamics that influence ownership, trust, and system performance. Communities may be excluded from planning processes, leading to technologies that do not match local needs or cultural contexts. Simultaneously, regulatory uncertainty or bureaucratic delays can deter private sector investment. In the absence of a unified governance model, these disjointed efforts not only create inefficiencies but also risk reproducing the very energy poverty they seek to eliminate.

This paper aims to address these challenges by proposing a multi-stakeholder governance model designed specifically for decentralized energy access in rural communities. The model seeks to formalize collaboration between key actors, governments, private sector entities, local communities, and non-governmental organizations, through defined roles, participatory decision-making structures, and adaptive oversight mechanisms. The objective is to shift from fragmented project delivery to a coordinated governance ecosystem that enables sustainable and equitable energy access at scale.

1.3 Methodological Approach

This research adopts a conceptual approach rooted in governance theory and stakeholder analysis. At its core, the study draws from institutional theory to understand how formal and informal rules shape actor behavior, influence policy implementation, and affect the long-term viability of decentralized systems. By examining how institutions enable or constrain cooperation among actors, this lens offers a structured way to analyze the political and administrative dimensions of energy access. Additionally, the stakeholder theory framework provides insight into the diversity of interests, motivations, and power relations that exist across public, private, and community actors.

To develop the governance model, the study synthesizes lessons from documented frameworks and academic literature across energy transitions, development studies, and public policy. The paper avoids empirical simulations or isolated case studies, focusing instead on theory-informed synthesis and analytical reasoning. This approach enables a comprehensive understanding of system-wide design principles that are generalizable across multiple contexts while remaining sensitive to local variations in institutional capacity and stakeholder engagement.

Evaluation of the proposed model is based on criteria such as inclusivity, transparency, accountability, and institutional resilience. These criteria are derived from best practices in collaborative governance and public infrastructure delivery, ensuring that the model is not only theoretically sound but also practically relevant. The model is critically examined for coherence, applicability, and potential trade-offs, enabling reflection on both its strengths and limitations. In doing so, the study positions itself as a strategic contribution to the governance dimension of decentralized energy transitions in rural development.

2. Theoretical Foundations

2.1 Concepts of Decentralized Energy Access

Decentralized energy systems refer to electricity generation and distribution technologies that operate independently or semi-independently of national or regional grids [11]. These systems are typically deployed close to the point of consumption and are designed to meet localized demand, particularly in rural or remote areas [12]. Common configurations include solar home systems, mini-grids powered by solar photovoltaic panels, biomass, or small hydro installations, and hybrid systems incorporating storage and diesel back-up. Their modular design enables incremental deployment, and recent advancements in smart meters, mobile payment systems, and remote monitoring have enhanced their scalability and reliability [13].

In rural contexts, decentralized systems are especially relevant due to several structural constraints that inhibit grid extension. High capital costs, difficult terrain, sparse populations, and low projected revenue often discourage utility companies from investing in centralized infrastructure expansion [14]. Furthermore, rural electrification via grid extension is frequently hampered by political interference, insufficient public funding, and weak institutional coordination. Decentralized systems, by contrast, provide a flexible, responsive solution that can bypass these constraints, delivering basic to intermediate tiers of electricity access faster and often more affordably [15, 16].

Crucially, decentralized access is not only a technical innovation; it redefines how energy systems are

governed. Unlike centralized grids, which are typically state-owned and operated through hierarchical bureaucracies, decentralized systems open up space for varied actors to participate in planning, financing, implementation, and management. This structural shift necessitates a parallel transformation in governance approaches to ensure that these systems are equitable, sustainable, and socially embedded [17].

2.2 Governance and Multi-Stakeholder Theory

Governance, in the context of energy access, refers to the systems of rules, practices, and relationships through which decisions are made and implemented. Effective governance ensures not only technical delivery but also legitimacy, transparency, and long-term sustainability. It involves both vertical coordination (across levels of government and institutions) and horizontal coordination (among local actors, civil society, and private partners). The vertical dimension is critical for aligning national policy frameworks with local realities, while the horizontal dimension facilitates community participation, local knowledge integration, and responsiveness to user needs [18, 19].

Multi-stakeholder governance theory emphasizes the inclusion of diverse actors in the decision-making process, recognizing that complex problems such as rural energy poverty cannot be solved by any single institution. This approach draws on the principle of deliberative democracy and the idea that stakeholder diversity can improve problem-solving by incorporating different knowledge types, values, and interests. It challenges the traditional state-centric or market-driven models by redistributing authority and accountability among public, private, and community actors [20, 21].

In decentralized energy projects, multi-stakeholder involvement is not merely desirable; it is essential. Governments can provide regulatory support and long-term policy stability; private firms bring innovation, capital, and efficiency; local communities contribute contextual knowledge, labor, and ownership; while NGOs and development partners often act as facilitators or intermediaries [22]. A governance model that coordinates these actors in a structured, transparent, and participatory way is more likely to deliver resilient and user-centered energy systems, particularly in environments where institutional capacity is weak [23, 24].

2.3 Review of Existing Governance Gaps

Despite growing recognition of the importance of decentralized systems, current governance arrangements remain inadequate for managing their complexity. One major gap lies in the exclusion of local communities from meaningful participation. Often, energy projects are planned and executed by national ministries, foreign donors, or private developers with limited engagement from the intended users. This top-down approach undermines legitimacy, reduces user uptake, and impedes maintenance due to a lack of community ownership. The result is frequently a mismatch between system design and actual demand, leading to underutilized infrastructure or outright abandonment.

Another critical weakness is the fragmentation of institutional responsibilities. In many settings, multiple agencies may have overlapping mandates, such as energy, rural development, environment, and finance, without effective coordination mechanisms. This siloed approach leads to duplicated efforts, inefficiencies in resource allocation, and policy incoherence. Similarly, private investors often face regulatory uncertainty, unclear licensing procedures, or conflicting signals from different arms of government, which increases project risk and discourages long-term commitment.

Furthermore, many governance models lack formal mechanisms for accountability, transparency, and dispute resolution. In the absence of clear frameworks for monitoring, feedback, and enforcement, decentralized systems may become vulnerable to elite capture, corruption, or mismanagement. These deficiencies are particularly acute in rural areas where institutional capacity is low and oversight

mechanisms are weak or non-existent. Without a coherent governance model that addresses these systemic gaps, the promise of decentralized energy risks being undermined by the very institutional failures it seeks to circumvent.

3. Model Design: Multi-Stakeholder Governance Framework

3.1 Core Design Principles

A functional and sustainable governance model for decentralized energy access must be grounded in foundational design principles that shape how actors interact, make decisions, and share responsibilities. The first principle is inclusivity, ensuring that all stakeholders, especially traditionally marginalized groups such as rural women, youth, and low-income households, are meaningfully engaged in governance processes. Inclusive structures prevent elite capture, enhance social legitimacy, and enable energy systems to reflect local needs and aspirations.

Transparency is equally vital, both in decision-making and in the flow of financial, technical, and operational information. Open processes build trust among stakeholders and serve as a deterrent to corruption or mismanagement. Transparent governance structures should ensure that all decisions, ranging from technology selection to tariff setting, are well-communicated and subject to community oversight [25].

Accountability must be embedded through defined roles, performance monitoring, and consequences for non-compliance or neglect. Stakeholders, from government agencies to community leaders, must be accountable for their commitments and actions. This is closely tied to the principle of subsidiarity, which advocates for decision-making at the lowest effective level. Local actors should have genuine authority over operations and maintenance, tariff negotiation, and grievance resolution. Empowering communities in this way enhances ownership and long-term sustainability [26, 27].

Finally, the model must be designed with resilience in mind. Rural energy systems often operate in politically volatile or economically fragile contexts. Therefore, governance arrangements must be flexible and robust enough to withstand funding disruptions, leadership changes, or climatic events. This can be achieved through diversified funding channels, institutional redundancy, and adaptive feedback mechanisms [28].

3.2 Roles and Responsibilities of Key Actors

A clear allocation of roles and responsibilities is central to the success of any multi-stakeholder governance model. Government actors, including national ministries and local authorities, are primarily responsible for creating the enabling environment. This includes setting policy direction, designing supportive regulatory frameworks, offering subsidies or incentives where appropriate, and ensuring grid compatibility and safety standards. Governments also play a convening role, bringing stakeholders together, resolving jurisdictional overlaps, and upholding equity standards in access and affordability [29].

The private sector brings critical capabilities to the governance model. Technology providers, energy service companies, and financial institutions contribute innovation, capital, and operational efficiency. Their involvement enables the deployment of state-of-the-art technologies, scalable business models, and sustainable cost-recovery mechanisms. However, their engagement must be guided by clear regulations, risk-sharing instruments, and social obligations to prevent profit-maximizing behavior that undermines affordability or inclusiveness [30].

Local communities and non-governmental organizations (NGOs) serve as the social foundation of the governance system. They possess valuable local knowledge about user needs, land ownership, cultural dynamics, and informal norms that shape project success. Communities can participate through energy committees, cooperatives, or user associations, taking on roles in site selection, tariff negotiation, and

system oversight. NGOs often act as facilitators, capacity builders, and watchdogs, helping bridge the trust gap between technical actors and local users. Their involvement ensures that projects are not only technically viable but also socially embedded.

This tripartite configuration, public, private, and community, must be recognized not as a division of labor but as a shared governance ecosystem, with overlapping responsibilities and mutual accountability. Each actor must have both a stake and a voice in shaping outcomes [31, 32].

3.3 Coordination Mechanisms and Decision-Making Structures

Effective coordination among diverse stakeholders requires structured mechanisms that enable communication, negotiation, and joint decision-making. One such mechanism is the establishment of multi-stakeholder forums, which serve as platforms for dialogue, planning, and dispute resolution. These forums may include representatives from government, energy providers, user associations, and NGOs, and can operate at local, regional, or national levels depending on the complexity of the system. They help align expectations, harmonize strategies, and surface grievances before they escalate into conflict.

Joint committees can be institutionalized to oversee specific functions such as tariff setting, procurement, or monitoring and evaluation. These committees ensure that decisions are informed by multiple perspectives and are responsive to both technical realities and community priorities. For more localized governance, community boards, elected or selected from among users, can manage day-to-day operations, mediate disputes, and liaise with external actors [33].

Crucially, the governance model must incorporate feedback loops that allow the system to learn and adapt. These include regular performance audits, user satisfaction surveys, and technical reviews, all feeding into iterative improvements in management or service delivery. Additionally, there must be conflict resolution frameworks that are independent, culturally appropriate, and accessible to all stakeholders, especially marginalized users.

To build adaptive governance, the model should allow for flexibility in institutional design, financial flows, and stakeholder participation. This requires not only technical foresight but also political will and institutional maturity. Ultimately, a governance model's strength lies in its ability to evolve with changing conditions while maintaining core commitments to equity, participation, and reliability.

4. Policy and Implementation Considerations

4.1 Institutional Alignment and Regulatory Support

The success of a multi-stakeholder governance model for decentralized energy access is contingent upon strong institutional alignment across different levels of government and coherent regulatory frameworks. National energy policies must explicitly recognize decentralized systems not as interim solutions but as integral components of the national energy mix. Ministries responsible for energy, rural development, finance, and local government must coordinate mandates to avoid jurisdictional conflicts and policy fragmentation. Institutional alignment ensures that stakeholders operate under unified objectives and benefit from predictable support systems [34, 35].

Local authorities play a pivotal role in implementation. Their proximity to communities positions them as essential actors in permitting, site access, stakeholder engagement, and grievance resolution. However, their involvement must be backed by both capacity and authority. Decentralization policies should empower local governments to support decentralized energy initiatives through planning integration, technical support units, and regulatory facilitation. Without this subnational commitment, top-down models risk disconnection from community realities and implementation bottlenecks [36].

Regulatory harmonization is also vital. A fragmented or ambiguous regulatory environment can deter private sector investment and discourage innovation.

Clear frameworks on licensing, tariff setting, quality standards, and dispute resolution are necessary to minimize transaction costs and ensure accountability. Finally, political will is indispensable. Policymakers must demonstrate long-term commitment through consistent funding, legislative backing, and inclusive national strategies. Only with aligned institutions and robust regulatory scaffolding can the proposed governance model gain traction and legitimacy [37, 38].

4.2 Financing and Resource Mobilization

A well-structured governance model creates a conducive environment for mobilizing diverse sources of finance. Blended finance, which combines public funds, private investment, and donor contributions, is increasingly recognized as essential to scaling decentralized energy in rural areas. Public funds can de-risk early-stage investments or support viability gap funding, while donor capital can catalyze innovation and capacity building. The private sector brings commercial discipline, innovation, and scalability, but typically requires clarity on risk-sharing and return expectations [39].

The governance model facilitates financial alignment by establishing credible institutions for fund management, including joint finance committees, third-party auditors, and participatory budgeting mechanisms. These institutions enhance confidence among donors, banks, and investors by providing transparent processes for project selection, disbursement, and monitoring. By reducing information asymmetry and improving accountability, they help unlock capital that would otherwise be deterred by perceived governance risks [40].

Transparency in fund allocation is paramount. Communities must understand how funds are raised, allocated, and used. This transparency not only deters corruption but also builds social trust and user buy-in, both critical for long-term financial sustainability, especially when user fees or tariffs are involved. The governance model should mandate public disclosure of financial records, performance reports, and procurement decisions. Ultimately, successful resource mobilization depends not only on technical project viability but also on the credibility and transparency of the institutions that govern them [41, 42].

4.3 Capacity Building and Community Engagement

For decentralized energy systems to thrive under a multi-stakeholder governance model, investments in capacity building must be prioritized. Local stakeholders, community leaders, cooperative members, technicians, and local government officials often lack the technical, financial, or managerial skills required to fulfill their roles effectively. Structured training programs can address these gaps, focusing on system maintenance, financial literacy, governance procedures, and conflict resolution. Capacity building should not be treated as a one-off intervention but as an ongoing process embedded in the life cycle of the energy system.

Community engagement goes beyond consultation; it involves empowering communities to participate meaningfully in governance decisions. This includes giving communities a voice in technology selection, tariff negotiation, and operations management. Mechanisms such as community energy committees, participatory planning sessions, and citizen monitoring platforms embed democratic accountability and enhance ownership. When communities perceive themselves as co-owners rather than passive beneficiaries, they are more likely to contribute to system upkeep, discourage vandalism, and resolve local conflicts [43, 44].

Long-term sustainability is inextricably linked to local ownership, both in perception and practice. Governance models should include pathways for transferring operational responsibility to community institutions over time, supported by technical and financial oversight from national or regional bodies. When systems are owned and governed locally, they are more likely to survive political transitions, donor withdrawal, or private sector exit. Building trust, institutional memory, and a culture of responsibility

at the community level is therefore a cornerstone of durable decentralized energy access [45].

5. Conclusion

This paper has proposed a structured multi-stakeholder governance model designed to enhance decentralized energy access in rural communities. The model's novelty lies in its formalization of inclusive roles, transparent decision-making structures, and adaptive coordination mechanisms that go beyond traditional technical and financial approaches to electrification. By grounding the model in core governance principles, including inclusivity, transparency, accountability, subsidiarity, and resilience, it addresses the fundamental institutional and social gaps that have historically undermined rural energy projects.

Importantly, the model directly confronts three persistent challenges: fragmentation, by establishing clearly defined roles across actors and creating platforms for coordination; lack of coordination, by introducing forums and joint committees to align diverse interests and actions; and legitimacy deficits, by embedding community engagement and oversight into all stages of project development and management. Unlike donor-driven or top-down frameworks, this governance model enables shared ownership and sustained stakeholder commitment, making decentralized energy systems more socially embedded and operationally resilient. By rethinking governance as a co-productive process, the paper makes a strategic contribution to the field of energy access and offers a pathway toward more accountable and scalable rural electrification interventions.

Theoretically, this paper contributes to the growing literature on governance in energy transitions by advancing a stakeholder-centric approach to decentralized infrastructure. It extends traditional governance theory by applying it to the unique institutional conditions of rural energy poverty, where informal norms, limited state capacity, and fragmented authority often coexist. The model also reinforces the value of participatory governance, offering a counter-narrative to market- or state-dominant models that often marginalize end users.

Practically, the implications are substantial. The model provides a replicable blueprint for policymakers, developers, and civil society actors seeking to implement decentralized energy projects that are both effective and equitable. It highlights the need to move beyond technology deployment to institutional design, ensuring that systems are not only installed but also maintained, governed, and trusted. In doing so, it offers a pragmatic response to the persistent failures of grid expansion and the pitfalls of uncoordinated rural energy interventions. Moreover, by emphasizing capacity building, regulatory clarity, and shared financing mechanisms, the model offers tools for scaling decentralized solutions across diverse geographies. Its application could significantly accelerate progress toward universal energy access while strengthening local governance systems and democratic participation.

To translate this model into practice, key stakeholder groups must undertake a coordinated set of policy, institutional, and operational actions. Governments, as the central enablers of national energy transitions, should formally institutionalize decentralized energy access within broader development and energy strategies. This involves not only prioritizing it in national plans but also mandating inter-ministerial coordination to prevent duplication and policy conflict. Crucially, governments must provide the legal recognition and support required for local energy committees to function effectively. Additionally, clear and consistent regulations on licensing, tariff-setting, and quality standards are needed to reduce risks for both community actors and private investors, ensuring transparency and predictability in the investment environment.

Private sector actors have an equally critical role to play. They should engage local communities early in the design and deployment stages of energy projects to foster social alignment and avoid implementation

failures. Transparent business models that disclose cost structures, service metrics, and performance data should be adopted, allowing users and oversight bodies to assess service quality and sustainability. Furthermore, private firms are encouraged to collaborate with governments and civil society organizations to co-finance capacity-building initiatives and support long-term maintenance strategies. This collaborative investment in human and institutional capital can significantly improve system durability and user satisfaction.

Civil society organizations and development partners serve as vital intermediaries and facilitators in the governance ecosystem. They are well-positioned to convene multi-stakeholder platforms, mediate competing interests, and enhance mutual understanding among actors. Their support is essential in delivering training programs, technical assistance, and participatory planning processes that build local governance capacity. In addition, they play a monitoring and evaluative role, ensuring that projects are not only assessed on the basis of technical performance but also judged by governance quality, inclusiveness, and institutional resilience.

REFERENCES

[1]. V. R. Nalule, Energy poverty and access challenges in sub-Saharan Africa: The role of regionalism. Springer, 2018.

[2]. K. Kaygusuz, "Energy for sustainable development: A case of developing countries," Renewable and sustainable energy reviews, vol. 16, no. 2, pp. 1116-1126, 2012.

[3]. Y. Mohammed, M. Mustafa, and N. Bashir, "Status of renewable energy consumption and developmental challenges in Sub-Sahara Africa," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 27, pp. 453-463, 2013.

[4]. S. C. Bhattacharyya, "Energy access programmes and sustainable development: A critical review and analysis," Energy for sustainable development, vol. 16, no. 3, pp. 260-271, 2012.

[5]. S. Karekezi and W. Kithyoma, "Renewable energy strategies for rural Africa: is a PV-led renewable energy strategy the right approach for providing modern energy to the rural poor of sub-Saharan Africa?," Energy policy, vol. 30, no. 11-12, pp. 1071-1086, 2002.

[6]. D. F. Barnes and W. M. Floor, "Rural energy in developing countries: a challenge for economic development," Annual review of energy and the environment, vol. 21, no. 1, pp. 497-530, 1996.

[7]. N. Avila, J. P. Carvallo, B. Shaw, and D. M. Kammen, "The energy challenge in sub-Saharan Africa: A guide for advocates and policy makers," Generating Energy for Sustainable and Equitable Development, Part, vol. 1, pp. 1-79, 2017.

[8]. S. Pachauri et al., "Energy access for development," 2012.

[9]. E. Akhigbe, N. Egbuhuzor, A. Ajayi, and O. Agbede, "Optimization of investment portfolios in renewable energy using advanced financial modeling techniques," International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research Updates, vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 40-58, 2022.

[10]. E. O. Ogunnowo, M. A. Adewoyin, J. E. Fiemotongha, and T. Odion, "Advances in Predicting Microstructural Evolution in Superalloys Using Directed Energy Deposition Data," 2022.

[11]. E. Mboumboue and D. Njomo, "Potential contribution of renewables to the improvement of living conditions of poor rural households in developing countries: Cameroon′ s case study," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 61, pp. 266-279, 2016.

[12]. E. Y. Gbabo, O. K. Okenwa, and P. E. Chima, "Constructing AI-Enabled Compliance Automation Models for Real-Time Regulatory Reporting in Energy Systems."

[13]. O. Agbede, "Financial valuation of green bonds for sustainability-focused energy investment portfolios and projects," 2021.

[14]. D. Palit and K. R. Bandyopadhyay, "Rural electricity access in South Asia: Is grid extension the remedy? A critical review," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 60, pp. 1505-1515, 2016.

[15]. D. P. Kaundinya, P. Balachandra, and N. H. Ravindranath, "Grid-connected versus stand-alone energy systems for decentralized power—A review of literature," Renewable and sustainable energy reviews, vol. 13, no. 8, pp. 2041-2050, 2009.

[16]. A. Lahimer, M. Alghoul, F. Yousif, T. Razykov, N. Amin, and K. Sopian, "Research and development aspects on decentralized electrification options for rural household," Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, vol. 24, pp. 314-324, 2013.

[17]. E. Y. Gbabo, O. K. Okenwa, and P. E. Chima, "Integrating CDM Regulations into Role-Based Compliance Models for Energy Infrastructure Projects."

[18]. N. Sanjel and B. Baral, "Modelling and analysis of decentralized energy systems with photovoltaic, micro-hydro, battery and diesel technology for remote areas of Nepal," Clean Energy, vol. 5, no. 4, pp. 690-703, 2021.

[19]. I. Javid et al., "Futuristic decentralized clean energy networks in view of inclusive-economic growth and sustainable society," Journal of Cleaner Production, vol. 309, p. 127304, 2021.

[20]. D. Dentoni, V. Bitzer, and G. Schouten, "Harnessing wicked problems in multi-stakeholder partnerships," Journal of Business Ethics, vol. 150, pp. 333-356, 2018.

[21]. K. Maani, Multi-stakeholder decision making for complex problems: A systems thinking approach with cases. World Scientific, 2016.

[22]. L. J. Jansen and P. P. Kalas, "Improving governance of tenure in policy and practice: A conceptual basis to analyze multi-stakeholder partnerships for multi-stakeholder transformative governance illustrated with an example from South Africa," Sustainability, vol. 12, no. 23, p. 9901, 2020.

[23]. M. Yami, J. Barletti, and A. M. Larson, "Can multi-stakeholder forums influence good governance in communal forest management? Lessons from two case studies in Ethiopia," International Forestry Review, vol. 23, no. 1, pp. 24-42, 2021.

[24]. G. Benedetto, G. Corinto, F. Marangon, and S. Troiano, "Implementing the Future Rural Policy. A Multi-stakeholder Governance Test in Reality," in CAP 2014-2020: Scenarios for European Agri-Food and Rural Systems, vol. 1: Universitas Studiorum Srl-Publisher, 2015, pp. 347-353.

[25]. A. M. Goetz and R. Jenkins, Reinventing accountability. Springer, 2005.

[26]. T. Ledger, "'The logic of appropriateness': understanding non-compliance in South African local government," Transformation: Critical Perspectives on Southern Africa, vol. 103, no. 1, pp. 36-58, 2020.

[27]. A. Shah, "Responsibility with accountability: A FAIR governance framework for performance accountability of local governments," Zbornik radova Ekonomskog fakulteta u Rijeci: časopis za ekonomsku teoriju i praksu, vol. 32, no. 2, pp. 343-377, 2014.

[28]. P. Newell and S. Bellour, "Mapping accountability: origins, contexts and implications for development," 2002.

[29]. D. Lewis, N. Kanji, and N. S. Themudo, Non-governmental organizations and development. Routledge, 2020.

[30]. G. Wright and K. Andersson, "Non-governmental organizations, rural communities and forests: A comparative analysis of community-NGO interactions," Small-Scale Forestry, vol. 12, pp. 33-50, 2013.

[31]. R. Nyangosi, S. N. Nyang'au, J. Oenga, and A. J. Suleiman, "Role of non governmental organizations (NGOs) in social development in developing Nations," 2016.

[32]. N. Z. Abiddin, I. Ibrahim, and S. A. Abdul Aziz, "Non-governmental organisations (NGOs) and their part towards sustainable community development," Sustainability, vol. 14, no. 8, p. 4386, 2022.

[33]. A. M. Clark, "Non-governmental organizations and their influence on international society," Journal of international affairs, pp. 507-525, 1995.

[34]. T. Kulkarni, "Water Governance and Policy Challenges in Urban and Rural Drinking Water Supply in Developing Countries, with Insights from Multiple Industries," Journal of Engineering and Applied Sciences Technology. SRC/JEAST-421. DOI: doi. org/10.47363/JEAST/2022 (4), vol. 299, pp. 2-7, 2022.

[35]. E. Melville, "The roles of communities and local authorities in the GB sustainable energy transition: a commons and multi-stakeholder governance perspective," University of Surrey, 2018.

[36]. A. Di Vaio, L. Trujillo, G. D'Amore, and R. Palladino, "Water governance models for meeting sustainable development Goals: A structured literature review," Utilities Policy, vol. 72, p. 101255, 2021.

[37]. M. U. Klein and B. Hadjimichael, The private sector in development: Entrepreneurship, regulation, and competitive disciplines. World Bank Publications, 2003.

[38]. K. Blind, "15. The impact of regulation on innovation," Handbook of innovation policy impact, vol. 450, 2016.

[39]. S. Tenev, C. Zhang, and L. Brefort, Corporate governance and enterprise reform in China: Building the institutions of modern markets. World Bank Publications, 2002.

[40]. C. E. Cuevas and K. P. Fischer, Cooperative financial institutions: Issues in governance, regulation, and supervision (no. 82). World Bank Publications, 2006.

[41]. J. K. Kristensen, M. Bowen, C. Long, S. Mustapha, and U. Zrinski, PEFA, public financial management, and good governance. World Bank Publications, 2019.

[42]. J. B. McKinney, "Effective financial management in public and nonprofit agencies," 2015.

[43]. J. G. Tovar, "Can Multi-Stakeholder Forums Promote Balanced Power Relations, Collaboration and a Sustainable Development? A Comparative Analysis of Territorial Planning in Two Very Different Brazilian States," University of Florida, 2020.

[44]. C. Tacconelli, "An integrated approach to decentralized energy systems planning for developing countries," 2021.

[45]. A. MacDonald, A. Clarke, and L. Huang, "Multi-stakeholder partnerships for sustainability: Designing decision-making processes for partnership capacity," in Business and the ethical implications of technology: Springer, 2022, pp. 103-120.