Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews

Not quite cooking on gas: Understanding biogas plant failure and abandonment in Northern Tanzania

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	RSER-D-22-00478R1
Article Type:	Original Research Article
Section/Category:	Waste to Energy
Keywords:	SDG7; Tanzania; Energy Ecosystem; Energy Access; biogas; Failure
Corresponding Author:	Benjamin Robinson UNITED KINGDOM
First Author:	Joseph Hewitt
Order of Authors:	Joseph Hewitt
	Maria Holden
	Benjamin Robinson
	Sarah Jewitt
	Mike Clifford
Abstract:	The potential for biogas to fulfil an integral role in promoting sustainable energy solutions, particularly in the Global South, is evident, and especially pertinent in the Sustainable Development Goal era. Internationally, multiple initiatives driven by private, public and third sectors have resulted in a significant growth in the numbers of biogas plants constructed. These processes are highly visible in Tanzania which has witnessed considerable investment across the sector in recent decades leading to a proliferation of biogas systems. However, research suggests that many of these plants experience failures which can lead to the ultimate abandonment of the systems, eroding the potential benefits of widespread biogas adoption. This research explores some of the main drivers of biogas plant failure and abandonment in the northern Tanzania through a rapid review of the literature identifying current sector best practice and a series of semi-structed interviews with key stakeholders including biogas plant owners, operators, constructors, government officials and private enterprises. Our analysis reveals a range of clear and, at points, interrelated themes associated with biogas failure which can be largely grouped under the following banners; poor construction and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, operation and maintenance issues, and training provision and knowledge erosion. By illuminating the subtleties surrounding each challenge, this paper is designed to stimulate a re-evaluation of how long-term, sustained and successful use of biogas plants can be fostered through a reduction in failure and/or abandonment. This is particularly important given that the biogas sector continues to evolve and expand across the globe.
Response to Reviewers:	We thank all the editors and reviewers for their comments, please see the "detailed response to reviewers" for our specific and individual responses. Thanks you for helping significantly increase the quality of this paper.

Faculty of Engineering
University of Nottingham
Nottingham
NG7 2RD

+44 (0)7942 789093
benjamin.robinson@nottingham.ac.uk

18th January 2021

Dear Dr. Foley,

We wish to submit an original research article entitled "*Not quite cooking on gas: Understanding biogas plant failure and abandonment in Northern Tanzania"* for consideration by Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews. We confirm that this work is original and has not been published elsewhere, nor is it currently under consideration for publication elsewhere.

We believe that this manuscript is appropriate for publication by Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews and is relevant to its scientific readership as this article focuses on a critically unresearched element of the adoption and sustained use of small-scale biogas plants - plant failure and abandonment. We also present a significant review element of existing literature and then evidence this with the lived experience of biogas plant stakeholders in rural Tanzania. Our interviews suggest a range of reasons behind plant failure and abandonment including operational, structural and maintenance challenges. We show that without addressing these underlying forces, these often-interrelated issues serve to undermine many of the positive advancements in biogas plant development across Tanzania.

This work was funded by InnovateUK's "Smart Biogas Network' (Grant Number 132479) and by InnovateUK's "Smart Biogas II - Increasing Wealth from Waste" (Grant Number 105909) and was approved under the University of Nottingham ethical guidelines. We recommend Ben Cambell, Sujatha Raman, Charlotte Ray as reviewers for this paper.

The authors have no conflicts of interest to disclose and have no financial interest or benefit arising from the direct applications of their research. The article has been fully proof-read by a native English speaker with extensive field experience. The authors are also available review new submissions for Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews.

Please address all correspondence concerning this manuscript to me at:
Benjamin.robinson@nottingham.ac.uk

Thank you for your consideration of this manuscript.

Sincerely,

Ben Robinson

Manuscript No.: RSER-D-22-00478
Title: Not quite cooking on gas: Understanding biogas plant failure and abandonment in Northern Tanzania

Note that author(s) are not obliged to use any references (e.g. conference articles, journal articles or reports etc.) recommended, suggested or provided by reviewer(s). In fact author(s) are fully within their rights to reject such a suggestion outright unless the author(s) feels that the suggested reference(s) add materially to the content and or quality of the submission.

Reviewers and/or Editors' comments:	Author Responses
The editorial requirements 1) to 7) are as follows;	
1) Submit the original manuscript showing clearly all textual changes using track changes. Just highlighting textual changes in yellow (or other colour) is not acceptable. This includes all edits related to reviewer(s) comments and the Editorial points.	Done
2) Submit the clean revised version of the manuscript.	Done.
3) Provide a 'Response to reviewers and Editor document' with a point by point response to each comment from the reviewer(s) and the Editor (i.e. points 1 to 7). Carefully and fully address the issues raised and refer to each comment from the reviewer(s) and the Editor clearly in the revised/edited/changed text in the marked-up copy of the original manuscript (e.g. line number X to Y on page X in the marked-up manuscript) in this response.	Done – contained in this document.
4) Read the 'Guide for Authors' at https://www.elsevier.com/journals/renewable-and-sustainable-energy-reviews/1364-0321/guide-for-authors very carefully. It is the sole responsibility of the author(s) to ensure that their article is correct and meets RSER style and format fully in terms of contents and layout (e.g. authorship, order of authorship, addresses, article structure, keywords, abbreviations, nomenclature, captions on figures and tables, acknowledgement of those that helped and or funded the research including datasets, references).	We have completed this task.
5) Ensure that permission is attained for all copyrighted graphics, images, tables and/or figures. Note that for any figures, graphics or images published elsewhere by the author or others, the author(s) must arrange permission and this must be clearly stated in the 'Acknowledgements' section at the end of the article. If the author(s) cannot arrange permission, then the graphics, images, tables and or figure must be removed from the manuscript.	We have completed this task.
6) Check the English carefully for grammar, spelling and syntax. This is an English language journal. It is also not the role of reviewer(s), the Editor or indeed the publishing team to proof read the English, grammar and or syntax of a manuscript. The function of the reviewer(s) and an editor is to examine scope, robustness and technical content. Proof reading is the sole responsibility of the author(s), for example, articles are written in the first or third person and the use of "I," "we" or "they" should be avoided. Note if an article is revised and resubmitted with poor	We have removed the use of first person except in the quotes from respondents. We have also fully proof-read the paper.

English, grammar and or syntax it will be rejected. Author(s) should get help from a colleague with better English, or alternatively a paid English language editing service of which there are many, could be arranged. For example, Elsevier offers author-paid language editing services via the Author Webshop, see http://webshop.elsevier.com/languageediting. However, using an English language service (including Elsevier's) is NOT a guarantee that an article will be subsequently accepted for publication.	
7) Check your manuscript for intentional or unintentional plagiarism of your own work or work by others elsewhere. All author(s) must read 'Ethics in publishing' in the 'Guide for Authors' and 'Publishing Ethics' at https://www.elsevier.com/about/our-business/policies/publishing-ethics and 'Ethical guidelines for journal publication' at https://www.elsevier.com/authors/journal-authors/policies-and-ethics The policy of RSER is to publish new and original work. Text, even in introductions, is the intellectual property of the original publication, and should never be used without clearly distinguishing that it is from another source (either by quotations or indentations). Author(s) cannot also reuse or recycle some (or indeed all) of their work published elsewhere as it is already covered by copyright. Each article should present some novelty and new result, and it is the Editor's opinion that this should be written in the author(s) own words. Unless the author(s) have a legitimate explanation for the large amount of textual overlap between their submitted manuscript and previously published work(s), an article will not be considered further for publication. All manuscripts submitted to RSER are checked for originality using the CrossRef Similarity Check database. For more information on CrossRef visit their website at http://www.crossref.org/crosscheck.html Submit the revised manuscript, the marked-up original manuscript and the 'Response to reviewers and Editors document' as follows; 1. Go to: https://www.editorialmanager.com/rser/Default.aspx 2. Enter your login details. 3. Click [Author Login]. This takes you to the Author Main Menu. 4. Click [Submissions Needing Revision]. Include interactive data visualizations in your publication and let your readers interact and engage more closely with your research. Follow the instructions here: https://www.elsevier.com/authors/author-services/data-visualization to find out about available data visualization options and how to include them	We have completed this task.

with your article. MethodsX (optional)	
Reviewer #1:	
This is a very interesting work reporting and documenting the utilization of biogas in Tanzania. The work dives into several detailed aspects for this domain in Tanzania. The work addresses the main sparks that led to failure of biogas plants. Further, the work relies on a set of data based on interviews with stakeholders in this domain. This work is seen important especially under the sustainable development goal and the decarbonization of energy sector.	Thank you for your comments and taking the time to review our manuscript
1-Introduction: this section should be further improved and states clearly the novelty of this work compared to other studies.	The novelty and significance of the work has been highlighted towards the end of the introduction
2- Introduction: Some focus should be given to the current need to substitute fossil fuels and specifically natural gas. Then, some focus should be given to the expected role of renewables.	Thank you. We have addressed this point in the introduction.
3- Methods: This section is well elaborated and detailed. However, I would recommend the authors to support this section with a flowchart revealing the steps of the methodology.	Given that our methods section only has two steps we do not think a flowchart would add significant value.
4 - Findings: This section is more a discussion rather than findings with numbers.	In line with more social science and qualitative approach we have combined our results and discussions sections into one findings section. There are no numbers in our paper as we rely on a qualitative method with a phenomenological approach focused on understanding the lived experience of our participants.
5- Conclusions: This is an unnecessarily long section. This should be condensed to minimum.	We have edited the discussion and conclusion which are now two separate sections to help address this comment.
6- This is more a technical report of white paper rather than a scientific paper. Please consider the differences between those types and improve the paper accordingly.	We have made improvements across the paper to address this comment.
7- Recommendation: Try to insert some figures in the findings section. This would be helpful.	We have added figures into the methods section which show the types of biogas units, however, we do not feel that extra figures would strengthen the findings section.
8- Comment: Make sure to follow the rules of data privacy when revealing the comments/replies of people.	We have rechecked all the quotes and they comply with the ethical approval given by the authors academic institution.
Reviewer #2: This paper attempted to examine the issues associated with biogas plant in Northern Tanzania. Some lit was reviewed followed by semi structured interviews.	Thank you for taking the time to review our paper.
The global significance of this study needs to be stated clearer.	Thank you. We have highlighted this more clearly in the introduction.
The logic of this research is not clear. what is the purpose of the lit review? what is the logic relationship with the interviews. The way it was	We used the results of the rapid review to frame our discussions with the key biogas stakeholder groups. We have added a sentence in section two

presented, these two parts were independent, with themes coming out from each part. More synthesis is required,	paragraph 1 to highlight this. Additionally, the two findings sections (section 4 & 5) share headings as a way of further linking the key themes from the literature and the lives experience of our participants.
how the lit was located? e.g. database, keywords, timeframe.	We have included the relevant information needed when conducting a rapid review in section 2.1 paragraph 2.
interview: sampling approach? analysis method, e.g. coding process, validity and reliability?	We have added in our sampling method to section 2.2.1. paragraph 1. The coding process is outlined in section 2.2.2. and we consider the reliability of the data in section 2.2.3 when exploring limitations.
there is lack of discussion of findings.	We have added a discussion section.
critical findings should be highlighted in conclusions.	We have further highlighted the key learnings in the conclusion.
Reviewer #3: Dear Authors	
The submitted manuscript is interesting and original. This paper makes a study for biogas plants at a local level in Tanzania. This issue regarding energy transition, which is based on the local energy resources, inc. biogas ones are assumed as one of the crucial features of rural sustainability. Nevertheless, there are some improvements required before publication, as follows: Why did the authors decide on a rapid literature review of the small-scale biogas? I would recommend an in-depth literature review so that all problems related to the functioning of the small-scale biogas, both technical and socio-cultural issues, can be identified. I can't entirely agree with the authors' opinion that small-scale biogas plants have often been overlooked in previous energy studies. What does it mean: small-scale biogas plant? This issue also needs to be defined in this article.	We thank you for your detailed review of our work. Unfortunately, an in-depth literature review wasn't possible in the time that was available hence we chose the rapid review method to help guide the development of interview guides and identification of potential stakeholder participants. We do not believe that this has affected the quality of our findings. We have acknowledged the limition of using this method in the limitations section of the methods. We have modified small-scale to household scale throughout the paper to improved clarity
I would recommend discussing small-scale biogas plants in a broader context. Not only as a source for cooking (which is really important especially for rural African women), but as a solid, perspective source of heat, electricity, and fertilizer, generally as one of the energy solutions for off-grid rural areas. As the results of this paper suggest: the biogas plant in this primary technology is unreliable. It does not meet the recipients' expectations. So, it would be worth considering the use of modern technology that allows you to obtain electricity, which can be successfully used for cooking and other energy needs. These issues should be included in the paper.	As we were focussed on participant generated reasons for biogas plant failure and abandonment, we feel that this would be outside of the scope of this paper - further research may consider the implications of this research in the wider energy sector.
There is a lack of discussion. It should be added. I would recommend focusing this chapter on the	We have added a short discussion section

education on the biogas plants, their operation, installation, and opportunities to improve the perception of biogas plants.	Our data was also generated by our participants and thus the focus of the paper was also generated by their lived experience with biogas plant abandonment and failure.
There is a lack of graphics, and maps; for instance, maps with the location of the analysed area, and the main energy sources in Tanzania, inc. biogas, and others.	In response to the comment earlier about the paper looking like a white paper we have looked to keep the figures to a minimum. We have added additional information in the introduction about the Tanzanian energy landscape.
Reviewer #4: The paper is extremely well written and can provide useful hints to bio gas practitioners thanks to the well structured field work. What in my opinion is missing in the paper is some quantitative framework details.	We thank you for your review.
For instance: - how much biogas installed capacity is planned in the area? how much coming from big vs. small plants? - what is the share of "failure" in the two categories?	Unfortunately, we do not have access to this data as our study was solely qualitative and focused on the lived experience of the biogas stakeholders in the small scale market.
- how relevant is biogas in the energy policy of Tanzania in total and in comparison with other renewable sources?	We have chosen to focus on the biogas stakeholder lived experience in this paper and believe that whilst the policy landscape is relevant it lies out of the focus of this paper.
In general, I think it would be useful if authors could provide a more detailed picture of the rural energy situation in the area and the actions taking place. This will surely help the reader to better put their interesting analysis effort in a wider context.	We have added extra information about the Tanzanian energy landscape in the introduction.
Minor: the acronym of Africa Biogas Partnership Program shouldn't be ABPP instead of ABBP?	We have corrected the acronym to ABPP.
Reviewer #5:	
1. Abstract: Typo here "semi-structed interviews". Another example of typos is an extra colon in Introduction section where you define RO2: "stakeholders to: understand". I would recommend a careful and thorough writing and grammar check.	We have corrected the typo in the abstract and removed the extra colon. We have fully re-checked the rest of the document.
2. Introduction: My comment is about this part: "In 2016, the TDBP received nine billion Tanzanian shilling ($3.9 million USD) worth of funding from the governments of Tanzania, Netherlands and Norway for the TDBP to install10,000 subsidized rural biogas plants by December 2017 [22,23]. Progress has been slow in recent years due to the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic and additionally with the second phase of the project coming to a close in 2019 [24]." How can you blame Covid-19, which started by late 2019, for the slow progress of instalment of biogas plants back in 2016, 2017, and even 2019?	We do not claim that COVID-19 was the cause of slow progress before 2019 as we state “progress has been slow in recent years” due to the closure of phase two of the program and after that the affects of COVID-19. However, we have rewritten this sentence to make our point clearer.
3. Section 2.1: No references are mentioned for the second paragraph. I would expect to see some references in what is called a "literature review".	Second 2.1. outlines the methods used for the rapid review and thus contains the key references. We have added a number of references to the second paragraph that add contextual value.

4. Conclusion: This section is too long and includes some materials that could have been placed in the literature review section.	We have edited this section and split the conclusion into two sections to address this point.

Marked Version of revised manuscript

Not quite cooking on gas: Understanding biogas plant failure and abandonment in Northern Tanzania

Hewitt, J.[a], Holden, M.[b], Robinson, B.L.[c*], Jewitt, S.[a], Clifford, M.J.[c]

[a] School of GeographyEnergy, Construction and Environment, The University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD. Coventry, University, Priory Street, Coventry, CV1 5FB
[b] School of Health Sciences, The University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD.
[c] Faculty of Engineering, The University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD

ABSTRACT

The potential for biogas to fulfil an integral role in promoting sustainable energy solutions, particularly in the Global South, is evident, and especially pertinent in the Sustainable Development Goal era. Internationally, multiple initiatives driven by private, public and third sectors have resulted in a significant growth in the numbers of biogas plants constructed. These processes are highly visible in Tanzania, which has witnessed considerable investment across the sector in recent decades leading to a proliferation of biogas systems. However, research suggests that many of these plants experience failures which can lead to the ultimate abandonment of the systems, eroding the potential benefits of widespread biogas adoption.

This research explores some of the main drivers of biogas plant failure and abandonment in the Nnorthern Tanzania through a rapid review of the literature identifying current sector best practice and a series of semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including: biogas plant owners, operators, constructors, government officials and private enterprises. Our The analysis reveals a range of clear and, at points, interrelated themes associated with biogas failure which can be largely grouped under the following banners;banners: poor construction and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, operation and maintenance issues, and training provision and knowledge erosion. By illuminating the subtleties surrounding each challenge, this paper is designed to stimulate a re-evaluation of how long-term, sustained and successful use of biogas plants can be fostered through a reduction in failure and/or abandonment. This is particularly important given that the biogas sector continues to evolve and expand across the globe.

Highlights:

- Advancements in biogas technologies are offset by plant failure and abandonment.
- Reasons for failure include operational, structural and maintenance challenges.
- These forces are often ignored, undermining many of the positive advancements.
- Addressing such problems is critical to reduce failure and abandonment rates.

Key Words: SDG7, Tanzania, Energy Ecosystem, Energy Access, Biogas, Failure

Word Count: 7437

* Corresponding Author e-mail address: benjamin.robinson@nottingham.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Biogas is derived from the anaerobic digestion (AD) of biomass and organic waste material and can be burned directly, used in combined heat and power units to generate electricity, cleaned to create biomethane for use in national grids or as a transport fuel. It is also recognised as having significant value for managing waste, while the digestate produced as a by-product of AD is widely valued in farming communities for its potential to reduce reliance on chemical fertiliser [1,2]. Reflecting efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the global energy and agricultural sectors, biogas has received significant recent attention as part of global strategies to increase reliance on renewable fuels, de-carbonise energy supply, ~~and~~ mitigate climate change and reduce reliance on fossil fuels [3–5]. It is also valued for its potential contribution to Sustainable Development Goal 7.1.2's aim of achieving 'universal access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking' by 2030 [5]; particularly in light of slow progress to date in the uptake and sustained (exclusive) use of cleaner cooking solutions [5–9]. ~~Of particular concern~~ There is also a ~~is the~~ need to reduce the health impacts associated with ~~household exposure to~~ household air pollution from ~~polluting combustion sources – notably~~burning biomass, ~~energy~~ particularly given that cooking with traditional solid fuels is estimated to cause ~~around~~ approximately 4 million premature deaths annually [10].

~~Historically~~In the decades after Tanzania's independence ~~in~~ in ~~(~~1961~~)~~, the country's energy landscape ~~in Tanzania~~ has been driven by "hydropowered industrialisation" [11]. However, ~~in the decades after independence, yet,~~ this source of power now only constitutes 1.2% of the total energy consumption (with petroleum 7.8% and natural gas 2.4%)
[12]. Moreover, ~~D~~despite 84% of the final total energy consumption being through renewable energy, and with 38% of the population having access to electricity (Urban 73%, Rural 18%), 90% of Tanzania's population still rely significantly~~ply~~ on burning biomass as their primary source of energy ~~resulting in only 4% of the population having access to clean cooking fuels and technologies~~ [13,14] In Tanzania, as well as more broadly across sub-Saharan Africa, off grid areas, where biomass fuels are the primary sources of household energy, there is a lack of infrastructure to support transitions to electricity or LPG.~~As reflected across sub-Saharan Africa as well as in Tanzania~~~~In rural, off-grid areas of the global South where solid biomass fuels are the primary sources of household energy~~ ~~and~~~~lack infrastructure to support transitions to electricity or LPG may be limited.~~, As such, ~~S~~small-scale biogas units have the potential to~~are viewed as having particular value in~~ improve~~ing~~ access to clean modern energy sources for cooking, heating and lighting whilst helping to substitute for fossil fuel based alternatives like LPG [15–19]. In China, small-scale biogas systems have been widely promoted for over 30 years [20], while India's National Biogas and Manure Management Programme promoted AD for improving household access to clean cooking and lighting fuels [21,22]. More recently, the Africa Biogas Partnership Program (ABP~~B~~P) has promoted small-scale biogas in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Burkino Faso and Ethiopia with 51,000 units being constructed since 2015. As key potential beneficiaries of biogas as a clean cooking fuel [23], the ABP~~B~~P has sought to train women in the construction and maintenance of biogas plants [24].

~~In Tanzania, b~~Biogas technology was first introduced in Tanzania by the ~~SIDO (~~Small Industries Development Organisation (SIDO).~~)~~ ~~i~~In 1975, in collaboration with a number of Non-G~~g~~overnment Organisations (NGOs) it was ~~, and~~ expanded with the support of the ~~CAMARTEC (~~Centre for Agricultural Mechanisation and Rural Technologies (CAMARTEC~~)~~ and the Dutch not-for-profit international development organisation SNV [25]. Further support for small-scale AD plants came from the Tanzania Domestic Biogas Project (TDBP),

Formatted: Highlight

implemented through the ABP~~B~~P, which oversaw the construction of over 12,000 biogas plants between 2009 and 2015. In 2016, the TDBP received nine billion Tanzanian shilling ($3.9 million USD) worth of funding from the governments of Tanzania, Netherlands and Norway for the TDBP to install 10,000 subsidized rural biogas plants by December 2017 [26,27]. Progress ~~has~~ in Tanzania and across east Africa ~~has been~~ slowed after ~~-~~the second phase of the project closed in 2019 [28] and more recently ~~in recent years~~ due to the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic~~ and additionally with the second phase of the project coming to a close in 2019 [24]~~. The scheme was targeted particularly at farmers with livestock who could use animal manure and other organic wastes as feedstock for their AD plants and focused especially on northern regions of Arusha, Kilimanjaro and Manyara, due to their high proportion of cattle rearing households [25,29].

While biogas technology has become increasingly visible through such national initiatives coupled with global efforts to promote clean energy sources and mitigate climate change, these positive changes have been somewhat undermined by the lack of sustained use of many small-scale biogas systems or their subsequent failure ~~/~~or abandonment [30–33]. Understanding some of the factors responsible for this is a key focus of this paper and reflects growing interest within the household energy sector on barriers to the sustained and exclusive use of clean energy sources rather than just their initial uptake [6–9,34]. The aim of this paper is thus to build a qualitative understanding of the key factors responsible for the abandonment of small-scale biogas plants in Northern Tanzania and to suggest evidence based, user-identified, solutions to reduce biogas plant abandonment. This aim is realised through two Research Objectives (RO) where emphasis is placed on both the technical and social components of this multidimensional process, exploring new and underreported factors which contribute to these failures:

- RO1 -~~:~~ Conduct a rapid literature review of small-scale biogas plant literature to identify common barriers to initial adoption and sustained use. The results of which will be used inform initial interview guides and identify stakeholders for RO2.
- RO2 - ~~:~~ Conduct qualitative interviews with key biogas plant stakeholders to~~:~~ understand perceptions of small-scale biogas plants, shed light on key reasons for their failure in Northern Tanzania, and present user-identified solutions to small-scale biogas plant abandonment.

In response to calls to bridge gaps between 'hard' technology-based and 'soft' social science based approaches with more human-centred research [35,36], our contribution to the small-scale biogas plant discourse is twofold. First, to create a holistic and multi-dimensional understanding of the context specific behaviours and attitudes of ~~those~~ people ~~engaged~~ in Northern Tanzania who engage with biogas plants on a regular basis;~~,~~ especially ~~those~~ owners or operators ~~that~~ whose interactions ~~with~~ ~~ed~~ with these systems ~~which were often~~ are integral to their everyday lives and routines. Second, to understand the lived experiences of such individuals and to shed light on the hardware and software issues that underlie acceptance and use of biogas plants ~~as well as~~or their failure and abandonment. ~~The identification of these processes, across these two significant contributions, can inform future biogas interventions, enabling more sustained usage of biogas systems in such environments.~~ The paper's novelty lies in the use of qualitative research to obtain the end--user perspectives that are so often neglected from technology-focused research and innovation [37]~~ [add ref to McLeod et al]~~. The focus on barriers to sustained use of small-scale biogas rather than just initial uptake provides important insights into why 'backsliding' from clean to polluting energy sources occurs; complementing studies of this phenomenon in relation to other fuels and technologies [38]~~ [9]~~. The paper's significance lies in its potential to inform future small-scale biogas interventions, enabling them to better meet end-user needs whilst promoting more sustained and sustainable access to clean energy in communities that currently lack this. The findings are likely to be of interest to practitioners, policy makers and academics with interests in increasing access to clean, renewable energy in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

The structure of the~~is~~ paper is as follows:~~;~~ ~~in~~ Section 2 ~~we~~ outlines the methodological approaches used. To provide ~~the literature~~ context for ~~our~~ the qualitative results, ~~in~~ Section 3 draws on existing literature to ~~we outline~~ identify the main barriers associated with small scale AD systems in a range of different regional, agro-ecological, climatic and institutional contexts. ~~We~~ The findings are presented ~~our findings i~~n Section 4, and ~~this~~ include~~s~~ user perceptions of biogas as a cooking fuel, user perceptions of the causes of poor functionality and failure of biogas plants and user-identified solutions to biogas plant failures. The paper concludes, in Section 5, by offering a number of practical actions which seek to address some of the more common issues associated with biogas plant failure which, if implemented, have the potential to significantly reduce abandonment rates in Northern Tanzania and beyond.

2. Methods

The methodology for this research contains two ~~methodological~~ elements. The f~~, f~~irst is~~,~~ a rapid literature review of the small-scale biogas plant failure and abandonment literature ~~to~~ which sets out ~~establish~~ the current state of knowledge and sector understanding. The s~~S~~econd draws on 30 interviews to capture~~,~~ is ~~phase two captures~~ a qualitative portrait of five biogas stakeholder groups ~~–~~whose lived experiences ~~is~~ are critical in understanding the underlying issues which cause biogas plant failure and or ~~abandonment. We link~~ ~~tThese~~abandonment. These two elements are linked ~~by~~ through the ~~utilisation~~use of findings from the rapid review ~~ing the results of the rapid review~~ to shape ~~the~~ discussions with the five biogas stakeholder groups.~~,~~

2.1. Phase 1: Rapid Literature Review of Small-Scale Biogas Plant Failure Literature

~~Our~~ The rapid review methodology~~—~~ provides “a type of knowledge synthesis in which components of the systematic review process are simplified or omitted to produce information in a short period of time” (p.2) [39]. This enables researchers to identify key literature quickly and effectively in narrow fields of study in time-limited contexts [40,41].

Whilst the wider energy sector and other energy technologies such as solar PV and improved cookstoves have received significant attention in low-income settings, small-scale biogas plants have in some cases~~often~~ been overlooked in previous energy studies [32,33,42]. This, due to the complexity of biogas plant implementation (as discussed in this paper) as it requires a detailed understanding of the complex socio-cultural preferences of end-users, further narrows the literature search and lends itself to the rapid review method. ~~We chose to include b~~Both published and grey literature ~~but~~were drawn upon but the search was not ~~did not~~ further limited ~~the search~~ by restricting publication date or journal type. The rapid review started by drawing on the extensive knowledge of the researchers to establish widely cited systematic reviews that outlined the user-perceived barriers to small-scale/household/decentralised biogas plants. Then using literature databases such as Science Direct [43] and Connected Papers [44], ~~we extrapolated the~~ references ~~of~~ in the widely cited systematic reviews were extrapolated to follow the narrative through other publications and grey literature.

2.2. Phase 2: A Portrait of Lived Experience in Northern Tanzania

Based on ~~our~~ the research objectives, ~~we pursued~~ a qualitative research pathway was developed, with individual interviews with a range of stakeholders, as outlined below. Semi-structured interviews with respondents enabled researchers to keep discussions focused on biogas specifically while allowing respondents to share their own views as to how such plants are integrated into their everyday lives. Direct observation of the biogas plants in the field helped provide an additional layer of context in terms of understanding the way in which biogas plants were constructed, used and maintained in an active environment. Interviews were facilitated with the assistance of ECHO (East Africa Impact Center), a Christian NGO, with an office based on the outskirts of Arusha in Northern Tanzania. ~~We were able to use t~~The organisation's network of stakeholders specific to the biogas sector was also drawn upon for, organising interviews and undertaking biogas plant visits in October 2017. This organisation has a strong developmental and agricultural focus and concentrates on a variety of issues related to improving rural livelihoods, with an explicit overarching objective of reducing poverty amongst the rural poor.

2.2.1. Data Collection

In total, 30 interviews were conducted with five stakeholder groups (These key stakeholders were identified by project partners using purposive sampling based on their extensive experience in the Tanzanian biogas sector.

Table 1) across three different areas in Northern Tanzania: Arusha, Kilimanjaro and Manyara regions. This number of interviews enabled the research to create a broad understanding of a range of factors associated with biogas plant failure that were specific to this geographical location. These key stakeholders were identified by project partners using a purposive sampling method based on their extensive experience in the Tanzanian biogas sector.

Table 1: Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group	No. of Interviews	Detail.
Owners of Operational Systems	12	Farmers and a small number of other institutions, such as schools
Owners of Non-Functional Systems	10	Included to elicit a wide range of views around system failure and barriers to sustained use
Government Representatives	2	Representing departments responsible for the development of agricultural technologies
Biogas Plant Constructors	3	Biogas plant manufacturers – predominantly focused on plastic-based systems (floating dome and bag) – and constructors (known locally as masons) who mainly built concrete, fixed-dome digesters
International NGOs and Consultants	3	Involved in the development of Tanzania's biogas sector and whose activities ranged from increasing educational awareness to supporting the development of new biogas businesses.

The questions asked during the interviews varied by stakeholder type but included enquiries about different types about different types of biogas plant design (as presented in Figure 1 and

Figure 2), common challenges associated with their maintenance, the efficiency of gas production as well as the broader political and economic environment surrounding the biogas sector. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Nottingham, Faculty of Engineering Research Ethics Committee. All participants provided informed consent knowing that all their data would be anonymised and held confidentially. All consent forms and participant information sheets were verbally translated into Kiswahili. Where discussants were unable to provide a written signature their consent was represented in the form of a thumb print or audio recorded statement.

Figure 1: Concrete Fixed-Dome Biogas Digestor

Figure 2: Plastic Bag Biogas Digestor

2.2.2. Data Analysis

All interviews conducted were transcribed before being qualitatively examined using a thematic analysis approach [45] to elicit dominant narratives emerging from the interview process which built~~d~~ on ~~the~~ core topics identified in the rapid reviews.

~~We also recognise the role of positionality, bias and outsider status [40] in this data collection and analysis process.~~

2.2.3 Limitations

Phase 1, the rapid review method, has a number of limitations, such as issues around transparency and reflexivity [41] ~~thus we~~ Issues of ~~acknowledge our own~~ unconscious bias and positionality as European researchers are also ~~-~~acknowledged [46]. The most significant limitation of this method is that it may not capture more obscure literature as a systematic

Formatted: Normal, Left

review would, however ~~we have mitigated these issues by drawing from~~ the extensive experience of the authors in the small-scale biogas sector helps to mitigate these issues.

In phase 2, the role of positionality, bias and outsider status need to be acknowledged in relation to the data collection and analysis process. ~~we looked to mitigate the role of~~Issues surrounding the role of outsider status [46] were mitigated by using existing connections and ~~with~~ partners based in these regions ~~is part~~ of Northern Tanzania. Most notability, this was achieved through connections with the aforementioned NGO ECHO which has long established community presence in and around Arusha. Through ECHO, it was possible to ~~we were able to~~ connect with the Tanzania Domestic Biogas Programme and long-established international development organisation SNV who have worked extensively in this field, specifically in this geographical space. Such institutions were able to connect ~~our researcher~~the authors with biogas stakeholders in the community, from users and advocates to constructors and maintainers. In cases where the stakeholders were non-English speaker~~'~~s interviews were conducted with the support of a reputable translator identified by the project's in-country partner, ECHO.

~~We~~ The authors were acutely aware of ~~our own~~ their positionality as external researchers and therefore interviews were selected as the key methodological approach to allow the discussion ~~the~~ of issues that most affected stakeholders on the ground. This was in contrast to the structured, externally driven or quantitative approaches, which could have been employed and would have been centred much more actively on existing Western understandings of the failure and abandonment of biogas plants, in addition to other cleaner energy solutions. ~~Our~~ The focus was to present a neutral and receptive framework for understanding the strengths and challenges associated with biogas production in these communities, centred firmly on the lived experiences of those currently engaged.

3. Findings: Small-Scale Biogas Plant Failure

Globally a number of research studies have been designed to explore the primary factors which result in a loss of functionality or failure and subsequent abandonment of biogas plants [6,33,47,48]. However, despite a recent increase in ~~this~~ literature on broader 'socio-cultural or 'software' factors influencing household, notably cooking, fuel use and priorities [6,8,49,50], research on biogas – and on energy more broadly - has tended to be dominated by a focus on more technological or 'hardware' factors [35].

3.1. The Why (User Perceptions of Biogas as a Cooking Fuel)

While the technological aspects of such operation and maintenance issues are quite well documented, the economic and socio-cultural 'software' factors underpinning them are spatially varied and less well studied, despite their importance in explaining a loss of biogas plant functionality. From a user perspective, a lack of biogas production to anticipated levels is frequently linked to a lack of sustained use and subsequent failure or abandonment as it necessitates the 'stacking' of additional fuel sources [8,51,52]. In areas where these alternative fuels such as wood are cheap or easy to obtain, this can result in prolonged periods of biogas plant inactivity and loss of function as well as fewer health and environmental gains as users continue to collect and burn biomass [6,18]. Fuel stacking may also be encouraged by user preferences for food to be cooked in a specific way or if additional, more aspirational fuels such as electricity become available [30]. In Ethiopia, the inability to connect biogas units to traditional stove types discouraged sustained use [52], while in other areas the visual appearance of some plants discouraged their use [30]. Software factors including cultural resistance to the use of animal and human waste for energy creation can also act as significant barriers to the long term integration of biogas technologies, as exemplified in Bangladesh [35], Sri Lanka [30], Ghana [53] and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa [54].

3.2. Four Common Themes of Biogas Plant Failure from the Literature

3.2.1. Theme 1: Construction and Installation Quality

Reflecting a focus on hardware factors, the first themes in the literature on small-scale biogas plant failure concerns poor quality installation including the use of inappropriate technology for particular geographical locations. The application of biogas plant technology that is inappropriate for use in sub-Saharan Africa accounts for a lack of long term sustainability [33]. Similarly, in Sri Lanka, a lack of consideration of soil conditions, vibration patterns and the correct positioning of the digester during the construction phase have led to cracking and leaks[1] [30].

3.2.2. Theme 2: Sub-Optimal Feeding Practices

Other difficulties include the occurrence of system malfunctions due to solid digestate incrustation floating in the main tank, reducing the production of biogas [55] or the failure to keep anaerobic digesters within certain pH parameters (ideally close to pH neutral) which can reduce their efficiency and ultimately result in their abandonment [56]. In some cases, this reflects a lack of user-training in operation and maintenance issues, or poor understanding of basic troubleshooting [30]. Drawing on innovations in developing sensor technologies to record the performance of a range of household energy systems [21,22,34,57–59], there is potential to address some of these problems through on-site monitoring and transmitting data on biogas plant performance and functionality for remote analysis [34,59,60].

3.2.3. Theme 3: Operation and Maintenance

The lack of a regular, continuous supply of feedstock (such as animal waste) throughout the seasons or the time-costs associated with collecting feedstock in nomadic or free grazing systems may constitute significant barriers to sustained biodigester use [30,31,33,47]. Deaths of animals, climatic variations, reductions in grazing lands or abandonment of animal husbandry may also cause a lack of the necessary levels of biomass to input [30][2]. The failure of users to employ the– correct ratio of animal manure to water, either through lack of knowledge or the unavailability of water, has also caused processing problems [6,33]. Location-specific and climatic factors may also play a role in impairing the digestion process and reducing gas production. These include the inability to add sufficient quantities of water in seasonally dry areas [6] or interruptions to digestion caused by low winter temperatures in more mountainous regions [54].

Where mechanical failures are responsible for poor functionality, meanwhile, the inability to quickly and cost-effectively source and fit spare parts can have major implications for the continued use of the biogas plant's, continued use – a particularly problem which is exacerbated within rural settings [30]. In Zimbabwe, a large-scale clean energy project designed to demonstrate the sophisticated nature of biogas systems, collapsed, in part, due to the lack of availability of spare parts [48]. In the same arena, an absence of trained technicians in the locality of biogas plants exacerbates these issues in low-income African countries [33].

3.2.4. Theme 4: Training Provision and Knowledge Erosion

Further difficulties are evident in the day-to-day operation of the biodigester and the labour required for this. Some systems require daily cleaning, which has proved to be too onerous for some users [6,61] while others require loading at height which can complicate the feeding process [30]. In sub-Saharan Africa, instances whereby an insufficient desire on the part of

[1] The improper construction may be as a result of tight time schedules underpinned by target-driven instillation practises though does not give specific examples [30].

[2] The input of other materials to supplement waste materials due to shortages has also generated problems with the biodigester leading to plant failure [30].

users to maintain the digester effectively led to biogas units becoming deactivated [31,42]. In some cases, the departure of young men in the family to pursue other work has, at times, left a maintenance void that other family members have been unable to fill [30].

From an organisational standpoint, a lack of project monitoring or post-installation follow-up ~~following installation~~ has contributed to a lack of understanding of how hardware and software factors intersect to cause poor functionality or abandonment of biogas plants. Failures have also been attributed to a lack of focused energy policy in low-income countries which have experienced growth in the biogas sector [31]. Inadequate awareness amongst users as to the advantages of the technology (some users requested biogas systems to solve issues with waste disposal without any intention to use the biogas) can be traced to poor information exchange [30]. Additionally, successful biogas installation and continued use is built upon institutional arrangements and appropriate policies which ensure~~s~~ that products on the market are of high quality [31]. The marketplace needs to be organised efficiently and facilitate the flow of these high-quality products and ensure comprehensive information exchange between stakeholders ~~in order to~~to reduce the threat of biogas plant failures.

3.3. The Research Gap

These issues do not represent an exhaustive list of factors which can result in the failure of small-scale biogas plants ~~failure~~ in ~~low and middle income settings~~LMICs. Additional factors are likely to have been substantially overlooked in previous literature on the subject, whilst others play a less visible role including factors ~~that often tend to be~~ linked to biogas plant adoption rather than a lack of sustained use or failure once installed. Generally, users' financial limitations are considered more of a barrier to the adoption of rather than the sustained use of biogas technologies [31,33,54,61], yet labour and maintenance costs imply longer-term financial and time commitments that may become ~~unaffordable~~ unsustainable~~over time~~. Another important dynamic is that of land ownership, since the fixed nature of many biodigesters, especially those built into the ground, present issues around ownership and responsibility in situations where land is either rented or contested leading to potential conflict and abandonment [33,62].

Given the range of factors influencing biogas plant failure across the global South, it is difficult to identify a single prominent driver ~~of biogas plant failure~~. Rather there is a diverse and often context-specific patchwork of factors responsible for a lack of sustained use, loss of functionality and abandonment. Identifying which of these issues are evident in Northern Tanzania, and the underlying processes which have produced these conditions as well as how to overcome these challenges are presented in the following section.

4. Findings: Evidencing Lived Experience of Biogas Plant Users

This section explores ~~some of~~ the key themes which emerged from the interviews conducted, examining user experiences of both cooking with biogas and maintaining small-scale biogas plants along with the perceptions of different stakeholders on factors contributing to a lack of sustained use, loss of functionality and abandonment. Lastly, ~~we~~ it highlights some user-based priorities and suggested solutions for addressing biogas functionality problems that were identified during ~~our~~ the interviews.

4.1. User Perceptions of Biogas as a Cooking Fuel

On the subject of biogas as a cooking fuel, responses were generally positive, with biogas described as quick and simple to access as it only required opening a tap and lighting the flame rather than the more labour-intensive process of starting a fire with biomass. Interviewees agreed that given a choice of cooking with biogas or other fuels, biogas was their preferred option. This was mainly down to smoke production, particularly in confined spaces with one respondent noting:

Commented [A1]: delete?

> ‘My husband has a problem with his eyes when I’m cooking, he doesn’t dare even come into the kitchen…but when I’m using biogas, he can come to the kitchen and we cook together’ (Interview 5).

Biogas was particularly valued for heating water in the morning (when biomass fires would normally require lighting from scratch) and also for cooking soft items like vegetables.

Despite a general enthusiasm for cooking with biogas, however, key themes arising from ~~our~~ the interviews indicated problems associated with poor functionality, insufficient gas production and, in some cases, complete plant failure that hindered a sustained and exclusive shift to the use of clean cooking fuels. Echoing studies elsewhere [6,18], the failure of biogas plants to fully meet users’ cooking needs was linked to a tendency to ‘stack’ fuels, with biogas frequently being supplemented with firewood (either collected or purchased), charcoal or LPG. In many cases, ~~our~~ interviewees expressed frustration that they couldn’t rely on biogas for more of their cooking needs:

> ‘So the worst thing is to be out of gas when cooking’ (Interview 4).

> ‘If you could be able for the production of the biogas to be like more longer to use it, the people would not even think even to use the firewood or charcoal’ (Interview 22).

> ‘It’s not like much. It’s not like using [a] long time. Sometimes [we] use the gas, sometimes [we] use the firewood because there’s not enough gas to use to cook everything’ (Interview 3).

For some users, temperature variations associated with the changing seasons were identified as a cause of seasonal fluctuations in biogas yields (and increased reliance on biomass fuels for cooking), with the response below typical of the sentiment:

> ‘The problem [is] between changing seasons of the year. Because during the rainy season, the plant is going to be like cool. It's no more like gas production’ (Interview 22).

Because of the relatively consistent temperatures across the year in this part of the country, however, minimal disruption to gas production was reported on the whole[3] and even where plants were affected by cold weather, users reported that the rate of gas production slowed rather than ceased altogether. Nevertheless, users still felt constrained in the type of cooking that they could do with biogas. Some respondents noted that their biogas units failed to provide sufficient gas for the preparation of local dishes such Ugali or Makande that required lengthy periods of slow cooking~~.~~[4]. ~~We also encountered~~ A~~a~~ reliance on traditional fuels was also encountered including the use of firewood and charcoal to cook ‘heavier’ foods, such as maize or beans, which form the basis of local cuisine.

4.2. User Perceptions of the Causes of Poor Functionality and Failure of Biogas Plants

Reflecting wider literature on the *causes* of sub-optimal biogas yields, poor functionality and biogas plant failure [6,51,54], ~~we have linked~~ key themes that emerged from the rapid review have been linked to ~~our~~ interviewees’ explanations of ~~these~~ issues related to poor construction

[3] NB. It cannot be ruled out that biogas users at higher altitude (for example, deeper into Kilimanjaro region) suffer more from temperature variations which could affect gas production. However a number of sites visited were at significant altitude and were not adversely impacted.

[4] For a typical six cubic metre plant, enough gas to cook for 2-4 hours per day was widely reported by users when the plant was fully operational.

and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, basic operation and maintenance and training-related issues.

4.2.1. Theme 1: Construction and Installation Quality

The failure of biogas plants was linked back repeatedly by owners to initial mistakes made ~~at~~ during the installation phases which fell into ~~a number of~~several specific categories. Firstly, ~~we witnessed a number of~~a few biogas plants were observed which were either no longer used or in need of repair due to issues of subsidence. This can be caused by ~~a number of~~ factors including the system being built on unstable land, using soil of the wrong consistency or poor choice of site location. This issue is particularly difficult to remedy, since addressing structural failure can be both costly and time consuming, especially for biogas systems out of warranty.

Secondly, cracks in the digester, for those made of both concrete and plastic, were identified as an important contributor to system failures, which biogas plant owners predominantly linked to poor installation. Cracking can lead to multiple problems including loss of pressure inside the digester, drying out of material inside the system and disruptions to flows of slurry from inlet to outlet. However, the cause of such cracking was contested among stakeholders as while biogas users tended to believe installers were responsible, those building the systems, as well as some government representatives, indicated that cracking could be a sign of user neglect rather than poor workmanship. Either way, the loss of functionality or limitations on gas production caused by these issues at the installation phase were clearly influential in the failure or abandonment of some systems.

Thirdly, problems associated with piping were routinely identified as contributing to biogas plant failure. Again, these can be categorised into two main issues, both deriving from the installation. Leakages of gas from the pipes, resulting in less gas for end users, was a significant problem. Poor workmanship, particularly in relation to points of connectivity between digester and pipe, was identified by biogas plant owners as the cause of these leakages. This ~~— a~~ challenge was exacerbated, at times, by the significant distance between the biodigester and kitchen. Similarly, users highlighted rusting on the pipes connecting the biogas digester with the kitchen as a factor responsible for reduced functionality which sometimes contributed to abandonment, as the material and labour costs associated with replacing damaged or rusting pipework was deemed prohibitive. Such rusting is primarily attributed to cost-cutting at the point of installation, with iron pipes being used instead of ~~other~~ higher quality materials, such as plastic.

By contrast, representatives from the government department ~~informed us~~ mentioned that they had~~ve~~ not observed the use of iron pipes in biogas installations and did not recommend this given the potential for rusting and associated challenges around gas leakage. While liability for issues such as subsidence, cracking and rusting ~~as a result of~~because of errors in the construction or installation phase (either wilful or otherwise) remain contested, the fact that some systems ~~are~~ were not built to the necessary standard wa~~i~~s clearly a contributing factor around biogas plant failures and abandonment in Northern Tanzania. Users also linked these issues to plants producing significantly less gas for the end user than would have been expected prior to installation.

4.2.2. Theme 2: Sub-Optimal Feeding and Maintenance Practices

A second theme arising during discussions of the causes of insufficient gas yield, poor plant functionality and failure concerned sub-optimal biogas plant feeding and maintenance practices. Echoing the literature on biogas plant operation and maintenance [6,30,31,47,52], most apparent were issues related to the feeding of the biodigester. These can be categorised under ~~a number of~~several key themes related to the behaviour of those responsible for ensuring that the system is used correctly and their access to the resources they needed to feed the plant.

~~In order to~~To create the correct consistency of material for input to the digester, animal waste is mixed with water[5] in order to facilitate a smooth flow of material through the digester. Depending on the digester design, location and climate, this mixture is usually to a specified ratio; for example, two buckets of waste to two buckets of water with two or three buckets of each needed per day for a six cubic metre plant. This requires not only good access to these resources but also to the labour required to feed the plant regularly to ensure that the feedstock flows at the correct speed through the digester. Without the correct consistency of material facilitated by this mixing, the digester can become clogged, its usual flow impeded and, as a direct consequence, little or no gas production is recorded.

Through both discussions with users about their feeding routine and examination of the inside of the digester, it was evident that users were, in many instances, not feeding the digester with the correct ratios of waste to water. The suboptimal production of gas is likely to be linked directly to this issue. Less common but nonetheless noteworthy was the tendency of some users to add inappropriate materials including grass to the digester ~~in an attempt to~~to supplement the animal waste, which in a limited number of instances affected the supply of gas. Additionally, even where the feedstock type and mixture was correct, the inability of users to feed the digester regularly enough was identified as a factor in the breakdown or reduced production in some of the plants visited. ~~In order for~~For the plant to work most efficiently, a steady flow of materials must continuously move through the system, allowing for the anaerobic digester to produce the gas and to create and maintain the necessary gas pressure to force the slurry through the outlet. ~~Therefore~~Therefore, a regular feeding pattern (either once or twice per day dependent on the system, at around the same time each day) is required to maintain this process.

In some cases, seasonal variations in water availability interrupted the regularity of feeding patterns or contributed to the use of incorrect waste to water ratios. It was evident that some users found it difficult to access water during the dry season:

> 'After rainy season ended we start the problem of having water. We need to travel from home to [water source], it's like 400m. So when go and back it's like 800m. Every day.' (Interview 4).
>
> 'Yes, we've had that problem [lack of water] because we use tap water. The water we trap from the mountains. So we had the problem of not having water here. So it's took us like two weeks without using the biogas' (Interview 1).

Although ~~our~~ the research did not suggest that water shortages were in themselves significant contributors of biogas plant failures, they clearly created temporary challenges for users and were linked to periods of paused feeding or plant inactivity which in turn had an impact on gas yield.[6]

---

[5] Animal faeces can also be mixed with urine instead or water. However, this was only realistic in cases where cattle were subject to zero-grazing, which only accounted for approximately 50% of biogas users interviewed.

[6] Again, this is geographically sensitive and represents the situation in Northern Tanzania. Given the country's size and climatic variation, such issues may be more or less prominent in different regions.

4.2.3. Theme 3: Operation and Maintenance

A third key theme that emerged in explanations for biogas plant failure and poor functionality concerned the responsibility of the user to operate the plant appropriately and perform basic maintenance. Particular attention was drawn to the ongoing issue of water forming in the pipe connecting the digester with the kitchen and the need to remove this water, ~~–~~ through the regular opening and closing of a purpose-built tap on the piping, ~~—~~ to prevent reductions in the flow of gas.[7] While most users were aware of the need to remove water in this way, this knowledge was not universal. Frustration with a perceived lack of gas production, at times leading to abandonment, ~~-~~ even when the supply was simply being blocked by the presence of water. This ~~-~~ represents an issue with a straightforward resolution, yet equally is one which has the potential to have a serious impact on gas production and plant functionality. A simple solution for this problem may already be in existence. SimGas, a private sector biogas plant construction company, provide a two-year warranty against structural failures, and such a mechanism can provide reassurances to potential customers who are naturally wary of the ability of poor installation to undermine their investments. It is unlikely that all plants will be constructed perfectly, therefore providing such support is critical to preventing ~~the~~ system failure, especially in the first years after installation.

4.2.4. Theme 4: Training Provision and Knowledge Erosion

The evident lack of such knowledge among some users echoed a fourth key theme emerging from explanations of biogas plant failure which concerned the training of biogas plant users and the erosion, over time, of knowledge obtained during such training. During interviews with biogas plant owners, it became clear that the installation of their plants was usually accompanied with some form of user training on how the system should be operated to maximise efficiency and lifespan. Both the Centre for Agricultural Mechanisation and Rural Technology (CAMARTEC), the government department overseeing biogas development in Tanzania over recent decades, and private sector biogas businesses have offered training to households in how to operate their new biogas system efficiently. Training typically covers how to feed the plant (amounts, timings, ratios etc.), how to address simple issues, such as extracting water from the pipe using the tap, and the uses for bio-slurry.

Despite this ~~often~~ comprehensive training, biogas plant failures due to operator error represent a significant challenge to their long term use; despite the fact that in most cases users have invested their own funds[8] in the system and value the free fuel it produces. Some broader context is therefore required to understand this outcome. The primary users of biogas technology in this location are farmers who, given their assets such as land and livestock and their investment in biogas technology, are not at the very bottom of the economic pyramid within Tanzanian society. Furthermore, given their slightly elevated economic position, some farmers can afford to employ a small number of workers to assist in the everyday running of their farms. Particularly amongst owners of larger and more sophisticated plants as, although ~~- those that~~ they may have initially ~~had i~~invested more in the plant, ~~-~~ much of the day-to-day running of the biogas system was done by ~~such workers~~their employees including: collecting and moving animal waste, mixing it with liquid and feeding the plant, as well as semi-regular plant maintenance such a removing water from the pipe.

It was also clear that some of these workers, at the time of the biogas plant installation, were provided with training on how to use the technology, along with plant owners, as it was envisaged that they were most likely to be directly engaged with the system on a regular basis. However, ~~G~~given the relatively high turnover of such employees~~, however~~, problems tended

---

[7] Regular in this instance was dependent on the amount of water forming but for a plant operating to potential, weekly removal was typical.

[8] Some have received subsidies over the years from either government or third sector organisations, but even these usually require some of contribution from end-users.

to arise when they were replaced by new staff and some of the expertise passed on by the departing worker, became lost or misunderstood. Clearly, this has had significant implications for the ~~long term~~long-term sustainability of biogas plants in this region and illustrates that while training at the point of installation is self-evidently vital to successful use, it does not guarantee that the technology will be used correctly over its lifespan.

4.3. User-identified Solutions to Biogas Plant Failures

During the course of ~~our~~ discussions with biogas stakeholders and users, a few notable suggestions regarding the design of small-scale biogas plants were highlighted as having potential to promote their sustained use and ~~long term~~long-term viability. ~~With regard to~~Regarding operation and maintenance issues, user convenience was also highlighted by owners as integral to effective operation and maintenance of biogas plants. This issue manifested itself in multiple forms, however central to most observations was the need to make the process of feeding as simple and convenient as possible. For example, if animals were based in a stall with a concrete floor linked to an adjacent inlet of the digester, the waste material could be easily collected and processed by the user. In contrast, it was noted that if the operator had to expend time and energy collecting waste in wheelbarrow, then transport it to the system in a different part of the dwelling; the inconvenience associated with this process had the potential to discourage users. Location of the plant, proximity and ease of process were each cited as challenges which can lead to incorrect plant operation in this environment, all of which feed into the broader theme of ensuring such systems are designed to be fundamentally user-friendly.

In terms of addressing problems linked to insufficient biogas supply, plant owners, ~~in particular~~especially those ~~that~~ who were responsible for cooking with the gas, valued knowing how much gas there was left in the system to enable them to make choices about when and what to cook. Some of the systems were installed with a pressure gauge, which, while technically measur~~ed~~ing the gas pressure and not the gas amount, allowed users to estimate the time left to cook with the fuel. Their owners were positive about having access to this basic information as it allowed them to manage their use of gas to best suit their needs. They therefore felt that an expansion of the use of such gauges would allow those cooking to maximise the effectiveness of the gas produced, even if this was below their total requirements.

5. ~~Conclusion~~Discussion

The production of biogas from animal waste, when used correctly, remains an excellent way to use existing waste materials at low cost to produce a sustainable fuel which can reduce the damaging impacts associated with household air pollution as well as lowering the rates of biomass burning. Whilst it is encouraging that significant numbers of plants have been constructed in Tanzania, it is disheartening to see so many abandoned by users so soon after installation. It is also disappointing that the effectiveness of biogas promotion initiatives are often undermined by the frequent inability of small-scale biogas units to meet all cooking requirements, necessitating continued reliance on biomass fuels. Also, as even relatively brief interruptions to the use of biogas plants can increase the risk of technical failures, addressing such issues often requires relying on biomass fuels until the biogas plant is operational again. Instead of achieving a full replacement of biomass fuels with biogas, ~~. T~~the adoption of such clean cooking technologies is frequently associated continued fuel stacking. This, in turn, undermines potential health gains associated with biogas use whilst making the abandonment of plants more likely than if users had reliable access to sufficient gas from such systems.

It is evident, through both engagement with the literature and the primary research conducted as part of this exploration, that biogas plant failure outcomes can be viewed as a series of software and hardware challenges rather than one single issue. These challenges are visible at multiple stages (installation, operation, maintenance, and training) and include different actors (masons, users and, the natural environment), all of whom can contribute to the failure of biogas plants.

Fundamental to the longevity of a biogas plant is the initial construction. Technicians and practitioners continue to debate the most suitable model of system for the Tanzanian context; be that concrete fixed-dome, inflatable bag or plastic covered which can be expanded through one metre extensions as per the needs of the customer. Whichever design is selected, the requirement to provide some form of insurance against poor installation is essential to ensuring ensure that plants are not abandoned as a result. Conflict between constructor and owner in such contexts is likely, and identifying which party is responsible and therefore liable for the repairs is problematic.

The way in which biogas systems are operated on a day-to-day basis is clearly central to their continued viability; a fact which is bought in sharp focus by the significant number of plants which were inactive or underperforming in this geographical region due to operational errors. The lack of appropriate education and training has previously been cited as a driver of biogas plant failures [30,33], however in this research we discovered that at the vast majority of sites visited, such services were offered at the time of construction. HoweverNevertheless, the current literature fails to acknowledge a major challenge in this arena – the erosion of this knowledge over time due to the continuous turnover of those tasked with feeding and maintaining the plant. In general, key instructions, such as when to feed the digester and what ratio of waste to water is needed, were usually not recorded on paper, with new workers briefed by outgoing staff verbally, if at all. Finding a solution is essential as without broader support, the initial training can have very little long-term value. , whether that be (as we propose)Potential options include systematic training refresher visits from installers or through other means such as the provision of physical guidelines at the time of purchase or access to online information., is essential as without broader support, the initial training can have very little long-term value.

In addition, the disappointment of end users in the limited or less-than-expected production of gas was evident in conversation with owners resulting in biogas having a poor reputation in the area. These problems are often exacerbated by issues outlined around poor construction or incorrect operation, but it is important for those using the gas for cooking to be able to get the most possible use out of the fuel available. The inclusion of pressure gauges provides a welcome addition in many such kitchens, with users able to estimate the time left to cook and consequently which meals can be prepared with the resources available. The availability of such information can help make the system more valuable to the operator and, as a result, users are less likely to abandon them completely.

6. Conclusion

Technology in this field continues to develop at a steady rate and provide significant opportunities for future work especially through solutions using 'Internet of Things' principles. The advancements in sensor technology [63] - which can be monitored either on-site or remotely - have started to be used to record data across a variety of intervention strategies [7,8,34,57,59,60]. For the biogas sector, such developments may prove useful when attempting to keep plants active and production high, with the potential for sensors to monitor output and performance continuously, providing data which can highlight problems with the system before gas production is significantly affected.

This paper presents a number ofseveral key learnings. Fundamental to future policy development around reducing biogas planet abandonment is a focused and accurate understanding of the key reason behind current trends which this research provides. Poor construction and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, inadequate maintenance issues along with limited training provision and knowledge erosion each contribute significantly to biogas plant challenges, ranging from sub-optimum operation to complete desertion by owner operators. This research provides an evidence-based understanding of the key drivers of such decisions by users, which is vital given the ability of biogas technology to reconcile the existing and continuing political movement to reduce carbon emissions with the need to advance global ambitions around sustained poverty reduction for populations and communities on the economic fringes in developing nations.

To conclude, this research recognises that reducing the failure rates of biogas systems in this geographical area is a complex issue, however steps can be undertaken to reduce the impact of some of the most damaging factors which lead to system abandonments. Specifically, this paper represents a call to action to biogas businesses, installers and constructors to rethink the way in which they deliver training as well as further integrating design features which allow users to understand the performance of their biogas plant.

~~6.~~7. Funding

This research was made possible by InnovateUK's "Smart Biogas Network" (Grant Number 132479) and partially supported by InnovateUK's "Smart Biogas II - Increasing Wealth from Waste" (Grant Number 105909).

~~7.~~8. References

[1] DEFRA. Anaerobic Digestion – Shared Goals. London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; 2009.

[2] DEFRA. Anaerobic Digestion Strategy and Action Plan: A commitment to increasing energy from waste through anaerobic digestion. London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; 2011.

[3] Pathak H, Jain N, Bhatia A, Mohanty S, Gupta N. Global warming mitigation potential of biogas plants in India. Environ Monit Assess 2009;157:407–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-008-0545-6.

[4] Massé DI, Talbot G, Gilbert Y. On farm biogas production: A method to reduce GHG emissions and develop more sustainable livestock operations. Anim Feed Sci Technol 2011;166–167:436–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.075.

[5] International Energy Agency (IEA). Tracking SDG7: The Energy Progress Report 2018. Washington DC: International Bank of Reconstruction and Development and World Health Organisation; 2018.

[6] Puzzolo E, Pope D, Stanistreet D, Rehfuess E, Bruce N. Clean fuels for resource-poor settings: A systematic review of barriers and enablers to adoption and sustained use. Environ Res 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.01.002.

[7] Ruiz-Mercado I, Masera O, Zamora H, Smith KR. Adoption and sustained use of improved cookstoves. Energy Policy 2011;39:7557–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.03.028.

[8] Ruiz-Mercado I, Canuz E, Walker JL, Smith KR. Quantitative metrics of stove adoption using Stove Use Monitors (SUMs). Biomass Bioenergy 2013;57:136–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.07.002.

[9] Sesan T, Jewitt S, Clifford M, Ray C. Toilet training: what can the cookstove sector learn from improved sanitation promotion? Int J Environ Health Res 2018;28:667–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2018.1503235.

[10] World Health Organization. Burning opportunity: clean household energy for health, sustainable development, and wellbeing of women and children. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016.

[11] Movik S, Allouche J. States of power: Energy imaginaries and transnational assemblages in Norway, Nepal and Tanzania. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;67:101548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101548.

[12] International Energy Agency. Tanzania Energy Outlook. IEA 2022. https://www.iea.org/country/n_country.asp (accessed March 28, 2022).

[13] The World Bank. Tracking SDG7: The Energy Progress Report. 2019.

[14] The World Bank. DataBank on Poverty and Equity 2021.

[15] Balachandra P. Dynamics of rural energy access in India: An assessment. Energy 2011;36:5556–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.07.017.

[16] Bhattacharyya SC. Energy access programmes and sustainable development: A critical review and analysis. Energy Sustain Dev 2012;16:260–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2012.05.002.

[17] Bond T, Templeton MR. History and future of domestic biogas plants in the developing world 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2011.09.003.

[18] Katuwal H, Bohara A. Biogas: A promising renewable technology and its impact on rural households in Nepal 2009. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2009.05.002.

[19] Mondal MAH, Kamp L, Pachova NI. Drivers, barriers, and strategies for implementation of renewable energy technologies in rural areas in Bangladesh—An innovation system analysis 2010. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENPOL.2010.04.018.

[20] Zheng Y, Wei JG, Li J, Feng S, Li Z, Jiang G, et al. Anaerobic fermentation technology increases biomass energy use efficiency in crop residue utilization and biogas production 2012. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2012.03.061.

[21] MNRE. Implemtation of National Biogas and Manure Management Programme (NBMMP) during 11th five year plan. Delhi: Minstry of New and Renewable Energy; 2009.

[22] Reddy BS, Srinivas T. Energy use in Indian household sector - An actor-oriented approach 2009. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENERGY.2009.01.004.
[23] Dohoo C, Guernsey J, Critchley K, Vanleeuwen J. Pilot Study on the Impact of Biogas as a Fuel Source on Respiratory Health of Women on Rural Kenyan Smallholder Dairy Farms. J Environ Public Health 2012. https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/636298.
[24] Energia. A Guide on gender mainstreaming in the Africa Biogas Partnership Programme (ABPP). The Netherlands: 2010.
[25] E N, L S, F TH. Tanzania Domestic Biogas Programme: Implementation document. TDBP. TDBP; 2009.
[26] The Citizen. Sh9bn committed to biogas project in rural Tanzania 2016. https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/tanzania/news/business/sh9bn-committed-to-biogas-project-in-rural-tanzania-2545656 (accessed October 29, 2021).
[27] SNV. 10,000 biogas plants to be installed in Tanzania with support from the Government & Norwegian Embassy 2015. https://snv.org/update/10000-biogas-plants-be-installed-tanzania-support-government-norwegian-embassy (accessed October 29, 2021).
[28] ABPP. Evaluation of ABPP: Executive Summary. 2019.
[29] National Bureau of Statistics. Census of Agriculture 2007/2008: Technical And Operation Report 2012. https://www.nbs.go.tz/index.php/en/census-surveys/agriculture-statistics/45-census-of-agriculture-2007-2008-technical-and-operation-report (accessed October 29, 2021).
[30] Alwis AD. Biogas – a review of Sri Lanka's performance with a renewable energy technology 2002. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0973-0826(08)60296-3.
[31] Mengistu MG, Simane B, Eshete G, Workneh T. A review on biogas technology and its contributions to sustainable rural livelihood in Ethiopia 2015. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2015.04.026.
[32] Muller C, Yan H. Household Fuel Use in Developing Countries: Review of Theory and Evidence 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENECO.2018.01.024.
[33] Mwirigi J, Balana B, Mugisha J, Walekhwa P, Melamu R, Nakami S, et al. Socio-economic hurdles to widespread adoption of small-scale biogas digesters in Sub-Saharan Africa: A review 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOMBIOE.2014.02.018.
[34] Northcross A, Shupler M, Alexander D, Olamijulo J, Ibigbami T, Ana G, et al. Sustained usage of bioethanol cookstoves shown in an urban Nigerian city via new SUMs algorithm 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2016.05.003.
[35] Sovacool B. The political economy of energy poverty: A review of key challenges 2012. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2012.05.006.
[36] Sovacool B, Bazilian M, Toman M. Paradigms and poverty in global energy policy: Research needs for achieving universal energy access 2016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/6/064014.
[37] Hartley S, McLeod C, Clifford M, Jewitt S, Ray C. A retrospective analysis of responsible innovation for low-technology innovation in the Global South. J Responsible Innov 2019;6:143–62.
[38] Jewitt S, Atagher P, Clifford M. "We cannot stop cooking": Stove stacking, seasonality and the risky practices of household cookstove transitions in Nigeria. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;61.
[39] Tricco AC, Antony J, Zarin W, Strifler L, Ghassemi M, Ivory J, et al. A scoping review of rapid review methods. BMC Med 2015;13:224. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-015-0465-6.
[40] Khangura S, Konnyu K, Cushman R, Grimshaw J, Moher D. Evidence summaries: the evolution of a rapid review approach. Syst Rev 2012;1:10. https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-1-10.
[41] Ganann R, Ciliska D, Thomas H. Expediting systematic reviews: methods and implications of rapid reviews. Implement Sci 2010;5:56. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-56.
[42] Rupf GV, Bahri P, Boer KD, McHenry M. Broadening the potential of biogas in Sub-Saharan Africa: An assessment of feasible technologies and feedstocks 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2016.04.023.

[43] Science Direct. Science, health and medical journals, full text articles and books. 2022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/.
[44] Connected Papers. Find and explore academic papers 2022. https://www.connectedpapers.com/ (accessed March 10, 2022).
[45] Denzin NK, Lincoln YS. The SAGE handbook of qualitative research / edited by Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif. London: Thousand Oaks, Calif. London : SAGE; 2018.
[46] Sovacool BK, Axsen J, Sorrella S. Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design. Energy Res Soc Sci 2018;45:12–42.
[47] Tucho GT, Moll H, uiterkamp AS, Nonhebel S. Problems with Biogas Implementation in Developing Countries from the Perspective of Labor Requirements 2016. https://doi.org/10.3390/EN9090750.
[48] Parawira W. Biogas technology in sub-Saharan Africa: status, prospects and constraints 2009. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11157-009-9148-0.
[49] Barnes B, Rosenbaum J, Mehta S, Williams K, Jagoe K, Graham JP. Behavior Change Communication: A Key Ingredient for Advancing Clean Cooking. J Health Commun 2015. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2014.996305.
[50] Hanna R, Duflo E, Greenstone M. Up in Smoke: the Influence of Household Behavior on the Long-Run Impact of Improved Cooking Stoves 2012. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2039004.
[51] Masera O, Saatkamp BD, Kammen D. From Linear Fuel Switching to Multiple Cooking Strategies: A Critique and Alternative to the Energy Ladder Model 2000. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(00)00076-0.
[52] Mengistu MG, Simane B, Eshete G, Workneh T. Factors affecting households' decisions in biogas technology adoption, the case of Ofla and Mecha Districts, northern Ethiopia 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RENENE.2016.02.066.
[53] Arthur R, Baidoo MF, Antwi E. Biogas as a potential renewable energy source: A Ghanaian case study 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RENENE.2010.11.012.
[54] Gebreegziabher Z, Naik L, Melamu R, Balana B. Prospects and challenges for urban application of biogas installations in Sub-Saharan Africa 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOMBIOE.2014.02.036.
[55] Roubík H, Mazancová J, Banout J, Verner V. Addressing problems at small-scale biogas plants: a case study from central Vietnam 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2015.09.114.
[56] Zafar S. Description of a Biogas Power Plant. BioEnergy Consult n.d. https://www.bioenergyconsult.com/description-biogas-plant/ (accessed October 29, 2021).
[57] Piedrahita R, Dickinson K, Kanyomse E, Coffey E, Alirigia R, Hagar Y, et al. Assessment of cookstove stacking in Northern Ghana using surveys and stove use monitors 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2016.07.007.
[58] Schelling N, Hasson MJ, Huong SL, Nevarez A, Lu W-C, Tierney M, et al. SIMbaLink: towards a sustainable and feasible solar rural electrification system. ICTD 2010, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1145/2369220.2369260.
[59] Tejwani R, Kumar G, Solanki C. Remote Monitoring for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Rural Application Using GSM Voice Channel 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EGYPRO.2014.10.145.
[60] Hope R, Thomson P, Koehler J, Foster T, Thomas MG. From Rights to Results in Rural Water Service - Evidence from Kyuso, Kenya, 2014. https://doi.org/10.35648/20.500.12413/11781/II035.
[61] Kabir H, Yegbemey R, Bauer S. Factors determinant of biogas adoption in Bangladesh 2013. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2013.08.046.
[62] Lamourdia T, Drechsel P, Olaleye AO, Adeoti A, Barry B, Vohland K. Adoption Driver and Constraints of Resource Conservation Technologies in Sub-Saharan Africa 2006:21.

[63] Inclusive Energy. Smart Biogas. Incl Energy 2022. https://www.inclusive.energy/smart-biogas (accessed January 18, 2022).

Not quite cooking on gas: Understanding biogas plant failure and abandonment in Northern Tanzania

Hewitt, J.[a], Holden, M.[b], Robinson, B.L.[c*], Jewitt, S.[a], Clifford, M.J.[c]

[a] School of Energy, Construction and Environment, Coventry, University, Priory Street, Coventry, CV1 5FB
[b] School of Health Sciences, The University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD.
[c] Faculty of Engineering, The University of Nottingham, University Park, Nottingham, NG7 2RD

ABSTRACT

The potential for biogas to fulfil an integral role in promoting sustainable energy solutions, particularly in the Global South, is evident, and especially pertinent in the Sustainable Development Goal era. Internationally, multiple initiatives driven by private, public and third sectors have resulted in a significant growth in the numbers of biogas plants constructed. These processes are highly visible in Tanzania, which has witnessed considerable investment across the sector in recent decades leading to a proliferation of biogas systems. However, research suggests that many of these plants experience failures which can lead to the ultimate abandonment of the systems, eroding the potential benefits of widespread biogas adoption.

This research explores some of the main drivers of biogas plant failure and abandonment in Northern Tanzania through a rapid review of the literature identifying current sector best practice and a series of semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders including: biogas plant owners, operators, constructors, government officials and private enterprises. The analysis reveals a range of clear and, at points, interrelated themes associated with biogas failure which can be largely grouped under the following banners: poor construction and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, operation and maintenance issues, and training provision and knowledge erosion. By illuminating the subtleties surrounding each challenge, this paper is designed to stimulate a re-evaluation of how long-term, sustained and successful use of biogas plants can be fostered through a reduction in failure and/or abandonment. This is particularly important given that the biogas sector continues to evolve and expand across the globe.

Highlights:

- Advancements in biogas technologies are offset by plant failure and abandonment.
- Reasons for failure include operational, structural and maintenance challenges.
- These forces are often ignored, undermining many of the positive advancements.
- Addressing such problems is critical to reduce failure and abandonment rates.

Key Words: SDG7, Tanzania, Energy Ecosystem, Energy Access, Biogas, Failure

Word Count: 7437

* Corresponding Author e-mail address: benjamin.robinson@nottingham.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Biogas is derived from the anaerobic digestion (AD) of biomass and organic waste material and can be burned directly, used in combined heat and power units to generate electricity, cleaned to create biomethane for use in national grids or as a transport fuel. It is also recognised as having significant value for managing waste, while the digestate produced as a by-product of AD is widely valued in farming communities for its potential to reduce reliance on chemical fertiliser [1,2]. Reflecting efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from the global energy and agricultural sectors, biogas has received significant recent attention as part of global strategies to increase reliance on renewable fuels, de-carbonise energy supply, mitigate climate change and reduce reliance on fossil fuels [3–5]. It is also valued for its potential contribution to Sustainable Development Goal 7.1.2's aim of achieving 'universal access to clean fuels and technologies for cooking' by 2030 [5]; particularly in light of slow progress to date in the uptake and sustained (exclusive) use of cleaner cooking solutions [5–9]. There is also a need to reduce the health impacts associated with household air pollution from burning biomass, particularly given that cooking with traditional solid fuels is estimated to cause approximately 4 million premature deaths annually [10].

In the decades after Tanzania's independence in 1961, the country's energy landscape has been driven by "hydropowered industrialisation" [11]. However, this source of power now only constitutes 1.2% of the total energy consumption (with petroleum 7.8% and natural gas 2.4%) [12]. Moreover, despite 84% of the final total energy consumption being through renewable energy, and with 38% of the population having access to electricity (Urban 73%, Rural 18%), 90% of Tanzania's population still rely significantly on burning biomass as their primary source of energy [13,14] In Tanzania, as well as more broadly across sub-Saharan Africa, off grid areas, where biomass fuels are the primary sources of household energy, there is a lack of infrastructure to support transitions to electricity or LPG. As such, small-scale biogas units have the potential to improve access to clean modern energy sources for cooking, heating and lighting whilst helping to substitute for fossil fuel based alternatives like LPG [15–19]. In China, small-scale biogas systems have been widely promoted for over 30 years [20], while India's National Biogas and Manure Management Programme promoted AD for improving household access to clean cooking and lighting fuels [21,22]. More recently, the Africa Biogas Partnership Program (ABPP) has promoted small-scale biogas in Kenya, Uganda, Tanzania, Burkino Faso and Ethiopia with 51,000 units being constructed since 2015. As key potential beneficiaries of biogas as a clean cooking fuel [23], the ABPP has sought to train women in the construction and maintenance of biogas plants [24].

Biogas technology was first introduced in Tanzania by the Small Industries Development Organisation (SIDO). In 1975, in collaboration with a number of Non-Government Organisations (NGOs) it was expanded with the support of the Centre for Agricultural Mechanisation and Rural Technologies (CAMARTEC and the Dutch not-for-profit international development organisation SNV [25]. Further support for small-scale AD plants came from the Tanzania Domestic Biogas Project (TDBP), implemented through the ABPP, which oversaw the construction of over 12,000 biogas plants between 2009 and 2015. In 2016, the TDBP received nine billion Tanzanian shilling ($3.9 million USD) worth of funding from the governments of Tanzania, Netherlands and Norway for the TDBP to install 10,000 subsidized rural biogas plants by December 2017 [26,27]. Progress in Tanzania and across east Africa slowed after the second phase of the project closed in 2019 [28] and more recently due to the effect of the COVID-19 pandemic. The scheme was targeted particularly at farmers with livestock who could use animal manure and other organic wastes as feedstock for their AD plants and focused especially on northern regions of Arusha, Kilimanjaro and Manyara, due to their high proportion of cattle rearing households [25,29].

While biogas technology has become increasingly visible through such national initiatives coupled with global efforts to promote clean energy sources and mitigate climate change, these positive changes have been somewhat undermined by the lack of sustained use of many small-scale biogas systems or their subsequent failure or abandonment [30–33]. Understanding some of the factors responsible for this is a key focus of this paper and reflects growing interest within the household energy sector on barriers to the sustained and exclusive use of clean energy sources rather than just their initial uptake [6–9,34]. The aim of this paper is thus to build a qualitative understanding of the key factors responsible for the abandonment of small-scale biogas plants in Northern Tanzania and to suggest evidence based, user-identified, solutions to reduce biogas plant abandonment. This aim is realised through two Research Objectives (RO) where emphasis is placed on both the technical and social components of this multidimensional process, exploring new and underreported factors which contribute to these failures:

- RO1 - Conduct a rapid literature review of small-scale biogas plant literature to identify common barriers to initial adoption and sustained use. The results of which will be used inform initial interview guides and identify stakeholders for RO2.
- RO2 - Conduct qualitative interviews with key biogas plant stakeholders to understand perceptions of small-scale biogas plants, shed light on key reasons for their failure in Northern Tanzania, and present user-identified solutions to small-scale biogas plant abandonment.

In response to calls to bridge gaps between ‘hard’ technology-based and ‘soft’ social science based approaches with more human-centred research [35,36], our contribution to the small-scale biogas plant discourse is twofold. First, to create a holistic and multi-dimensional understanding of the context specific behaviours and attitudes of people in Northern Tanzania who engage with biogas plants on a regular basis; especially owners or operators whose interactions with these systems are integral to their everyday lives and routines. Second, to understand the lived experiences of such individuals and to shed light on the hardware and software issues that underlie acceptance and use of biogas plants or their failure and abandonment. The paper’s novelty lies in the use of qualitative research to obtain the end-user perspectives that are so often neglected from technology-focused research and innovation [37]. The focus on barriers to sustained use of small-scale biogas rather than just initial uptake provides important insights into why ‘backsliding’ from clean to polluting energy sources occurs; complementing studies of this phenomenon in relation to other fuels and technologies [38]. The paper’s significance lies in its potential to inform future small-scale biogas interventions, enabling them to better meet end-user needs whilst promoting more sustained and sustainable access to clean energy in communities that currently lack this. The findings are likely to be of interest to practitioners, policy makers and academics with interests in increasing access to clean, renewable energy in low- and middle-income countries (LMICs).

The structure of the paper is as follows: Section 2 outlines the methodological approaches used. To provide context for the qualitative results, Section 3 draws on existing literature to identify the main barriers associated with small scale AD systems in a range of different regional, agro-ecological, climatic and institutional contexts. The findings are presented n Section 4, and include user perceptions of biogas as a cooking fuel, user perceptions of the causes of poor functionality and failure of biogas plants and user-identified solutions to biogas plant failures. The paper concludes, in Section 5, by offering a number of practical actions which seek to address some of the more common issues associated with biogas plant failure which, if implemented, have the potential to significantly reduce abandonment rates in Northern Tanzania and beyond.

2. Methods

The methodology for this research contains two elements. The first is a rapid literature review of the small-scale biogas plant failure and abandonment literature which sets out the current state of knowledge and sector understanding. The second draws on 30 interviews to capture is a qualitative portrait of five biogas stakeholder groups whose lived experiences are critical in understanding the underlying issues which cause biogas plant failure and or abandonment. These two elements are linked through the use of findings from the rapid review to shape discussions with the five biogas stakeholder groups.

2.1. Phase 1: Rapid Literature Review of Small-Scale Biogas Plant Failure Literature

The rapid review methodology provides “a type of knowledge synthesis in which components of the systematic review process are simplified or omitted to produce information in a short period of time” (p.2) [39]. This enables researchers to identify key literature quickly and effectively in narrow fields of study in time-limited contexts [40,41].

Whilst the wider energy sector and other energy technologies such as solar PV and improved cookstoves have received significant attention in low-income settings, small-scale biogas plants have in some cases been overlooked in previous energy studies [32,33,42]. This, due to the complexity of biogas plant implementation (as discussed in this paper) as it requires a detailed understanding of the complex socio-cultural preferences of end-users, further narrows the literature search and lends itself to the rapid review method. Both published and grey literature were drawn upon but the search was not further limited by restricting publication date or journal type. The rapid review started by drawing on the extensive knowledge of the researchers to establish widely cited systematic reviews that outlined the user-perceived barriers to small-scale/household/decentralised biogas plants. Then using literature databases such as Science Direct [43] and Connected Papers [44], references in the widely cited systematic reviews were extrapolated to follow the narrative through other publications and grey literature.

2.2. Phase 2: A Portrait of Lived Experience in Northern Tanzania

Based on the research objectives, a qualitative research pathway was developed, with individual interviews with a range of stakeholders, as outlined below. Semi-structured interviews with respondents enabled researchers to keep discussions focused on biogas specifically while allowing respondents to share their own views as to how such plants are integrated into their everyday lives. Direct observation of the biogas plants in the field helped provide an additional layer of context in terms of understanding the way in which biogas plants were constructed, used and maintained in an active environment. Interviews were facilitated with the assistance of ECHO (East Africa Impact Center), a Christian NGO, with an office based on the outskirts of Arusha in Northern Tanzania. The organisation’s network of stakeholders specific to the biogas sector was also drawn upon for organising interviews and undertaking biogas plant visits in October 2017. This organisation has a strong developmental and agricultural focus and concentrates on a variety of issues related to improving rural livelihoods, with an explicit overarching objective of reducing poverty amongst the rural poor.

2.2.1. Data Collection

In total, 30 interviews were conducted with five stakeholder groups (These key stakeholders were identified by project partners using purposive sampling based on their extensive experience in the Tanzanian biogas sector.

Table 1) across three different areas in Northern Tanzania: Arusha, Kilimanjaro and Manyara regions. This number of interviews enabled the research to create a broad understanding of a range of factors associated with biogas plant failure that were specific to this geographical location. These key stakeholders were identified by project partners using purposive sampling based on their extensive experience in the Tanzanian biogas sector.

Table 1: Stakeholder Groups

Stakeholder Group	No. of Interviews	Detail.
Owners of Operational Systems	12	Farmers and a small number of other institutions, such as schools
Owners of Non-Functional Systems	10	Included to elicit a wide range of views around system failure and barriers to sustained use
Government Representatives	2	Representing departments responsible for the development of agricultural technologies
Biogas Plant Constructors	3	Biogas plant manufacturers – predominantly focused on plastic-based systems (floating dome and bag) – and constructors (known locally as masons) who mainly built concrete, fixed-dome digesters
International NGOs and Consultants	3	Involved in the development of Tanzania's biogas sector and whose activities ranged from increasing educational awareness to supporting the development of new biogas businesses.

The questions asked during the interviews varied by stakeholder type but included enquiries about different types of biogas plant design (as presented in Figure 1 and

Figure 2), common challenges associated with their maintenance, the efficiency of gas production as well as the broader political and economic environment surrounding the biogas sector. Ethical approval was obtained from the University of Nottingham, Faculty of Engineering Research Ethics Committee. All participants provided informed consent knowing that all their data would be anonymised and held confidentially. All consent forms and participant information sheets were verbally translated into Kiswahili. Where discussants were unable to provide a written signature their consent was represented in the form of a thumb print or audio recorded statement.

Figure 1: Concrete Fixed-Dome Biogas Digestor

Figure 2: Plastic Bag Biogas Digestor

2.2.2. Data Analysis

All interviews conducted were transcribed before being qualitatively examined using a thematic analysis approach [45] to elicit dominant narratives emerging from the interview process which built on core topics identified in the rapid reviews.

2.2.3 Limitations

Phase 1, the rapid review method, has a number of limitations, such as issues around transparency and reflexivity [41] Issues of unconscious bias and positionality as European researchers are also acknowledged [46]. The most significant limitation of this method is that it may not capture more obscure literature as a systematic review would, however the extensive experience of the authors in the small-scale biogas sector helps to mitigate these issues.

In phase 2, the role of positionality, bias and outsider status need to be acknowledged in relation to the data collection and analysis process. Issues surrounding the role of outsider status [46] were mitigated by using existing connections and partners based in these regions of Northern Tanzania. Most notability, this was achieved through connections with the aforementioned NGO ECHO which has long established community presence in and around Arusha. Through ECHO, it was possible to connect with the Tanzania Domestic Biogas Programme and long-established international development organisation SNV who have worked extensively in this field, specifically in this geographical space. Such institutions were able to connect the authors with biogas stakeholders in the community, from users and advocates to constructors and maintainers. In cases where the stakeholders were non-English speakers interviews were conducted with the support of a reputable translator identified by the project's in-country partner, ECHO.

The authors were acutely aware of their positionality as external researchers and therefore interviews were selected as the key methodological approach to allow the discussion of issues that most affected stakeholders on the ground. This was in contrast to the structured, externally driven or quantitative approaches, which could have been employed and would have been centred much more actively on existing Western understandings of the failure and abandonment of biogas plants, in addition to other cleaner energy solutions. The focus was to present a neutral and receptive framework for understanding the strengths and challenges associated with biogas production in these communities, centred firmly on the lived experiences of those currently engaged.

3. Findings: Small-Scale Biogas Plant Failure

Globally a number of research studies have been designed to explore the primary factors which result in a loss of functionality or failure and subsequent abandonment of biogas plants [6,33,47,48]. However, despite a recent increase in literature on broader 'socio-cultural or 'software' factors influencing household, notably cooking, fuel use and priorities [6,8,49,50], research on biogas – and on energy more broadly - has tended to be dominated by a focus on more technological or 'hardware' factors [35].

3.1. The Why (User Perceptions of Biogas as a Cooking Fuel)

While the technological aspects of such operation and maintenance issues are quite well documented, the economic and socio-cultural 'software' factors underpinning them are spatially varied and less well studied, despite their importance in explaining a loss of biogas plant functionality. From a user perspective, a lack of biogas production to anticipated levels is frequently linked to a lack of sustained use and subsequent failure or abandonment as it necessitates the 'stacking' of additional fuel sources [8,51,52]. In areas where these alternative fuels such as wood are cheap or easy to obtain, this can result in prolonged periods of biogas plant inactivity and loss of function as well as fewer health and environmental gains as users continue to collect and burn biomass [6,18]. Fuel stacking may also be encouraged by user preferences for food to be cooked in a specific way or if additional, more aspirational fuels such as electricity become available [30]. In Ethiopia, the inability to connect biogas units to traditional stove types discouraged sustained use [52], while in other areas the visual appearance of some plants discouraged their use [30]. Software factors including cultural resistance to the use of animal and human waste for energy creation can also act as significant barriers to the long term integration of biogas technologies, as exemplified in Bangladesh [35], Sri Lanka [30], Ghana [53] and elsewhere in sub-Saharan Africa [54].

3.2. Four Common Themes of Biogas Plant Failure from the Literature

3.2.1. Theme 1: Construction and Installation Quality

Reflecting a focus on hardware factors, the first themes in the literature on small-scale biogas plant failure concerns poor quality installation including the use of inappropriate technology for particular geographical locations. The application of biogas plant technology that is inappropriate for use in sub-Saharan Africa accounts for a lack of long term sustainability [33]. Similarly, in Sri Lanka, a lack of consideration of soil conditions, vibration patterns and the correct positioning of the digester during the construction phase have led to cracking and leaks[1] [30].

3.2.2. Theme 2: Sub-Optimal Feeding Practices

Other difficulties include the occurrence of system malfunctions due to solid digestate incrustation floating in the main tank, reducing the production of biogas [55] or the failure to keep anaerobic digesters within certain pH parameters (ideally close to pH neutral) which can reduce their efficiency and ultimately result in their abandonment [56]. In some cases, this reflects a lack of user-training in operation and maintenance issues, or poor understanding of basic troubleshooting [30]. Drawing on innovations in developing sensor technologies to record the performance of a range of household energy systems [21,22,34,57–59], there is potential to address some of these problems through on-site monitoring and transmitting data on biogas plant performance and functionality for remote analysis [34,59,60].

---

[1] The improper construction may be as a result of tight time schedules underpinned by target-driven instillation practises though does not give specific examples [30].

3.2.3. Theme 3: Operation and Maintenance

The lack of a regular, continuous supply of feedstock (such as animal waste) throughout the seasons or the time-costs associated with collecting feedstock in nomadic or free grazing systems may constitute significant barriers to sustained biodigester use [30,31,33,47]. Deaths of animals, climatic variations, reductions in grazing lands or abandonment of animal husbandry may also cause a lack of the necessary levels of biomass to input [30][2]. The failure of users to employ the correct ratio of animal manure to water, either through lack of knowledge or the unavailability of water, has also caused processing problems [6,33]. Location-specific and climatic factors may also play a role in impairing the digestion process and reducing gas production. These include the inability to add sufficient quantities of water in seasonally dry areas [6] or interruptions to digestion caused by low winter temperatures in more mountainous regions [54].

Where mechanical failures are responsible for poor functionality, the inability to quickly and cost-effectively source and fit spare parts can have major implications for the continued use of biogas plants, particularly within rural settings [30]. In Zimbabwe, a large-scale clean energy project designed to demonstrate the sophisticated nature of biogas systems, collapsed, in part, due to the lack of availability of spare parts [48]. In the same arena, an absence of trained technicians in the locality of biogas plants exacerbates these issues in low-income African countries [33].

3.2.4. Theme 4: Training Provision and Knowledge Erosion

Further difficulties are evident in the day-to-day operation of the biodigester and the labour required for this. Some systems require daily cleaning, which has proved to be too onerous for some users [6,61] while others require loading at height which can complicate the feeding process [30]. In sub-Saharan Africa, instances whereby an insufficient desire on the part of users to maintain the digester effectively led to biogas units becoming deactivated [31,42]. In some cases, the departure of young men in the family to pursue other work has, at times, left a maintenance void that other family members have been unable to fill [30].

From an organisational standpoint, a lack of project monitoring or post-installation follow-up has contributed to a lack of understanding of how hardware and software factors intersect to cause poor functionality or abandonment of biogas plants. Failures have also been attributed to a lack of focused energy policy in low-income countries which have experienced growth in the biogas sector [31]. Inadequate awareness amongst users as to the advantages of the technology (some users requested biogas systems to solve issues with waste disposal without any intention to use the biogas) can be traced to poor information exchange [30]. Additionally, successful biogas installation and continued use is built upon institutional arrangements and appropriate policies which ensure that products on the market are of high quality [31]. The marketplace needs to be organised efficiently and facilitate the flow of these high-quality products and ensure comprehensive information exchange between stakeholders to reduce the threat of biogas plant failures.

3.3. The Research Gap

These issues do not represent an exhaustive list of factors which can result in the failure of small-scale biogas plants in LMICs. Additional factors are likely to have been substantially overlooked in previous literature on the subject, whilst others play a less visible role including factors linked to biogas plant adoption rather than a lack of sustained use or failure once installed. Generally, users' financial limitations are considered more of a barrier to the adoption of rather than the sustained use of biogas technologies [31,33,54,61], yet labour and

---

[2] The input of other materials to supplement waste materials due to shortages has also generated problems with the biodigester leading to plant failure [30].

maintenance costs imply longer-term financial and time commitments that may become unsustainable. Another important dynamic is that of land ownership, since the fixed nature of many biodigesters, especially those built into the ground, present issues around ownership and responsibility in situations where land is either rented or contested leading to potential conflict and abandonment [33,62].

Given the range of factors influencing biogas plant failure across the global South, it is difficult to identify a single prominent driver. Rather there is a diverse and often context-specific patchwork of factors responsible for a lack of sustained use, loss of functionality and abandonment. Identifying which of these issues are evident in Northern Tanzania, and the underlying processes which have produced these conditions as well as how to overcome these challenges are presented in the following section.

4. Findings: Evidencing Lived Experience of Biogas Plant Users

This section explores the key themes which emerged from the interviews conducted, examining user experiences of both cooking with biogas and maintaining small-scale biogas plants along with the perceptions of different stakeholders on factors contributing to a lack of sustained use, loss of functionality and abandonment. Lastly, it highlights some user-based priorities and suggested solutions for addressing biogas functionality problems that were identified during the interviews.

4.1. User Perceptions of Biogas as a Cooking Fuel

On the subject of biogas as a cooking fuel, responses were generally positive, with biogas described as quick and simple to access as it only required opening a tap and lighting the flame rather than the more labour-intensive process of starting a fire with biomass. Interviewees agreed that given a choice of cooking with biogas or other fuels, biogas was their preferred option. This was mainly down to smoke production, particularly in confined spaces with one respondent noting:

> ‘My husband has a problem with his eyes when I’m cooking, he doesn’t dare even come into the kitchen…but when I’m using biogas, he can come to the kitchen and we cook together’ (Interview 5).

Biogas was particularly valued for heating water in the morning (when biomass fires would normally require lighting from scratch) and also for cooking soft items like vegetables.

Despite a general enthusiasm for cooking with biogas, however, key themes arising from the interviews indicated problems associated with poor functionality, insufficient gas production and, in some cases, complete plant failure that hindered a sustained and exclusive shift to the use of clean cooking fuels. Echoing studies elsewhere [6,18], the failure of biogas plants to fully meet users’ cooking needs was linked to a tendency to ‘stack’ fuels, with biogas frequently being supplemented with firewood (either collected or purchased), charcoal or LPG. In many cases, interviewees expressed frustration that they couldn’t rely on biogas for more of their cooking needs:

> ‘So the worst thing is to be out of gas when cooking’ (Interview 4).

> ‘If you could be able for the production of the biogas to be like more longer to use it, the people would not even think even to use the firewood or charcoal’ (Interview 22).

> ‘It’s not like much. It’s not like using [a] long time. Sometimes [we] use the gas, sometimes [we] use the firewood because there’s not enough gas to use to cook everything’ (Interview 3).

For some users, temperature variations associated with the changing seasons were identified as a cause of seasonal fluctuations in biogas yields (and increased reliance on biomass fuels for cooking), with the response below typical of the sentiment:

> 'The problem [is] between changing seasons of the year. Because during the rainy season, the plant is going to be like cool. It's no more like gas production' (Interview 22).

Because of the relatively consistent temperatures across the year in this part of the country, however, minimal disruption to gas production was reported on the whole[3] and even where plants were affected by cold weather, users reported that the rate of gas production slowed rather than ceased altogether. Nevertheless, users still felt constrained in the type of cooking that they could do with biogas. Some respondents noted that their biogas units failed to provide sufficient gas for the preparation of local dishes such Ugali or Makande that required lengthy periods of slow cooking[4]. A reliance on traditional fuels was also encountered including the use of firewood and charcoal to cook 'heavier' foods, such as maize or beans, which form the basis of local cuisine.

4.2. User Perceptions of the Causes of Poor Functionality and Failure of Biogas Plants

Reflecting wider literature on the *causes* of sub-optimal biogas yields, poor functionality and biogas plant failure [6,51,54], key themes that emerged from the rapid review have been linked to interviewees' explanations of issues related to poor construction and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, basic operation and maintenance and training-related issues.

4.2.1. Theme 1: Construction and Installation Quality

The failure of biogas plants was linked back repeatedly by owners to initial mistakes made during the installation phases which fell into several specific categories. Firstly, a few biogas plants were observed which were either no longer used or in need of repair due to issues of subsidence. This can be caused by factors including the system being built on unstable land, using soil of the wrong consistency or poor choice of site location. This issue is particularly difficult to remedy, since addressing structural failure can be both costly and time consuming, especially for biogas systems out of warranty.

Secondly, cracks in the digester, for those made of both concrete and plastic, were identified as an important contributor to system failures, which biogas plant owners predominantly linked to poor installation. Cracking can lead to multiple problems including loss of pressure inside the digester, drying out of material inside the system and disruptions to flows of slurry from inlet to outlet. However, the cause of such cracking was contested among stakeholders as while biogas users tended to believe installers were responsible, those building the systems, as well as some government representatives, indicated that cracking could be a sign of user neglect rather than poor workmanship. Either way, the loss of functionality or limitations on gas production caused by these issues at the installation phase were clearly influential in the failure or abandonment of some systems.

Thirdly, problems associated with piping were routinely identified as contributing to biogas plant failure. Again, these can be categorised into two main issues, both deriving from the installation. Leakages of gas from the pipes, resulting in less gas for end users, was a significant problem. Poor workmanship, particularly in relation to points of connectivity

---

[3] NB. It cannot be ruled out that biogas users at higher altitude (for example, deeper into Kilimanjaro region) suffer more from temperature variations which could affect gas production. However a number of sites visited were at significant altitude and were not adversely impacted.

[4] For a typical six cubic metre plant, enough gas to cook for 2-4 hours per day was widely reported by users when the plant was fully operational.

between digester and pipe, was identified by biogas plant owners as the cause of these leakages. This challenge was exacerbated, at times, by the significant distance between the biodigester and kitchen. Similarly, users highlighted rusting on the pipes connecting the biogas digester with the kitchen as a factor responsible for reduced functionality which sometimes contributed to abandonment, as the material and labour costs associated with replacing damaged or rusting pipework was deemed prohibitive. Such rusting is primarily attributed to cost-cutting at the point of installation, with iron pipes being used instead of higher quality materials, such as plastic.

By contrast, representatives from the government department mentioned that they had not observed the use of iron pipes in biogas installations and did not recommend this given the potential for rusting and associated challenges around gas leakage. While liability for issues such as subsidence, cracking and rusting because of errors in the construction or installation phase (either wilful or otherwise) remain contested, the fact that some systems were not built to the necessary standard was clearly a contributing factor around biogas plant failures and abandonment in Northern Tanzania. Users also linked these issues to plants producing significantly less gas for the end user than would have been expected prior to installation.

4.2.2. Theme 2: Sub-Optimal Feeding and Maintenance Practices

A second theme arising during discussions of the causes of insufficient gas yield, poor plant functionality and failure concerned sub-optimal biogas plant feeding and maintenance practices. Echoing the literature on biogas plant operation and maintenance [6,30,31,47,52], most apparent were issues related to the feeding of the biodigester. These can be categorised under several key themes related to the behaviour of those responsible for ensuring that the system is used correctly and their access to the resources they needed to feed the plant.

To create the correct consistency of material for input to the digester, animal waste is mixed with water[5] in order to facilitate a smooth flow of material through the digester. Depending on the digester design, location and climate, this mixture is usually to a specified ratio; for example, two buckets of waste to two buckets of water with two or three buckets of each needed per day for a six cubic metre plant. This requires not only good access to these resources but also to the labour required to feed the plant regularly to ensure that the feedstock flows at the correct speed through the digester. Without the correct consistency of material facilitated by this mixing, the digester can become clogged, its usual flow impeded and, as a direct consequence, little or no gas production is recorded.

Through both discussions with users about their feeding routine and examination of the inside of the digester, it was evident that users were, in many instances, not feeding the digester with the correct ratios of waste to water. The suboptimal production of gas is likely to be linked directly to this issue. Less common but nonetheless noteworthy was the tendency of some users to add inappropriate materials including grass to the digester to supplement the animal waste, which in a limited number of instances affected the supply of gas. Additionally, even where the feedstock type and mixture was correct, the inability of users to feed the digester regularly enough was identified as a factor in the breakdown or reduced production in some of the plants visited. For the plant to work most efficiently, a steady flow of materials must continuously move through the system, allowing for the anaerobic digester to produce the gas and to create and maintain the necessary gas pressure to force the slurry through the outlet. Therefore, a regular feeding pattern (either once or twice per day dependent on the system, at around the same time each day) is required to maintain this process.

[5] Animal faeces can also be mixed with urine instead or water. However, this was only realistic in cases where cattle were subject to zero-grazing, which only accounted for approximately 50% of biogas users interviewed.

In some cases, seasonal variations in water availability interrupted the regularity of feeding patterns or contributed to the use of incorrect waste to water ratios. It was evident that some users found it difficult to access water during the dry season:

> ‘After rainy season ended we start the problem of having water. We need to travel from home to [water source], it's like 400m. So when go and back it's like 800m. Every day.’ (Interview 4).

> ‘Yes, we've had that problem [lack of water] because we use tap water. The water we trap from the mountains. So we had the problem of not having water here. So it's took us like two weeks without using the biogas’ (Interview 1).

Although the research did not suggest that water shortages were in themselves significant contributors of biogas plant failures, they clearly created temporary challenges for users and were linked to periods of paused feeding or plant inactivity which in turn had an impact on gas yield.[6]

4.2.3. Theme 3: Operation and Maintenance

A third key theme that emerged in explanations for biogas plant failure and poor functionality concerned the responsibility of the user to operate the plant appropriately and perform basic maintenance. Particular attention was drawn to the ongoing issue of water forming in the pipe connecting the digester with the kitchen and the need to remove this water, through the regular opening and closing of a purpose-built tap on the piping, to prevent reductions in the flow of gas.[7] While most users were aware of the need to remove water in this way, this knowledge was not universal. Frustration with a perceived lack of gas production, at times leading to abandonment, even when the supply was simply being blocked by the presence of water. This represents an issue with a straightforward resolution, yet equally is one which has the potential to have a serious impact on gas production and plant functionality. A simple solution for this problem may already be in existence. SimGas, a private sector biogas plant construction company, provide a two-year warranty against structural failures, and such a mechanism can provide reassurances to potential customers who are naturally wary of the ability of poor installation to undermine their investments. It is unlikely that all plants will be constructed perfectly, therefore providing such support is critical to preventing system failure, especially in the first years after installation.

4.2.4. Theme 4: Training Provision and Knowledge Erosion

The evident lack of such knowledge among some users echoed a fourth key theme emerging from explanations of biogas plant failure which concerned the training of biogas plant users and the erosion, over time, of knowledge obtained during such training. During interviews with biogas plant owners, it became clear that the installation of their plants was usually accompanied with some form of user training on how the system should be operated to maximise efficiency and lifespan. Both the Centre for Agricultural Mechanisation and Rural Technology (CAMARTEC), the government department overseeing biogas development in Tanzania over recent decades, and private sector biogas businesses have offered training to households in how to operate their new biogas system efficiently. Training typically covers

[6] Again, this is geographically sensitive and represents the situation in Northern Tanzania. Given the country’s size and climatic variation, such issues may be more or less prominent in different regions.

[7] Regular in this instance was dependent on the amount of water forming but for a plant operating to potential, weekly removal was typical.

how to feed the plant (amounts, timings, ratios etc.), how to address simple issues, such as extracting water from the pipe using the tap, and the uses for bio-slurry.

Despite this comprehensive training, biogas plant failures due to operator error represent a significant challenge to their long term use; despite the fact that in most cases users have invested their own funds[8] in the system and value the free fuel it produces. Some broader context is therefore required to understand this outcome. The primary users of biogas technology in this location are farmers who, given their assets such as land and livestock and their investment in biogas technology, are not at the very bottom of the economic pyramid within Tanzanian society. Furthermore, given their slightly elevated economic position, some farmers can afford to employ a small number of workers to assist in the everyday running of their farms. Particularly amongst owners of larger and more sophisticated plants as, although they may have initially invested more in the plant, much of the day-to-day running of the biogas system was done by their employees including: collecting and moving animal waste, mixing it with liquid and feeding the plant, as well as semi-regular plant maintenance such a removing water from the pipe.

It was also clear that some of these workers, at the time of the biogas plant installation, were provided with training on how to use the technology, along with plant owners, as it was envisaged that they were most likely to be directly engaged with the system on a regular basis. However, given the relatively high turnover of such employees, problems tended to arise when they were replaced by new staff and some of the expertise passed on by the departing worker, became lost or misunderstood. Clearly, this has had significant implications for the long-term sustainability of biogas plants in this region and illustrates that while training at the point of installation is self-evidently vital to successful use, it does not guarantee that the technology will be used correctly over its lifespan.

4.3. User-identified Solutions to Biogas Plant Failures

During the course of discussions with biogas stakeholders and users, a few notable suggestions regarding the design of small-scale biogas plants were highlighted as having potential to promote their sustained use and long-term viability. Regarding operation and maintenance issues, user convenience was also highlighted by owners as integral to effective operation and maintenance of biogas plants. This issue manifested itself in multiple forms, however central to most observations was the need to make the process of feeding as simple and convenient as possible. For example, if animals were based in a stall with a concrete floor linked to an adjacent inlet of the digester, the waste material could be easily collected and processed by the user. In contrast, it was noted that if the operator had to expend time and energy collecting waste in wheelbarrow, then transport it to the system in a different part of the dwelling; the inconvenience associated with this process had the potential to discourage users. Location of the plant, proximity and ease of process were each cited as challenges which can lead to incorrect plant operation in this environment, all of which feed into the broader theme of ensuring such systems are designed to be fundamentally user-friendly.

In terms of addressing problems linked to insufficient biogas supply, plant owners, especially those who were responsible for cooking with the gas, valued knowing how much gas there was left in the system to enable them to make choices about when and what to cook. Some of the systems were installed with a pressure gauge, which, while technically measuring the gas pressure and not the gas amount, allowed users to estimate the time left to cook with the fuel. Their owners were positive about having access to this basic information as it allowed them to manage their use of gas to best suit their needs. They therefore felt that an expansion

[8] Some have received subsidies over the years from either government or third sector organisations, but even these usually require some of contribution from end-users.

of the use of such gauges would allow those cooking to maximise the effectiveness of the gas produced, even if this was below their total requirements.

5. Discussion

The production of biogas from animal waste, when used correctly, remains an excellent way to use existing waste materials at low cost to produce a sustainable fuel which can reduce the damaging impacts associated with household air pollution as well as lowering the rates of biomass burning. Whilst it is encouraging that significant numbers of plants have been constructed in Tanzania, it is disheartening to see so many abandoned by users so soon after installation. It is also disappointing that the effectiveness of biogas promotion initiatives are often undermined by the frequent inability of small-scale biogas units to meet all cooking requirements, necessitating continued reliance on biomass fuels. Also, as even relatively brief interruptions to the use of biogas plants can increase the risk of technical failures, addressing such issues often requires relying on biomass fuels until the biogas plant is operational again. Instead of achieving a full replacement of biomass fuels with biogas, the adoption of such clean cooking technologies is frequently associated continued fuel stacking. This, in turn, undermines potential health gains associated with biogas use whilst making the abandonment of plants more likely than if users had reliable access to sufficient gas from such systems.

It is evident, through both engagement with the literature and the primary research conducted as part of this exploration, that biogas plant failure outcomes can be viewed as a series of software and hardware challenges rather than one single issue. These challenges are visible at multiple stages (installation, operation, maintenance, and training) and include different actors (masons, users and the natural environment), all of whom can contribute to the failure of biogas plants.

Fundamental to the longevity of a biogas plant is the initial construction. Technicians and practitioners continue to debate the most suitable model of system for the Tanzanian context; be that concrete fixed-dome, inflatable bag or plastic covered which can be expanded through one metre extensions as per the needs of the customer. Whichever design is selected, the requirement to provide some form of insurance against poor installation is essential to ensure that plants are not abandoned as a result. Conflict between constructor and owner in such contexts is likely, and identifying which party is responsible and therefore liable for the repairs is problematic.

The way in which biogas systems are operated on a day-to-day basis is clearly central to their continued viability; a fact which is bought in sharp focus by the significant number of plants which were inactive or underperforming in this geographical region due to operational errors. The lack of appropriate education and training has previously been cited as a driver of biogas plant failures [30,33], however at the vast majority of sites visited, such services were offered at the time of construction. Nevertheless, the current literature fails to acknowledge the erosion of this knowledge over time due to the continuous turnover of those tasked with feeding and maintaining the plant. In general, key instructions, such as when to feed the digester and what ratio of waste to water is needed, were usually not recorded on paper, with new workers briefed by outgoing staff verbally, if at all. Finding a solution is essential as without broader support, the initial training can have very little long-term value. Potential options include systematic training refresher visits from installers or through other means such as the provision of physical guidelines at the time of purchase or access to online information.

In addition, the disappointment of end users in the limited or less-than-expected production of gas was evident in conversation with owners resulting in biogas having a poor reputation in the area. These problems are often exacerbated by issues outlined around poor construction or incorrect operation, but it is important for those using the gas for cooking to be able to get the most possible use out of the fuel available. The inclusion of pressure gauges provides a welcome addition in many such kitchens, with users able to estimate the time left to cook and consequently which meals can be prepared with the resources available. The availability of such information can help make the system more valuable to the operator and, as a result, users are less likely to abandon them completely.

6. Conclusion

Technology in this field continues to develop at a steady rate and provide significant opportunities for future work especially through solutions using 'Internet of Things' principles. The advancements in sensor technology [63] - which can be monitored either on-site or remotely - have started to be used to record data across a variety of intervention strategies [7,8,34,57,59,60]. For the biogas sector, such developments may prove useful when attempting to keep plants active and production high, with the potential for sensors to monitor output and performance continuously, providing data which can highlight problems with the system before gas production is significantly affected.

This paper presents several key learnings. Fundamental to future policy development around reducing biogas plant abandonment is a focused and accurate understanding of the key reason behind current trends which this research provides. Poor construction and installation, sub-optimal feeding practices, inadequate maintenance issues along with limited training provision and knowledge erosion each contribute significantly to biogas plant challenges, ranging from sub-optimum operation to complete desertion by owner operators. This research provides an evidence-based understanding of the key drivers of such decisions by users, which is vital given the ability of biogas technology to reconcile the existing and continuing political movement to reduce carbon emissions with the need to advance global ambitions around sustained poverty reduction for populations and communities on the economic fringes in developing nations. To conclude, this research recognises that reducing the failure rates of biogas systems in this geographical area is a complex issue, however steps can be undertaken to reduce the impact of some of the most damaging factors which lead to system abandonments. Specifically, this paper represents a call to action to biogas businesses, installers and constructors to rethink the way in which they deliver training as well as further integrating design features which allow users to understand the performance of their biogas plant.

7. Funding

This research was made possible by InnovateUK's "Smart Biogas Network" (Grant Number 132479) and partially supported by InnovateUK's "Smart Biogas II - Increasing Wealth from Waste" (Grant Number 105909).

8. References

[1] DEFRA. Anaerobic Digestion – Shared Goals. London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; 2009.

[2] DEFRA. Anaerobic Digestion Strategy and Action Plan: A commitment to increasing energy from waste through anaerobic digestion. London: Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs; 2011.

[3] Pathak H, Jain N, Bhatia A, Mohanty S, Gupta N. Global warming mitigation potential of biogas plants in India. Environ Monit Assess 2009;157:407–18. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10661-008-0545-6.

[4] Massé DI, Talbot G, Gilbert Y. On farm biogas production: A method to reduce GHG emissions and develop more sustainable livestock operations. Anim Feed Sci Technol 2011;166–167:436–45. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.anifeedsci.2011.04.075.

[5] International Energy Agency (IEA). Tracking SDG7: The Energy Progress Report 2018. Washington DC: International Bank of Reconstruction and Development and World Health Organisation; 2018.

[6] Puzzolo E, Pope D, Stanistreet D, Rehfuess E, Bruce N. Clean fuels for resource-poor settings: A systematic review of barriers and enablers to adoption and sustained use. Environ Res 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envres.2016.01.002.

[7] Ruiz-Mercado I, Masera O, Zamora H, Smith KR. Adoption and sustained use of improved cookstoves. Energy Policy 2011;39:7557–66. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enpol.2011.03.028.

[8] Ruiz-Mercado I, Canuz E, Walker JL, Smith KR. Quantitative metrics of stove adoption using Stove Use Monitors (SUMs). Biomass Bioenergy 2013;57:136–48. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biombioe.2013.07.002.

[9] Sesan T, Jewitt S, Clifford M, Ray C. Toilet training: what can the cookstove sector learn from improved sanitation promotion? Int J Environ Health Res 2018;28:667–82. https://doi.org/10.1080/09603123.2018.1503235.

[10] World Health Organization. Burning opportunity: clean household energy for health, sustainable development, and wellbeing of women and children. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2016.

[11] Movik S, Allouche J. States of power: Energy imaginaries and transnational assemblages in Norway, Nepal and Tanzania. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;67:101548. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101548.

[12] International Energy Agency. Tanzania Energy Outlook. IEA 2022. https://www.iea.org/country/n_country.asp (accessed March 28, 2022).

[13] The World Bank. Tracking SDG7: The Energy Progress Report. 2019.

[14] The World Bank. DataBank on Poverty and Equity 2021.

[15] Balachandra P. Dynamics of rural energy access in India: An assessment. Energy 2011;36:5556–67. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.energy.2011.07.017.

[16] Bhattacharyya SC. Energy access programmes and sustainable development: A critical review and analysis. Energy Sustain Dev 2012;16:260–71. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esd.2012.05.002.

[17] Bond T, Templeton MR. History and future of domestic biogas plants in the developing world 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2011.09.003.

[18] Katuwal H, Bohara A. Biogas: A promising renewable technology and its impact on rural households in Nepal 2009. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2009.05.002.

[19] Mondal MAH, Kamp L, Pachova NI. Drivers, barriers, and strategies for implementation of renewable energy technologies in rural areas in Bangladesh—An innovation system analysis 2010. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENPOL.2010.04.018.

[20] Zheng Y, Wei JG, Li J, Feng S, Li Z, Jiang G, et al. Anaerobic fermentation technology increases biomass energy use efficiency in crop residue utilization and biogas production 2012. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2012.03.061.

[21] MNRE. Implemtation of National Biogas and Manure Management Programme (NBMMP) during 11th five year plan. Delhi: Minstry of New and Renewable Energy; 2009.

[22] Reddy BS, Srinivas T. Energy use in Indian household sector - An actor-oriented approach 2009. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENERGY.2009.01.004.

[23] Dohoo C, Guernsey J, Critchley K, Vanleeuwen J. Pilot Study on the Impact of Biogas as a Fuel Source on Respiratory Health of Women on Rural Kenyan Smallholder Dairy Farms. J Environ Public Health 2012. https://doi.org/10.1155/2012/636298.

[24] Energia. A Guide on gender mainstreaming in the Africa Biogas Partnership Programme (ABPP). The Netherlands: 2010.

[25] E N, L S, F TH. Tanzania Domestic Biogas Programme: Implementation document. TDBP. TDBP; 2009.

[26] The Citizen. Sh9bn committed to biogas project in rural Tanzania 2016. https://www.thecitizen.co.tz/tanzania/news/business/sh9bn-committed-to-biogas-project-in-rural-tanzania-2545656 (accessed October 29, 2021).

[27] SNV. 10,000 biogas plants to be installed in Tanzania with support from the Government & Norwegian Embassy 2015. https://snv.org/update/10000-biogas-plants-be-installed-tanzania-support-government-norwegian-embassy (accessed October 29, 2021).

[28] ABPP. Evaluation of ABPP: Executive Summary. 2019.

[29] National Bureau of Statistics. Census of Agriculture 2007/2008: Technical And Operation Report 2012. https://www.nbs.go.tz/index.php/en/census-surveys/agriculture-statistics/45-census-of-agriculture-2007-2008-technical-and-operation-report (accessed October 29, 2021).

[30] Alwis AD. Biogas – a review of Sri Lanka's performance with a renewable energy technology 2002. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0973-0826(08)60296-3.

[31] Mengistu MG, Simane B, Eshete G, Workneh T. A review on biogas technology and its contributions to sustainable rural livelihood in Ethiopia 2015. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2015.04.026.

[32] Muller C, Yan H. Household Fuel Use in Developing Countries: Review of Theory and Evidence 2018. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ENECO.2018.01.024.

[33] Mwirigi J, Balana B, Mugisha J, Walekhwa P, Melamu R, Nakami S, et al. Socio-economic hurdles to widespread adoption of small-scale biogas digesters in Sub-Saharan Africa: A review 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOMBIOE.2014.02.018.

[34] Northcross A, Shupler M, Alexander D, Olamijulo J, Ibigbami T, Ana G, et al. Sustained usage of bioethanol cookstoves shown in an urban Nigerian city via new SUMs algorithm 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2016.05.003.

[35] Sovacool B. The political economy of energy poverty: A review of key challenges 2012. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2012.05.006.

[36] Sovacool B, Bazilian M, Toman M. Paradigms and poverty in global energy policy: Research needs for achieving universal energy access 2016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/6/064014.

[37] Hartley S, McLeod C, Clifford M, Jewitt S, Ray C. A retrospective analysis of responsible innovation for low-technology innovation in the Global South. J Responsible Innov 2019;6:143–62.

[38] Jewitt S, Atagher P, Clifford M. "We cannot stop cooking": Stove stacking, seasonality and the risky practices of household cookstove transitions in Nigeria. Energy Res Soc Sci 2020;61.

[39] Tricco AC, Antony J, Zarin W, Strifler L, Ghassemi M, Ivory J, et al. A scoping review of rapid review methods. BMC Med 2015;13:224. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12916-015-0465-6.

[40] Khangura S, Konnyu K, Cushman R, Grimshaw J, Moher D. Evidence summaries: the evolution of a rapid review approach. Syst Rev 2012;1:10. https://doi.org/10.1186/2046-4053-1-10.

[41] Ganann R, Ciliska D, Thomas H. Expediting systematic reviews: methods and implications of rapid reviews. Implement Sci 2010;5:56. https://doi.org/10.1186/1748-5908-5-56.

[42] Rupf GV, Bahri P, Boer KD, McHenry M. Broadening the potential of biogas in Sub-Saharan Africa: An assessment of feasible technologies and feedstocks 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2016.04.023.

[43] Science Direct. Science, health and medical journals, full text articles and books. 2022. https://www.sciencedirect.com/.
[44] Connected Papers. Find and explore academic papers 2022. https://www.connectedpapers.com/ (accessed March 10, 2022).
[45] Denzin NK, Lincoln YS. The SAGE handbook of qualitative research / edited by Norman K. Denzin, Yvonna S. Lincoln. 5th ed. Thousand Oaks, Calif. London: Thousand Oaks, Calif. London : SAGE; 2018.
[46] Sovacool BK, Axsen J, Sorrella S. Promoting novelty, rigor, and style in energy social science: Towards codes of practice for appropriate methods and research design. Energy Res Soc Sci 2018;45:12–42.
[47] Tucho GT, Moll H, uiterkamp AS, Nonhebel S. Problems with Biogas Implementation in Developing Countries from the Perspective of Labor Requirements 2016. https://doi.org/10.3390/EN9090750.
[48] Parawira W. Biogas technology in sub-Saharan Africa: status, prospects and constraints 2009. https://doi.org/10.1007/S11157-009-9148-0.
[49] Barnes B, Rosenbaum J, Mehta S, Williams K, Jagoe K, Graham JP. Behavior Change Communication: A Key Ingredient for Advancing Clean Cooking. J Health Commun 2015. https://doi.org/10.1080/10810730.2014.996305.
[50] Hanna R, Duflo E, Greenstone M. Up in Smoke: the Influence of Household Behavior on the Long-Run Impact of Improved Cooking Stoves 2012. https://doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.2039004.
[51] Masera O, Saatkamp BD, Kammen D. From Linear Fuel Switching to Multiple Cooking Strategies: A Critique and Alternative to the Energy Ladder Model 2000. https://doi.org/10.1016/S0305-750X(00)00076-0.
[52] Mengistu MG, Simane B, Eshete G, Workneh T. Factors affecting households' decisions in biogas technology adoption, the case of Ofla and Mecha Districts, northern Ethiopia 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RENENE.2016.02.066.
[53] Arthur R, Baidoo MF, Antwi E. Biogas as a potential renewable energy source: A Ghanaian case study 2011. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RENENE.2010.11.012.
[54] Gebreegziabher Z, Naik L, Melamu R, Balana B. Prospects and challenges for urban application of biogas installations in Sub-Saharan Africa 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOMBIOE.2014.02.036.
[55] Roubík H, Mazancová J, Banout J, Verner V. Addressing problems at small-scale biogas plants: a case study from central Vietnam 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JCLEPRO.2015.09.114.
[56] Zafar S. Description of a Biogas Power Plant. BioEnergy Consult n.d. https://www.bioenergyconsult.com/description-biogas-plant/ (accessed October 29, 2021).
[57] Piedrahita R, Dickinson K, Kanyomse E, Coffey E, Alirigia R, Hagar Y, et al. Assessment of cookstove stacking in Northern Ghana using surveys and stove use monitors 2016. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ESD.2016.07.007.
[58] Schelling N, Hasson MJ, Huong SL, Nevarez A, Lu W-C, Tierney M, et al. SIMbaLink: towards a sustainable and feasible solar rural electrification system. ICTD 2010, 2010. https://doi.org/10.1145/2369220.2369260.
[59] Tejwani R, Kumar G, Solanki C. Remote Monitoring for Solar Photovoltaic Systems in Rural Application Using GSM Voice Channel 2014. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EGYPRO.2014.10.145.
[60] Hope R, Thomson P, Koehler J, Foster T, Thomas MG. From Rights to Results in Rural Water Service - Evidence from Kyuso, Kenya, 2014. https://doi.org/10.35648/20.500.12413/11781/II035.
[61] Kabir H, Yegbemey R, Bauer S. Factors determinant of biogas adoption in Bangladesh 2013. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2013.08.046.
[62] Lamourdia T, Drechsel P, Olaleye AO, Adeoti A, Barry B, Vohland K. Adoption Driver and Constraints of Resource Conservation Technologies in Sub-Saharan Africa 2006:21.

[63] Inclusive Energy. Smart Biogas. Incl Energy 2022. https://www.inclusive.energy/smart-biogas (accessed January 18, 2022).

Highlights

- Advancements in biogas technologies are offset by plant failure and abandonment.
- Reasons for failure include operational, structural and maintenance challenges.
- These forces are often ignored, undermining many of the positive advancements.
- Addressing such problems is critical to reduce failure and abandonment rates.

RSER Author Checklist Table

Item	Check	Important notes for Authors/Requirement
Article type	Select the single correct article type here and state in brackets the paper word count. • Full-length article (7214)	Papers will be indexed as Full-length articles, Review articles, Retractions, Corrigendum, Addendum or Editorials as explained above in this GFA.
Manuscript	This is the 'entire' article that the reviewers and authors will assess. It is used later to prepare the published article, so it is important that all details required by the GFA are included.	The manuscript should be a single MS Word file or pdf that includes the cover letter, the RSER Author Checklist table and the paper as per the layout in the GFA.
Cover letter	A maximum of two pages, dated and addressed to the Editors stating the name and affiliation of the authors, it should state the following clearly; • Title paper, key findings and why novel and meets the journal scope, • Article type and if relates to a conference special issue. • Any details relating to elements of the work already published as a Preprint/Archiv/Working paper/conference paper etc. or as a thesis or other with a precise explanation, • Any details of funding agencies etc., • Provide a declaration of interest, • List any recommended reviewers, • The corresponding author must sign the Cover letter as the person held responsible for all aspects of the paper during and after the publication process.	Note that the role of the corresponding author is very important as they are responsible for the article ultimately in terms of Ethics in Publishing, making sure that the GFA is adhered to, informing readers of any relationships with organisations or people that may influence the work inappropriately as discussed in the GFA, all the content of the article and that the Proof is correct. It is very difficult if not impossible to edit a paper once published. Most mistakes in articles occur when corresponding authors are changed after/during acceptance; examples include leaving out acknowledgements of funding agencies and the full and correct author affiliations.
Layout of paper	The elements/headings listed below should appear in the order below in the paper: • Title • Author details • Abstract • Highlights • Keywords • Word Count • List of abbreviations including units and nomenclature • 1.0 Introduction • 2.0 Material and methods • 3.0 Theory/calculation • 4.0 Results • 5.0 Discussion • 6.0 Conclusion • Acknowledgements • List of References	Note read carefully the specific details of each element/heading in this GFA. The main headings i.e. 2.0 to 6.0 can vary from article to article, but all articles must include the title, author details, abstract, keywords, highlights, word count and list of abbreviations on page 1 of the paper.
English, grammar and syntax	State checked: Yes	The authors must proof read and check their work. This is NOT the role of the editorial team, reviewers or the publishing team. Some guidance on English, grammar and syntax is provided in this GFA below, but it is ultimately the author's responsibility.
Title	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	The title should not include acronyms or abbreviations of any kind. Excessive use of capitals letters should also be avoided.
Author names and affiliations	State checked and adhered to GFA yes or no.	The names of the authors in order of contribution or supervision or seniority depending on the funding agency/field requirements should be presented below the title of the article as follows: Last, First by initial e.g. Foley, A.M.[1], Leahy, P.[2] 1 = School of Mechanical & Aerospace Engineering, Queen's University Belfast, BT9 4AH, United Kingdom 2 = School of Engineering, University College Cork, Ireland

Corresponding author	Show clearly in the paper, beside the name of the author with an asterix and footnote. Confirm that this has been done.	The corresponding author must be denoted in the article by an asterix superscript beside their name and a footnote, as follows: Foley, A.M.[1, *] * = corresponding author details, a.foley@qub.ac.uk Note that only one corresponding author can be identified.
Highlights	These should be inserted as requested in the article and uploaded as a separate file.	Details on highlights are in the GFA below.
Graphical abstract	State if attached, No.	Note submitting a graphical abstract is at the discretion of the authors. It this is not required by RSER.
Copyright	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes List here any tables, figures, graphs or other images that required copyright.	Authors are responsible for arranging copyright for any already published images, figures, graphs and tables borrowed from third parties. Citing a source is not enough, in fact this is an Ethics in Publishing issue. Guidance on arranging copyright is provided in the GFA below.
Referencing style	State checked and adhered to RSER preferred style: Yes State that all	The preferred journal style is Vancouver (i.e. [1], [2] etc., see details on using in this GFA. All references must be numbered chronologically starting at 1 in square brackets in the paper and the list of references. All references mentioned in the Reference List are cited in the text, and vice versa.
Single column	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	Note an article submitted in two column format will be automatically rejected.
Logos/emblems etc.	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	A paper must NOT be submitted with Elsevier logos/layout as if already accepted for publication.
Embed graphs, tables and figures/other images in the main body of the article	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	Although you will be required to submit all images, images MUST appear embedded in the main body of the article where they are to appear in the final published article.
Figures/Graphs/other images	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	Any captions for graphs should be below the graph in the Manuscript. Note that all figures must be individually uploaded as separate files in the correct format, check format requirement in this GFA. Ensure all figure citations in the text match the files provided.
Tables	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	Any captions for tables should be above the graph in the Manuscript. Note that all figures must be individually uploaded as separate files in the correct format, check format requirement in this GFA. Ensure all table citations in the text match the files provided.
Line numbering	State checked and adhered to GFA: Yes	RSER journal uses automatic line numbering, so authors must submit their source files without line numbers.
Acknowledgements	State read guidance on Acknowledgements in GFA and included, yes or no.	The questions authors need to ask themselves, when preparing their acknowledgement are as follows: • Was this work funded by a government agency, industry or other philanthropic organisation? If yes, the corresponding author must check and include any grant/award/funding details. • Were any data sources, models, images used or provided by others, who did not contribute to the article? If yes, then it is to good practice to name and thank them individually. • Did any colleagues, friends or family proof read your work? If yes then it is also polite to mention them.
Ethics in Publishing	State checked carefully by all the authors named on the paper.	It is vital that all authors read our requirements for Ethics in Publishing. Once your name is on the article you all are responsible for any plagiarism issues. Note that a corresponding author must email the Editor in Chief to get approval for any changes in authorship before any Proof is finalised. A change in name of the corresponding author must also be done with the written consent of the author and the Editor in Chief nominated by the existing corresponding author.
Ethical Statement	Upload an Ethical Statement or alternatively state in the Cover Letter.	Read details in this GFA,

Declaration of interests

☒The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

☐The authors declare the following financial interests/personal relationships which may be considered as potential competing interests:

Credit Author Statement

Hewitt, J.: Conceptualization, Writing- Original draft preparation, Methodology, Formal analysis.

Holden, M.: Conceptualization, Methodology, Formal analysis, validation

Robinson, B.L.: Conceptualization, Writing- Original draft preparation

Jewitt, S.: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing - Reviewing & Editing

Clifford, M.J.: Conceptualization, Supervision, Writing - Reviewing & Editing, Funding acquisition