Current knowledge on the novel semiarid photovoltaic ecosystems and their impacts on biodiversity

Iranzo, Esperanza C.[a,*], Nicolau, José Manuel[a], Reiné, Ramón[a], Tormo, Jaume[a]

[a] Department of Agricultural and Environmental Sciences, Technological College, Zaragoza University. Carretera de Cuarte, s/n. 22071 Huesca, Spain.

* Corresponding author: E.C. Iranzo. E-mail: esperanza.iranzo@gmail.com

Highlights

- PVPs constitute novel ecosystems with altered microclimate, soil and biodiversity
- Research on impacts on wildlife is biased towards passerine birds and pollinators
- The complexity of natural processes is not considered in researchs of PVPs' impacts
- Long-term monitoring is needed to understand the novel ecosystems of the PVPs
- Integration of restoration tools and grazing into PVPs can improve dryland habitats

Abstract

The transition from fossil fuels to renewable energy sources is fundamental to mitigate the effects of global climate change. Renewable power capacity is increasing globally, and solar photovoltaic will be the dominant renewable energy source by 2050. Photovoltaic parks require great extensions of land, usually in drylands. But both ecosystems created by solar parks and the effect of solar parks on ecosystems are scarcely studied. This paper reviews the current knowledge on the impact of solar energy production on arid and semiarid ecosystems and describes the structure and functioning of these novel ecosystems, including changes in microclimatic conditions, soil quality, vegetation, and biodiversity and show how these factors hinder the full recovery of ecosystems in the solar parks. Finally, we address the limitations and challenges of restoring ecosystems within photovoltaic power plants and suggest the use of modern ecological restoration techniques and the incorporation of grazing with rational planning to improve the ecosystems in photovoltaic power plants in drylands. In any case, more research is needed to fully understand the long-term impacts of photovoltaic parks on the environment and the evolution of the novel ecosystems in the photovoltaic power plants.

Keywords

Biodiversity, Conservation, Ecosystem services, Environmental impacts, Land use change, Novel ecosystems, Photovoltaic landscape, Renewable energy, Solar park.

1. Introduction

In order to mitigate the effects of global climate change, transitioning from fossil fuels to renewable energy is fundamental. To achieve the target of limiting the global average temperature increase to 1.5°C by 2030, as proposed by the Paris Agreement within the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change [1], rapid, large-scale expansion of low- and zero-carbon renewable energy sources is already underway, promoted by local and national governments. In fact, the transition from carbon-intensive fossil fuels to renewable energy sources has been accelerated in the last decade on a global scale. Currently, renewable energy sources contribute ~1/4 of the world's growing electricity production, and the number of renewable energy facilities has tripled since 2003 [2,3]. Moreover, according to IEA projections, global renewable energy capacity will increase by almost 2 400 GW (almost 75%) between 2022 and 2027 [4]. Currently, solar photovoltaics generation accounts for almost 50% of the annual renewable power generation energy market [5] and is predicted to become the dominant renewable energy source by 2050 [2,4].

This growth in infrastructure construction and renewable energy production has been faster than legislation and scientific research can adapt, so there are legal and knowledge gaps that are being filled as regulation and research on the effects of renewable energy on biodiversity, landscape, and society advance. In this sense, it is important to highlight that many developing countries lack land-use planning policies, so the establishment of renewable energy plants is not regulated [6]. According to Rehbein et al. [7], 17.4 % of current (operational) large-scale renewable energy facilities (above 10MW generation capacity) are located in areas with some level of environmental protection, most of them in Western Europe. Moreover, a large proportion of under-development energy facilities will impact important conservation areas in Europe, India, Southeast Asia, and South America. Following the current trend, in 2028 the number of active renewable energy facilities within important conservation areas could increase by ~42%. These data show that current legislation is not sufficient to keep these projects apart from areas of high natural value [7,8,9]. According to the observed growth trend, conflicts between conservation and renewable energy development will likely intensify in the near future. In this sense, coordinated spatial planning of renewable energy expansion and biodiversity conservation by governments, and other decision-makers to avoid compromising their respective objectives, is essential [10]. The next challenge is to understand how the novel ecosystems created by the renewable energies work to avoid their impacts.

Solar energy production requires a large land area compared to fossil fuel plants. For example, it needs almost 4 times more land area than a coal plant to produce the same energy [9], which is detrimental to other productive activities and natural ecosystems. Therefore, solar energy production involves the conversion of large areas, which can have a large environmental impact at different scales. Due to the characteristics of the radiation necessary for the production and profitability of solar energy, the selection of sites for the installation of photovoltaic plants (PVPs hereinafter) is made according to technical and economic criteria (amount of insolation, topography, proximity to transmission corridors, and to population centres; [11]), while factors related to the potential impacts on biodiversity and habitat loss are not usually included to evaluate the location of the projects [9,12]. Arid and semi-arid ecosystems, with abundant space and sunshine, are the most adequate for the siting of PVPs. These ecosystems are especially sensitive to disturbance because of the particular plant and animal communities they host. Therefore, the construction of PVPs has a significant environmental impact [10,13,14].

The construction of PVPs gives rise to new ecosystems, the functioning of which is still poorly understood. Hobbs et al. [15] explain how novel ecosystems can result in hybrid systems retaining some original characteristics as well as novel elements, whereas larger changes will result in novel ecosystems, which comprise different species, interactions, and functions. The structure of PVPs ecosystems is conditioned by the rows of solar pannels, the new characteristics of the soils, the management of the vegetation to protect the solar panels, the fencing, and the connectivity with the surrounding ecosystems, among others [16]. Understanding how ecological processes function in this context is a challenge, but this understanding is key in order to manage the ecosystems to maximise the biodiversity and ecosystem services they provide. But both current knowledge on the effects and functioning of PVPs ecosystems is scarce and needs to be reviewed to reach conclusions. Hence, the aim of this literature review is to examine the state of knowledge about the effects of PVPs on the environment and biodiversity, especially in arid and semi-arid ecosystems. Section 2 addresses the main impacts associated with the different stages of construction of PVPs, from the manufacturing of the panels to the end of their useful life. Section 3 focuses on the general impacts of PVPs on the environment and ecosystems described in the literature. Section 4 describes the characteristics and functioning of the novel photovoltaic ecosystems. In particular, the changes on soil, flora and fauna are addressed. Sections 5 summarises and contextualises the results of the literature review; identifies limitations ad knowledge gaps in the study of PVP impacts, and proposes future steps for research in PVPs novel ecosystems; it also presents some proposals for PVP restoration in semi-arid ecosystems to minimise negative impacts. Finally, a critical comment on the review and the concluding remarks are presented in section 6.

2. Impacts associated with the different stages of solar energy production

The main research lines associated with the environmental impact of solar energy can be classified into three stages: manufacturing of photovoltaic modules, infrastructure construction and lifetime, and post-use or decommissioning phase. However, the number of research papers discussing the effects of the initial and final stages of PVPs is negligible compared to those studying the lifetime stage. This could lead to assume, erroneously, that the only impacts of solar energy on the environment occur during the operation of the PVPs, which can alter the overall picture of the benefits and negative effects of PVPs on the environment. Although the impacts of the solar panels manufacturing and PVPs dismantling on ecosystems remain poorly studied, in this section we describe the main impacts detected in each of the stages in order to summarize the current research.

2.1. Module manufacturing phase

Research in photovoltaic module production focuses on developing more powerful and efficient panels to increase performance [17]. The module's manufacturing has numerous impacts on the environment. During this process, large amounts of energy and a large volume of water are consumed [18]. In the manufacturing of photovoltaic panels, heavy metals and harmful and hazardous chemicals for humans and the environment are used [17,19]. Moreover, this is the stage that produces the largest carbon footprint [18,19]. Thus, the carbon footprint generated and the amount of water used at this stage is highly dependent on the materials and technology used and the country where the panels are produced [18].

2.2. PVP's construction and operation phase

From an environmental point of view, the operation phase (including the construction of the PVPs) is the most studied phase because of its direct effects on the landscape and biodiversity. These effects are discussed in more detail in sections 3 and 4. But in general, the main critical points are the choice of the construction site, the effects during construction, and the effects of the panels themselves during the lifetime of the PVP. Solar energy requires large areas of land for solar panels, which leads to habitat transformation and degradation. During the construction phase, changes in the physical structure of the soil occur due to the use of heavy machinery [20] causing potential increases in erosion [21], and the establishment of vegetation becomes harder because of soil compaction.

In addition to solar panels, the construction of complementary infrastructure (roads, power lines, buildings, etc.) has also impacts on biodiversity. These impacts include the destruction and fragmentation of habitats (outside of those strictly considered by the PVP), increased risk of being run over and collisions with power lines, increased human presence in remote areas (due to the availability of new roads), and increased risk of dispersal of invasive species, amongst others [22]. There are numerous studies on the effects of linear infrastructures on biodiversity, so we will not dwell on them here [23,24,25]. However, it is striking that these secondary and support structures of all photovoltaic installations are not taken into account in studies on the effects of PVPs on biodiversity [19,22].

During the operation phase of PVPs, solar panels change microclimatic conditions (temperature, humidity; and photosynthetically active radiation) which may result in changes in plant communities. Effects on vegetation growth and flowering, plant and animal species richness and abundance, among others, have also been detected (see subsections 4.3 and4.4).

2.3. Decommissioning phase

The dismantling phase of the PVPs is a major challenge for the solar industry and the environment. Photovoltaic panels contain a large number of heavy metals such as lead or cadmium and many other harmful chemicals [19,26], so their improper storage or incorrect disposal can have negative consequences for the environment, polluting soil and water. However, due to the relatively short time of existence of this energy production system, there is still little experience with the dismantling of PVPs and recycling of their components.

Currently, only Europe obliges solar panel manufacturers to collect and dump solar pannels waste. Outside Europe, a few countries have addressed the issue of photovoltaic waste regulation, but in most countries with PVP installations there are no waste management and recycling regulations. Therefore, panels are usually disposed of on regular sites, where the modules can degrade and leach harmful chemicals into the soil [26].

Panel recycling is a relatively new field of research and the current aim is to recover and recycle the most important parts for use in new panels or other uses, reduce production costs, and optimise the use of the metals they contain. There are three different solar module recycling processes: physical, chemical, and thermal [26]. Two types of PV recycling technology are currently commercially available, although new ones are being investigated, but still on a laboratory scale. Current systems for recycling modules have the disadvantage that they produce a lot of waste, gases, and other toxic substances, and consume large amounts of energy [19,26].

3. General effects of PVPs on arid and semiarid ecosystems

PVPs require large areas of land, which are transformed into vast extensions of solar panels and other infrastructure, modifying ecosystems and affecting their dynamics. The concern to conserve ecosystems and biodiversity in this new scenario of "photovoltaic landscapes" has encouraged technical and scientific studies to determine associated ecological impacts and the selection of optimal areas for the siting of PVPs in which a compromise between biodiversity conservation and electricity production is achieved [12,27]. In general, these works have shown that in order to conserve biodiversity, renewable energy projects should be developed on already disturbed or degraded lands or lands with low environmental value, with little reduction in energy production [12,27]. These degraded areas are often close to cities or towns, so a new element comes into play: social opinion towards the construction of large areas with solar panels [6,28,29]. Reducing visual impact and social rejection are some of the aspects taken into account in the selection of sites for PVPs, which causes them to be generally built-in remote and out-of-sight locations, even if this means affecting areas of higher natural value [12,27]. In any case, some kind of territorial planning is necessary to make PVPs and biodiversity compatible [16].

One of the main negative impacts of PVPs on natural ecosystems is the loss and fragmentation of habitats. The construction of PVPs can lead to the clearing of vegetation and conversion of natural habitats, resulting in habitat loss for many species. Migratory species and species that require large home ranges or have specific habitat preferences may be particularly affected [10]. There are many examples of threatened and protected species affected by the construction of PVPs. One of the most famous is the impact of PVPs in California's Mojave Desert on desert tortoise populations [14,30]. PVPs development poses a substantial risk to tortoise populations, due to habitat destruction and fragmentation. Desert tortoises dig burrows that provide habitat for many animals (rodents, lizards, burrowing owls). Therefore, the loss of tortoises will affect all species that depend on tortoise burrows for shelter and breeding. This case exemplifies how the affection of individual species can have a cascading effect on entire communities and ecosystems.

Habitat fragmentation can disrupt the ecological processes and increase the risk of local population decline. Especially for species with low mobility, it can lead to the isolation of populations forced to live on small habitat islands which has consequences for fitness and population viability and threatens gene flow. PVPs can also create barriers or disturbances that impede the movement and migration of wildlife [31] and seed dispersal. Moreover, PVPs can harm wildlife both directly (collisions, roadkill, etc.) and indirectly (loss of habitat, change in resource availability, increased stress from noise or human presence; [14]).

PVPs also cause soil compaction and erosion, as well as blockage or alteration of drainage channels, mainly during the construction phase. Depending on the technology used, siting areas may be completely cleared, which may affect plant colonisation and establishment and wildlife habitat. During utility operation vegetation is cut to control vegetative growth, affecting vegetation performance and the availability of habitat for wildlife [10,13,32]. Moreover, the creation of new shaded areas by the solar panels may change the plant communities of arid areas, favouring shade-tolerant plants and harming heliophytes [10,33].

Another major threat of PVPs to the environment, which is generally overlooked, is the cumulative effect of different projects (which are assessed individually in the environmental assessment studies), and their impact on ecosystems and landscape-scale dynamics of wildlife populations [10,12,34]. Kim et al. [9], demonstrated that the cumulative area loss of natural and semi-natural habitats by medium-scale PVPs was comparable to the loss of habitats incurred upon constructing large PVPs. However, in many countries, "small" and "medium" projects are subject to lighter assessment processes than large PVPs, leading companies to split large projects into many smaller energy-producing projects.

4. Characteristics and functioning of the novel semiarid photovoltaic ecosystems

4.1. Microclimatic characteristics

During the PVP operation phase, solar panels modify microclimatic conditions: air temperature and photosynthetically active radiation (PAR) are lower under PV panels than in control plots without panels, while air humidity shows the opposite pattern. This increase in air humidity is attributed to the shading effect produced by the panels (lower net radiation and air temperature; [35]). Fixed-mount solar panels create a shaded area where these microclimatic conditions are maintained throughout the day, while solar tracking panels create temporally varying shading conditions [36].

The solar panels also influence air circulation, wind speed and turbulence under the panels [37,38,39]. These alterations in air circulation are dependent on the structure of the installations (width of corridors, height of trackers, etc.) and the climate in which they are located.

In general, the microclimate is characterised by lower incident radiation, lower maximum temperature and lower daily thermal amplitude under the panels compared to plots adjacent to the panels [34,37]. The panels appear to soften the arid microclimate, dampening temperature extremes and relative air humidity immediately below them.

As indicated in the following sections, these particular microclimatic conditions have a significant influence on soil activity, vegetation and wildlife.

4.2. Soil

In general, soil physical properties under the panels varied little with respect to control plots outside the panels [38,40,41,42], but, in some cases, are worst compared with semi-natural habitats (pinewood and shrubland; [20]). Chemical properties under the panels are similar to those of abandoned vineyards, but showed significant differences with semi-natural habitats [20,40]. Moreover, soil pH variation in PVPs depends on habitat type [34,42]. According to Zhang et al. [34], in farmland ecosystems, soil pH increases under the panels, whereas in grassland ecosystems, soil pH measured under the panels is lower than in control plots.

Soil respiration measured through CO2 fluxes under solar panels has been little studied to date, and existing studies show that changes in CO2 efflux depend on habitat type [20,34]. A reduction in CO2 effluxes under solar panels, as reported by Lambert et al. [20] in a Mediterranean region, indicates lower litter decomposition and nutrient cycling, suggesting that these ecosystem functions may be affected under solar panels.

Changes in microclimatic conditions produced by solar panels induce changes in the composition of soil microorganisms. Thus, there is a reduction of microbiological activity and microbial biomass under the solar panels [20,40]. Bacterial and fungal communities show distinct responses to PVPs, and these responses seem to be affected by construction time, climate and other as yet unidentified factors, which is reflected in the fact that different studies have obtained opposing results. Li et al. [40] detected a significant change in the beta diversity of bacterial communities, but not in their alpha diversity, and an increase in the alpha diversity of the fungal community under the panels. In contrast, Liu et al. [41] in a study conducted on PVPs of different ages since their construction, detected reduced prokaryotic alpha diversity under the panels, but no effects on fungal diversity. Surprisingly, this lower diversity is correlated with soil moisture under the panels. These results suggest that some soil prokaryotic taxa that survived in dry and arid ecosystems may not adapt to the moist conditions created by the panels, while fungal communities show more resistance to environmental variations [41].

However, in other cases PVPs can produce a number of negative impacts on soil on which, to our knowledge, research is quite limited yet, although they are recognised as important factors in numerous papers and reports [20,21,34,40,42]. These include increased runoff and erosion, alteration of sediment transport, drainage channels and hydrological processes in and around PV installations [21,42], and contamination of soil and vegetation from chemicals contained in panel cleaning water.

During the construction phase of the PVPs facility, soil tillage, clearing and partial topsoil removal can lead to increased erosion and reduced soil aggregate stability, resulting in a degradation of soil physical quality compared to semi-natural and natural habitats (pinewood and scrubland; [20]). On the other hand, there is no consensus on the effects that the construction of PVPs has on soil carbon content, soil chemical properties, soil temperature or soil water content [20,34,40].

Finally, two conclusions made by numerous authors are: i) the time elapsed since the construction of PVPs is too short for changes in microclimatic conditions to influence soil physical and chemical properties. And, ii) long-term monitoring including different seasons is required to evaluate the response of soil properties and microorganisms to PVPs [20,38,40]. Furthermore, land use prior to the installation of the PVPs will determine the evolution of soil properties. In the case of PVPs located in former agricultural land, their effects on the soil will be conditioned by the management of the crops. If soil conservation practices were carried out, soil conditions are likely to worsen, while if intensive agriculture was applied, they may improve in the PVP.

4.3. Vegetation

The knowledge of the effects of PVPs on vegetation growth and physiological parameters is mainly thanks to studies that have been carried out with crops grown under panels in agrivoltaic systems. Some of these results can be extrapolated to natural vegetation but there is still a lot of research work to be done. The main effects of PVPs on vegetation are related to the generation of shade and the alteration of the microclimate under the panels. The presence of solar panels reduces direct solar radiation on the ground and vegetation. These factors have an impact on plant physiology and phenology, as evapotranspiration is reduced, growth is slowed and flowering and fruit ripening are delayed [11,32,43]. However, the production is similar or higher in agrivoltaic systems than in traditional farming systems [44]. On the other hand, plants growing under panels are characterised by larger and thinner leaves adapted to shaded conditions [43] (Elamri et al. 2018). Moreover, the panels also reduce the risk of frost and damage by heavy rain and hail events, by acting as a protective roof [45].

Vegetation development in these new ecosystems is conditioned by some characteristics of the solar facilities, such as the type of panels (fixed vs. tilting), the distance between panels (corridors width) and their height, as they determine the solar radiation incident on vegetation. A study carried out recently, highlights that a change in the orientation of the panels from the current N-S to SE or SW, would increase the light distribution at the ground level, which may produce notable improvements in the growth of crops, which receive more sun, without affecting energy production [46]. The alterations of the panels in air circulation are also dependent on the structure of the installations (width of corridors, height of trackers, etc.) and the climate in which they are located, so the effects this may have on vegetation are highly context dependent.

With regard to plant communities, numerous studies have found that richness and diversity are greater under the panels than in the control areas outside the PVPs. These studies use agricultural crop fields as the control situation, which represents preconstruction land cover but usually host low diversity. In contrast to previous results, studies comparing plant diversity and biomass under the panels (shading), in the corridors between panels (non-shading), and in natural vegetation controls outside the PVP (non-shading), reported less plant diversity (and dominated by grasses) and less above-ground biomass under the solar panels compared with control and corridor areas [37,40].

The effects of PV panels on plant diversity and biomass are diverse, highly dependent on the ecosystem, and can even be in opposite directions [13,34,37,47]. PVPs enhanced vegetation cover and aboveground biomass under the solar panels in grassland, farmland and desert due to the protection against high light intensities, while vegetation cover under panels decreases in woodlands. Furthermore, PVPs also cause changes in plant community structure, which may not necessarily be reflected in plant diversity shifts [13,33,47]. The vegetation community present in PVPs is mainly composed of ruderal, colonising and annual grasses species, the same species that appear in the early stages of field abandonment [13,33]. This is due, on the one hand, to the large-scale land preparation prior PVPs construction, during which the vegetation is generally removed and the soil undergoes a process of erosion and compaction. On the other hand, it is due to the natural colonisation process after the abandonment of crop fields. As a consequence, plant communities in PVPs are generally primary stages of succession that are re-established and developed during the operation of the PVPs. And that are kept in this state because of the operation activities, p.e. mowing to avoid tall vegetation.

When studying the plant community under the solar panels and in the corridors between them in a semi-arid ecosystem, higher richness and species diversity is usually recorded under the panels [33,47]. However, these higher indexes do not mean a higher quality or recovery of vegetation under the panels compared to the plant community outside the panels, since, in this type of ecosystem, mature communities are composed of few species [33]. This work shows that, in semi-arid areas, measures such as richness, abundance or diversity are not suitable for studying the effects of PVP on plant communities [33,47]. High values of these indices may indicate modifications in the structure and composition of vegetation, as the panels favour the presence of shade-tolerant or shade-loving species that are not typical of these environments, which does not mean an "improvement in biodiversity" at all. In these cases, where communities are usually composed of few stress tolerant species, it is important to identify the species that are part of the mature stage of the community and to use areas of natural or semi-natural vegetation as controls to avoid erroneous conclusions.

4.4 Wildlife

PVPs have both positive and negative effects on wildlife. Some of these effects affect virtually all animal groups while others are specific to some groups. The most general effects reported in the literature, which are applicable to all groups, are described below.

As previously explained, PVPs often require a large area of land, which can lead to the loss of habitats for wildlife [9]. Fencing PVPs modifies natural habitats, creating patched areas and increasing habitat fragmentation. This is of particular relevance for migratory species, as it can affect migration routes as well as resting, breeding or wintering sites. PVPs can also create barriers or disturbances that impede the access to forage and water resources, mates, or breeding sites [31]. At the PVP scale, soil erosion, loss of vegetation cover and vegetation maintenance actions during utility operation also impact the habitat for wildlife and can increase the risk of local population decline [10,48].

Structures and facilities associated with PVPs (including power lines and roads) increase the risk of wildlife collision and direct mortality [14,49]. In addition, PVPs increase noise, vibrations, lighting, and human activity during the construction and operation phase, which can negatively impact wildlife and lead to behavioural changes in local populations [49]. Nocturnal species and species that use polarised light for orientation and navigation may be especially affected by artificial light, potentially altering their activity patterns and behaviour [14]. Furthermore, the electromagnetic fields generated by solar panels may also disrupt animal behaviours [14].

Positive effects of PVPs have also been described for wildlife, such as sites that provide shaded areas in semi-arid climates. Theoretically, PVPs may also act as refuges from predators or hunting grounds for carnivores and raptors. But by providing positive effects for some species it will actually harm other species which will produce disequilibrium at the ecosystem level. However, although these are expected effects of PVPs to our knowledge there have been no studies to evaluate them, and the presence of mammals and raptors within PVPs is generally reported anecdotally [50,51].

Regarding the study of wildlife on PVPs, there is a significant bias in the literature towards two animal groups: passerine birds and pollinators (mainly honeybees and bumblebees). While other groups are under-represented. In the framework of the latest policies and recommendations to cope with global change, the importance of pollinators for achieving the United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) is highlighted [52]. Experts agree that PVPs offer considerable potential to mitigate the causes of the decline in pollinator populations but there is currently limited scientific understanding, especially in light of the cumulative effects of projected PVPs [2]. Within this international framework, PVPs are recently including management interventions to enhance pollinator biodiversity, such as providing foraging and reproductive resources for pollinators [32,53,54] (see section 5).

Currently, studies on pollinators focus mainly on honeybees, bumblebees and butterflies, comparing abundance inside and outside PVPs [50,51,53,55]. These studies detect higher butterflies and bumblebees abundance inside PVPs, where plant species have been sowed, compared to control plots located at agricultural fields, so it is considered that PVPs favour the presence of pollinators, which are also beneficial for the surrounding crops. These studies show the benefits of actions taken within PVPs to favour pollinators in agricultural environments, where intensification and the use of agrochemicals have drastically reduced the populations of pollinators and other arthropods. In this sense, PVPs can act as a refuge, feeding and breeding site for these species. In contrast, Grodsky et al. [48] detected lower richness and abundance of non-bee insect pollinators (including beetles and flies) inside solar installations in the Mojave Desert than outside them. Although the study was conducted at a Concentrated Solar Power Plant facility, a similar displacement of non-bee insect flower visitors is likely to occur at PVPs in desert and semi-arid habitats where pollinator-friendly measures are not implemented.

Among the most important factors for the presence of pollinators are floral diversity, the presence of late flowering plants, creation of hedgerows, sown vegetation and allowing naturally established vegetation. On the other hand, the management techniques used in PVPs that are most harmful to pollinators are spring cutting (because it reduces flower load), mowing, and agrochemical application [53]. To benefit pollinators, good quality hedgerows are important structures that provide foraging resources and shelter, and support breeding pollinators. Good quality hedgerows are those that are continuous and unbroken hedgerows containing at least three woody plant species that provide forage to pollinators throughout the season [56].

The type of PVP (fixed-mount vs. solar tracking panel) also appears as an important factor influencing the assemblage of pollinators and other arthropods in PVPs. Thus, Graham et al. [32] found that pollinators respond even to the microclimate created by solar tracking panels with respect to insolation (full-shade vs. partial-shade). Specifically, the abundance, richness and diversity of pollinators in partial-shade plots and full-sun plots were similar, and in both cases higher than those detected in full-shade plots. In another study conducted in the Atacama Desert (Chile), Suuronen et al. [36] neither detected differences in arthropod richness and diversity under solar tracking panels and control plots outside the panels but did detect differences with respect to fixed-mount PVPs, whereas, in addition, the taxonomic composition was different under the panels. Interestingly, these authors conclude that the differences found may be due to microhabitat selection regardless of the microclimatic conditions.

However, positive effects of PVPs on pollinators, should not mask other poorly studied impacts, such as the change in arthropod community structure and composition detected by Suuronen et al. [36] whose long-term consequences for the ecosystem are unknown; the lack of comparative studies with natural habitats, where diversity and abundance may be higher than in agricultural lands; the lack of studies at the ecosystem and food web level, of which pollinators are a link; or the possible bottom-up and top-down effects of PVPs on ecosystems [10]. In this sense, vegetation change and/or the loss of some plant species in PVPs can affect specialist insect species through loss or shortage of food resources or shelter (see [57]), with repercussions for the rest of the food web. Moreover, the loss of some insect species may have negative consequences for plants that depend on insect pollination, such as cacti [48] and ecosystem services. Photovoltaic panels reflect polarized light which attracts aquatic insects that mistake them for water bodies where they lay their eggs, making the PVPs an ecological trap [14]. Some authors have suggested that PVPs generate electromagnetic fields that may affect insect foraging behaviour, communication and migration [48]. Moreover, noise pollution has negative consequences for both acoustic and non-acoustic oriented insects, although specific studies in PVPs on the latter two topics are practically non-existent to date [48,49].

Passerine birds are the group that has attracted the most attention with regard to their use of PVPs, although the number of studies is quite limited. Regarding the effect of PVPs on passerines, the results of the studies are not consistent, suggesting that the effects of PVPs on birds depend, on the one hand, on the foraging behaviour and spatial requirements of each species [58]. And on the other hand, in the control situation selected. Montag et al. [50] detected a higher diversity of birds within PVPs than in the surrounding farmland. The authors suggest that this is likely to reflect a shift from a homogeneous to a more heterogeneous habitat with more foraging opportunities. However, when comparing bird species richness and density between a PVP and semi-natural habitat, Visser et al. [59] found that both richness and density were lower than in the boundary and adjacent untransformed landscape. Accordingly, DeVault et al. [60](2014) reported that PVPs could potentially alter bird community structure. In this study, they detected lower bird species richness within PVPs than in adjacent grasslands. Although the density of birds within PVPs was higher than in adjacent grasslands.

PVPs provide food, shade and perch that are selectively used by some small generalist and open country/grassland species [59,60]. However, ground-nesting birds seem to avoid nesting at PVPs [50], so the concentration of PV facilities may pose a serious threat to the survival of steppe passerines. The effects of PVPs on other non-passerine bird groups have not been extensively studied [61], but existing studies suggest that corvids and raptors avoid PVPs [59,61].

Non-passerine steppe birds are at risk across Europe because of agricultural intensification and habitat and nest destruction. This group is one of the most affected by PVPs as they need an unbroken line of sight to breed [62,63,64]. These species are particularly sensitive to landscape-scale changes and the accumulation of PVPs in the distribution range of these species represents a significant loss of habitat and a major threat to their survival [62,64]. The effects on this group of birds should be incorporated as one of the critical factors when determining the site for the construction of PVPs. However, as mentioned above, other criteria for site selection are prioritised and compensatory measures are often proposed to mitigate the negative effects on this group, although the effectiveness of such actions on the survival of these species has not been demonstrated.

Other negative impacts on birds that have been described, although with little supporting evidence, include death from collision with panels and associated power lines [49,59,65]; incineration of birds as they pass through the solar "flux" at Concentrated Solar Power Plants [61]; and attraction by the reflective surface of solar panels ("lake effect"): birds (mainly waterfowl and shorebirds) may mistake the reflective surfaces of PV panels for water bodies and attempt to land on them, resulting in injury or even death due to impact or because once on land they are unable to take off [49].

The number of scientific publications on the effects of PVPs on mammals is limited compared to research on birds or pollinators. Except for a few studies on species of conservation concern [31,57,66,67], the use of PVPs by mammals in arid or semi-arid areas is limited to anecdotal reports without a scientific approach [50,51]. These reports cite the presence of mammals (rabbits, foxes, roe deer, badgers) within game-fenced PVPs, but apart from these occasional observations, nothing is known about whether PVPs have an attracting or repelling effect on mammals nor about the impact on their behaviour and populations. The exception to the lack of studies on mammals is bats, for which some studies have been conducted on their abundance and richness inside PVPs [68,69,70]. These studies point to a lower presence and/or activity of bats inside PVPs than outside them, suggesting an avoidance effect [50,70]. This can be explained by the fact that bats are not able to identify solar panels (and other anthropogenic materials and structures) correctly, mistaking them for water bodies, and as a consequence of habitat loss and fragmentation.

On the other hand, studies on conservation concern species report different effects of PVPs on wildlife. Cypher et al. [67] describe the success of conservation measures carried out in several PVPs to encourage the use of the facilities by the San Joaquin kit fox. In contrast, Grodsky et al. [57] and Sawyer et al. [31] describe the barrier effect of PVPs on wild ungulate populations. The construction of PVPs within their home-range represents a significant loss of habitat, disrupts their migration corridors, reduces connectivity between habitats and alters the behaviour of wild ungulates. Finally, it is worth noting the absence of studies on the effects of PVPs on other animal groups such as micromammals or reptiles [71], with the exception of the desert tortoise, whose case has been described in section 3.

5. Discussion

Photovoltaic power generation systems are undergoing a rapid evolution towards more efficient and cost-effective technologies. In just a few years, PVPs have evolved from using modules mounted on fixed bases to systems mounted on structures that follow the movement of the sun (trackers) or bifacial modules that make it possible to take advantage of the radiation reflected by the ground. However, despite improvements in performance, solar energy still requires large areas of land, which creates a potential conflict between environment protection, food production and electricity generation in the use of land. Besides, many questions remain unsolved about the direct and indirect effects of the land use change, the panels and the associated infrastructure on biodiversity and the functioning of these novel ecosystems.

After the literature review, some points and limitations detected are worth mentioning. Research about characteristics of vegetation in PVPs usually refers to a short period, both after PVP construction and the duration of data collection, and there is a lack long time series to detect the effects and analyse the evolution of the communities. Moreover, there is a lack of physiological and phenological studies on wild vegetation species; and there is also a significant lack of studies on community scale, seed dispersal and colonisation processes. On the other hand, the use of biodiversity indices without considering functional characteristics and without taking into account the structure and composition of local plant communities in their mature stages can lead to erroneous interpretations of the results. Regarding literature about fauna and PVPs, most studies focus on avifauna and pollinators, while other animal groups are hardly studied at all. Besides, literature to date refers mainly to very basic aspects (richness and abundance), without considering impacts on behaviour, fitness or population dynamics, among others. Therefore, more research on wildlife and PVPs interactions is needed to fully understand the impacts and how to mitigate any negative effects. In addition, the literature usually addresses the effects of PVPs with a focus on isolated processes or species, but ecosystems are made up of many species and their interactions with the biotic and abiotic environment. Therefore, it is foreseeable that PVPs will not have an effect on a single species, but rather that they may affect the ecological network. PVPs can affect the interactions among soil, plants, and animals, triggering bottom-up and/or top-down processes. Understanding the effects of PVPs on interactions between species and processes is essential to determine their impact on ecosystem functioning [57]. In addition, there is no scientific monitoring of the evolution of ecosystems after the settlement of the PV facilities [30]. Monitoring studies focus on the PVP/facility level, but there is a lack of research at the landscape and ecosystem levels. Besides, cumulative environmental impacts of existing and proposed renewable energy projects should be taken into account both, prior to construction and during operation, to ensure biodiversity conservation, especially in light of the increased pressure that climate change will exert on arid ecosystems [10]. It should also be noted that some processes respond faster than others. Thus, changes in floristic or animal composition can be detected shortly after PVPs are constructed, while other processes such as changes in soil physicochemical properties, edaphofauna responses, infiltration or runoff have slower response times and require long-term monitoring. But, as this review has shown, scientific research to date is limited to very basic (but much needed) questions about the effects of PVPs on biodiversity. However, more complex studies are needed that include different levels of ecosystems and at large spatial and temporal scales, studies of vegetation physiology and phenology, population dynamics or fauna behaviour, in order to have a clearer picture of how biodiversity and ecological processes change in these novel photovoltaic landscapes.

To address the conflict between environment protection and electricity generation, dual use of the land for solar PV has been commonly tested in recent years. Thus agrivoltaic systems, which integrate crop production and PV power generation, appeared in the first instance. Agrivoltaics offer a potential solution to the production of electricity and rising food demand potentially solving the land occupation problem. Although agrivoltaics are mainly focused on crop production or livestock raising, some agrivoltaics have also started to incorporate measures to favour the presence of pollinators [53,72,73,74,75]. Sowing and naturalization of PVPs with flowering plants are also actions undertaken to support pollinator insects and beekeeping in line with one of the priority sustainable development goals set by the United Nations. In recent years, many PVPs are making a special effort to increase the supply of flowering plants to favour pollinators, especially bees, through beekeeping associated with PVPs [53,73,74,75].

In recent years, multifunctional 'solar landscapes' schemes are being designed, managed to deliver a wide range of ecosystem services. These systems seek to integrate different functions, services and dimensions such as biodiversity, provisioning and regulating functions, visibility or cultural services [54,76,77]. This new approach in designing and assessing PVP aims to convert "grey" infrastructures into Green Infrastructures in accordance, e.g. with the EU Biodiversity Strategy for 2030. Green Infrastructures are promoted by the European Union policy for both rural and urban areas. Under this Green Infrastructure framework, if solar plants are properly planned, localised, developed and managed over time, they can provide environmental, economic, educational, recreational and social benefits at multiple scales [16,74,77,78].

Currently, some of the existing PVPs consider the implementation of restoration measures after construction to reduce environmental degradation and contribute to the recovery of ecosystem services [74,78]. In arid and semi-arid areas low and variable rainfall, as well as other stressors such as low soil nutrient availability, make ecosystems highly susceptible to land degradation and difficult to restore after such degradation [79]. The construction of PVPs implies a remarkable habitat change with respect to the previous situation and the pre-existing ecosystem. But arid and semi-arid ecosystems are resilient and, if the factors hindering spontaneous regeneration are eliminated, ecosystems will usually recover by themselves. Based on our review, in PVPs the such limiting factors are:

- Changes at landscape level that hinder the use of habitat by fauna (habitat loss) and the movements across the landscape (habitat fragmentation)

- Altered soil properties which hinder plant establishment

- Altered microclimate because of the shadow created by the panels

- Ruderalization of communities. Which produces losses on valuable species

But such limiting factors are very similar to the limiting factors to restore agricultural lands. That means that by combining (1) the framework of agricultural land restoration [80], (2) new restoration techniques e.g. species selection [81](del Campo et al. 2010), improved plant production techniques [82], innovative implantation techniques [83,84] or use of biological interactions to improve restoration outcomes [85] and (3) the increased knowledge of ecology of drylands [86,87], there are a set of tools fit for purpose to restore PVPs in drylands.

The international principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration [88], propose a range of activities and interventions to improve environment and reverse degradation that range from reducing societal impacts to fully recovery of the ecosystems. If the land is not much degraded and the future uses allow it the restoration practitioners goal will be to restore a pristine ecosystem but if the land is very degraded or the future use does not allow full ecosystems restoration the goal of the restoration practitioner will be to recover the land as much as possible to provide ecosystem services. In the case of PVPs, there are a series of limitations that hinder the full recovery of the land, which are:

- Some habitat restoration will not be compatible with the PVPs. Vegetation in the PVPs close to the panels needs to be short and will be mowed regularly, hence some areas will be kept as grasslands or at early successional stages and will never reach the state of a fully recovered ecosystem.

- Some species will not be able to survive inside PVPs regardless of restoration. Because (1) their habitat cannot be reconstructed in a PVP or (2) because PVPs profoundly change the appearance of the landscape and it is not perceived as suitable by some species any more. e.g. landscape is not open anymore and then the landscape is not perceived as suitable habitat by steppe birds.

- Restoration practitioners need to consider that they are dealing with a novel ecosystem (*sensu* Hobbs et al. [89]) and attempts to return systems to within their historical range of biotic and abiotic characteristics and processes may not be possible [90].

- Finally, current knowledge on ecological restoration in solar parks is scarce, in fact, to our knowledge, few articles have been published on the subject (but see [33 or 91]).

Integration of grazing with rational planning into PVPs as a restoration-management tool is a challenge that has not been studied enough [11,77], and it can offer several opportunities:

- Controlling vegetation growth, substituting regular maintenance operations, minimizing or even eliminating the use of herbicides, lawnmowers and weed-eaters, which have negative impacts on the environment and can also damage PVP systems [92]. This also reduces greenhouse gas emissions [93] and contributes to fertilising the soil.

- Livestock grazing is also compatible with pollinator projects such as the creation of habitats for wild pollinators or placement of beehives [94].

- Solar grazing enterprises could increase and diversify the income of sheep farmers and thus benefit the livelihoods and financial viability of rural communities [93].

As ecological restoration, pasture restoration by grazing in PVP has several nuances due to PVPs functioning and climatic conditions [94] and will depend on the design of a good grazing plan that considers the following ideas:

- Choose the grazing animal according to the risk of damage to solar panels by animals and vice versa [11].
- If possible design the panels to fit the grazing, e.g. elevated panels which allow free movement of animals provide improved animal welfare and more desirable microenvironments (Shade) for plant diversity and biomass production [96,97].
- Stocking rates must be calculated to establish a rotational grazing system [94].
- Pastoralists' knowledge is indispensable [98] and needs to be taken into account when designing the grazing plans.
- Move livestock throughout the landscape from species-rich natural pastures to PVPs helps the dispersal of palatable species [99].
- Consider sowing some forage species in the early stages of restoration to encourage sward establishment.
- An intense monitoring program is necessary to ensure that livestock rotations are done properly, that there are no problems between grazing and the actions necessary for normal operation of the PVPs, e.g. maintenance tasks, and that livestock do not damage the infrastructure or harm themselves.

Finally, whichever restoration method is used, Before-After-Control-Impact (BACI) designs are recommended when studying the impacts of renewable energy on the environment [100] which will improve the understanding of the impacts. And, evaluate restoration actions, e.g. by means of the Five-Star System and Ecological Recovery Wheel [88]. In both cases, do urge a critical examination of the selection of reference or control systems, as they have great repercussions on the results obtained. It is also important to consider the species composition of local communities in their mature stages so as not to misinterpret the results in the use of biodiversity indices.

In conclusion, while solar energy production has positive long-term effects on the environment by reducing Greenhouse gas emissions, it also has many negative impacts on ecosystems, ranging from microclimatic and soil alterations, changes in vegetation and arthropods communities to habitat loss and fragmentation. Consequently, it is important to recognise and assess the benefits and risks to find reasonable solutions that enable renewable energy development and conservation of the environment and biodiversity. Proper site selection, habitat restoration efforts, best management practices, and the incorporation of wildlife corridors or exclusion zones can help minimise negative impacts and promote coexistence between renewable energy development and ecosystem conservation. To make the energy transition to renewable energies such as photovoltaic energy compatible with biodiversity conservation, it is necessary to act at different levels. As large PVPs - located in rural/natural environments - are necessary to supply energy for mobility and industry, their ecological restoration is a fundamental action. Finally, it is essential to carry out more research to understand the effects of renewable energies on the environment in order to be able to act on them.

6. Concluding remarks

After the bibliographic review, some aspects stand out.

1. *Novelty*. The recent emergence and expansion of PVPs (and other renewable energies) which means that there are large gaps in knowledge about their effects on ecosystems.
2. *PVPs affects natural areas of high ecological value.* First of all, the literature shows that many valuable natural areas are affected by the construction of PVPs, which indicates a limited consideration of biodiversity during the process of site selection for PVPs.
3. *PVPs create novel ecosystems.* PVP construction produces changes in microclimatic and soil conditions that affect the pre-existing biodiversity, altering the functioning and composition of the previous plant and animal communities, and creating a novel ecosystem that needs to be studied in detail.
4. *Do not take into account the complexity of systems and interactions.* The literature usually addresses the effects of PVPs with a focus on isolated processes or species, but PVPs may affect the ecological network. Understanding the effects of PVPs on interactions between species and processes is essential to determine their impact on ecosystem functioning.
5. *There is a lack of long-term monitoring and complex research about these novel ecosystems.* There is no scientific monitoring of the evolution of ecosystems after the settlement of the PV facilities, and there is also a lack of research and monitoring at the landscape and ecosystem levels or cumulative environmental impacts of existing and proposed renewable energy projects. Moreover, scientific research to date is limited to very basic (but much needed) questions about the effects of PVPs on biodiversity and more complex studies at large spatial and temporal scales are needed.
6. *Grazing can be used as a useful restoration tool in PVPs*. Although ecological restoration in semi-arid environments is a challenge, incorporating a well-designed grazing plan can contribute to restore plant communities and improve the quality of the habitat.

References

[1] United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change. Annual Report. https://unfccc.int/; 2019 [accessed: 15 May 2023]

[2] IRENA. Future of Solar Photovoltaic: deployment, investment, technology, grid integration and socio-economic aspects (A Global Energy Transformation paper). Abu Dhabi: International Renewable Energy Agency; https://www.irena.org/-/media/Files/IRENA/Agency/Publication/2019/Nov/IRENA_Future_of_Solar_PV_2019.pdf; 2019 [accessed: 20 May 2023]

[3] Obama B. The irreversible momentum of clean energy. Science. 2017;355(6321):126-9.

[4] International Energy Agency Renewables 2022, IEA, Paris https://www.iea.org/reports/renewables-2022, License: CC BY 4.0; 2022 [accessed: 22 May 2023]

[5] Renewables Global Status Report REN21. 2020. Secretariat, France, Paris

[6] Dhar A, Naeth MA, Jennings PD, El-Din MG. Perspectives on environmental impacts and a land reclamation strategy for solar and wind energy systems. Sci Total Environ 2020;718:134602.

[7] Rehbein JA, Watson JE, Lane JL, Sonter LJ, Venter O, Atkinson SC, et al. Renewable energy development threatens many globally important biodiversity areas. Glob Chang Biol 2020;26(5):3040-51.

[8] de Andrés-Ruiz C, Iranzo-García E, Espejo-Marín C. Solar Thermoelectric Power Landscapes in Spain: A New Kind of Renewable Energy Landscape?. In: Frolova M, Prados MJ, Nadaï A, editors. Renewable energies and European landscapes. Springer, Netherlands; 2015, p. 237–254.

[9] Kim JY, Koide D, Ishihama F, Kadoya T, Nishihiro J. Current site planning of medium to large solar power systems accelerates the loss of the remaining semi-natural and agricultural habitats. Sci Total Environ 2021;779:146475.

[10] Moore-O'Leary KA, Hernandez RR, Johnston DS, Abella SR, Tanner KE, Swanson AC, et al. Sustainability of utility-scale solar energy–critical ecological concepts. Front Ecol Environ 2017;15(7):385-94. https://doi.org/10.1002/fee.1517

[11] Al Mamun MA, Dargusch P, Wadley D, Zulkarnain NA, Aziz AA. A review of research on agrivoltaic systems. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2022;161:112351.

[12] Cameron DR, Cohen BS, Morrison SA. An approach to enhance the conservation-compatibility of solar energy development. PloS One 2012;7(6), e38437

[13] Grodsky SM, Hernandez RR. Reduced ecosystem services of desert plants from ground-mounted solar energy development. Nat Sustain 2020;3(12):1036-43.

[14] Lovich JE, Ennen JR. Wildlife conservation and solar energy development in the desert southwest, United States. BioScience 201;61(12):982-92.

[15] Hobbs RJ, Higgs E, Harris JA. Novel ecosystems: implications for conservation and restoration. Trends Ecol Evol 2009;24(11):599-605.

[16] Tölgyesi C, Bátori Z, Pascarella J, Erdős L, Török P, Batáry P, et al. Ecovoltaics: Framework and future research directions to reconcile land-based solar power development with ecosystem conservation. Biol Conserv 2023;285:110242.

[17] Obaideen K, AlMallahi MN, Alami AH, Ramadan M, Abdelkareem MA, Shehata N, et al. On the contribution of solar energy to sustainable developments goals: Case study on Mohammed bin Rashid Al Maktoum Solar Park. Int J Thermofluids 2021;12:100123.

[18] Tawalbeh M, Al-Othman A, Kafiah F, Abdelsalam E, Almomani F, Alkasrawi M. Environmental impacts of solar photovoltaic systems: A critical review of recent progress and

future outlook. Sci Total Environ 2021;759:143528. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2020.143528

[19] Rahman A, Farrok O, Haque MM. Environmental impact of renewable energy source based electrical power plants: Solar, wind, hydroelectric, biomass, geothermal, tidal, ocean, and osmotic. Renew Sust Energ Rev 2022;161:112279.

[20] Lambert Q, Bischoff A, Cueff S, Cluchier A, Gros R. Effects of solar park construction and solar panels on soil quality, microclimate, CO2 effluxes, and vegetation under a Mediterranean climate. Land Degrad Dev. 2021;32(18):5190-202.https://doi.org/10.1002/LDR.4101

[21] Yavari R, Zaliwciw D, Cibin R, McPhillips L. Minimizing environmental impacts of solar farms: a review of current science on landscape hydrology and guidance on stormwater management. Environ Res: infrastruct. sustain 2022;2(3):032002. https://doi.org/10.1088/2634-4505/AC76DD

[22] Hernandez RR, Easter SB, Murphy-Mariscal ML, Maestre FT, Tavassoli M, Allen EB, et al. Environmental impacts of utility-scale solar energy. Renew Sust Energ Rev 2014;29:766-79.

[23] Benítez-López A, Alkemade R, Verweij PA. The impacts of roads and other infrastructure on mammal and bird populations: a meta-analysis. Biol Conserv 2010;143(6):1307-16.

[24] Biasotto LD, Kindel A. Power lines and impacts on biodiversity: A systematic review. Environ Impact Assess Rev 2018;71:110-9.

[25] Dorsey B, Olsson M, Rew LJ. Ecological effects of railways on wildlife. In: Van Der Ree R, Smith DJ, Grilo C, editors. Handbook of road ecology. Hoboken: Wiley, 2015, p.219-27 https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118568 170.ch26

[26] Chowdhury MS, Rahman KS, Chowdhury T, Nuthammachot N, Techato K, Akhtaruzzaman M, et al. An overview of solar photovoltaic panels' end-of-life material recycling. Energy Strat Rev. 2020;27:100431.

[27] Phillips SE, Cypher BL. Solar energy development and endangered species in the San Joaquin Valley, California: Identification of conflict zones. Western Wildlife. 2019;6:29-44.

[28] Irie N, Kawahara N, Esteves AM. Sector-wide social impact scoping of agrivoltaic systems: A case study in Japan. Renew Energy 2019;139:1463-76. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RENENE.2019.02.048

[29] Torma G, Aschemann-Witzel J. Social acceptance of dual land use approaches: Stakeholders' perceptions of the drivers and barriers confronting agrivoltaics diffusion. J Rural Stud 2023;97:610-25. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JRURSTUD.2023.01.014

[30] Agha M, Lovich JE, Ennen JR, Todd BD. Wind, sun, and wildlife: do wind and solar energy development 'short-circuit'conservation in the western United States?. Environ Res Lett 2020;15(7):075004.

[31] Sawyer H, Korfanta NM, Kauffman MJ, Robb BS, Telander AC, Mattson T. Trade-offs between utility-scale solar development and ungulates on western rangelands. Front Ecol Environ 2022;20(6):345-51.

[32] Graham M, Ates S, Melathopoulos AP, Moldenke AR, DeBano SJ, Best LR, et al. Partial shading by solar panels delays bloom, increases floral abundance during the late-season for pollinators in a dryland, agrivoltaic ecosystem. Sci Rep 2021;11(1):7452. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-021-86756-4

[33] Lambert Q, Gros R, Bischoff A. Ecological restoration of solar park plant communities and the effect of solar panels. Ecol Eng 2022;182:106722. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOLENG.2022.106722

[34] Zhang Y, Tian Z, Liu B, Chen S, Wu J. Effects of photovoltaic power station construction on terrestrial ecosystems: A meta-analysis. Front Ecol Evol 2023;11:1151182.

[35] Chang R, Shen Y, Luo Y, Wang B, Yang Z, Guo P. Observed surface radiation and temperature impacts from the large-scale deployment of photovoltaics in the barren area of Gonghe, China. Renew Energy 2018;118:131-7. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.renene.2017.11.007

[36] Suuronen A, Muñoz-Escobar C, Lensu A, Kuitunen M, Guajardo Celis N, Espinoza Astudillo P, et al. The influence of solar power plants on microclimatic conditions and the biotic community in Chilean desert environments. Environ Manage 2017;60:630-42. https://doi.org/10.1007/S00267-017-0906-4

[37] Armstrong A, Ostle NJ, Whitaker J. Solar park microclimate and vegetation management effects on grassland carbon cycling. Environ Res Lett 2016;11(7):074016. https://doi.org/10.1088/1748-9326/11/7/074016

[38] Noor NF, Reeza AA. Effects of solar photovoltaic installation on microclimate and soil properties in UiTM 50MWac Solar Park, Malaysia. InIOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science 2022 (Vol. 1059, No. 1, p. 012031). IOP Publishing.

[39] Yin DY, Ma L, Qu JJ, Zhao SP, Yu Y, Tan LH, et al. Effect of large photovoltaic power station on microclimate of desert region in Gonghe Basin. Bull. Soil Water Conserv 2017;37(3). https://doi.org/10.13961/j.cnki.stbctb.2017.03.003

[40] Li C, Liu J, Bao J, Wu T, Chai B. Effect of Light Heterogeneity Caused by Photovoltaic Panels on the Plant–Soil–Microbial System in Solar Park. Land 2023;12(2):367. https://doi.org/10.3390/LAND12020367

[41] Liu Y, Ding C, Su D, Wang T, Wang T. Solar park promoted microbial nitrogen and phosphorus cycle potentials but reduced soil prokaryotic diversity and network stability in alpine desert ecosystem. Front Microbiol 2022;13:976335.

[42] Zhou MR, Wang XJ. Influence of photovoltaic power station engineering on soil and vegetation: Taking the Gobi Desert Area in the Hexi corridor of Gansu as an example. Sci Soil Water Conserv 2019;17(02):132-8. https://doi.org/10.16843/j.sswc.2019.02.016

[43] Elamri Y, Cheviron B, Lopez JM, Dejean C, Belaud G. Water budget and crop modelling for agrivoltaic systems: Application to irrigated lettuces. Agric Water Manag 2018;208:440-53.https://doi.org/10.1016/J.AGWAT.2018.07.001

[44] Barron-Gafford GA, Pavao-Zuckerman MA, Minor RL, Sutter LF, Barnett-Moreno I, Blackett DT, et al. Agrivoltaics provide mutual benefits across the food–energy–water nexus in drylands. Nat Sustain. 2019; 2(9):848-55. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41893-019-0364-5

[45] Willockx B, Kladas A, Lavaert C, Bert U, Cappelle J. How Agrivoltaics Can Be Used as a Crop Protection System. EUROSIS Proceedings. 2022.

[46] Willockx B, Lavaert C, Cappelle J. Geospatial assessment of elevated agrivoltaics on arable land in Europe to highlight the implications on design, land use and economic level. Energy Rep 2022;8:8736-51. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.EGYR.2022.06.076

[47] Zhai B, Gao Y, Dang X H, Chen X, Cheng B, Liu X J, et al. Effects of photovoltaic panels on the characteristics and diversity of Leymus chinensis community. Chinese J Ecol 2018;37(8):2237 https://doi.org/10.13292/j.1000–4890.201808.029

[48] Grodsky SM, Campbell JW, Hernandez RR. Solar energy development impacts flower-visiting beetles and flies in the Mojave Desert. Biol Conserv 2021;263:109336. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BIOCON.2021.109336

[49] Bennun L, van Bochove J, Ng C, Fletcher C, Wilson D, Phair N, Carbone G. Biodiversity impacts associated to solar power projects - resource | IUCN. https://www.iucn.org/resources/file/biodiversity-impacts-associated-solar-power-projects. 2021. [accessed 23 February 2023]

[50] Montag H, Parker G, Clarkson T. The effects of solar farms on local biodiversity: a comparative study. Clarkson and Woods and Wychwood Biodiversity. 2016.

[51] Parker GE, McQueen C. Can solar farms deliver significant benefits for biodiversity? http://www. wychwoodbiodiversity. co. uk/assets/solar_and_biodiversity_report_parker_mcqueen_201 3d. pdf; 2013 [accessed: 16 February 2023]

[52] Patel V, Pauli N, Biggs E, Barbour L, Boruff B. Why bees are critical for achieving sustainable development. Ambio 2021;50:49-59. https://doi.org/10.1007/s13280-020-01333-9

[53] Blaydes H, Potts SG, Whyatt JD, Armstrong A. Opportunities to enhance pollinator biodiversity in solar parks. Renew Sustain Energy Rev 2021;145:111065. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2021.111065

[54] Oudes D, Stremke S. Next generation solar power plants? A comparative analysis of frontrunner solar landscapes in Europe. Renew Sust Energ Rev 2021;145:111101.

[55] Randle-Boggis RJ, White PC, Cruz J, Parker G, Montag H, Scurlock JM, et al. Realising co-benefits for natural capital and ecosystem services from solar parks: a co-developed, evidence-based approach. Renew Sust Energ Rev. 2020;125:109775. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RSER.2020.109775

[56] Garratt MP, Senapathi D, Coston DJ, Mortimer SR, Potts SG. The benefits of hedgerows for pollinators and natural enemies depends on hedge quality and landscape context. Agric Ecosyst Environ 2017;247:363-70.

[57] Grodsky S, Moore-O'Leary K, Hernandez R. From butterflies to bighorns: Multi-dimensional species-species and species-process interactions may inform sustainable solar energy development in desert ecosystems. In Proceedings of the 31st Annual Desert Symposium, Zzyzx, CA, USA 2017; p. 15-17.

[58] Harrison C, Lloyd H, Field C. Evidence review of the impact of solar farms on birds, bats and general ecology. Natural England Technical Report. Natural England and other parties 2017. Report number NEER012. ISBN 978-1-78354-414-1

[59] Visser E, Perold V, Ralston-Paton S, Cardenal AC, Ryan PG. Assessing the impacts of a utility-scale photovoltaic solar energy facility on birds in the Northern Cape, South Africa. Renew energy 2019;133:1285-94. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.RENENE.2018.08.106

[60] DeVault TL, Seamans TW, Schmidt JA, Belant JL, Blackwell BF, Mooers N, et al. Bird use of solar photovoltaic installations at US airports: Implications for aviation safety. Landsc Urban Plan 2014;122:122-8.

[61] Taylor R, Conway J, Gabb O, Gillespie J. Potential ecological impacts of ground-mounted photovoltaic solar panels. https://www.bsg-ecology.com; 2019. [accessed: 05 April 2023]

[62] Ministerio Para La Transición Ecológica Y El Reto Demográfico (MITECO). https://www.miteco.gob.es/es/biodiversidad/temas/conservacion-de-especies/especies-silvestres/Guia_metodologica_repercusiones_instalaciones_solares_especies_avifauna_esteparia.aspx; 2020 [accessed: 10 April 2023]

[63] Serrano D, Margalida A, Pérez-García JM, Juste J, Traba J, Valera F, et al. Renewables in Spain threaten biodiversity. Science 2020;370(6522):1282-3. https://doi.org/10.1126/SCIENCE.ABF6509

[64] Silva JP, Arroyo B, Marques AT, Morales MB, Devoucoux P, Mougeot F. Threats affecting Little Bustards: human impacts. In Little Bustard: Ecology and Conservation, Cham: Springer International Publishing.2022; p. 243-71.

[65] Kosciuch K, Riser-Espinoza D, Gerringer M, Erickson W. A summary of bird mortality at photovoltaic utility scale solar facilities in the Southwestern US. PloS one 2020;15(4):e0232034.

[66] Chock RY, Clucas B, Peterson EK, Blackwell BF, Blumstein DT, Church K, et al. Evaluating potential effects of solar power facilities on wildlife from an animal behavior perspective. Conserv Sci Pract 2021;3(2):e319.https://doi.org/10.1111/CSP2.319

[67] Cypher BL, Boroski BB, Burton RK, Meade DE, Phillips SE, Leitner PH, et al. Photovoltaic solar farms in California: can we have renewable electricity and our species, too?. California Fish and Wildlife 2021;107:231-48.

[68] Barré K, Baudouin A, Froidevaux JS, Chartendrault V, Kerbiriou C. Insectivorous bats alter their flight and feeding behaviour at ground-mounted solar farms. J Appl Ecol 2023;61, 328-39 https://doi.org/10.1111/1365-2664.14555

[69] Szabadi KL, Kurali A, Rahman NA, Froidevaux JS, Tinsley E, Jones G, et al. The use of solar farms by bats in mosaic landscapes: Implications for conservation. Global Ecol Conserv 2023;44:e02481.

[70] Tinsley E, Froidevaux JS, Zsebők S, Szabadi KL, Jones G. Renewable energies and biodiversity: Impact of ground-mounted solar photovoltaic sites on bat activity. J Appl Ecol 2023;60(9):1752-62.

[71] Peschel R, Peschel T, Marchand M, Hauke J. Solar parks-profits for bio-diversity. Association of Energy Market Innovators. 2019.

[72] Menta C, Remelli S, Andreoni M, Gatti F, Sergi V. Can Grasslands in Photovoltaic Parks Play a Role in Conserving Soil Arthropod Biodiversity?. Life 2023;13(7):1536. https://doi.org/10.3390/life13071536

[73] Mount Morris Agrivoltaics Study: Co-locating Solar and Agriculture at the Morris Ridge Solar Energy Center. https://www.agrisolarclearinghouse.org/mount-morris-agrivoltaics-study-co-locating-solar-and-agriculture-at-the-morris-ridge-solar-energy-center/; 2020 [accessed: 02 May 2023]

[74] Semeraro T, Scarano A, Santino A, Emmanuel R, Lenucci M. An innovative approach to combine solar photovoltaic gardens with agricultural production and ecosystem services. Ecosyst Serv 2022;56:101450. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ECOSER.2022.101450

[75] Walston LJ, Mishra SK, Hartmann HM, Hlohowskyj I, McCall J, Macknick J. Examining the potential for agricultural benefits from pollinator habitat at solar facilities in the United States. Environ Sci. Technol 2018;52(13):7566-76.

[76] Oudes D, Van Den Brink A, Stremke S. Towards a typology of solar energy landscapes: Mixed-production, nature based and landscape inclusive solar power transitions. Energy Res Soc Sci 2022;91:102742.

[77] Zaplata MK. Solar parks as livestock enclosures can become key to linking energy, biodiversity and society. People Nat 2023;5(5):1457-63. https://doi.org/10.1002/pan3.10522

[78] Semeraro T, Pomes A, Del Giudice C, Negro D, Aretano R. Planning ground based utility scale solar energy as green infrastructure to enhance ecosystem services. Energy Policy 2018;117:218-27.

[79] Vallejo RV, Smanis A, Chirino E, Fuentes D, Valdecantos A, Vilagrosa A. Perspectives in dryland restoration: approaches for climate change adaptation. New Forests 2012;43(5-6):561-79. https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-012-9325-9

[80] Rey Benayas JM, Bullock JM. Restoration of biodiversity and ecosystem services on agricultural land. Ecosystems 2012;15:883-99. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10021-012-9552-0

[81] Del Campo AD, Navarro RM, Ceacero CJ. Seedling quality and field performance of commercial stocklots of containerized holm oak (Quercus ilex) in Mediterranean Spain: an approach for establishing a quality standard. New For 2010;39:19-37 https://doi.org/10.1007/s11056-009-9152-9

[82] Valdecantos A, Cortina J, Vallejo VR. Nutrient status and field performance of tree seedlings planted in Mediterranean degraded areas. Ann For Sci 2006;63(3):249-56. https://doi.org/10.1051/forest:2006003

[83] Fuentes D, Smanis A, Valdecantos A. Recreating sink areas on semiarid degraded slopes by restoration. Land Degrad Dev 2017;28(3):1005-15. https://doi.org/10.1002/ldr.2671

[84] Valdecantos A, Fuentes D, Smanis A, Llovet J, Morcillo L, Bautista S. Effectiveness of low-cost planting techniques for improving water availability to Olea Europaea seedlings in degraded drylands. Restor Ecol 2014;22(3):327-35. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12076

[85] Vicente E, Moreno-de las Heras M, Merino-Martin L, Nicolau JM, Espigares T. Assessing the effects of nurse shrubs, sink patches and plant water-use strategies for the establishment of late-successional tree seedlings in Mediterranean reclaimed mining hillslopes. Ecol Eng 2022;176:106538. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecoleng.2021.106538

[86] Castillo-Escrivà A, López-Iborra GM, Cortina J, Tormo J. The use of branch piles to assist in the restoration of degraded semiarid steppes. Rest Ecol 2019;27(1):102-8. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.12704

[87] Navarro-Cano JA, Goberna M, González-Barberá G, Castillo VM, Verdú M. Restauración ecológica en ambientes semiáridos: recuperar las interacciones biológicas y las funciones ecosistémicas. https://www.uv.es/cide/Documentos/RESTAURACION_ECOLOGICA.%20Libro.pdf; 2017 [accessed: 02 May 2023]

[88] Gann GD, McDonald T, Walder B, Aronson J, Nelson CR, Jonson J, et al. International principles and standards for the practice of ecological restoration. Restor Ecol 2019;27(S1):S1-46. https://doi.org/10.1111/rec.13035

[89] Hobbs RJ, Arico S, Aronson J, Baron JS, Bridgewater P, Cramer VA, et al. Novel ecosystems: theoretical and management aspects of the new ecological world order. Glob Ecol Biogeogr 2006;15(1):1-7.

[90] Seastedt TR, Hobbs RJ, Suding KN. Management of novel ecosystems: are novel approaches required?. Front Ecol Environ 2008;6(10):547-53. https://doi.org/10.1890/070046

[91] Blecha M, Obriejetan M, Stangl R. Maximizing Ecosystem Services through Grassland Restoration and Adaptive Management in Solar Parks. Copernicus Meetings; 2023 Feb 22. https://doi.org/10.5194/egusphere-egu23-15110

[92] Handler R, Pearce JM. Greener sheep: Life cycle analysis of integrated sheep agrivoltaic systems. Cleaner Energy Systems. 2022;3:100036. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cles.2022.100036

[93] Kochendoerfer N, Thonney ML. Grazing Sheep on Solar Sites in New York State: Opportunities and Challenges. Scope and scaling-up of the NYS sheep industry to graze ground-mounted photovoltaic arrays for vegetation management. Department of Animal Science, Cornell University, Ithaca, USA. https://solargrazing.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/02/Solar-Site-Sheep-Grazing-in-NY.pdf; 2021.

[94] Agrivoltaic Solutions, LLC. Agricultural integration plan: managed sheep grazing & beekeeping. Morris Rifge Solar Energy Center Case No. 18-F-0440. https://www.edf-re.com/wp-content/uploads/004C_Appendix-04-B.-Agricultural-Integration-Plan-and-Grazing-Plan.pdf; 2022 [accessed 13 December 2023].

[95] Lambert Q, Bischoff A, Enea M, Gros R. Photovoltaic power stations: an opportunity to promote European semi-natural grasslands?. Front Environ Sci 2023;11:1137845. https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2023.1137845

[96] Vaverková MD, Winkler J, Uldrijan D, Ogrodnik P, Vespalcová T, Aleksiejuk-Gawron J, et al. Fire hazard associated with different types of photovoltaic power plants: Effect of vegetation management. Renew Sust Energ Rev 2022;162:112491. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2022.112491.

[97] Kampherbeek EW, Webb LE, Reynolds BJ, Sistla SA, Horney MR, Ripoll-Bosch R, et al. A preliminary investigation of the effect of solar panels and rotation frequency on the grazing behavior of sheep (Ovis aries) grazing dormant pasture. Appl Anim Behav Sci 2023;258:105799. https://doi.org/10.1016/J.APPLANIM.2022.105799

[98] Fernández-Giménez ME, Fillat Estaque F. Pyrenean pastoralists' ecological knowledge: documentation and application to natural resource management and adaptation. Hum Ecol 2012;40:287-300. https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-012-9463-x

[99] Auffret AG. Can seed dispersal by human activity play a useful role for the conservation of European grasslands?. Appl Veg Sci 2011;14(3):291-303.https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1654-109X.2011.01124.x

[100] Smokorowski KE, Randall RG. Cautions on using the Before-After-Control-Impact design in environmental effects monitoring programs. Facets 2017;2(1):212-32. https://doi.org/10.1139/facets-2016-0058