

# DIGITALES ARCHIV

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft  
ZBW – Leibniz Information Centre for Economics

Morea, Donato; Poggi, Luigi Antonio

## Article

### An innovative model for the sustainability of investments in the wind energy sector : the use of green Sukuk in an Italian case study

#### Provided in Cooperation with:

International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy (IJEPP)

*Reference:* Morea, Donato/Poggi, Luigi Antonio (2017). An innovative model for the sustainability of investments in the wind energy sector : the use of green Sukuk in an Italian case study. In: International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy 7 (2), S. 53 - 60.

This Version is available at:

<http://hdl.handle.net/11159/1169>

#### Kontakt/Contact

ZBW – Leibniz-Informationszentrum Wirtschaft/Leibniz Information Centre for Economics  
Düsternbrooker Weg 120  
24105 Kiel (Germany)  
E-Mail: [rights\[at\]zbw.eu](mailto:rights[at]zbw.eu)  
<https://www.zbw.eu/econis-archiv/>

#### Standard-Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieses Dokument darf zu eigenen wissenschaftlichen Zwecken und zum Privatgebrauch gespeichert und kopiert werden. Sie dürfen dieses Dokument nicht für öffentliche oder kommerzielle Zwecke vervielfältigen, öffentlich ausstellen, aufführen, vertreiben oder anderweitig nutzen. Sofern für das Dokument eine Open-Content-Lizenz verwendet wurde, so gelten abweichend von diesen Nutzungsbedingungen die in der Lizenz gewährten Nutzungsrechte.

<https://zbw.eu/econis-archiv/termsfuse>

#### Terms of use:

*This document may be saved and copied for your personal and scholarly purposes. You are not to copy it for public or commercial purposes, to exhibit the document in public, to perform, distribute or otherwise use the document in public. If the document is made available under a Creative Commons Licence you may exercise further usage rights as specified in the licence.*



# An Innovative Model for the Sustainability of Investments in the Wind Energy Sector: The Use of Green Sukuk in an Italian Case Study

**Donato Morea<sup>1\*</sup>, Luigi Antonio Poggi<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup>Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Rome Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy, <sup>2</sup>Department of Industrial Engineering, University of Rome Tor Vergata, Rome, Italy. \*Email: [donato.morea@uniroma2.it](mailto:donato.morea@uniroma2.it)

## ABSTRACT

In this paper we present the technical-energy-economic feasibility of wind power systems. An Italian 1 megawatt case study was considered to evaluate the importance of incentives in order to achieve the grid parity. Due to the severe reduction of incentives in the last years, in the present work we propose the use of Sukuk, a Shari'ah-compliant instrument used in the Islamic finance, as an alternative financial instrument used to limit the extent of leverage associated with financing. The building cost thresholds necessary to achieve the grid parity and a profitable and bankable project are presented with a sensitivity analysis. In the framework of the efforts against climate change and the emission of greenhouse gas, our results evidenced the importance of incentives and the applicability of the use of Shari'ah-compliant sukuk instruments in order to provide a feasible and sustainable investment in the wind energy sector.

**Keywords:** Wind Energy, Grid Parity, Green Sukuk

**JEL Classifications:** Q420, L940, P480

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Renewable energy is a priority in the framework activities of the European Union (EU) energy policy strategies. Both in the 2020 strategy and in the 2050 objectives, renewables play a crucial role in order to achieve the greenhouse gas (GHG) emission reduction of 80-95% below 1990 levels by 2050 (Campisi et al., 2017; Ciarreta et al., 2014; Gerigk et al., 2012; European Commission, 2011). In this context, EU countries could become model countries proving the feasibility of the transition to renewables, leading innovation, maintaining the leadership in the field, and furthermore generating several employment opportunities (Malizia et al., 2016; Poggi and Singh, 2016; Pacesila et al., 2016). However, a clear methodology to evaluate the feasibility in terms of bankability and profitability of an investment in renewables should consider the so-called country-specific effects, and in particular the regulatory frameworks able to support the use of renewable energy and especially wind energy. A part from the regulatory factors, the economic feasibility is proved by the evolution of the cash flows over time, depending on the price of the electric power and the

production cost (Chase, 2012; Ernst and Young, 2015). The state-of-the-art of the European experience suggests that a feed-in tariff offers more cost-effective support than a tradable green certificate, because it is less risky and allows these capital-intensive projects to be viable with a lower cost of capital (Campisi et al., 2016).

In the recent years, similar studies were dedicated to the investment feasibility in the renewable energy sector. Several studies showed that an incentivization policy is needed in order to achieve positive margins and the grid parity, given a fixed building cost of the power system. The goal of achieving the grid parity consist in this case in reaching the parity between the energy purchase cost and the cost of electricity production from the case-study wind energy farm (Campisi et al., 2015). In particular, such findings were presented in the achievement of the solar grid parity with real options in Italy (Biondi and Moretto, 2015), in a long-term analysis of pumped hydro storage to firm wind power (Foley et al., 2015), in an overview of wind energy in the world and assessment of current wind energy policies in Turkey (Kaplan, 2015), in the energy and economic performance of photovoltaic

systems in Italy (Campisi et al., 2015; Sgroi et al., 2014; Squatrito et al., 2014), in the cost-competitiveness evaluation of renewable energy technologies in terms of grid parity (Gu Choi et al., 2015), in the wind power investment comparison in Denmark, Finland and Portugal (Monjas-Barroso and Balibrea-Iniesta, 2013), in the investment feasibility of a renewable energy mix in Malaysia (Muzathik et al., 2012), in the generation costs of on-shore and off-shore wind energy farms in Europe (Blanco, 2009) and in the investment feasibility of a hydropower plant in Norway (Kjærland, 2007).

Over the period 2005-2014, wind power generation tripled and has become the second largest contributor to renewable electricity, taking over biomass. The 2014 EU wind power production reached 247 terawatt-hour (TWh), boosted by Germany, Spain and United Kingdom (UK) as the top 3 producers (European Commission, 2015). Due to subsidy restriction policies in Italy, wind energy market dropped when compared to the last decade, when government incentives were sensibly higher, causing the grid parity of such technology to become more complex and challenging to achieve (Campisi et al., 2016).

In this paper, we will give a quantification of the energy performance and study the incentive-dependency of a wind farm evaluating the building cost thresholds that allows the investment to be profitable and bankable and the system to reach the grid parity (Campisi et al., 2016). At the state of the art of the Italian regulatory framework we propose an alternative financing tool: The Islamic finance. For this purpose, we introduce the utilization of green sukuk, that are Shari'ah-compliant instruments potentially applicable to the Italian context. Also, we present the threshold of building cost necessary to achieve the grid parity with no incentives, showing the dependency of such investment to the governmental incentive policy. Results are displayed also to drive the attention of the strategy experts in the field to an alternative financing instrument able to limit the extent of operating leverage associated with financing (Morea and Poggi, 2017), in the framework of energy projects devoted to the reduction of GHG emissions and the consequent negative effects of climate change.

## 2. ISLAMIC FINANCE FOR INVESTMENT SUSTAINABILITY

Accounting for about the 1% of world total assets in 2014 (about \$2 trillion), the Islamic finance has sensibly developed worldwide during the last decades, constantly growing even if the Islamic banking still makes up only a fraction of the total world assets (The Economist Newspaper Limited, 2014; Tahir, 2007; Karim and Archer, 2002). In this kind of finance, there is no separation between religion and socio-political aspects. In fact, the Islamic finance is compliant with the Islamic law, the Shari'ah jurisprudence (Fang, 2014; Bacha, 2013; Taylor, 2002, Zawawi et al., 2014). According to that, the Shari'ah-compliant finance instruments must adhere to the ban on liquor, tobacco and different medications, pork items, betting, erotica, deadly implements and ruinous weapons. Also, other principles states that such instrument and the related exchanges must avoid speculation, gambling,

unreasonably uncertain or ambiguous contracts, taking advantage of the counterparty's ignorance, corruption, and more importantly, financial returns not correlated to a real activity with a certain level of risk, i.e. the concept of usury but also intended as interest (Ahmad, 2008; Jensen, 2008). This is the most striking distinction between conventional and Islamic finance is the restriction on usury, which converts into a denial on interest.

In the public debate following the 2007 economic and financial crisis, the Islamic finance was progressively proposed as an attractive basis for changing the worldwide monetary framework. However, the recent developments faced a highly-polarized debate, making it very hard to create a profound and final comprehension of the Islamic tools and their applicability in the Eastern countries (Nienhaus, 2011; Perry and Rehman, 2011; Koyama, 2010; Aydin, 2011; Warde, 2010; Metwally, 1997). It should also be noted that current studies addressing the applicability of Islamic finance tools to the Eastern economy and their outputs, used heuristic tools and classical profit-maximizing assumptions of conventional finance (Beck et al., 2010; Hayat and Kraeussl, 2011; Musse et al., 2015; Hussain et al., 2016).

The worldwide debate has produced notes and papers tending to particular strategy issues related to the Islamic banking and managing (Diaw, 2015; Manaf et al., 2014; Kammer et al., 2015). Some studies argued that the Islamic banks are less prone to deposit withdrawals and granted more loans during financial crisis and are less sensitive to changes in deposits (Kawawi et al., 2014). Also, according to Manaf et al. (Song and Oosthuizen, 2014) Islamic Banks are more stable than ordinary banks. However, most recent research in the field sensibly differ and it was concluded that the stability of a bank system may dramatically change among various nations and banks (López et al., 2014; Farooq and Zaheer, 2015; Campisi et al., 2015).

Project financing tools have been applied to the Italian renewable energy sector with outstanding achievements in the recent years (Campisi et al., 2016). In Italy, due to the government incentives policy, from 2008 to 2013 the renewable energy production increased by 23 TWh from 2008 to 2013 (Clò et al., 2015). However, such an incentive policy boosted the increase of the diffusion of limited-risk profiles with high interests and eventually caused financial interests to prevail over the industrial and environmental ones. As a result, the persistence of the international economic crisis and the exhaustion of incentives, resulted in the disappearance of financing entities in the field (Campisi et al., 2016).

In this scenario, a steady progression of the green economy would be ensured by reconsidering the subsidizing systems, and the financing tools, extending the examination to the diverse social and financial models available (Rarasati et al., 2014; Markom et al., 2012). In that sense, the instruments proposed by the Islamic finance could represent valuable tools for the renewable energy sector financing (Adelekan et al., 2013; Lai, 2015; Gheeraert and Weill, 2015; Suzuki and Uddin, 2016; Maurer, 2010). Several projects have been recently financed with the issuance of green sukuk, Islamic finance securities of equal denomination representing individual ownership interests in a portfolio of

eligible existing or future assets (Morea and Poggi, 2017), for example the One Solar Watt Per Person project in Indonesia and Orasis project in France.

Such instruments represent interest-free loans used for the realization of real assets that provide a reasonable and fair remuneration for the investment in the form of a fixed share (i.e. a commission). That means sukuk are closely linked to the real economy, not a mere liquidity retrieval tool that does not the utilization of the liquidity itself. In the renewable energy sector, an special purpose vehicle could be capitalized issuing sukuk bonds (Kordvani, 2009). Numerous future renewable energy sector investments could be facilitated using Islamic sukuk, encouraging the expansion of the investor base and increasing resources. Keeping in mind the end goal to make this model proposed reasonable and lawfully attainable in Europe and in Italy, a preliminary examination of the legislation framework and several amendments are needed, and it is likewise that this tasks would be addressed by means of political decisions (GSE, 2016c).

### 3. ITALIAN GOVERNMENT INCENTIVES

Currently, the “Gestore Servizi Energetici” (GSE), the Italian company responsible for the subsidies for renewable energy production and energy efficiency, has offered a feed-in tariff system. In fact, government incentives devoted to helping renewables to achieve grid parity ceased in Italy with Ministerial Decree of 5 July 2012 (the “Quinto Conto Energia”), after a decade of steady growing from its introduction in the Italian legislator framework (Legislative Decree n. 387/2003 receiving the Europe Directive 2001/77/EC) (GSE, 2016a). In the feed-in tariff system, a reward is provided for the electricity production from renewable sources, that is a single regulated tariff (€/Megawatt hour [MWh]). However, even if it was evidenced, on the one hand, the easy implementation of such system, the low costs associated with it compared to a national trading scheme, and the possibility to continuously revise it according to new technological breakthroughs, on the other hand it was also shown how difficult is to set the tariff at an appropriate level, trading-off the effects of excessive rents increase when tariffs are too generous and stifling development when tariffs are too mean (Campisi et al., 2016; Green and Vasilakos, 2011; Haas et al., 2011).

In this regulatory framework, a large wind energy capacity was installed in Italy. Wind energy accounted for about 8.7 GW of installed power in 2014 (+1.7% respect 2013) and about 5.44% of the total Italian generation with 14,897 GWh produced (Terna, 2014), increasing by 23 TWh from 2008 to 2013 (Clò et al., 2015). The subsidies policy over the last years boosted the technological development, leading to falling costs and increasing efficiency. Today, grid parity for a wind farm is possible to achieve. Producers can sell the electricity according to the Ministerial Decree (D.M.) 23 June 2016 (GSE, 2016c). The incentive mechanism is represented by the “Tariffa Onnicomprensiva,” an alternative to the “Green Certificates,” consisting in a fixed tariff applicable to the electricity sold by producers operating qualified plants powered by renewable sources. This tariff remains fixed and

applicable for all plants that came into operation after 1 January 2013, extending the criteria stated in the Ministerial Decrees 6 July 2012 and 23 June 2016 (GSE, 2016; GSE, 2016c). The rate is called “comprehensive” because its value includes an incentive component and a component taking into account the electricity actually fed into the grid. Until the end of the incentive period, the “Tariffa Onnicomprensiva” should be the only source of income from selling such electricity. Once the incentive period is over, the economic conditions stated on the Italian Law no. 387/2003, article 13, should be applied (GSE, 2016; GSE, 2016a; GSE, 2016b; GSE, 2016c). For wind power, the different tariffs according to the wind farm size are presented in Table 1, according to the Annex 1 of Ministerial Decree 23 June 2016 (GSE, 2016c). Please note that in the current study we consider the “Tariffa Onnicomprensiva” reported in Table 1 as the only component of the selling price of the electricity produced by the wind farm.

### 4. ITALIAN ON-SHORE WIND FARM CASE STUDY: TECHNO-ECONOMIC PROJECT CHARACTERISTICS

An Italian on-shore wind farm for the production of electrical energy with an installed capacity of 1 MW is the case study. It represents a common type of wind farm present at the state of the art in Italy, composed by 50 small generators JIMP of 20 kW each.

Assuming an average wind speed of 4.85 m/s on a tower of 18 m and a Weibull distribution of the probability density distribution over the wind speed (Ibrahim et al., 2014), we have estimated the energy production by means of a software simulation. The inputs of the software were: Average wind speed (m/s) = 4.85; Weibull K = 2.00; site altitude (m) = 0; wind shear = 0.20; anemometer height (m) = 10.00; tower height (m) = 18.00; turbulence factor = 10.00%. As a result of the analysis the producibility was quantified as follows:

- Hub average wind speed (m/s) = 5.46;
- Air density factor = 0%;
- Average output power (kW) = 3.48;
- Daily energy output (kWh) = 83.60;
- Annual energy output (kWh) = 30,514;

**Table 1: Regulated tariff (“Tariffa Onnicomprensiva”) for electricity generated by wind farms in Italy according to the Italian Ministerial Decree 23 June 2016 (Source: GSE, 2016c)**

| Type of plant | Power (kW)    | Tariff (€/MWh) | Useful life (years) |
|---------------|---------------|----------------|---------------------|
| On-Shore      | 1<P ≤ 20      | 250            | 20                  |
|               | 20<P ≤ 60     | 190            | 20                  |
|               | 60<P ≤ 200    | 160            | 20                  |
|               | 200<P ≤ 1000  | 140            | 20                  |
|               | 1000<P ≤ 5000 | 130            | 20                  |
|               | P>5000        | 110            | 20                  |
| Off-shore     | 1<P ≤ 5000    | -              | -                   |
|               | P>5000        | 165            | 25                  |

- Monthly energy output = 2,543;
- Percent operating time = 72.2%.

The net annual energy production of a single wind turbine resulted about 30.5 MWh. Therefore, the annual wind farm energy production accounted for about 1500 MWh. However, it should be noted that this is a hypothetical case study, while in the case of a real investment, the site location should be chosen according to wind speed data over a long period of at least one year. Disregarding the uncertainty on the production costs and price of electricity, subsidies and other regulatory aspects, we assume that the wind farm would generate cash flows from its implementation (construction set to 2016, start-up on 2017) until the end of the average life expectancy of the turbines assumed to be 20 years. Furthermore, to evaluate the sustainability and profitability of the investment, the following parameters were taken into account in the analysis.

- Regulated tariff (“Tariffa Onnicomprensiva”) for electricity generated by the wind farm (1 MW): 140 €/MWh (GSE, 2016c).
- Construction cost: € 2,000,000 (€/kilowatt [kW] 2,000); this cost is based on market values.
- Annual operation, maintenance and insurance costs is estimated at 70,000 €/year.
- About the sources of financing, we assume a 20% of the investment as equity and the remaining (80%) as debt, following other studies (Campisi et al., 2015).
- Fixed equity: € 400,000 (20% of the investment).
- Green sukuk issued (the remaining of investment [80%]): € 1,600,000 (equal to the bank loan in the conventional finance case) (Morea and Poggi, 2017).
- According to the Italian civil law, amortization is assumed equal to 4.5% of the building cost in the first year (2017), 9% of the building cost for the following 10 years (from 01/2018 to 12/2027), and the remaining is accounted in the last period (2028).
- Weighted average cost of capital (WACC) is set to be equal to 5%, according to the market values and previous studies (Campisi et al., 2015; Monjas-Barroso and Balibrea-Iniesta, 2013).
- Corporate income tax in Italy (i.e. IRES) is estimated at 27.5% of earnings before taxes and it is assumed to be constant over the period examined (Morea, 2005).
- Annual Islamic finance commission: 2% of the green sukuk investment, according to the Islamic interbank benchmark rate and the London interbank offered rate (Morea and Poggi, 2017).

## 5. METHODOLOGY

Indicators and parameters taken into account were the net present value (NPV), the internal rate of return (IRR), the WACC, the annual debt service cover ratio (ADSCR) and the annual loan life cover ratio (ALLCR). It should be noted that the WACC can remarkably vary depending on the company capital structure, the sources that they use to raise money, the project type, and the regional legislation (Campisi et al., 2014; Campisi and Costa, 2008; Campisi and Nastasi, 1993; Mondol and Hillenbrand, 2013; Gatti, 2012; Thusen and Fabrychy, 1993).

The evaluation of profitability and bankability of the proposed wind farm project was carried out identifying the regulatory frameworks, estimating the cash flows and the uncertainties for the project. The following conditions were taken into account (Gatti, 2012; Campisi and Costa, 2008; Campisi and Nastasi, 1993; Thusen and Fabrychy, 1993).

- $NPV > 0(1)$
- $IRR > WACC(2)$
- $ADSCR > 1(3)$
- $ALLCR > 1(4)$

## 6. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The NPV analysis highlighted negative levels of available cash flow during the period from 2029 to 2036, and the indicators are out of the admissibility range. Therefore, the investment should be rejected. In particular, as shown in Table 2, it was evidenced a negative level of NVP, as well as ADSCR and ALLCR indicators out of the desirable range. Investment recovery could be guaranteed only decreasing the parametric cost of building the wind farm. Using the green sukuk instruments as a financing tool of the investment in order to reach the grid parity in the current Italian legislation and electricity market constraints, such building cost was progressively reduced from € 2,000,000 (Table 3). The cost threshold corresponding to  $NPV = 0$  and  $IRR = WACC = 5\%$  consisted of € 1,240,290 (Tables 3 and 4). It should be noted that the analysis was also repeated using the conventional models of interests on the traditional bank loan instead of supposing to use the green sukuk. In fact, in the conventional finance scenario the threshold of parametric cost which would guarantee the investment recovery was € 1,197,834, producing the same negative results expected. The Islamic finance case produced better bankability indicators, reducing the gap between the current situation and that of a profitable and bankable project. Further analysis about the Islamic finance scenario imposing the above-mentioned profitability and bankability criteria ( $ADSCR > 1$  and  $ALLCR > 1$ ) produced as a result that the construction cost should be lower than € 1,215,000 as shown in Table 3 in order to make the investment profitable and bankable. To summarize, it was evidenced that the investment may be recovered when the cost of building the wind farm is approximately 62% of the start-up cost of the case study (€ 2,000,000). Table 3 evidenced how until the breakeven point is reached, the ratio of fixed equity on total costs increases while the costs in the parametric analysis decreased. Furthermore, Table 5 presents the WACC sensitivity analysis assuming values from 3% to 7%. Several scenarios were depicted by this variation: The results evidenced a negative level of NVP for WACC from 6% to 7% (Table 5).

## 7. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we have presented the economic and financial analysis of an Italian on-shore wind farm case study investment, in order to evaluate its profitability and bankability according to the above-mentioned criteria, showing the strong dependency from incentives in order to reach the grid parity. An alternative financing model was introduced, based on the use of the Islamic finance green sukuk instruments. The most striking difference between such banking

**Table 2: Actual building cost of the wind farm (NPV<0): Financial and economic analysis**

| Reference years and time points                                       | 2016       | 2017    | 2018    | ... | 2035    | 2036    |
|---|------------|---------|---------|-----|---------|---------|
|   | t=0        | t=1     | t=2     | ... | t=19    | t=20    |
| Net annual energy production (MWh)                                    | 0          | 1500    | 1500    | ... | 1500    | 1500    |
| Development of revenues (€): "Tariffa Omnicomprensiva"                | 0          | 210,000 | 210,000 | ... | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| Development of costs (€): Operations, maintenance and insurance costs |            | 70,000  | 70,000  | ... | 70,000  | 70,000  |
| Investment (€): Cost of building the wind farm                        | 2,000,000  | -       | -       | ... | -       | -       |
| Coverage (€): Equity  | 400,000    | -       | -       | ... | -       | -       |
| Loan (€)  | 1,600,000  | -       | -       | ... | -       | -       |
| Annual payment  | -          | 112,000 | 112,000 | ... | 112,000 | 112,000 |
| Income statement (€)  |            |         |         |     |         |         |
| Total revenues  |            | 210,000 | 210,000 | ... | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| Total costs   |            | 70,000  | 70,000  | ... | 70,000  | 70,000  |
| EBITDA  |            | 140,000 | 140,000 | ... | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Amortisation  |            | 90,000  | 180,000 | ... | 0       | 0       |
| Net operating margin  |            | 50,000  | -40,000 | ... | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Islamic commission  |            | 32,000  | 32,000  | ... | 32,000  | 32,000  |
| EBT   |            | 18,000  | -72,000 | ... | 108,000 | 108,000 |
| Corporate income tax (IRES)   |            | 4950    | 0       | ... | 29,700  | 29,700  |
| Profit/Loss   |            | 13,050  | -72,000 | ... | 78,300  | 78,300  |
| Cash flow (€)   |            |         |         |     |         |         |
| EBITDA  |            | 140,000 | 140,000 | ... | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Corporate income tax (IRES)   |            | 4950    | 0       | ... | 29,700  | 29,700  |
| Cash flow for debt service  |            | 135,050 | 140,000 | ... | 110,300 | 110,300 |
| Islamic commission  |            | 32,000  | 32,000  | ... | 32,000  | 32,000  |
| Repayable capital   |            | 80,000  | 80,000  | ... | 80,000  | 80,000  |
| Repayable capital+islamic commission                                  |            | 112,000 | 112,000 | ... | 112,000 | 112,000 |
| Available cash flow   |            | 23,050  | 28,000  | ... | -1700   | -1700   |
| NPV (€)   | -1,297,773 |         |         |     |         |         |
| IRR (%)   | -          |         |         |     |         |         |
| DSCR  | -          | 0.21    | 0.25    | ... | -0.02   | -0.02   |
| LLCR  | -          | 0.17    | 0.16    | ... | -0.01   | -0.01   |
| ADSCR   | 0.14       |         |         |     |         |         |
| ALLCR   | 0.06       |         |         |     |         |         |

Source: Own elaboration. EBITDA: Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization, NPV: Net present value, IRR: Internal rate of return, DSCR: Debt service cover ratio, LLCR: Loan life cover ratio, ADSCR: Annual debt service cover ratio, ALLCR: Annual loan life cover ratio, EBT: Earnings before taxes

**Table 3: Parametric cost thresholds for the investment recovery and for profitable and bankable project**

| Wind farm building cost (€) | Equity (€) | Annual payment (€) | WACC (%) | NPV (€)    | IRR (%) | ADSCR | ALLCR |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|------------|---------|-------|-------|
| 2,000,000                   | 400,000    | 112,000            | 5        | -1,297,773 | -       | 0.14  | 0.06  |
| 1,500,000                   | 400,000    | 77,000             | 5        | -428,885   | -1.28   | 0.63  | 0.51  |
| 1,300,000                   | 400,000    | 63,000             | 5        | -91,077    | 3.56    | 0.97  | 0.83  |
| 1,250,000                   | 400,000    | 59,500             | 5        | -14,811    | 4.76    | 1.07  | 0.93  |
| 1,240,290                   | 400,000    | 58,820             | 5        | 0          | 5       | 1.09  | 0.95  |
| 1,225,000                   | 400,000    | 57,750             | 5        | 23,323     | 5.38    | 1.13  | 0.98  |
| 1,215,000                   | 400,000    | 57,050             | 5        | 38,576     | 5.64    | 1.15  | 1.01  |
| 1,100,000                   | 400,000    | 49,000             | 5        | 213,988    | 8.85    | 1.46  | 1.30  |
| 928,000                     | 400,000    | 36,960             | 5        | 476,344    | 15.25   | 2.17  | 2.00  |

Source: Own elaboration. NPV: Net present value, IRR: Internal rate of return, ADSCR: Annual debt service cover ratio, ALLCR: Annual loan life cover ratio, WACC: Weighted average cost of capital

procedures and conventional ones is that the Islamic model do not include interest, but a commission (2% of the sukuk investment in the case study). This model is presented as a possible tool available for renewable energy projects financing. In this way, according to the International Shari'ah Research Academy for Islamic finance, profit-loss sharing is fairly distributed between contracting parties, and the bank using such instruments acts like an intermediary by serving the interests of the community promoting value creation (Ismail, 2010). However, also using sukuk instead of the traditional finance instruments, the achievement of the grid parity for an on-shore wind farm comparable to that of the case study, according to the Italian regulatory framework (GSE, 2016c), is strongly dependent from

the incentives, as well as from the wind availability, the amount of investments, the taxation system, the use of the produced energy, and the electricity market prices. However, it is argued that the increasing innovation and development in the renewable energy field could lead to a reduction of building costs so that would be possible to partially compensate the reduction of the incentives (Adelekan et al., 2013; Lai, 2015). According to this study, as well as other studies (Blanco, 2009; Biondi and Moretto, 2015; Campisi et al., 2015), the results underlined that grid parity is still not achieved in Italy for such technologies. According to the analysis presented, it is possible to identify the gap between the actual cost of wind energy technology and what should it cost to be economically

**Table 4: Threshold of the parametric cost for NPV=0: Financial and economic analysis**

| Reference years and time points                                       | 2016      | 2017    | 2018    | ... | 2035    | 2036    |
|---|-----------|---------|---------|-----|---------|---------|
|   | t=0       | t=1     | t=2     | ... | t=19    | t=20    |
| Net annual energy production (MWh)                                    | 0         | 1500    | 1500    | ... | 1500    | 1500    |
| Development of revenues (€): "Tariffa Omnicomprensiva"                | 0         | 210,000 | 210,000 | ... | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| Development of costs (€): Operations, maintenance and insurance costs |           | 70,000  | 70,000  | ... | 70,000  | 70,000  |
| Investment (€): Cost of building the wind farm                        | 1,240,290 | -       | -       | ... | -       | -       |
| Coverage (€): Equity  | 400,000   | -       | -       | ... | -       | -       |
| Loan (€)  | 840,290   | -       | -       | ... | -       | -       |
| Annual payment  | -         | 58,820  | 58,820  | ... | 58,820  | 58,820  |
| Income statement (€)  |           |         |         |     |         |         |
| Total revenues  |           | 210,000 | 210,000 | ... | 210,000 | 210,000 |
| Total costs   |           | 70,000  | 70,000  | ... | 70,000  | 70,000  |
| EBITDA  |           | 140,000 | 140,000 | ... | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Amortisation  |           | 55,813  | 111,626 | ... | 0       | 0       |
| Net operating margin  |           | 84,187  | 28,374  | ... | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Islamic commission  |           | 16,806  | 16,806  | ... | 16,806  | 16,806  |
| EBT   |           | 67,381  | 11,568  | ... | 123,194 | 123,194 |
| Corporate income tax (IRES)   |           | 18,530  | 3,181   | ... | 33,878  | 33,878  |
| Profit/loss   |           | 48,851  | 8,387   | ... | 89,316  | 89,316  |
| Cash flow (€)   |           |         |         |     |         |         |
| EBITDA  |           | 140,000 | 140,000 | ... | 140,000 | 140,000 |
| Corporate income tax (IRES)   |           | 18,530  | 3,181   | ... | 33,878  | 33,878  |
| Cash flow for debt service  |           | 121,470 | 136,819 | ... | 106,122 | 106,122 |
| Islamic commission  |           | 16,806  | 16,806  | ... | 16,806  | 16,806  |
| Repayable capital   |           | 42,014  | 42,014  | ... | 42,014  | 42,014  |
| Repayable capital+Islamic commission                                  |           | 58,820  | 58,820  | ... | 58,820  | 58,820  |
| Available cash flow   |           | 62,650  | 77,999  | ... | 47,302  | 47,302  |
| NPV (€)   | 0         |         |         |     |         |         |
| IRR (%)   | 5         |         |         |     |         |         |
| DSCR  | -         | 1.07    | 1.33    | ... | 0.80    | 0.80    |
| LLCR  | -         | 1.14    | 1.15    | ... | 0.81    | 0.81    |
| ADSCR   | 1.09      |         |         |     |         |         |
| ALLCR   | 0.95      |         |         |     |         |         |

Source: Own elaboration. EBITDA: Earnings before interest, taxes, depreciation and amortization, NPV: Net present value, IRR: Internal rate of return, DSCR: Debt service cover ratio, LLCR: Loan life cover ratio, ADSCR: Annual debt service cover ratio, ALLCR: Annual loan life cover ratio, EBT: Earnings before taxes

**Table 5: WACC sensitivity analysis results**

| Wind farm building cost (€) | Equity (%) | Annual payment (€) | WACC (%) | NPV (€) | Δ NPV (€) | IRR (%) | ADSCR | ALLCR |
|-----------------------------|------------|--------------------|----------|---------|-----------|---------|-------|-------|
| 1,215,000                   | 33         | 57,050             | 3        | 184,001 | +145,425  | 5.64    | 1.15  | 0.99  |
| 1,215,000                   | 33         | 57,050             | 4        | 106,219 | +67,643   | 5.64    | 1.15  | 1.00  |
| 1,215,000                   | 33         | 57,050             | 5        | 38,576  | -         | 5.64    | 1.15  | 1.00  |
| 1,215,000                   | 33         | 57,050             | 6        | -20,407 | -58,983   | 5.64    | 1.15  | 1.01  |
| 1,215,000                   | 33         | 57,050             | 7        | -71,569 | -110,145  | 5.64    | 1.15  | 1.01  |

Source: Own elaboration. NPV: Net present value, IRR: Internal rate of return, ADSCR: Annual debt service cover ratio, ALLCR: Annual loan life cover ratio, WACC: Weighted average cost of capital

independent, not considering any government incentives, evidencing how a significant reduction of the initial investment costs will be the main force for the development of wind energy, because it is a capital-intensive technology (Campisi et al., 2016).

This study can represent a wide variety of possible scenarios and could be useful to perform a comparative evaluation of alternatives that makes investment attractive. Also, it could be useful in shaping government policies to reward those systems reducing GHG emissions and that provide a valuable contribution to contain the negative effects of climate change particularly regarding the reduction of GHG emissions (Kanudia et al., 2013). In fact, incentives, are at the state of the art still key factors in meeting the EU 2020 objectives (Campisi et al., 2015). Academic studies, like this presented, can highlight the sustainability criteria

and applicability constraints of the Islamic finance instruments in different contexts, but effective interactions of economic agents and professionals with policy makers, utility decision makers, investors and consulting services, is crucial to obtain an effective introduction of such instruments in the global financial system. Familiarity of conventional investors and companies with Islamic finance instruments increased in the past few years (Bokhari, 2000; Goud, 2007; Joliffe, 2003). However, the extent of the standardization of such structures and support from governments of non-Muslim countries, also by means of tax reduction, is still limited (Musse et al., 2015). Features like asset-backing, bans on uncertainty and interest, and risk and profit sharing makes the Islamic finance instruments tied to a tangible and identifiable asset, and therefore more resilient and sustainable (Askari et al., 2012; Gharbi, 2016; Hanif, 2016; Salim et al., 2016).

## REFERENCES

- Adelekan, S., Wamuziri, S., Binsardi, B. (2013), Evaluation of Islamic financing products for housing and infrastructure development. In: Proceedings of 29<sup>th</sup> Annual Association of Researchers in Construction Management (ARCOM) Conference, Reading, United Kingdom. September, 2-4. p191-200.
- Ahmad, M. (2008), Sub-Prime Crisis from Islamic Commercial Law Perspective. Kuala Lumpur: Social Science Research Network.
- Askari, H., Iqbal, Z., Krichne, N., Mirakhor, A. (2012), Risk Sharing in Finance - The Islamic Finance Alternative. Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.
- Aydin, N. (2011), The 2008 financial crisis: A moral crisis of capitalism. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(22), 8697-8706.
- Bacha, O.I. (2013), Risk management, derivatives and shariah compliance. *AIP Conference Proceedings*, 1522(1), 17-28.
- Beck, T., Demircuc-Kunt, A., Merrouche, O. (2010), Islamic vs. Conventional Banking. Business Model, Efficiency and Stability. Policy Research Working Paper, 5446. Washington, DC: The World Bank.
- Biondi, T., Moretto, M. (2015), Solar grid parity dynamics in Italy: A real option approach. *Energy*, 80, 293-302.
- Blanco, M.I. (2009), The economics of wind energy. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 13(6), 1372-1382.
- Bokhari, F. (2000), Investors Find A Benchmark - Islamic Mutual Funds. *Financial Times*.
- Campisi, D., Nastasi, A. (1993), Capital usage and output growth in multiregional multisectoral models: An application to the Italian case. *Regional Studies*, 27(1), 13-27.
- Campisi, D., Costa, R. (2008), *Economia Applicata All'ingegneria - Analisi Degli Investimenti e Project Financing*. Rome: Carocci.
- Campisi, D., Costa, R., Mancuso, P., Morea, D. (2014), *Principi di Economia Applicata all'Ingegneria - Metodi, Complementi ed Esercizi*. Milan: Hoepli.
- Campisi, D., Morea, D., Farinelli, E. (2015), Economic sustainability of ground mounted photovoltaic systems: An Italian case study. *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, 9(2), 156-175.
- Campisi, D., Gitto, S., Morea, D. (2016), Effectiveness of incentives for wind energy: Models and empirical evidences from an Italian case study. *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management*, 11(2), 39-48.
- Campisi, D., Gitto, S., Morea, D. (2017), Light emitting diodes technology in public light system of the municipality of Rome: An economic and financial analysis. *International Journal of Energy Economics and Policy*, 7(1), 200-208.
- Chase, J. (2012), Breakthroughs in solar power, Bloomberg New Energy Finance. Available from: [https://www.data.bloomberglp.com/bnef/sites/3/2013/11/BNEF\\_2012\\_03\\_19\\_University\\_Solar\\_Power.pdf](https://www.data.bloomberglp.com/bnef/sites/3/2013/11/BNEF_2012_03_19_University_Solar_Power.pdf). [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 14].
- Ciarreta, A., Espinosa, M.P., Pizarro-Irizar, C. (2014), Is green energy expensive? Empirical evidence from the Spanish electricity market. *Energy Policy*, 69, 205-215.
- Clò, S., Cataldi, A., Zoppoli, P. (2015), The merit-order effect in the Italian power market: The impact of solar and wind generation on national wholesale electricity prices. *Energy Policy*, 77, 79-88.
- Diaw, A. (2015), The global financial crisis and Islamic finance: A review of selected literature. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 6(1), 94-106.
- Ernst and Young. (2015), *World Islamic Banking Competitiveness Report 2016*. Available from: <http://www.ey.com/Publication/vwLUAssets/ey-world-islamic-banking-competitiveness-report-2016>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 14].
- European Commission. (2011), *Renewables Make the Difference*. Luxembourg: Publications Office of the European Union.
- European Commission. (2015), *Renewable Energy Progress Report COM (2015) 293 Final*. Brussels, 15/06/2015. Available from [http://www.eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:4f8722ce-1347-11e5-8817-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC\\_1&format=PDF](http://www.eur-lex.europa.eu/resource.html?uri=cellar:4f8722ce-1347-11e5-8817-01aa75ed71a1.0001.02/DOC_1&format=PDF). [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 01].
- Fang, E.S. (2014), Islamic finance in global markets: Materialism, ideas and the construction of financial knowledge. *Review of International Political Economy*, 21(6), 1170-1202.
- Farooq, M., Zaheer, S. (2015), Are Islamic banks more resilient during financial panics? *Pacific Economic Review*, 20(1), 101-124.
- Foley, A.M., Leahy, P.G., Li, K., McKeogh, E.J., Morrison, A.P. (2015), A long-term analysis of pumped hydro storage to firm wind power. *Applied Energy*, 137, 638-648.
- Gatti, S. (2012), *Project Finance in Theory and Practice*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Academic Press.
- Gerigk, J., Halbritter, K.S., Handgraaf, M.J.J., Manser, J., Ohndorf, M., Schubert, R. (2012), The current climate and energy policy in the EU and in Switzerland. Available from: <http://www.off4firms.ethz.ch/wp-content/uploads/2013/01/Off4Firms-Working-Paper-D1-3.pdf>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 31].
- Gharbi, L. (2016), A critical analysis of the use of fair value by Islamic financial institutions. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 7(2), 170-183.
- Goud, B. (2007), Dismay Over Hold-Up on Islamic Bonds. *Financial Times*, 11 October.
- GSE. (2016), *Tariffa omnicomprensiva*. Available from: <http://www.gse.it/it/Qualifiche%20e%20certificati/Tariffa%20omnicomprensiva/Pages/default.aspx>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].
- GSE. (2016a), *Evoluzione del conto energia*. Available from: <http://www.gse.it/it/conto%20energia/fotovoltaico/Evoluzione%20del%20Conto%20Energia/Pages/default.aspx>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].
- GSE. (2016b), *Simplified Purchase and Resale Arrangements*. Available from: [http://www.gse.it/en/ridssp/SimplifiedPurchaseandResaleArrangements\(RID\)/Pages/default.aspx](http://www.gse.it/en/ridssp/SimplifiedPurchaseandResaleArrangements(RID)/Pages/default.aspx). [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].
- GSE. (2016c), *Incentivi DM 23 Giugno, 2016*. Available from: <http://www.gse.it/it/Qualifiche%20e%20certificati/DM%2023%20giugno%202013/Pagine/default.aspx>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].
- Gheeraert, L., Weill, L. (2015), Does Islamic banking development favor macroeconomic efficiency? Evidence on the Islamic finance-growth Nexus. *Economic Modelling*, 47, 32-39.
- Green, R., Vasilakos, N. (2011), The economics of offshore wind. *Energy Policy*, 39, 496-502.
- Gu Choi, D., Yong Park, S., Park, N.B., Chul Hong, J. (2015), Is the concept of 'grid parity' defined appropriately to evaluate the cost-competitiveness of renewable energy technologies? *Energy Policy*, 86, 718-728.
- Haas, R., Resch, G., Panzer, C., Busch, S., Ragwitz, M., Held, A. (2011), Efficiency and effectiveness of promotion systems for electricity generation from renewable energy sources - Lessons from EU countries. *Energy*, 36, 2186-2193.
- Hayat, R., Kraeussl, R. (2011), Risk and return characteristics of Islamic equity funds. *Emerging Markets Review*, 12(2), 189-203.
- Hanif, M. (2016), Economic substance or legal form: An evaluation of Islamic finance practice. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 9(2), 277-295.
- Hussain, M., Shahmoradi, A., Turk, R. (2016), An overview of Islamic finance. *Journal of International Commerce, Economics and Policy*, 7(1), 88-115.
- Ibrahim, M.Z., Yong, K.H., Ismail, M., Albani, A., Muzathik, A.M. (2014), Wind characteristics and gis-based spatial wind mapping study in Malaysia. *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management*, 9(2), 1-20.

- Ismail, A.G. (2010), Islamic banks and wealth creation. Research Paper No. 9/2010, International Shari'ah Research Academy for Islamic Finance (ISRA).
- Jensen, N.C. (2008), Avoiding another subprime mortgage bust through greater risk and profit sharing and social equity in home financing. *Arizona Journal of International and Comparative Law*, 25(3), 825-855.
- Joliffe, A. (2003), Double burden of stamp duty to be eliminated. *Financial Times*, 9 April.
- Kammer, A., Norat, M., Piñón, M., Prasad, A., Towe, C., Zeidane, Z., IMF Staff Team. (2015), Islamic finance: Opportunities, challenges and policy options. IMF Staff Discussion Note SDN/15/05, International Monetary Fund.
- Kanudia, A., Gerboni, R., Loulou, R., Gargiulo, M., Labriet, M. (2013), Modelling EU-GCC energy systems and trade corridors: Long term sustainable, clean and secure scenarios. *International Journal of Energy Sector Management*, 7(2), 243-268.
- Kaplan, Y.A. (2015), Overview of wind energy in the world and assessment of current wind energy policies in Turkey. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 43, 562-568.
- Karim, R.A.A., Archer, S. (2002), *Islamic Finance: Innovation and Growth*. London: Euromoney Books & AAOIFI.
- Kjærland, F. (2007), A Real option analysis of investments in hydropower—the case of Norway. *Energy Policy*, 35, 5901-5908.
- Kordvani, A. (2009), A legal analysis of the Islamic bonds (sukuk) in Iran. *International Journal of Islamic and Middle Eastern Finance and Management*, 2(4), 323-337.
- Koyama, M. (2010), Evading the 'Taint of Usury': The usury prohibition as a barrier to entry. *Explorations in Economic History*, 47(4), 420-442.
- Lai, J. (2015), Industrial policy and Islamic finance. *New Political Economy*, 20(2), 178-198.
- López Mejía, A., Aljabrin, S., Awad, R., Norat, M., Song, I. (2014), Regulation and Supervision of Islamic Banks. IMF Working Paper WP/14/219, International Monetary Fund.
- Malizia, A., Poggi, L.A., Ciparisse, J.F., Rossi, R., Bellecci, C., Gaudio, P. (2016), A review of dangerous dust in fusion reactors: From its creation to its resuspension in case of LOCA and LOVA. *Energies*, 9(8), 578.
- Manaf, U.A., Markom, R., Mohd Ali, H., Abdul Rahim Merican, R.M., Hassim, J.Z., Mohamad, N. (2014), The development of Islamic finance alternative dispute resolution framework in Malaysia. *International Business Management*, 8(1), 1-6.
- Markom, R., Ali, E.R.A., Hasan, A. (2012), The current practices of Islamic build operate transfer (BOT) financing contracts: A legal analysis. *Pertanika Journal of Social Science and Humanities*, 20, 73-85.
- Maurer, B. (2010), Form versus substance: AAOIFI projects and Islamic fundamentals in the case of sukuk. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 1(1), 32-41.
- Metwally, M. (1997), Economic consequences of applying Islamic principles in Muslim societies. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 24(7/8/9), 941-953.
- Mondol, A.D., Hillenbrand, S.K. (2013), Grid parity analysis of solar photovoltaic systems in Europe. *International Journal of Ambient Energy*, 31(3), 1-11.
- Monjas-Barroso, M., Balibrea-Iniesta, J. (2013), Valuation of projects for power generation with renewable energy: A comparative study based on real regulatory options. *Energy Policy*, 55, 335-352.
- Morea, D. (2005), Le imposte societarie e le scelte di finanziamento delle imprese. *Economia Società e Istituzioni*, 17(3), 433-476.
- Morea, D., Poggi, L.A. (2017), Islamic finance and renewable energy: An innovative model for the sustainability of investments. In: *Proceedings of the International Annual IEEE Conference of AEIT*, Capri, Italy, October, 5-7.
- Musse, O.S.H., Echchabi, A., Aziz, H.A. (2015), Islamic and conventional behavioral finance: A critical review of literature. *Journal of King Abdulaziz University: Islamic Economics*, 28(2), 249-266.
- Muzathik, A.M., Ibrahim, M.Z., Samo, K.B., Wan Nik, W.B. (2012), Assessment and characterisation of renewable energy resources: A case study in Terengganu, Malaysia. *Journal of Sustainability Science and Management*, 7(2), 220-229.
- Nienhaus, V. (2011), Islamic finance ethics and Shari' ah law in the aftermath of the crisis: Concept and practice of Shari' ah compliant finance. *Ethical Perspectives*, 18(4), 591-623.
- Pacesila, M., Burcea, S.G., Colesca, S.E. (2016), Analysis of renewable energies in European union. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 56, 156-170.
- Perry, F.V., Rehman, S.S. (2011), Globalization of Islamic finance: Myth of reality? *International Journal of Humanities and Social Science*, 1(19), 107-119.
- Poggi, L.A., Singh, K. (2016), Thermal degradation capabilities of modified bio-chars and fluid cracking catalyst (FCC) for acetic acid. *Biomass and Bioenergy*, 90, 243-251.
- Rarasati, A.D., Trigunaryah, B., Too, E. (2014), The opportunity for implementing Islamic project financing to the Indonesian infrastructure development. *Contemporary Studies in Economic and Financial Analysis*, 95, 103-116.
- Salim, B.F., Mahmoud, M.H. (2016), Islamic finance: Is it a time to be considered as an alternative during financial crisis times? A comparative study in gulf cooperation council. *International Journal of Economics and Financial Issues*, 6(3), 1123-1131.
- Song, I., Oosthuizen, C. (2014), Islamic banking regulation and supervision: Survey results and challenges. IMF Working Paper WP/14/220, International Monetary Fund.
- Sgroi, F., Tudisca, S., Di Trapani, A.M., Testa, R., Squatrito, R. (2014), Efficacy and Efficiency of Italian energy policy: The case of PV systems in greenhouse farms. *Energies*, 7(6), 3985-4001.
- Squatrito, R., Sgroi, F., Tudisca, S., Di Trapani, A.M., Testa, R. (2014), Post feed-in scheme photovoltaic system feasibility evaluation in Italy: Sicilian case studies. *Energies*, 7(11), 7147-7165.
- Suzuki, Y., Uddin, S.M.S. (2016), Recent trends in Islamic banks lending modes in Bangladesh: An evaluation. *Journal of Islamic Accounting and Business Research*, 7(1), 28-41.
- Tahir, S. (2007), Islamic banking theory and practice: A survey and bibliography of the 1995-2005 literature. *Journal of Economic Cooperation*, 28(1), 1-72.
- Taylor, J.M. (2002), Islamic banking the feasibility of establishing an Islamic bank in the United States. *American Business Law Journal*, 40(2), 385-414.
- Terna. (2014), Dati statistici sull'energia elettrica in Italia 2014. Available from: <http://www.terna.it>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 10].
- The Economist Newspaper Limited. (2014), Big interest no interest. Available from: <http://www.economist.com/news/finance-and-economics/21617014-market-islamic-financial-products-growing-fast-big-interest-no-interest>. [Last accessed on 2016 Oct 27].
- Thusen, G.J., Fabrych, W.J. (1993), *Engineering Economy*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- Warde, I. (2010), *Islamic Finance in the Global Economy*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.
- Islamic project finance, N.A., Ahmad, M., Umar, A.A., Khamidi, M.F., Idrus, A. (2014), Financing PF2 projects: Opportunities for Islamic project finance. *Procedia Engineering*, 77, 179-187.