



MinLand: Mineral resources in sustainable land-use planning

A H2020 Project

Topic: SC5-15d - Linking land use planning policies to national mineral policies

Deliverable: D3.1 Framework for case studies

Authors: Carvalho Jorge M. F.¹, Figueira Maria João², Lisboa José Vitor¹ and Dinis Paula C.², Luodes Nike M.³, Arvidsson Ronald⁴, Arvanitidis Nikolaos⁴, Berger Gerald⁸, Endl Andreas⁸, Gugerell Katharina⁶, Murguia Diego⁷, Raaness Agnes⁵, Schiellerup Henrik⁵, Stanley Gerry⁹, Tost Michael⁶, Wertichová Blažena⁷ and WP3 task 3.1 Working Group:

Arranz-González Julio César¹²; Barnes Jerry¹⁹, Berne Sybil¹⁹, Delgado-Arenas Pedro¹², Fernández-Naranjo Francisco Javier¹²; Forsgren Anders¹⁴, Hatzilazaridou Kiki¹⁶, Koivuhuhta Auri¹, Kot-Niewiadomska Alicja¹¹, Krzysztof Galos¹¹, Långbacka Bo O.¹, Langendoen Magnus¹³, Marasmi Christian¹⁵, Van der Meulen Michiel¹⁰, Van der Sluis Theo¹⁰, Panagiotopoulou Chrysa¹⁸, Rauhala Jarmo E.¹, Rodríguez-Gómez Virginia¹², Torppa O.Akseli¹, Tuomela Pekka¹, Vadillo-Fernández Lucas¹², Witteman Tessa¹⁰, Åkerhammar Peter⁴

¹LNEG Laboratório Nacional de Energia e Geologia I.P., Portugal (Task 3.1 leaders)

²DGEG Direção Geral de Energia e Geologia, Portugal (Task 3.1 leaders)

³GTK Geological Survey of Finland, Finland (WP3 leader – case studies of land use planning in exploration and mining)

⁴SGU Sveriges Geologiska Undersökning, Sweden (Project coordinator)

⁵NGU Norges Geologiske Undersøkelse, Norway (WP2 leader – land use planning policies and practices)

⁶MUL Montanuniversität Leoben, Austria (WP4 leader- Land use practices, valorisation and valuation of geological and societal data and civil society impacts)

⁷Minpol GmbH, Agency for International Minerals Policy, Austria (WP5 leader – Common framework for natural resource planning)

⁸WU, Wirtschaftsuniversität Wien, Austria (WP6 leader – Practitioner guidelines and peer – learning)

⁹GSI Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment (Task leader in WP6- Case synthesis and preparation of Good Practice Guidance documents)

¹⁰TNO, Nederlandse Organisatie voor Toegepast Natuurwetenschappelijk Onderzoek Tno

¹¹Polska Akademia Nauk Instytut Gospodarki Surowcami Mineralnymi i Energia, MEERI PAS, Poland

¹²Instituto Geológico y Minero de España IGME Sp, Spain

¹³Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten LV, Sweden

¹⁴Boliden Mineral AB, Sweden

¹⁵Regione Emilia Romagna RER Italy

¹⁶Institutouto Geologikon Kai Metalleftikon Erevnon IGME Gr, Greece

¹⁷Industrial Minerals Association Europe IMA

¹⁸National Technical University of Athens – NTUA, Greece

¹⁹MacCabe Durney Barnes Ltd MDB, Ireland

Published: March 2018 - Updated: 24 May 2018 - Corrected 6 December.2019





Table of Contents

MinLand: Mineral resources in sustainable land-use planning..... 1

A H2020 Project..... 1

Topic: SC5-15d - Linking land use planning policies to national mineral policies 1

 Deliverable: D3.1 Framework for case studies 1

 Introduction 3

 Framework conditions 3

 Country specific conditions 4

 Analysis and Good practice perspectives of WP4, WP5 and WP6 4

 Survey’s terminology..... 5

Instruction for performing the Case Study 7

The case study is analysed through an initial description of the case, using as a support the tables 1, 2 7

 Table 1- Case Study Identification..... 7

 Table 2- Case study description 8

 Table 6 : Identification and characterisation of case aspects relevant for peer learning and good practice learning..... 9

 Table 3- Part of the SURVEY to the AUTHORITIES/ and industry or industry’s representative relevant for the CASES..... 11

 Table 4: Survey for case owner. This part is addressed to the company, in case of a permit application or concession; or to a local dev. authority, in case of regional planning cases.... 15

 Table 5: The case analysed by the point of view of the communities, stakeholders, addressed to associations 16



Introduction

Work Package 3 (WP3) of MinLand project will use selected case studies to explore the relationship between the minerals industry and government bodies responsible for land use planning. The results of this exercise will be used to understand how minerals policy is integrated into land use planning policy, regulations and guidance across Europe. The achievements will be further developed in other project actions to build up proposals for good practices on safeguarding resources and ensuring subsequent improved utilization of mineral raw materials throughout EU Member States in the future. The aim is to extract information that can be used to identify case study aspects of good practice for mineral and land use policy integration in a wider sense, practice legislation, practical procedures and necessary conditions for data and other supportive structures. The good practice is here defined as practices that find solutions for mineral extraction when several land uses are present in an efficient and timely order, minimizing time for permitting and allowing extraction, however taking into consideration that other land uses exists, and affected parties INVOLVED. Thus, a so-called sustainable land-use is the goal.

This deliverable developed a framework of analytical criteria applied to case studies to ensure that each one will contribute to highlight the basic principles and guidance of current land use planning systems, as well as the differences in decision making processes across EU Member States. Special attention will be given to how mineral raw materials' and mining industries' land use functionality connects to mineral and land use policies, legislations and permitting procedures at national, regional and local levels:

- Case studies will cover past and current exploration, extractive and quarrying sites and mining projects.
- Cases studies will cover different resource types from metallic and industrial minerals to construction materials.
- Cases studies will bring up specificities of the mineral sector including surface and sub-surface exploration and exploitation.
- Cases studies will identify competing land-use settings and aspects such as densely populated areas, city planning, indigenous people, sites of natural or cultural heritage, agriculture, forestry and nature conservation (e.g. Natura 2000, Natural Parks).

Case studies reporting challenges and achievements regarding integration of mineral resources in land use planning processes across Europe are the base for the formulation of good practices. Stakeholder consultation will help to identify relevant issues not covered by the case studies.

The presented framework will be focus for scrutiny and development by the MinLand consortium as new information arise from the case studies and partners. Therefore, the below template questionnaire is a template to be adopted to local conditions by each partner elaborating on case studies.

Framework conditions

WP 3 is going to collect information about relevant selected cases that cover the different life stage of mineral resource development: pre-exploration stage, exploration, exploitation and rehabilitation. These address land use planning, permitting processes - as land use issues regarding mineral exploration and extraction are strongly related to operative permitting procedures - mining/quarrying, processing, refining.... When analysing minerals and land use policies linkage, MinLand has recognised the following main cornerstones that are the basis to approach the case studies:

- Pre exploration/ Planning phase: the phase in which adequate geological and land use information is being produced and made available to support mineral resource and land use planning policies.
- During the permitting phase for mineral exploration and prospecting.
- During permitting for mining and overall exploitation (Concession, Licensing, or other legal procedures).
- During post-closure management and rehabilitation.

How the land use is related to these activities will be investigated to understand the context of land use conflicts.



The interactions between mineral resource development and land use planning are pointed out to understand existing classification schemes and valuation of the economic, social and environmental dimensions included in land use planning strategies and procedures.

Country specific conditions

The legal and institutional conditions play an important part for case study elaboration and, thus, must further be viewed within the country specific legislations. Here MinLand, recognizes at least three main different existing clusters of legal systems. Within the EU it is also understood that national and regional legislation may differ to a smaller or larger extent. The example below is to highlight for the consortium and the stakeholders the need to understand the context within which land use issues are to be defined within the EU and EEA.

- Civil law systems with highly codified laws based upon Napoleonic or German law.
- Common law systems of Ireland and the UK.
- Scandinavian law of the Scandinavian countries and Finland which consists of framework legislation where law may be set in courts but with strong influences of civil law.

Since land use and permitting procedures are coupled with the legislation at hand we recognize that single countries have their own singularities to be explored and cases must be approached accordingly. Therefore, the below questions may require modifications regarding the legal and policy context however also whether the questions are directed towards industry, authorities and other stakeholders.

Analysis and Good practice perspectives of WP4, WP5 and WP6

The role of civil society in land use practices is an aspect that is explored. These will be re-addressed with various aspects within WP4 and WP5, to provide in depth analysis of key elements in land use practice, including valuation, mineral classification schemes, civil society participation in mineral extraction activities and land use planning.

Regarding characterization and safeguarding of mineral resources, motivations, valuation, implementation measures are addressed. Furthermore goals, purposes and motivation of various stakeholders related to mineral resources, land use, and relevant policy making/influence are evaluated. These aspects will also be elaborated within WP4 and WP5 to bring safeguarding of mineral resources into the broader sustainable development context.

The cases will be analysed to identify obstacles and solutions encountered to point out good practice aspects. The good practice stream includes:

- A) assessment of the required data and how these have been used in policy formulation and land use planning
- B) identify actual and evaluate potential land uses
- C) assessment of the values applied to select the land use, evaluating if the minerals have been addressed on equal footing as other land uses
- D) assessment on how and to what level land use and mineral policies have been integrated – specifically how minerals can be extracted
- E) assessment of how transparent the respective land use planning process has been
- F) assessment of INSPIRE Directive compliance
- G) assessment of how and to what extent societal aspects have been considered and whether civil society has been involved in the decision making processes (social license)
- H) assessment to what degree strategic aspects of protecting mineral resources (safeguarding) have been considered

The good practice streams will inform the development and structure of a fit-for-purpose, good practice guidance document and facilitate case learning and exchange among practitioners in WP6.

WP3 will also involve selected local stakeholders to compile the case information and to promote public and industry awareness. In selected countries stakeholders will be involved in local workshops. This engagement effort will



contribute to WP7 activity that creates a network among stakeholders, and cluster with other relevant EU Horizon 2020 projects.

Therefore, to provide inputs for the other activities of the project the stages in which mineral resources / mining activity interact with land use planning are analysed using analytical criteria relating to:

- The Minerals and Land Use policies.
- The value and the strategic public importance of mineral resources compared to other natural resources
- The competing land use planning and minerals safeguarding strategies.
- The Stakeholders involvement in land use planning (not the Social License to Operate a mine, but rather the influence of civil society and mining industry in land use planning decisions, requirements for indigenous people, etc.) and transparency of the land use planning process.
- The resolution of conflicts during land use planning, e.g., not given that one type of land use always will stop other land uses like mineral exploration and extraction.

The case studies will complement WP 2 where compilation of information on legislation and policy is the main component but within WP3 the focus is upon how these aspects affect actual cases of exploration and exploitation permitting, and the minerals and land use policies design and implementation. Information gathered within WP3 will be stored within the MinLand data base (WP 2).

Survey's terminology

Some common (but non-formalised) concepts:

CRM: List of critical raw materials for the EU, created by the European Commission, which is subject to a regular review and update (it can be found here: <https://ec.europa.eu/transparency/regdoc/rep/1/2017/EN/COM-2017-490-F1-EN-MAIN-PART-1.PDF>). The list included 27 critical raw materials: Antimony, Baryte, Beryllium, Bismuth, Borate, Cobalt, Coking coal, Fluorspar, Gallium, Germanium, Hafnium, Helium, Indium, Magnesium, Natural graphite, Natural rubber, Niobium, Phosphate rock, Phosphorous, Scandium, Silicon metal, Tantalum, Tungsten, Vanadium, Platinum Group Metals, Heavy Rare Earth Elements, Lights Rare Earth Elements.

EXPLOITATION: Integrated extraction, processing, and refining of mineral resources to produce mineral raw commodities.

GOVERNANCE: All formal and informal arrangements and institutions to establish, implement and monitor policies and legislation.

LAND USE PLANNING: A branch of public policy seeking to order and regulate the use of land in an efficient way

LEGISLATION: The action or process of making governmental (national, federal, regional or local) laws, regulations, decrees, etc. aiming at the relationships within the administrative public institutions and between those institutions and the individuals by establishing rules, obligations, procedures, etc.

MINERALS: The same as Mineral Resources when referred to in policy and economic contexts.

MINERAL RESOURCE: A concentration or occurrence of solid material of economic interest in or on the Earth's crust in such form, grade or quality and quantity that there are reasonable prospects for eventual economic extraction. It includes undiscovered and identified resources. Their relative economic interest may be classified according specific schemes of common usage (UNFC, PERC, JORC, etc.).

MINERAL RESERVE: the economically mineable part of a Mineral Resource.

MINERALS SAFEGUARDING: The same as Mineral Resources Protection. The act, process or procedure of ensuring that areas containing, or potentially containing, mineral resources are not occupied by other uses that may prevent their future extraction, including the places for installing mining/quarrying infrastructures.



MINERAL STERILISATION: The loss of or disruption to access to mineral resources due to the use of land for the development of activities that prevent their exploration or extraction.

MINERALS VALUE: The same as Mineral Reserves Value. It refers to the intrinsic value of the mineral resources, but taking into account the environmental, social, techno-economical, market and other components, which are the Modifying Factors in the Mineral Resources classification codes. It is not applicable to undiscovered mineral resources.

NEEI: Non-energy extractive industry.

ONE-STOP-SHOP: A public administration facilitating a full-service operation, allowing multiple authorisation and permitting requirements to be met in one place.

POLICY: Public documents presenting the principles and/or strategic governmental approaches (national, regional or local) for a specific topic. Policies show goals and planned activities, and eventually will need implementation of pieces of legislation to be effective. It must be taken into account that some countries distinguish between Policy and Legislation (e.g. National Strategy for Sustainable Development is a policy document. Legislation related to environmental protection, land use planning, etc., must comply with that policy).

SPATIAL DATA: The data or information that identifies the geographic location of features on Earth. The same as geospatial data or geographic information.



Instruction for performing the Case Study

The case study is analysed through an initial description of the case, using as a support the tables 1, 2

The questions are driving for getting deep informations on how the system works, they are generic to allow to be fit for different jurisdictions and practises in mineral and land use cases of exploration, mining and quarrying, but answers should describe in detail the systems and the interactions between minerals and land planning

Table 1- Case Study Identification

| | |
|---|--|
| (Case title) | |
| (Country) | |
| (Responsible Partner) | |
| Type of mineral resources? (distinguish primary commodities and associated commodities ; e.g. primary: kaolin, sub-product: silica sand; primary: Cu & Zn, sub-product: Au, Ge). Are the minerals (elements) part of the EU CRM list of 2017? | |
| Is the case about exploration/undiscovered resources, exploitation, rehabilitation or about pre-exploration legislative land use planning procedures encompassing all the stages? | |
| Is the case about open-pit or underground mining, both or not applicable? | |
| Which is the scale that the case addresses: local, regional, national, transboundary, multi-scale or other? Please (a) describe and (b) explain. | |
| Extents of the project (km2) or not applicable? | |
| Company or companies involved (identify) or Not Applicable? | |
| Are the mineral resources private and/or public owned? (e.g. minerals are state-owned and a concession is given to companies under the conditions xxx, minerals are private-owned, ...) | |



Table 2- Case study description

Guidance Note: The partner is in charge of making an accurate description about the evolution of the case over time within the context, finding out and thinking about the aspects listed. This is centred only on the case.

| |
|--|
| <p>Please make a description of the case taking into account</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Case description step by step explaining the development of the case in the area - evolution over time - permitting stages involved and other aspects like EIA, SEA, environmental permit, social aspects , stakeholders, and the role of responsible institutions involved - Specific aspects not mentioned in the case study identification - describe also to the level of expertise regarding geology and mining involved throughout the process - describe if and how the case has been affected by the context: Framework conditions (Describe the external (non-case internal) factors that facilitated the development of the case (aspects that influence the development of the case in a negative or positive way (i.e. good networking between stakeholders, civil society involvement, informal talks...)) - Problems encountered and Impacts achieved. Nordic countries focus also throughout the report on the level of involvement of reindeer herders and Sami communities in land use planning. |
|--|

Guidance Note (table below): WP 2 addresses the national level of legislation, WP2 does not cover permitting. In this table we want to explore the specific frame of the case study. This might be multi-scale. We want to understand how the system works, how the legislative and administrative procedures are interacting between each-other at different levels, how the local level is affected. MinLand partners answer according to own expertise, if they feel that they cannot provide the informations, they find the right expert to provide the needed information- the area of expertise required is within mining authority and land planning authority issues. (Contact information handled and stored according to MinLand procedures- contacts are verified for quality control)

Make a brief description of how current mineral resources legislative and administrative procedures interact with land use planning legislative and administrative procedures. The need is to explore and understand the relations between minerals and land use planning

| | |
|--|--|
| <p>Consult Experties in LAND USE PLANNING AUTHORITY issues if needed</p> | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Describe how are minerals enters into land use – also including policy/legislative developments- brief description of the system <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Top-down or a bottom-up approach (Top-down: the national plan provides a framework which is then detailed in regional and local plans; Bottom-up: land use is formulated at local level and then aggregated into consecutive upper levels, or mixed?) - Horizontal or vertical process (Horizontal: integrating all the several planning aspects at a specific administrative level; Vertical: integration of all the aspects of a specific sector through all administrative levels – Sectoral Planning. e.g. Natura2000 Sectoral Plan Mineral/mining and land-use objectives and needs are identified, actions identified - check if , how and when Strategic Environmental Assessment (SEA) including social impact assessment are applied, and if it is addressed the relationship between minerals and land use, and in which terms - Description of measures and procedures for protection or safeguarding of mineral resources / if there are procedures to identify relative priorities of mining compared to other policy dimensions such as land-use planning - existing land use sectoral plans for mineral resources |
|--|--|



| | |
|---|--|
| <p>Consult Expert in MINING AUTHORITY issues if needed</p> | <p>Issues related to the permitting for mineral resources.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Existing types of permitting according to the ownership of mineral resources (e.g. permits for private-owned minerals versus state-owned minerals) - Existing types of permitting according to the minerals value chain stage (i.e. exploration, mining, processing, refining, rehabilitation) - Description of national, regional, local procedures. Reporting requirements, scheduled evaluations |
| | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - describe if Environmental Impact Assessment is applied and at which stages and spatial scales - within all the description specify the steps/procedures and authorities and levels involved - describe also at which level and for which scope the Civil society is involved |
| <p><i>Guidance Note (table below): Answer about the case and its area, but this part provides also a possibility of collecting new inputs on other experiences</i></p> | |
| <p>Please make a description of the main conflicting land uses with minerals' life cycle's land use, existing conflicts and resolution measures, not forgetting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Type of land uses involved (e.g. Natura2000 or other nature conservation areas, densely populated area, agriculture, forestry, civil infrastructures, reindeer herding.....); - possible conflicts between mining/minerals and other policy domains (specifying the scales) - Mineral resources permitting stage (i.e. exploration, extraction, remediation); - Authorities involved and communication/coordination between them (i.e for conflict mitigation) | |

After have performed the description of the case with the support of expertise in mining and land planning fields in case the partner does not possess the competence in the field, it is performed the interview to authorities, to the companies (if relevant), to the other identified stakeholders and community associations or other associations interested or affected by the case. It is not performed a survey person by person to the community. (Contact information handled and stored according to MinLand procedures- contacts are verified for quality control)

It is preferable to collect answers in form of an interview, in order to be able to go deeper in getting informations when it is seen that the answer got is too superficial for our scopes. **The table 3,4,5 are the base for questionnaire, Annex 1.** Many answers include descriptions and explanations to understand the systems and what is behind decisions. Table 3,4,5 are addressed to different groups that each MinLand partner proposing a case identify to answer about the case and the case's area.

After have collected the answers and have reported the basic description the MinLand partner that present the case should use own expertise to answer the questions in table 6. They are not standalone questions, but rather should be seen in the light of already acquired results from questions in table 1, 2, 3, 4 and 5. Thus, the questions below act as an "overlay" to the "analytical questions". These results need to be validated by the responsible MinLand partner elaborating the case (with support from WP 6), not the case owner (=person/organization who is involved in the case) to guarantee objectivity.

Table 6 : Identification and characterisation of case aspects relevant for peer learning and good practice learning

| | |
|--------------------------------|---|
| 6.1 Key success factors | <p>What were the internal case factors that contributed its success (e.g. actions taken by the institutions or decisions made during the life-time/process of the case; policy related: legislation or policy strategy, organisational: new institution created or altered institutional process etc.) and describe WHY they are considered as success factors.</p> |
|--------------------------------|---|



| | |
|---|---|
| <p>6.2 Problems encountered</p> | <p>Describe some short-comings, problems overcome or not-overcome during the case's life-time (i.e. In after-thought how would you have addressed the problem in hindsight, ex-post optimisation)</p> |
| <p>6.3 framework conditions/contextual factors</p> | <p>Describe the external factors that facilitated the development of the case (aspects that influence the development of the case in a negative or positive way; e.g. a positive SLO setting, a legislative instrument, changing economic development/commodity price etc.)</p> |
| <p>6.4 Impacts achieved</p> | <p>State in how far the case managed to reach its goal and achieve its anticipated impact on its intended beneficiaries/stakeholders. Potentially describe on which parts it could still improve.</p> |

During collection of information from other parties than MinLand partners it is essential deliver and have accepted the **Informed Consent form Annex 2**. The personal data will be stored according to MinLand D1.1. Data Management Plan.



ANNEX 1. Survey

Table 3- Part of the SURVEY to the AUTHORITIES/ and industry or industry's representative relevant for the CASES

| | Analytical Criteria | | |
|--|---|--|--|
| | 3.1 Are land use plans legally binding or simply indicative? | | |
| | 3.2 Usually, land use plans are subject to periodic review processes. What is the duration between reviews? Which are the reasons for renewal? | | |
| | 3.3 Is it possible to change the land use designation (e.g. from non-minerals to minerals designation) outside that periodicity? If YES, how long does it usually take? What are the necessary steps? Is this part of the process before exploration/extraction or part of the permitting process? | | |
| | 3.4 Is the protection or safeguarding of minerals mandatory, optional or not addressed , in the land use planning process? If it is optional, please describe what influences the decision and who makes the decisions | | |
| | 3.5 Is the designation of areas for minerals equivalent to mineral protection or safeguarding areas (<i>i.e. where there is inhibition for land uses that can hinder the extraction of minerals</i>) - explain? | | |
| | 3.6 Does land use planning consider the possibility of coexistence of multiple land uses relatively to the different stages of the minerals value chain? (<i>Explain the stages that allow it. Explain which kind of coexisting activities can be performed and if they would be changing their status from complementary to conflicting during evolution of the site (pre-exploration, exploration, exploitation, rehabilitation)</i>) | | |
| | 3.7 Does land use for minerals preclude other land uses? If Yes please explain (e.g. a mining concession may preclude other uses, but an exploration permit area does not) | | |
| | 3.8 Which kind of tools and at which level safeguarding of minerals in land use planning are performed? (Rules, zoning, both?) | | |



| | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| | 3.9 Does the permitting process consider the mining infrastructures/"Annexes" (buildings, tailings, roads, etc.)? if yes at which stage of prospecting/extraction and through which means. If not, explain. | | |
| | 3.10 Regarding the minerals information system and land use information system, is data INSPIRE compliant ¹ ? What type of information (<i>i.e. land use data and raw materials data</i>) is publicly available and where? | | |
| | 3.11 Please outline the ability/capacity (<i>i.e. expertise</i>) of land planning authorities for integration of mineral resources in the process of land use planning (<i>i.e. inter-disciplinary teams available, including geologists, technical support from other organisation departments/public administration</i>), networks and sharing of expertise between authorities? | | |
| | 3.12 Are there specific data-sharing or governance mechanisms for exchange of information between geological surveys, mining authorities and land use planning authorities? Please specify. | | |
| | 3.13 Is there adequate expertise involved in the land planning for minerals including data and tools: Are there specific GIS tools assisting the mining and land use planners? Is data adapted to GIS? | | |
| | 3.14 Is there a one-stop-shop for permits? If No, which are the obstacles? How is the one-stop shop organised? What are reasons in favour/against one stop shops | | |
| The Value | <p>3.15 Does the land use planning process designate areas for minerals considering the value of the minerals? and which values are considered?</p> <p>3.16 Are there different levels of reflecting the knowledge of the minerals (<i>i.e., is an area prospective (might have valuable minerals), is the deposit delineated, is it prospected etc.</i>)</p> <p>3.17 For prospected deposits are they determined according to the international reporting codes for classifying mineral resources? If Yes, please specify. Is the information on</p> | | |



| | | | |
|----------------|--|--|--|
| | <p>prospected deposits is publicly available and describe how it is used by different authorities</p> | | |
| | <p>3.18 When planning, is land designation for minerals weighted and evaluated against other land uses? How important are mining/mineral issues as compared to other local policy priorities (e.g., GDP growth, environment, housing, social/cultural, landscape/nature protection)? E.g. how are benefits and costs to the communities and environment evaluated when designating areas for minerals but also with respect to the societies need in terms of raw materials, jobs, stronger economy, etc.? How are different policy priorities weighed against each other and discussed in decision making, which evaluation criteria are used in the decision making process and which kind of data and information are often needed?</p> | | |
| The importance | <p>3.19 Which geological information is used by the authorities to decide whether an area has geological potential?</p> | | |
| | <p>3.20 Is there a need for new geological information in order to determine if an area/region is prospective, if there are unknown deposits?</p> | | |
| | <p>3.21 Is EU critical raw materials list being considered in land use planning and permitting decisions? If so how?</p> | | |
| | <p>3.22 Is there any assessment of the mineral resources so that it can be weighed against that of other natural resources? If Yes, please explain. Are there procedures identified to decide relative priorities of mineral resources compared to other policy aims</p> | | |
| | <p>3.23 Is there explicit weighting of mineral resources/objectives in terms of coordination, harmonization or prioritization? please describe.</p> | | |
| | <p>3.24 For the protection or safeguarding of minerals, is it mandatory to have some kind of assessment of their importance or socio-economic value/interest? (i.e. prospective/hypothetical resources are excluded from safeguarding).</p> | | |



| | | | |
|-----------|---|--|--|
| | 3.25 Are there and which are incentives to implement minerals into land use planning? | | |
| | 3.26 Outside of exploration areas, are the prospective/hypothetical resources safeguarded? If Yes, how? | | |
| Community | 3.27 Does the legal framework foresee land use conflict management procedures? If yes, describe | | |
| | 3.28 Which are the factors - from the most important to the least important - that influence land use designations? ³ | | |
| | 3.29 Has civil society including mining stakeholders been engaged in land use planning? If Yes, at what level (national, regional, local), at what stage of the process and is it mandatory? If No- why not? How are they involved in the planning process and in the decision making? (is it consultation, information, partnership, community control? – describe how procedures are set up and how are different actors involved) ² | | |
| | 3.30 How are the results of the public participation considered in the final decision on land use planning (<i>i.e. do they simply influence the decision or bind the decision</i>)? | | |
| | 3.31 How are environmental designations (<i>e.g. Natura 2000 sites</i>), <i>water protection areas, etc. dealt with? E.g. do they override all other possible uses of land or admit the coexistence with safeguarding of minerals?) (i.e. admits the coexistence of extractive activity)</i> . Which conflicts are occurring and how are they managed/mitigated? Who is involved in the conflict management? | | |

Note 1:INSPIRE Directive 2007/2/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 14 March 2007 establishing an Infrastructure for Spatial Information in the European Community (INSPIRE), entered into force on the 15th May 2007 and requires to be fully implemented by 2021.

Note 2: definition of consultation, information, partnership, community control
Level of Participation according to (Arnstein 1969, Hamdi & Goerthert, 1997; Wates, 2000, Horelli 2002). **Consultation.** Authorities are in charge of the project, but they ask opinions about the presented. The role of the community is that of an interest group **Information:** Authorities are still in charge, but one-way flow of information exists either as in- forming or retrieving data from the public, for instance, through surveys. The community is treated in the abstract. **Partnership.** Shared working and decision making with the authorities (not necessarily politicians in formally regulated planning cultures). The role of the community is that of stakeholders who have a stake in the project. **Community control.** The community (users and residents) decides and the experts or practitioners are used as resources

(Internal use - note 3: Answer 3.28- important to maintain during evaluation of the answers the knowledge of the person who answered, keep the answers disaggregated.)



Table 4: Survey for case owner. This part is addressed to the company, in case of a permit application or concession; or to a local dev. authority, in case of regional planning cases....

| | Pre-Exploration/ Planning phase | Permitting phase for exploration and prospecting | Permitting phase for exploitation | Post closure management/ Rehabilitation |
|---|------------------------------------|---|--------------------------------------|--|
| 4.1 Is the permitting process dependent on EIA? at what stages and what is included? | | | | |
| 4.2 Is there any assessment of the mineral resources value (economic interest)? Are international reporting codes for classifying mineral resources being used. | | | | |
| 4.3 Is there a formal decision-making / administrative process to assess the final use / designation of land? 4.4 How is transparency in the process implemented ? <i>(i.e. how are decisions communicated publicly, do authorities have to respond to...)</i> | | | | |
| 4.5 Does the application/case refer to an area addressed for minerals as a primary priority? If Yes, what are the possible secondary/coexistent uses? If Not, what is the primary use? | | | | |
| 4.6 Regarding the case study data, are these INSPIRE compliant? If yes, which kind of data and are public available and where? | | | | |
| 4.7 Before the case, was the land assigned to a different land use? If Yes, how and how long was the process to change the land use? A regular part of the application process or during the periodic land use review process or an exceptional modification process? | | | | |
| 4.8 Which have been the positive aspects perceived relatively to the case by the community? what have been the concerns? ³ | | | | |
| 4.9 If it was necessary to change the type of land use to be according to mineral land use, was there the need for implementation of additional land use regulations? If Yes, please explain. | | | | |



| | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|
| 4.10 If it was necessary to change the type of land use to be according to minerals use, which were the actions adopted in dealing with landowners and the society in general? | | | | |
| 4.11 Which were the benefits and costs to the communities from the boosting of new activities? | | | | |

Table 5: The case analysed by the point of view of the communities, stakeholders, addressed to associations

| | Pre-Exploration/ Planning phase | Permitting phase for exploration and prospecting | Permitting phase for exploitation | Post closure management/ Rehabilitation |
|---|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---|
| 5.1 Is there a formal decision-making / administrative process to assess the final use / designation of land? 5.2 How is transparency in the process implemented ? <i>(i.e. how are decisions communicated publicly, do authorities have to respond to...)</i> | | | | |
| 5.3 At what stage(s) is the community/ interested/affected parties involved? How have you been involved, was the level of involvement considered appropriate? a. How were the results of the participation process considered in the decision making? | | | | |
| 5.4 Was the project well accepted by the local communities - Which have been the concerns relatively to the case? what was well received? | | | | |
| 5.5 Which were the benefits and costs to the communities from the boosting of new activities? | | | | |
| 5.6 Are there any mandatory/voluntary compensation measures foreseen in the framework legislation procedures? a. If yes, please explain Are these perceived as adequate? b. if not , please explain why | | | | |
| 5.7 Were any mandatory and/or voluntary compensatory measures taken? a. If yes, please explain. b. Were these perceived as adequate by the company and by those compensated? | | | | |



| | | | | |
|---|--|--|--|--|
| 5.8 How are different policy priorities weighed against each other and discussed in decision making, which evaluation criteria are used in the decision making process and which kind of data and information are often needed | | | | |
| 5.9 How important are mining/mineral issues as compared to other local policy priorities (e.g., GDP growth, environment, housing, social/cultural, landscape/nature protection)?E.g. how are benefits and costs to the communities and environment evaluated when designating areas for minerals but also with respect to the societies need in terms of raw materials, jobs, stronger economy, etc.? ³ | | | | |

(Internal use - note 3: Answer 5.9- important to maintain during evaluation of the answers the knowledge of the person who answered, keep the answers disaggregated.)