

MinLand: Mineral resources in sustainable land-use planning

A H2020 ProjectH2020 Grant Agreement: GA 776679

Deliverable: D7.6 "Main conclusions of the Regional (or National or Local) Workshops"

Authors:

Ch. Panagiotopoulou¹, M. Taxiarchou², Sybil Berne², MacCabe Durney Barnes², Alicja Kot-Niewiadomska³, Sara Louise Gottenhuber⁴, Gerald Berger⁴, Katharina Gugerell⁵, Michael Tost⁵, Ronald Arvidsson⁶, Peter Åkerhammar⁶, Nike Luodes⁷, Agnes Raaness⁸, Joacim Jacobsson⁹, Magnus Langendoen⁹, Anders Forsgren¹⁰, Christian Marasmi¹¹, Virginia Rodríguez Gómez¹², Julio César Arranz González¹², Francisco Javier Fernández Naranjo ¹², José Vitor Lisboa¹³, Jorge Cavalho¹³, Maria João Figueira¹⁴, Paula Dinis¹⁴, Augusto Filipe¹³, Kyriaki Hatzilazaridou¹⁵, Foteini Halkiopoulou¹⁵, Katerina Adam¹

- ¹National Technical University of Athens (NTUA)
- ² Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI)
- ³Mineral and Energy Economy Research Intitute Polish Academy of Science
- ⁴Vienna University of Economics and Business (WU)
- ⁵Montanuniversität Leoben (MUL)
- ⁶Geological Survey of Sweden
- ⁷Finnish Geological Survey
- ⁸Norwegian Geological Survey
- ⁹County Adminsitrative Board of Sweden
- ¹⁰Boliden

¹¹ Emilia-Romagna Region, Soil and Coast protection and Land Reclamation Servie

1

- ¹²Geological Survey of Spain (IGME SP)
- ¹³ Geological Survey of Portugal (LNEG)
- ¹⁴ Direcção Geral de Energia e Geologia (DGEG)

¹⁵Geological Survey of Greece (IGME GR)

Published: January 2019

Updated:



Contents

Introduction	5
1. Local Workshop in Ireland	6
1.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop	6
1.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion	6
1.1.2 Local Workshop Design	6
1.1.3 Invitation	7
1.2 Local Workshop	9
1.2.1 Workshop programme	9
1.2.2 Presentation summaries	9
1.2.3 Round Tables	13
1.3 Workshop Conclusions	17
1.3.1 Audience statistics	17
1.3.2 Conclusions	19
2. Local workshop in Poland	20
2.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop	20
2.1.1 Tanics selected for Local Workshop Discussion	
2.1.2 Local Workshop Design	
2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation	
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop 	
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop 2.2.1 Workshop program 	20 21 22 22
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 	20 21 22 22 22 22
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 2.2.3 Round Tables 	20 21 22 22 22 22 22 22 23
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 2.2.3 Round Tables 2.2.4 Photos of the event 	20 21 22 22 22 22 22 23 23 25
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 2.2.3 Round Tables 2.2.4 Photos of the event 2.3 Workshop Conclusions 	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27 27
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27 27 27 27
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 25 27 27 27 27 30
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27 27 27 27 27 30 30
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop program 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 2.2.3 Round Tables 2.2.4 Photos of the event 2.3 Workshop Conclusions 2.3.1 Audience statistics 2.3.2 Conclusions 3.1 Local Workshop in Austria 3.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop 3.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27 27 27 27 27 27 30 30 30
 2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop program 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 2.2.3 Round Tables 2.2.4 Photos of the event 2.3 Workshop Conclusions 2.3.1 Audience statistics 2.3.2 Conclusions 3.1 Audience statistics 3.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop Discussion 3.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 3.1.2 Local Workshop Design 	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27 27 27 27 27 27 30 30 30 30 30 31
 2.1.1 Topics selected for total workshop Discussion 2.1.2 Local Workshop Design 2.1.3 Invitation 2.2 Local Workshop program 2.2.1 Workshop program 2.2.2 Presentation summaries 2.2.3 Round Tables 2.2.4 Photos of the event 2.3 Workshop Conclusions 2.3.1 Audience statistics 2.3.2 Conclusions 3.1 Local Workshop in Austria 3.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop 3.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 3.1.2 Local Workshop Design 3.1.3 Invitation 	20 21 22 22 22 22 23 23 25 27 27 27 27 27 27 27 30 30 30 30 30 30 31



3.2.1 Workshop program	35
3.2.2 Presentation summaries	37
3.2.3 Round Tables	40
3.3 Workshop Conclusions	45
3.3.1 Audience statistics	45
3.3.2 Conclusions	45
4. Scandinavian Workshop	47
4.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop	47
4.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion	47
4.1.2 Local Workshop Design	49
4.1.3 Invitation	49
4.2 Local Workshop	50
4.2.1 Workshop programme	50
4.2.2 Presentation summaries	52
4.2.3 Round Tables	52
4.3 Workshop	57
4.3.1 Audience statistics	57
4.3.2 Conclusions	57
5. Local Workshop at Emilia Romagna Region	58
5.1 Preparation for the Local Workshop	58
5.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion	58
5.1.2 Local Workshop Design	58
5.1.3 Invitation	59
5.2 Local Workshop	59
5.2.1 Workshop program	59
5.2.2 Presentation summaries	60
	60
5.2.3 Round Tables	
5.2.3 Round Tables 5.2.4 Photos of the event	61
5.2.3 Round Tables5.2.4 Photos of the event5.3 Workshop Conclusions	61
 5.2.3 Round Tables 5.2.4 Photos of the event 5.3 Workshop Conclusions 5.3.1 Audience statistics 	
 5.2.3 Round Tables 5.2.4 Photos of the event 5.3 Workshop Conclusions 5.3.1 Audience statistics 5.3.2 Conclusions 	
 5.2.3 Round Tables 5.2.4 Photos of the event 5.3 Workshop Conclusions 5.3.1 Audience statistics 5.3.2 Conclusions 6. Local Workshop in Spain 	
 5.2.3 Round Tables 5.2.4 Photos of the event 5.3 Workshop Conclusions 5.3.1 Audience statistics 5.3.2 Conclusions 6. Local Workshop in Spain 6.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop 	
 5.2.3 Round Tables 5.2.4 Photos of the event 5.3 Workshop Conclusions 5.3.1 Audience statistics 5.3.2 Conclusions 6. Local Workshop in Spain 6.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop 6.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion 	



6.1.3 Invitation	64
6.2 Local Workshop	68
6.2.1 Workshop program	68
6.2.2 Presentation summaries	69
6.2.3 Round Tables	
6.3 Workshop Conclusions	
6.3.1 Audience statistics	
6.3.2 Conclusions	
7. Local Workshop in Portugal	89
7.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop	89
7.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion	89
7.1.2 Local Workshop Design	
7.1.3 Invitation	
7.2 Local Workshop	
7.2.1 Workshop program	
7.2.2 Presentation summaries	
7.2.3 Round Tables	
7.3Workshop Conclusions	
7.3.1 Audience statistics	
7.3.2 Conclusions	
8. Local Workshop in Greece	101
8.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop	
8.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion	
8.1.2 Local Workshop Design	
8.1.3 Invitation	
8.2 Local Workshop	
8.2.1 Workshop program	
8.2.2 Presentation summaries	
8.2.3 Round Tables	105
8.2.4 Photos of the event	
8.3 Workshop Conclusions	
8.3.1 Audience statistics	
8.3.2 Conclusions	110



Introduction

The change of the general perception of mining and metallurgy throughout Europe, the interlinking between policies and other framework conditions (such as land use planning processes) in the Raw Material Sector, the identification of bottlenecks that inhibit the acknowledgment of mining and metallurgy as significant drivers for the development of the regions are all long-term objectives of MinLand project.

For the success of these objectives it is crucial to achieve communication with the stakeholders that are affected by mining and metallurgical activities, as well as with the regional and national authorities that are responsible for the design and implementation of policies. Therefore, in order for MinLand to reach out to the basis of mining and metallurgy sector within the Regions, a series of 8 Local workshops were carried out. The involved countries were: Ireland, Italy, Greece, Sweden, Norway, Finland, Spain, Portugal, Poland, Austria. For the better coordination between the workshop organisers, as well as for the better alignment concerning the design and execution of the workshops, it was decided to use the first Local Workshop that was held in Ireland as the "pilot" workshop. Nevertheless, the corresponding partners selected the subject of each workshop, so as to better reflect the needs and special conditions of the respective Region or Country. It must be highlighted that it was not foreseen for Norway and Finland to host a local workshop, but it was agreed between the three Scandinavian countries to join forces during the Swedish workshop, that was re-named as a "Scandinavian workshop".

The present report contains the description of the topics selected for each local workshop, as well as the discussions that took place along with the conclusion that were extracted after each local workshop.



1. Local Workshop in Ireland

1.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

1.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

For the local workshop organised in September 2018 in Dublin, Ireland, three topics were discussed during the afternoon session. These are:

- a) Policy integration
- b) Permitting
- c) Transparency and public participation

The topics were selected as they were key issues arising from the Irish survey carried out as part of Work Package 3. They also addressed issues which are familiar to other European Member States and are at the core of the MinLand project. The integration, or lack thereof, of minerals interests in land use plan is at the core of MinLand, which seeks to identify suitable ways by which these can be integrated in land use planning. Permitting was selected because, while there is a one-stop-shop for exploration licensing, there are currently three permits required from three separate agencies for development (planning permission, state mining licence/lease, and an integrated pollution control licence). This can make the process cumbersome and complex, and lengthy. Finally, transparency was selected as it is topic ubiquitously discussed across Europe. Although, Ireland is often described as quite open to third parties, it is often questioned whether it is too open.

1.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The workshop was split into two with a morning session and an afternoon session.

During the morning sessions, seven presentations were given. These are outlined in section 2.1. The afternoon session was dedicated to group work and split into three sub-sessions covering each of the topics - policy integration, permitting and transparency and public participation.

It was considered that the workshop should include presentations which described the MinLand project providing context for the topics to be discussed in the afternoon, outline the 'peer learning' process and to learn from practitioners from other countries.

The use of round table discussions combined with 'peer learning' was selected as the preferred method for the afternoon session The intent was to have tables which would reflect as far as possible all stakeholders and parties involved in mining development. To that effect, participants would not be given the opportunity to select their own table and that the three groups would work on each of the topics. It is the researchers' experience that by splitting



groups in such manner allows for participants to learn from each other and to have the opportunity to speak with parties with whom they do not normally interact.

As a result, the Irish research team invited representatives from stakeholders in mining and land use policy implementation. A stakeholder mapping exercise was carried out and a database developed, which included, name, association, position, and email contact. From this database, candidate participants were selected. Participants were selected from the following:

- Planning authorities
- State agencies and government departments
- Mining and exploration companies
- Citizen organizations and interest groups
- Researchers
- Planning consultants, mining consultants and other experts involved in mining and exploration.

Aside from the invitation, limited background information was provided. However, as some of the participants had been involved in the surveys, those would have been more familiar with the project and its objectives. A project programme was sent to attendees in the week prior to the event and included in the invitation.

1.1.3 Invitation

A dedicated email address (<u>Minland@gsi.ie</u>) was created by Geological Survey Ireland (GSI) to respond to guests' questions and to give legitimacy to the project/workshop. The following invitation was sent to the list of identified stakeholders:



MinLan	SEP 27 MinLand Forum	
	by Geological Survey Ireland	
\heartsuit	Sales Ended Details	

Description

JOIN US

Geological Survey Ireland and MacCabe Durney Barnes are pleased to invite you to the MinLand Forum to be held in Geological Survey Ireland, Beggars Bush, Haddington Rd, Dublin 4 on Thursday 27th September 2018.

MinLand is a project designed to meet the challenges relating to the integration of mineral development in land use planning. The project is financed by the European Union under the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation - Horizon 2020 under the Societal Challenge 5 Call.

The four MINLAND project objectives are to:

- produce a database of existing policies and legislation,
- analyse case studies of the integration of mineral and land use plann
- prepare guidelines on how to link land use and mineral policies and practices, and

to ensure knowledge exchange among relevant stakeholders.

As part of this project, we would like to invite you to take part in a forum and workshop attended by experts from Sweden, Austria, Portugal, Finland, Greece and Spain. We will be discussing how to best reconcile mining interests with land use planning. Outline Programme:

10.30 - 11.00: Registration and Coffee 11.00 - 11.05: Welcome - Koen Verbruggen, Director, Geological Survey Ireland 11.05 - 11.20: Introduction to the MinLand Project - Ronald Ardvisson, Geological Survey of Sweden 11.20 - 12.15: European Case Studies - Presentations by International Experts 12.15 - 12.40: Ireland - Best Practice in Minerals Development - Eibhlin Doyle, Exploration and Mining Division 12.40 - 13.00: Case Study on Lead and Zinc Mining Development in Ireland - Jerry Barnes, MacCabe Durney Barnes 13.00 - 14.00: Lunch 14.00 - 16.00: Workshop Sessions 16.00 - 16.15: Coffee break 16.15 - 16.45: Discussion and Q&A - Moderator, Gerry Stanley, Geologist 16.45: Close We will send an update with a detailed programme closer to time. Please mail **minland@gsi.ie** if you have any querie Please note that places are limited so register now!

We look forward to seeing you!

The invitation was shared using the event management website Eventbrite. It allows monitoring the number and name of attendees and gathers other statistics. Other means were used to invite people including the researchers' own networks and phone calls to specific candidate participants.

8

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

Date And Time

Thu, September 27, 2018 10:30 AM - 5:00 PM IST Add to Calendar

Location

Geological Survey Ireland Beggar's Bush Haddington Road D04 K7X4 Dublin 4 View Map

www.minland.eu



1.2 Local Workshop

1.2.1 Workshop programme

The programme was as outlined in the invitation above.

1.2.2 Presentation summaries

1.2.2.1 Introduction

The morning session was opened by Koen Verbruggen, the Director of Geological Survey Ireland who welcomed the participants and researchers who had travelled from other European countries to attend the event.



1.2.2.2 Ronald Arvidsson (SGU)– MinLand Project



The first presentation was delivered by Ronald Arvidsson of the Geological Survey of Sweden, the Coordinator of the Consortium. He gave an outline of the MinLand project and its objectives and how it was carried out (work packages). He presented some of the outputs such as the data repository, the case studies, the guidelines and good practice recommendations.

1.2.2.3 Sara Gottenhuber (WU) – Peer Learning Approach

The second presentation was given by Sara Gottenhuber of the Institute for Managing Sustainability, Vienna University for Economics and Business, a MinLand partner. She outlined the principle of peer learning as part of the MinLand project. The objective of the presentation was to clarify why participants would be asked to interact with each other in the afternoon session and how it would inform the Good Practice Guide. She also presented the impact survey which was carried out at the end of the workshop.

q



1.2.2.4 Ronald Arvidsson (SGU)– Common Issues for the Integration of Mineral and Land Use Planning

The third presentation was given by Ronald Arvidsson of the Geological Survey of Sweden. This time, he introduced common issues in mining from across Europe. Such issues appear at all stages of the mining life-cycle from prospection to remediation. He gave a summary on the degree of policy integration on mineral and land use planning. Other common issues included permitting, stakeholder involvement, availability of geological information and spatial designations such as Natura 2000.

1.2.2.5 Nike Luodes (GTK) – Review of European Case Studies



The fourth presentation was given by Nike Luodes of the Geological Survey of Finland, a MinLand partner. As the leader of WP 3 on case studies, she provided a summary of the findings of the case studies, to date. The case studies were carried out to establish what constitutes good practice across Europe. Topics covered by the case studies include: policy integration, identification and evaluation of land uses, values applied in spatial planning, transparency, compliance with the Inspire Directive, consideration of societal aspects and safeguarding of mineral resources. Eleven case studies have been prepared and include studies from Sweden, Ireland, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Italy, Greece, Austria, Hungary, Poland and Finland. She also provided a brief outline of the preliminary findings.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



1.2.2.6 Paula Dinis (DGEG) – Mining and Social Acceptance in Portugal

The fifth presentation was given by Paula Dinis of the Portuguese General Direction for Energy and Geology (DGEG), a MinLand partner. She firstly gave a short summary of what the Portuguese government did to promote mining before providing more detail on how social acceptance was being promoted in Portugal. She explained that the Government changed the royalty policy which provided sharing the royalty collected from an operation between the central and local authorities with a view to improving the social licence to operate. Royalties are now split between the national, regional and/or local authorities. Up to 25% of the royalties may be directed to social responsibility programmes, environmental or heritage programmes, local authority projects where a mining concession in located or toward investment in research and development.



1.2.2.7 Eibhlín Doyle (EMD)– Best Practice in Mineral Development in Ireland

The sixth presentation was given by Eibhlín Doyle of the Exploration and Mining Division (Department of Communications, Climate Action and Environment) which outlined the advantages Ireland offered to mineral developers Some of the factors include, the mineral potential, particularly zinc, the availability of expertise, the quality of infrastructure, economic stability and the availability of relevant geological data. She then provided an update in relation to the recently passed Minerals Development Act 2017 and an overview of the permitting process from prospecting to remediation.





1. 2.2.8 Jerry Barnes (MDB) – Case Study on Lead and Zinc Mining in Ireland



The seventh presentation was given by Jerry Barnes of MacCabe Durney Barnes, a MinLand partner and co-organiser of the Dublin workshop. His presentation focused on the aspects of best practice identified as part of the case study focusing on lead and zinc mining in Ireland. His presentation included a short summary of the legislative policy framework for mineral and development in the country including integrated pollution license. He explained how mining developments were assessed and gave an overview of the principal conflicts between mining and other land also uses. He discussed public participation, closure, remediation and aftercare management plans (CRAMP) and transparency. The key objective for his presentation was to lay the foundations for the workshop sessions held later in the day.

12 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679





1.2.3 Round Tables

Three round tables were organised for the workshop session. Each group (three in total) were allocated a minute-taker/observer from the Irish research team. The three topics were discussed in 40-minute rounds. A list of indicative questions was provided for each of the topics. These questions acted as conversation guides but the group could address any matter associated with the topic.







13 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

www.minland.eu



1.2.3.1 Policy Integration

The first topic discussed was policy integration. The suggested questions and issues provided to each group were:

- a) Integration of minerals interest in land use planning
- b) Need for zoning or spatial designations
- c) Adequacy of current policy framework in relation to current demands
- d) Need for one-fits-all policy framework
- e) What are the key land use conflicts? How can they be addressed?
- f) Support for Planning Authorities, what do they need:
 - a. Guidelines for Planning Authorities?
 - b. Expertise in the Planning Authorities and An Bord Pleanála?
 - c. More support from central government?
 - d. Other
- g) National interest vs. local interest
- h) Current land use vs other compatible land uses, i.e. land uses where activities, such as mining, are permitted consistent with legal constraints and environmental/ social objectives?

Outcomes

Each group then presented a summary of their discussions. The first group discussed how permitting was split amongst three authorities (planning authority, EPA and Minister for Communications, Climate Action and Energy). Two of the three permits/licences require environmental impact assessment. The group considered that there was a certain lack of clarity in that regard. The group nonetheless recognised that planners made reasoned assessment.

The second group considered that mineral development was in effect three-dimensional with development happening at surface and sub-surface level, whereas most development occurs on the surface. They considered that it may be helpful to designate areas in the sub-surface.

The third group noted that there was a disconnect between industry expectations and the policy framework and how the public sees/accepts it. It was noted that people are generally not aware that you can have several uses simultaneously in a given space. They also considered that there needed to be clear standards on how to meet environmental targets.

1.2.3.2 Permitting and Licensing

The second topic discussed regarded licensing and permitting. The suggested questions/ issues were:

- a) Should mineral development be considered to as 'strategic national development' and any Planning Application submitted to An Bord Pleanála directly (no direct role for the Local Authorities, except as a 'statutory consultee')?
- b) Exploration permitting has a one-stop-shop for obtaining a Prospecting Licence. Is a similar one-stop-shop needed for development?



- c) Standard of assessment across the board (amongst local authorities / the Board).
- d) Skills and needs of/ for assessors
- e) What is the optimal time-frame?
- f) Should the role of judicial review be restricted? Should there be a special 'Planning Court' similar to the Commercial Court?
- g) What is likely significant impact? Does mineral exploration fall into this category? Does any specific exploration activity fall into this category?

Outcomes

The first group considered whether classifying mining development as a 'Strategic Infrastructure Development'¹ (SID) was warranted with a view to shorten and/or simplify the process. It was noted that the relatively low number of planning applications for mining did not justify such designation. The group also considered commonalities with the Portuguese system. The role of third parties was also considered with mention made of 'serial objectors'. Material differences in the EIA process for planning and for the integrated pollution control licence were also discussed.

Interestingly, the second group viewed the designation of mines as SID as positive as they considered that a) the low number of mining cases meant that it would not add a substantial workload to An Bord Pleanála, b) the fact that the subject matter is mineral resources, i.e. natural resources, therefore, these should be considered to be of national interest. It would allow shortening the timeframe for obtaining planning permission, which would be advantageous as minerals prices tend to fluctuate. The need for a robust assessment was seen as essential.

The third group shared similar view on decision-making as the second group. However, in this instance, it was considered that (local) planning authorities did not have the required expertise to carry out the assessment. The example of Norway was discussed, specifically the fact that companies prepare zoning plans to be integrated into land use plans. Timeframes was also discussed. The group did not reach consensus on whether a one-stop-shop was required for permitting of mining development. It was considered that regardless of the proposal, any decision that is major will be appealed anyway. Finally, the creation of a 'one-stop-shop' agency on the model of Marine Scotland² was considered.



¹ SID can generally be described as development which is of strategic economic or social importance to the State or a region. It also includes development which will contribute significantly to the fulfilment of any of the objectives of the National Planning Framework or any regional spatial and economic strategy for an area, or which would have a significant effects on the area of more than one planning authority. An Bord Pleanála is the competent authority for SID.

² Marine Scotland is a 'one-stop-shop' agency dealing with any kind of marine development (aquaculture, energy, etc.) which support applicants in their administrative procedures, pointed them toward the right person/agency.

1.2.3.3 Public Participation and Transparency

The list of suggested questions/issues was as follows:

- a) What mechanisms should be used for public consultation?
- b) Is the current system used/ abused?
- c) Too much or too little in exploration?
- d) Too much or too little in development?
- e) Too much or too little in IPC?
- f) Too much or too little in other permits?
- g) Timeframes for consultations too long/ short?
- h) Building trust and confidence: how?
- i) Is the public educated / knowledgeable enough of mining activities? Are impacts well understood?
- j) Perception of mining in Ireland
- k) Measures to adopt to improve public acceptance
- I) Areas of public policy or legislation to increase public acceptance

Outcomes

The first group noted that in general people had a negative perception of mining. In that context, they considered that a multi-faceted approach was required to improve public acceptance. This would include education on why mineral extraction was required and that elected representatives should be educated as, they more often than not, follow 'popular opinion' rather than evidence and facts. The group considered that Ireland was not very good at having 'national conversations'. It further considered the way consultation was currently carried out, where private companies (as applicants) undertake the consultation with the public. Considerations were given to consultation initiatives being carried out by a neutral entity. Local knowledge and expertise was also discussed, whereby the group recognised that generally national and international expertise was used but that local expertise was potentially overlooked.

The second group concurred on the negative public perception of mineral development. It also agreed that education of why mining was necessary was required and that factual information should be made available. The Greek and Portuguese experiences were noted, whereby companies try to improve public acceptance and sometimes fail. It was noted that in Sweden, the public was generally mis-informed on the subject due to misinformation being spread on social media. Addressing such problems can be quite costly. Corrib gas in Ireland was noted as the Irish example of negative public perception. The project was negatively received and that the process ended up taking much longer and was much more expensive than planned. The group considered that it was the duty of public authorities to step in and to 'describe, defend and explain' why mining was necessary. In practical terms, the group noted that talking to landowners had positive effects and that widening the audience as the project progresses was necessary. Finally the group noted that EIA considered the three pillars of sustainable development: economic, environment and social, but that while the second



pillar appeared to be the core focus of the exercise, the third one appeared to be forgotten. The group reflected on Paula Dinis' earlier presentation which discussed the share of royalties at local level. They considered that it was a 'great idea' and that it would be welcome in Ireland. Finally, good practice examples should be promoted as it positively reflects on the industry. The group identified the example of the Lisheen mine (now closed) where water quality was higher after being treated by the mine than prior to entering it.

The last group discussed the typical mechanisms for public consultation such as notification, display etc. It considered that having staff continuity throughout the process would be beneficial to project outcomes and would allow for the development's smooth operation. Again the case of the Corrib Gas pipeline was noted as an example of what not to do. The group considered that it was essential that people should feel that they are benefitting from mining rather than losing something. In that regard, Lisheen and Tara mines were both noted as good examples.

1.3 Workshop Conclusions

1.3.1 Audience statistics

The Irish research team invited participants representing all stakeholders in the minerals exploration and development process. Data was collected by Sara Gottenhuber of WU as part of the Impact Survey. Findings extracted from her report³ are included in this section.

Overall, 26 participants from Ireland, Northern Ireland, Greece, Portugal, Finland, Austria, Norway and Sweden participated (this also included 8 representatives from the MINLAND consortium). The breakdown was as follows:

- Seven had a background in planning or environment, one of them from a planning authority, the others being either from state agencies or the private sector.
- Ten were from geological surveys, nine of whom were geologists;
- Two were solicitors;
- Three were from industry;
- Three worked in government (regulators);
- One came from academia.



³ Gottenhuber, S., 2018, MinLand Pilot Workshop: Impact Survey and Process Observation, October 2018



The research team felt that although they had made the best efforts to get a spread of stakeholder participation, planning professionals - specifically from the public sector - were largely underrepresented due to current staff shortages. Also, distance from rural planning authorities to the venue played a role in their absence. Nonetheless, the impact survey indicated that the group discussions were very helpful for the participants' work. Other comments include:

- 'Further understanding of both exploration and development within the Irish system.'
- *'Interesting to hear the experience of other countries.'*
- 'Interesting to have an insight into how other stakeholders / planners / consultants think. The workshop made processes more transparent.'
- 'The workshop provided a more holistic view of minerals.'
- 'Different approaches to local engagement, e.g. 25% of royalties to be reinvested in local communities, as the example of Portugal'.

The participants noted the aspects they gained most from in the morning presentations:

- The importance of community engagement and how it is addressed in other countries (e.g. Portugal);
- Findings on best practice aspects in lead and zinc mining in Ireland;
- Legislative insights from Ireland.

Some aspects were considered to be transferrable to their own situation:

- Earmarking royalties for regional and local funds as in Portugal:
- Integration of other departments into the development plan and development management process;
- Public engagement, awareness of reversibility of mining and use of social networks;



1.3.2 Conclusions

To conclude the event, Gerry Stanley, formerly Head of Minerals in Geological Survey Ireland and member of the MinLand Advisory Group, acting as moderator, provided concluding remarks. He reflected on the deliberations and made a number of points which summarises the discussions as follows:

On permitting:

- Land use is generally determined by the planning application as there is no mineral specific spatial designation or zoning in Ireland.
- EIA is often used as the planning tool.
- Sub-surface is a serious issue. There are too many uses (water, tunnels, geothermal, storage, etc.) and the use of the sub-surface is generally not understood or comprehended in planning.
- In some cases, like Ireland, it is appropriate not too spatially designate areas for minerals.
- Better data and better use of data would help land use planning.
- Some issues might be considered further, e.g. Strategic Infrastructure Development.
- Public land versus private land are there/ should there be different approaches?

On public perception:

- Public perception of mining is determined by legacy sites.
- Too many bad examples, not necessarily from the minerals sector.
- The role of education in improving public perception was again recognised.
- The benefits to be harnessed from mining are misunderstood by the public.



2. Local workshop in Poland

2.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

2.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

Aim of Polish Local Workshop was discussion about possibility of mining activity in complicated environmental and spatial conditions (based on case study – Czatkowice Limestone Mine). The expansion of exploitation was related to the complicated local environmental conditions associated with occurrence of landscape park (the new part of deposit is located in park boundary), natural reserve, Natura 2000 area, Monastery Complex and drinking water intakes. Starting the mining activity required many activities related to abolition of extraction ban in landscape park, obtaining of environmental decision and changes of local spatial planning documents.

2.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The workshop was divided into <u>three parts</u> (look agenda). The <u>first part</u> of the local workshop included following presentations (connected with MinLand Project):

- Introduction to MinLand Project,
- Good practices in MinLand Project,
- Assumption of "Peer Learning" method.

The <u>second part</u> of meeting was focused on characteristic of "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine, which is the Polish case study in MinLand Project. This part of workshop was carried out by representatives of company, who delivered following presentations:

- General presentation of "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine,
- The way of "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine to the new mining concession,
- Environmental issues in the process of obtaining a new concession,
- Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on the example of "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine.

The first and second part of meeting ended with a discussion which was continued during third part of workshop - technical visit at the Czatkowice mine.

The meeting was attended by 27 experts from the following institutions: central authorities, regional government, local government, consulting companies, research institutions and industry (detailed in part 3.1). Guests participating in the meeting, along with the invitation received a press release regarding the MinLand Project.



2.1.3 Invitation

Invitation in the English version:

INVITATION

to the local workshop of the MinLand Project entitled "Good practices in the field of land use at various stages of mining activity on the example of the "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine"

Dear Madam/Sir

MinLand Project is financed by the European Union in the Framework Programme for Research and Innovation - Horizon2020 and started on the 1st of December 2017 for a duration of two years. The aim of the project is to support of access to documented and unexploited mineral deposits and prospective areas of their occurrence within the European Union. The way to achieve this is to properly integrate the spatial and raw materials policy in the Member States of the Community.

The MINLAND consortium, coordinated by the Geological Survey of Sweden builds upon participation from all over Europe. The consortium consists of partners and third parties covering such expertise as geological land use information (Eurogeosurveys – geological surveys umbrella organization), mining authorities, land use authorities, industry and academy (22 institutions from 12 European countries and Norway). One of the partners is the Mineral and Energy Economy Research Institute Polish Academy of Sciences (more information at www.minland.eu).

One of the important elements of the project is the promotion of good practices in the field of land use during exploration works and mining activity. To this purpose, the MinLand participants were required to select appropriate case studies illustrating the various (other than mining) land use directions at the stage of prospecting, exploration of mineral deposits and prospective areas, exploitation, and reclamation of post-mining areas. Among the selected examples was the "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine belonging to the TAURON Group S.A. The selection was determined by the complex environmental and spatial conditions in which the mine successfully operating for over 20 years. The next step of the MinLand Project is the organization of local workshops, during which the case study will be discussed in the group of people representing various institutions related to spatial planning and mining activities.

I cordially invite you to a Local Workshop of the MinLand project: "Good practices in the field of land use at various stages of mining operations on the example of the Czatkowice Limestone Mine" (program attached), which will take place on 08.10.2018 at "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine. Participation in the workshop is free.

On behalf of the Polish team that is involved in the MinLand project, I hope that your participation in the workshops will be possible. If you are interested, please confirm your arrival by email to: kamyk @ min pan.krakow.pl.

Sincerely



2.2 Local Workshop

2.2.1 Workshop program

PROGRAM (English version)		
SESION I		
10.30-11.30	1. Welcome, introduction - A. Szymkiewicz (Czatkowice Limestone Mine), K. Galos (MEERI PAS)	
	2. Introduction to MinLand Project – K. Galos (MEERI PAS)	
	3. Good practices in MinLand Project – A. Kot-Niewiadomska (MEERI PAS)	
	4. Assumption of "Peer Learning" method – A. Kot-Niewiadomska (MEERI PAS)	
11.30-11.45	COFFEE BREAK	
	SESION II	
11.45-13.15	 General presentation of Czatkowice Limestone Mine – A. Szymkiewicz (Czatkowice Limestone Mine) 	
	2. The way of Czatkowice Limestone Mine to the new concession – <i>T. Seta</i> (Czatkowice Limestone Mine)	
	3. Environmental issues in the process of obtaining a new concession – A. Pawłowska (KW "Czatkowice")	
	4. Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on the example of Czatkowice Limestone Mine – M. Tańska (<i>KW "Czatkowice"</i>)	
	5. Discussion	
13.15-13.45	LUNCH	
13.45-15.00	SESION III Technical visit – Czatkowice Limestone Mine (with discussion)	

2.2.2 Presentation summaries

Presentation 1: Introduction to MinLand Project:

- Aim and scope of MinLand project;
- Structure of MinLand project;
- Polish background and context.

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



Presentation 2: Good practices in MinLand Project:

- The role and position of good practices aspect in MinLand project;
- Short description of selected case studies from MinLand project;
- Introduction to Polish case study.

Presentation 3: Assumption of "Peer Learning" method:

- Characterization of "peer learning" method;
- *"peer learning" method in MinLand project.*

Presentation 4: General presentation of Czatkowice Limestone Mine:

- History of company;
- Characteristics of Czatkowice deposit;
- Characteristics of the assortment.

Presentation 5: The way of Czatkowice Limestone Mine to the new concession:

- the time frame of the procedure for obtaining a mining license;
- extending the exploitation environmental and spatial local conditions;
- the amendment procedures of local spatial documents and Regulation of Kraków Valleys Landscape Park (abolition of extraction ban)

Presentation 6: Environmental issues in the process of obtaining a new concession:

- environmental impact assessment;
- Decision on Environmental Conditions.

Presentation 7: Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) on the example of Czatkowice:

• accepted standards of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the field of: social dialogue, environmental protection, customer relations, fair market practices, personal development and employee satisfaction.

2.2.3 Round Tables

The main aspects of discussion:

- <u>complicated environmental and spatial local conditions</u> related to, among others, following elements: Kraków Valleys Landscape Park, Natural Reserve "Eliaszówka Valley", Natura 2000 area, Carmelite Monastery, Krzeszówka Stream and drinking water intakes (for Krzeszowice Community).
- <u>amendment of Regulation of Kraków Valleys Landscape Park</u> (abolition of extraction ban): one of the few cases in Poland of excluding the area for mining activity from the landscape park boundary. one of the most important condition of excluding was creation of approximately 33 ha of protective belt in the form of plantings, around the north-eastern border of the deposit extension, and establishing migration corridors for bats; the most important argument that decided to separate the area



from the park's borders, was the use direction of raw material - sorbents produced by mine are mainly used by power plants and combined heat and power plants in modern flue gas purification technologies;

- <u>amendment of local spatial planning documents (financed by Czatkowice Limestone</u> <u>Mine</u>): Study of Conditions and Directions of Spatial Development of City and Municipality of Krzeszowice - the change of the Study, proposed by the Company, related to the plots to be included in an expanded extraction area within the boundaries of the documented "Czatkowice" deposit and within the limits of expected extraction impact. Local Development Plan - as part of development a new local plan, it was necessary to change the purpose of agricultural and forest land and to define a new direction of use for them (mining);
- <u>decision on Environmental Conditions</u> the obtaining procedure (including Environmental Impact Report) and main provisions;
- <u>social dialogue</u> during mining license obtaining procedure and current mining activity;
- <u>negotiating with the Regional Directorate of the State Forests and private land</u> <u>owners -</u> as part of the project, the Company had to acquire title to land having a total area of approx. 81 ha (among others: state forests – 29 ha (protection forests), private areas – 19 ha, owned by the Krzeszowice Municipality, the State Treasury, a private entrepreneur and private owners);
- <u>the issue of successive reclamation</u> following the completion of the investment in 2060 the whole area of the excavation (both the current exploited and a new one), i.e. approximately 120 hectares, will be reclaimed (forest direction).



2.2.4 Photos of the event



25 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

www.minland.eu









A link to the press coverage of the Polish local workshops: http://nettg.pl/news/153143/gornictwo-kopalnia-czatkowice-przykladem-dobrych-praktyk

26 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

www.minland.eu



2.3 Workshop Conclusions

2.3.1 Audience statistics

Finally the meeting was attended by 27 experts from the following institutions:

- central authorities (Higher Mining Authority, Regional Mining Office),
- regional government (Regional Directorate of State Forests, The Complex of Landscape Parks of Malopolska Voivodeship - regional institutions of environmental protection),
- local government (District Geologists, representatives of Krakow district),
- consulting companies (architectural and spatial planning firms),
- research institutes, universities (Mineral and Energy Economy Research Institute of the Polish Academy of Science, Silesian University),
- industry (minerals producers and consumers).

The structure of participants:



2.3.2 Conclusions

In "Czatkowice" Limestone Mine (Małoposka Province, Southern Poland) belonging to TAURON Group, works associated with the preparation of the area for mining from a new deposit have been launched. The investment located across the area of approximately 50 hectares guarantees a possibility of extraction in the mine until 2060. Sorbents produced by mine are mainly used by power plants and combined heat and power plants in modern flue gas purification technologies. Currently, the Czatkowice Limestone Mine produces approximately 40% (available on the domestic market) sorbents used for flue gas desulfurization. The expansion of exploitation was related to the complicated local environmental conditions associated with occurrence of landscape park (the new part of



deposit is located in park boundary), natural reserve, Natura 2000 area, Monastery Complex and drinking water intakes. Starting the mining activity required many activities related to abolition of extraction ban in landscape park, obtaining of environmental decision and changes of local spatial planning documents.

The procedure for obtaining a extraction licence went very smoothly and in a relatively short time. During the procedures, no major problems were encountered. The main key success factors are following:

- properly conducted (and early enough) detailed exploration work of the new part of deposit,
- early enough initiated (by the Company) the procedure of obtaining a extractive license,
- well-planned sequence of formal and administrative activities (including the development of appropriate documents)
- production of high quality products (especially sorbents);
- positive Company image and related social acceptance based on:
- its previous activities in the field of mining, reclamation of post-mining areas and minimization of the mining activities impact on the environment,
- accepted standards of Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) in the field of: social dialogue, environmental protection, customer relations, fair market practices, personal development and employee satisfaction,
- the company successfully combines business activities with all activities for the benefit of the local society. The company actively and responsibly participates in the local community life by engagement in solving the local problems and supporting many local initiatives. It is willing to take action in partnership with other local entities.
- favorable attitude of local (Mayor of Krzeszowice Municipality) and regional authorities (the Marshal of Małopolskie Voivodeship),
- demand for raw material ("Czatkowice" limestone quarry provides sorbents to several largest power plants in the south-western part of Poland, where they are used for both the flue gas desulphurisation and fluidised-bed boiler combustion processes. Furthermore, carboniferous limestone is used in the construction industry, including the road building sector and agriculture).

General conclusions:

- properly implemented spatial planning system on the local level (commune level in Poland) may decide on success it takes into account the all environmental conditions of the development of a given commune, including the occurrence of the documented mineral deposits;
- it is necessary to ensure proper provisions in the documents regulating the functioning of various forms of nature conservation (e.g. landscape parks)
- the commune's experience suggests the need to <u>update local planning documents</u> <u>even every 5 years</u> (but they should take into account the perspective of at least 10 years);



- facilitation for mining entrepreneurs (shortening procedures) is the <u>possibility of</u> <u>parallel work</u> on amendment of local spatial planning documents (the Study of Conditions and Directions of Spatial Development of Commune and the Local Spatial Management Plan of Commune (in Polish hierarchy of spatial documents the Study... is superior document in relation to Local Spatial...));
- it is necessary to improve (shorten) <u>procedures related to environmental impact</u> <u>assessment and obtaining environmental decisions;</u>
- properly conducted dialogue with the local community and local authorities may decide on success (CSR could be the key to success!!!);
- it is much easier for mining entrepreneurs to operate in municipalities with a mining tradition (brownfield projects). The real challenge is to start a mining activity in "greenfield land".



3. Local Workshop in Austria

3.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

3.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

For the Austrian Local Workshop, titled **'Policies for mineral safeguarding – how to integrate mechanisms of mineral safeguarding into land-use planning',** the main case study under investigation was the Austrian Mineral Resources Plan (AMRP). This particular case relates to good practice in innovative methods to determine mineral deposits for safeguarding purposes. Scrutiny of the AMRP led to the selection of 3 topical streams for the purpose of the workshop:

- <u>Stream 1: The National Perspective</u> Focus on Safeguarding Strategy for Future Mineral Resources.
 - What was the reason to develop a plan in the first place?
 - Examples from other countries e.g. mechanisms and interlinkages.
 - The uniqueness of a 'future resource' safeguarding strategy.
- Stream 2: Multi-Level Governance Governance From a Strategic Planning Tool
 - Multi-level cooperation (between different levels of government) examples from other countries?
 - What were the challenges: communication, political, etc.?
 - What is working well and what is not working so well?
 - What do you need in order to make improvements?
- <u>Stream 3: Cross-Cutting</u> Weighing of different interests/ policy objectives (integrated in both of the above streams)
 - Aligning objectives/ agendas on different levels of government.
 - Link between different streams and systems?
 - Horizontal and Vertical policy integration differences?
 - Focus on the mechanisms rather than the political agenda/ objectives interfering.

Minerals safeguarding is a concept to protect mineral deposits for future generations and to guarantee access for future demand. The challenge is to link this concept, originating from minerals policy, to spatial and land-use planning policy. The workshop looked into mineral safeguarding policies on the level of the policy-making and design of mineral and land use planning, as well as into concrete planning instruments and governance mechanisms. Public policy has taken up the responsibility to provide different approaches to address this challenge: The Austrian Minerals Resources Plan is one of a few safeguarding mechanisms in Europe and was recognised as a good practice approach towards mineral safeguarding.

In an effort to include examples from other EU MS, as well as from different levels and aspects of land-use planning e.g. policy, consultancy, etc., the workshop featured a presentation from the Austrian Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism, the County Administrative Board of Västerbotten (Sweden) and a regional environmental land-use consultant (Austria). The



workshop was intended to include examples of innovative methods of mineral safeguarding from Portugal, but due to a last minute cancellation, this was left out.

3.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The local workshop was designed by WU and MUL by identifying the three topical streams outlined above. The first half of the day of the Local Workshop was comprised of presentations and moderated discussions related to the presentations. The second half of the day was devoted to interactive group-work around main observations and key lessons learned from the presentations and frameworks needed to achieve transferability of good practice. The workshop was designed to: Give an overview of the project in an EU context and 'set the scene' for exchange; provide understanding of the topical streams of safeguarding and land-use planning; and allow space for exchange, discussion and collaborative learning.

The target audience identified through the topical streams were:

- Civil servants working in public administration, engaged with minerals policy, environmental planning/policy, land use planning & zoning at national and regional level;
- experts from industry, planning practise and academia working on land use issues & zoning, minerals policy;
- public authorities and organisations affiliated with EIA (UVP) processes related to minerals exploration and extraction; and
- geological survey experts working on mapping of deposits

Workshop design in more detail: The workshop was designed with an introductory part containing a welcome address, an overview of the MinLand project, and an introduction to the concept and process of the peer learning workshop. This was followed by an introductory ice-breaker where the pre-structured seating arrangement allowed participants to meet and discuss with each other, thereby setting the scene for an open atmosphere for learning and exchange. This was followed by in-depth presentations related to the above mentioned topical streams which formed the basis of the workshop discussions. The following presentations were held during the first half of the day:

- 1. Good Practice Topics and Challenges
- Overview of land-use challenges and different strategies in the EU
 - 2. Minerals Policy and Minerals Planning Experiences from Austria
- In-depth information of the Austrian Minerals Resource Plan: development and implementation
 - 3. Minerals and Land-Use Planning Experiences from Sweden
- Legislation and strategies for land-use planning in practice
- 4. Land-Use Planning, Environment and Minerals

- Regional experience of land-use planning practice and mineral raw materials in Carinthia Each presentation was followed by approximately 20 minutes of discussion, bringing in expertise of the participants to discuss main observations, challenges, lessons learned and their own experience in dealing with topics of mineral safeguarding and land-use planning. The ample space for discussion as well as questions to the presenters allowed for crucial in-



depth learning and understanding, both of the presented cases, including practices from the national and regional level in Austria and Sweden.

In the second part of the day, participants were divided into smaller groups (3-4) to reflect on the 3 most important success factors and challenges (in their opinion) discussed during the first half of the day, and what framework conditions that can enable their transfer into another context.

3.1.3 Invitation



Invitation to the MINLAND local Workshop in Austria

"Policies for mineral safeguarding – How to integrate mechanisms of mineral safeguarding into land use planning"

Hosted by the Austrian Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism

Denisgasse 31, 1200 Vienna

Vienna, 17 January 2019

Dear colleagues,

With this email, we would like to cordially invite you to the MINLAND Local Workshop in Austria, entitled "Policies for mineral safeguarding – How to integrate mechanisms of mineral safeguarding into land use planning", which takes place in Vienna on 17 January 2019. Please find the Draft Agenda for the event attached to this email.

The workshop in part of a series of stakeholder workshops organised in the MINLAND project. The main objectives of the workshop are:

- Showcase important good practice aspects of the Austrian Minerals Policy Plan (*Österreichischer Rohstoffplan*) (AMRP) on policy design, implementation, and evaluation & revision;
- Discuss the nexus of land-use and minerals in (spatial) planning and –development and challenges in planning practise and public administration



- Discuss possibilities to transfer important good practice elements of how to implement mineral safeguarding mechanisms on the national, regional, and local level; and
- Provide spaces for peer learning and exchange to enable investigations of framework conditions that facilitate or hinder the transfer of good practice aspects for safeguarding.

Minerals safeguarding is a concept to protect mineral deposits for future generations and to ensure access for future demand. The challenge is to link and integrate this concept, originating from minerals policy, into spatial, land-use and environmental policy and planning. The workshop will look into mineral safeguarding policies on the level of the policy-making and design of mineral and land use planning, as well as into specific planning instruments and governance mechanisms. Public policy has taken up the responsibility to provide different approaches to address this challenge: The Austrian Minerals Resources Plan is one of a few safeguarding mechanisms in Europe and was recognised as a good practice approach towards mineral safeguarding.

Target audience:

- Civil servants working in public administration, engaged with minerals policy, environmental planning/policy, land use planning & zoning at national and regional level;
- experts from industry, planning practise and academia working on land use issues & zoning, minerals policy;
- public authorities and organisations affiliated with EIA (UVP) processes related to minerals exploration and extraction; and
- geological survey experts working on mapping of deposits;

Case study under investigation:

The Austrian Mineral Resources Plan – a safeguarding tool for mineral resources and its implementation on different levels of governance: The AMRP's goal is to document rawmaterial deposits and outline minable deposits with low conflict potential with other policyrelevant land-uses. The case looks into how the AMRP - a policy instrument to safeguard mineral resources on the national level - is integrated into policy governance and decisionmaking processes as well as on the legislative domain on the provincial level. The case offers good practice information on how non-regulatory policy instruments can be integrated into different governance levels and regulatory domains by illustrating two different provincial implementation approaches.

The MINLAND project has been designed to meet challenges concerning competing land-use planning related to different land-use interests. Competition about use of land is fierce within Europe. Currently, the need for metals, construction raw materials and industrial minerals is increasing. There is a debate regarding the access to land for exploration and extraction of mineral raw materials, including critical raw materials. MINLAND aims to shed light on the complexity of land-use and minerals planning and strives for improved, integrated



policymaking and planning processes. The EU has recognised the need for integrated land use policies and a better understanding on the nexus with mineral policy strategies within Europe. See <u>http://minland.eu/</u> for further information.

We are looking forward to your participation and kindly ask you to confirm your participation by sending an email to <u>katharina.gugerell@unileoben.ac.at</u> not later than 10 January 2019. You will receive a confirmation of your registration within 3 working days. Participation at the event is free and by personal invitation only. Space, however, is limited to 40 participants, so please register as soon as possible.

We very much look forward to welcoming you at the MinLand local Workshop in Austria and hope to hear from you soon!

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



3.2 Local Workshop

3.2.1 Workshop program



MINLAND: Mineral Resources in Sustainable Land-Use Planning

Policies for Mineral Safeguarding – How to integrate mechanisms of mineral safeguarding into land-use planning

MINLAND Local Workshop Vienna

hosted by Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism

17 January 2019, 9:00-14:30

Address: Denisgasse 31, 1200 Vienna

Working Language: English (due to international workshop participants)

08:45-09:00 Registration

09:00 -09:30 Welcome and Introduction

Welcome address

Robert Holnsteiner, Austrian Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism



	The MINLAND Project and concept of Peer Learning
	Sara Gottenhuber, Vienna University of Economics and Business
09:30 – 10:00	Good Practice Topics and Challenges
	Workshop objectives and targeted challenges
	Katharina Gugerell, Montanuniversität Leoben, Department of Mining Engineering and Mineral Economics
	Incl. Q&A
10:00 — 10:45	Minerals Policy and Minerals Planning – Experiences from Austria
	The 'Österreichische Rohstoffplan' – Austrian Minerals Resource Plan: Safeguarding future resources through land-use planning
	Robert Holnsteiner, Austrian Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism
	Incl. Q&A
10:45 – 11:00	Coffee Break
11:00 – 11:45	Minerals and Land-Use Planning – Experiences from Sweden
	Experiences with Minerals and Land-Use Planning in Västerbotten
	Magnus Langedoen, County Administrative Board Västerbotten, Sweden
	Incl. Q&A
11:45 – 12:15	Land-Use Planning, Environment and Minerals

36 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679


Challenges in landscape planning practise and mineral raw materials

Doris Damyanovic, Landscape Planning Bureau Freiraum.Landschaft

12:15 – Lunch

13:00

14:15

14:30

13:00 – Conversation about Lessons Learned on Policies for Mineral Safeguarding

- Challenges and Recommendations
 - Reflections and Results

14:15 – Wrap-up and Questionnaire

3.2.2 Presentation summaries

Robert Holnsteiner – Welcome address and context of mining in Austria

Robert Holnsteiner from the Austrian Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism welcomed the participants to the workshop and provided an overview of the structure of the ministry and the Directorate-General for Mining. He also gave an overview of the Austrian minerals context, outlining that more than 10,000 sites are currently registered, and that the mining industry is dominated by aggregate extraction (sand, gravel and hard rocks). He argued that the Interactive Raw Material Information System (IRIS) is considered a best practice example of Raw Material Information System and that, although the mining industry currently only makes up 0.4% of the Austrian GDP, the value added of the entire construction sector contributes to over 20% of the GDP.

Sara Gottenhuber – The MinLand and Concept of Peer Learning

Sara Gottenhuber from the Vienna University of Economics and Business gave an overview of the purpose and objective of the MinLand project, i.e. linking mineral policies with land-use policies by 1) creating a knowledge repository, 2) facilitating minerals and land-use policy making, 3) strengthening transparent land-use practices, and 4) foster networking. She also outlined the process and concept of peer learning, an introduction which was followed by an introductory ice-breaker.

Katharina Gugerell – Good Practice Topics and Challenges



Katharina Gugerell from Montanuniversität Leoben (MUL) gave an important presentation on the nexus between land-use and minerals. She argued that mineral resources are often not mentioned nor considered in supranational land-use policies, such as, e.g. the European Spatial Development plan. If these aspects are included, it is often in conjunction with land degradation often missing a nuanced perspective on mineral resources, including e.g. an 'ecosystem service' perspective. Katharina Gugerell commented on the different systems of policy integration prevalent in EU MS; and how minerals policy link to other policies and decision support systems in e.g. Austria, Ireland, Finland, and Sweden. She noted that the perception of competing land use often are centred around nature value (e.g. Natura 2000 areas), tourism and cultural heritage, and that mineral resources as an economic value competes with economic viability of other interests e.g. regional development. She notes the importance of communication and coordination within these processes; between different policy streams, departments of public administration and the apparent lack of both formal and informal platforms of exchange. Moreover, Katharina Gugerell outlines the different understanding of safeguarding – permits and licenses, making mineral deposits visible in landuse plans, safeguarding deposits via land-use, anticipatory safeguarding of known deposits (and protect them from sterilisation).

Robert Holnsteiner – Minerals Policy and Minerals Planning – Experiences from Austria

Robert Holnsteiner gave a presentation on the Austrian Minerals Resource Plan outlining how the three pillars of the AMRP aim to foster sustainable access to non-energy, non-agricultural raw materials. The AMRP is an extensive planning tool for land-use and mineral safeguarding, implemented on а voluntary basis. Robert Holnsteiner discussed Picture 1 Robert Holnsteiner



how the plan was designed (starting with a resolution by parliament in 2001) and how it can be used to, for instance, identify potential conflict-free land zones with viable deposits. He outlined two integral aspects of the plan, the demand (state owned & free to mine mineral raw materials) and supply (land-owner materials/aggregates) oriented safeguarding processes - e.g. how much aggregates will be needed to satisfy coming demand and what sources are viable (supply) to exploit?



Magnus Langedoen – Minerals and land-use planning – experiences from Sweden

Magnus Langedoen, Head of the county administrative board of Västerbotten (Sweden), gave a presentation on how land-use planning is structured in Sweden. He outlined the special provisions on the management of land, designed to promote an all-around assessment from society's perspective to clarify reasonable use of natural resources both in a long- and a shortterm perspective. The planning comprises of 'weighing of national interests' where maps for planning often depict overlapping 'areas of national interest' e.g. reindeer herding grounds, Natura 2000 areas etc. The priority of interests is then the main source for consideration, making it a political decision of which land-use should be prioritised (Swedish Environmental Code). Magnus Langedoen explained that this is an on-going process between various ministires, departments and regional authorities. The advantages thereof consists in having one permit for environmental questions and that 'national interests' gives an indication to new projects. Challenges, however, as outlined by Magnus Langedoen's presentation are that the land-use permitting and planning process often occurs at an early stage before the total impact of a project can be estimated.



Picture 2 Magnus Langedoen

39





Doris Damyanovic – Land-use planning, environment and minerals – challenges in landscape planning practice and mineral raw materials

Doris Damyanovic gave a presentation on her experience of landscape planning and nature conservation and included examples from her work in the Austrian region of Carinthia. She

outlined the formal and informal part of the process of environmental permitting in planning for e.g. mining site restauration and post-mining renaturation as well as considerations given to protected species. Doris Damyanovic provided insights of her experience with mining permit contra nature conservation permission and that the process of nature conservation permission focused on involving local actors, authorities, municipality representatives and land-owners from an early stage in direct exchange. She gave examples of 'negotiation rounds' in e.g. public hearings and feedback from projects in Carinthia. She stressed the importance of interdisciplinaryand stakeholder collaboration from the beginning of the planning process and the benefits of involving actors in face-to-face meetings and onsite visits.



Picture 3 Doris Damyanovic

3.2.3 Round Tables

The interactive exchange elements of the local workshop were built into the local workshop throughout the day, the first 3 discussion rounds were held in conjunction with the topical presentations and were thus related to the topical streams; allowing the participants to raise questions and reflect upon main observations and experience from their own work. The first



Picture 4 Participant Discussion Rounds

40

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



3 rounds of discussion took place in the entire group, whereas the final collaborative exchange was done in smaller groups where participants were invited to write down observations and transferability recommendations.

Discussion 1 – Good Practice Topics and Challenges (Stream 1)

- Participants discussed the importance of having a stable legal framework and how this could feed into a better perception of mining and improved Social License to Operate (SLO). For example through increased financial investments or re-investments into the communities beyond 'job creation'.
- Participants also discussed the value of possible incentives to improve the framework for exploration, to make investments attractive also for mining, and early policy integration and clear legal frameworks provides clarity for actors/industry interested in exploration.
- Another discussion point was the potential (and challenge) of defining 'areas of public interest' that this can function on a local level but harder to realise in diverse governance frameworks throughout EU e.g. 'the different governance structures are making 'streamlining' responsibilities, legislations and procedures difficult.

Discussion 2 – National Perspective of Safeguarding and Multi-level Governance (Stream 1&2)

- Participants discussed if a national safeguarding strategy such as the ARMP is feasible on a European level or if it would be 'too centralised'.
- The dissemination and implementation plan of the ARMP as a voluntary tool were discussed e.g. the setup of a 'Raw Material Alliance', or through discussions, events and publications. The regions are also encouraged to further develop the plan, e.g. Lower Austria currently revising the ARMP according to new practices.
- The parameters of the ARMP were discussed and also who would have access to the information it contains in finding e.g. "conflict-free" and economically viable sources to exploit. The plan was further discussed as a way to increase public acceptance of mining in minimising potential conflicts of interest.
- The participants further discussed that a plan is one way of evaluating security of supply on a national level but raised the question of how to guarantee security of supply from e.g. international sources.





Picture 5 Participant Discussion Rounds

Discussion 3 – Weighing of different interests/ policy objectives (Stream 2&3)

- Participants discussed the reactive and proactive approach to weighing different interests considering the examples from Austria and Sweden and how e.g. value of commodity was considered (in a short- and long term scenario).
- Participants discussed the differences and similarities in governance and collaboration between e.g. national and regional authorities in e.g. procedures in concession and exploration permits, review and feedback processes and how this impacted social acceptance and permitting time.
- Participants also addressed the question of having consecutive permitting (as in the example of Carinthia) and if it is better to have a parallel process (as in Sweden).



Picture 6 Participant Discussions

42 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



Group Exercise – Lessons Learned and Transferability.

In the final exercise of the local workshop, participants were divided into smaller groups (ensuring a mix of participants) to address success factors and challenges, as well as transferability needs.



Picture 7 Group Discussion on lessons learned and transferability

Each group was asked to write down their 3 main success factors and challenges that they identified from the presentations and discussions and to discuss the framework needed to achieve transferability of such 'good practice' into a different context.



Picture 8 Group Discussion on lessons learned and transferability

43 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



The output of the group work was presented by each group respectively, clustered, and discussed with all participants. Participants further discussed the importance of showing 'the face of mining today' and that mining has a more positive image in regions with mines due to the generated opportunities.



Picture 9 Results of the group discussions

Table 1 gives an overview of some of the topics addressed and discussed in the peer exchange:

Success Factors and Challenges	Transferability Needs
Defining and harmonising national interests	Political acceptance of the system in concern
Clear rules on weighing – transparency and public acceptance	Regional mandates (best done on sub- national level)
Geological knowledge and methodological expertise	Strengthen GeoSurveys of Member States
Forward-planning based on supply and demand (and national interests) – proactive rather than reactive	Cross-sectoral communication, collaboration between all parties and actors (authorities and interest groups)
 Parallel process of: Weighing of interests Permitting (mining and environment etc.) 	Cross-sectoral communication, collaboration between all parties and actors (authorities and interest groups)
Data transparency and access	Harmonise data policies
Independent court as decision-maker	All stakeholders should be involved (to achieve public acceptance)

Table 1 Discussion Highlights and Transferability

44



Consideration of preloads	Multi-level approach (also scaling)
'Smart mining'	On-site visitation

3.3 Workshop Conclusions

3.3.1 Audience statistics

The Austrian Local Workshop contained participants from Academia (33%), Government Authorities (33%), Geological Surveys (20%), Consultancy (7%) and CSOs (7%).



The mix of participants contributed to interesting and relevant discussions from different perspectives. The size of the group also enabled an in-depth, fruitful and open exchange on the selected topics.

3.3.2 Conclusions

The workshop provided an important open space for discussion and learning between the peers from good practice cases and examples both from Austria and from Sweden. Based on the discussions and reflections during the day, the main learning points were:

- 1. The importance of establishing connections, collaborations and networks of stakeholders, especially of different policy streams and disciplines
- 2. Collaborative and open governance structures and involvement of stakeholders to ensure weighing of interests and increase public acceptance and transparency.
- 3. The importance of transparent and institutionalised processes of weighing land-use options in planning processes

45



- 4. The differences of classified, e.g. 'national interests' and how this can contribute to strategic safeguarding;
- How strategic safeguarding can take different forms and should match the 'context' (e.g. institutional, socio-economic, spatial, etc.) as well as both supply- and demand (short- and long-term) challenges;
- 6. Approaches and methods to evaluate mineral deposits and how this can be linked to land-use planning.
- 7. The usefulness of parallel processes (of permitting).
- 8. The importance of a mix of different (policy-) instruments and tools (regulatory, soft tools, incentives/motivational structures) to support the delivery of the policy agenda and support policy performance

The discussions and group exercise on success factors and transferability also led to important workshop conclusions in fostering 'forward-planning' proactive strategies to minimise, e.g. conflicting interests, and the transparency of different interests can allow for a more predictable legal framework both for involved interest groups and for industry. Another important conclusion, that arose from the discussion and presentations, were the usefulness and importance of geological data, and that there is a need to address issues of accessibility and data policies if the good practice of AMRP should be applicable to other European Member States.



Picture 10 Success factors & transferability aspects

46

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



4. Scandinavian Workshop

The local workshop in Sweden was a joint workshop for Sweden, Norway and Finland. Further participation from the consortium was also attained from Austria. The Workshop was held as one in a series of workshops within the MinLand project during the fall 2018 until January 2019.

The workshop was held in Umeå at the localities of the Västerbotten County Administrative Noard, MinLand partner LV. It was a two day seminar stretching from lunch Monday 19th until afternoon Tuesday 20th.

4.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

4.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

The workshop benefitted greatly from the pilot WS on Ireland, September 27, 2018. Three main topics were found equally suitable for the Nordic WS as for the Irish after web meeting and electronic communication between the different participating MinLand organisations. The questions were adapted to the needs for the Nordic countries. The topics were the following:

- 1. Policy integration
- 2. Permitting
- 3. Transparency

The first topic, policy integration, was selected because in the Nordic countires land use policies and minerals are tightly connected with somewhat similar but different approaches. It is also one of the key issues for permitting which thus connects to topic 2. Topic 3 was developed around mitigation of impact of mining upon other issues as well as transparency.

The topics were used to initiate and steer discussions during the workshop sessions as given here below:

Topic 1 – Policy Integration

- a) Integration of minerals interest in land use planning, the weight of the protection of minerals in Areas of national Interest and the value of the concession?
- b) Adequacy of current policy framework in relation to current demands. Current land use vs other compatible land uses, i.e. land uses where activities, such as mining, are permitted are they consistent with legal constraints and environmental/ social objectives?
- c) What are the key land use conflicts? How can they be addressed?
- d) Support for Planning and Permitting Authorities, what do they need:
 - a. Guidelines for Planning Authorities?



- b. Expertise in the Planning Authorities?
- c. More support from central government.
- d. Other

Topic 2 – Permitting and Licencing

- a) Is the basic principle of permitting you have reasonable and effective. As an how to relate to the example the Swedish three step approach (Finnish), (Norwegian):
 - i. prospecting (very permissive and should be seen as a land use that co- exist with other land uses).
 - ii. concession (at which level a protection of the land use is invoked and should result in making it possible for the company to work towards the final step of land use comes in the permitting process)
 - iii. applying for an environmental permit.
 - iv. Sami
 - a. If not how to improve? Has the system evolved too much from the initial purpose of the legislator?
- b) Standard of expertise and capacity for assessments across the authorities involved in the permitting
 - a. is that on an acceptable level.
 - b. Is there a lack of necessary geological, economical or other expertise involved in the different stages of the permitting?
- c) The recent verdict of Norra Kärr does this constitute a break in the Swedish mineral policy and if so how should this be remediated?
- d) What is the optimal time-frame?

Topic 3 – Public Participation and Transparency

- a) What mechanisms should be used for public consultation?
- b) Is the current system adequate?
- c) Building trust and confidence: how?
- d) Is the public educated / knowledgeable enough of mining activities? Are impacts well understood?
- e) Perception of mining in Sweden/Finland/Norway
- f) Measures to adopt to improve public acceptance
- g) Areas of public policy or legislation to increase public acceptance



4.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The workshop was held from lunch the 19th until afternoon the 20th. The duration of the workshop was a result of experiences from the Dublin pilot WS. This time was found to be ample. The WS was firstly containing an introductory part regarding the project and Peer Learning. Secondly presentations from each country was done giving aspects on respective topics. Therafter a workshop session was held. This was repeated for all three subject. It was found that one table was deemed as relevant and proved to give the audience enough with time. Coffe breaks, lunch breaks and dinner all greatly benefitted in creating an atmoshpere of learning and sharing allowing also informal discussions which later popped in the formal WS setting.

4.1.3 Invitation

Invitation, including terms of conditions (i.e., the rights and data protection issues as well as information on consent of participation) was sent to the following groups of people:

- Authorities at local, regional and national level.
- Politicians at local level with mining operations
- Industrial representatives
- NGOs (stakeholders)

With each invitation was included a programme, a terms and conditions with informed consent, a short introduction in local language.

49



4.2 Local Workshop

4.2.1 Workshop programme

19 November

12.30 - 13.00	Registration and coffe
13.00 - 13.05	Welcome by Magnus Langendoen and round the table.
13.05 – 13.20	Introduction of the Minland-projektet – Ronald Arvidsson, Sveriges geologiska undersökning (SGU)
13.20 – 13.30	The concept of the workshop learning from each other – peer learning Ronald Arvidsson
13.30 – 13.45	Integration of av minerals into land use – solutions and challenges an European perspective – Ronald Arvidsson, SGU
13.45 - 14.05	The Austrian mineral policy in land use – Katharina Gugerell
14.05 – 14.25	The case of Kevitsa, Finland – policy integration Nike Luodes
14.25 – 14.50	Kaffe/te
14.50 – 15.20	MinLand cases in Sverige – policy integration – Peter Åkerhammar SGU and Anders Forsgren Boliden
15.20 - 15.40	Land use policy of Norge – minerals into land use – Agnes Raaness
15.40 - 16.40	Workshop 1 – Policy integration
16.40– 17.15	Conclusions day 1
	 Summary workshop 1 What did we learn?

- Good practice from Europa to Scandinavia
- Good practice from Scandinavia to Europa



20 November

08.30-08.50	Land use aspects in permitting, solutions and pitfalls Norway – Agnes Raaness
08.50-09.10	Land use aspects in permitting, solutions and pitfalls – Sweden Mats Aunes Bergsstaten and Magnus Langendoen Länsstyrelsen Västerbotten
09.10-09.30	Land use aspects in permitting, solutions and pitfalls – Finland – Nike Luodes
09.30-10.10	Coffee/te
10.10-11.10	Workshop 2 – Permitting
11.10-11.40	Summary WS2
11.40-1225	Lunch
12.25-12.40	Participation from the public, procedures for solving land-use conflicts. Importance of dialogue, compensation measures and other solutions. – Finland and Norway. Nike and Agnes.
12.40 -12.55	Ecological compensation at the Aitik Mine, Anders Forsgren, Boliden, Sweden,
12.55 – 13.10	Public participation – an European perspective- Katharina Gugerell
13.10 - 13.40	Workshop 3 – transparency
13.40 - 14.10	End of day 2
	 Summary WS3 What have learned? Good practice from Europa till Scandinavia Good practice från Skandinavia to Europe Don't forget the feedback form

Thank you for participating!

Placement of participants

The MinLand team arranged a certain number of participants around each table. One chairman was selected per table with a mix of participants from different organisations with one rapporteur. The rapporteur was responsible for concluding what was discussed. One secretary was also appointed.

Location : Länsstyrelsen i Västerbottens län, Storgatan 71B, Umeå



Working language: English due to the international participation

4.2.2 Presentation summaries

The cases were introduced in the presentations and made available to the audience. The presentations were realized in four blocks:

Block 1: Introduction to project and Peer Learning by Ronald Arvidsson. The Peer learning methodology presentation was the same as held in Dublin by Sara Gottenhuber.

Block 2: Policy integration with examples from Austria (Katharina Gugerell), Finland (Nike Luodes), Norway (Agnes Raaness) and Sweden (Peter Åkerhammar).

Block 3: Permitting with examples from Norway (Anges Raaness); Sweden (Mats Aunes, Magnus Langendoen), Finland (Nike Luodes)

Block 4: Transparency with presentations by Anders Forsgren (Boliden) regarding mitigation of impact of mining on sensitive nature and Europe (Katharina Gugerell).

Photo of the event



4.2.3 Round Tables *Topic 1 – Policy Integration Safeguarding*

Safeguarding was discussed and compared between different countries while certain principles were agreed upon such as:

• Protect a mineral deposit at a time when value is known to a certain degree (so that it does not become sterilised due to other land uses).

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



 Protect large enough area – usually the exact delineation of the deposit is only a small portion of the total area covered by the deposit. Another aspect is when the deposit may be developed to becoming a mine then the mine demands a larger area than the deposit. If such an area is not available then the mine cannot be developed with all necessary parts, like industrial areas and tailings ponds.

It was highlighted that safeguarding shows similarities but also significant differences between the countries. For example in Austria, soft regulation seems to work. Concerns were raised regarding the NI system in Sweden which does not protect the deposits until the concession stage. It was noted that "the NI system is there to support an optimal use of the land and as such it gives a certain protection to a land use once it has been recognised as an area of NI". Regarding the exploration phase, there are no large restrictions or problems (in general).

A second discussion was over whether the policies in effect have the anticipated results. It was stated that "there are deposits that would be possible to mine if there had been a long term protection in effect".

The third point in the discussion concerned the advantages of increasing the level of safeguarding in the different systems. A general conclusion was that it is not a good idea to increase protection systems for mining purposes only, due to the risk of competition with different kinds of interests. Nevertheless, it is important to have in depth knowledge about the deposit as well as a plan for the infrastructure of the mine. As a concluding remark for this subject it was noted that "there would be good to have some kind of protection for specific target areas of high interest in the exploration phase".

One challenge that was mentioned, also connected to area of safeguarding, is the "Huge problems with the water framework directive" since it is hard to find locations for tailings ponds and it is important to create a protection for the infrastructure of the mine.

According to the Norway system, there are different levels of prospect areas according to the variation in knowledge and importance of the deposits. In practice, three levels exist:

- Knowledge about the existence of the deposit
- Knowledge of the Deposit
- Detailed knowledge of the deposit

The participants noted that this might be an efficient method. It was also discussed that evaluation of deposits could be done according to known instruments like UNFC or the PERC codes. (Note: Codes like UNFC and PERC are described within D4.1.)

Concerning Finland that has a functioning system, minerals have entered into the Finnish system through GTK so it might be an effective example. Furthermore, minerals have entered into regional plans instead of national interests.



It was also stressed in order to raise the importance of minerals into a sufficient level it is significant to have high quality geological data which can allow the evaluation of a deposit.

Areas of sensitive nature and other protection (e.g., water directive - not minerals):

Specific points in this discussion was that (exploration not a problem in protected areas):

- Svemin has developed a toolbox for exploration in protected areas.
- In Finland exploration is normally allowed but mustn't affect the environment negatively. Not allowed in restricted areas though.
- A specific solution to no impact on sensitive areas is 3D land use:
 - Boliden has an exploitation concession under a N2000 area.
 - Exploration has been applied for at Taberg in Småland, but is currently appealed.
 - In Finland there is an upcoming mine (Sakatti) that will go under a N2000 site.

It was noted that the environmental performance of mining has come to such a state that "A modern mine has such good environmental performance that it must be possible to mine under it."

Tourism:

- Quarries and tourism are antagonists in Austria.
- Tourism can be improved by mining infrastructure
- Complicated processes not always produce what they are supposed to.
- Local societies against mining tourism and agriculture. How to overcome the opposition is a problem.
- Cooperation between authorities and support in communication technique etc.
- However, it was also noted that in Sweden, in several mining areas there is no opposition between mining and tourism. Examples, Lycksele municipality (Kristineberg mine and Fäbodlidtjärn case study, Kiruna mine) which proves that the opposite might be the case, i.e., no negative impact.

Topic 2 – Permitting and Licencing

The SAMI impact on land use was discussed. It was mentioned that the ILO 169 was signed by Norway, but not Sweden and not Finland. In practise in order for an exploration company to get an exploration permit, the Sami parliament in both Finland and Norway must agree to the exploration project. In Finland this applies only to the Sami homeland which is the northernmost part Lapland.

Exploration stage:



The conclusion regarding permitting and licencing during exploration stage that it is a land use that can coexist with other land uses since it has little or no impact. Nevertheless, for prospecting-drilling in Norway and Finland, the consent of the landowner is required. In a different case then a permit is needed. On the other hand, In Sweden a workplan and providing information to the stakeholders are necessary. In certain cases, restrictions apply and solutions must be sought with affected stakeholders (e.g., Sami during movement of reindeers, impact on sensitive nature during certain periods of the year – drilling while land is frozen).

It was discussed whether a change in practices, the negative impact on media and the negative image of mining had any impact on the number of applications for mining concessions in Sweden. The answer was that in Sweden, during the last six years, 25 exploitation concessions have been granted which is a level similar to that of the previous years. It is not clear though if there is an impact on green-fields since only very few of these application are green-fields.

Public opinion and perception over mining play a very important role and have a crucial impact on mining processes:

- It is considered Important to inform the public about the differences between different stages in the process. For example, explorative drilling does not automatically lead to a new mine.
- People involved in mining industry do not receive communication training for addressing to stakeholders. Nevertheless, there are some industry recommendations about how to handle stakeholders.
- It was deemed important to establish early contact with the public.
- There are many ongoing mining projects concerning communication and conflicts as well as examples of companies that work with social impact assessments.
- It was stated that the role of authorities is to work with facts but they also have to take into account the feelings and opinions amongst stakeholders.
- There is a new discussion about critical minerals due to the need in high-tech applications like e.g. batteries and magnets (for more efficient electric turbines and lighter components in vehicles).

The functionality of mining land use

- In Finland areas of interest for mining can be displayed in comprehensive plans, sometimes introduced on initiative from the companies.
- In Norway there is no concession stage and it works although there is a risk that companies might spend money to no use.
- There might be of interest to make an alteration to the Swedish system and only make judgements according to the environmental act once. It was thus noted that the recent development of doing the environmental impact twice gave no added value to the process since the final evaluation has to pass the environmental court with adequate environmental performance. The suggestion is to omit the unnecessary process in the permitting stage and to make the process as simple as possible.



- In Sweden the environmental court is the first instance to try an application for environmental permit. This is not the case in Norway and Finland where this is performed by authorities.
- The demands in current EIA practice are of a very high standard. E.g., to get an environmental permit you need to hire highly specialised and qualified expertise because the raised demands on mining environmental applications.
- In Norway there is a principle that questions should be decided on the lowest possible level, i.e., municipal level. For this to work there is a need of national guidelines.
- It was noted that the demands on authorities and courts in the permitting and land use process is such that it is demanded a high expertise in mining and environmental impacts from mining including technical and geological expertise. Thus expertise is central.
- Further it was concluded that EIA should be at the final stage knowledge of the project isn't enough until then. It was also noted that if, e.g., test mining demanded EIA a light versions might be useful/necessary in earlier stages (this can also fit within present legislation and practices).
- It was noted that systems of all countries delivers, but there are some examples of bad practise that should not be passed on. This was however not specified.
- It was discussed how the current practices for the concession are being applied in Sweden and that it might need adjustments. Specific examples were though not reported here. The Swedish system might need adjustment so that the land use is not decided in the exploitation concession.
- The political landscape was also discussed and it was generally perceived that the politicians have not taken their responsibility lately. As such, land use is often more of a political decision but it is perceived that politicians don't want to handle complex issues.

Topic 3 – Public Participation and Transparency

Participation from the public, procedures for solving land-use conflicts. Importance of dialogue, compensation measures and other solutions

 Sami and land use issues were briefly discussed. Unfortunately, no Sami were present. It was mentioned that there might not be any differencies of Sami as stakeholders compared to other stakeholders. For the local stakeholder it is usually important to know how they are affected and if there any positive aspects that they can gain from being a part of this process in addition to negative impacts. It was mentioned that some Sami are pro-mining.

The public participation

It is important that these issues contain at least the following bullet points:

- Social responsibility
- Environmental responsibility



• Economic responsibility

A number of important points that a company can work towards are the following (Boliden):

- It is also Important to let people who disagree spend time together.
- If there are disagreement between the industry and the stakeholder: How do you reach people that don't agree with the mining project?
- In consultation meetings between the mining company and the stakeholder if everyone agrees then there are lacking some group of stakeholders!
- If stakeholders that are against don't participate, there might be information gaps that would be important for authorities.

It was also stressed that participation from planning authorities is also important in order to cover the full spectrum of legal and practice issues.

One important aspect is to define the phase into which to involve stakeholders, whether it is early phase, later phase or during the whole process.

4.3 Workshop

4.3.1 Audience statistics

The audience represented the following countries: Sweden, Norway, Finland and Austria. Four county boards and regions (Sweden and Finland), three geological surveys (Sweden, Norway, Finland), and the Swedish Mining Inspectorate. Per group of people the following were represented:

- County administrative Boards or region seven
- Geological Surveys four
- Industry one
- Academia land use one
- Local politician municipal level one
- Mining inspectorate one

4.3.2 Conclusions

The workshop was perceived as very successful with high level discussion and the selection of the three topics following the Irish WS as adequate. The international mix of participants were also attributed to contribute significantly to the success giving further dimensions and possibilities for comparisons on a level princi+ples important to attain. The length of the WS was adequate, adding additional time compared to the Irish WS giving ample time for the



WS discussions. The lunch to afternoon, two day WS, also gave the participants a possibility to network and thus contribute to fruitful discussions.

5. Local Workshop at Emilia Romagna Region

5.1 Preparation for the Local Workshop

5.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

Main topics selected:

- Minland project: objectives and first results and main results from other EU project (MINATURA 2020, SNAP-SEE, SARMA)
- Emilia-Romagna case study
- New quarry police competences
- Atlas of historical mines
- Update of the quarry restoration manual

These topics were selected to present a wide and comprehensive view of the "quarry sector" in Emilia-Romagna Region, with particular focus on EU project.

5.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The meeting was intended to be based on presentations but with large time for discussion and question. The main target was professional, industries and P.A.



5.1.3 Invitation

Extractive activities in Europe, and even more so in Italy, have been affected in the last decade by a strong crisis caused both by the decrease in the demand for traditional raw materials and by the increasing competition from emerging countries. This economic aspect is accompanied by a "negative" perception on the part of the public opinion not commensurate with the growing need for rare and precious raw materials linked to new technologies (smartphones, hybrid cars, etc.).

The conference will therefore be an opportunity to present the experience and perspectives of the Emilia-Romagna Region in the context of mining activities within a sector that is returning to a priority interest for the European Union. We will talk about the European projects to which the Region has participated; in particular of the MINLAND project, of the possibilities related to quarries restoration projects, of the new quarries land registry and the reorganization of the mining police competences.

In particular, the MINLAND project aims to promote actions and strategies for sustainable raw material planning. The project, funded by the Horizon 2020 program with a budget of about 1.5 M and will last two years from 1 December 2017, involves 22 partners from all over Europe, led by the Swedish Geological Survey. For the Emilia-Romagna Region, the Land, Coastal and Reclamation Service takes part.

The redefinition of the territorial areas through the recovery of the areas of the former quarry and the enhancement of natural emergencies through the creation of a mining / naturalistic route to Baiso is an excellent example of sustainable planning and management of resources and territory. For this reason, Baiso is one of the 12 projects chosen by the partnership as good practices to be proposed at European level.

Finally, for the first time, the atlas of historic mines and the update of the Manual for the recovery and environmental rehabilitation of the quarries in Emilia-Romagna will be presented, works co-financed by the European MINATURA 2020 project.

5.2 Local Workshop

5.2.1 Workshop program

Extractive activities in Emilia-Romagna and European projects

9:45 Registration of participants

10:00 Greetings (Fabrizio Corti, Mayor of Baiso, Paride Antolini, president of the Order of Geologists of Emilia-Romagna, Monica Guida, Responsible for Soil and Coast protection and Land Reclamation Service)

Conference opening: moderate Monica Guida

10.10 The MINLAND project and the European mining policy (Christian Marasmi, Soil and Coast protection and Land Reclamation Service)



10:30 The case study of Baiso and the mining route (Giorgia Campana, Alessandro Ghinoi, Giuliano Cervi, professionals)

11:00 Extractive activities: the role of the Region, the future perspectives and the new quarry registry (Marcello Nolè, Soil and Coast protection and Land Reclamation Service)

11:30 The competences of the Agency for Territorial Security and Civil Protection following the reform of Regional Law 13/15 (Alessio Campisi, Regional Agency for Territorial Security and Civil Protection)

11:45 The atlas of historic mines (Maria Teresa De Nardo, Geological, Seismic and Soil Service)

12:10 Recovery of the quarries in Emilia-Romagna (Enrico Muzzi, Department of Agro-Food Sciences and Technologies, University of Bologna)

12:30 Debate

13:00 Conclusion (Fabio Rombini, Geological, Seismic and Soil Service)

5.2.2 Presentation summaries

The MINLAND project and the European mining policy (Christian Marasmi, Soil and Coast protection and Land Reclamation Service): a brief presentation about Minland project and how the Eu policy on mining sector will affect the region in the future

10:30 The case study of Baiso and the mining route (Giorgia Campana, Alessandro Ghinoi, Giuliano Cervi, professionals): detailed presentation of analysis and results of the minland case study

11:00 Extractive activities: the role of the Region, the future perspectives and the new quarry registry (Marcello Nolè, Soil and Coast protection and Land Reclamation Service): the role of the region in the mining sector, with particular references on the modification of the regional law, and the new quarry registry that will collect all the information regarding quarries in the regional territory

11:30 The competences of the Agency for Territorial Security and Civil Protection following the reform of Regional Law 13/15 (Alessio Campisi, Regional Agency for Territorial Security and Civil Protection)

11:45 The atlas of historic mines (Maria Teresa De Nardo, Geological, Seismic and Soil Service): presentation of the atlas of historic mine developed during the minatura 2020 project

12:10 Recovery of the quarries in Emilia-Romagna (Enrico Muzzi, Department of Agro-Food Sciences and Technologies, University of Bologna): result of the analysis made by the University of quality of quarry restoration projects made in Emilia-Romagna during last 15 years.

5.2.3 Round Tables

During the meeting there's no a specific round table but an open session of question. Many questions were dedicated to the modification of regional law and the new competences given



to the regional agency of civil protection. Other italian regions representatives asked some question related to Eu project. The question time lasted 45 minutes.

5.2.4 Photos of the event





61 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



5.3 Workshop Conclusions

5.3.1 Audience statistics

In total we had 98 participants, 55% coming from P.A, 35% of professional and the rest 10% from university (mainly student)

5.3.2 Conclusions

The workshop is intended to be an illustration of the state of the art of the regional mining sector, with particular emphasis on Eu project. Most of the people were interested in the part dedicated to the law updating, with competences given to Regional agency of civil protection. But also the presentation of the Baiso case studies raise the interest of the audience, in particular has shown how regional funds can be spent in quarry areas to create a new use of the territory. The colleagues from other italian regions were particular interested in participating to future Eu project.



6. Local Workshop in Spain

6.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

6.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

The topics for the Spanish Local Workshop were selected in order to solve the issues related to the integration of the mining activity on land-use planning in Spain, trying to include those questions that have been appearing in the Consortium Meetings of the MinLand project. The topics covered by the local workshop were related to policy integration issues, permitting and licensing aspects and public participation and transparency.

6.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The Spanish Local Workshop was designed following the recommendations from the D.6.1 *Common approach for peer learning and good practice guidance* and from the document MINLAND PILOT WORKSHOP: Impact Survey and Process Observation.

At the beginning of the workshop design process, the target audience was determined. Mining authorities, land-use planning authorities (at the national and regional level for both), people from the mining private sector, mining associations, university, geological service and NGO were included. The aim was to gather a representation of all the stakeholders in mineral resources and land-use planning.

An invitation email was sent including, attached, a document with background information in order to attract the interest of the audience and to provide the framework for the later discussions (see Section 1.3 of this document). The LW agenda was also included in the email (see Section 2.1 of this document).

The LW began with four small oral presentations, including background information about the MinLand project, the links between mining and land use planning in Spain, the Spanish case study *Mining-environmental planning in the West Ribera del Ebro, Navarra* and an overview of the Peer learning approach (see Section 2.2 of this document). In the middle of the morning, round tables started and continued after lunch. Following the "lessons learnt from the Irish Pilot Local Workshop", the objective of the LW design was to maximise the time for the exchange of ideas and discussion between the participants. Thus, 20% of the duration of the LW was dedicated to presentations and 80% was dedicated to information exchange and discussion.

When the round tables moment came, the room was physically prepared for the round tables. We choose a "Cross-Tier group" approach. People were organised by the workshop organisation in two round tables in a way that at least one representative of a specific sector was present on them. Each round table was conducted by a person from the workshop organisation. Three topics for discussion were previously selected by the organisation in order to conduct the discussion during the round tables. For each topic, some indicative questions were raised. A list with the topics and questions was given to each participant at the moment of the round tables formation (see Section 2.3 of this document). The participants were

63



informed that this was not a closed list and new topics or questions could be proposed and discussed. We thought that this approach would be more effective in order to achieve an effective information exchange.

6.1.3 Invitation

The invitations were sent by email to all the possible participants. This was the invitation:

Dear Sir or Madam,

I am writing to you on the occasion of the realization of a Local Workshop within the framework of the European MinLand project, which will be held at the headquarters of the Geological Survey of Spain (Calle Ríos Rosas, 23, Madrid) on January 10, 2019. I am pleased to invite you to attend and participate in that day.

It has been recognized that one of the greatest challenges for the extractive industry is the access to the territory and its uses. Thus, the MinLand project, financed by the Horizon 2020 Program, investigates good practices in territorial planning policies and practices in relation to prospective and mining activities throughout the European continent.

During the workshop, the MinLand project will be presented as well as an overview of the links between mining and land use planning in Spain. The Spanish case study selected for the MinLand project, related to mining-environmental planning will be also presented.

We intend to bring together all the agents that may be involved or interested in miningenvironmental planning projects and in the integration of mining into land-use planning instruments. The realization and results of these local workshops are very important for the objectives of the MinLand project and a great opportunity to put on the table different topics that will be the subject of debate.

In the attached document you will find more information about the MinLand Project and the agenda. If you wish, you can obtain more information about the MinLand Project on the official website: <u>http://minland.eu/project/</u>

I hope this workshop to be interesting for you. Please confirm your attendance to the email address <u>v.rodriguez@igme.es</u>

In addition to the invitation, **background information** on the MinLand project, the peer learning approach and the Spanish case study was attached:

SPANISH LOCAL WORKSHOP, MINLAND PROJECT

We are pleased to invite you to the Spanish Local Workshop in the framework of the European project MinLand to be held in Madrid on January 10, 2019. The Workshop has been designed in two stages. The first stage consists of four oral presentations which address the following topics: information about the MinLand project, introduction to the "peer to peer" learning approach, aspects related to the integration of mining in land use planning in Spain and,



finally, information about the Spanish case study in the MinLand project Miningenvironmental planning in the West Ribera del Ebro, Navarra.

The purpose of the workshop is to bring together all the stakeholders involved or interested in mining-environmental planning and its integration into land use planning instruments. The realization and results of this local workshop are very important for the objectives of the MinLand project and offers a great opportunity to discuss about different topics under the point of view of each participant according to its expertise, competences or interests. The workshop has been designed under the prism of the "peer learning approach", with the organization of work tables.

INTRODUCTION TO THE MINLAND PROJECT

The MINLAND project has been designed to meet challenges concerning competing land-use planning related to different land-use interests.

Competition about use of land is fierce within Europe. Currently, the need for metals, construction raw materials and industrial minerals is increasing. There is a large need for access to land for exploration and extraction of mineral raw materials, including critical raw materials. MINLAND aims to secure access to land, with actual or potentially valuable resources, for exploration and extraction of minerals, in an integrated and optimised process, within the EU.

The EU has recognised the need for shared guidelines about harmonised land use and the need for mineral policy strategies within Europe. MINLAND offers an answer to these challenges and is therefore rewarded with an EU Horizon2020 grant for the coming 24 months.

The main goal for the MINLAND project is to ensure access to areas with actual or potentially valuable resources for mineral exploration and exploitation activities within the EU. Exploration and exploitation are required in order to secure European access to necessary raw materials, including critical raw materials (CRM). In order to achieve this goal, the proposed MINLAND project will pursue four overarching objectives:

Objective 1 «create a knowledge repository»: A comprehensive and structured data base with current policies, case studies and best practices about land use planning will be created. These will cover the process from exploration to mining to re-use of post-mining area.

Objective 2 «**facilitate minerals and land use policy making**»: Develop practitioner guidelines for linking land use- and mineral policies; linking implications for land use planning and mineral deposits of public importance (MDoPI), with safeguarding of mineral raw materials within EU. Solutions to safeguarding land for mineral exploration and exploitation versus other land uses will be elaborated.

Objective 3 «strengthen transparent land use practices»: A clear overview will be created of: adequate land use data; adequate geological information; INSPIRE compatibility; necessary information; necessary tools; necessary instruments, such as PERC and UNFC, FRB, etc.



Analyses of case studies addressing these issues will provide input for the design of a selection of best practices. Conclusions and information gathered within the project will provide an important source at local, regional, national and EU-scale, for transparent land use practices.

Objective 4 «foster networking»: Relevant stakeholders will be identified among the practitioners (i.e. land-use planners and mining authorities at local, regional and national levels etc.) and will be included in an interactive and open participation process, ensuring knowledge exchange and continuous learning, and supporting the dissemination of good practices.

These overarching objectives are mutually supportive and can be further broken down into specific sub-objectives. Each sub-objective is addressed by one or more of the project's work packages.

THE SPANISH CASE STUDY IN THE MINLAND PROJECT: MINING-ENVIRONMENTAL PLANNING IN THE WEST RIBERA DEL EBRO, NAVARRA.

A first stage for the implementation of the objectives of MinLand project goes through the compendium of cases studies in the European territory in order to obtain examples of practices of land-use planning in relation to mining and the provision of comprehensive guidance criteria for the agents of the member states of the EU facultative in public policies, land use planning, industries and other relevant groups.

The Spanish project "Mining-environmental planning in the West Ribera del Ebro, Navarra", commissioned by the Mining Service of the Autonomous Community of Navarra and developed by the Geological Survey of Spain was selected to be a part of the MinLand case studies.

Navarra is one of the European regions which have highest aggregates consumption. This Spanish autonomous region is a net importer of this kind of materials. At the date, is the only Spanish region with an aggregate consumption above the European average (despite the crisis in the construction sector). Thus, pressures on the environment due to aggregates exploitation are elevated. Due to the proximity of the exploitation areas to the rivers (as happens in many parts of the world), the occurrence of conflicts with agriculture and transport infrastructures is very likely. In addition, in Navarra, the agri-food sector is one of the most important engines of the economic development of the region, both in terms of agricultural production, as in weight of the industrial sector oriented to the packaging and transformation of agricultural production, and the wine industry (Qualified Designation of Origin of wine of Rioja). It should be noted the production of vegetables, many of them protected by designation of origin: piquillo peppers from Lodosa, artichokes from Tudela and asparagus from Navarra, among others. Thus, the land-planning project is an essential tool to make compatible these land uses. The methodology applied in the project is exportable to any other region, especially where aggregates exploitation exists.

The mapping of potentially exploitable mineral resources can be a valuable tool as a starting point for the integration of mineral resources in the Land Use Planning process. However,



there are other important variables that should be considered to select the most appropriate location.

In this context, the main objective of the Mining-Environmental Planning project was to carry out the spatial planning of mineral resources with an approach based on the optimization of mining operations and the minimization of environmental impacts. Some of the main planning factors in the territory, apart from the potential of aggregates mining in the area, were the existence of a large number of regulatory forms of environmental and cultural protection and the great importance of protecting the soil resources in the area. A territorial analysis was carried out, including an environmental inventory, an inventory of exploitable resources, an analysis of the visual impact and the impacts on the landscape, and a socio-economic and cultural heritage study. The mining activity was also evaluated through a technical and environmental characterization and an inventory of mining operations. A territorial diagnosis was made: the natural value was calculated (based on the intrinsic value of the environmental and cultural elements) and the carrying capacity of the territory for the mining activities was determined.

The final results were a territorial zoning proposal (exclusion zones or non-exploitable zones and exploitable zones with three different levels of priority), a mining and environmental planning map (with 80000 ha of covered surface at 1:25000 scale), and the definition of exploitation and restoration criteria and models.

THE PEER LEARNING APPROACH

One of the objectives (objective 2) of the MinLand project focuses on the promotion of the inclusion of mining in land use planning policies precisely within the framework of the peer learning approach. Thus, the Local Workshop has been designed in the light of the peer learning approach.

Peer learning is defined as "...a two-way reciprocal learning activity in which learning should be mutually beneficial and involve the sharing of knowledge, ideas and experience between participants...peers learn extensively by explaining their ideas to others, working collaboratively, giving and receiving feedback, and evaluating their own learning..."

This learning methodology is based on three aspects: the practice of exchange (knowledge, ideas or experiences), learning through real cases and the willingness and ability to share. The MinLand project has proposed addressing this methodology through the advice and guidance of specific cases involving the application of good practices, and the actual application of the knowledge acquired by participants through the development of a guide of lessons learned.

The implementation of the process of peer learning during the local workshop will consist, first of all, in a general presentation of the most relevant information related to the purpose of the seminar (mining and spatial planning). Then, the most relevant issues, previously defined, will be addressed through small working groups (tables) made up of participants of different profiles (academic, administrative, business, associative, etc.). Finally, a summary of the conclusions obtained will be provided, which will be exposed to all the participants, so



67

that the aspects discussed in the different tables can be addressed by all the participants and obtain conclusions as unanimous as possible.

6.2 Local Workshop

6.2.1 Workshop program

This was the Agenda for the Spanish Local Workshop:

AGENDA

Madrid, 10th January 2019

9:00 - 9:30	Registration
9:30 – 9:35	Welcome
First stage.	General information. Oral presentations.
9:35 – 9:50	Introduction to the MinLand project (10 min, 5 min for questions)
9:50 – 10:05	Peer learning approach, how and why (10 min, 5 min for questions)
10:05 - 10:20	Links between mining and land use planning in Spain (10 min, 5 min for questions)
10:20 – 10:45	Review about the Spanish cases about mining and environmental planning. Presentation of the Spanish case study in the MinLand Project: <i>Mining-environmental planning in the West Ribera del Ebro, Navarra</i> (20 min, 5 min for questions)
Second stage.	Round tables (p2p approach)
10:45 - 11:00	Explanations of the key points: Formation, structure and working of the round tables and topics for discussion (10 min, 5 min for questions)
11:00 - 11:30	Round tables: Formation and comments on first stage (30 min)
11:30 - 12:00	Coffee break
12:00 - 14:00	Round tables: Discussion on the selected topics (2 h)
14:00 - 15:00	Lunch
15:00 - 16:00	Round tables: Discussion on the selected topics (1h)
16:00 - 16:15	Conclusions extracted from the round tables (15 min)
16:15-17:00	Round tables: Comments on second stage (45 min)



6.2.2 Presentation summaries

A total of four short oral presentations were exposed to the audience. All the presentations were conducted by people of the Geological Survey of Spain involved in the MinLand project. The aim of the presentations was to provide more in-depth information than that provided in the invitation. Since the very beginning of the LW, discussions between participants were established. The audience was very interested in the information provided and the time for questions extended a bit more than expected. This was very valuable information for the organisers because it showed the audience's interest in specific topics that was very useful for conducting the following discussion.

More information about the presentations is available below:



The four presentations were as follows:

 Introduction to the MinLand project. General information about the MinLand project was presented: General and specific objectives, information about de Consortium, structure of the work packages, links between them and a brief description of each WP with the specific objectives. Finally, information about the involvement of the Geological Survey of Spain in the project was provided.



69 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



- **Peer learning approach, how and why**. This was a very important presentation, similar in extension to that about the information of the MinLand project. In this presentation, the peer learning approach was presented to the audience: definition of peer learning, the objectives and advantages of this approach, the different ways to implement it and the manner selected for the implementation in the Spanish Local Workshop. In that way, the audience was informed about what was expected of them and how the procedure was to be carried out.



	~	Mine	ral Resources in Susta	iinable Land-Use Pla	ming
	-	lasificación	por Grupos	Dara las mon	
	Nivel 1	1.1 Purceranse intelains encargados de la assilicación o asignación de Usos de suelo	Operadoresi en temas del zo 1.3 Panconarios regionales encargados de la zosficiación o asignación de seus	L'action y placementerite L'action y placementerite	de trabajo
90	Nivel 2	2.1 Parconarios estatales	2.2 Functionarius regionales	resolución de permises 2.3 Académicos / Universitad	industrial involucinals on la velocitad de permisea
			Contraction of the local division of the		An Consideren / Institution de Resettigentés privados
	Nivel 3	3.1 Servicos Geológicos	3.2 Académacos / Universaliad	1.3 Consultance	2.4 Institute de Inseingach
and the second second			Industria y actores	de la sociestat cod	Prosta .
	Nivel 4	4.3 Actores de la industria un responsabildad en las concesiones (Aloctaciones, Consultores de sues de suelo)		4.2 Societad Cort - ONGs, grupos de retento tocal afectados por la actividad miserioj	
		The project has reacted for drighter rea	Longer Gront Statiger 2000 manufact	erender propriet ofer basis ig to	
	The second second			te Annen 21	A DESCRIPTION OF THE OWNER OF THE
					E Plant
And the second se					and the second

70 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679





Links between mining and land use planning in Spain. The general framework on land-use planning and mining planning for the Spanish case was presented, including policy and legal frameworks. The diagram showed the complex Spanish framework ranging from the European level, going through the national, regional and local levels and leading finally to the mining permit process. Also, the links between the environmental mandatory laws, land-use planning and mining strategies and activities were showed.



71 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



Review about the Spanish cases about mining and environmental planning. Presentation of the Spanish case study in the MinLand Project: Miningenvironmental planning in the West Ribera del Ebro, Navarra. In the last presentation, we presented the Spanish case study in the MinLand project. General information about the mining-environmental approach developed by the Geological Survey of Spain in different regions of Spain was showed. Then, more in-depth information about the case of Navarra was presented: all the stages of the study were covered, concluding with the Mining-Environmental planning Map and the zoning of the West Ribera del Ebro showing those areas excluded for the mining activity and those in which mining activity was suitable with three levels of priority (in which the mining land-use is vocational, compatible with conditions and compatible with strong restrictions respectively). The participants were very interested in the





72 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679


6.2.3 Round Tables

About 80% of the LW duration was invested in the round tables. The participants were divided in two round tables following a "Cross-Tier group" approach. Three topics were previously chosen for discussion. For each topic, some indicative questions were raised. The topics and questions were selected in consistency with those fixed for the Irish Local Workshop but adapted to the Spanish case. In view of the discussions established during the questions time after the presentations, the organisers could early evaluate the adequacy of the topics and the questions chosen. A list with the topics and questions was given to each participant at the moment of the round tables formation. The participants were informed that this was not a closed list and new topics or questions could be proposed and discussed.

The topics chosen and the questions were:

Topic 1 – Policy Integration

- i) Integration of minerals interest in land use planning
- j) Need for zoning or spatial designation
- k) Adequacy of current policy framework on mining in relation to current mining demands. What works? What should change?
- I) Adequacy of current policy framework on land-use planning in relation to current mining demands. What works? What should change?
- m) What are the key land use conflicts? How can they be addressed?
- n) Support for Planning Authorities, what do they need:
 - a. Guidelines for Planning Authorities?
 - b. More support from regional and central government?
 - c. Inter-administrative coordination mechanisms?
 - d. Other
- o) National interest vs. local interest
- p) Current land use vs other compatible land uses, i.e. land uses where activities, such as mining, are permitted consistent with legal constraints and environmental/ social objectives?
- q) Which would you consider as good practices in land-use planning policies in connection with the mining activity?

Topic 2 – Permitting and Licensing

- h) Should mineral development be considered to as 'strategic national development'?
- i) How do you consider the time needed for obtaining permits and licences in mining projects (too short, adequate, too long)? What kind of actions would be implemented to reach an optimal time-frame?
- j) It would be useful a one-stop-shop process for obtaining permits and licences in exploitation mining projects?

Topic 3 – Public Participation and Transparency



- m) What mechanisms should be used for public consultation?
- n) Is the current system sufficient and appropriate?
- o) Too much, adequate or too little in exploration?
- p) Too much, adequate or too little in development?
- q) Timeframes for consultations too long/adequate/too short?
- r) Building trust and confidence: how?
- s) Is the public educated / knowledgeable enough of mining activities? Are impacts well understood?
- t) Social perception of mining in Spain
- u) Measures to adopt to improve public acceptance
- v) Areas of public policy or legislation to increase public acceptance

All the participants were very active in the round tables. It was initially intended to conduct the discussions following the topics and question in order but, sometimes a discussion led to another different and talks jumped from one topic or question to another. At the end, all the topics were covered and, practically, all the questions (more information in the section 3.2 *Conclusions* of this document).



At the end of the round tables and the exposition of the LW conclusions, a questionnaire for the evaluation of the LW was distributed to the participants. The questionnaire was designed following the model questionnaire used for the evaluation of the Irish Local Workshop. The questions focused on the Peer learning experience, the identification of good practices from the case study and its transferability. The completion of the questionnaire was voluntary.



QUESTIONNAIRE ON EVALUATION OF THE SPANISH LOCAL WORKSHOP – MINLAND PROJECT

Please, tick which organisational background applies to your work:

Dublia	Business/private sector	Academia	Geological Survey	NGO/Civil	Other,
rubic				Society	please
poncy				organ	specify:

Q1: How could you describe your overall MINLAND Peer Learning experience? Please tick:

1 = non-	9	3	4	5 = very
satisfactory	L			satisfactory

Q2: Which parts of the event were most useful for your work and why?

Q3: Was there enough time/opportunity to exchange information with other participants?

Q4: Do you believe what you have learned at the event will benefit your organisation? If so, in what way?

Q5: Which good practice aspects of the case did you find the most relevant for you and your work?



Q6: Which good practice aspects of the case study could be used/transferred/integrated into your home organisation or country?

Q7: What barriers (e.g. political, administrative) do you foresee for transferring good practice aspects of the case into your home organisation?

Q8: What enabling factors could support you in transferring case good practice aspects in your home organisation (i.e. what would you need to make it work)?

The questionnaire was entirely or partially completed by almost all participants. The peer learning experience was evaluated with a mean of 4.4 (in a 1 to 5 scale). One participant gave a score of 3 with an attached explanation: she considered that the peer learning approach could have been improved if "Sub-Tier group" round tables had taken place before the Cross-Tier group" round tables. That person also noted that perhaps it was impossible in a one-day workshop (see more details about the questionnaire's answers in section 3.2 of this document).

6.3 Workshop Conclusions

6.3.1 Audience statistics

Twenty-three invitations were sent. The target audience included: mining authorities (at the national and the regional level), land-use planning authorities (at the regional level), and people from the mining private sector, mining associations, university, geological service and NGO. One person invited to the LW thought that a colleague would be more appropriated for attending the LW. Thus, at the end, a total of 24 invitations were sent. Unfortunately, only 11 participants could attend, plus the three organisers from the Geological Survey of Spain. That is, a total of 14 participants (57% females, 43% males). The affiliations of the participants were as follows:

- 1 person from the Official College of Geologist
- 2 people from the Mining Authority (one person from the national Mining Authority and one person from the regional Mining Authority of Navarra)
- 3 people from Mining Associations
- 2 people from the University
- 1 people graduated in Geography and member of the Regional Government of Madrid.
- 5 people form the Geological Survey of Spain (including the three organisers).



The evaluation questionnaires were filled by the 82% of the participants (two people from public institutions, two from the Geological Survey, two from the University and three from mining associations).

The fact that, finally, anybody from the land-use planning authority of Navarra and from environmental NGO could attend the workshop has been considered as a weakness of the Spanish LW. The non-attendance was confirmed the day before the LW. In that respect, it may be considered that the LW was slightly positively biased towards the mining sector.

Despite this, we consider the LW a success in view of the great participation of the audience during the event, the level of satisfaction of the participants and the conclusions achieved.

6.3.2 Conclusions

Prior to the LW celebration, the people invited expressed their interest in the Local Workshop, even people that finally could not attend it. The most reluctant were, perhaps, the people form the public institutions (involved in public policies). Some people asked for a more detail information that was provided by email. The most interested stakeholders were those from the private sector (mining associations). At the beginning of the LW, people did not seem to know well what was expected from them in the event. The presentation about the peer learning approach was fundamental to solving the issue. The participants became more interested as the presentations progressed. Thus, the time for questions extended a bit more than expected and first discussions spontaneously appeared. This was very valuable information for the organisers because the audience's interest was being showed and was very useful for conducting the following discussion and for evaluating the suitability of the topics and questions selected for the round tables.

Furthermore, this extra time for sharing opinions early contributed to a friendly climate that served as an "ice breaker". This fact, combined with other mechanisms selected for this purpose (room configuration, participants presenting themselves to the others, etc.) enabled to start the round tables and the discussions expeditiously and appropriately. All the participants were very active in the round tables. It was initially intended to conduct the discussions following the topics and question in order but, sometimes a discussion led to another different and talks jumped from one topic or question to another.

The main conclusions of the discussions on the three selected topics were summarized as follows:

Topic 1 – Policy Integration

a) Integration of minerals interest in land use planning

It is important that mineral resources (and the possible activity related to their exploitation) are integrated into the different land management instruments given that they establish guidelines and general guidelines on the physical management of the territory, from a "macro" point of view (spatial and urban development, natural resources, communications corridors, protected areas, economic activity zones, etc.). From this point



of view, mining activity in general should be considered at least as potentially authoritative (subject to compliance with current regulations), since it is about resources and uses of the territory. If it is not mentioned expressly, it would be diluted in "economic activity" and "natural resources". However, since any mineral substance can be investigated or exploited, it is difficult to plan the territory taking mineral resources into account. Another issue is the well-known deposits, abandoned mining areas not restored and active mines. It is important to highlight that, regardless the integration of the mineral resources of interest in the land-use planning, if the lines of action of the regional mining strategies are not taken into account, all the efforts carried out for this integration is useless. The people form the mining associations believe that the integration is possible within the framework of the EIA processes. However, the expert on land-use planning thinks that planning is important as an expression of the policies of a country or region and that integration would make sense.

It would be necessary to include de mining authorities in the Land-Use Law. When a valuation of the land is performed under the Land-Use Law, mandatory reports are required to the coastal authority, the hydrological authority, etc. It should be mandatory to consult also the mining authority. For answering this consultations, mining authority can use mining potential maps, mining indications or databases. But it would be very useful to develop national mining potential maps.

b) Need for zoning or spatial designation

Most of the participants believe that there is no need for designating a special zoning category for integrating the mining use in the land-use planning, although they consider that land-use planning should take into account the possibility of mining use giving it an equitable treatment with the rest of possible uses. The planners should be informed with regard to the mineral resources and mining aspect. They trust on EIA process for weighing the different land-uses. The compatibility of mining (or incompatibility) with other land-uses derives from the result of its Environmental Impact Assessment. In any case, it is important to include in territorial planning policies the fact that if a viable mining deposit is discovered, the policy can be revised to try to match the interests of territorial and environmental protection with the interests of putting mineral resources into exploitation. Moreover, they consider that the mining use should prevail over other land-uses in the case of actual mineral resources. Finally, it is necessary to introduce the concept of mineral resources of public utility within the framework of a national mining strategy.

c) Adequacy of current policy framework on mining in relation to current mining demands. What works? What should change?

Participants thinks that there is an important issue. The mineral resources are public property and, by contrast, the mining activity is a private initiative, both exploration and development. In this context, the representative from the regional mining authority believes that, being a private activity, there should not be policies on mining, except those that can be understood as generators of better conditions for the development. It is



commented that, currently, there is only one national regulatory framework (Mining Law) and the three regional mining strategies (in only three Autonomous Communities). In those regions, the mining strategies works very well in certain aspects (training in the sector, improvement of the mining social image, SWOT analysis reviewable every five years, etc.). In general, the members of the round table admit that the national normative framework works. In addition to the legislation on environmental impact, the Mining Law is a constant reference for most of the participants. The expert on land-use planning believes that a clear national mining policy should be performed and that the guidelines for spatial planning should include "master plans", such as those of natural resources of some communities, with or without cartography. Another option would be to produce "white paper" type documents, with suggestions, proposals for action, etc. What may be important is the existence of institutional coordination for the determination of how mining issues have to be addressed at a normative level, taking into account all aspects (territorial, mining, strategic, environmental, social, economic, ...), since sometimes the same administration encourages economic activity and mining on the one hand but on the other hand limits activities in certain places or protects aspects that directly affect future developments (where deposits are located), and that derives in conflicts. The main conclusions about this question at the final of the discussion are:

- It is essential to develop a National Mining Strategy. This strategy should contemplate de public utility of certain mineral resources.
- The current Mining Law needs to be updated. In Spain several many modification attempts have been begun but have not been forthcoming.
- Institutional coordination is essential in order to address mining issues.

d) Adequacy of current policy framework on land-use planning in relation to current mining demands. What works? What should change?

The expert on land-use planning stresses once again the land-use planning as an expression of the policies of a country, region or municipality. She advocates the need for documents as Mining Master Plans in which the mining activity is integrated as part of the possibilities for development of a region on equal terms to other land-uses. The rest of the participants express that the land-use policies do not respond to the expectations of the mining sector. Within the framework of land-use planning, mining activity is not usually taken into account. The mining activity is not clearly considered and it is always a source of debate and problems for mining development. The Land-use planning should clearly explain or establish the compatibility of mining activity within the land zoning (land-use designations for a certain areas). However, for example in Navarra, extractive activity is specifically contemplated in the Land Management Plans (it is generally indicated as authoritative under conditions). In addition, the decentralisation of the landuse competences and the complexity of the land-use flowchart represents a substantial handicap. At the end of the permitting process, are the municipal authorities who permit or not the change of the previous designated land use. Since the mining use is not integrated in the regional land-use planning, the criteria applied by the municipalities, often respond to very local interests.



e) What are the key land use conflicts? How can they be addressed?

The main land-use conflicts identified by the participants are those with the urban use and with other land-uses linked to the tourism. Also conflicts with agricultural or environmental protection uses can occur. All participants agree that the best way to deal with these conflicts is through better information, communication, transparency and participatory processes within the framework of the EIA process. The weighting of the different land-uses must be performed on the basis of an evaluation of economic, social and environmental aspects and political decisions in the case of resources of national interest or mineral deposits of public importance.

f) Support for Planning Authorities, what do they need:

Among the answers to this question, it is pointed out that what would provide a better support for the integration of mining use is a greater inter-administrative coordination. It is also expressed that the technical teams dedicated to land-use planning should be more multidisciplinary, with greater weight of professionals with geological-mining training. As a final reflection, the royalties or benefits from the mining exploitation must be transferred to population settled in the territory in order to improve local development.

- *a.* Guidelines for Planning Authorities?
 Yes, but not only for the planning authorities, also for the planning drafting teams, since territorial planning is usually carried out by external teams.
- b. More support from regional and central government? It is indispensable. It is important because the regional or national administrations are able to organize meetings or inter-territorial conferences in which experiences are exchanged, helping the municipalities where there is no mining tradition to understand the issues related to this activity. On the other hand, regional administrations have in their workforce mining experts who can offer support to local entities.
- c. Inter-administrative coordination mechanisms?
 It is fundamental. As previously mentioned, sometimes there are different interests that fall on the same territory or different administrations involved, and it is difficult to determine which is more relevant.
- d. Others. More funding for training and for extra personnel.

80

g) National interest vs. local interest

It is essential to perform a National Raw Material Strategy that permeates in the regional level. The National Strategy should be the basis for the development of Regional Mining Strategies, being adapted each one to the reality of the particular autonomous region. Within this "national vision", the State could promote strategic mining activities via "Mining promoting laws". For the people of the mining associations, the general interest must prevail over the private interest, and the national interest over the regional/local one (see article 128 of the Constitution and Title I of the Mining Law 22/1973). In this sense, it is important to establish national-regional-local coordination at the level of



regulations and priorities to be taken into account once a deposit has been discovered: to know what elements should be assessed and to establish mechanisms to minimise or compensate impacts and giving response to all parts involved. In many cases, the Autonomous Communities do not appeal to the national interest considering only their regional/local position. The scale-interest conflicts have a bottleneck when achieving the local level, in which particular interests are expressed. In any case, a National Mining Strategy should be indicative, not mandatory.

h) Current land use vs other compatible land uses, i.e. land uses where activities, such as mining, are permitted consistent with legal constraints and environmental/ social objectives?

Mining activity usually achieves an economic and social performance superior to other uses, such as agriculture. Its development is not incompatible with agricultural or environmental use. An underground exploitation has little effect on the land and its use while, in open pit exploitation when transferring mining is carried out, the effect is small, (being agricultural or natural uses compatible in areas not yet exploited or in zones already restored). In some cases, since activities such as hunting are not allowed inside the facilities, the mining operations become shelters for certain species. Also the water ponds and pits act as a call effect to bird species. In any case, mining use should be evaluated with parity compared with other land-uses within the EIA procedures (based on economic value, social and environmental aspects and general interest).

i) Which would you consider as good practices in land-use planning policies in connection with the mining activity?

Some participants consider that extrapolating the mining-environmental planning approach performed in the Spanish case study in the MinLand project to other autonomous regions would be a good practice. They appreciate particularly the proposed zoning that integrates the mining potential and the legal constraints and environmental/ social objectives. The results of the methodology in zoning classes (areas excluded from the mining activity and areas with mining carrying capacity and three levels of priority) are directly applicable to whatever part of the territory. It is also pointed out that it is necessary to observe the mining activity as an opportunity for the rural development.

All participants express that the urban planning should be less restrictive and the EIA procedure should be sufficient to evaluate the relative weight of the land-uses, without the need for more spatial planning to define the uses.

Other good practices include:

- Making a comparative of the different approaches in Land-Use Planning and Mining (by autonomous communities and countries), to see which ones work and which do not.
- Having a public record of the mining restorations that are being made, with "before", "during" and "after" images that can help the planners to have perspective.



- Developing after closure rehabilitation plans in accordance with land-use planning policies.
- Including experts on geology and mining from public institutions or regional mining services in the development of land-use planning.

Topic 2 – Permitting and Licensing

a) Should mineral development be considered to as 'strategic national development'?

The participants remark the need for a Mining Strategy at the national level, according to the EU Raw Materials Strategy but adapted to the needs and the mining potential of Spain. In this context, some types of mineral resources could be designed as "resources for strategic national development". One participant advocates for the development and/or updating of the Spanish law on the "promotion of mining" (the last updating is dated 1993). Natural resources in general (and minerals in particular) should be considered a 'strategic development issue' at the national level. Thus, the dependence of other producing countries on certain resources necessary for industrial development would be minimized and this development would be promoted through new investments, job creation and additional wealth due to the synergies generated by the exploitation of our resources. On the one hand it is commonly accepted that the wealth and prosperity of a society is based on its economic progress, which is supported in modern societies in industrial production, which needs a continuous supply of mineral raw materials. The crisis that has hit Europe and Spain in recent years has made clear the need to have an industrial sector with greater participation in the economy and stronger. For this, raw materials are necessary. On the other hand, it would be necessary to develop a strategy that would set in motion the existing legislative mandates (see Article 128 of the Spanish Constitution; Title I, Article Five and Third Final Provision of Law 22/1973 on Mines; the preamble of the Law 6/1977 on the Promotion of Mining; the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the Initiative for raw materials: meeting the basic needs in Europe to generate growth and employment (04/11/2008) and the provision First Final of Law 54/1980, of November 5, of modification of the Mining Law). A national strategic development is not only indispensable, but is a legislative mandate. Currently, three Mining Strategies has been developed at the regional level. It would be extended to the entire Spanish territory. The participants consider that the methodology exposed in the Spanish case study resulting in "Mining aptitude maps" and "Mining-environmental maps" would be transferable to other Spanish regions, facilitating the development of a National Mining Strategy. In this framework, the different regional governments and, by extension the national government, could express their needs for mineral resources and the mining potential of their regions.

b) How do you consider the time needed for obtaining permits and licences in mining projects (too short, adequate, too long)? What kind of actions would be implemented to reach an optimal time-frame?



People from the mining sector (both public and private) consider that the permitting process is arduous and takes much longer than the deadlines established by law, sometimes even for exploration. The excessive time spent discourages the development of new projects. People from the private mining sector also pointed out that it is unusual that the competent authorities report to the promoters about the status of the processes. The main reasons for the excessive time in the permitting processes are:

- The procedures involve several steps with different laws establishing their own time periods.
- Deadlines between publications, receipt of reports, forwarding of documents, etc. exists.
- The legal requirements for resolution within a certain period disappear as soon as the administrative body requests information from a third party, which may not consider its answer as a priority.
- Certain procedures are not limited in time.
- For the same activity, consecutive permits and licenses are required, and the times are added.

The representative from the regional mining authority point out that, sometimes, the excess of time is due to a poor quality of the EIA studies and the projects and that this document should get right to the point in order to facilitate the evaluation process. Moreover, he points out that the permitting process length is legally established and rights should be exercised against the excessively extended periods by denouncing it. Representatives of the mining associations express that this is not actually being done because, generally, it entails to enter into litigation with the administration and it can be counterproductive.

Actions that could be implemented to improve the time for obtaining permits and licences include:

- More administrative agility in requesting reports from third parties.
- More clarity on the requirements and contents of the projects from the administration. Uniform criteria between autonomous regions (environmental aspects, security, procedures, etc.)
- Avoiding redundancies in projects.
- Clarification of details via meetings with the applicants.
- Inter-administrative coordination. Mining authorities can assess other authorities to solve mining issues about the project.
- Stricter compliance with time limits by the administration.
- Agile and decisive bidirectional communication (administration/promoter) that favours the resolution of conflicts.
- Electronic procedures for permitting.
- c) It would be useful a one-stop-shop process for obtaining permits and licences in exploitation mining projects?



The affirmative answer is unanimous. It is suggested that a one-stop-shop would be very useful, with a single process coordinated by the regional authority which should collect reports from other authorities at the regional and local level.

Topic 3 – Public Participation and Transparency

a) What mechanisms should be used for public consultation?

Public participation is guaranteed through the legal mechanisms of official consultation within the permitting process (public exhibitions of the projects and consultations with interested parties according to the Mining Law 21/1973, RD 975/2009 on Restoration and mining waste management and EIA Law 22/2013). However, through social responsibility initiatives, mining companies can strength their relationship with the local community by establishing formal channels of communication with different interest groups. These mechanisms may include the holding of citizen participation processes aligned with the guidelines of international, national and regional participation processes. In this sense it can be recommended that companies distribute their own process of citizen participation. All the participants admit that the mining sector should be more open to the society. Other mechanisms that can be used are: mining round tables, "open days", suggestion boxes, training workshops for citizens, sponsorships, etc. In those autonomous regions where "mining round tables" with all the stakeholders are established (e.g. Castilla La Mancha), the public participation is enhanced. These initiatives should be considered as a factor of excellence, but should not be mandatory. Making it mandatory would introduce additional delays to the already long processing times.

b) Is the current system sufficient and appropriate?

The current system allows authorities to listen the concerns of the citizens. The Administration takes into account the public opinion when granting and continuing with the procedures of a mining project. It is considered adequate but some aspects could be improved. It would be necessary to establish and, perhaps, enhance the technical and critical capacity of the evaluators of the public consultations. Despite this, the public participation is usually low and often groups with hidden interests come into the limelight. In this point, the mining sector point out that it could be solved by being more active at the local level. The nearer to the population the exploitation is, the more significant information must be given.

- c) Too much, adequate or too little in exploration?
- d) Too much, adequate or too little in development?

In both cases, participants considered adequate the public participation process. But they express that, sometimes, the results of the public consultations extend the permitting process times in excess. This is particularly applicable to the development stage.

e) Timeframes for consultations - too long/adequate/too short?



For large-scope or complex projects perhaps the timeframes fall short but, in general, are appropriate. The problem comes when those times are not respected. All participants agree.

f) Building trust and confidence: how?

The key point is INFORMATION. Although one participant express that the guarantees systems should be enough to inspire confidence, all agree that it is crucial to communicate and to inform with transparency (not communicating only the kindly face) and technical information. It is important to show real examples of exemplary mining projects. It is advisable to take a proactive attitude and better explain the need for minerals in our daily lives as well as the importance of mineral resources in the achievement of the Sustainable Development Goals. Trust can also be transmitted through direct communication: talks and meetings with citizens, associations, companies, etc., accompanied in the process by the authorities. Another important point is the form in which information is provided. Who should be the responsible for providing the information in order to enhance the confidence? There is unanimity in this point between de participants: a set of all the actors, including the public authorities. For example, in Navarra, the mining companies perform periodic meetings with citizens to explain what is being done in coordination with the involved authorities.

g) Is the public educated / knowledgeable enough of mining activities? Are impacts well understood?

Everyone agrees. No, the public is not well informed. Furthermore, the available information focuses on the negative impacts, especially on environmental damage and is often exaggerated, decontextualized or partial.

h) Social perception of mining in Spain

There is a poor social perception of mining in Spain. People from mining associations and from the mining authorities express that, as soon as a mining project is trying to start, a platform contrary to the project appears. These "anti-mining" platforms gain advantage over the mining companies that are often still carrying out their studies and do not have definitive data. The "anti-mining" platforms focus their efforts from the beginning on issues related to health and the local economy to put the population against the project. Once that message has penetrated into the population, it is very difficult to get them to change their minds. Moreover, they point out that the media generally publish only negative aspects of the industry. Complementarily, the view of the people from the Geological Survey and the land-use planning expert emphasised that the mining sector needs to be consistent with the fails of the sector: Spain has an extended legacy of abandoned mines without rehabilitation and this fact heavily influences the social perception. Furthermore, recent rehabilitation projects do not have been successful as expected. All the participants agree that the mining sector does not have known o does not have been able to transmit the correct information about the current reality of the



mining projects to the population. It is necessary to make efforts in social image and communication.

i) Measures to adopt to improve public acceptance

People are not aware of the importance of the geological resources. It is also pointed out that the companies or the administrations concerned should carry out education and promotion campaigns including economic, social and environmental valuations of the two scenarios (mining activity in the territory or importing the resources). Some measures that can be implemented include:

- The benefits coming from the mining activity to the local population should be tangible. For example (especially in economically depressed areas), mining activity could act as a force for change of the local development model.
- Including appropriate information about minerals and mining in the educational system.
- Training teachers, especially at the primary and secondary levels.
- Organization of exhibitions of minerals.
- Informative events and forums with educational purposes.
- Development of awareness campaigns to understand and make clear the need for mining for our society.
- Use of didactic videos about mining in social media.
- Reporting on non-financial performance.
- Sharing also the positive news of the sector.
- Investment in social media and communication.
- Involving communication experts in the strategic plans of mining companies and associations.

j) Areas of public policy or legislation to increase public acceptance

In order to increase public acceptance, the public policies could:

- To improve basic education at primary and secondary level in these subjects. To inform the public more about geological-mining resources.
- Establishing coordination systems between different administrations and departments.
- Coordination with companies to implement an alternative development plan (agreed land-use for the territory) after the closure of a mining project.
- To promote the public understanding of the mineral resources as a national matter of concern in terms of growth, reduction of external dependence, generation of qualified employment and fight against rural depopulation.

Regarding the results from the questionnaires, the main results can be summarised as follows:

86

- The peer learning experience was evaluated with a mean of 4.4 (in a 1 to 5 scale). One participant gave a score of 3 with an attached explanation: she considered that the peer learning approach could have been improved if "Sub-Tier group" round tables



had taken place before the Cross-Tier group" round tables. Obviously, the implementation of this approach would require a workshop designed for, at least, two days.

- The answer to question 2 (Which parts of the event were most useful for your work and why), was unanimous. For the participants, the most useful part was de round tables: information and ideas exchange and the knowledge of other points of view. The participants also considered that the a better understanding of the needs of the private sector, associations and other organisms lead the public institutions to know the society's concerns and needs. One of the participants considered that the presentation about the general overview about the links between mining and land use planning in Spain was very useful for him.
- The majority of the participants considered that the time for the round tables was appropriate. One participant pointed out that more time would have been very positive.
- All the participants considered that what they have learnt will benefit their organisations. Some of them expressed that it would be advisable to export this peer learning approach to other themes.
- About the good practices arising from the Spanish case study, the participants considered that the Mining Potential Map (mining aptitude) and the Mining-environmental Planning Map (land zoning as a result of a balance between the mining aptitude and the carrying capacity of the territory) were the most relevant to them.
- In the question 6 of the questionnaire, participants were asked about the transferability of the good practices of the case study. The participants considered that the methodology developed in the case study would be directly transferable to the entire the Spanish territory. They considered that this kind of approach would be useful for the integration of the mining activity into the land-use planning, because one of the results is a land zoning perfectly compatible with land-use planning in Spain.
- Participants considered that the main barriers for transferring good practice aspects of the case into their home organization are: Legislative aspects, complexity of the land-use planning legislative framework and difficulties that this framework poses with reference to the mining activity, political and administrative barriers and the decentralization of mining and land-use planning competences in Spain.
- Finally, participants were asked about enabling factors that could support the transferability of the case good practice aspects. The participant highlighted the need for more administrative coordination, new or amended appropriate legislation, and more occasions for sharing information and knowledge between stakeholders (including society and NGOs) in events similar to the Local Workshop, Mining round tables, etc. The also highlighted the need for sharing appropriate and transparent information to the society for improving the knowledge about the mining activity and the acceptance.

One of the lessons learnt from the Spanish Local Workshop is that it would have been useful to provide the list with the topics and questions for discussion previously, perhaps with the



invitation and the background information. Thus, even people finally not attending, could have expressed their opinions by answering the questions before the event and the organisers could have put this ideas into the floor during the LW. Another lesson, suggested by a participant in the LW, is that the peer learning could have been improved if "Sub-Tier group" round tables would have taken place before the Cross-Tier group" round tables.

Finally, all the participants expressed their interest in the final results of the MinLand project and some of them, even people that could not assist to the workshop, said that they wished to be part of the stakeholder's network and, if possible, to attend subsequent Network Meetings.



7. Local Workshop in Portugal

7.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

7.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

The main subject of the Portuguese Local Workshop (LWS), organized by LNEG and DGEG, which took place in Lisbon at the LNEG Campus was the Portuguese case study: "Portugal land use planning innovative methodology for mineral resources". It relates to the integration of mineral resources into land use planning, bearing in mind that: mineral resources are irremovable and non-renewable; their exploitation/utilization is temporary; geodiversity is a concept to be implemented.

Therefore, beyond the peer-learning intentions, the topics' main goals were to identify and analyse difficulties concerning the implementation of the Portuguese informal methodology to safeguard mineral resources in the land use planning process, and propose solutions. The selected topics concern three main themes: policy integration; public acceptance and social responsibility; and permitting and allocation of mineral resource rights.

Regarding the first theme, two policy concepts concerning mineral resources areas, which are not legislated, but are frequently used in delimiting mineral resources areas at the municipality level, were proposed for debate: Potential Area and Complementary Exploitation Area and their integration in municipality land use plans. Aspects taken into account in the Peer Learning session were the possibility to integrate these concepts in legislation, as well as the coexistence and parity of uses concepts..

In the second theme the topic concerned the social recognition of the importance of mineral resources and solutions to improve the image of the mineral resources sector.

The third theme related to the difficulties found and the possible solutions to get new permits in areas of rustic soil that are not assigned to "Areas for the Exploitation of Geological Resources" in the municipal land use plans.

All the topics are in line with Minland main objective as contributing to the formalization of policies to ensure that exploration and exploitation activities in the EU have access to areas where mineral resources exist or potentially exist in the EU. They are particularly focused in facilitating the development of LUP and mineral resources policies and increasing transparency in the practice of integrating the mineral resources in LUP.

To each theme was given 30 minutes for debate.

One page with the following topics was given to each round-table before the Peer Learning session begun:

Theme 1. Policy Integration (30 min)

- How to consider the concepts of "Potential Area" and "Complementary Exploitation Area" in the municipal land use plans (PDMs), taking into account:

- Inclusion in legislation or only through the creation of guidelines
- The compatibility between different uses of rustic soil ("principle of coexistence")

www.minland.eu



- Equitable evaluation of possible uses in order to avoid unnecessary sterilization of mineral resources ("parity principle").
- Difficulties
- Solutions: how to overcome difficulties.

Theme 2. Public acceptance and social responsibility (30 min)

- What is the public perception of the importance of mineral resources?
- Main obstacles
- How to overcome difficulties and improve the image of the mineral resources sector? What initiatives and by whom?

Theme 3. Permitting and allocation of mineral resource rights (30 min)

- Is it easy to get new mining permits in areas of rustic soil, without being in "Geological Resource Area"?
- Which difficulties?
- How to overcome these difficulties.

7.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The Lisbon LWS was structured in four sessions.

In the morning took place a presentations session concerning an explanation of the WS itself, the importance of minerals to the society, the current Portuguese legislative status concerning the relationship between minerals and LUP, the concept of safeguarding minerals in LUP, the MinLand project in the context of the Raw Materials Initiative, and the Portuguese mining authority (DGEG) practice for the integration of minerals in LUP, as well as some cases of success.



Figure 1- Presentation session

90

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679



The afternoon started with a period of discussion and interactive work on specific themes (section 1.1), subordinated to the major theme: Portugal land use planning methodology for safeguarding mineral resources in land use planning

Considering the peers involved we considered the results of the LWS would be more productive with a round table organization. in order to achieve in each group a diverse audience that could cover the different matters involved in the themes and topics to be discussed, it was tried to make an equitable distribution of the pairs of the different professional areas: mining and planning authorities, geosurvey and research, industry, and municipalities. Therefore, 4 working groups were organized in three different rooms, with the following distribution: group 1 and 2 with 8 peers, group 3 with 7 peers and group 4 with 6 peers. In each group a spokesman volunteered to compile and present the results. A sheet with the topics to discuss (section 1.1) was given to the peers in each round table. The four organizers accompanied and encouraged the discussion in each group.



Figure 2- Group 1

Figure 3- Group 2



Figure 4- Group 3

Figure 5- Group 4

The third session took place in the auditorium with all groups present, where each group spokesman presented the conclusions achieved.





Figure 6- Coffee-breack and networking

In the last session, several peers have intervened in the debate about the results obtained and in the end of the discussion the debate moderators presented the final conclusions.



Figure 7- Final session debate

7.1.3 Invitation

The invitation form presented below was sent to land use, policy, geo data and management experts as well as industry actors, approximately one month before the event. Forty-eight registrations were received at the Lisbon LWS. Forty seven were presented in the first session and twenty nine in the round-tables plus the four organizers.

Invitation form (translation from Portuguese):

Dear Sir/Madam,



The LNEG - National Energy and Geology Laboratory and the DGEG - General Directorate of Energy and Geology are pleased to invite you to participate in the MinLand Workshop - The opportunity to integrate mineral resources in the planning phase of the territory in Portugal.

The Workshop will take place on January 23, 2019, starting at 09:30 am, at Carlos Ribeiro Auditorium, at the LNEG Campus in Alfragide – <u>(link to location)</u>.

Registration at the event is free but mandatory.

More information, Program and Registration available at <u>http://www.lneg.pt/divulgacao/eventos/765</u>



MinLand Workshop:

The opportunity to integrate mineral resources in the planning phase of land-use planning in Portugal

January 23, 2019, from 09:30 to 17:30 - Carlos Ribeiro Auditorium, LNEG Campus in Alfragide

The MINLAND project - <u>MINLAND</u> - <u>Mineral resources in sustainable land-use planning</u> is proceeding under the Horizon 2020 program of the European Commission and has the participation of 22 partners from 18 Member States, including Portugal, which is represented by DGEG and by LNEG. Its main objective is to contribute to the integration of mining planning and spatial planning policies in order to create conditions that facilitate the safeguarding of non-energy mineral resources.

The Basis Law on the Geological Resources and the Main Options of the State Plan for 2019 state that: "[...] In terms of the use and valorisation of geological resources, the Government will promote the elaboration of the national geological mapping and the sectoral plan of mineral resources in the scope of the Legal Regime of the Territorial Management Instruments (RJIGT), boosting its use as a decision support tool. [...] In addition, the Government will guarantee conditions to safeguard the potential of geological resources, strengthening this component in territorial management instruments (IGT), taking into account the development and management of spatial data infrastructures (SDIs) [...].

This workshop is expected to involve representatives of regional and national entities involved in the decision-making / issuing of opinions in the areas of spatial planning, mineral resources and the environment, as well as the business and academic sectors.

The opinions expressed in this working session do not bind the respective institutions.



7.2 Local Workshop

7.2.1 Workshop program

The LWS was scheduled from 9:30 – 17:30 including a 30min registration period, and 1:45min break (please consult final agenda below for more information). The actual workshop formats had the following timeslots:

- > 1h50' for presentations
- > 1h30' for roundtable discussions (peer exchange)
- > 1h for presentations, discussion and summary
- > 2h35' for breaks

Final agenda:

MinLand Workshop: The opportunity to integrate mineral resources in the planning phase of land-use planning in Portugal

23/01/2019 - Lisbon

09h30-10h00	Reception of participants
10h00-10h10	Presentation of the model and objective of the interactive workshop:
	neer-learning concent
	Paula Dinis (DGEG)
10h10-10h30	R & D. Importance. Sustainability and Inventory of Mineral Resources
101110 101150	Daniel Oliveira (LNEG)
10b20-10b50	The importance of planning and integration of mineral resources in the
101130-101130	The importance of planning and integration of mineral resources in the
	LUP. Silve Dereire (DCEC)
10450 11410	Silva Pereira (DGEG)
10020-11010	The MinLand project in the context of the EU Raw Materials Initiative.
	Jorge Carvalho (LNEG)
11h10-11h30	Coffee break
11h30-11h50	Mineral resources and access to the territory: the challenges. Which
	perspectives for the future?
	Paula Dinis (DGEG)
11h50-12h10	Cases of success in the activity of mineral resources.
	Maria Figueira (DGEG)
12h15-14h00	Lunch
14h00-15h30	Discussion and interactive work on specific themes, subordinated to the
	major theme: Territorial planning in Portugal as an instrument for
	safeguarding and access to natural resources.
15h30-16h00	Presentation of the conclusions of each group on each theme by the
	spokesperson
16h00-16h30	Coffee Break
16h30-17h30	Discussion and summary
101130 171130	

7.2.2 Presentation summaries

The LWS included one first small presentation about the workshop and the peer-learning concept (10 min) and five presentations (20 min) broaching mineral resources and its integration in territory and the Minland project relevance.

The titles and key points of each presentation were as follows:



1. Peer-learning Workshop (Paula Dinis, DGEG)

- Peer-learning concept and objectives
- Explanation about the peer-learning WS, how it will be organized and themes and topics to discussion.

2. R & D, Importance, Sustainability and Inventory of Mineral Resources (Daniel Oliveira, LNEG)

- The use of minerals in our daily life
- Minerals R&D in Portugal: databases, mineral resources maps, thematic mapping and application to LUP



Figure 8- Presentation 2

<u>3. The importance of planning and integrating mineral resources in Spatial Planning (Silva Pereira, DGEG)</u>

- Portugal Territorial Space
- Current Situation (Mines and Quarries)
- Legal Framework of Geological Resources and Spatial Planning
- Territorial Planning Constraints
 - ✓ Legal
 - ✓ Planning
 - ✓ Specifically concerning geological resources
 - ✓ Compatibility with other interests



Figure 9- Presentation 3

95

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

www.minland.eu



4. The MinLand project in the context of the EU Raw Materials Initiative (Jorge Carvalho, LNEG)

- Mineral Resources Safeguarding concept background, definition, constraints
- EU policy Raw Materials Initiative and follow on:
 - ✓ the MINATURA 2020 project aiming to develop the concept and methodology for the definition and subsequent protection of Mineral Deposits of Public Importance (MDoPI) in order to protect them for future use. The Portuguese methodology and applications to 3 case studies
 - ✓ the MinLand project aiming to contribute to the formalization of policies to ensure that exploration and exploitation activities in the EU have access to areas where mineral resources exist or potentially exist in the EU; its structure, partners and selected case studies.



Figure 10- Presentation 4

5. Mineral resources and access to the territory: challenges posed. What prospects for the future? (Paula Dinis, DGEG)

- The dependency on mineral resources and the recognition of its importance
- Access to territory in Portugal, legislative aspects and municipal land use plans
- LUP, social and environmental challenges and opportunities
- Reflection on the society dependency on mineral resources and situation in EU and future perspectives



Figure 11- Presentation 5 96

This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

www.minland.eu



6. Good practice cases in Portugal (Maria J. Ferreira, DGEG)

Presentation of four cases of success in the activity of mineral resources: the methodology for the preparation of sectoral plans; the Neves Corvo Mine – Somincor; Secil - Quarry of Outão - Arrábida Natural Park; and the Integrated Projects - Natural Park of the Serras de Aire e Candeeiros.



Figure 12- Presentation 6

7.2.3 Round Tables

The topics for round table discussions (section 1.1) were first introduced to the audience in the first presentation (Peer-learning Workshop) and were again distributed in a sheet to the participants before the peer-learning session has begun.

<u>Theme 1 (Policy Integration). The concepts of "Potential Area" and "Complementary</u> <u>Exploration Area" in the municipality sectoral plans</u>

Regarding if whether the concepts should be included in legislation or just considered in a guideline/recommendations, all groups were unanimous in that they should be included in legislation (particularly the "Complementary Exploitation Area" concept which respects to areas where well-documented resources are known but not yet subjected to any permit); the recommendations already exist, but frequently they are insufficient, as they are not followed. Group 1 suggested that a factor space/time/ value should be considered. An EU directive could also be a solution (Group 2).

The principles of parity and coexistence of land uses should be included in the legal framework and vocabulary of the General Directorate for Territory (DGT), which is now being revised.

The main difficulties relate to the decision-makers, public opinion, legislation (national and municipality level), and sometimes the municipalities, that are strict in the refusal of the extractive activity.

Main solutions would first go through a more efficient dissemination among populations of the exploration projects to be implemented; other pointed solutions were the application of royalties in local projects, and also the possibility of applying royalties to quarries (private domain in PT legislation), besides mineral deposits in mines (public domain in PT legislation).



Theme 2 (Public acceptance and social responsibility). The perception of the importance of mineral resources

All groups were unanimous stating the lack of awareness of the importance of mineral resources by society in general, which do not want to know about them, including decision-makers and even politicians at governmental level – those who can change lines of action depending on the government in place.

The difficulties are again related to a weak perception of the mineral resources importance, past environmental liabilities, the lack of transparency by some small mining (exploration) companies, and even a certain excessive bad image of the activity related to mineral resources in the social networks and in the media, which always give more emphasis to the bad examples, and so on. Except in areas where exploitation activity is firmly established in the community, the perception of the importance of nonmetallic mineral resources (e.g. aggregates) is even lower.

The solutions to overcome difficulties and improve the image of the mineral resources sector include: first, the public education, especially at school (children), and through the dissemination of science programs; at the level of the media, there is a need for more training on the part of the journalists who approach this subject, and also politicians. NGO's, associations (e.g. Assimagra) and mining authority (DGEG) should play a more active role, in order to sensitize companies to social projects, decentralize and improve communication. There is a need for greater valuation and access to primary resources. Again, it was suggested the possibility of applying royalties also to quarries and use it in the local communities.

<u>Theme 3 (Permitting and allocation of mineral resource rights). Get new permits in areas of</u> <u>rustic soil, without being in "Geological Resource Area"</u>

It is very difficult to get new permits in areas that are not expressly considered for this purpose (unanimous) on the municipal land use plans.

The difficulties are related to several aspects:

- The mining law where the main principles are established is recent but the associated regulations were not yet updated. These are from the year 1990;
- If no mineral resources spaces are provided in the PDM, it is not possible to get the mining permit.
- There are mining companies with no environmental and social responsibility, the fines are obsolete;
- The administration is not demanding with the deadlines to be fulfilled.

The solutions include creating additional legislation, mechanisms to allow reanalysis of the municipal land use plans in short periods for mineral resources, and flexibility to assess unpredicted situations. The exploiters need a shorter time to get the mining permits, but must be more responsible and the fines must be updated. The administration must be more demanding with the deadlines to be fulfilled.



7.3Workshop Conclusions

7.3.1 Audience statistics

The LWS organisers had paid due attention to inviting participants from the different tier practitioners which either had a stake in the case presented or in learning from the case. For the workshop were received 54 entries in the online form, having actually attended the morning presentations, 47 participants. At the peer-learning workshop that took place in the afternoon, there were 29 participants (64% of the total). The stakeholder-constellation were as follows:

- > 9 participants from the planning and management authorities encompassing:
 - 5 from two Commissions for Regional Coordination and Development (CCDR-C and CCDR-LVT), which mission is to ensure coordination and articulation of the various sectoral policies at the regional level, as well as the implementation of policies on the environment, land-use planning and cities
 - 3 from the Portuguese Environmental Agency (APA), which mission is to propose, develop and



monitor the integrated and participatory management of environmental policies and sustainable development (e.g. EIA, sectoral plans), in coordination with other sectoral policies and in collaboration with public and private entities that compete for the same purpose

- 1 from the General Directorate for Territory (DGT), which is the national public entity that is responsible for pursuing public policies for land use planning at national level and town planning, promoting and supporting good practices of territorial management. It has authority for spatial planning, town planning and geographical information, as well as for the establishment and maintenance of the reference geographic databases
- 9 participants from the General Directorate of Energy and Geology (DGEG), the Portuguese mining authority;
- 5 participants from the National Energy and Geology Laboratory (LNEG), the Portuguese geological survey;
- 4 participants from the business sector, representing 3 different mining, exploration and consulting companies (Parapedra, Sinese and Visa Consultores);
- > 2 participants from a municipality (Fundão town hall).

7.3.2 Conclusions

There is a need to integrate mineral resource areas in LUP legislation, especially the concept of "Complementary Exploitation Area", which is already used in land use planning as an informal guideline.



The difficulties encountered in defining and allocating mineral resource areas, and consequently their safeguarding, particularly at the municipality level, derive from several situations:

- a lack of a national mineral resources sectoral plan, providing the safeguarding framework and the possibility of exploring and exploiting mineral resources outside the areas already assigned for minerals in the municipal land use plans;
- low flexibility of other sectoral plans in relation to the mineral resources;
- low public acceptance of mineral resources activities, derived mainly from biased information (misinformation) and a poor perception of its importance.

Solutions

- It must be created a Mineral Resources Sectoral Plan with legislation supporting the safeguarding of minerals, similarly to the National Ecological Reserve (REN) and the National Agricultural Reserve (RAN).
- Creation of mechanisms to allow reanalysis of the municipal land use plans in short periods for mineral resources, and flexibility to assess unpredicted situations.
- it is necessary to raise awareness among the general public of activities related to mineral resources through education in schools, media, social networks; NGO's, associations. The mining authority should play a more active role, in order to sensitize companies to social projects, decentralize and improve communication and transparency.
- One solution proposed across all topics was the application of royalties or fees not only to mineral deposits (mines) but also to mineral masses (quarries) and that the application of up to 50% of these rates on actions at the community where the activity is carried out.





8. Local Workshop in Greece

8.1 Preparations for the Local Workshop

8.1.1 Topics selected for Local Workshop Discussion

One of the main issues/challenges of the extractive industry is facing is to secure that Mineral Raw Materials (MRMs) are taken into account in Spatial Planning. The key topic selected to be discussed in the Greek workshop comprised the recently announced elaboration of a Special Spatial Plan for MRMs. The aim of this Special Spatial Plan is the development of a policy for the spatial arrangement of the extractive sector, based on the sustainable development principles. It will encompass the main directions for the spatial planning of the extractive sector in accordance with the existing land use planning and will ensure the potentiality of access to and exploitation of Mineral Raw Material deposits while addressing land-use competition issues. It will be harmonized with the National Strategy for the strategic planning and development of the country's mineral wealth.

MINLAND project has been designed to address these challenges as well, since it aims to secure access to land, with actual or potentially valuable resources, for exploration and extraction of minerals, in an integrated and optimized process.

8.1.2 Local Workshop Design

The Greek workshop was organized in such a way so as, the expected feedback from the invited stakeholders, would reflect on all overarching objectives of the Minland project. It involved both, presentations (1st part morning session) and two panel discussions (2nd part afternoon session). Both parts included a Q&A session for the audience to express their views, make comments and address questions to the speakers and the panelists. Due to the topics selected, the workshop attracted the attention and interest of two of the most important groups of peers: industry actors and highly ranked public servants from the competent for Mining and Spatial Planning Ministry (i.e. YPEN). The organization of the workshop started around 1,5 months before the actual date of the event. Due to the unprecedented interest for participation and in order to better accommodate the interaction with all the participating peers, the organizers, switched to two panel discussions to take place consecutively, in the same room and in the presence of all the participants. This design, proved effective and contributed more to the success of the workshop. More details on the procedures followed, topics discussed and outcomes of the panel discussions, are given in paragraph 2.3 of the present report.

The workshop was scheduled from 9:00 – 14:30 including a 30min registration period, and 1:15min break. The actual workshop formats had the following timeslots:

- > 1 hour for presentations followed by a 10 min Q&A session
- 2 hours for panel discussions (peer exchange) including an interactive Q&A session with the audience
- > 15 minutes for closing remarks
- 1,15 hours for breaks

The workshop had a clear objective from the start (outlined in paragraph 3.2 of the present report). This helped the organizers to select more easily the relevant peers, spark interest in the workshop and guide the content of presentations and panel discussions. The topics for



the panel discussions and keynote presentations, were selected in order to fulfill a twofold outcome: on one hand, to give the opportunity to all invited peers to exchange their views and learn from each other on topics that are of great interest to all and on the other, to collect ideas and views from a large spectrum of peers on issues relevant to the Minland project's objectives and challenges (more details in paragraphs 2.2 & 2.3 of the present report). For these reasons, the workshop's main topic was focused on the new Special Spatial Plan for MRMs (announced in 2018) that presents a great challenge for both the extractive industry and the Mining and Spatial Planning authorities.

The organizers had paid due attention to inviting participants from the different predefined MINLAND peer groups. Overall, 71 participants from Greece, participated (this also included 2 representatives from the MINLAND consortium).

All the invited peers, were informed about the Minland project, the programme and objectives of the workshop and the topics and questions of the panel discussions, prior to the event. The material that was handed out during registration on the day of the event, is available through the MinLand database upon request.

8.1.3 Invitation

Invitation

We have the pleasure to invite you to the workshop "Mineral Raw Materials and Spatial Planning" which will take place on Friday, 9 November 2018, in the Auditorium of the Ministry of Environment and Energy, Mesogeion Avenue119, Athens.

The workshop is co-organized by the Institute of Geology and Mineral Exploration and the School of Mining and Metallurgical Engineering of NTUA and it is realized within the framework of the Minland project (Mineral resources in Sustainable Land-use planning).

One of the main issues/challenges of the extractive industry is facing is to secure that Mineral Raw Materials are taken into account in Spatial Planning. MINLAND project has been designed to address these challenges.

A key topic to be discussed in the workshop comprises the Special Spatial Plan for Mineral Raw Materials as well as the challenges-perspectives of Spatial Planning in Greece in general.

The Director General of IGME

the Professor of NTUA

D. Tsagkas

I. Paspaliaris



8.2 Local Workshop

8.2.1 Workshop program

Programme

Mineral Raw Materials and Spatial Planning

Friday 9 November 2018, Ministry of Environment & Energy, Athens

9.00–9.30	Registration and networking coffee
9.30–9.40	Review of the programme and objectives of the workshop (K. Hatzilazaridou, IGME)
9.40–9.45 NTUA)	Welcome and Opening Remarks (Representatives of the Ministry, IGME and
9.45-9.55	The Minland project (Ch. Panagiotopoulou, NTUA)
Session I	Presentations
9.55–10.20	Spatial Planning in Greece, challenges and perspectives: The Special Spatial Plan for Mineral Raw Materials (A. Gourgiotis, Department of Spatial Planning, YPEN)
10.20–10.40	Mineral Raw Materials and Spatial Planning (P. Tzeferis, General Directorate of Mineral Raw Materials, YPEN)
10.40–10.50	The case study of Bauxite mines in Fokis, Administrative Region of Sterea Ellada (L. Karka)
10.50–11.00	Q&A
11.00–11.15	Coffee break
Session II	Panel discussions
11.15–12.15	Topic of 1 st panel discussion: «Mineral Raw Materials' safeguarding and Spatial Planning» (Moderator: F. Chalkiopoulou, IGME GR)
12.15– 13.15	Buffet networking lunch
13.15–14.15	Topic of 2 nd panel discussion: "Permitting and Special Spatial Plan for Mineral Raw Materials-Public consultation and social acceptance (Moderator: K. Adam, NTUA)
14.15– 14.30	Summary of conclusions and closing remarks (K. Hatzilazaridou, IGME)



8.2.2 Presentation summaries

1st presentation titled "Spatial Planning in Greece, challenges and perspectives: The Special Spatial Plan for Mineral Raw Materials"

Key points:

- Main challenges and perspectives of the Greek Spatial Planning system;
- The importance of incorporating MRMs in Spatial Planning;
- The Special Spatial Plan for MRMs-its significance and expected benefits for the extractive industry;
- Regulatory and legislative framework enforce and levels of Spatial Planning-New developments.

2nd presentation titled "Mineral Raw Materials and Spatial Planning"

Key points:

- Review of the factors that affect the Spatial Planning for MRMs;
- The example of Quarrying Areas as a basic institutional tool for the sustainable management of aggregates' production from primary sources in Greece-The procedures followed for their delineation;
- The National Spatial Planning Policy-The Statutory Frameworks for Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development;
- The Spatial Planning as a tool for sustainable development;
- Examples of Sector Conflicts: Mining or Grazing? Beekeeping or Mining? RES or agriculture? RES or Tourism? Mining or landscape?
- Extractive activity and Natura 2000 network- Regulatory framework for their protection;
- Environmental-Spatial Planning and carrying capacity;
- Problems and challenges related to Spatial planning of MRMs-Spatial structure of the extractive industry;
- Revision and specialization of the recently approved Regional Spatial Plans;
- National Policy for MRMs and Spatial Planning; the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs.

3nd presentation titled "The case study of Bauxite mines in Fokis, Administrative Region of Sterea Ellada"

Key points:

- The development potential of the Fokis area; Mineral resources-cultural and natural capital;
- The exploitation status of bauxite deposits of Fokis;
- Tourism-protection regimes of cultural and natural heritage;



• The directions and guidelines of the Regional Spatial Plan of Sterea Ellada.

8.2.3 Round Tables

The topics and subtopics of the two panel discussions were distributed to the panelists and the invited participants, prior to the event. They were also available and distributed during registration, on the day of the event. The predefined process of the panel discussions was the following: The two panel discussions took place, according to the programme, consecutively, in the same room and in the presence of all the participants. The moderator of each panel, presented in the beginning all the panelists (2,5 min) and summarized in the end, for another 2,5 min, the answers and comments of the panelists. The moderator addressed each one questions to every panelist. The panelists were offered 1,5 to 2 min to answer each question. Afterwards, the organizers opened the floor for questions and comments (25-30 min).

The two panels explored and discussed the safeguarding issues of MRMs with regards to the provisions of the prevailing Spatial Planning framework conditions and the upcoming new developments, the major challenges and barriers the extractive sector is facing and which approaches should be adopted to improve social acceptance. How the upcoming new developments in the Spatial Planning for MRMs could facilitate the permitting procedures, which are the main reasons for the rejection of extraction projects in Greece and which land uses are usually in conflict with minerals?

Topic of 1st panel discussion: «Mineral Raw Materials' safeguarding and Spatial Planning»

Moderator: F. Chalkiopoulou, IGME GR

Panelists: K. Laskaridis (IGME GR), A. Gourgiotis (YPEN), D. Lampou (YPEN), C.Roumpos (Public Power Corporation SA), M. Taxiarhou (NTUA)

Questions addressed to the panelists:

- 1.1 Can we say that in Greece, on the basis of the prevailing regulatory framework, the Mineral Raw Materials are safeguarded? If not, how this can be accomplished within the framework of Spatial Planning?
- 1.2 Should and how exploration activities be reflected in Spatial Planning?
- 1.3 What measures (or approaches) should be adopted and by whom, in order to improve the social acceptance for Mineral Raw Materials' (MRMs) exploitation? Will and how, the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs, contribute towards this direction?

Key points of the comments, discussions and recommendations on the topics of the 1st panel discussion:

- The implementation of projects for MRM exploitation faces major challenges and barriers mainly related to conflicts with other land uses;
- Land-use planning for MRMs will ensure their accessibility and exploitation by addressing land-use competition issues;
- The elaboration of a "Special Spatial Plan for MRMs" builds on the efforts of the public administration of Greece to develop a policy for the spatial arrangement of the extractive sector, based on the sustainable development principles;

www.minland.eu

- With the development of the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs the following will be achieved: Guidelines for the lower (and legally binding) levels of spatial planning, guidelines for the co-existence of MRMs with special protection regimes (e.g. Natura sites, etc.), guidelines for the resolution of land-use conflicts;
- The need for the rational use of natural resources is one of the issues requiring the regulatory intervention of the state at local, regional and / or national level;
- The Special Spatial Plan for MRMs is not a static tool and should be regularly updated through research by taking into account the exploration and prospecting data that the Geological Surveys acquire;
- To improve social acceptance for MRMs exploitation, various approaches were discussed such as:
 - The guidelines of the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs should be harmonized and tailored to the underlying Spatial Plans, especially at the local (municipal) level. This is the key point for the successful implementation of the guidelines laid down by the Spatial Planning, but also for the development of an activity that is socially acceptable;
 - Launching communication campaigns with the participation of all stakeholders (state, universities, individuals, industry) on land use planning and MRMs, emphasizing the feasibility of coexistence between mining activities and other activities and reflecting on the terms and conditions of this coexistence;
 - Pilot presentation of the development of the areas due to the existence of the MRMs;
 - Pilot reporting of remedial actions and various good practices to reverse the adverse effects of mining over time;
 - Honest reference to adverse effects;
 - The adoption of good practices from other countries e.g. by offering more favorable compensatory measures for local communities (the example of Portugal).

Topic of 2nd panel discussion: "Permitting and Special Spatial Plan for Mineral Raw Materials-Public consultation and social acceptance

Moderator: K. Adam, NTUA

Panelists: X. Tzimopoulos (Delphi-Distomo Mines), Z. Dedousi (YPEN), P. Tzeferis (YPEN), C. Kavalopoulos (Greek Mining Enterprises Association), A. Sokratidou (Public Power Corporation SA)

Questions addressed to the panelists:

- 2.1 Shall and how, the development of a Special Spatial Plan for MRMs facilitate the permitting procedures for new extraction projects?
- 2.2 Which are the main reasons for the rejection of extraction projects in Greece? Which land uses are usually in conflict with minerals?
- 2.3 Which could be an effective participatory/consultation framework in order the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs to be accepted by the relevant stakeholders and the public?



Key points of the comments, discussions and recommendations on the topics of the 2nd panel discussion:

- The development of a Special Spatial Plan for MRMs may facilitate the permitting procedures for new extraction projects by:
 - Identifying land uses that will take into account all existing spatial plans
 - Defining exclusivity or coexistence criteria with other activities
 - Describing areas that have potential for future mining development and under what conditions
 - Describing the areas under protection (e.g. Natura) and if within them there are exploitable MRMs, under which regulatory framework and conditions the latter may take place
 - Resolving competition issues with other coexisting land uses
 - Establishment of priority mining areas
 - Adopting rules for prioritizing land use
 - Preventing conflicts due to the clarification of mining activity limits
 - Timely resolution of land use conflicts
 - Placing MRMs in parity with other natural resources
 - Considering the exploitation of MRMs as a priority activity in the area of interest
 - Ensuring accessibility to new MRMs in the future
 - Creating a framework that will be compatible with all the Regional and Local Spatial Development Frameworks with regards to the exploitation of known mineral deposits;
- > The main reasons for the rejection of extraction or exploration projects in Greece are:
 - Due to opposition from local communities, environmental issues, safety issues, reservations formulated in the respective spatial planning or due to protection of the cultural environment
 - If, according to the existing Spatial Plans (on Municipal level), they are incompatible with the forms of development envisaged by the latter and if they are in conflict with other land uses (e.g. forest land, archaeological sites, tourism, RES development, NATURA sites etc.)
 - Due to bureaucratic impediments (e.g. delays during the stage of environmental permitting)
 - Due to the need to relocate infrastructure projects (including settlements);



8.2.4 Photos of the event





108 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

www.minland.eu


8.3 Workshop Conclusions

8.3.1 Audience statistics



Fig. 1: Participants at Greek Local Workshop

In reference to the Minland Peer Classification (Figure 13 of the Deliverable 6.1: Common approach for peer learning and good practice guidance), practitioners on permitting, zoning and land-use planning (Tier1) and policy framework experts on minerals and land-use policy (Tier 2) represented 40% of the workshop's attendees. Geo-data and management experts (Tier 3) represented 38%. The rest 22% of the workshop's attendees, comprised industry associations, industry actors and independent experts and consultants (Others).



8.3.2 Conclusions

Spatial planning is the starting point for almost every productive activity. The need for the rational use of natural resources is one of the issues requiring the regulatory intervention of the state at local, regional and / or national level. At the same time, given the distrust of the local communities towards mining activities, prior assurance of social consensus and acceptance is an important factor for the smooth development of the latter. How will spatial planning ensure access to MRMs? How licensing procedures for new mining projects could be improved/facilitated? How can we achieve a better integration of spatial planning policy with mining and national policy for the exploitation of MRMs, in order to build a balanced relationship between economic growth, natural environment and competing land uses? Which approaches/measures should be adopted to improve social acceptance for MRMs exploitation? Addressing these challenges and exploring possible solutions and recommendations with invited peers, were the main goals of the Greek workshop. The presentations and panel discussions held, gave a comprehensive and interesting in-depth views of the general challenges of the sector, the Greek Spatial Planning procedures and perspectives and the recent Spatial Planning initiatives to facilitate access to MRMs (i.e. the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs).

Main conclusions and recommendations:

The incorporation of MRMs in land use planning will ensure their accessibility and exploitation by addressing land-use competition issues. The elaboration of the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs is one of the key steps towards this direction and a constant request of all the social partners in Greece;

The implementation of projects for MRM exploitation faces major challenges and barriers mainly related to conflicts with other land uses. The land uses that are usually in conflict with minerals are: Settlements and infrastructure projects, NATURA sites, agricultural land, woodlands, grazing areas, archaeological sites, tourist areas and river streams;

The elaboration of a "Special Spatial Plan for MRMs" builds on the efforts of the public administration of Greece to develop a policy for the spatial arrangement of the extractive sector, based on the sustainable development principles. The Special Spatial Plan for MRMs is not a static tool and should be regularly updated through research by taking into account the exploration and prospecting data that the Geological Surveys acquire. With the development of the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs the following will be achieved: Guidelines for the lower (and legally binding) levels of spatial planning, guidelines for the co-existence of MRMs with special protection regimes (e.g. Natura sites, etc.), guidelines for the resolution of land-use conflicts;

The development of a Special Spatial Plan for MRMs may facilitate the permitting procedures for new extraction projects by:

- Identifying land uses that will take into account all existing spatial plans
- Defining exclusivity or coexistence criteria with other activities
- Describing areas that have potential for future mining development and under what conditions



- Describing the areas under protection (e.g. Natura) and if within them there are exploitable MRMs, under which regulatory framework and conditions the latter may take place
- Resolving competition issues with other coexisting land uses
- Establishing of priority mining areas
- Adopting rules for prioritizing land use
- Preventing conflicts due to the clarification of mining activity limits
- Timely resolution of land use conflicts
- Placing MRMs in parity with other natural resources
- Considering the exploitation of MRMs as a priority activity in the area of interest
- Ensuring accessibility to new MRMs in the future
- Creating a framework that will be compatible with all the Regional and Local Spatial Development Frameworks with regards to the exploitation of known mineral deposits;

The main reasons for the rejection of extraction or exploration projects in Greece are:

- Due to opposition from local communities, environmental issues, safety issues, reservations formulated in the respective spatial planning or due to protection of the cultural environment
- If, according to the existing Spatial Plans (on Municipal level), they are incompatible with the forms of development envisaged by the latter and if they are in conflict with other land uses (e.g. forest land, archaeological sites, tourism, RES development, NATURA sites etc.)
- Due to bureaucratic impediments (e.g. delays during the stage of environmental permitting)
- Due to the need to relocate infrastructure projects (including settlements);

To improve social acceptance for MRMs exploitation, various approaches were discussed such as:

- The guidelines of the Special Spatial Plan for MRMs should be harmonized and tailored to the underlying Spatial Plans, especially at the local (municipal) level. This is the key point for the successful implementation of the guidelines laid down by the Spatial Planning, but also for the development of an activity that is socially acceptable;
- Launching communication campaigns with the participation of all stakeholders (state, universities, individuals, industry) on land use planning and MRMs, emphasizing the feasibility of coexistence between mining activities and other activities and reflecting on the terms and conditions of this coexistence;
- Pilot presentation of the development of the areas due to the existence of the MRMs;
- Pilot reporting of remedial actions and various good practices to reverse the adverse effects of mining over time;
- Honest reference to adverse effects;
- The adoption of good practices from other countries e.g. by offering more favorable compensatory measures for local communities (the example of Portugal).

A timely and effective participatory/consultation campaign should be launched, to demonstrate the benefits of a Special Spatial Plan for MRMs, despite the concerns expressed

111



on the ability and willingness of local communities to engage in a meaningful dialogue. Such a campaign could comprise indicatively the promotion of the benefits for local communities through the organization of information days in mining areas, with active participation of the representatives from the Greek Association of Mining Enterprises, the Mining Authorities and the Geological Survey.

112 This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under Grant Agreement No 776679

