



TASK 7.1: KNOWLEDGE IDENTIFICATION

D7.1 Deliverable
31/May/2018

Pamela Lesser¹, Guillaume Bertrand²

¹ *University of Lapland, Yliopistonkatu 8, 96300, Rovaniemi, Finland*

² *BRGM, Georesources Economics and Observatory Unit 3, avenue Claude-Guillemin, BP 36009 - 45060 Orléans cedex 2 – France*

Disclaimer

The information in this document is provided as is and no guarantee or warranty is given that the information is fit for any particular purpose. The user thereof uses the information as its sole risk and liability.

The document reflects only the author's views and the Community is not liable for any use that may be made of the information contained therein.

Dissemination level		
PU	Public	X
CO	Confidential, only for members of the consortium (including the Commission Services)	

Deliverable administration			
No & name	D7.1 Knowledge Identification		
Status		Due	M6
		Date	2018-05-31
Author(s)	Pamela Lesser, Guillaume Bertrand		
Description of the related task and the deliverable. Extract from DoA	<p>T7.1 Knowledge Identification (LAY) M1 – 6</p> <p>Contributors to this task are the ‘knowledge producing’ work packages in the MIREU project.</p> <p>The purpose of this task is to coordinate efforts with other Work Package (WP) leaders in order to identify and compile the explicit knowledge produced by the Work Packages (WPs). By knowing, at the very beginning of the project, the type of data to be created throughout the project, the specifications for the Knowledge Portal can be better designed at the outset and tailored to the needs of the MIREU project. This task requires strong inputs from the WPs dedicated to the production of knowledge. A thorough list of knowledge already existing within the consortium, and also to be acquired from external sources, will be elaborated. This list will determine the knowledge that will be delivered by leaders of other WPs to WP7. This way, a complete map of the knowledge to be generated and used throughout the project will be produced. This map will include knowledge status (already existing within the consortium/pending to elaborate), owner, retrieval/production responsible (corresponding WP leader) and IPR issues (if any).</p>		
Participants	Pamela Lesser (LAY), Guillaume Bertrand (BRGM) and all knowledge producing WPs		
Comments			
V	Date	Authors	Description

About MIREU

The project MIREU aims to establish a network of mining and metallurgy regions across Europe with a view to ensure the sustained and sustainable supply of mineral raw materials to the EU. The network will help the regions to share knowledge and experiences when facing the challenge to establish and maintain an extractive industry. MIREU will facilitate an exchange between all interested stakeholders in the regions, namely regulatory authorities, political and administrative bodies, development agencies, mining companies, non-government organisations, as well as the general public. The project will develop a shared knowledge base, taking into account the region-specific geographic and economic features, cultural, societal and language diversity, and their historical developments. The network will also learn from experience in other regions of the World. This knowledge base will allow to understand what has been conducive and what hampering to the development of extractive and metallurgical industries. It will also provide the context for a bottom-up integration of these activities into their respective socio-economic and socio-cultural context. Development is about people and, therefore, bringing people into the decision-finding procedure in order to achieve a ‘social license to operate’ will be a key aspect of the project. Guidelines and recommendations for actions to be taken to foster a sustained and sustainable development of the extractive industries will be developed in close co-operation with a range of selected regions from the European Union. These regions will form a nucleus and multipliers for a more extensive network beyond the life-time of the project.

Table of Contents

1.	Executive Summary	5
2.	Introduction.....	6
2.1	Purpose and target group	6
2.2	Contributions of partners	6
2.3	Baseline.....	6
2.4	Relations to other activities.....	6
3.	Questionnaire Responses.....	7
3.1	Personal Data	7
3.2	Contact Information.....	7
3.3	Work Packages producing knowledge.....	7
3.4	Type of data to be produced	7
3.5	Brief description of each data type.	7
3.6	Format of data.....	9
3.7	Names of data sets	9
3.8	Ownership of data.....	10
3.9	Web links to data	10
3.10	Access to data	10
3.11	EU regions/countries involved	10
3.12	Map viewer.....	11
3.13	Knowledge Portal Expectations.....	11
4.	Conclusions.....	11
4.1	Summary of achievements	11
4.2	Impacts.....	12
4.3	Other conclusions and lessons learnt	12
5.	Acronyms and terms (All).....	12
6.	References (All).....	12
7.	Appendices.....	12

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

As the leader of T7.1 (Knowledge identification), the University of Lapland was tasked with providing as clear a picture as possible of the different types of information to be uploaded by each Work Package into the Knowledge Portal, so that the specifications of MIREU's knowledge platform can be as accurate as possible from the project outset.

In order to gather the information, an electronic questionnaire using Webropol was developed and sent to all of the WP leaders. This questionnaire is the first foray into better understanding the information requirements the partners in MIREU have and the type of documentation each Work Package will produce or collect. The questionnaire consists of 13 questions that asked about personal contact information, the type of data to be produced (i.e. report, article, database, web service, etc.), the format the data will be in (docx, pdf, etc.), the owner of the data and if it is public information, the EU regions/countries involved, and the expectations of the Knowledge Portal.

The purpose of the questionnaire is for the WP leaders to describe the type of data they are planning to eventually upload into the MIREU Knowledge Portal. A separate questionnaire was to be filled out for each different type of data that will be uploaded. It should, however, be noted that the questionnaire is an internal working document and has no legal binding value. Its purpose is only to anticipate specifications of the MIREU Knowledge Portal in order to best fit the data to be produced.

The results of the survey show that most of the data will be in typical formats (Word, pdf, etc.) with no request being made for some type of service that would be difficult to produce.

To summarise the findings:

- Concerning the type of data to be produced and/or collected, it is equally split between reports and databases followed by articles, web service, video clips and a photo album.
- Most of the data will be in pdf format followed by docx, xlsx and then jpeg/avi/wmv and similar audio/video formats.
- Some existing datasets are proposed to be used, such as ProMine and OneGeology.
- The vast majority is open access data (89%) although 56% is confidential and 44% is restricted (sum is greater than 100% as several answers were allowed).
- In terms of expectations, there are a couple of suggestions including using an interactive map to ascertain information about the regions; using a multiple key word searching function in a stakeholder data base; including a group download/copy function; and for the Knowledge Portal to be flexible as ideas for the deliverables are likely to change.

It is reasonable to assume that whatever information requirements the partners ultimately have can be subsumed into, and fulfilled by, the Knowledge Portal.

2. INTRODUCTION

2.1 Purpose and target group

The purpose of T7.1 is to describe, early in the project, the data to be produced from MIREU that will ultimately be uploaded into the Knowledge Portal so that the specifications for the Portal can be as accurate as possible. This was achieved via an electronic questionnaire sent to all of the WP leaders of the project. A separate questionnaire was required for each different type of data to be uploaded. The questionnaire, however, is only meant to be an internal working document and has no legal binding value.

2.2 Contributions of partners

The University of Lapland is the leader of Task 7.1 (Knowledge identification) with BRGM being involved directly in the task as well. By definition, all of the partners who filled out the questionnaire have also contributed to the completion of the task.

As the information collected for T7.1 is the foundation of the Knowledge Portal, it is important to get as comprehensive and clear idea of what type of information will be produced. An electronic questionnaire with 13 questions was developed via Webropol and sent to each WP leader. As each different type of data needed a separate questionnaire, the total number of responses do not correlate directly with the number of WP leaders; rather, six (6) out of nine (9) WP leaders responded for a total of 12 responses. Three of the WP leaders did not respond after repeated requests.

2.3 Baseline

This section is not applicable as the baseline concerning knowledge production was zero before the distribution of the questionnaire.

2.4 Relations to other activities

WP7, Knowledge Management, is the center of knowledge production for the MIREU project. It will provide open access to knowledge gained over the lifetime of the project via an online web portal. This web portal, in turn, will be linked with the existing Minerals4EU European Minerals Knowledge Data Platform. The Platform will also deliver knowledge gained during the project to the EIP Raw Materials Scoreboard, especially in terms of regional dimensions of framework conditions and Social License to Operate.

3. QUESTIONNAIRE RESPONSES

3.1 Personal Data

Question: Do you wish to remove personal data from MIREU's records?

Number of respondents: 12

Out of 12 responses (6 partners), one partner wanted to have their personal data removed.

3.2 Contact Information

Question: Please enter your contact details.

All of the partners who filled out the questionnaire, except for one, provided their contact information. Regions represented include France, Finland (Lapland), Germany (Saxony) and Poland (Malopolska).

3.3 Work Packages producing knowledge

Question: For which work package will the information be produced?

According to the survey, WP2 will produce the highest number of different types of data. While that is likely the case, the high percentage (58.33%) has more to do with the respondent filling out numerous questionnaires, as was requested, for each different type of data. All of the other respondents filled out one survey.

3.4 Type of data to be produced

Question: What type of data will be developed?

Six (6) categories were provided: report, article, database, web service, video clips and photo album.

The two front-runners are 'reports' and 'database', both at 42% (5 responses). 'Article' was next with 33% (4 responses), followed by web service (3 responses) and video clips (3 responses) with 25% each, and lastly photo album at 17% (2 responses).

3.5 Brief description of each data type.

Question: Please provide a 1-2 sentence description of each data type.

The responses are as follows:

- "The MIREU portal should include a map viewer, to add public access data layers that might be of interest via web services. This could be, for instance, the geological map from OneGeology or the mineral deposits from ProMine."
 - "Three public reports: Directory of Regions and stakeholders relevant to network regions and members of the CoMMER (D2.1), SWOT analysis of regions and valorisation of mining heritage (D2.2) and Report on demand and best-practise for networking of regions (D2.3). Two confidential reports: Report on Stakeholder Group Workshops on thematic SWOT analysis results (D2.4) and Minutes on CoMMER meeting in Brussels (D2.5)"
 - "Articles will potentially be generated alongside the reports or activities (ex. summary of a report and articles about workshops/events)."
 - "Stakeholder database"
 - "MIREU SWOT analyses: Information gathered from surveys. Surveys results are possibly in the forms of docx. pdf. and xlsx. (T2.3, T2.4 and tasks from other work packages)"
 - "Video clips may be made during workshops/events or as part of the regional data for SWOT analyses."
 - "Photos may be made during workshops/events or part of the regional data for analyses."
 - "Supplement of previous database description. It is possible that images and videos are part of the databases of WP2, especially for the SWOT analyses database."
 - "Reports as declared in the application and articles from the project results.
WP1 Reports: four confidential deliverables according to the work plan
WP10 Reports: Deliverables according to the work plan (partly confidential)"
 - "WP10 Database: Consortium contact lists (confidential), participant lists of the progress meetings and the final conference (confidential)"
-

- "Report for T4.1 which maps the Social License to Operate framework and stakeholders in the MIREU regions. "
- "Article based on T4.1, which will likely be developed as the project goes on and be published in a peer-reviewed journal."
- "Web Service - I am not sure exactly what form this will take, but it would be great to have online tools to help stakeholders understand and map out strategies for achieving SLO."
- "Video clips - The first SLO Workshop was live streamed/videotaped and is available through YouTube."

3.6 Format of data

Question: What format will the data be in?

There are a total of 25 different answers corresponding to the separate data types that will be produced.

- PDFs are cited as the data type that will be most used (8 responses and 72.73% of all responses)
- Word documents are the second most prevalent (7 responses and 63.64% of the total)
- Excel spreadsheets ranked third (5 responses at 45.45%)
- CSV format (1 response at 9.09%)
- Other – 4 responses were given as follows:
 - databases displayed through web services.
 - avi, flv, wmv, mov or mp4
 - jpeg, gif, tiff or png
 - jpeg, gif, tiff, png, avi, flv, wmv, mov or mp4

3.7 Names of data sets

Question: If an existing data set is to be used, please provide the name of the data set and key search words.

There were only 4 responses to this question and the answers included:

- ProMine: search "ProMine GTK Finland" in Google
- OneGeology: search "OneGeology Europe" in Google
- The original data set is located on the MIREU website from ERRIN. It is an internal database so please contact Ryan and/or Heidi for access/name/key words.
- Data set from the T7.1 Questionnaire

3.8 Ownership of data

Question: Who owns and produces the data?

Some of the data is public access, some the property of the MIREU project, and the Geological Survey of Finland also is the owner of data to be used in the project.

A contact for the Geological Survey of Finland is provided.

3.9 Web links to data

Question: please provide any web links to the source of data.

- ProMine: <http://promine.gtk.fi/>
- OneGeology Europe: <http://www.europe-geology.eu/onshore-geology/geological-map/onegeologyeurope/>
- Other respondents asked to be contacted directly for the links.
- SLO Workshop YouTube links:
8.5: <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=A26Qs9Og7pM>
9.5: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=RCn6_AJkwK8

3.10 Access to data

Question: How public is the information?

Four categories were presented: Open access, restricted, confidential and other. Eight (8) answers given were for open access (88.89%), four (4) for restricted (44.44%) and five (5) for confidential. One response was for other (11.1%) and the other specifically referred to public reports.

3.11 EU regions/countries involved

Question: Which EU regions/countries are involved?

Responses include:

- Data layers will have to cover all regions of EU28.
- All MIREU regions: Alentejo PT, Andalucía ES, Aragon ES, Castilla y Leon ES, Cornwall UK, Czech Republic CZ, Ireland IE, Kosice SR, Lapland FI, Lower Silesia PL, Maramures RO, Northern Karelia FI, Saxony DE, Sterea Ellada GR, Styria AT, Västerbotten SE and the possible future MIREU regions

3.12 Map viewer

Question: Will a map viewer be needed? If so, what are the following?

1. *Under geolocation (latitude and longitude):* all features are geolocated.
2. *The Geographic Coverage (municipal, regional, national):* the only answer that came back was 'Regions'.
3. *Name of the Feature Being Mapped:* mining/metallurgy sites.

3.13 Knowledge Portal Expectations

Question: What information/service would you like to see in the Knowledge Portal and for what purpose?

There are 4 responses :

- "It might be interesting to select regions, either in a drop-down menu or by clicking on a map, to access a list of all information/documents related to the selected region."
- "It would be great if there are (multiple) key word searching functions in stakeholder data base and group download/copy function (ex. copying e-mail addresses altogether)."
- "Scientific articles. Case studies."
- "Perhaps the most important feature is for the Knowledge Portal to be flexible as ideas for deliverables will likely change. Still, the basic formats will not be all that complicated."

4. CONCLUSIONS

4.1 Summary of achievements

The questionnaire achieved its main aim, which is to more accurately describe the type of data that will be produced and/or collected by the individual work packages to allow the development of the Knowledge Portal in such a way that it can accommodate the future knowledge needs of the MIREU project.

4.2 Impacts

While the information in this document is not binding and is intended to be the first attempt at collecting all of the data produced by the various work packages, it will still serve as the foundation for the Knowledge Portal which is the central point of dissemination for the 'knowledge' produced in the MIREU project.

4.3 Other conclusions and lessons learnt

In terms of lessons learned, there are several WP leaders who did not respond to the questionnaire, and their future input is needed. In addition, it is possible that as the project progresses different types of data will be produced. That said, it is likely the Knowledge Portal will still be able to accommodate that data and there should be no discernable problems.

5. ACRONYMS AND TERMS (ALL)

BRGM: Bureau de Recherches Géologiques et Minières (French geological survey)

CoMMER: Council of Mining and Metallurgy European Regions

D: deliverable

EIP: European Innovation Partnership

ERRIN: European Regions Research and Innovation Network

EU: European Union

GTK: Geologian tutkimuskeskus (Geological Survey of Finland)

SWOT: strengths / weaknesses / opportunities / threats

T: task

WP: work package

Countries in section 3.11 are listed using ISO ALPHA-2 code.

6. REFERENCES (ALL)

Not applicable.

7. APPENDICES

Please see Appendix A for the results to the questionnaire.
