



MINTELL4EU: UNFC RAW MATERIALS CASE STUDIES – EXPERIENCE FROM GeoERA

Pasi Eilu (Geological Survey of Finland, GTK)

Janne Hokka (GTK), Kari Aasly (NGU), Mark Simoni (NGU)

UNECE training, 5 April 2022



This project has received funding by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement number 731166



MINTELL4EU: 19 CASE STUDIES IN 9 COUNTRIES

	Gold	Copper	Cobalt	Manga- nese	REE	Phos- phate	Carbo- nates	Graphite	Aggre- gates	Natural stone	Peat	Gypsum	Perlite
Austria									R				
Belgium						n							
Croatia									R				
Denmark							N		N				
Finland	N	N	N					N			R		
Hungary				[S]								[r]	[r]
Norway						n		r	r	r			
Slovenia									N				
Sweden					r								
#	1	1	1	1	1	2	1	2	5	1	1	1	1

N: National, aggregated

n: National, site

R: Regional, aggregated

r: Regional, site

S: Site, site



This project has received funding by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement number 731166



MINTELL4EU:

19 CASE STUDIES IN 9 COUNTRIES (+ other recent experience)

- UNFC is easy and simple for CRIRSCO-compliant resources
- Any resource can be classified into UNFC categories

Major issues:

- Old data and information (*what is the current relevance?*)
- Recent data not CRIRSCO-compliant, yet categorised into UNFC classes as it were so (*how can we trust the categorisation?*)
- Information not accessible (*industrial minerals; legislation not demanding reporting of any kind; practices of hiding data*)
- *A large variation in how evaluators quantify resources, interpret the EFG criteria*



This project has received funding by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement number 731166



Challenges in mapping 'historic' (and some other) resources into UNFC categories (*+ some solutions*)

- Non-compliant, i.e., **bridging document cannot be used**
- Old reporting **documents and related data can be scanty to non-existent** => Hard to assess the quality and data density => high numbers for UNFC categories
- Some commodities reported in an older but not in the latest resource => **Different UNFC categories in a deposit for individual commodities** (e.g., lithium at 222, but tantalum at 343)
- CRIRSCO-compliant resource >10 years ago, then the company left the prospect, the possible **new owner has not released a new resource** => Change from 221, 222, 223 to 321, 322, 323 or to 331, 332, 333 (from compliant to non-compliant resources!)
- IM deposit: **overall resource only given, only in an EIA** => all goes into 111+112+221+222+223 (if active project or a mine, and permits granted) or 3,3,3 (if non-active and not permitted)

WHAT TO DO?

- ❑ National and international ***policy frameworks*** needed to overcome poor data availability and sharing
- ❑ Need for ***clearer guidelines allowing as little as possible subjective interpretation*** to improve quality and facilitate consistent categorization within the UNFC
- ❑ **A permanent body organising and supporting training across all countries, organisations, evaluators**

Main focus of trainees: ***experts working on deposit databases and national resources accounting***, i.e., experts in public organisations



This project has received funding by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement number 731166



GEOLOGICAL
SURVEY OF
NORWAY
- NGU -



Thank you!



Pasi Eilu (*pasi.eilu@gtk.fi*)
Janne Hokka (*janne.hokka@gtk.fi*)
Kari Aasly (*kari.aasly@ngu.no*)
Mark Simoni (*mark.simoni@ngu.no*)
MINTELL4EU WP4



MINTELL4EU WP4 deliverables at:

<https://geoera.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/D4.1-Mintell4EU-Case-Study-Overview.pdf>

<https://geoera.eu/wp-content/uploads/2021/10/D4.2-UNFC-Harmonisation-issues-gaps-and-recommendations.pdf>

UNFC guidelines report by GTK:

https://tupa.gtk.fi/raportti/arkisto/46_2020.pdf



This project has received funding by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under grant agreement number 731166