

*The role of bureaucrats in  
mine development:  
The effect of institutional design*

---

*Gregory Poelzer*

*Political Science, Luleå University of Technology*

*12.02.19*

# *Key Questions*

---

- What management model(s) do bureaucrats use in the Swedish context?
- How does greater bureaucratic autonomy affect decision making?

# *The Role of Bureaucrats*

---

- Policy interpretation and implementation
- Account for input from multiple sources: project proponent (company), land users (traditional land use), land owners, interest groups, etc.
- What approach should bureaucrats take when processing this information?

# *Management Models*

---

- Legal Bureaucratic
  - Precise rules applied by impartial officials
- Professional
  - Decisions taken by individuals with occupational training related to their sector
- Corporatist
  - Interest groups get influence

# *Legitimacy and the Policy Process*

---

- Legitimacy allows those in authority to carry out their work with little resistance – it earns compliance
- Achieving legitimacy can be understood as the congruence of norms/beliefs and action/outcomes
- In the policy process, question of who should be able to interact and the nature of the interaction – input and throughput legitimacy
- How do input and throughput legitimacy relate to mine development processes?

# *Mine Development Process*

---

- Two Key Pieces of Legislation
  - Minerals Act and Environmental Code
- Mining Permit focuses on economic viability, Environmental permit focuses on meeting environmental protection standards
- Where do social issues fit?
  - Cultural recognition, distributive justice, procedural fairness, etc.

# *Different Mining Contexts*

---

- Norrbotten, Sweden and Saskatchewan, Canada
  - Established mining industries with different degrees of legitimacy problems
- Identified expert public officials in the mine development process
- Aim to understand how the officials prefer the process to work and how to account for different interests

# *Bureaucrats in Mine Development*

---

- Do norms exist amongst public officials in the perception of the mine development process?
- Policy processes require interaction of key actors – input and throughput legitimacy
- How does throughput legitimacy relate to input legitimacy?



# Canada

What actors are involved in the mine development process?	Do these actors currently hold a significant role in the mine development process? Yes or No If so, in what stage?	What actors are the most influential?  Rank five at most, 1 being the highest level of influence	What actors should be the most influential?  Rank five at most, 1 being the highest level of influence
<b>Mining Company</b>	Yes, across the entire process	2	2
<b>Government</b>	Yes, different offices and agencies at different stages	1	1
<b>Land Owners</b>	No		
<b>Indigenous Groups</b>	No (sometimes)		
<b>Municipalities</b>	No		
<b>Others (anyone interested)</b>	No		

# Sweden

What actors are involved in the mine development process?	Do these actors currently hold a significant role in the mine development process? Yes or No If so, in what stage?	What actors are the most influential?  Rank five at most, 1 being the highest level of influence	What actors should be the most influential?  Rank five at most, 1 being the highest level of influence
<b>Mining Company</b>	Yes, across the entire process	2/3	2/3
<b>Government</b>	Yes, different offices and agencies at different stages	1/2	1
<b>Land Owners</b>	Yes	3/2	3/4
<b>Indigenous Groups</b>	No (sometimes)	4	4/3
<b>Municipalities</b>	No		
<b>Others (anyone interested)</b>	No		

# *Technical or Political*

---

- Dissatisfaction with the current legislative framework
- Government officials have the possibility to shift influence by granting greater influences to different actors
- Close reading of the legislation versus a flexible interpretation
- Input legitimacy begins to scratch the surface of the perception of public officials

# Canada

Does the mine development process fulfill your expectations regarding transparency?

- The transparency of the current process works as intended, companies are deliver their reports as government expects.
- One issues that may arise in the future is the ability for relatively anonymous individuals to post misinformation through non-traditional channels

Does the mine development process fulfill your expectations regarding accountability?

- Expectations are increasing, but improved management of terms of conditions have come as a result
- Results-based legislation helps address issues of accountability

Does the mine development process fulfill your expectations regarding responsiveness?

- Mandated response times help address responsiveness
- Sometimes the project proponent can be guilty of being unresponsive – dragging the process out and placing blame on government
- A large task for government to monitor and check all the information going out to the public, could become overwhelming and require more resources

# Sweden

Does the mine development process fulfill your expectations regarding transparency?

- Sweden possesses very strong legislation regarding transparency
- Possibility for transparency issues at an early stage in the process
- Only people very engaged and knowledgeable of the process aware of transparency or lack thereof
- Often number, figures provided in the body of reports do not match the conclusions provided

Does the mine development process fulfill your expectations regarding accountability?

- Following the law is vital, but not accountability needs to move beyond this level
- Being accountable can place some government bodies in a vulnerable position, perceived as the villain in the process
- Different processes require different levels of accountability

Does the mine development process fulfill your expectations regarding responsiveness?

- Sometimes providing answers becomes difficult when there is a sense that no solutions exist
- Groups that completely withdraw from the process for fear of being perceived as complicit affect responsiveness
- Mining companies complain about the lead times but they also fail at completing applications
- Competence in government a problem, lack of resources to be efficient
- New measures to improve reporting of lead-times

# *Coordination or Checks and Balances*

---

- Ministerial overview or fragmented, autonomous public officials
- Shared goals?
- Public agencies keeping each other accountable
- Swedish officials work in both the corporatist and legal-bureaucratic models, Canadian mostly legal-bureaucratic and professional

# *Top-down Legitimacy Issues?*

---

- 'The state' is not a monolith – legitimacy problems can be perceived from within government
  - Should public officials be involved in political decisions?
  - How does discord at the top affect public perception?
- Throughput legitimacy provides context to disagreement at the input level
  - What factors more heavily, who participates or how they participate?