Assessment of Homework 3 of Juho Kutvonen

(Groupwork of Juho Kutvonen and Salla)

**Knowledge-policy interaction**

|  |
| --- |
| **Characterization of knowledge-policy interaction**  |
| **Attribute**  | **characterization**  |
| Impacts  | The effects of metals on lake water as domestic water as a result metal emissions from the Talvivaara mine |
| Causes  | Present metal emission from the Talvivaara mine negatively affecting the feasibility of nearby lake water as domestic water.  |
| Problem owner  | * Local residents who experiences the impacts
* Environmental authorities, who provide metal emission restrictions to Talvivaara mine.
* Talvivaara mine experts and engineers to review designing structures to ensure that the metal emissions could be reduced.
 |
| Target  | * The city council can use the results to give recommendations or guidelines for proper mechanisms of operation of the mine to cut down metal emissions.
* Local residents living nearby lakes to document first had experience.
* Communication and public relations out fits is responsible for the communication of recommendations
 |
| Interaction  | They provided a very direct and specific scope of participation and a good knowledge and policy interaction framework as indicated in their detailed draft, in my opinion. |

|  |
| --- |
| **Characterization of the dimensions of openness.**  |
| **Dimension**  | **Characterization**  |
| Scope of participation  | They provided the following participants: ELY centre, Local residents living nearby lakes, SYKE, and added that Talvivaara mine is excluded because it may be partial. I think they did a good job by providing a detail account of participants and also providing reasons why Talvivaara mine is excluded.  |
| Access to information  | Their draft gave enough information concerning this aspect.  |
| Timing of openness  | They provided detailed accounts here.  |
| Scope of contribution  | They gave enough information on the intended users specific roles each will play.  |
| Impact of contribution  | * There was a good number of specific participants: ELY centre, local residents living nearby lakes and SYKE,
 |

**Explanations of categories of interaction within the knowledge-policy interaction framework.**

I believe their draft was well thought out and carefully planned. It contained clear information regarding specific participants and their corresponding roles.

**Evaluation of the assessment draft**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation according to the properties of good assessment**  |
| **Attribute**  | **Score**  | **Explanation**  |
| Quality of content  | 3 | The draft was clear and concise containing relevant information. |
| Applicability: Relevance  | 3  | As mentions earlier the draft contained some practical and workable ideas. |
| Applicability: Availability  | 3 | In summary,I would say it was a well thought out draft. They seem to understand the situation on the ground.  |
| Applicability: Usability  | 4  | For similar reason, because it was well thought out, it scores also good marks as far as usability is concerned in my opinion.  |
| Efficiency  | 3  |  Good attempt as it sought to solicit for ideas from several participants. The information was organised in small workable units.  |

**Comments and ideas how to improve the draft**

In general they seem to have clear understanding and first hand information on the issue they were tackling. I will only congratulate them for a good work done.

# Assessment of Homework 3 of Sami Rissanen

(Groupwork of Sami Rissanen & Jukka Hirvonen)

NOTE: Incidentally, the two grouped I evaluated worked on local Finnish issues. They worked on Talvivaara mine and its environmental concerns . Both groups seem to have a full understanding and first hand information about the concern they addressed in their drafts. For this reason, most of my evaluations are similar.

**Knowledge-policy interaction**

|  |
| --- |
| **Characterization of knowledge-policy interaction**  |
| **Attribute**  | **characterization**  |
| Impacts  | The effects of mineral dust (PM10 and PM2,5) from the Talvivaara mine that is present in air of mining and working area where workers are exposed to different heavy metal types: t.ex: copper, nickel, kobolt etc. |
| Causes  | Hazards of fine particle emissions (PM10, PM2,5) from the Talvivaara mine to mine workers and people who live nearby mine or work nearby mine area |
| Problem owner  | Talvivaara mining company Kainuun ELY-keskus (Centre for Economic Development, Transport and the Environment) Regional TTL (Työterveyslaitos) |
| Target  | Mine workers and people who live nearby mine or work nearby mine areaTalvivaara mining company wants to know is the air quality in acceptable levelELY-keskus needs to know is the air quality legal and safe to workers  |
| Interaction  | They provided a very direct and specific scope of participation and a good knowledge on what each participant offers as indicated in their detailed draft, in my opinion. They however did not mention local residents who I consider as important.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Characterization of the dimensions of openness.**  |
| **Dimension**  | **Characterization**  |
| Scope of participation  | They provided the following participants: A consultant to measure air quality. Company, ELY-keskus, DARM group, Regional TTL, The Finnish Association for Nature Conservation (FANC). However, they left out local residents who are also important. Also, I don’t understand how they seem to project that the company will be biased.  |
| Access to information  | Their draft gave enough information concerning this aspect.  |
| Timing of openness  | They provided detailed accounts here.  |
| Scope of contribution  | They gave enough information on the intended users specific roles each will play.  |
| Impact of contribution  | There was a good number of specific participants: A consultant to measure air quality. Company, ELY-keskus, DARM group, Regional TTL, The Finnish Association for Nature Conservation (FANC). |

**Explanations of categories of interaction within the knowledge-policy interaction framework.**

I believe their draft was well thought out and carefully planned. It contained clear information regarding specific participants and their corresponding roles.

**Evaluation of the assessment draft**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation according to the properties of good assessment**  |
| **Attribute**  | **Score**  | **Explanation**  |
| Quality of content  | 3 | The draft was clear and concise containing relevant information. |
| Applicability: Relevance  | 3  | As mentions earlier the draft contained some practical and workable ideas. |
| Applicability: Availability  | 3 | In summary, I would say it was a well thought out draft. They seem to understand the situation on the ground.  |
| Applicability: Usability  | 3 | For similar reason, because it was well thought out, it scores also good marks as far as usability is concerned in my opinion.  |
| Efficiency  | 3  |  Good attempt as it sought to solicit for ideas from several participants. The information was organised in small workable units.  |

**Comments and ideas how to improve the draft**

In general they seem to have clear understanding and first hand information on the issue they were tackling. I will only congratulate them for a good work done. Both group did very well and I am impressed with their work as beginners but with time it could be further improved with much detail and specific actions since some aspects were vague and broad.

# Assessment of Homework 3 of Joshua Nartey

(Groupwork of Joshua Nartey & Thomas Agyei)

**Knowledge-policy interaction**

|  |
| --- |
| **Characterization of knowledge-policy interaction**  |
| **Attribute**  | **characterization**  |
| Impacts  | Climate Change due to GHG emissions in general.  |
| Causes  | We did not give much detail on sources of the GHG emissions. From what we have learnt from the course so far, we are equipped for an excellent work later.  |
| Problem owner  | * The city government is responsible for implementation of laws, guidelines and recommendation.
* The owner of industries makes decisions about how to handle their emissions.
* Energy production, transport and all other GHG producing groups are responsible for their emissions.
* The citizens are responsible for their actions and awareness of the climate change
 |
| Target  | * Intended users: Ghana, other neighbouring countries, EPA, Ghana
* All intended users and the citizens can use the results.
* Universities, Research institutions and groups and NGOs Municipal and District Assemblies (MDAs).
 |
| Interaction  | The drafted assessment can be categorized as a shared knowledge-interaction framework. Different groups of participants contribute to the assessment and have their specific roles and responsibilities. We were however criticised on how difficult to get a all participants on board.  |

|  |
| --- |
| **Characterization of the dimensions of openness.**  |
| **Dimension**  | **Characterization**  |
| Scope of participation  | Many different groups and agencies are allowed to participate. The scope is very wide. This was considered a good point of our draft.  |
| Access to information  | The many groups who will participate in the assessment will have to access all information of the assessment and also disseminate it.  |
| Timing of openness  | Honestly a more excellent and specific work should be done on this area.  |
| Scope of contribution  | There was a wide scope of contribution and scope of participation is very wide for effective contribution of all participants in a bid to prevent the idea of imposition on people what they should do.  |
| Impact of contribution  | The draft gave a rather general information about the impact of contribution.  |

Explanations of categories of interaction within the knowledge-policy interaction framework.

The drafted assessment can be categorized as a shared knowledge-interaction framework. Different groups of participants contribute to the assessment and have their specific roles and responsibilities.

**Evaluation of the assessment draft**

|  |
| --- |
| **Evaluation according to the properties of good assessment**  |
| **Attribute**  | **Score**  | **Explanation**  |
| Quality of content  | 4  | The question is very open and have a global appeal with broad participants for their diverse opinions.  |
| Applicability: Relevance  | 4  | The question and the assessment are both relevant, practical and realistic to our current global needs. |
| Applicability: Availability  | 3  | The diverse groups acting as participants of the assessment, will have all available data already during the assessment.  |
| Applicability: Usability  | 4  | It will very usable because of the diverse participation which would subsequently lead to clear understanding and commitment. |
| Applicability: Acceptability  | 4  | It is well planned and involves more people, institutions and interest groups so it very likely to be accepted.  |
| Efficiency  | 3  | We admit that though it was a high point to involve so many participants, it efficiency will also be difficult to be achieved as common with working with more people.  |

**Comments and ideas how to improve the draft**

In general it was a well thought out draft which involves a lot of participants. It stated ways to reduce emission of GHGs, and it is very important to mention neighboring countries since GHG emissions could negative affect other countries as well. We however, acknowledge that we should have used headings and subheadings to improve the clarity.

-