

## TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR PROJECTS

No	Name of project
2011/09	Improving permitting and inspection of IPPC pig farming installations by developing practical guidance

### 1. Scope

<b>1.1. Background</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• In 2009 a comparison programme on permitting and inspection of IPPC pig farming installations in IMPEL member countries was carried out. The project focused on five key issues: manure storage, manure spreading, animal housing system, air-abatement systems and odor assessment. The aim of the project in 2009 was to learn from each other, to exchange experiences and identify good practices.</li> <li>• The final project report showed that competent authorities in IMPEL member Countries Member States regulate pig farms in many different ways. This is both true for installations above and below the threshold in the IPPC directive. There is, for instance, a variety of systems on manure storage and on animal housing. IPPC permits issued by the Member States vary in their level of detail. Inspections vary in intensity and frequency. It became also apparent that measures not seldom have negative effects like leakages from manure lagoons.</li> <li>• The project report concluded that a further exchange of information between IMPEL members is important and the development of practical guidance for permit writers and inspectors would be desirable.</li> <li>• This project builds on the previous project and aims at producing practical tools to support the permitting and inspection of IPPC pig farms.</li> <li>• As follow up of this project authorities could start applying the guidance tools and where necessary take measures and make changes in their organisation. This process could be supported by IMPEL by organising training and implementation workshops.</li> </ul>
<b>1.2. Link to MAWP 2010 – 2012 and IMPEL’s role and scope</b>	<p>Strategic Goal I: Capacity building</p> <p>Strategic Goal II Improving Methodologies</p> <p>Strategic Goal III: Development of good practices</p>
<b>1.3. Objective (s)</b>	<p>The objectives of the project are to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Collect more in depth information on permitting and inspection practices related to IPPC pig farming</li> <li>2. Assess common problems and needs for guidance</li> <li>3. Develop practical tools to help authorities improve regulating IPPC pig farms</li> </ol>
<b>1.4. Definition</b>	The project, to be carried out in 2011 and 2012, consists of three phases:

	<p><u>Phase 1 – Reviewing current practices to assess common problems and needs (January-June 2011)</u></p> <p>Building on the information collected in the previous comparison programme the different permitting and inspection practices in the IMPEL Member Countries will be examined more closely. Authorities will be invited to review their present permitting and inspection practices, using the Doing the right things (DTRT) methodology. This methodology distinguishes a number of connected organisational steps, called the Environmental Inspection Cycle. Though DTRT takes the organisation of environmental inspections as starting point, it does also cover permitting which is regarded as one of the factors which to a very high extent determines the context in which inspections have to be carried out. An instruction will be developed to help authorities apply the DTRT methodology for this particular exercise. The reviews undertaken by authorities will generate more detailed information on how permitting and inspection take place. It will help authorities to identify more precisely what problems they experience and on for what subjects they would benefit from further guidance.</p> <p><u>Phase 2: Assessing what guidance could be developed (June – September 2011)</u></p> <p>The information and findings from the reviews will be discussed by experts from authorities in different IMPEL Member Countries in a workshop to assess common problems and needs and identify what practical tools could be developed.</p> <p><u>Phase 3: Development of guidance tools (October 2011-May 2012)</u></p> <p>Based on the results of phase 2 the suggested guidance tools will be developed. In the process of drafting the tools the results of some of the reviews carried in phase 1 will be examined in more detail. Part of that work will be performing a number of joint inspections. Guidance tool could also contain energy-efficiency. (recommenation from IMPEL-project energy-efficiency)</p> <p><u>Phase 4: Workshop to discuss draft guidance tools and production of final project report. (June-September 2012)</u></p> <p>In a workshop experts will discuss the draft tools. A final project report with the proposed tools will conclude the project.</p>
<b>1.5. Product(s)</b>	<p>2011:</p> <p>A first interim report describing the main findings of the reviews carried out by authorities, a workshop and a second interim report summarising the discussions of the workshop and outlining the guidance tools to be</p>

	<p>developed. 2012 A third interim project report with draft tools, a workshop and a final report which will contain the guidance tools.</p>
--	--

## 2. Structure of the project

<b>2.1. Participants</b>	<p>1) International Project Team: 6 experts from 6 IMPEL Member Countries 2) Workshops: experts from IMPEL Member Countries in the IPPC pig-farming sector,</p>
<b>2.2. Project team</b>	<p>Lead country and co lead country: The Netherlands and Latvia Italy (confirmed in cluster 1) France (cluster 1: to be confirmed), Sweden (cluster 1: to be confirmed), Romania (to be asked and be confirmed)</p>
<b>2.3. Managers Executor, Co-chair,</b>	<p>Mr. John Visbeen (NL. Province of Utrecht) and Ms Judith Dipane (Latvia, EPA)</p>
<b>2.4. Reporting arrangements</b>	<p>Regular reporting to Cluster Improving permitting, inspection and enforcement (Cluster 1)</p>
<b>2.5 Dissemination of results / main target groups</b>	<p>The report will be put on the IMPEL website and disseminated to the authorities in the Member States. The report will also be submitted to the EU institutions.</p>

### 3. Resources required

3.1 Project costs and budget plan			2011 €	2012 €
	1. Overhead (organisation) cost :			
	2 Project meeting costs (total):		<b>31.625</b>	<b>31.625</b>
	<b>Project Team Meetings</b>	<b>No of meetings in 2011: 3</b>	<b>No of meetings in 2012: 3</b>	
	No of Participants covered in budget:	5	5	
	Travel:	5 * 3 * 500 €	5 * 3 * 500 €	7.500
	Accommodation:	5 * 3 * 125 €	5 * 3 * 125 € (including joint inspections)	1.875
	Catering:			
	Meeting venue:			
	<b>Workshop</b>			
	No of Participants covered in budget:		25	
	Travel:	25 * 500 €		12.500
	Accommodation:	25 * 2 * 125 €		6.250
	Catering:	25 * 2 * 50 €		2.500
	Meeting venue:			1.000
	3. Other costs:			
	Consultant:			<b>25.000</b>
	Translation:			<b>15.000</b>
	Dissemination:			
	Other (specify):			
	<b>TOTAL cost (1+2+3)</b>		<b>56.625</b>	<b>71.625</b>
<b>3.2. Fin. from IMPEL budget</b>	2. Project meeting costs:		28.125	28.125
	3. Other costs:			
	Consultant:		25.000	25.000
	Translation:			15.000
<b>3.3. Co-financing by MS (and any other )</b>	1. Overhead costs as co-financing contribution, committed by...(name of institution).....			
	2. Project meeting costs (workshop accommodation and catering) as co-financing contribution, committed by Province of Utrecht (tbc)		3.500	3.500
<b>3.4. Human from MS</b>	Project team members	Project team meetings (preparation, participation and follow up) Workshop (preparation, participation and follow up)	12 days Each member	20 days (including joint inspections) Each member
	Carrying out reviews by authorities		5 days Each review	
	Participating in workshop		5 days Each participant	5 days Each participant

#### 4. Quality review mechanisms

By Project Team and Cluster
-----------------------------

#### 5. Legal base

<b>5.1. Directive / Regulation / Decision</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- IPPC Directive</li><li>- BREF Intensive rearing of poultry and pigs</li><li>- RMCEI</li></ul> <p>Other relevant material:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>- COM Communication on the Review of the RMCEI (2007, 1493)</li><li>- Proposal for a directive on industrial emissions (IPPC) (Recast) (2007, 843 final)</li></ul>
<b>5.2. Article and description</b>	- Annex 1, article 6.6 IPPC
<b>5.3 Link to the 6<sup>th</sup> EAP</b>	- More effective implementation and enforcement of environmental legislation is one of the priorities of the 6 <sup>th</sup> EAP.

#### 6. Project planning

<b>6.1. Approval</b>	By IMPEL General Assembly, November 2010
<b>6.2. Financial Contributions</b>	
<b>6.3. Start</b>	January 2011
<b>6.4 Milestones</b>	tbd
<b>6.5 Products</b>	
<b>6.6 Adoption</b>	By IMPEL General Assembly, November 2011