

TOR Reference No.:	Author(s): Giuseppe Sgorbati (ITALY - ARPA Lombardia)
Version: 01.1	Date: 08_11_2014
TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR WORK UNDER THE AUSPICES OF IMPEL	

1. Work type and title

1.1 Identify which Expert Team this needs to go to for initial consideration	
Industry	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Waste and TFS	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water and land	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Nature protection	<input type="checkbox"/>
Cross-cutting – tools and approaches -	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Type of work you need funding for	
Exchange visits	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Peer reviews (e.g. IRI)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conference	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Development of tools/guidance	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Comparison studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Assessing legislation (checklist)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Other (please describe):	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Full name of work (enough to fully describe what the work area is)	
Risk Criteria Database and extension of the use of Risk Analysis Tools for Programming and Prioritization of Environmental Inspections	
1.4 Abbreviated name of work or project	
Risk Criteria Database & Risk Analysis Tools Development	

2. Outline business case (why this piece of work?)

2.1 Name the legislative driver(s) where they exist (name the Directive, Regulation, etc.)
<p>Industrial Emission Directive (IED) 2010/75/UE</p> <p>Recommendation on Minimum Criteria for Environmental Inspections (RMCEI) 2001/331/EC</p> <p>Seveso Directives I, II and III (Council Directive 82/501/EEC, Council Directive 96/82/EC, Directive 2012/18/EU)</p> <p>Water Framework Directive (WFD) 2000/60/EC</p>

Common Agricultural Policy

2.2 Link to IMPEL MASP priority work areas

- | | |
|--|-------------------------------------|
| 1. Assist members to implement new legislation | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |
| 2. Build capacity in member organizations through the IMPEL Review Initiatives | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Work on 'problem areas' of implementation identified by IMPEL and the European Commission | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> |

2.3 Why is this work needed? (background, motivations, aims, etc.)

The general need

The project is needed because there is a strong general demand for effective instruments for aiming inspections, in an optimized way, for the check of respect of EU legislation related to human activities, not only for large Industries but also for other human activities.

The quality of the environment also depends on smaller installations and on agriculture, with potential and actual impact over environmental compartments such as air, soil, water.

The optimization of the inspective activities is today even more needed because the maximized attention in public administration resource use cope with the efforts that MS have to make to maintain an high level in environmental protection, so contributing in reaching a level playing field and in closing implementation gap

Background

In last years, IMPEL developed several projects aimed to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of inspection activities from the point of view of environmental outcomes. Among all, EasyTool – IRAM gave to Environmental Authorities an effective instrument for prioritization of inspections, fulfilling the indications from IED art. 23; also, it has been successfully used for inspection tasks other than IED, e.g.: for installation under Seveso Directives.

The tool use a risk analysis based approach, and it needs the selection of risk criteria: impact and operator performance criteria and related indicators and parameters, which depend upon the inspection task and the available information related to the installation and the environment in which the installation itself is located.

The selection of risk criteria and related indicators has been recognized as one of the most critical issues in using a risk analysis tool. For this reason, Impel General Assembly in December 2013 approved "Risk Criteria" (RC) project, leaded by Germany and Italy, aimed at the sharing of knowledge, experience and best practices about information to be used as a criterion or indicator for risk appraisal and priority setting in inspection programming .

The overall goal of the project was identified in fostering the implementation of IED, RMCEI and Seveso Directive and in making easier the achieving of a level playing field for EU Industries, that is deemed necessary in the 7th EAP.

Motivations

At present time (September 2014) the RC project is running on time, several information has been gathered, a basic database structure has been designed and implemented.

During the development of the activities of the project three very important issues emerged:

- 1) The collection of risk criteria is to be considered as a "dynamic" activity, and the database which will be set up as "deliverable" of running RC IMPEL project must be maintained and updated in the future; it has to become a web based instrument, fully accessible and it has to be able to answer to queries and, hopefully, it should be integrated in, or linked with, web based risk analysis tool
- 2) The collected risk criteria must not be fit only for specific industry sectors, as IED and Seveso, which have the privileges to be in a restricted number and to have a lot of information at disposal of Inspection Authorities; other activities, in much greater number and not so individually well-known could require different sets of risk indicators to

overcome the lack of information or to tackle specific sectorial environmental impacts to be extended to several other human activities as first element in fostering risk analysis based inspection programs

- 3) Very often, the same Risk Criteria, indicator or parameter can be useful for different Inspection Tasks (e.g.: description of the environment around an installation): having at disposal a unique database for different Inspection tasks can help in homogenization of inspection programming and represent for IMPEL Member a best practices sharing action.
- 4) Furthermore, recent contacts with the European Commission pointed out a general need of increasing protection levels for water and soils, in the perspective of filling the present “implementation gap” in many related sectors. Among topics stemming out during discussions with the Commission, one seems to be of particular relevance: the need of well targeted inspections in agricultural activities, considering the potential and actual impacts of this sector on water and land quality; these topics, in general, are in relationship with
 - detecting non- compliance with ND requirements (national legislation) and moving actors to compliance
 - detecting non- compliance with wfd basic measures (article 11.3.) (national legislation) and moving actors to compliance
 - detecting non- compliance with cross compliance conditions (eu legislation) and moving actors to compliance

2.4 Desired outcome of the work (what do you want to achieve? What will be better / done differently as a result of this project?)

The aim of the project is to foster the use of risk analysis tool in all sectors of environmental inspections, as instrument to optimize the use of resources of Inspective Authorities, through:

- the continuous collection and sharing of experience about risk criteria and their use, for the generality of inspection tasks, through the creation of a web based tool accessible to inspection authorities to facilitate the choice of impact criteria to be used In risk analysis tool
- the extension of the use of risk analysis tools for the prioritization of inspections to tackle sources of environmental pollution different than IED and Seveso activities, through the adaption of existing tools, or the creation of new tools, the dissemination of the techniques.

In the realization of the project, special focus will be dedicated to provide for:

- Agricultural risk indicators and parameters, specific risk analysis tool for inspection programming in this field

2.5 Does this project link to any previous or current IMPEL projects? (state which projects and how they are related)

The project is linked with running RC criteria Project, in the line of DRTR and EasyTool project. Furthermore, it is linked with IED – WFD I, II, III projects and to running project aimed at water diffuse pollution tackling.

3. Structure of the proposed activity

3.1 Describe the activities of the proposal (what are you going to do and how?)

The project is characterize by different actions and will go through different phases as:

- 1) Stabilization of results of running RC project and its continuous updating

- a. Design of a dynamic web based RC DataBase
- b. Definition, based on present and future experiences, of new extraction keys for RCs in the DB, description of features/categorization of RCs
- c. Creation of an Administrator for the management of the database and definition of the role and activities, in relationship with different ET
- 2) Extension of the DB to new inspection tasks not yet covered by running RC project (e.g: future EU binding framework for inspections, Agriculture, CAP, WFD and MSFD, daughter directives were applicable);
 - a. Analysis and identification of the areas to be covered with a new RC collection
 - b. Definition of a specific questionnaire for collection of risk criteria and indicators (if already used) or of proposals
 - c. Collection of answers and organization in DB
- 3) Design of Risk Analysis Tool for specific inspection tasks or study for adaption of existing ones (e.g.: IRAM):
 - a. Identification of elements to be considered in “task specific” Risk Analysis (e.g.: indicators for pressures, environmental conditions, crisis areas to be managed)
 - b. Guidelines for of adaption of existing Risk Analysis Tool to new tasks
 - c. Identification of the inspection tasks which need a “task specific” Risk Analysis tool
 - d. First sketch of new Risk Analysis tools, where useful
- 4) Organization of workshops and seminars for the dissemination of the results of the activities

3.2 Describe the products of the proposal (what are you going to produce in terms of output / outcome?)

Outputs:

The outputs will be delivered in an arch of time of more than one year.

In the first year will be delivered:

- Dynamic database of Risk Criteria for the identified range of inspection tasks: IED, Seveso directives, RMCEI, Agriculture, enforceable duties related to WFD, MSFD, soil and land and, in future, for new EU binding framework for inspections.
- Definition of Administrator, rules for database management
Analysis and manual for extension of the use or existing Risk Analysis tool (e.g.: IRAM) to other inspection tasks
- Prerequisites and sketch of a selected number of “task specific” Risk Analysis Tool (if possible, design and production of a prototype of Risk Analysis tool for selected inspection task as prioritized by IMPEL. (e.g. for a priority: agriculture),
- Reports and information material for the diffusion / promotion of risk analysis methods and risk criteria

In following years will be delivered:

- The continuous management and maintenance of the Risk Criteria Database
- Proposal for convergence on specific Risk Indicators and Parameters.
- The production of specific Risk Analysis tools or the adaption of existing ones for the use with different Inspection tasks, on the basis of priorities fixed by IMPEL
- Workshops on Risk criteria and Risk Analysis, participations with presentations in relevant events

Outcomes:

- Convergence toward risk analysis as instrument for inspection planning and programming, based on common risk indicators with the aim to foster level playing field across Europe.
- Promotion of risk analysis use in new fields, such as Agriculture and general inspection tasks at present non imposed by EU laws, with the aim of stitching up implementation gap and of

- optimization in resource use
- Promotion of a common culture on risk analysis and highlighting of relevant information and data to be managed in Risk Analysis, also in the perspective of simplifying administrative burden of enterprises and public administration
 - Solid base to deal with the Commission's work for the production of new European inspection binding framework

3.3 Describe the milestones of this proposal (how will you know if you are on track to complete the work on time?)

First year:

The work of the first year has three main items to be followed, which could be managed, eventually, with a partition of the Project Team into groups, depending also on the number and skills of participants: a) "database design and management", b) "new risk criteria collection", c) "New Risk Analysis Tool design"

In the first year both the tasks have to be developed

a) Database design and management:

The Database design will start from the outputs and outcomes of running RC project, which will have, as deliverable (end of 2014), a collection of Risk Indicators and Parameters both in form of text and in in form of spreadsheet / relational database. Further steps are aimed at the construction of a web based tool fully accessible without the need of having a client software installed on PCs.

- i. First definition of the features of the database and accessibility to fulfill demands for a stable database on risk criteria: how we want that the database works and how the information have to be inserted and retrieved: march – april 2015
- ii. Contacts with web DB designer, consultation and further improvement, release of a prototype: May – September 2015
- iii. Start up of DB, migration of already collected data: October – December 2015

b) New Risk Criteria collection:

- i. Design of new questionnaire for collection of further Risk Criteria, Indicators and Parameters: march – april 2015
- ii. Distribution of questionnaires and collection of answers; data entry in already existing database: April – September (to be ready for transfer in web DB in 2015)

c) New Risk Analysis Tool design

- i. Questions to Impel Members about use of Risk Analysis Tool if needed, collection of demands from IMPEL members for perceived needs for the use of a Risk Analysis Tool (in the meantime with above point b) ii.)
- ii. Analysis of the answers (in the meantime with above point b) ii.)
- iii. Production of a report with priority for specific Risk Criteria Analysis production, and guide lines for adaption of existing Risk Analysis Tools to new tasks (October – December 2015)

A final Workshop on Risk Analysis on selected topics will be programmed for a date before the end of 2015.

Following years:

In following years, the work to be done will be:

- the updating and maintenance of the Web Risk Criteria Database and the production of prioritized new Risk Analysis Tools, and the dissemination of results among IMPEL Members, in a program to be defined and approved each year within the term for next year ToR presentation.
- The adaption of existing Risk Analysis tool, as IRAM, or the development of new ones, for

further inspection tasks, identified by IMPEL, the test of new solutions, the sharing of results

3.4 Risks (what are the potential risks for this project and what actions will be put in place to mitigate these?)

1) risk of not reaching critical mass in the project team constitution. It is estimated as minimal be overcome in consideration of the good participation to running RC project, of which this project can be considered as a follow up, and through cooperation of ET leaders and members, because the project is to be considered useful for every field in which inspection activities are to be carried out.

2) Risk of overlapping and duplicating related to other project referred to inspection planning and/or programming. It can be minimized or eliminated through a common analysis and willingness of Cluster Management Group. This project aims to an optimization of resources to build and manage a database on RC, common to different Inspection Tasks; this project is aimed too at capacity building in risk analysis with the contribution of IMPEL Areas and Experts already operating in this field.

3) Economical risk: risk of not having at disposal funds needed for IT instruments developments that has to be implemented. If IMPEL should not pay for (all of) the expenses, cooperation of IMPEL organizations could be searched to overcome the problem. Fundings could also be provided by a Life project aimed at general fostering of IMPEL activities.

4. Organisation of the work

4.1 Lead (who will lead the work: name, organisation and country) – this must be confirmed prior to submission of the TOR to the General Assembly)

Giuseppe Sgorbati – ARPA Lombardia (Environmental protection agency of Lombardia), Italy

4.2 Project team (who will take part: name, organisation and country)

Participation of members from previous Risk Criteria project (it has to be considered a followup of this project) and members with expertise in agriculture. To be specified. (approx. 10 members)

4.3 Other IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country)

TBD

4.4. Other non-IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country)

TBD

5. High level budget projection of the proposal. In case this is a multi-year project, identify future requirements as much as possible

	Year 1 (exact)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
How much money do you require from IMPEL? (€)	34,220			
How much money is to be co-	TBD			

financed				
Total budget				

6. Detailed event costs of the work for year 1

	Travel € (max €360 per return journey)	Hotel € (max €90 per night)	Catering € (max €25 per day)	Total costs €
Event 1	3,240	1,620	500	5,360
<Startup Project Team meetig>	(P.T.9 x 360 €)	(P.T.: 9 x 90 € x 2 nighs)	(P.T.: 10 x 25 € x 2 days)	
<March 2015>				
<Italy>				
<10>				
<2>				
Event 2	3,240	1,620	500	5,360
<Second Project Team meeting>	(P.T.9 x 360 €)	(P.T.: 9 x 90 € x 2 nighs)	(P.T.: 10 x 25 € x 2 days)	
<June 2015>				
<TBD>				
<10>				
<2>				
Event 3	7,560	4,590	1,350	13,500
<Workshop and BtB Project Meeting>	(21 x 360 €)	(P.T.: 9 x 90 € x 3 nights) + (Ext. Part.: 12 x 90 € x 2 nights)	(P.T.: 10 x 25 € x 3 days) + (Ext. Part.: 12 x 25 € x 2 days)	
<november>				
<TBD>				
<22>				
<2>				
Event 4				
<Type of event>				
<Data of event>				
<Location>				
<No. of participants>				
<No. of days/nights>				
Total costs for all events	14,040	7,380	2,350	24.220

7. Detailed other costs of the work for year 1

7.1 Are you using a consultant?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes	<input type="checkbox"/> No
--	---	-----------------------------

7.2 What are the total costs for the consultant?	[10,000 €]
7.3 Who is paying for the consultant?	IMPEL
7.4. What will the consultant do?	Design and if possible in first year set up of Online Risk Criteria Database
7.5 Are there any additional costs?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Namely:
7.6 What are the additional costs for?	
7.7 Who is paying for the additional costs?	
7.8. Are you seeking other funding sources?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Namely: Some member organization may have interest in supporting directly the development of the project – Funding from external projects
7.9 Do you need budget for communications around the project? If so, describe what type of activities and the related costs	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No Namely:

8. Communication and follow-up (checklist)

	What		By when
8.1 Indicate which communication materials will be developed throughout the project and when <i>(all to be sent to the communications officer at the IMPEL secretariat)</i>	TOR ✓ *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	September 2014
	Interim report ✓ *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	July 2015
	Project report ✓ *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	December 2015
	Progress report(s) ✓	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Cluster meeting
	Press releases	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	With project report
		<input type="checkbox"/>	and/or important events
	News items for the website ✓ *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Start /With project report
	News items for the e-newsletter	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Start /With project report
	Project abstract ✓ *	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	March 2015
	IMPEL at a Glance ✓	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	November 2015
Other, (give details): document and presentations in case of		In time for event participation	

	participation of IMPEL members in events related to inspections (national and international)		
8.2 Milestones / Scheduled meetings (for the website diary)	See 3.3		
8.3 Images for the IMPEL image bank	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No		
8.4 Indicate which materials will be translated and into which languages	Will be proposed to the Project Team to translate main documents (Project report, newsletter, press release in their languages)		
8.5 Indicate if web-based tools will be developed and if hosting by IMPEL is required	It will be developed a online database of risk criteria and and other info in support of Risk Analysis Tools use. It would be better that it is integrated in (or linked with) IRAM webpage		
8.6 Identify which groups/institutions will be targeted and how	The target group is mainly Inspection Authorities. It will be used suitable documents from point 8. Also the EC will be informed of ongoing work and project result		
8.7 Identify parallel developments / events by other organisations, where the project can be promoted	The product is to be promoted in national and international events about inspections and IED implementation		

^) Templates are available and should be used. *) Obligatory

9. Remarks

Is there anything else you would like to add to the Terms of Reference that has not been covered above?

*In case of doubts or questions please contact the
IMPEL Secretariat.*

*Draft and final versions need to be sent to the
IMPEL Secretariat in word format, not in PDF.*

Thank you.

