

TOR Reference No.:	Author: Martin Baranyai
Version: 4	Date: 20/1/2015
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 type="checkbox"/>
Waste and TFS	<input type="checkbox"/>
Water and land	<input type="checkbox"/>
Nature protection	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Cross-cutting – tools and approaches -	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.2 Type of work you need funding for	
Exchange visits	<input type="checkbox"/>
Peer reviews (e.g. IRI)	<input type="checkbox"/>
Conference	<input type="checkbox"/>
Development of tools/guidance	<input type="checkbox"/>
Comparison studies	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Assessing legislation (checklist)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Other (please describe):	<input type="checkbox"/>
1.3 Full name of work (enough to fully describe what the work area is)	
Case study on EU Timber regulation implementation and enforcement	
1.4 Abbreviated name of work or project	
EUTR implementation and enforcement	

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

2.1 Name the legislative driver(s) where they exist (name the Directive, Regulation, etc.)
Regulation (EU) 995/2010 (the EU Timber Regulation ; the EUTR) Regulation 607/2012

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 organisations through the IMPEL Review Initiatives | <input type="checkbox"/> |
| 3. Work on 'problem areas' of implementation indentified by IMPEL and the European Commission | <input type="checkbox"/> |

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

The state of play of implementation of the EU Timber Regulation is still unsatisfactory as demonstrated by the latest surveys conducted by the Commission. The outcome of the surveys is supported by parallel analysis of non-governmental organisations (e.g. WWF 2014 barometer, ClientEarth, Greenpeace). Absence of effective and uniform implementation and enforcement of the EU Timber Regulation is worrying as it may jeopardise the instrument and may have negative impact on the entire FLEGT Action Plan.

A main tool for achieving effective implementation and enforcement of the regulation is the checks carried out by the Member States` Competent Authorities on operators. Checks must be conducted in accordance with periodically reviewed plans following a risk-based approach, as provided for in Article 10(2) of the EUTR. Checks may be conducted also when a competent authority is in possession of relevant information, including on the basis of substantiated concerns provided by third parties. Checks may require collaboration with other authorities like the Customs and enforcement bodies like the prosecution office and the police.

To ensure uniform and effective implementation of the EU Timber Regulation across the EU it is necessary to collect and compare good practices in:

- elaboration of risk based inspection plans;
- collaboration with other authorities and enforcement bodies;
- dealing with substantiated concerns provided by third parties.

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?)

- Case study on inspection plans the Competent Authorities in each Member State have set up
- Case study on the dealing with substantiated concerns provided by third parties
- General view on quantity and quality of the inspections

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

No this is a new topic.

3. Structure of the proposed activity

3.1 Describe the activities of the proposal (what are you going to do and how?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ✓ questionnaire to all Member States, ✓ inventory of inspection plans ✓ inventory of checks carried out ✓ inventory of substantiated concerns and how they have been dealt with ✓ inventory of enforcement practices ✓ presentation of the outcomes of the questionnaire and inventory and good practices during a workshop
3.2 Describe the products of the proposal (what are you going to produce in terms of output / outcome?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • List of good practices • List of identified challenges and recommendations • Presentation and discussion
3.3 Describe the milestones of this proposal (how will you know if you are on track to complete the work on time?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Develop questionnaire • Work on the results • Report
3.4 Risks (what are the potential risks for this project and what actions will be put in place to mitigate these?)
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ Lack of response on questionnaire ➤ Low interest from some EUTR Competent Authorities

4. Organisation of the work

4.1 Lead (who will lead the work: name, organisation and country)
Martin Baranyai, Czech Environmental Inspectorate (CZ)
4.2 Project team (who will take part: name, organisation and country)
<p>Jaap Reijngoud – consultant (EU TWIX officer)</p> <p>National coordinators indicated following participants: Katica Bezuh (CR - Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection) Daniel Szekely and Christian Trupina (RO – both National Environmental Guard) Aavo Sempelson (EE – no organization indicated by Estonia) Marcel Aguis (MT - no organization indicated by Malta)</p>

4.3 Other IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country)

Potential interest was indicated by Italy (Corpo Forestale) and Poland (tbc)

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

Alison Hoare (UK – Chatham House)

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?	2700			
How much money is to be co-financed				
Total budget	2700			

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	320	180		500
<Type of event>				
<Data of event>				
<Location>				
<No. of participants>				
<No. of days/nights>				
Event 2				
<Type of event>				
<Data of event>				
<Location>				
<No. of participants>				
<No. of days/nights>				
Event 3				
<Type of event>				
<Data of event>				
<Location>				
<No. of participants>				

<No. of days/nights>				
Event 4				
<Type of event>				
<Data of event>				
<Location>				
<No. of participants>				
<No. of days/nights>				
Total costs for all events	320	180		500

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?	{40 hours x € 55 = € 2200,-}
7.3 Who is paying for the consultant?	IMPEL
7.4. What will the consultant do?	Develop questionnaire, gathering Information through open sources and analysis of results questionnaire, compile list of Good Practices, and publishing these lists on the website of IMPEL and other Enforcement mailing lists such as EU TWIX (Consultant has good contacts with Enforcement bodies)
7.5 Are there any additional costs?	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No
7.6 What are the additional costs for?	500 € for participation of 1 person at the workshop of Chatham House focused on illegal logging issues and meeting of the Commission EUTR Enforcement group
7.7 Who is paying for the additional costs?	IMPEL
7.8. Are you seeking other funding sources?	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No Namely:
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 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 ✓ * Interim report ✓ * Project report ✓ * Progress report(s) ✓ Press releases News items for the website ✓ * News items for the e-newsletter Project abstract ✓ * IMPEL at a Glance ✓ Other, (give details):	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/> <input type="checkbox"/>	
8.2 Milestones / Scheduled meetings (for the website diary)	- February -March: develop questionnaire within the working group - April: distributing and answering questionnaire (sending reminders) - May - June: work on the outcome and drafting report		
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	-		
8.5 Indicate if web-based tools will be developed and if hosting by IMPEL is required	-		
8.6 Identify which groups/institutions will be targeted and how	The Member States` Competent Authorities designated under the EU Timber Regulation		
8.7 Identify parallel developments / events by other organisations, where the project can be promoted	The Commission EUTR Enforcement group; The Council Working Party on forestry Chatham House		

✓) 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.