

TERMS OF REFERENCE FOR IMPEL PROJECT

* Please read the supporting notes before filling in each section of this form.

1. Project details

Name of project
Waste Sites II

2. Scope

2.1. Background	<p>The proposal is based on the experiences derived from the first Waste Sites project of 2011-2012 which confirmed the assumption that in order to control illegal waste exports from the EU more effectively – notably of e-waste and end-of-life vehicles – it is important to target the sources of these waste streams and the “upstream” facilities where the waste is collected, stored and/or treated before the export. Site-oriented policing measures have advantages compared to transport inspections in so far as they focus on local and regional hubs of the waste trade instead of accidentally intercepting individual shipments, they involve larger quantities of the waste, and they are more likely to uncover the underlying structure of the business behind illegal exports.</p> <p>For more details see Terms of Reference of Waste Sites project (phase 2, no. 2012/18).</p>
2.2. Directive / Regulation / Decision	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Directive 2008/98/EC on waste (Waste Framework Dir., WFD) • Regulation (EC) No. 1013/2006 on shipments of waste (Waste Shipment Regulation, WSR)
2.3. Article and description	<p>Under Article 34(1) WFD, establishments or undertakings which carry out waste treatment operations, establishments or undertakings which collect or transport waste on a professional basis, brokers and dealers, and establishments or undertakings which produce hazardous waste shall be subject to appropriate periodic inspections by the competent authorities.</p> <p>Under Art. 50 WSR Member States shall, by way of measures for the enforcement of this Regulation, provide, <i>inter alia</i>, for inspections of establishments and undertakings in accordance with the WFD and for spot checks on shipments of waste or on the related recovery or disposal. Checks on shipments may take place, among others, at the point of origin. Member States shall cooperate, bilaterally or multilaterally, with one another in order to facilitate the prevention and detection of illegal shipments.</p>
2.4 Link to the 6th EAP	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Art. 8(1) and (2)(iii) EAP: Minimisation of the quantity of waste for disposal, ensuring safe disposal, avoiding emissions, development of environmentally sound waste recycling • Art. 9(2) EAP: Strengthening international environmental governance, achieving mutual supportiveness between trade and environmental protection, etc.
2.5. Link to MAWP	<p>The project “Inspection of waste sites” is listed in the IMPEL TFS MAWP 2011-2015 (p. 20) for the years 2011-12. Its continuation</p>

	should help in the future IMPEL effort (cf. MAWP, p. 9) to identify and develop good practices, produce guidance, tools and common standards and actively contribute to further improvements as regards inspection and enforcement of EU law especially with regard to the waste management facilities involved in exports of waste.
2.6. Objective (s)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To promote cooperation and the exchange of best practices between competent authorities in the IMPEL member countries regarding the control of waste shipments and the inspection and compliance management at “upstream” waste sites; • To stimulate the practical application of the Waste Sites Manual developed in the first Waste Sites project, to translate it from English into other languages and to update it on the basis of practical experience; • To spread the use of a “waste stream approach” in IMPEL member countries by testing it on current cases; • To explore best practices regarding the use of proactive strategies in the context of waste sites, e.g. by media campaigns, communication with business associations, traders and shipping lines.

3. Structure of the project

3.1. Activities	<p>The Waste Sites II project would be organized along the following lines:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A core group of: IMPEL representative, project manager and a number of supporting members should be formed. • Active participation in the project would essentially be realized by taking part in ‘twinning groups’, composed of inspectors from 2 or 3 countries. Members should represent the countries involved in an actual existing waste flow to and from waste sites. One of them should act as ‘case-holder’ to coordinate the joint activities and the information exchange (Basecamp!). • The project manager would supervise the different twinning groups, give advice and connect to IMPEL. The project team should be made up of the core group and the respective case-holders. • In addition, the project manager – assisted by the project team - would collect best-practice examples for proactive strategies on waste sites control. • A two-year duration is envisaged to allow more time for preparation, practical work and evaluation of results. The project would start with a kick-off meeting of all participants. The number of project team meetings should be limited to 3-4 altogether, supplemented by teleconferences if necessary. A workshop or final meeting of participants in 2014 would be useful to discuss and disseminate the project results. In addition, the
------------------------	------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

	<p>twinning teams should organize their meetings and exchanges at their own pace and in close connection to the regular work of inspectors (including communication with police, customs and other services).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The overall budget should not go much beyond the one for the first Waste Sites project, i.e. envisaged is a total amount of approx. 25,000 € over two years which should cover the essential project meetings, some translation costs and an extra amount for travel costs to facilitate the inspector exchanges where necessary. • The difference to the Enforcement Actions (EA) project would consist in the focus on site inspections and the use of data from the sites' logistical and financial administration, as part of the "waste stream approach". Joint activities with the "EA" project are intended. • The Waste Sites Manual would be used as a starting point, but not imposed and not limitative. In order to facilitate use of the Manual, its translation into at least some languages of countries that participate in twinning groups and intend to adopt the methodology presented will be supported as far as the content is concerned. Results of the project should be reflected in an update of the Manual. • On top of this, the lessons drawn from the project would be summarized in a final project report.
<p>3.2. Product(s)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Joint inspections, • Workshop, • Translation and update of Waste Sites Manual, • Final project report.
<p>3.3. Planning (Milestones)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Dec. 2012 Approval of project by IMPEL General Assembly. ▪ Feb/March 2013 Kick-off meeting of participants, start of translations. ▪ May 2013 Translation of Waste Sites Manual finalized. ▪ April-June 2013 First round of joint inspections. ▪ Sept.-Nov. 2013 Second round of joint inspections. ▪ Feb.-April 2014 Third round of joint inspections. ▪ May 2014 Workshop with participants and other experts. ▪ July 2014 Distribution of workshop report. ▪ Oct. 2014 Final project report, update of Waste Sites Manual. ▪ Nov./Dec. 2014 Approval of docs by IMPEL General Assembly.

4. Organisation

4.1. Lead	Germany (State of Hesse)
4.2. Project team	Thomas Ormond (DE, project manager), Kirsten Göbel (DE) Piet ten Brink (NL), Mattias Lindgren (Sweden), Barry Sheppard (UK) Bojan Pockar (Slovenia), Other members to be decided.
4.3. Participants	Administrations of project team members in DE, NL, SE, UK and SLO; possibly other member countries (e.g. AT, BG, FI)

5. Quality review

By IMPEL-TFS cluster

6. Communications

6.1. Dissemination of results	<ul style="list-style-type: none">- Updated Waste Sites Manual to IMPEL-TFS members via Basecamp,- Project report to members and the public via Basecamp and IMPEL website,- Translations of Manual to national regulators via Basecamp and national agencies' intranet, possibly also in print,- Possibly communication of project results to Commission desk officer,- Communication of results to the media by news item on IMPEL website and by press releases at national level.
6.2. Main target groups	Domestic national, regional and local government (waste shipment and waste site inspectors, environmental authorities), police and customs
6.3. Planned follow up	To be assessed in the course of the project.

7. Project costs/Resources required (in 2013)

	Estimated costs	Budget requested from IMPEL (€)	Total payments committed by lead authority (€)	Payments by lead authority directly to the project (€)	Payments by lead authority via the IMPEL budget (€)
• Project meetings in total (2013)	9,700	9,700			
<i>Meeting 1 (Kick-off meeting):</i>					
No of Participants:	15	(10 travelling)			
Travel:	3,000	3,000			
Accommodation:	1,000	1,000			
Catering:	500	500			
Meeting venue:	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	4,500	4,500			
<i>Meeting 2 (Project team):</i>					
No of Participants:	8	(6 travelling)			
Travel:	1,800	1,800			
Accommodation:	600	600			
Catering:	200	200			
Meeting venue:	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	2,600	2,600			
<i>Meeting 3 (Project team):</i>					
No of participants:	8	(6 travelling)			
Travel:	1,800	1,800			
Accommodation:	600	600			
Catering:	200	200			
Meeting venue:	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	2,600	2,600			
• Consultant:	0	0	0	0	0
• Translation:					
• Dissemination:					
• Attendance for Project Manager at Cluster meetings:	500		500		
• Other (specify): Travel costs of inspectors for joint inspections	1,500	1,000	500		
TOTAL	11,700	10,700	1,000		
Human Resources	Project manager: 10 days Project team members: 6 days Other participants: 3 days				

7. Project costs/Resources required (in 2014)

	Estimated costs	Budget requested from IMPEL (€)	Total payments committed by lead authority (€)	Payments by lead authority directly to the project (€)	Payments by lead authority via the IMPEL budget (€)
• Project meetings in total (2014)	11,600	11,600			
<i>Meeting 1 (Workshop):</i>					
No of Participants:	30	(20 travelling)			
Travel:	6,000	6,000			
Accommodation:	2,000	2,000			
Catering:	1,000	1,000			
Meeting venue:	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	9,000	9,000			
<i>Meeting 2 (Project team):</i>					
No of Participants:	8	(6 travelling)			
Travel:	1,800	1,800			
Accommodation:	600	600			
Catering:	200	200			
Meeting venue:	0	0	0	0	0
Sub-Total:	2,600	2,600			
<i>Meeting 3:</i>					
No of participants:					
Travel:					
Accommodation:					
Catering:					
Meeting venue:					
Sub-Total:					
• Consultant:	0	0	0	0	0
• Translation:					
• Dissemination:					
• Attendance for Project Manager at Cluster meetings:	500		500		
• Other (specify): Travel costs of inspectors for joint inspections	1,000	500	500		
TOTAL	13,100	12,100	1,000		
Human Resources	Project manager: 10 days Project team members: 5 days Other participants: 2,5 days				