

TOR Reference No.: 2019/19	Author(s): Simon Bingham Amended by: Elisabete Dias Ramos	
Version: 3	Date: 12 August 2019	
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 Waste and TFS Water and land Nature protection Cross-cutting tools and approaches			
1.2 Type of work you need funding for			
Exchange visits Peer reviews (e.g. IRI) Conference Development of tools/guidance Comparison studies Assessing legislation (checklist) Other (please describe):			
1.3 Full name of work (enough to fully describe what the work area is)			
A mini conference to explore opportunities for imp the public during an environmental incident or em	_		
1.4 Abbreviated name of work or project			
Environmental Incident Public Communications.			

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

2.1 Name the legislative driver(s) where they exist (name the Directive, Regulation, etc.)
All primary Environmental Directives including the Environmental Liabilities Directive.



2.2	2 Link to IMPEL MASP priority work areas	
1. 2. 3.	Assist members to implement new legislation. Build capacity in member organisations through the IMPEL Review Initiatives. Work on 'problem areas' of implementation identified by IMPEL and the European Commission.	

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

Although most environmental regulators are not responsible for leading on public communications, or for responding to incidents at sites they do not regulate, there was a general acknowledgement that during an environmental incident, whether or not it was at a regulated site, there would be significant public and media expectation of effective communications from the regulator. This is not reflected either in well-established communications channels and staff availability, or in clear roles and responsibilities between the regulator and other responders. The environmental, human health and reputational risks of this situation are evident. The project has identified enhancing the capability and capacity of EU environmental regulators to communicate effectively with the public during an incident or emergency as a high priority next step for the project.

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?)

To bring together IMPEL practitioners with roles in ensuring adequate arrangements for incident and emergency response, to explore opportunities for improving the effectiveness of communicating with the public during an incident or emergency.

The event will use expert presentations, case studies, and demonstrations and include the following themes:

- The importance of public communications during environmental incidents:
 - o Regulator duty vs public/media expectation.
 - o Incidents at regulated sites.
 - o Incidents at unregulated sites.
 - Natural hazard events.
- Proactive and reactive communications.
- Engaging with the media.
- Engaging with social media.
- The use of environmental regulator web presence.
- Coordination with other emergency responders.
- Ensuring the 24/7 availability of trained staff.
- Ensuring the 24/7 availability of public communications channels.
- Devices and systems.
- Citizen Science incident reporting and feedback.



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

This mini conference was identified as required within the IMPEL project 'Environmental Incident and Emergency Response Project 2018/19'.

3. Structure of the proposed activity

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

- Mini conference.
- Report of the conference.

A mini conference spanning two days (afternoon/morning). The event is likely to attract around 25 participants and require an additional 5 presenters.

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

The ability to contribute effectively to managing accidents and incidents is a key role of environmental regulators. The IMPEL Incident and Emergency Response project aims to determine the effectiveness of current arrangements across EU regulators, identify shortcomings, and promote good practice to mitigate those shortcomings.

The principal data collection exercise of the project is a questionnaire circulated to all IMPEL members, supported by a workshop. So far, 19 countries have responded to the questionnaire, and 14 people participated in the workshop. The results suggest that regulators have, on average, only 60% confidence that their arrangements are effective. Responses so far indicate weaknesses in regulation of sites, such as no requirement for an on-site emergency plan, no permit condition relating to training and exercising, shortcomings in incident debriefing and lessons learned, little assessment of the potential impacts of natural hazards, and poor recovery planning.

The responses also highlight weaknesses in arrangements within the regulators themselves. For example, only 21% have business continuity plans in place, only 31% have guaranteed out-of-hours staff availability, fewer than 16% have 24/7 public communications capability, only one third have incident training arrangements in place, and just 16% are positive about their arrangements to debrief incidents and learn lessons.

Although most environmental regulators are not responsible for leading on public communications, or for responding to incidents at sites they do not regulate, there was a general acknowledgement that during an environmental incident, whether or not it was at a regulated site, there would be significant public and media expectation of effective communications from the regulator. This is not reflected either in well-established communications channels and staff availability, or in clear roles and responsibilities between the regulator and other responders. The environmental, human health and reputational risks of this situation are evident. The project has identified enhancing the



capability and capacity of EU environmental regulators to communicate effectively with the public during an incident or emergency as a high priority next step for the project.

- 3.3 Describe the milestones of this proposal (how will you know if you are on track to complete the work on time?)
 - Mini conference.
 - Report of the conference.
- 3.4 Risks (what are the potential risks for this project and what actions will be put in place to mitigate these?)

The project is a low risk project.

4. Organisation of the work

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

Mark Wells, Scottish Environment Protection Agency (SEPA), Scotland.

- 4.2 Project team (who will take part: name, organisation and country)
- 4.3 Other IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country)

None anticipated unless on own funds.

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

None anticipated unless on own funds.

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

	Year 2019 (exact)	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
How much money do you require from IMPEL?	25,000 €			
How much money is to be co- financed				
Total budget	25,000 €			



6. Detailed other costs of the work for year 2019

6.1 Are you using a consultant?	☐ Yes	▼ No
6.2 What are the total costs for the consultant?	N/a.	
6.3 Who is paying for the consultant?	N/a.	
6.4 What will the consultant do?	N/a.	
6.5 Are there any additional costs?	☐ Yes Namely:	▼ No
6.6 What are the additional costs for?	N/a.	
6.7 Who is paying for the additional costs?	N/a.	
6.8 Are you seeking other funding sources?	☐ Yes Namely:	▼ No
6.9 Do you need budget for communications around the project? If so, describe what type of activities and the related costs.	☐ Yes Namely:	▼ No



7. Communication and follow-up (checklist)

	What		By when
7.1 Indicate which communication materials will be developed throughout the project and when. (all to be sent to the Communications Officer at the IMPEL Secretariat)	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):		October 2018 November 2019 (if + when necessary) November 2019 November 2019 November 2019 November 2019
7.2 Milestones / Scheduled meetings (for the website diary).	Mini Conference.		
7.3 Images for the IMPEL image bank.	▼ Yes □ No		
7.4 Indicate which materials will be translated and into which languages.	Project abstract (dependent on project team members).		
7.5 Indicate if web-based tools will be developed and if hosting by IMPEL is required.	No.		
7.6 Identify which groups/institutions will be targeted and how.	All IMPEL members via invite.		
8.7 Identify parallel developments / events by other organisations, where the project can be promoted.	To be assessed as part of the project.		

<sup>Templates are available and should be used. *) Obligatory

*</sup>



8.	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 <u>IMPEL Secretariat</u>.

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