

TOR Reference No.:	Author(s): John Visbeen
Version: 3	Date: 09-11-2015

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 Waste and TFS	
Water and land	
Nature protection	
Cross-c utting – 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)

Reinforcement Programme on Inspection Skills according to Landfill Sites in IMPEL Member countries 2016; 2 joint inspections and workshop.

1.4 Abbreviated name of work or project

IMPEL Landfill project 2016/..

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

2.1 Name the legislative driver(s) where they exist (name the Directive, Regulation, etc.)

- IED
- Landfill Directive



		of Environmental Law
-	Waste framework directive	
-	RMCEI	
-	Industrial Emissions Directive	
2.2	Link to IMPEL MASP priority work areas	
1.	Assist members to implement new legislation	
2.	Build capacity in member organisations through the IMPEL Review Initiatives	
3.	Work on 'problem areas' of implementation identified by IMPEL and the	
	European Commission	
2.3	Why is this work needed? (background, motivations, aims, etc.)	
•	proving implementation of EU law is high priority objective of both the Commissio	on and
	PEL. Recent reports on implementation of EU waste legislation have shown that	
	plementation and enforcement of EU waste law remain poor particularly regardi	-
was	ste framework directive, the landfill directive and the waste shipment regulation"	
	Desired outcome of the work (what do you want to achieve? What will h	be better /
doi	ne differently as a result of this project?)	
•	Identification of good inspection practices, improve guidance and checklist	
•	<u>Cooperation</u> (and helping each other) between IMPEL Member Countries to wor	k towards a
•	consistent regulatory and enforcement regime, Feedback to policy makers on the (effectiveness of) the various approaches and	practicas in the
•	field of permitting and inspection of landfill sites in IMPEL Member countries	practices in the
•	Improvement of enforcement cooperation between authorities concerned at lar	dfille
-	(Environmental agency and Waterboard)	iumis
2.5	Does this project link to any previous or current IMPEL projects? (state v	vhich projects
and	how they are related)	
	dfill 2015	

3. Structure of the proposed activity

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

Project Team: project team leader and 5 experts from 5 IMPEL member countries (project leader, two experts previous joint inspections, three countries of upcoming joint inspections)
I: Joint inspection country Malta (joint inspection MS + three other MS who can offer knowledge),
II: Joint inspection country + workshop PM (joint inspection MS + 15 participants)

To be decided: Proposed countries for hosting joint inspection and workshop: Malta already confirmed; preferred MS for 2016 are France, Germany, Norway or Ireland)

The Landfill-issues are placed under the TFS Waste cluster in new IMPEL-structure. In 2016 we will work on a stronger link with this cluster.



Based on earlier experiences to take into account for landfill selection:

As far as 2016 inspections are concerned we should find one landfill that can be indicated as best practice and one with EU infringements. We can also evaluate to face the topic of inspections in a constructing landfill or closing one: therefore we may choose a landfill in construction or in the phase of closing the activity and recovering the site. New in 2016 is that the joint inspections will be combined with practical training on the topics of the working groups (biogas detection ecc) and training on preparation-execution-reporting of inspection.

Work on a document including the points of the EU Landfill Directive with a different implementation and interpretation in MS, or whose application is critical in MS. In 2016 the aim is to make the guidance document and the checklist more "practical and usable for inspectors.

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

-1 joint inspections and 1 joint inspection in combination with workshop -Project report ,

-Guidance document for inspection of landfill sites, this includes also the checklist (revised) -a document including the points of the EU Landfill Directive with a different implementation and interpretation in MS, or whose application is critical in MS. Based on this document there will be feed back to EU Commission on gaps of implementation.

-put together a list on Basecamp of useful guidelines (examples of good practise) from various Member States.

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

1. January 2016: Project team meeting telecon, preparation 3 joint inspections and workshop

- 2. March/April 2016: 1 Joint inspections
- 3. April/May 2016; revising guidance document
- 4. May/June 2016: 1 joint inspection and workshop
- 5. Oct/Nov 2016: final Project Report + document with recommendation to EU commission according to implementation gaps.

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

-lack of staff,

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)

John Visbeen (Netherlands) Romano Ruggeri (Italy)

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



Nina Hansson (Sweden) Stuart Gunput (Netherlands) MS joint inspection MS joint inspection

4.3 Other IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country) -Ronald Smallenburg (inspector Waterboard)

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

-Bianca Schijven (consultant)

-Ronald van Tunen (inspector Waterboard)

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	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4
	(exact)			
How much money do you	14600	14490	14490	14490
require from IMPEL?				
How much money is to be co-	5000(tbc)	2500(tbc)	2500(tbc)	2500(tbc)
financed				
Total budget	19600	16990	16990	16990



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	5X360=1800	5x3x90 = 1350	5x4x25=500	1800+1350+
Joint inspection				500 =3650
March - April				
Malta (confirmed)				
5 partcipants				
3 nights				
Event 2	15X360=5400	15x3x90 =	15x4x25=1500	5400+4050+
Joint inspection + workshop		4050		1500 =10950
May – June				
MS (tbc)				
15 participants				
3 nights				
Total costs for all events				3650 10950=
				14600

7. Detailed other costs of the work for year 1

7.1 Are you using a consultant?	Ves No
7.2 What are the total costs for the consultant?	[5000]
7.3 Who is paying for the consultant?	Provinces Netherlands (tbc)
7.4. What will the consultant do?	Revise guide document and checklist
7.5 Are there any additional costs?	☐ Yes
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?	Ves No Namely:



7.9 Do you need budget for	🗖 Yes	No No
communications around the	Namely:	
project? If so, describe what		
type of activities and the		
related costs		

8. Communication and follow-up (checklist)

Т

	What		By when
8.1 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): -Guidedocument (revised) -examples of good practise		
8.2 Milestones / Scheduled meetings (for the website diary)	Preparatory meeting-project team meeting Joint inspection 1 Joint inspection 2+workshop Guidedocument (revised) Document with recommendations for EU Commission according to implementation gaps		
8.3 Images for the IMPEL image bank	Ves 🗆 No		
8.4 Indicate which materials will be translated and into which languages	The used landfill inspection preparation documents and the revised guidance document will be brought under the attention of national coordinators, with the aim to distribute these documents within their Member states. Translation needs attention. Member States may use the examples of good practice to improve their inspections.		
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
8.7 Identify parallel developments / events by
other organisations, where the project can be promoted

✓) 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 <u>IMPEL Secretariat</u> in word format, not in PDF.

Thank you.