



Notes of meeting (version 23/01/15)

13th IMPEL General Assembly

11-12 December 2014,

Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Rome, Italy

Thursday 11 December 2014

Session 1: Welcome

Chair: *John Seager*

1. Opening address by Chair of IMPEL

John opened the 13th General Assembly of IMPEL and welcomed everyone to the meeting.

2. Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted by the General Assembly.

3. Welcome presentation by ISPRA

"Implementation of Environmental Legislation in Italy: the role of ISPRA," by Alfredo Pini - Environmental Inspections Office Manager.

Alfredo gave the welcome presentation to IMPEL on behalf of Italy. ISPRA is the National Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, consists of 1300 employees, was established in 2008 and is an independent research body, though it reports to the Ministry of Environment, Land and Sea. It works with the 21 regional environmental agencies and the Federal Council to manage a common work programme to develop guidelines and methodologies.

Alfredo gave some background as to the adoption of environmental regulations in Italy. Regarding monitoring environmental compliance, ISPRA is responsible, at a State level, for 185 installations. This is supported by the regional agencies and the various police forces. Alfredo gave some statistical information on the number of inspections carried out over the last 5 years as well as the number of person-hours used.

4. Welcome to the new IMPEL National Coordinators

The new National Coordinators of Denmark (Berith Nielsen), Finland (Juha Lahtela), Slovenia (Nevenka Zvokelj) and Iceland (Sigrun Augustdottir). Unfortunately, Liga Zvirbule from Latvia was unable to join us for this meeting. Berith, Juha, Nevenka and Sigrun introduced themselves to the General Assembly.

Session 2: Concluding the development of IMPEL & future strategy

Chair: *John Seager*

1. Summary of progress so far

John reminded the GA that IMPEL started this progress last December in Lithuania and that at the last GA in Brussels the principles were broadly agreed. He said there were some outstanding issues to be finalised such the prioritising of IMPEL's work as well as role and relationship of the Cluster Management Group with the Board.

2. Prioritising IMPEL work

Simon gave an introductory presentation on the work that the 5 expert team leaders and others have done to finalise the prioritisation mechanism.

There was a request for a clarification on the decision making structure from the Gillian (UK). John and Simon clarified that the final decision on the work programme rests with the General Assembly. ISPRA asked about the communications plan as one of the minimum criteria that projects should satisfy. Giulietta Rak said that communications cost money. John reminded the GA that IMPEL has a Communications Group who facilitates communications in IMPEL and that they have a separate budget to help with this though it was important to add that the responsibility for actually carrying out communications work should be done by the project (teams) themselves.

Kristina (Germany) said that the prioritisation should be amended following the information gathered regarding the participation from member countries, which should substantially be taken into account for project prioritisation. John said that the Board had discussed and agreed with this principle at its previous meeting. As a result, the Board had agreed that it hoped to bring forward its schedule for 2015 so that that process could be carried out earlier within the year. Isabel (Portugal) added that in addition to the last point, the responsibility for understanding who will take part should be carried out by those preparing the project Terms of References (ToRs) and this should already be drafted in the project proposal.

The General Assembly agreed to adopt the minimum criteria for projects and expert team prioritisation of new ToRs with the amended wording as discussed and agreed during the meeting.

The following criteria was agreed:

Minimum Criteria for new ToRs

- Demonstrate a clear link to a specific implementation gap or required need to help members bridge that gap
- identify the added value of the activity for the participants and for IMPEL as a whole
- demonstrate how the activity will be implemented by members / countries that commit to taking part so that appropriate participation is guaranteed
- clearly identify the benefits that will be delivered and how they will be realised
- demonstrate a clear and achievable project and financial plan
- identify the target audience and beneficiaries of the activity and have a clear communication plan for the outputs of the activity
- include information on how the project will be evaluated
- include, as a final product, an abstract (as already approved in the final report of the Cross-Cutting EIC project) and translations in the languages of the participants.

Expert Team prioritisation of new ToRs

- New ToRs fulfil minimum requirements
- The available budget for the ET is known
- The present ET members agree on the ranking proposals
- The ET identifies which ToRs are in danger
- The CMG agrees on an overall ranking, taking into account announced participation depending on the character of the project
- The Board confirms the availability of funding for the projects in ranked order

- The GA decides on the projects for the programme.

3. Implementation Challenge study

Chris Dijkens gave an update on the work of the Implementation Challenge study. This was supported by a presentation from Terry Shears on draft conclusions of study. It was agreed that a draft would be circulated and that comments on the draft report should be submitted to Terry Shears before 01 February 2015. The final draft report reflecting comments received will then be circulated by 01 March 2015. It was also agreed that the report will contribute to the work programme for 2016 and beyond. Based on the report and the work of the Expert Teams in 2015, it will also help to replace the Multi Annual Strategic Programme.

4. Composition of IMPEL Board and Cluster Management Group

The role of the cluster management group was briefly discussed as well as proposals to amend the structure of the Board.

John reminded the GA that decisions are made in this meeting and the Board's role is to guide the network in between and implement decisions of the GA.

John gave a summary of the Board's proposal to the GA on the composition of the Board and the role/relationship with the CMG. He said that this proposal was developed on the 18 November 2014 meeting of the Board. He informed the GA that the Board decision to prepare this proposal was not a unanimous decision but it was a majority decision. He added that Italy, though a member of the Board, chose to make a separate proposal to the GA that has been circulated. Umberto followed John by giving a summary of this proposal.

Kristina summarised the German view by saying that the Board should consist of: Chair, Vice Chair, all 5 Expert Team leaders. Kristina reminded the GA that individuals time is also very important and may ultimately be the key factor in deciding who takes part. She added though that we should do our utmost to encourage regional representation. Kristina said that we should also invite the host of the GA meeting in that year to attend and take part in the Board meetings.

Isabel said that more important than geographical representation is the involvement of committed persons who have the time to take part in IMPEL. She said she supported the idea to invite the GA host into the Board. Isabel also said that the Expert Team leaders are also approved by the GA. She supported the idea of the CMG because of the important role they have in ensuring a good coordination of the projects.

Armin said that Austria still did not see the need for the cluster management group.

Chrystalla said that based on her recent experience in the Board, she thinks it is important that all 5 ET team leaders should be involved because of the responsibilities of the Board e.g. budget issues. It was important to have 5 ET team leaders because this will help to ensure continuity. She proposed to have a member of IMPEL involved in the Board and to rotate this every 6 months. Having the host Presidency in the Board helps the NC to understand IMPEL more and helps the Board to get closer to IMPEL members.

Aleksandra said that Poland does not think the countries should be split into 3 groups as indicated in the Italian proposal. Countries should not be divided into: "15", "13" and non-EU. Poland proposed the following composition of the Board: Chair, Vice Chair, 1 representative of the Cluster Management Group and 2 Members of countries that have and will have the Presidency. With that solution the number of participants of the Board meetings will be limited to 5, so less costs incurred and the representation of both Expert Teams and countries will be assured.

Larry said that based on recent experiences he does not think there is a democratic deficit in the Board and that through projects, clusters/ETs etc. that members have plenty of opportunities to influence the direction of IMPEL. He asked that IMPEL focus its discussion more on the practical issues that IMPEL is best at rather than discussing ideological discussions.

Henk said the difference between one or two participants in the Board is neither here nor there. The cost savings would be minimal so this is not a huge factor in making a decision. Henk asked that we refer to the CMG as an informal working group rather than as an additional structured layer. In summary, Henk said that we should go with the Board proposal of '2+5' for a few years and then re-evaluate the system later.

Nondas said that beyond the Chair, electing individuals to the Board is not necessary, though he wished to support the Board proposal.

Gillian said that the Board has a managerial role and not a technical one, which is the role of the CMG. She said she supported the Board proposal of 2+5 with an invitation to the GA host.

The result of the vote was as follows:

- 27 (25 in the room + 2 via early paper submissions) supported the proposal by the Board.
- 6 countries were either not represented or wished to abstain.
- There was 1 country (Italy) that did not agree with the conclusion.

It was agreed that the network would proceed along the main lines of the Board's proposal to the General Assembly with some small amendments. The amendments were to invite the host of the General Assembly in that year to take part in the IMPEL Board and to review the situation after 2 years to see if the system was working. The specific Board proposal to reduce the number of Expert Team leaders in the Board was not specifically agreed but that this would form part of the review process in 2 years time.

To clarify, the new look IMPEL Board from 2015 onwards would be: *the Chair of IMPEL, Vice Chair, all 5 Expert Team Leaders and representative of the host country of the General Assembly.*

5. IMPEL rules and Statute

Elen asked why one of the proposed criteria highlighted on P.11 of the earlier draft of the Strategy paper (submitted to the GA in Brussels in May 2014), related to the number of supporting member countries needing to be 51% or more, had been deleted from this revised draft of criteria. Referring back briefly to the earlier GA agenda item, Simon said that the Task Group working on the strategy had agreed to reduce and streamline the number of criteria to simplify the process. This simplification had been at the request of the last General Assembly in Brussels.

It was agreed that the agenda items discussed earlier in this General Assembly meeting related to the new composition of the Board and the prioritisation mechanism will also need to be reflected in the new version of the rules and Statute.

Rikard asked why we are using the word activities in addition to projects now. Michael explained that IMPEL carries out activities as well as projects. Projects are time limited and create outputs but that we do this in conjunction with activities which are not necessarily time limited nor create outputs e.g. NCP Best practice meeting.

There was agreement to change the wording of the Cluster Management Group to the 'Programme Management Group'.

There was agreement in the room to include a change to the rules and statute relating to section 3.1, pp.7. Rights & Obligations of MS:

All network members will strive for the most extensive participation and representation possible of the different regions, supranational integrations that reflect the diversity of IMPEL bodies and activities.

It was agreed that the Secretariat would make the changes and re-circulate the rules and Statute for agreement via written method.

6. Expert Teams

The Expert Team (ET) leaders gave a summary of the work of their groups so far and what is planned for the coming year(s). The GA was also reminded that the provisional Expert Team Leaders and their Deputies should be voted on at the first Expert Team meetings of 2015. The roles will then be approved by the General Assembly (via correspondence) in 2015.

Allison gave a background summary of the Waste TFS Expert Group including by explaining the strong history of the TFS Cluster in particular. A significant challenge will be about re-focusing its efforts to include the waste area in its work. Kevin added that they would welcome new members to take part in the Steering Committee of the group. John said that the rest of IMPEL can learn a lot from the TFS group because of the high participation rates in its activities.

Horst introduced the work of the Industry & Air ET. In 2015, this ET will be looking at the following project areas:

- IED implementation
- Lessons Learnt from Accidents
- Onshore oil & gas regulation

John introduced the work that the new Green ET is working on. John informed the GA that Martin Baranyai is working as the deputy in this group. John summarised the work in 2014 of the ET:

- Collegial support: Impel Review Initiative – peer review focussed on implementation and execution green legislation in Romania
- Extend network (more Member States, NGO's, Interpol), share expertise, and develop tool: Workshop to Establish Green Expert team - November 27/28 2014
- Collaboration with EU network of Judges and Prosecutors
- Improve implementation: Recommendations on ringing birds.

John said that one of the main areas of work so far had been the illegal killing of birds project. A good start had been made in terms of working with non-IMPEL partners and networks such as FACE (the EU Hunters Federation), Birdlife International, EU TWIX, the THEMIS network, the European Commission and the Bern Convention. John said that the work so far had highlighted several missing links such as: 1) to improve the effectiveness of inspection and enforcement, 2) to improve the effect of prosecution and the impact of sanctions, 3) examining alternative approaches and awareness raising / communication strategies and, 4) to extend the enforcement network. John gave some excellent examples of the type of 'story-telling' that the ET had been doing regarding enforcement practices and results.

Unfortunately Giuseppe Sgorbati, team leader of the Water and Land ET, could not attend the meeting but had sent some information to John Seager in advance of the meeting so that he could summarise the work of this ET. John said that the Water and Land ET had some specific challenges that could/should be addressed going forward:

- Diffuse pollution from agriculture
- Lack of regulation for soil protection
- Failing sewage works and leakages from old pipelines
- Costs of waste water solutions
- Building permits issued without proper environmental authorisation
- Monitoring of priority chemicals

- Over-abstraction of water: over-allocation and illegal activity
- Physical modification of water bodies

Further activities had also been discussed as potential activities going forward such as:

- Marine strategy: support to competent authorities, role in Regional Sea Conventions implementation
- Urban wastewaters treatment plants
- “Baseline report” for ground waters and soil protection in IED
- Emergency activities in accidents involving water pollution issues.
- Soil decontamination and ground water protection in polluted industrial sites
- Satellite and other remote sensing techniques in support of land and water monitoring and inspections – Illegal water abstraction – (also in Copernicus Earth Observation satellite exploitation);
- Adaption to climate change
- Soil degradation
- Soil sealing

Simon gave a brief summary of the Cross Cutting group. Jesus Ocio from Spain will deputise for Simon.

Two dates are now in the diary for the Cross Cutting Expert Team meetings due to take place in 2015: 10 / 12 March in Lisbon and in Glasgow (meeting back to back with Technology conference) on 21-25 September 2015. Simon said that the ET will look at several areas of work including:

- Inspection regimes - best practice (What is an effective inspection regime and How can we tell we have got it right?)
- Orphaned & Legacy sites (Abandoned waste and mineral sites - public liability, Financial security instruments & processes, Liability and clean up)
- INSPIRE Directive for regulatory agencies (what, why, how?)
- Compliance assessment and why it is needed (What is a compliance assessment scheme? How does it differ from risk assessment? How do I build one?)
- Indicators - What works well and why?

Bent (Norway) said that the summary presentations given by the ET team leaders were very useful to hear and would suggest that we continue with this in future General Assemblies. Going further, he said that they should be even more concrete or specific about the goal and achievements of IMPEL as well as by outlining what the further goals and work for the following year would be, concerning the implementation challenge within each ET area.

Session 3: IMPEL activities

Chair: *Umberto Benezzoli*

1. Approval of 2013 & 2014 project reports and activities

The General Assembly approved the following 2013 and 2014 project reports and activities:

- FR-2013-05 DECO (June 2014)
- FR-2013-16 Achieving better compliance in the agricultural sector through networking and partnership working of environmental and agricultural inspectorates
- FR-2013-19 & 2014-03 Waste Sites II
- FR-2014-12 Choosing Appropriate Interventions, phase 3
 - FR-2014-12 Choosing Appropriate Interventions, phase 3: Guidance document

There were no comments on the final reports. These were approved by the General Assembly. Jean Luc however did emphasise the importance of building on the results of the DECO project report. Umberto

agreed and said that the Soil Conference that is planned for 2015 will help to address this point. Nancy reminded the project managers about the need to prepare and submit a project abstract for each of the approved projects.

The General Assembly was reminded that some reports were outstanding. These are:

For 2013

- 2013/15 - Compliance assurance through company compliance management systems (project II / 2013-2014).

For 2014

- 2014/01 - IMPEL-TFS Prosecutor Project
- 2014/02 - IMPEL-TFS Best Practice meeting 2014
- 2014/04 - Reinforcement Programme on inspection skills according to Landfill sites in IMPEL Member countries 2014; 3 joint inspections
- 2014/05 - IMPEL TFS Conference 2014
- 2014/07 - IMPEL Review Initiative (IRI) of the Malta Environment and Planning Authority
- 2014/09 - IMPEL Review Initiative (IRI) of the Dutch Environmental Agency “DCMR” in the Rotterdam region
- 2014/10 - Linking the Directive on Industrial Emissions (IED) and REACH Regulation, phase 2
- 2014/11 - Definition of risk analysis criteria, and their implementation through risk indicators and parameters, for the prioritization of environmental inspections of industrial installations in accordance with the Industrial Emissions Directive(IED) – Supporting the implementation of IRAM sharing knowledge and experience on Impact and Operator Performance Criteria
- 2014/13 - Sharing good practice in tackling diffuse pollution and nitrate loss from farms & farmsteads
- 2014/14 - Nature protection in permitting and inspection of industrial installations Implementation of Art. 6(3) of the Habitats Directive
- 2014/15 - Roadmap to combating illegal killing, trapping and trade of birds
- 2014/16 - Critical success conditions for compliance assurance and improvement of environmental performance through company compliance /environmental management systems; project II / 2014
- 2014/18 - Sharing of draft proposals between member states for implementing derogations from BAT-AEL’s under article 15 paragraphs (4) and (5) of the Industrial emissions Directive 2010/75/EU
- 2014/19 - End of Waste
- 2014/20 - Tool to review the impact of new and existing legislation on TFS (TRIT)

The Secretariat announced that the project leaders for outstanding reports would be asked to submit their final reports in the Spring of 2015. A communication about the specific date would be circulated in due course. The Secretariat would then ask the General Assembly to approve the outstanding work via written procedure.

Session 4: IMPEL work programme 2015

Chair: *Umberto Benezzoli*

1. Work Programme 2015

&

2. Board proposal on budget of IMPEL in 2015

The discussions regarding the 2015 budget and 2015 work programme were discussed simultaneously.

The GA was informed that the European Commission had not confirmed the amount of LIFE+ funding that IMPEL could apply for. As a result, the GA could not agree on a 2015 work programme or budget.

It was agreed that when further information was sent to the Board from the European Commission, that the Board would then work with the Expert Team Leaders to propose a budget and a work programme to be approved via written procedure.

Friday 12 December 2014

Session 5: IMPEL success stories 2014

Chair: Chris Dijkens

IMPEL success stories 2014

Presentation on the positive results of IMPEL work over the last years:

- *Allison Townley on the Enforcement Actions & Waste Sites projects*
- *Horst Buether on Supporting the Implementation of the Industrial Emissions Directive and risk assessment*
- *John Visbeen on the Illegal Killing of Birds project and development of the new 'green' area of work in IMPEL.*

Chris introduced this agenda item by giving an introductory presentation about some of the key successes that IMPEL has made over the last 2 years:

- Evaluation Study of IMPEL's effectiveness
- Development of new IMPEL strategy
- Expansion of network into 'blue' & 'green' areas
- Adjusted governance structure to the new strategy
- Execution of the Implementation Challenge project
- Emphasis on improving communications
- Establishment of the Communications Group
- Secretariat capacity focused on communications
- Engagement with key partners
- Membership ENFORCE
- Country engagement programme e.g. Slovenia, Germany, Kosovo
- Robust dialogue / communication and cooperation with the European Commission

Going forward, Chris said that there were some challenges ahead:

- Ensuring continuity & implementing IMPEL strategy
- To expand membership of IMPEL
- Develop strategic partnerships e.g. networks connected to blue and green themes, prosecutors, judges, etc
- Exploring and stimulating co-funding opportunities through other potential funding sources

- Connecting with CCA's Working Group on inspections to explore cooperation in the area of Seveso III Directive
- Enhance active participation and continue the 'country engagement programme.

Allison, Horst and John presented 3 key topic areas where IMPEL has had some notable successes.

Session 6: European Commission

Chair: *Chris Dijkens*

Update by Mr. Miroslav Angelov, Policy Officer: Legal Issues European Commission - Directorate General for Environment Unit D.4 (Governance, Information & Reporting).

Miroslav gave an update to the General Assembly about some of the developments on key pieces of legislation in DG Environment. An annexed summary was submitted to the GA. Please see this document for further details.

Session 7: Organisational matters

Chair: *Jean Luc Perrin*

1. Ratification of Cluster TFS nomination for Chair

Allison Townley was nominated and approved as the new Cluster TFS Chair. Allison works at the Northern Ireland Environment Agency in the UK and has been involved in IMPEL for over 10 years. She has been on the Steering Committee of the cluster and will succeed Jon Engstrom.

2. Election of Chair & Vice Chair (2015-2017)

Based on the decision of the previous day regarding the Board composition, Umberto Benezoli withdrew his candidacy during the meeting. As such the General Assembly agreed to elect John Seager and Chris Dijkens for a further two years as Chair and Vice Chair respectively. This was a unanimous decision of those present.

3. Board report on financial state of IMPEL in 2014

Michael Nicholson from the IMPEL Secretariat gave a summary of the network's financial position so far in 2014. A full, detailed report would be circulated in due course.

4. Membership

a) Application for membership

The applications from the State Inspectorate of Environment & Water, Albania and from AssoArpa, the National Association of 21 regional public Agencies responsible for environmental protection in Italy, were accepted by the General Assembly and they become the newest members of IMPEL.

b) Membership fees

The Board submitted a proposal to the General Assembly to review the principles regarding non-payment of membership fees.

Umberto suggested that there should be a different recommendation: to automatically discontinue membership if membership fees have not been paid rather than go through the process of voting on it at the General Assembly. Umberto also commented that the period of 3 years is too long considering the

membership fee is at a modest level. However, Kristina and Jean Luc said they would be reluctant to support an automatic expulsion of members if they have not paid their fees after 3 years.

Larry also asked that the Board prepare a debt recovery plan using a staged approach to manage non payment of fees.

A principle was agreed by the General Assembly that they would decide, on a case-by-case basis, the membership of members where there has been no payment of fees after a 3 year period.

Following on from that principled discussion the GA talked about the case of the State Environmental Inspectorate of FYR Macedonia who had not paid their fees since 2011. The background to how the Board had managed this situation up until present was detailed in the note sent to the GA in advance of the meeting.

Chris informed the General Assembly that FYR Macedonia had, in the last few days leading up to the meeting, communicated to the Board that they were willing to pay € 1,500. As a result, Chris proposed to the GA that a slightly different approach be taken as per the written proposal submitted to the GA previously. He proposed that the Board contact FRYOM and present the following:

- The State Environmental Inspectorate would be given 6 months to pay the 2014 fees i.e. until the middle of 2015.
- The 2015 fees are to be paid in full in 2015.
- The rest of the fees would be arranged upon a payment plan.

The General Assembly agreed with this approach.

5. Communications

a) General update incl. development of new IMPEL website, *Nancy Isarin*

Nancy Isarin gave a general update on communications in IMPEL including the work of the Communications group and the development of the new IMPEL website to be launched 01 January 2015.

b) Proposal on development of IMPEL logo & change to name of IMPEL network, *Chris Dijkens*

The IMPEL Board forwarded a short discussion note to the General Assembly regarding the title of IMPEL and the IMPEL logo.

Umberto said that he would prefer only a small modernisation (Concept 1). Isabel said that IMPEL is a well known network and preference would maybe to have a small upgrading / modernisation. Gillian asked whether the communications group had carried out a branding assessment to understand the reasons for change. She also asked the cost of the change and who would make changes on the templates if approved. Nancy said that the change would cost about 2000EUR. No formal, external assessment had been done by the Communications Group.

Armin said the newsletters were particularly helpful to promote and explain what IMPEL is doing. He agreed with no change to the logo. Kristina said IMPEL had achieved a certain degree of 'fame' and the brand of IMPEL was precious. She concluded that we ought not to change the logo.

It was agreed that the GA would proceed with Concept 1, some small modernisation but the essence of the current logo would remain. The Board would then work with the Consultant to prepare a final version and send the final version to the network for agreement via written method.

Regarding the title of IMPEL; France, Germany and Sweden said that the retention of the word 'Union' would be the preferred option. Sebastien said that he agreed too with Jean Luc, Rikard and Kristina. The emphasis was on applying EU law. Sebastien (Switzerland) and Sigrun (Iceland), as representatives of non-EU countries, both wished to thank the GA for raising and discussing this issue but both agreed that it is not something they think should necessarily be changed.

It was agreed that the title would remain as it is.

Session 8: IMPEL / European Commission conference on Inspections

Chair: *Chris Dijkens*

IMPEL / European Commission conference on Inspections

Simon Bingham gave feedback to the General Assembly on the results of the conference that took place between IMPEL and the EC on 10 December 2014 in Rome. For a detailed note on the results of this workshop, please see their meeting notes.

Session 9: Conclusions and close of meeting

Chair: *Chris Dijkens*

1. Date of next meeting

Chris, on behalf of the IMPEL Board said we would send details on proposed details about the next General Assembly meeting in due course. He mentioned September 2015 as a possible date with the intention of attempting to bring forward the yearly schedule of IMPEL.

2. Conclusions and close of meeting

Chris thanked participants for attending and taking part in the discussions.

First Name	Family Name	Country	Organisation
Elisabetta	DE CAPOA	ITA	Ministero Ambiente
Beatrice	FRONCILLO	ITA	Ministero Ambiente
Alessandra	BURALI	ITA	Ministero dell'Ambiente e della Tutela del Territorio e del Mare
Alessandra	NEGRIOLLI	ITA	ARPA Lombardia -Agenzia Regionale Protezione Ambiente
Horst	BUETHER	GER	Regional Government Cologne
Lenka	NĚMCOVÁ	CZE	Czech Environmental Inspectorate
Lawrence	KAVANAGH	IRL	Environmental Protection Agency
Christian	DELADRIÈRE	BEL	Department of the Environment of the Walloon Region
Pasquale Umberto	BENEZZOLI	ITA	ARPA Lombardia
Nancy	ISARIN	NED	IMPEL
Michael	NICHOLSON	GBR	IMPEL
María	COLMENARES	ESP	Ministerio de Agricultura, Alimentación y Medio Ambiente
Simon	BINGHAM	UK	Scottish Environment Protection Agency
Bruno	MESQUITA	POR	The Regional Environmental Center
Bent	BOLSTAD	NOR	Norwegian Environment Agency
Henk	RUSSINK	NED	Human Environment and Transport Inspectorate
Alfredo	PINI	ITA	ISPRA
Barbara	BELLOMO	ITA	ISPRA
Diana	NISSLER	GER	EPA Network
Perrin	JEAN-LUC	FRA	Ministry of Environment
Giulietta	RAK	ITA	ISPRA
Florin	HOMOREAN	ROU	National Environmental Guard
Octavian	POPESCU	ROU	National Environmental Guard
Martin	BARANYAI	CZE	Czech Environmental Inspectorate
Cyril	BURDA	SVK	Slovak Inspectorate of the Environment
John	VISBEEN	NED	Province of Utrecht
Iksan	VAN DER PUTTE	NED	Environment and Climate Regional Accession Network (ECRAN)
Sébastien	TRUFFER	SUI	Federal Office for the Environment (FOEN)
Stefano	TIBALDI	ITA	ARPA - Agenzia Regionale Prevenzione e Ambiente dell'Emilia-Romagna
Berith	NIELSEN	DEN	EPA
Kevin	MERCIECA	MLT	Malta Environment & Planning Authority
Gillian	PRATT	UK	Environment Agency
Loredana	SPIRITO	ITA	
Elen	STRALE	UK	Environment Agency

Kristina	RABE	GER	German Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
Armin	HEIDLER	AUT	FM for the Environment
Aleksandra	SKAŃSKA	POL	Chief Inspectorate for Environmental Protection
Hanna	JASTRZĘBSKA	POL	Chief Inspectorate for Environmental Protection
Anita	POKROVAC PATEKAR	CRO	Ministry of Environmental and Nature Protection
Floriје	KQIKU	KSV	Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning
Miroslav	ANGELOV	BUL	European Commission
Claude Camille Marcel	PETERS	LUX	ADMINISTRATION DE L'ENVIRONNEMENT
Felice	CAPPELLUTI	ITA	MATTM-DPNM
Chrystalla	STYLIANOU	CYP	Department of Environment
Juha Uolevi	LAHTELA	FIN	Ministry of the Environment
Antonio	VENDITTI	ITA	MATTM DVA
Valentina	PUCCI	ITA	MATTM DVA
Paola	CEOLONI	ITA	Ministero dell'Ambiente - Direzione Valutazioni Ambientali
Jesus A	OCIO	ESP	Environmental Inspection Authority of the Basque Government
Amedeo	POSTIGLIONE	ITA	Co-Fondatore e Vicepresidente Forum Europeo Giudici per l'Ambiente
Moa	EK	SWE	Swedish EPA
Rikard	JANSON	SWE	Swedish EPA
Petra	PTACKOVA	CZE	Ministry of Environment of the Czech Republic
Paul	BERNAERT	BEL	Environmental Inspectorate Flemish Government/Belgium
Christian	DIKENS	NED	IMPEL
Epameinondas	TOLERIS	GRE	Ministry of Environment Energy & Climate Change
Nevenka	ZVOKEJ	SLO	Inspectorate of agriculture and the environment
Isabel	SANTANA	POR	General Inspectorate for the
John	SEAGER	UK	IMPEL
Pinar	TOPKAYA	TUR	General Directorate of Environmental Management, Turkish Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Kemal	DAG	TUR	General Directorate of Environmental Management, Turkish Ministry of Environment and Forestry
Enis	TELA	ALB	State Inspectorate of Environment, Forestry and Water
Allison	TOWNLEY	UK	Northern Ireland Environment Agency
Marco	AVANZO	ITA	Laurea
Donato	MONACO	ITA	Laurea
Sigrīd	RAEDSCHELDERS	BEL	VHRM
Terence	SHEARS	UK	-
Roberta	FRAIOLI	ITA	MINISTERO DELL'AMBIENTE E DELLA TUTELA DEL TERRITORIO E DEL MARE
Sigrún	ÁGÚSTSDÓTTIR	ISL	Icelandic EPA
Giuseppe	SGORBATI	ITA	ARPA Lombardia