

| TOR Reference No.: 2017/10 | Author(s): Jean-Pierre Janssens, Aurélie Dulière | |
|---|--|--|
| Version: 2 | Date: 14/10/2016 | |
| 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 describ | oe what the work area is) | | | |
| The IED Baseline Report 3 – IMPEL project on the use of the Baseline Report in the context of definitive closure of an IED site | | | | |
| 1.4 Abbreviated name of work or project | | | | |
| IED Baseline report 3 | | | | |

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

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

European Commission Guidance concerning baseline reports under Article 22(2) of Directive 2010/75/EU on industrial emissions

(2014/C 136/03)



| | | | of Environmental Law |
|-----|---|---|----------------------|
| | | | |
| 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 | V | |
| 2 2 | NAME 1-161 I I I - I - I - I - I - | | |

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

This project is a follow up of a project we conducted in 2015-2016 on the Implementation of the IED Baseline Report by the Member States.

In 2016 we sent out a Questionnaire concerning the practical implementation of the IED Baseline Report. Based upon the answers we received from 35 competent authorities representing 16 Member States, we identified 6 priority subjects generating diverging answers or questions that needed further discussion during our workshop that took place on the 10th-11th of October 2016.

In addition to the member of the project team, experts from 7 other Member states took part to the workshop (Portugal, Spain (regions of Catalonia and Galicia), Denmark, Finland, UK (Scotland), Slovenia and Czech Republic). During our exchanges, we established general recommendations and gave more precise content to some of the definitions of essential notions present in the IED BR guidance so that they can be more easily put into practice by all the MS in the context of the baseline report.

We were also able to identify very practical procedures/practices already used by some participants in their implementation of the Baseline report, that gain a common approval from the group on the topics of definition of the limits of the site in the context of the baseline report, criteria to implement the monitoring, assessing the relevant hazardous substances and the meaning of "significant pollution". Those can be used in a broader scope than IED implementation and can be readily put into practice by competent authorities with a less extended experience with soil contamination management and will be part of our report.

There is clearly a need to go further and to create a "tool box" that would give a broader scope of answers to the practical questions of competent authorities confronted with baseline report implementation and soil quality assessment at the final closure of a site. Within the group of participants of our workshop, we identified 4 experts with a broad experience and who would very usefull to participate to this next step.

This will close the project on IED Baseline report implementation started in August 2015.

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?)

We propose to set an tool box with practical tools already used by experienced competent authorities, adapted if necessary to be generally applicable and translated into English.



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

IED Baseline report 1 (2015) and IED Baseline report 2 (2016).

3. Structure of the proposed activity

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

- extended team meeting (project team+ 4 participants) on presentation of practical tools combined with a first team meeting (constitution of the tool box)
- second meeting (finalising the report and closure of the project on IED Baseline report implementation)

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

Tool box

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

- extended team meeting combined with our first Meeting (May 2017)
- Meeting 2: september 2017

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

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)

Jean-Pierre Janssens, Brussels Environment (IBGE-BIM), Belgium Aurélie Dulière, Brussels Environment (IBGE-BIM), Belgium



| 4.2 Project team (who will take part: name, organisation and country) |
|---|
| |
| |
| |
| 4.3 Other IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country) |
| |
| tbd |
| |
| 4.4. Other non-IMPEL participants (name, organisation and country) |
| |
| |
| |

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

6. Detailed event costs of the work for <u>year 1</u>

| | Travel € (max €360 per return journey) | Hotel € (max €90 per night) | Catering € (max €25 per day) | Total costs € |
|---------------------------------------|--|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|
| Event 1 | 3960 | 990 | 550 | 5500 |
| Extended meeting | | | | |
| may 2017 | | | | |
| <location> tbd</location> | | | | |
| <no. of="" participants=""> 11</no.> | | | | |
| <no. days="" nights="" of=""> 2</no.> | | | | |
| Event 2 | | 630 | 175 | 805 |
| meeting 1 | | | | |
| <data event="" of=""> may 2017</data> | | | | |
| <location>tbd</location> | | | | |
| <no. of="" participants="">7</no.> | | | | |
| <no. days="" nights="" of=""> 1</no.> | | | | |
| Event 3 | 1800 | 1260 | 350 | 3410 |
| Meeting 2 | | | | |



| | | of Environmental Law |
|---------------------------------------|--|----------------------|
| <data event="" of="">september</data> | | |
| 2017 | | |
| <location>tbd</location> | | |
| <no. of="" participants="">7</no.> | | |
| <no. days="" nights="" of=""> 2</no.> | | |
| Event 4 | | |
| <type event="" of=""></type> | | |
| <data event="" of=""></data> | | |
| <location></location> | | |
| <no. of="" participants=""></no.> | | |
| <no. days="" nights="" of=""></no.> | | |
| Total costs for all events | | 9760 |
| | | |

7. Detailed other costs of the work for year 1

| 7.1 Are you using a consultant? | ✓ Yes □ No |
|---|------------------------|
| 7.2 What are the total costs for the consultant? | 5000 |
| 7.3 Who is paying for the consultant? | Brussels Environnement |
| 7.4. What will the consultant do? | Help with the report |
| 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? | ☐ Yes |
| 7.9 Do you need budget for communications around the project? If so, describe what type of activities and the related costs | ☐ Yes |



8. Communication and follow-up (checklist)

| | 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): | |
| 8.2 Milestones / Scheduled meetings (for the website diary) | | |
| 8.3 Images for the IMPEL image bank | □ Yes □ 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 | | |
| 8.7 Identify parallel developments / events by other organisations, where the project can be promoted | | |

9. Remarks

Is there anything else you would like to add to the Terms of Reference that has not been covered above?

^{▼)} Templates are available and should be used. *) Obligatory



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.