

CONCLUSIONS

Post-Fukushima stress tests peer review

Public meeting, Brussels, 17 January 2012

Patrick Majerus

1) The stress-test specifications are generally seen positive, but skepticism remains

- Immediate response to early lessons from the Fukushima accident.
- Stress Test = International Benchmark
- Comprehensive risk assessment versus targeted reassessment of safety margins.
- Security-safety interface (ex: air plane)
- Not clear what results to expected.
- No human factors, aging.

2) The stress-test execution is globally welcomed

- Extensive analyses in a very short timeframe by operators and regulators.
- All reports were submitted on time and made public – more insight for the public.
- Organization EU public seminars and public web-site, but questions not directly answered.

3) Transparency policies and independence issues are criticized

- Regulators reviewing own practices.
- No direct involvement of other organizations during the review and peer review.
- Request for more public seminars (improving public involvement), raising awareness among the public and publishing all reports (not only national language)
- Selection of PR experts.

4) Mixed feelings concerning the modalities of the peer review

- Given timeframe is highly challenging.
- National regulators published conclusions before the peer-review.
- Coordination of many participants.
- Quality of the review and reviewers is essential.
- Priority given to safety, not to confidence.

5) High expectations towards the outcome of the peer review

- Establishment of a common and consistent European dimension in the evaluation of the Stress Test results.
- Requests for in depth peer reviews.
- Identification of weaknesses, cliff edge effects and appropriate plant improvements to enhance safety.
- Maintaining technical relevance.

continued 1

- Adhere to the “highest standards for nuclear safety”.
- Analyses beyond legal requirements.
- How are multi-reactor or multi-installation failure taken into account.
- Expectation for looking careful at reactors containment.

continued 2

- Sharing of good practices.
- Determination of safety margins.
- Potential impacts of the financial crisis.
- Do not exclude failures that may happen.
- Follow up of potential violations.

6) Need for continuous improvement beyond the Stress Test

- Harmonize new “highest” standards arising from the lessons learned?
- Need for strengthening legislative framework?
- EU in the role of a global promoter of nuclear safety (Conventions, third countries, etc)?
- 3rd track (?) on off-site emergency preparedness.
- Further analyses (dependence on nuclear energy, safety reassessment)?

7) Decisions of the meeting

- Publish list of country reviewers.
- Accept particular (ex: on one NPP) questions on ENSREG web.
- Presentations, including conclusions will be put on ENSREG web.
- A summary of the conclusions will be prepared and published within a week.

Thanks