**From:** NGO  
**Sent:**  12 Aug 2013   
**To:** PRT  
**Subject:** Re: Taiwan Stress Tests Peer Review

…………………

Thank you for details of the cut-off date issue.  I fully agree with your conclusion “The cut-off date of the whole exercise is the end of the peer review.”

I am sorry that the AEC and Taipower are misunderstand what “continuous improvement” means and they take this “Stress Test” and “Peer Review” as exam in the old school – pass the exam rather than real improvement.  It is very different from what western society looks the “continuous improvement” as.

This is why I argued if the difference of safety culture vs. good exam taker not identified prior the stress test and peer review, the whole idea of the ENSREG stress test and peer review will be messed up by those exam takers.

The attachments are recent findings of tsunami in Dec. 18, 1867 in last year and earlier this year by the Central Geology Survey of Minister of Economic Affairs, the Taipower is also under the MOEA.  The flood of tsunami higher than 20 meter are clearly proven because deposit of sea floor sand and rocks.  But either AEC or Taipower ignore this evidence from the stress test.

Please understand this is not the only evidence to prove the Taiwan National Report of Stress Test is not a faithful document.  It says “garbage in garbage out” for information society.  It’s also true in any industrial society.  We do not need expertise of nuclear engineering to identify the pitfall of the national report.

Legislators urge the AEC to postpone the peer review until all basic information is properly considered and put into the stress test process.  If the peer review taken in September, it will become a disgrace for “national report” because the stress test and peer review are required by the congress after 311 Fukushima accident.

I hope the peer review team would consider the consequence of the September trip because the OECD team in March fooled Taiwanese by the process not follow the ENSREG’s specifications of the stress test and peer review but they announced they are following the ENSREG review process and reported **“Overall, the team found that the stress test implemented at the operating reactors in Chinese Taipei met the criteria established by the AEC that were based on the specification endorsed by the European Union as developed by European Nuclear Safety Regulators' Group (ENSREG).”s in the ENSREG stress test.”**

If the peer review by OECD is legible, should we have another peer review by ENSREG?  This is question for everyone here.

……………….