



Minutes of the 17th meeting of ENSREG 24 February 2012

GENERAL ENSREG MATTERS

The Draft Agenda was adopted with changes in the sequence of items. A special agenda point on the letter of the Chairman on ENSREG future activities was introduced.

PEER REVIEW OF STRESS TESTS

Status report

Presentations were provided by Petr Krs, Project Manager of the Peer reviews, and Philippe Jamet, the Head of the Peer review Board (HLG_r(2012-17)_116).

In the discussion, the following elements were highlighted: importance of national seminars for the public; feedback from national discussions; tangible results should be taken into account.

Mr. Krs reiterated that the topical reports were thoroughly discussed by the peer review teams in February in Luxembourg. Mr. Jamet mentioned that suggestions made for the improvement of safety should be considered by national regulators.

The Chairman summarised that he expected that at the next ENSREG meeting the report produced by the Peer Review Board would be endorsed and transmitted to the Commission. Members were made aware that they would receive a draft of the report on the 15th April ready for the 25th April ENSREG meeting

The Chair indicated that the following issues remain to be to be dealt with:

- date of second public meeting on Stress Tests. It was agreed that the date should be more than 10 days after the release of the peer review report so that stakeholders could have time to analyse it;
- format of the Report of Peer review Board; so that it could be endorsed by ENSREG during the next meeting ;
- answer to the letter from ENEF. ENSREG agreed that most concerns raised in the ENEF letter were covered by the public seminars (Mr. Molin will draft a reply).

The Chairman mentioned that every country will prepare its report to the August extraordinary meeting of the Convention on Nuclear Safety (CNS). The Stress Test Reports will help in this context. On the way of using the peer review reports in the context of the 2012 CNS Extraordinary Meeting, the format of the reporting was discussed and several

options tabled. This could simply correspond to attaching the respective country peer review report.

Regarding questions on how to reach the general public, it should be reported (as done by P. Jamet) that national regulators should consider to host public information event at the conclusion of the peer review process.

Letter of the ENSREG Chairperson on future ENSREG activities

Several ENSREG Members took the floor and appreciated the intentions in the letter ("refreshing" ideas), highlighting at the same time (AT, DE, FR, NL) the importance of the work of the Working Groups. Ms McGarry asked for deep reflection on the issues. The discussions highlighted that ENSREG should recognise that the public see it as a cohesive group.

Mr Faross underlined that the ENSREG plenary should not do all the work; appropriate mechanisms have to be established. Mr Minon mentioned that this issue was more a management question. Mrs Martinez Ten and Mr Weightman stated that once all of the tasks of certain WG's were accomplished, these groups could then be disbanded.

Mr Stritar concluded the discussion by mentioning that the main intention of his letter was a discussion about the topics. The majority of the members believed the working groups were effective but there is a need to rationalise the work and make it tangible. Thus working Groups should not be disbanded at this stage, however reflection should take place on how to improve efficiency and make the best use of resources.

PROGRESS MADE BY THE ENSREG WORKING GROUPS

WG1 (NUCLEAR SAFETY)

The Representative of WG 1 reported on the progress in the following areas of work:

Sub- Group A - Format and Guidance for Member States Reports under Article 9.1

- ENSREG noted the ongoing work program for the draft ENSREG guidelines for MS Reports under Article 9.1
- noted the potential to use these guidelines to inform MS reports under the Joint Convention and the CNS

Mr Stritar highlighted that this group should work in cooperation with WG2 as much as possible in order not to duplicate work on reporting about the implementation of the Nuclear Safety and the Nuclear Waste Management directives.

Sub-Group B – Facilitation of Common Learning

This Group was disbanded after it was concluded that no real added value had yet been shown from seeking common European issues after each Convention meeting.

Sub-Group C - Self-assessments and peer reviews

- ENSREG endorsed the draft papers on 'Network of contact points for IRRS missions – duties of contact points' and 'Feedback on IRRS missions to the EU MS'

A short discussion on the organisation of (IRRS) peer reviews took place. The methodology is set out in the MoU signed by the ENSREG chair and the DDG of the IAEA, which is supported at present by a contract between the Commission and the IAEA.

ENSREG technical opinion on safety improvements in Ukraine

A silent procedure for endorsement by 9 March was started.

WG2 (RADIOACTIVE WASTE MANAGEMENT)

The Chairman of the Working Group on Waste Management reported on progress made since the last meeting. The Chair of WG2 was asked to look into several issues proposed for endorsement for the next ENSREG meeting concerning:

Implementing Management Systems according to the Waste Directive;
Guidance for Self-assessment and Peer-review under Article 14 of the Waste Directive;
Format of and Guidance for MS Reports under Waste Directive.

As in WG1 also in WG2 it was decided not to continue with the search for common EU learnings after each Joint Convention Meeting.

Mr Minon agreed to table a paper that details the views for the next meeting. An action was placed on Mr Minon to report before the next meeting on the difference in scope between what IRRS missions deliver now and what is needed to review the waste directive

Mr Molin proposed that the European Commission could organize a seminar for helping Member States during the transposition phase of the Nuclear Waste Directive.

WG3 (TRANSPARENCY)

The Chairperson of the Working Group on Transparency reported on the progress of the Group.

- ENSREG took note of the development of the website
- members were asked to check and update the Country Profiles
- postponed decision on 2nd ENSREG Conference to next ENSREG meeting
- postponed decision on application of a method of preparing and approving the minutes of meetings to Working Groups for next meeting
- took note of administrative initiatives, in particular those related to the evolution of the web application CIRCA

Adoption of 2012-13 ENSREG Work Programme

The Work Programme is to be amended following the decisions taken on the re-organisation of the work of the Working Groups. After that, a silence procedure will follow to approve it. The main deletions were the work of WG1 and 2 on common learning for Europe from the safety and joint conventions.

ENSREG INPUT FOR THE REVIEW OF EU NUCLEAR SAFETY LEGISLATION

A discussion on the public consultation launched by the European Commission and the general aspects of the necessity of revising the nuclear safety legislation took place. The EC representative reiterated that the work performed by the European Commission follows the mandate of the European Council. Although the Council requested the Commission to propose measures to amend the Nuclear Safety Directive before the end of 2011, the Commission will wait the outcome of the Peer reviews before proposing modifications to the Nuclear Safety Directive.

The Chairman proposed to ENSREG Members to respond to the online questionnaire. In response, several delegations highlighted that the public questionnaire was not designed for national regulators to respond.

The Chairman concluded the discussion by asking contributions either by answering the questionnaire or in any other format by 10 April to be sent to him, copy ENSREG secretariat. Chairman and Secretariat will consolidate the input for discussion and agreement at the next meeting. A group tasked to finalise the ENSREG response to the Commission could be established.

EXTRAORDINARY CNS MEETING - REPORTING AND CHANGES OF THE CONVENTION FROM EU PERSPECTIVE

The Chairman mentioned that some issues were already raised within the discussion for WG1. He mentioned the proposal by the Russian Federation to amend the CNS. Due to the limited number of present ENSREG Members, WG1 could be asked to deal with this issue although the work had been challenged earlier in the meeting.

ENSREG agreed to postpone approaching the CNS for change until the EU Member States had a consensus on what changes they felt were required.

Mr Faross proposed an approach along two parallel paths: on the one hand better implementation of CNS, and – on the other hand – making proposals for amendments of the Convention itself. Euratom is a party to this convention, therefore, the Commission will make a proposal for a Council mandate to propose and negotiate amendments based on the elements above.

ENSREG also decided to approach the presidency of the extraordinary CNS meeting and request time for a special session or event during the meeting where the European Stress Tests would be presented to the contracting parties of the convention and others present.

Initiative for the EU harmonisation of off-site emergency preparedness

The question whether ENSREG should propose supporting carrying out a third track on emergency preparedness and response, as highlighted in the Commission Interim Report on Stress Tests, was also requested by NGOs in the 17 January public Peer review meeting and referred to in the Chairman's letter ENSREG was informed that in this area, more EU coordination would be needed if this task were to be implemented.

Mrs Ziakova stated that other bodies than national nuclear regulatory authorities are competent for this question. Mr Faross underlined that substance, not procedure has to be discussed. The question of which authorities are competent to discuss the problem will need to be addressed separately. At present, this issue is not covered by the Stress Test specifications.

The Commission will finance a study that should deliver a consistent picture of the situation in each MS and has included off-site emergency preparedness in the new Basic safety Standards legislative proposal currently under discussion.

Several Members mentioned that this is a complex issue and a Task Force should be created for further analysis. Mr Stritar highlighted that this initiative could also improve the image of ENSREG. Some Members maintained that this initiative should not be called "3rd track". Mr Lentz stated that all countries – whether generating nuclear electricity or not – are concerned.

Mr Stritar concluded by suggesting this issue be covered during the next ENSREG meeting. No recommendations will be formulated at present. The Commission will prepare a presentation for the next meeting about the current arrangements in this area at the European level and its opinion of whether there are any weaknesses in those arrangements.

AOB

EURATOM TRAINING PASSPORT

A presentation was provided by a representative of DG RTD (HLG_r(2012-17)_119). DG RTD undertook to discuss possible projects with national regulators and to report to ENSREG within one year.

*

The proposal of the Chairman in his letter to invite Commission to make a self assessment according to IRRS Guidelines and invite IRRS-like peer review mission did not get the ENSREG support. However, the Mr. Faross invited ENSREG members to visit them and get personal impression how they work.

*

Mr Stritar mentioned that a new Chairperson of ENSREG is to be elected from July 2012.

*

It was agreed to hold an ENSREG meeting on 3 July 2012.

The next ENSREG meeting will take place on 25 April 2012.