



Minutes of the 30th meeting of ENSREG
30th June – 1st July 2015
Brussels

Participants

Official ENSREG members from all EU Member States as well as the European Commission, with the exception of Estonia, Latvia, Malta, and the Netherlands were represented in the meeting. Observers from Switzerland, and Turkey were also present.

1.0 Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted with the addition of two items under AoB on the ENSREG report to the European Parliament and the Council and the invitation from Ambassador Grossi to individual Regulators to attend and discuss the Vienna declaration in Buenos Aires.

2.0 Chairman's introduction and report

The chairman reported that since the last meeting he attended the WENRA meeting in spring 2015 and that he explained the ENSREG requirements for Topical Peer Reviews.

He introduced new members from the Netherlands (who unfortunately at the last minute could not attend), Bulgaria, Lithuania, UK and Slovenia.

He outlined the agenda highlighting the main topics of the Topical Peer Review. It was highlighted that the minutes of the previous meeting were only recently available. He also encouraged members to respect the ENSREG rules regarding submission of meeting documents at least 2 weeks in advance of the meeting to allow the secretariat sufficient time to process and circulate them to members.

3.0 Follow-up issues from the ENSREG Conference – actions required

HLG_r(2015-30)_308 Follow-Up issues from the ENSREG conference - actions required ENSREG President MOLIN

Mr Molin reflected on the outcomes of the conference, considering that it had been a high quality event. The event brought together a large panel of representatives from national regulators, NGOs, nuclear operators and academics. In his summary report Mr Molin identified the following potential actions for ENSREG arising from the conference:

- Effective and efficient implementation of legal framework for nuclear safety, waste and radiation protection
- Improvements to the peer review process
- Potential role for ENSREG in the area of security/vulnerability
- Development of the theme of "best available v best applicable" technologies
- Workshop on experiences under the waste directive implementation
- Emergency Preparedness and Response (EPR)
- Establishing a communication balance between comprehensive technical info and easily understood key messages
- Effective Public engagement and participation in decision making regarding LTO

The chairman reiterated the view that the conference had been a successful event with active high level international panel participants. He highlighted the importance of civil society engagement in all points of the agenda. He shared the view that there was a lower participation from industry, but emphasised that it was for the industry to defend the role and position of nuclear power in the energy context and the safety of nuclear plants, not the regulators.

The Chairman cautioned against an over reliance and over generalisation of the conclusions from the stress test exercise and that the limited scope of the exercise needed to be correctly communicated. Equally there had been suggestions that risk could be eliminated at NPPs, when in fact it can only be managed and minimised. There were already expectations for next conference and there was already a need to start looking ahead to identify a theme and topics for next conference. ENSREG members were generally of the opinion that the conference had been a successful one. Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) or the safety status of the European Nuclear fleet were received as candidate themes for the 4th ENSREG conference. Regarding the future format of the conference it was suggested that breakout sessions could be trialled to develop particular ideas in more detail.

The EC considered that the conference had been an active one, with significant discussions on a range of topics, the active participation of the civil society was particularly welcomed, but was of the opinion that the attendance was lower in terms of number of participants than in previous years and that there was a markedly lower participation from industry. Analysis would be required to understand the reasons.

The EC considered that the aspects of standardisation in the industry and the improvement of cooperation between Regulatory Bodies regarding the licensing process for LTOs and new builds are to be considered as well as actions under waste and decommissioning such as an ENSREG view on licensing of decommissioning. In this regard the decommissioning funding group were not necessarily the best placed to advise on such an issue, given that their mandate is limited to financing issues.

On Emergency Preparedness and Response (EP&R) the EC stressed that it was important to transmit the message of the continuum between the NSD and BSS on this issue. In this regard ENSREG has committed itself during the last meeting to consult with the civil protection in the field of EP&R and should report back next year on this consultation. It would then be appropriate for ENSREG to discuss if or how to bring debate to the European level. The Luxembourg Presidency had already indicated their desire to address EP&R and the HERCA/WENRA cross border issues in their council conclusions. Y. Pouleur (AFCN) considered that even if ENSREG was not in full control of all issues under the EP&R banner it was well placed to take a leading role.

On the issue of public engagement, the conference praised the fact that public debates were staged during final stress test stages. How should this be built upon? Should ENSREG engage with this issue?

On the issue of LTO should there be a debate on how this is tackled? Should there be a European approach? Will a policy be discussed in ENSREG? Will environmental impact assessments be needed in the context of LTO? Will public consultations be implemented? Provisions exist within the directives to cover these issues.

Several regulators welcomed an ENSREG discussion on possible enhanced peer review processes to allow public engagement in a managed and constructive format. The Spanish representative in particular reported on their difficulties associated with public consultations in the context of extending operating licenses. They encouraged ENSREG to develop a process for constructive public consultation in the context of LTO.

PF Chevet (ASN) highlighted that if in conference like the ENSREG one there is less nuclear industry involvement then Regulatory Bodies appear to be defending nuclear, which is not their role. Perhaps in 2 years the organization of the ENSREG conference should be changed, with less plenary sessions and more breakout themes. EP&R could be a relevant conference theme for next ENSREG in 2 years because nothing is secret on this topic (in comparison to security issues) and subject is of significant interest to the public.

4.0 Topical Peer Review (TPR)

HLG_r(2015-30)_299 WENRA - Suggested Topics for the 1st Topical Peer Review

HLG_r(2015-30)_307 ENSREG TPR - suggested topics_30-05-2015

HLG_r(2014-28)_268 Revised NSD - COUNCIL DIRECTIVE 2014-87-EURATOM

Mr Wanner, chairman of, WENRA introduced the agenda point. WENRA had been invited to develop candidate topic proposals at the last meeting. WENRA had asked its RHWG to look at the issue who had performed a brainstorming exercise. These had been discussed at the WENRA plenary held in Geneva, 26 – 27 March 2015 and 3 candidate topics had been proposed

- Periodic safety reviews
- Ageing management
- Natural hazards

All three topics are:

- Relevant for all countries where NPPs are operated, even if reactor technologies differ
- Significant to safety as they have consequences on the expected capabilities/performance and actual condition of structures, system and components
- For each of these topics, WENRA established Safety Reference Levels (RLs), their latest version being published in 2014. These RLs, for each of the topic, do include an explicit link with the need for continuous improvement

Mr Wanner then presented the 3 topics in more detail. Rather than repeat the content of the presentation the details can be found in the document.

[HLG_r\(2015-30\)_304 ENSREG_WG3_Presentation_01_July_2015 available on CIRCABC](#)

The report prepared by WENRA RHWG on the TPR (distributed during this meeting) presents the 3 topics drivers and benefits and some specific aspects related to each topic.

There was no consensus within WENRA RHWG regarding which topic should have priority compare to the other for the 1st TPR. Therefore RHWG decided to not express any preference in their report.

The ENSREG Chairman thanked WENRA for their work and presentation. He considered that the meeting should strive to take a decision on the generic topic area for the topical peer review exercise - then move to further detailing. Failing this further work should be commissioned to allow such a decision to be taken in the near future.

There was a wide and open discussion on the 3 proposals which can be summarised as follows

On the topic of Natural hazards

It was evident that this topic had been the focus of the stress test exercise over the past 4 years and that significant improvements had been and were still being implemented in the area. It was unanimously agreed that even if there remained work to be done in this area, more work at this time could distract current efforts.

At a political level it would at this time be inappropriate to again focus on this topic.

On the topic of Periodic Safety reviews (PSR)

All ENSREG members were of the opinion that PSR is an extremely broad topic which was more process, than technically orientated and as such not fully aligned with the decision taken at the previous ENSREG meeting to focus the TPR on a technical topic. Never the less the PSR topic was considered to be an appropriate one which would allow an exchange of experiences. There would however be a need to narrow the scope.

On the topic of Ageing Management

There was a strong consensus that this topic was the most appropriate title for the June 2017 TPR exercises.

The topic had a strong communication theme and was well understood by the public. The topic is an important element of any decision making process on LTO as well as a key a module of the PSR process. The topic was technical in its character and could be targeted and focused to specific safety related components or material problem areas such as piping, Reactor Pressure Vessel and cabling. Based on a proposal made by France (PF Chevet) concrete ageing was added to this list.

Several regulators requested clarity on which nuclear installations should be addressed under the ageing management Topical Peer Reviews and specifically whether it should only cover NPPs or could/should it be extended to other nuclear facilities such as research reactors or fuel storage facilities? In reply it was emphasised that the current WENRA safety Reference Levels are for the moment only applicable to Nuclear Power Plants and therefore the 1st TPR should consider in priority NPPs.

ENSREG took the decision to
Adopt "Ageing management" as the topic for the 2017 Topical Peer Review (TPR) exercise

ENSREG took the decision to
Invite WENRA to further develop and detail the Ageing Management technical proposal within the RHWG and the WENRA plenary and to present it to the next ENSREG meeting for final approval. WENRA were invited to interact with WG1 on this issue and in particular on whether the peer review should cover only NPPs or it could cover research facilities or fuel storage facilities

ENSREG took the decision to
Request WG1 to develop a draft process and timeline for the 2017 TPR exercise to be considered at the next ENSREG meeting

5.0 Global supply chain for new build – Guaranteeing Systems' quality

HLG_r(2015-30)_301 Regulating the Nuclear Industry Global Supply Chain
HLG_r(2015-30)_303 Regulating the Nuclear Industry Global Supply Chain - presentation

The presentation was given by Stuart Allen, ONR Principal Inspector & Supply Chain Regulation Lead.

The target of the presentation was to identify key challenges associated with regulation of the nuclear industry global supply chain and encourage cooperation on the issue between ENSREG authorities. Details can be found in the documents in the documents mentioned above.

The Supply Chain (SC) is an integral part of the design, build, operation and decommissioning of nuclear facilities. For a Licensee, or the nuclear sector, to achieve operational excellence, the SC needs to deliver products and services safely and to the agreed quality.

ONR expects nuclear site licence holders (Licensees) to have adequate Supply Chain management arrangements in place which ensure the delivery of nuclear plant, equipment and services 'right first time'.

Further details are provided in ONR's Technical Assessment Guide (TAG) NS-TAST-GD-077 'Supply Chain Management Arrangements for the Procurement of Nuclear Safety Related Items or Services', which has recently been updated to provide enhanced guidance to ONR inspectors. It should be noted that TAG's are not written for UK duty holders, and although they may be used as a source of guidance or good practice, they are not a prescriptive set of legal requirements.

Given the globalisation of SCs and the increasing risks of counterfeit, fraudulent and suspect items (CFSIs) entering the SC, the guidance also highlights the need to have adequate arrangements in place to mitigate the risks.

After the presentation there was a lively discussion addressing especially the following topics:

- Standards - Influence the development of best practice standards to support Licensee continual improvement but standardisation is not the only solution
- Operator responsibility and primary role of the licensee in the control of the supply chain
- Role of Regulatory Bodies in inspecting suppliers
- Safety culture
- Graded approach to nuclear safety in the supply chain
- Legal problems for Regulatory Bodies to inspect suppliers in some countries because there are not a nuclear facility
- Suppliers in other countries

6.0 ENSREG Workprogramme

HLG_p(2014-27)_135 ENSREG Workprogramme 2014-16 final

HLG_p(2011-15)_76 ENSREG Rules of Procedure

HLG_p(2012-21)_116 ENSREG Working Group Rules of Procedure

HLG_r(2015-29)_282 Paper on Task Force on WGs

HLG_r(2015-30)_298 ENSREG Masterplan

HLG_r(2015-30)_295 Proposal Paper from Simon Thornhill of ONR

The chairman introduced the agenda point summarising that the Workprogramme Task force had been asked to review and present proposals for the revise ENSREG Work Programme and to report back to the next ENSREG meeting.

The task force had presented proposals to revise the WP from 2016 with clear list of targeted actions with clear responsibilities and delivery dates.

The EC considered that there had in the recent time been drift and loss of focus of ENSREG actions (as evidenced by some of the actions listed on the Masterplan) and that there was now a need to refocus on strategic objectives and EC legislative priorities. The EC would support the revision of the WP and would submit a list of priority actions on which expert advise is needed. There were several new areas of action such as EP&R and decommissioning which might require new expertise to be brought to ENSREG. In this respect it would be pertinent to first establish the WP agenda and then identify the Working Group or Task Groups needed to deliver these actions.

It was re-emphasized by the EC and by Mr A. Molin and the Chairman that ENSREG was established and should operate primarily as an advisory body to the European Commission.

Views were exchanged about the ENSREG website and the need to have a permanent body to take care of the website within the financial constraints

Several regulators considered it was important that ENSREG itself could propose important actions.

ENSREG took the decision

That the Reflection Group would work to revise the ENSREG WP based on priority actions and to present it in the proposed format. This would be presented to the next ENSREG Plenary meeting of 2015 for approval. This new WP format should start in 2016.

A Reflexion Group should receive inputs from the different WGs and from the EC early September and to prepare a document combining text and schedule to present the future WP. This document should be submitted to the ENSREG members before next meeting in 2015.

ENSREG took the decision

To establish and regularly update the masterplan as a key management aid. These should be tabled at the next meeting.

7.0 Report on the NAcP peer review workshop

HLG_p(2015-29)_142 - 2nd NAcP Workshop - Statement from Mr Antonio Munuera

HLG_p(2015-29)_143 - 2nd NAcP Workshop - Summary Report

HLG_r(2015-30)_296 WG1 Report to ENSREG30_Report on NAcP Workshop

Mr Munuera presented a report on the 2nd NAcP Peer Review workshop. The event had been a successful one, with strong and open debate on individual country's reports. A summary report had been prepared and circulated for written approval. The report identified commendable practises and outstanding challenges and delays. While some countries are almost finished with their implementations, others have clear schedules to complete their actions by 2016. Most of the countries are progressing adequately with the implementation of their NAcPs, although some countries have rescheduled some specific actions up to 2020. While implementation work continues, additional follow-up actions are recommended and it was initially proposed that an updated national report and review in 2017, followed by a final statement on completion by 2020 might be appropriate.

Many regulators appreciated the rigour of the event and the serious and deep questions presented by the rapporteurs and reviewers to the individual country reports.

The EC welcomed the work done and appreciated the report. The process had clearly reinforced the principle of transparency. However, the EC indicated that they were not fully satisfied with the rate of safety implementations and strongly encouraged ENSREG to issue a statement on the issue without delay by written procedure and in any event, before the next meeting. Five years after Fukushima, public and civil society scrutiny on implementation is growing and regulators cannot afford to be seen as endorsing a slow implementation paced pared to the original set deadline of 2015-2018 for the major modifications to be implemented and 2020 for the latest one. Moreover there is a risk for loosing the momentum for improvements set by the original stress test exercise. If this were not possible then the EC would consider itself free to issue its own statement on the issue.

EC also requested ENSREG to identify a follow-up process for outstanding actions, identifying an accelerated timetable to full implementation as well as future reporting and peer review requirements. These tasks should be clearly identified in the Workprogramme. The EC considered the current proposals for final reporting in 2020 and full implementation by 2022 cannot be supported and indicated that an alternative planning needs to be prepared and further discussed. In the EC view the final report should ideally be issued in 2017 at the time of coming into force of the new NSD. WG1 should develop a process for an earlier reporting. Several members supported the need for an ENSREG statement on the adequacy of implementation from the nuclear safety point of view and the need to consider an earlier final report than the 2020 currently envisaged.

There was clear desire from the regulators to keep formally the NAcP follow-up actions and reporting quite separate from the formal NSD reporting. Some regulators expressed concern by the apparent pressure for strict and urgent deadlines for safety implementation, which could potentially reduce rather than enhance overall safety. The chairman emphasised that it was important that countries' implementation progress be compared against their own timetables.

There was a large consensus to provide public answers to the questions asked by NGOs. It is at the end a national responsibility and this point was not part of the Term of Reference for this NAcP peer review, but it fits the expectation of the public and ensures transparency.

Regarding the progress of implementation for the stress test related safety upgrades, several regulators pointed out the importance in the communication process to present quantitative and qualitative aspects

[ENSREG took the decision to Approve the 2nd NAcP Peer Review Workshop Summary Report](#)

[ENSREG took the decision to Mandate WG1 to prepare a declaration on this topic \(including judgement on safety upgrades progress and date for final reports\).](#)

ENSREG took the decision to

Asked WG1 to prepare a process for accelerated follow-up of outstanding actions, identifying a timetable to full implementation and future reporting and peer review requirements. These tasks should be clearly identified in the Workprogramme to be adopted at the next ENSREG meeting.

8.0 IAEA Fukushima presentation

Confidential - HLG_r(2015-30)_300 IAEA's Fukushima Comprehensive Report

Mr Caruso of the IAEA offered a confidential presentation of the IAEA findings following their analysis of the Fukushima Daiichi accident. Given the confidential nature of the presentation it would not be appropriate to report content at this time. It is understood that the full report will be made public September at the time of the IAEA general conference.

The chairman thanked Mr Caruso for his presentation and acknowledged the substantial body of work undertaken and that it represented a future reference source for Nuclear Safety and Emergency Response

Following Mr Caruso presentation, DG ENER DDG emphasized that in the EC view, the BSS directive impose more formal requirements to the Member States to communicate on the EP&R. Member State initiatives can be taken for cross border – regional cooperation (Lux initiatives).

9.0 AoB

9.1 ENSREG report to European Parliament and the Council

The chairman reminded members of the obligation to report to the EP during the calendar year. He proposed that the same format be used as for the 2013 report.

David Senior volunteered to coordinate the task with the assistance of the secretariat and WG3.

WGs 1-4 were invited contributing content relating to their activities during the reporting period.

9.2 Ambassador Grossi Buenos Aires invitation

In relation to Ambassador Grossi invitation to individual Regulators to attend and discuss the Vienna declaration in Buenos Aires in November 2015, ENSREG members did not consider the need for an ENSREG coordinated response. The invitation would be handled at the level of each regulatory authority.

9.3 WG1

Already presented

9.4 WG2

*HLG_r(2015-30)_306 ENSREG 30 - WG2 report back - draft 2015-07-01
HLG_r(2015-30)_297 WG2 Report back on activities at the 30th ENSREG*

The WG2 chairman, Bengt HEDBERG, highlighted their work to coordinate reviews and to develop the ARTEMIS programme.

WG2 was coordinating with WG1 to manage the regulatory interface issues.

WG2 is planning a workshop on 2016 on the topic of experience from reporting on national programmes. An EC workshop is also foreseen in 2017 on the experiences from the implementation of the Waste directive. It needs to be seen if these 2 workshops can or should be combined.

9.5 WG3

HLG_r(2015-30)_302 PAPER ON WG3 PRACTICES
HLG_r(2015-30)_304 ENSREG_WG3_Presentation_01_July_2015

The chairman, Christos Housiadas, reported that WG3 had been asked by ENSREG to consider alternative models for the delivery of the ENSREG Website and communication needs.

A document had been prepared but in view of the time constraints this would be presented to the next meeting. However on the issue of the website WG3 proposed that a team of 4 experts, 1 from each of the ENSREG WGs should manage and approve the website content, to be assisted by the ENSREG secretariat and the website contractor.

The EC emphasised the need for the decisions on content to be taken by ENSREG and supported the Spanish proposal that individual national regulator sites be linked to the ENSREG site.

Andreas Molin, supported the WG3 chair proposal, he emphasised the importance to be quick and efficient in updating the website and of providing the possibility for each WG to have direct editorial control to the website.

ENSREG agree to the proposal for the management of the website and invited nominations from the 4 WGs

9.6 WG4

The WG4 chairman, Mr Pouleur, reported that no new activities had been undertaken by WG4 since the last meeting. He outline that the WG works on an adhoc basis as required by DEVCO to comment on documents

Some WG4 members participate to INSC committee. Meetings are also organised with the IAEA, DEVCO, ENSREG WG4 representatives and representatives of the countries which benefit from the support.

Next week there will be a meeting of DEVCO to organise the revision of the midterm programme documents of the INSC.

The EC reminded ENSREG that the Armenian stress test report would require to be Peer reviewed (as well as in the future the Turkish stress test report) and wished to understand where within ENSREG the responsibility would lie. They recalled that an adhoc group was created to handle the Taiwan stress test report.

The chairman proposed that the Armenian case be handled in a similar manner via an adhoc group and that the Secretariat should write to Member State regulators to solicit a team leader and volunteers to perform the action

ENSREG took the decision to establish an Ad Hoc task group to perform the peer review of the Armenian Stress Test report

10.0 next meeting

The next ENSREG Plenary would take place on **Tuesday 24 November 2015 in Brussels**

Annex I
European High Level Group
on Nuclear Safety and Waste Management

30th meeting of ENSREG

Agenda

30th June 2015 (14:30-18:00)

Room MANS, Charlemagne Building,
170, rue de la Loi, 1040 Brussels, Belgium

1st July 2015 (09:00 – 12:00)

Room AB-3D, Albert Borschette building
36, rue Froissart, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

1. Opening of the meeting and Adoption of the agenda
2. Chairman's introduction and report
3. Follow-up issues from the ENSREG conference - actions required [A Molin]
4. Topical Peer Reviews
 - 4.1. WENRA presentation on a range of evaluated candidate technical topics for the 2017 Topical Peer Review [H Wanner]
 - 4.2. Discussions and possible decision in principle on the topic
5. The global Supply chain for new build - Guaranteeing systems' quality [S Allen, ONR]
6. Discussion on ENSREG Work programme and WG structures [A Hall]
7. Report on the NAcP peer review workshop [A Munuera]
8. Presentation on IAEA's Fukushima Comprehensive Report [G Caruso, IAEA]
9. A.O.B.
10. Next Meeting

Annex II

European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group (ENSREG) 30 June/1 July 2015 Meeting Presence list

COUNTRY	SURNAME	NAME	COMPANY
AUSTRIA	Molin	Andreas	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Nuclear Coordination
BELGIUM	Pouleur	Yvan	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control
BULGARIA	Stanimirov	Borislav	Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria
	Rogatchev	Alexander	Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria
CROATIA	Medaković	Saša	State Office for Radiological and Nuclear Safety
CYPRUS	Demetriades	Panicos	Radiation Inspections and control Service, Department of Labour Inspection, Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance
CZECH REPUBLIC	Krs	Petr	State Office for Nuclear Safety
	Hertlová	Lucie	State Office for Nuclear Safety
DENMARK	Øhlenschlaeger	Mette	National Institute of Radiation Protection
	Thomsen	Jimmy	Danish Emergency Management Agency
FINLAND	Alm-Lytz	Kirsi	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)
FRANCE	Chevet	Pierre-Franck	Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN)
	Pailler	Stéphane	Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy
	Ducousso	Erik	Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy
	Gillet	Guillaume	Permanent Representation of France to the EU
	Arnhold	Valérie	Permanent Representation of France to the EU
GERMANY	Vorwerk	Axel	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety

	Schneider	Siegbert	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Sommerfeld	Marina	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Banse	Heidi	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Becker	Björn	Gesellschaft für Anlagen- und Reaktorsicherheit (GRS)
GREECE	Housiadas	Christos	Greek Atomic Energy Commission
	Tafili	Vasiliki	Greek Atomic Energy Commission
	Mitrakos	Dimitris	Greek Atomic Energy Commission
HUNGARY	Fichtinger	Gyula	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority
IRELAND	McGarry	Ann	Environmental Protection Agency
	McMahon	Ciara	Environmental Protection Agency
	Smith	Kilian	Environmental Protection Agency
	Smith	Veronica	Environmental Protection Agency
ITALY	Laporta	Stefano	ISPRA, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
	Ranieri	Roberto	Italian Nuclear Regulatory Authority
LITHUANIA	Demčenko	Michail	VATESI - Lithuanian Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate
	Šlepavičius	Sigitas	VATESI - Lithuanian Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate
LUXEMBURG	Majerus	Patrick	Ministry of Health
The NETHERLANDS	Jansen	Rob	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection
PORTUGAL	De Sá Fonseca	António Carlos	COMRSIN
POLAND	Jurkowski	Maciej	National Atomic Energy Agency,

ROMANIA	Moisii	Roxana	Permanent Representation of Romania to the EU
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Turner	Mikulaš	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
SLOVENIA	Podjavoršek	Matjaž	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
SPAIN	Marti Scharfhausen	Fernando	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council
	Arana Landa	Francisco Javier	Ministry of Industry, Trade and Commerce
	De los Reyes	Alfredo	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council
	Munuera	Antonio	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council
SWEDEN	Persson	Mats	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
	Carlsson	Lennart	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
	Hedberg	Bengt	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
UNITED KINGDOM	Hall	Andy	Office for Nuclear Regulation
	Senior	David	Office for Nuclear Regulation
	Bibby	Liz	Office for Nuclear Regulation
	Donnelly	Kathy	Office for Nuclear Regulation
	Allen	Stuart	Office for Nuclear Regulation
SWITZERLAND	Wanner	Hans	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate
	Nilsson	Hugo	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate
TURKEY	Özdemir	Sancak	Turkish Atomic Energy Authority
IAEA	Caruso	Gustavo	International Atomic Energy Agency
EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Thomas	Gerassimos	Directorate-General for Energy
	Garribba	Massimo	Directorate-General for Energy
	Kuske	Michael	Directorate-General for Energy
	Mc Allister	Stuart	Directorate-General for Energy
	Pascal	Ghislain	Directorate-General for Energy