



Minutes of the 31st meeting of ENSREG
 24th November 2015
 Luxembourg

Participants

ENSREG members from all EU Member States as well as the European Commission, with the exception of Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Malta, Portugal and Romania were represented in the meeting. Observers from Switzerland, Norway, and the IAEA were also present as well as representatives from WENRA.

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted with a change in the order of the points 5 and 6.

2. Vice-Chairman's introduction and report

[HLG_p\(2011-15\)_76 ENSREG Rules of Procedure](#)

The meeting was opened by the ENSREG Vice-chairman Mr Petr KRS. He indicated that since the last meeting he had limited information to report apart from the earlier than expected retirement of Dr Andy Hall, the ENSREG chairman.

The ENSREG members thanked Dr Andy Hall for his important contribution and his excellent chairmanship during the period he was in charge.

He introduced a new member from Belgium. Two new members from Romania and the Netherlands could unfortunately not attend the meeting.

He informed the ENSREG members that to his knowledge, there was a candidate that ENSREG may consider for the ENSREG Chairman position, Mr P.F Chevet from ASN. There was no comments and no other candidate proposed by the floor for this position. The ENSREG vice chair reminded the floor that according to the ENSREG Rules of Procedure the decision to appoint a new chairman should be made by consensus.

The candidature of P.F Chevet was fully supported by the floor and P.F Chevet was endorsed as the new Chairperson of ENSREG for the next 2 years.

The EC congratulated the newly appointed chairman of ENSREG and expressed also its congratulation to the previous chairman Dr Andy Hall who had been a very good and very efficient chairman of ENSREG for almost 2 years.

3. Topical Peer Review (TPR)

[HLG_r\(2015-31\)_317 ENSREG TPR 2017- WENRA TS presentation](#)

[HLG_r\(2015-31\)_314 ENSREG TPR 2017 ToR](#)

Mr Feron, chairman of WENRA RHWG, presented the development process and the current status of the WENRA Technical Specifications for this first Topical Peer review on "ageing management".

The key aspects of this presentation were the following:

- WENRA proposed to focus the first TPR only on nuclear power reactors.
- The scope should clearly include reactors in operation and under construction

- Plants that are in final shutdown should not be included
- Obsolescence would not be included within the proposal
- Different items to be reviewed: cables, concealed piping, reactor pressure vessel or equivalent and containment structures with concrete

WENRA RHWG has prepared a (very) preliminary draft of the specification and established a dedicated working group to further develop the specification before the next RHWG meeting. Their view is that it is unlikely that a suitable draft specification will be available before the end of May 2016. The final approval of the TS by WENRA is, according to the planning presented, foreseen in fall 2016.

After the presentation made by WENRA, WG1 chairman Antonio Munuera presented the status of the development of the Terms of References for the Topical Peer Review. The draft of the ToR already exists; it is based for the moment on the optimistic WENRA planning for TS development where the TS will be ready in May 2016.

Regarding the current timetable for this peer review, the national assessment would take place from January 2017 to December 2017, the question and answer phase and desktop review from January to April 2018 and the peer review workshop in May 2018 with an endorsement of the results and associated communication by ENSREG in August 2018.

The ToR still requires further development and WG1 target is to continue developing it until the next ENSREG plenary in May 2016.

Following these two presentations, the floor was open for questions and discussions. The key topics discussed were the following:

- Mismatch between the timing proposed for the development of the TS by WENRA RHWG and the ToR by ENSREG WG1 (SE)
- Stakeholder's involvement and, public meetings are not foreseen so far. Communication to the public is planned but no consultation. At this level a process similar to the one used during the Stress Tests would be beneficial (LUX). A public consultation is a must for such kind of review (AT and IR).
- The communication by ENSREG about the TPR should better take place in September 2018 and could be based on a press conference (FR)
- The role of Topical Peer Review chair, reviewers and rapporteurs needs to be clarified as part of the ToR, like it was the case during the Stress Tests (AT, EC)
- 1 week workshop seems to be quite short to allow for an in depth review of the topic, especially if it is intended to strengthen the participation of the public (IT, EC)
- Importance of a good preparation for this TPR to ensure high quality of the report prepared (UK, NL, FR)

Some ENSREG members, like SK and FL, expressed the view that this TPR should be a technical review and therefore the involvement of the public should be limited to the possibility of asking questions and receiving answers during the desktop review phase. (NL) indicated that the timing proposed in the ToR was too tight and should be extended by 6 months.

The EC stated clearly that they were not satisfied with the current schedule and progress of the TS and ToR development. The EC was expecting the ENSREG Members to be more pro-active in the preparation of this TPR and to allow more time to all actors to prepare when the TS and ToR are fixed. With such tight schedule the peer review exercise is subject to risk of slippery. According to the minutes of the ENSREG June meeting, both TS and ToR should have been approved during this November meeting. The EC emphasised that sufficient time should be allowed between the moment when the TS and ToR are ready and the time when countries have to publish national reports, to ensure that in depth analysis work can be performed by utilities and Regulatory Bodies and to allow enough time for communication with the public.

The EC also highlighted that the Nuclear Safety Directive covers Nuclear Installations and not only Nuclear Power Plants. Several technical items identified in the TS apply to all Nuclear Installations, like cables, piping, etc. The EC encourages the Member States to extend the scope of the Topical Peer Review to other Nuclear

Installations on a voluntary basis, like it was done for the Stress Tests. This position was also supported by the UK which emphasised as well the importance of a good preparation.

ENSREG Chair summary of the discussions:

- Regarding timing, it is important to find the right balance between the time to prepare the TS/ToR and the time to perform the national and peer reviews. Timing is important, but the most important is the quality of work performed both during the preparation of the TS/ToR and during the national assessment/peer review.
- Extending the scope of the TPR to Nuclear Installations in general, would extend the time needed for TS preparation as WENRA is for the moment focusing on NPPs. However, this option should be left to the Member States to decide on a voluntary basis. WENRA should be invited to continue developing the TS for NPPs, but also to consider how the TS could be adapted for Nuclear Installations in general. WENRA should have a very detailed TS proposal ready by May 2016.
- Regarding communication and consultation with the public, it is also up to the countries themselves to define their communication plan on this topic. A consultation by internet during the desktop review (January to April 2018) seems an option, but a more detailed proposal would be needed from WG1 regarding the communication at the end of the process (message from ENSREG, press conference, etc.).
- The WENRA fall meeting is planned the 26-27 October 2016. The ENSREG fall meeting should follow closely to tackle the TPR topic.

ENSREG took the decision to

Agree on the preliminary calendar presented by WENRA RHWG and ENSREG WG1 for the Topical Peer Review preparation and implementation

Invite WENRA to further develop and detail the Technical Specifications for Ageing Management in the RHWG and the WENRA plenary with the target of having the TS ready, if possible, in May 2016.

Invite WENRA to look how the TS could be adapted for other Nuclear Installations than NPPs, like it was done for the EU Stress Tests. Consultation with other stake holders specialized in other Nuclear Installations should be encouraged.

Support the possibility for Member States to include, on a voluntary basis, other Nuclear Installations than NPPs to this TPR.

Request WG1 to finalise the ToR for the 2017 TPR exercise by May 2016 taking into account the ongoing work performed by WENRA and the comments made during this ENSREG meeting, regarding in particular public consultation, the role of the Topical Peer Review chair, reviewers and rapporteurs, workshop duration, etc.

The European Commission took note of the position of ENSREG regarding the preparation and implementation calendar of the TPR but stated clearly that they were not satisfied with the current progress of the TPR development as it introduces time pressure to the next steps of the peer review process. The European Commission indicated that they will not co-sign the proposed calendar.

4. ENSREG Work programme and WG structures – Review of proposals by the Reflexion Group – Decision on 2016-2019 WP

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

HLG_r(2015-31)_310 EC priorities for ENSREG WP2016-2019

HLG_r(2015-31)_311 ENSREG WP2016-2019 Note for plenary

HLG_r(2015-31)_312 ENSREG WP2016-2019 DRAFT V3

The chairman introduced the agenda point regarding the proposal for the revised ENSREG 2016-2019 Work Programme.

The draft work programme was produced by the reflection group and the working group chairs with the coordination of the UK Office for Nuclear Regulation. The presentation was given by Simon Thornhill (ONR).

To support the discussions on the WP topics a note had been prepared to set out the background and approach taken for the production of the work programme and to highlight key issues for consideration by the ENSREG plenary.

At the 30th meeting of ENSREG, the EC agreed to provide a note presenting the EC priorities for the ENSREG Work Programme 2016-2019. This was provided to the reflection group in September 2015 and was combined with contributions from the Working Group Chairs to create a first draft of the Work Programme. Significant work was done from September to November to develop the proposal presented during this plenary meeting. Whilst the reflection group was in agreement on the majority of tasks within the draft work programme, there are a small number of areas, in particular new tasks, where it was felt that they should be highlighted to the plenary for consideration.

The EC congratulated the Reflexion Group and the others who have been involved in the development of this new Work Programme. Overall the EC is satisfied with the WP as it is now, with some comments.

Key issues for consideration

Topic 1(c): Implementation of Art. 8a of the Nuclear Safety Directive 2014/87/EURATOM

- Within the EC note on priorities, there was a proposed role for ENSREG to “prepare Technical Guidelines to support a harmonised implementation at EU level of nuclear safety objectives for nuclear installations.” The EC consider this to be a top level priority for ENSREG in 2016 and that work is needed to ensure that practical implementation of the Directive’s Safety Objectives for all Nuclear Installations is effective and that a common understanding is shared by Member States.
- During discussions within the reflection group a view was put forward that this role was better suited to WENRA who have already undertaken considerable activities in the arena of technical guidance and harmonisation through the Safety Reference Levels
- A middle ground could be that ENSREG undertake work to consider how and what guidance could be produced to support a harmonised implementation at the EU level of the nuclear safety objectives, with any further work taken forward in partnership with WENRA building on the well-established working relationship between the two organisations.

To launch the discussions the ENSREG Chair summarised the two main ideas behind this topic, the preparation of Technical Guidelines and the practical implementation of the Safety Objectives. For the Technical Guidelines he indicated that the WENRA Safety Reference Levels could be considered as TGs for the Safety Objectives while the practical implementation could be check through Peer Reviews.

AT and DE indicated that they were in favour of the "middle ground" approach; there is a role to play for ENSREG in the field of Safety Objectives but WENRA is the reference for technical aspects.

BE highlighted the specificity of other Nuclear Installation, like radwaste facilities, in comparison to NPPs, the different level of risk and the potential difficulties to adapt the work done by WENRA for such type of NI. One possibility would be to ensure sufficient dialog between WG2 and WENRA on the topic. It is important to keep in mind that the Nuclear Safety Directive applies to Nuclear Installations and not only to NPPs. The same issue was raised by AT for research reactors.

The discussions which took place during the recent IAEA CNS workshop in Buenos Aires were reminded by BE and the need to compare how the aspect of practical implementation of the safety objectives applies to "old" reactors, especially to be in line with the scope of the Vienna declaration. BE pointed out that a commitment was taken to define a way to compare; the WENRA SRLs are certainly a good basis, but should be complemented by some benchmarking to see what has to be done in practice, for LTO for example.

SL reminded everybody that the same questions regarding ENSREG and WENRA is coming back all the time. The main difference is that in ENSREG, the members are nominated by the countries so represent them, whereas WENRA is a club. SL recommended to leave the work on the technical content to WENRA and endorse it or to complement it through ENSREG.

CEZ insisted on defining priorities for the different tasks of the ENSREG WP due to the large number of topics to cover and the limited resources.

The EC clearly indicated that reaching a harmonised implementation of safety objectives for nuclear installations at EU level is extremely important. Since Fukushima several new EU legislations have been decided. These impose structural changes and are putting pressure on regulator. This is at the core of the EC internal and international strategy.

The EC pointed out that regarding Safety Objectives, not everybody agrees that an implementation of the WENRA SRLs is sufficient to comply with the Directive. Complementary work will be needed by the regulators to transfer the "Safety Objectives" to concrete safety requirements that will permit the EU to maintain its leadership in this area. If ENSREG cannot do the necessary complementary work, the EC will need to identify alternative ways in the European context.

The "middle ground" approach starts addressing the issue by providing some guidance. It could serve as a basis for an EU position on the topic. There is a need to have a coherent EU position towards the public and internationally on this point. With the implementation of the revised NSD, the EC has the obligation to check the results.

FL supported to have a gradual approach for other NI than NPPs.

The ENSREG Chair summarised the discussions by proposing initiating a discussion with WENRA to extend the SRLs to other NI than NPPs in collaboration with ENSREG WG2 for example. He indicated that ENSREG should endorse the WENRA SRLs and work on the political declaration on this topic. He stated that the key question behind these Safety Objectives not covered at the moment by the work of WENRA is the retrofitting of old reactors to modern standards. The ENSREG Chair indicated that there are no criteria for that at the moment. He mentioned as well that in France a generic position on this issue is planned to be taken around 2018.

SK reminded about the commitment taken by each contracting party to take into account the IAEA Safety Standards and to report during the next CNS (in relation to article 18 of the CNS) and that there are certain differences between WENRA SRLs and IAEA Safety Standards.

UK indicated that this question of reasonable practicability is enshrined in its legislation and that it supports the WENRA approach.

ENSREG took the decision

That the WENRA Safety Reference Levels should serve as a basis for the Technical Guidelines necessary for the harmonised implementation of the Safety Objectives.

To invite WENRA to extend its work to other types of Nuclear Installations than NPPs and report to ENSREG on this topic.

To invite WENRA to look and provide advice on the question of "timely implementation of reasonably practicable safety improvements to existing Nuclear Power Plants" to target new NPPs safety objectives. The point will be discussed at the next WENRA plenary meeting.

To invite WENRA to propose a time table for the two topics mentioned above to ensure it will fit with the time table of the Nuclear Safety Directive implementation.

To keep this point as Topic 1 (c) in the ENSREG Work Programme but to reformulate it to take into account the comments made during this meeting.

Topic 2(b): Emergency Planning and Response

The discussion started with recalling the recent work performed by HERCA-WENRA in this field and the step forward provided by the new approach developed.

The main comments from different ENSREG Members were related to the risk of duplication of activities in this field following the "ENCO" report (IR, SK), the work done at the IAEA (SL), the fact that the situation is very different from one country to another and that this type of work is not within the competence of ENSREG members (SK), etc. Clarification was requested about the EC idea regarding a possible collaboration of ENSREG with the Euratom Article 31 group.

The EC explained that there are continuous discussions on the EP&R topic and that if the topic of ON-SITE EP&R is covered by the NSD, the topic of OFF-SITE EP&R is covered by the revised BSS. There is continuity between the two Directives and ENSREG should find ways to collaborate with Euratom Article 31 group to take this into account.

The EC recalled the earlier commitment of ENSREG Members to talk to civil protection stake holders in their countries.

SE highlighted the necessity to progress in the field of EP&R in the EU.

The ENSREG chair summarised the discussion as follows:

- The main priority is to implement the new HERCA-WENRA approach in the different EU countries (approach endorsed at the level of ENSREG) and to start having contacts with civil protection services and identify way for collaboration
- To ensure that the questionnaire prepared by HERCA-WENRA would be filled by Member States so that necessary information on EP&R arrangements are available and shared between countries through a workshop organised by HERCA and WENRA in June 2016.
- The second priority is to work with the Euratom Article 31 group
- To discuss the situation during the next ENSREG meeting

To put more political pressure on the implementation of the HERCA-WENRA approach, a seminar on the topic will be organised by HERCA-WENRA in Slovenia in June 2016. This seminar should involve a large number of stakeholders, including civil protection services.

Topic 2(c): Transport of radioactive material

Several countries (FR, DE, CEZ, UK, LT, NL) indicated that this topic is important but not in the mandate of ENSREG, is not a priority and is also covered by other organisations like the IAEA or EACA¹.

The EC indicated that it is a question of priorities. The EC will launch in 2016 a study on this topic to get an exhaustive picture of the situation in this field in the EU. The EC would like to get the support of ENSREG in the preparation and review of this study.

Based on this clarification, AT proposed to re-write the text of the Work Programme for this topic to clarify it. Several ENSREG Members (IT, UK, SE, FR, DE) expressed their interest to contribute to the preparation of the Technical Specifications of this study.

ENSREG took the decision

To reformulate the part of the Work Programme related to the Transport of Radioactive Material to clarify the scope of the task and the necessary work expected from ENSREG.

Duration of the Work Programme

The proposed Work Programme will cover a period of 4 years (2016-2019) whereas the ENSREG conference is organised every 2 years (2015 and next in 2017). ENSREG has the obligation to report to the European Parliament and the Council every 2 years (2015 and next in 2017). The key point of the discussion was to align the different time frames.

ENSREG took the decision

To keep, for the time being, a Work Programme covering 4 years (2016-2019) but to revise it at the beginning of 2017 to ensure that in the future the ENSREG WP is in sync with the timing of the ENSREG conference and the ENSREG report to the European Parliament and the Council.

¹ European Association of Competent Authorities , <http://euraca.eu>

ENSREG Work Programme 2016-2019

Due to the lack of time during the meeting, it was not possible to go step by step through the different topics of the ENSREG WP 2016-2019 and to approve them all. The major points as presented above were anyway discussed during the meeting, including the two following topics:

Topic 2(a).3

A question was raised (FR) regarding Article 1 (c) of the ENSREG Rules of Procedures. This point indicates that ENSREG shall work to develop a common understanding on financing of the decommissioning of nuclear installations and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste. This point was never addressed within ENSREG. It was clarified that during the 1st ENSREG meeting, it was decided that this point should be addressed by the Euratom Decommissioning Funding Group. However one ENSREG member (BE) indicated that the question of financing related to decommissioning is well covered by the NEA, but that the situation is not the same for the financing of waste. The ENSREG WG2 chair pointed out that this point is addressed in topic 2(a).3 of the ENSREG WP 2016-2019.

The ENSREG chairman concluded that there is no need to modify the ENSREG Rules of Procedures and supported the topic 2(a).3 of the ENSREG WP 2016-2019.

Topic 4(b) 3.

This topic covered the Stress Test peer review in Belarus. For the moment the targeted date is 2018. LT indicated that this is too late because it is the expected time for the commissioning of the unit. LT expressed the view that the peer review should be carried out before start-up of the NPP.

ENSREG took the decision

To update the draft version of the ENSREG Work Programme 2016-2019 based on the comments made during this meeting

To consult the ENSREG Members about the revised WP through a 10 days silence procedure before the end of 2015

To target the adoption of the final ENSREG Work Programme 2016-2019 just after the silent procedure provided that the comments received are not significant.

5. NAcP peer review workshop – follow-up actions and ENSREG statement on Implementation status

HLG_r(2015-31)_313 ENSREG statement NAcP DRAFT

The ENSREG chair presented in short the status regarding the development of the ENSREG statement on the progress on the implementation of the post Fukushima National Action Plans. The main points of discussion were related to the last two bullets of the text.

The position of some ENSREG Members (FL, SL) was that targeting as a first priority to implement all the post Fukushima safety upgrades as soon as possible could be counterproductive as major safety concerns could change with time and that new issues (like fire protection) could become more important than small post Fukushima modifications.

The EC pointed out the necessity to stick to original commitments regarding deadlines and to avoid recurrent delays in safety upgrades implementation.

The text was updated directly during the meeting and after a few iterations it was agreed by all ENSREG Members (see Annex II) and published on the ENSREG Website.

ENSREG took the decision to

Approve the final version of the ENSREG statement on the progress of the implementation of the post Fukushima National Action Plans (NAcPs)

6. HERCA-WENRA approach follow-up

P. Majerus reported on the effort made by the Luxembourg Presidency to finalise the Council conclusions on "Off-Site Nuclear Emergency Preparedness and Response" highlighting the difficulties encountered to include a direct reference to the HERCA-WENRA approach.

He presented some information about the country factsheets which are under development and should include key information regarding EP&R for each country.

He confirmed as well the organisation of a Workshop on the implementation of the HERCA-WENRA approach in Slovenia in June 2016. This seminar should involve a large number of stakeholders including civil protection services.

The EC expressed its support to the work of the Luxembourg Presidency in the field of EP&R and reminded that DG ENER is organising a seminar on the EP&R part of the BSS in Brussels on 1st and 2nd December 2015.

7. ENSREG 2-yearly report to the European Parliament and the Council

HLG_p(2015-31)_145 ENSREG_REPORT_2015 DRAFT

Liz Bibby (ONR) presented briefly the process followed to prepare the draft version of the ENSREG report to the European Parliament and the Council. She highlighted that very few comments were received during the 10 days silent procedure, which finished on 17th November 2015.

The EC indicated that it was a good report which describes the situation well but reminded that the report is now following the official EC process of review and signature and that some minor modifications could still be expected.

One ENSREG Member (FR) requested to have a bit more time to perform a final review of the report.

ENSREG took the decision to

Allow until 4th December for ENSREG members to provide final comments to the report. All comments will be compiled by the ENSREG secretariat. If these last comments are only editorial, it will be up to the ENSREG chairman to approve the report.

8. Review of the WGs activities since previous meeting

8.1 WG1

HLG_r(2015-31)_315 WG1 report to plenary

HLG_r(2015-31)_316 WG1 24th MoM 3 nov 2015

The WG1 chairman had to leave the meeting earlier but the main topics of his presentation were already discussed before. There was no comment from the ENSREG members about the WG1 presentation that was accessible to them on CIRCABC since 10 days.

8.2 WG2

HLG_r(2015-31)_318 ENSREG WG2 Workshop 2016 - draft ToR

HLG_r(2015-31)_320 ENSREG 31 - WG2 report back

The WG2 chairman, Bengt HEDBERG, reported on the work done since previous ENSREG meeting. He focused on the peer reviews under Directive 2011/70/Euratom and on the workshop that WG2 is planning to organise in 2016 on experience from reporting on national programmes.

8.3 WG3

[HLG_r\(2015-31\)_321 ENSREG_WG3_November_2015](#)

[HLG_r\(2015-31\)_319 Current Community and International Law with relevance to Transparency - Working Paper_update](#)

[8-HLG_r\(2015-30\)_302 PAPER ON WG3 PRACTICES](#)

In the absence of the chairman, Christos Housiadas the presentation was made by Mrs Vasiliki Tafili.

She reported about the new model of the ENSREG Website, on the paper on WG3 practices and on the last version of the WG3 working paper on "Current Community and International Law with relevance to Transparency".

Several questions were raised by ENSREG Members (FR, EC) regarding the paper on WG3 practices. In this paper on page 4 it is indicated that one of the tasks within the new mandate of WG3 could focus on providing assistance and support to MS. This is clearly outside the scope of the WG3, which is supposed to provide recommendations and support only to the EC.

Several comments were made on the working paper "Current Community and International Law with relevance to Transparency". The comments were mainly related to necessary improvements of the structure and that it was regrouping different types of text not having all a direct link to transparency.

The EC informed that they will ask a legal review of this paper and provide comments before the end of the year. FR indicated as well that comments will be provided by the end of the year.

As part of the WG3 presentation new tasks for the group were identified regarding communication. The EC queried whether these new tasks were requested by the ENSREG plenary. It was recalled that at the previous ENSREG meeting only the decision related to the ENSREG website was taken.

8.4 WG4

The WG4 chairman, Mr Pouleur, reported on a meeting of DEVCO to organise the revision of the midterm programme documents of the INSC. He indicated that the final report of this mid-term review will be available in 2017 and that ENSREG will have to provide an opinion on it.

9. AOB

The EC reminded the ENSREG members that the Armenian stress test report received in August 2015 would require being peer reviewed. Some ENSREG Members have already expressed their interest in participating to the peer review. The EC is in contact with the Armenian counterpart to organise this exercise and is at the moment finalising the necessary budget provisions. The EC will keep ENSREG members informed with the target to carry out the peer review in 2016.

The Belgian representative informed the ENSREG members of a workshop that will be organised on 11 January 2016 by FANC to present the last results of the Doel 3 and Tihange 2 safety case review following the hydrogen flakes discovered in their Reactor Pressure Vessels. He indicated the willingness of FANC to disseminate the results of the analyses, which will lead to the authorisation of NPP restart in November 2015, among Regulatory Bodies, TSOs and other stakeholders.

10.Next meeting

ENSREG 32nd plenary Meeting	10th MAY 2016 (venue Brussels)
ENSREG 33rd plenary Meeting	Tentatively: 3 or 4 NOVEMBER 2016 (To Be Confirmed, see date of OECD-NEA Steering Committee for Nuclear Energy)

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

31st meeting of ENSREG

Agenda

24th November 2015 (09:00 – 17:00)

Room BECH QUETELET

Rue 5, rue Alphonse Weicker, L-2721 Luxembourg, Luxembourg

1. Opening of the meeting and Adoption of the agenda
2. Vice Chairman's introduction and report
3. Topical Peer Reviews 2017
 - 3.1. WENRA presentation of the detailed technical content of the 2017 TPR on "Ageing Management" [F Feron]
 - 3.2. ENSREG WG1 presentation of the process and timeline for the 2017 TPR exercise [A Munuera]
 - 3.3. Discussions and decision on the process and technical content of the 2017 TPR
4. ENSREG Work programme and WG structures – Review of proposals by the Reflexion Group – Decision on 2016-2019 WP [Simon Thornhill]
5. NAcP peer review workshop – follow-up actions and ENSREG statement on Implementation status [ENSREG chair]
6. HERCA-WENRA approach follow-up [P Majerus]
7. ENSREG 2-yearly report to the European Parliament and the Council [Liz Bibby]
8. Review of the WGs activities since previous meeting
9. A.O.B.
10. Next Meeting

Annex II

ENSREG statement on the progress in the implementation of post-Fukushima National Action Plans (NACPs)

In the aftermath of the nuclear accident that occurred at the Fukushima Dai-ichi nuclear power plant in Japan on 11 March 2011, all EU nuclear power plants were reviewed in 2012 with a view to a comprehensive and transparent risk and safety assessment (“stress tests”) in light of the accident lessons learned. While the assessments found that the safety standards of nuclear power plants in Europe were generally high, further improvements were recommended.

As a follow up to the stress tests, national action plans (NACPs) were prepared by all participating countries describing actions to improve nuclear safety as well as their schedule for implementation, the majority of these actions being expected to be implemented by 2015-18, latest date being 2020. These NACPs were reviewed during a National Action Plan Workshop organised by ENSREG in 2013. Nuclear safety is a national responsibility exercised where appropriate in an EU-framework. Decisions concerning safety actions and the supervision of nuclear installations remain solely with the operators and national authorities.

The NACPs were revised late 2014 and reviewed by a 2nd NACPs Workshop in the spring of 2015. The second workshop focused in particular in evaluating progress of the implementation process, including additional measures undertaken and changes included in the original schedule. Special attention was devoted to the technical basis for the changes proposed as well as the review of studies and analyses identified and completed since the 2013 Workshop.

Following the 2nd NACP workshop, ENSREG:

- Endorses the summary report of the workshop which is made public on the ENSREG website²;
- Commends the importance of promoting the sharing of practices, experiences and challenges across European countries, with the aim of continuously improving safety;
- Recognizes the strong and continuous commitment of all participating nuclear operators and regulatory authorities towards the full implementation of all improvement actions identified in their respective NACPs and;
- that an important number of actions listed on the NACPs have been completed under the oversight of the national safety regulatory authorities.
- Notes that the status of implementation differs compared to the original deadlines presented in the 1st National Action Plan summary report³ where major modifications were to be implemented by 2015-2018, and at the latest by 2020. While many nuclear operators have almost completed implementation, and others have clear schedules to complete actions by 2016 some have rescheduled specific actions later than 2020;
- Considers that the rate of safety upgrade implementation should be strengthened to target agreed implementation deadlines, taking into account other safety priorities and quality requirements
- Recommends that a status report from each participating country on the implementation of the NACPs will be updated and published periodically to ensure a transparent monitoring with the aim of publishing a report on the implementation in 2017.

² <http://www.ensreg.eu/node/3889>

³ <http://www.ensreg.eu/node/1343>

Annex IIIENSREG 31st Meeting Presence list

COUNTRY	SURNAME	NAME	COMPANY
AUSTRIA	Molin	Andreas	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environment and Water Management, Nuclear Coordination
BELGIUM	Bens	Jan	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC)
	Pouleur	Yvan	
	Minon	Jean-Paul	ONRAF-Organisme national des Déchets Radioactifs et des Matières fissiles enrichies
BULGARIA	Stanimirov	Borislav	Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency (BNRA)
	Rogatchev	Alexander	
CZECH REPUBLIC	Krs	Petr	State Office for Nuclear Safety
DENMARK	Øhlenschlaeger	Mette	National Institute of Radiation Protection
ESTONIA	Muru	Karin	Estonian Environmental Board
FINLAND	Tiippana	Petteri	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)
FRANCE	Chevet	Pierre-Franck	Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN)
	Louët	Charles-Antoine	Ministry of Ecology, Sustainable Development and Energy
	Feron	Fabien	Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN)
	Pailler	Stéphane	Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN)
	Gillet	Guillaume	Permanent representation of France to the EU
GERMANY	Vorwerk	Axel	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Kuhn	Sebastian	

COUNTRY	SURNAME	NAME	COMPANY
GREECE	Tafili	Vasiliki	Greek Atomic Energy Commission
HUNGARY	Hullán	Szabolcs	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority
IRELAND	McMahon	Ciara	Environmental Protection Agency
ITALY	Matteocci	Lamberto	ISPRA, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
	Laporta	Stefano	
LITHUANIA	Demčenko	Michail	VATESI – State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate
LUXEMBURG	Majerus	Patrick	Ministry of Health, Luxemburg
The NETHERLANDS	van Aernsbergen	Lodewijk	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)
	Brugmans	Marco	
POLAND	Wlodarski	Janusz	National Atomic Energy Agency, Poland
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Turner	Mikulas	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
SLOVENIA	Stritar	Andrej	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
SPAIN	Munuera	Antonio	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CNS)
SWEDEN	Persson	Mats	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
	Hedberg	Bengt	
	Carlsson	Lennart	
UNITED KINGDOM	Senior	David	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)
	Bibby	Liz	
	Thornhill	Simon	

EUROPEAN COMMISSION	Thomas	Gerassimos	Deputy Director General – DG ENER
	Garribba	Massimo	Director D – DG ENER
	Klement	Stephan	Head of Unit/D1 – DG ENER
	Pascal	Ghislain	Policy officer/D1 – DG ENER

IAEA	Caruso	Gustavo	IAEA, Nuclear Safety and Security Department
SWITZERLAND	Wanner	Hans	ENSI
NORWAY	Mattsson	Hakan	Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority