



Minutes of the 39th meeting of ENSREG

14th November 2019

Brussels

Participants

With the exception of Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Croatia, Latvia, Malta and Portugal, ENSREG Members representing all EU Member States as well as the European Commission attended the meeting. Romania and Hungary were represented by alternates nominated by an ENSREG Member. Observers from Belarus, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, the IAEA, and the EU Council were also present.

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

The new ENSREG Chairperson, Ms Marta Žiaková opened the meeting, welcoming the participants and inviting comments on the minutes of the previous meeting and on the agenda of this meeting.

All comments received on the draft minutes posted for comments on CIRCABC had been incorporated and the final minutes of the 38th ENSREG meeting were adopted without remarks.

The agenda of this meeting, the 39th, was adopted without remarks and is attached as Annex I.

2. Chairperson's introduction and report

Ms Žiaková welcomed fourteen new Members to the group; the list of Members at the time of the meeting is attached as Annex II.

Following several recent changes to the officers of ENSREG during the preceding two meetings the current situation regarding the ENSREG Chair, vice-Chairs and Working Group Chairs is as follows.

Chair	Appointed
Marta Žiaková	38 th ENSREG meeting
Vice-Chairs	
Thomas Elsner	38 th ENSREG Meeting
Patrick Majerus	37 th ENSREG meeting

WG	Chair	Appointed
WG1	Kirsi Alm-Lytz (Finland)	38 th ENSREG meeting
WG2	Stefano Laporta (Italy)	34 th ENSREG Meeting
WG3	Patrick Majerus (Luxembourg)	37 th ENSREG meeting

3. Review of WG1, WG2 and WG3 activities since the previous meeting.

[HLG_r\(2019-39\)_448 WG1 Report to 39th ENSREG](#)
[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_468 Report from WG2](#)
[HLG_r\(2019-39\)_449 WG3-progress report November 19.pdf](#)

ENSREG took the decision to:

Take note of the WG reports presented by the chairs of WG1, WG2 and WG3 respectively.

ENSREG TPR Action Plan

[HLG_r\(2019-39\)_448 WG1 Report to 39th ENSREG](#)
[HLG_r\(2019-39\)_451 First TPR Action plan](#)

WG1 Chair, Ms Kirsi Alm-Lytz presented the activities of WG1's sub-group on Topical Peer Review (TPR).

She presented the draft ENSREG Action Plan (AP) covering the first ENSREG TPR. The AP contains three categories of actions:

- actions addressed to the Member States (MS),
- actions addressing the four EU-level challenges¹,
- actions for WG1 itself.

The next updates of the TPR NAcP are due at the end of 2021 and 2023 respectively. WG1 will prepare a status report at the end of 2021 and a summary report in May 2024. (Secretary's note: all MS participating to the TPR had submitted the ageing management TPR National Action Plans (NAcP) due at the end of September 2019. Note that Norway replied that it would no longer participate to this TPR exercise, as both its research reactors had been shutdown).

WG1 will liaise with IAEA/IGALL, WENRA, JRC, NEA/CSNI/WGIAGE regarding their current and planned activities in the areas of the four challenges.

Two comments had been received in respect of the draft uploaded to CIRCABC - deletion of action E.4, and delete wording at end of section 2 referring to further peer reviews. These comments had been accepted.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Approve the proposed TPR Action Plan and approve its publication, subject to incorporation of the two corrections described above.

TPR questionnaire

[HLG_r\(2019-39\)_448 WG1 Report to 39th ENSREG](#)

With a view to preparing and improving the efficiency and effectiveness of the next Topical Peer Review exercise in 2023/2024, Working Group (WG) 1 has prepared a questionnaire to be sent to all the countries which participated in the TPR exercise in order to compile feedback and to draw lessons for the next TPR.

The questionnaire addresses the objective and purpose of the TPR; its overall structure and duration; the desktop review phase; the TPR workshop; the preparation of the overall TPR report; and the preparation of NAcPs. The deadline for submitting responses to the questionnaire is 31 January 2020. (Secretary's note: the

¹ 1) Effectiveness of the overall ageing management plan and use of performance indicators;
 2) State of the art and qualified techniques for NDE;
 3) Acceptance criteria for the degradation mechanisms;
 4) Non-invasive inspection methods for long lengths or complex geometries.

questionnaire was distributed to TPR participants shortly after the meeting). WG1 will complete the analysis of the responses to the questionnaire by May 2020.

The WG1 report to the plenary also raised the matter of preparations for the next TPR, recalling that preparatory discussions for the first TPR started first in WENRA and then ENSREG plenary in 2014-2015. The second TPR should start no later than 6 years after the first TPR, i.e. in 2023, therefore it is important to set the preparations in motion – ENSREG needs to take a position in the near future on who-does-what-by-when. A wide-ranging discussion ensued, covering how best to incorporate experience from the first TPR; the contribution of other actors, notably WENRA; timetabling at both national and European levels; as well as the appointment of the supervisory Board.

Several participants noted that the second TPR process would be better set out in a single document rather than multiple documents as had been the case with the first TPR. Mr Tiippana, the Chair of the Board of the first TPR stressed the importance of early integration of the Board.

WG1 was tasked with drafting a single document setting out the process for preparing the second TPR, including a timeline, for the spring 2020 ENSREG plenary. Additional elements will be added as they become available, such as the assessment of the TPR questionnaire. The WG3 Chair should be fully associated to the preparation of this paper.

Regarding the selection of the topic of the second TPR, WENRA has already commenced discussion of possible topics and WG1 should hence liaise closely with WENRA (RHWG). ENSREG would take a decision on the topic during the autumn 2020 plenary meeting.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Ask WG1 to draft the paper setting out the overall process description for the second TPR, including a schedule.

EU Stress Tests – update

HLG_r(2019-39)_448 WG1 Report to 39th ENSREG

HLG_r (2018-36)_401 NAcP Status Report end 2018

The WG1 Chair took the opportunity to remind those concerned that the deadline for submission of the next EU Stress Test NAcP updates is 31 December 2019. Early 2020, WG1 will incorporate the information therein in the update of the WG1 stress test status report, taking account of the discussion at the 38th ENSREG meeting.

The Commission, supported by UK, expressed concern that some participants had still not completed implementation of the NAcP implementing the recommendations from the post-Fukushima stress tests. Indeed, some topics would not be closed before 2024, such long timescales adversely affect the credibility of the overall exercise. At the March 2019 meeting ENSREG asked WG1 to rewrite the summary report on the status of EU Stress Test National Action Plan implementation. The item should remain high on ENSREG's agenda.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Review situation at the next ENSREG meeting and rewrite the Summary Report following the submission of updated NAcPs.

Subgroup on CFSI

HLG_r(2019-39)_448 WG1 Report to 39th ENSREG

The WG1 Chair provided a progress report on the work of the WG1 sub-group examining counterfeit, fraudulent and suspect items (participants = FR, FI, CZ, NL SE, UK). The group is focussing on inspection practices, with the aim of sharing good practices and information on inspection approaches. The subgroup will organise a workshop in early 2020, with participation limited to the six subgroup members and some participants from industry, with consideration being given to the holding of workshop with a wider range of participants towards the end of 2020. The subgroup also aims to prepare a paper on the subject towards the end of quarter 2 2020.

Report on Activities of WG2

HLG-r(2019-39)_468 Report from WG2

The ENSREG WG2 Chair, Stefano Laporta, reported in detail about ENSREG WG2's activities since the last ENSREG plenary meeting, and in particular:

- specific common issues regarding the relation of National Programmes and National Reports under Directive 2011/70/Euratom (KPI's)
- reporting on radioactive waste and spent fuel inventories;
- ARTEMIS peer review missions under Directive 2011/70/Euratom

The subgroup charged with developing a draft position regarding the relation of National Programmes and National Reports under the Waste Directive presented its preliminary results at the 36th WG2 meeting. It had proved difficult to define suitable key performance indicators (KPI) for monitoring progress and WG2 members were of the view that KPIs might not be the best tool for progress monitoring. WG2 is closely coordinating with the Commission, and had provided comments on the terms of reference for the Commission's planned study on KPIs for monitoring implementation of national programmes (see agenda point 8 below). For the time being WG2 proposes to finalise a position paper on the subject at its next (37th) meeting, and at a later date could develop guidelines on the subject taking into account the Commission study on KPIs.

The Commission representative noted that the use of KPIs is a requirement stemming from Directive 2011/70/Euratom. The Commission itself routinely applies KPIs as a project management tool and could prepare a non-paper describing how the Commission uses KPI, to feed WG2 discussions. The Chair encouraged the WG2 Chair and DG ENER to organise a small workshop on the topic.

WG2's sub-group dealing with reporting of inventories had had a very fruitful meeting with the Commission on the 6th October 2019, and subsequently had presented a draft position paper to the WG's last meeting. The draft position takes the harmonized IAEA/EC/NEA data set into account, and represents the minimum set of data and/or information that have to be reported by Countries in reporting Inventories at the international level. The sub-group intends to finalise the position paper after the 19-20 November 2019 workshop on Inventory methodologies and approaches, in view of agreeing the paper in WG2 at its next meeting, and thereafter submitting the paper to the March 2019 (2020) ENSREG plenary for approval. The Commission representative thanked the group for its good work on this subject, which should significantly simplify reporting under the Directive.

The WG2 Chair updated the group on the planning of ARTEMIS peer reviews under Directive 2011/70/Euratom. Twenty-six out of twenty-eight Member States have so far formally or informally indicated their intention to receive ARTEMIS missions, with seven of these missions already having been carried out. He also informed the plenary that EU Member States have nominated seventy-five experts for performing ARTEMIS missions. The list of experts was submitted to the IAEA on the 10th October 2019.

It was observed that the workload associated with execution of the ARTEMIS missions which had not yet been carried out would be very challenging, with twenty-one missions either scheduled or still to be scheduled before the end of 2023. The situation was rendered still more challenging by the fact that IRRS missions in connection with the Nuclear Safety Directive would also be carried out during a similar timeframe, therefore it was very important to have sufficient experts available.

A subgroup of WG1 including some WG2 members has been reflecting upon how to improve the efficiency and effectiveness of IRRS and ARTEMIS missions, noting that IAEA had started a similar reflection and that a meeting with IAEA on the question would take place in the near future. The discussion would include optimization of back-to-back IRRS and ARTEMIS in the short term and integration in the longer term.

DE expressed its support, noting that there was substantial overlap between the regulatory and technical scope of both types of missions (waste management and decommissioning), with similar but not identical questions. A number of other countries also expressed their support. The Chair summarised the discussion noting that it was necessary to optimise the synergies between both types of missions, asking the IAEA through its representative to work in that direction. She also noted that it is not only regulators who are concerned by ARTEMIS missions.

The WG2 Chair informed the group that following the ENSREG Conference, several WG2 members had expressed an interest in decommissioning issues, such as parameters affecting schedule and costing predictability. He asked ENSREG to consider mandating WG2 to develop the terms of reference for a new task,

to be added to the next Work Program, related to approaches in identifying the starting and ending points of decommissioning.

Several Members noted that costing fell within the remit of the Decommissioning Funding Group, and that it was important to avoid duplication with activities carried out in other fora, NEA having already published guidance in this area. The Commission recalled that there were currently 93 shut-down reactors in the EU, with many already under decommissioning. However, there was currently no shared understanding of either the starting point of decommissioning or the end state of decommissioning.

ENSREG took the decision to

Ask WG2 to finalise the guidance on KPIs taking account of the inputs from the Commission and the current study on KPIs for monitoring implementation of national programmes.

Mandate WG2 to undertake a limited, exploratory review of Member States' approaches to decommissioning costing, focussing particularly on the definition of the end state after decommissioning is complete.

Guidance for Openness and Transparency

HLG_r(2019-39)_450 Guidance for Regulators Openness and Transparency - UPDATE 03-10-2019.pdf

HLG_r(2019-39)_449 WG3-progress report November 19.pdf

Mr Majerus, Chair of WG3, presented the WG's activities since the last plenary. The WG had prepared, for approval by the plenary, an update of the document entitled "Guidance for National Regulatory Organisations - Principles for Openness and Transparency" which dated from 2011. The updated version has been prepared as guidance on "Best Practice", rather than the "principles" of the original. New elements introduced to the document include the inclusion of examples of effective/proactive communication; the need to develop a complete communication toolkit and not just a web-site; and the need to reflect upon the treatment of sensitive information which cannot be publicly disclosed.

ENSREG took the decision to

Endorse the updated Guidance on Openness and Transparency for European Nuclear Safety Regulators and approve its publication.

Public Engagement on LTO and Decommissioning

HLG_r(2019-39)_449 WG3-progress report November 19.pdf

WG3 has started to develop a questionnaire for collecting information from Member States on existing arrangements for ensuring effective public engagement in the decision making process with respect to long-term operation (LTO) and decommissioning. However, the WG has not been able to finish the preparation of the questionnaire, for a number of reasons including the implications of the recent European Court of Justice ruling on the Doel case and the WG's discovery of the forthcoming publication of an NEA report on 'Legal Frameworks for Long-Term Operation of Nuclear Power Reactors', that will cover most of the information intended to be asked through the draft questionnaire.

The WG3 Chair added that, depending on the expectations of the ENSREG plenary, WG3 could focus on how the public is involved in decision-making related to the LTO. The following steps are proposed:

- Make a comparative study of how countries involve the public in decision making related to LTO
- On the basis of a number of documents, prepare a draft ENSREG position paper on public involvement with regard to LTO.

Mr Majerus's presentation generated an extensive discussion concerning the role of nuclear regulators in the legally complex area of LTO. Participants noted linkages to processes under the Espoo and Aarhus conventions, which may lie outside the remit of nuclear regulators. The need to avoid duplication with work done elsewhere was mentioned, in particular the NEA report, or bodies of the Espoo and Aarhus Conventions. The work should limit itself to public consultation in the context of (nuclear safety) regulatory decisions, and should not address environmental impact assessments more broadly. There was general agreement that the preparation of the

questionnaire should be put on hold for the time being and that the proposal for the WG3 to compare national approaches was useful.

The Belgian representative briefly described the Doel case insofar as it is relevant to ENSREG's work. Belgium operates a system of an unlimited operating licence for the safety-related issues and a limitation of the operational life by law. A change in national energy policy had resulted in a decision to extend the operational life of the Doel NPP for another ten years, which under the previous policy would have been shut-down in 2015. The European Court of Justice considered that an Environmental Impact Assessment should have been carried out when authorising the life time extension by law. The Belgian nuclear regulator, FANC, is not involved at the level of Belgian national energy policy, but it is involved where the nuclear safety aspects of the authorisation are concerned. There is currently a court case in the Belgian constitutional court on the subject.

The Commission representative briefed the group on the European Court of Justice's ruling from the Commission's perspective. First of all, the judgement raises complex legal issues which are currently under discussion between DG ENER and DG ENV. The judgement does not make an automatic link between LTO and EIA. Nor does it make an automatic link between the environmental impact Directive and the Espoo Convention. The Court's judgement does not identify clear financial thresholds for triggering EIA. The judgement also took certain special circumstances into account. The Nuclear Safety Directive contains a clear obligation on public involvement in the case of major works, the question therefore arises as to what extent this obligation is discharged by EIA procedures? He suggested that ENSREG and WG3 should limit their focus to the role of the nuclear safety regulator.

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

[Invite WG 3 to continue its reflections on public engagement in LTO/decommissioning and the sharing of good practices among regulators.](#)

Status of the ENSREG website

The Commission representative briefed the group about the operational status of the ENSREG website. During the early summer of 2019 major problems had been experienced with the stability of the website. In order to return to a situation of effective control of the website, arrangements have been put in place for in-house management of the website, the management of which was previously outsourced. Since then, the most critical and urgent tasks involved in making the ENSREG website fully operational again have been performed in a step-wise manner. The website is now stable and functional. Two missing elements still need to be retrieved or recreated: the speeches and presentations of the 2015 ENSREG conference and the page presenting ENSREG's organisational chart.

The contract with the external service provider for hosting and domain names expired on 23 October and has been renewed for the next 4 years. In spite of the fact that the website is hosted on an external domain and not on europa.eu, the relevant Commission rules on security and data protection are being applied and accordingly a list of issues is being addressed to bring the site into conformity with Commission rules. The final remaining issue (migration from http:// to https://) is currently being addressed. During the first half of 2020 the (Drupal) content management system will be upgraded to the latest version. It would be better to await the completion of the rebuilding of the website and the various upgrades before starting any other modifications to the website.

Mr Majerus also informed the group that WG3 will start working on a short communication policy document for ENSREG. Therefore it will collect a few examples of national policies and/or communication policies from similar organizations and discuss a first draft communication policy at the next WG3 meeting. The Chair expressed her encouragement for taking this work forwards.

4. Stress-Tests and NAcP outside the EU

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_465 Nuclear Power in Turkey.pdf](#)

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_461 Indicative programme Akkuyu Phase 1 Peer Review.pdf](#)

4.1 Turkey

The representative of Turkey presented an overview of Turkey's nuclear programme, the legal and regulatory framework in place, the Akkuyu project, and Turkey's commitment to undertaking an ENSREG Stress Test and ENSREG Peer Reviews. Turkey intends to construct twelve reactors in total, four at Akkuyu, four at Sinop, and a further four at a site which has not yet been identified. Turkey's new nuclear regulatory body (NDK) was established legally in 2018, and the final operational arrangements are nearing completion.

The Akkuyu NPP is being constructed according to the Build-Own-Operate model. It will consist of four VVER-1200 reactors. The original site license was issued in 1976 and renewed in 2013. The construction license for unit 1 was issued in April 2018 while the unit 2 license was issued in August 2019. The license for unit 3 is under review, and it is expected that the license application for unit 4 will be submitted in March 2020. A full scope IAEA SEED mission in respect of Akkuyu had taken place in 2017.

Turkey had aligned itself with the EU stress test process and accordingly in 2012 submitted a first national report concerning the Akkuyu project, however the design was not ready at that point in time. The stress test national report was updated following receipt of the license application in respect of unit 1 and transmitted to the Commission in mid-2019. The report has been published on the ENSREG website.

Preliminary discussions with the Commission on the possible organisation of the ENSREG peer review had taken place on the margins of a meeting in Brussels. Turkey was in agreement with a two-phase process for the organisation of the stress test process that would take due account of a high demand on human resources in early 2020 related to completion of the transition to Turkey's new regulatory structure, a follow-up SEED mission taking place in early quarter 2 2020, and work on the construction licenses for Akkuyu units 3 and 4.

The Commission representative outlined the discussions on the possible organisation of the peer review of the Turkish national stress test report. The 38th ENSREG plenary agreed to a two phase approach whereby in the first phase, an ENSREG team would undertake a partial review of the Topic 1 and Topic 2 issues. The second phase of the peer review would take place at a time when the design is sufficiently mature. Turkey was also in agreement with such an approach, providing the approach avoids adding to the Turkish regulator's heavy workload in quarter 1 2020. This period could be used for carrying out preparatory activities, such as selection of the peer review team, appointment of the team leader and topic leaders, preparation of the Practical Arrangements document, desktop review of the national stress test report, and launching a public consultation on the stress test national report.

The questions arising from the public consultation and the desktop review would be submitted to Turkey at the end of quarter 2 2020. During quarter 2 2020, the review team will prepare a draft peer review report on the basis of the answers supplied by Turkey. The phase 1 review mission should take place in quarter 4 2020, and the final report should be approved for publication early in 2021.

Turkey intends to participate to the review in a manner which fully respects ENSREG practices on transparency and public involvement, and this will be reflected in the Practical Arrangements document, which will address the full review cycle, including subsequent preparation and review of a national action plan (NAcP) and review of its implementation after an appropriate time interval.

(Note: the question of the appointment of a supervisory Board is addressed under point 4.5 below).

ENSREG took the decision to

Endorse the carrying out of a Peer Review of the Turkish National Stress Test report in accordance with the scheme outlined above.

Invite ENSREG Members to nominate by 31 December 2019 experts and team leaders to be available for participating to both phases of the Peer Review of Turkey's National Stress Test Report. (Nominations should be sent to the Secretariat).

4.2 Armenia

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_464 Armenia ST - Peer Review of NAcP Implementation.pdf](#)

Speaking in his capacity as leader of the Armenia Peer Review Team (PRT), Mark Foy presented the status of preparations for the peer review of Armenia's NAcP covering the Metsamor NPP. He recalled Armenia's 2011 commitment to voluntarily undertake EU stress tests, and that in 2016 ENSREG had peer reviewed Armenia's stress test national report. Armenia had prepared an NAcP in 2017 addressing the ENSREG team's recommendations, as well as the recommendations contained in the national stress test report, and in the summary report of the 2nd extraordinary CNS meeting.

However, the NAcP itself was not peer reviewed by ENSREG at the time of its adoption in contrast to the practice applied in previous exercises. This peer review also represents the first to be carried out on an individual country's NAcP.

The peer review team (PRT) received an updated version of the NAcP on 3 October 2019, at which point it commenced the desktop review and submitted its questions to the Armenian regulator (ANRA) on 30 October, receiving written replies on 13 November 2019. On the basis of these replies, the PRT intends to send a draft Peer Review Report to ANRA by 22 November 2019. The peer review mission itself is scheduled for the week commencing 25 November 2019.

The draft final report will be handed over to ANRA during the mission's exit meeting, with one month available for factual corrections only. The final report will have a similar structure to the Rapporteurs' reports produced in previous workshop peer reviews of NAcPs. The final report will be published on both the ANRA and ENSREG websites, accompanied by a joint press release.

The Commission representative thanked the PRT for their good work and stressed the importance of checking the implementation of recommendations.

ENSREG took the decision to

Endorse the carrying out of a Peer Review of the updated Armenian National Action plan in accordance with the scheme outlined above.

4.3 Belarus

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_463 Belarus Stress Test NAcP.pdf](#)

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_457 Lithuanian proposals regarding peer review of the Belarussian NAcP.pdf](#)

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_458 Position of LT experts on BY NAcP.pdf](#)

Speaking in his capacity as leader of the Belarus Peer Review Team (PRT), Mark Foy presented an update on the status of ENSREG peer review of Belarus's NAcP covering the Ostravets NPP). He outlined the background to Belarus's preparation of an NAcP, starting from Belarus's 2011 alignment with the EU stress test process, through signature of Practical Arrangements and preparation of the Belarus national report by Gosatomnadzor (GAN) in 2017, PRT mission to Minsk and Ostravets in March 2018, and agreement on the PRT report and recommendations in July 2018.

In August 2019, over 12 months after the agreement on the PRT report, GAN transmitted a Russian language version of the NAcP to ENSREG. Following receipt from the Commission in early October 2019 of an English translation of the NAcP, the PRT topic group leads had been able to complete a high level review of the NAcP and their views were conveyed to ENSREG members.

Mr. Mark Foy in his presentation noted that the NAcP is significantly different in structure and content from those NAcPs drafted as a result of the Stress Test Peer Reviews for countries of the European Union, where the emphasis was the presentation of actions decided as a result of the review. The list of measures/actions contains almost all proposals from the PRT report however, actions proposed by the PRT have yet to undergo feasibility studies/analyses.

The NAcP is based on the premise that the Ostravets NPP has no safety deficits and that therefore immediate action is not necessary. The Belarus regulator views the PRT's mission report as a confirmation by ENSREG that the NPP can control design-basis scenarios initiated by external and internal hazards.

Furthermore, the deadline for completion of the feasibility studies and analyses is long, some being scheduled for 2023 or later. Based upon the content of the NAcP, Belarus would appear to be intending to commission the NPP without making any modifications following the stress test process, and afterwards only making modifications if necessary. The findings of the ENSREG peer review team were broadly similar to the findings of Lithuania's experts, made following their own independent review.

Mr Foy suggested that ENSREG write to the head of GAN expressing disappointment at the extended timescales for completion of the work arising from the stress test and peer review team's recommendations. He also suggested that ENSREG and the Commission should agree with Belarus and GAN a future follow-up mission to determine progress with implementation of the NAcP.

The Lithuanian representative thanked the PRT for their good work, and briefly summarised Lithuania's own assessment of the NAcP, which had arrived at conclusions which were very similar to the PRT's conclusions.

He proposed that ENSREG:

- immediately initiate and organise with Belarus a peer review of the Belarussian NAcP;
- call upon Belarus to implement the most important safety improvement measures before commissioning;
- monitor implementation of the peer reviewed Belarussian NAcP and regularly report to the EU institutions and Member States.

He also noted that Lithuania had transmitted an updated draft of the bilateral agreement on early notification in September 2019, and hoped that it could be signed soon.

Several Members took the floor to thank the PRT for its good work and support its conclusions. The importance of timely implementation of stress test recommendations was underlined, as was the importance of ENSREG applying a consistent approach and consistently high standards both inside and outside the EU. Some Members emphasised the importance of continuing to engage with Belarus in a spirit of dialogue in order to make progress.

The representative of Germany suggested the establishment of a bilateral commission between LT and BY as a means of making progress. Germany's own experience of such bilateral commissions with some of its neighbours was positive.

The Commission representative noted that the PRT team's report was a good example of ENSREG fulfilling its technical mandate. He also noted the importance of bilateral cooperation between neighbouring regulators, as required by the CNS, and supported Germany's views on the value of bilateral commissions. He also underlined the importance of maintaining dialogue with Belarus in order to keep influence over and knowledge of the programme.

Upon invitation by the chair, the representative of Belarus (from the Belarussian Mission in Brussels) stated that he was disappointed by the critical assessment of its NAcP, noting that he would pass the message back and noting that Belarus fully recognises the importance of the highest levels of nuclear safety, having been a victim of the Chernobyl accident. He also expressed Belarus's appreciation for the support in capacity building received under the Instrument for Nuclear safety Cooperation.

The Chair concluded the discussion, proposing that she, the Commission and Mr Foy visit Minsk to present ENSREG's assessment of the Belarus NAcP. She added that GAN was a newly established regulator and encouraged EU countries to help support the development of the Belarussian regulator. The PRT leader emphasised that the aim was to work together with Belarus in a cooperative fashion. He also noted that the Ostravets reactors are of a modern design.

ENSREG took the decision to

Ask the Chair to write to the Head of GAN offering that she, the Commission and Mark Foy visit Minsk to present ENSREG's assessment of the NAcP, whilst also seeking GANs agreement to a peer review of the implementation of the NAcP.

4.4 Iran

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_462 Bushehr NPP stress tests.pdf](#)

The Commission representative briefed the group on the prospects of carrying out a peer review of the Iranian national stress test report for Bushehr NPP, approval of the national report being expected towards the end of 2020. Technical cooperation with Iran was being carried out under the political umbrella of the Joint Comprehensive Plan of Action (JCPOA). However, continuation of the cooperation with Iran is highly dependent upon the evolution of the situation with regard to the JCPOA.

Marc Noel from the JRC delivered a short presentation summarising nuclear safety cooperation with Iran under the Instrument for Nuclear Safety Cooperation (INSC). There are currently four cooperation projects with Iran under the INSC including support to the stress tests of the Bushehr NPP, and support to the Iranian nuclear regulator, INRA. Cooperation with Iran is complicated by the unique design of Bushehr NPP and by the effects of sanctions imposed by third countries.

The Bushehr licensee is currently finalising his stress test self-assessment report, which includes consideration of inputs from the 2018 OSART mission. The licensee's technical capabilities were complemented by experts supplied under the INSC. The licensee's current draft report identifies a large number of potential safety upgrades. INRA is expected to commence preparation of the national report in December 2019, with the expectation that the final report will be adopted at the end of 2020. Hence desktop review for an ENSREG peer review could not commence before the first quarter of 2021.

4.5 Establishment of a Permanent Board

The Commission representative noted that the preceding discussions demonstrated that there were some differences in how the various stress test peer reviews had been organised, in some cases a supervisory Board had been set up, in others not. In order to ensure a consistent approach across all stress test peer review exercises. It was therefore proposed to set up a permanent board to supervise all stress test peer review exercises.

The Board could be composed of three Members, appointed on a rotating basis, so that not all Board mandates would expire at the same time. The Board would have a strong technical component through the participation of a Member from a nuclear state, balanced by a Member from a non-nuclear state. The Commission would also participate to ensure balance.

The Board's supervisory and monitoring roles should extend through all stages of a given peer review process, starting from the initial peer review of the National Stress Test Report, through review of the resulting NAcP, and - after a suitable interval of time - review of the implementation of the NAcP.

The existing "standard" Practical Arrangements could be updated and extended in order to reflect the two-phase approach; to cover the review of the NAcP, and to reflect ENSREG's principles on public involvement and transparency.

Several Members reacted cautiously, wondering whether it was necessary to carry out stress tests on all new NPP. Others expressed a preference for only granting such a Board a mandate which would be for a limited time. Several Members expressed a wish to study a written proposal before taking any commitment.

The Commission representative observed that the discussion also pointed to the need for a future plenary meeting to consider whether there is a continuing need to conduct stress tests of new NPP, which in principle should be safer than existing operational NPP as they would normally be based upon Generation 3+ technology and follow the WENRA 2014 Reference Levels. Nonetheless, the question of transparency and public confidence should also be factored into the discussion.

The Chair noted that, in any case, there was an urgent need to appoint a supervisory Board to cover the current stress test peer review exercises, over the next two or three years.

ENSREG took the decision to

Ask the Secretariat to draft and circulate a specification for the Board, which will be tasked with overseeing stress test peer reviews in third countries.

Request nominations for the Board by the end of November 2019.

5. Licensing of SMRs

The Commission introduced the topic of how ENSREG should approach the regulatory aspects of the deployment of small modular reactors (SMR) in the European Union. There is a clear and growing interest in SMR technology, globally and within the EU. On the 21st October the US and the Commission organised a high-level event on SMRs, co-chaired by US Energy Secretary Perry, and the EU's Commissioner for Energy and Climate Change, Arias Cañete. The meeting showed the growing interest in the deployment of SMRs, including in the EU, and including for the purpose of production of process heat. One session addressed regulatory aspects of the deployment of SMRs, with the participation of the Chair of the NRC, the Chair of the Canadian Nuclear Safety Commission, ASN France, and ENSREG Members from Finland and the UK.

The question for European regulators is when they should engage and how should they engage – reactively or actively. For its part, industry is even advocating mutual recognition of reactor models. The Commission would be interested to hear from those Members having an interest in the subject, and perhaps involved in other fora such as the Multinational Design Evaluation Programme (MDEP).

The UK representative informed the group that MDEP was winding down the review of large-scale power reactors. However, there was insufficient interest within MDEP to take work on SMRs forward. There was a need to avoid duplication with activities carried out by the various agencies or small groups of countries. He also identified some of the regulatory challenges which could be posed by factory built SMRs or mobile SMRs.

The WENRA representative informed the group that WENRA is currently reviewing whether the Safety Objectives for new reactors can be adapted for SMRs.

The Finnish representative informed about discussions within the NEA's Committee on Nuclear Regulatory Activities, which may soon start examining licensing of SMRs. He also noted that IAEA's Regulatory Forum was active in the area. He suggested that ENSREG could establish a forum for industry, regulators, TSOs and other stakeholders. The representative of France called for the inclusion of stakeholders from industry in any reflection group which may be established. The representative of Austria noted that currently worldwide there is only one SMR in commercial operation, and that therefore the urgency was not so high, and that a small group with a watching brief may be appropriate.

ENSREG took the decision to

Return to the subject during the spring 2020 ENSREG plenary meeting.

6. Review – ENSREG Conference 2019

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_467 ENSREG Conference Steering Committee report to 39th ENSREG 39th.pdf](#)

The Chair of the ENSREG Conference Steering Committee, Mr. Lamberto Matteocci, reported on the fifth ENSREG Conference, which was held in Brussels on 6-7 June 2019.

The conference attracted 220 participants with a further 900 following the conference via web-streaming. The overall cost of staging the conference was around €30.000.

The conference, which was presided by Stefano Laporta and moderated by Ann MacLachlan, began with a high-level plenary followed by four thematic sessions:

- Session 1: Ageing Management in the light of the ENSREG TPR
- Session 2: Decommissioning and Decommissioning Waste Management
- Session 3: Standardization of Supply Chain and Component Obsolescence

- Session 4: Knowledge Management and Skills Preservation

The objective of the technical sessions was to encourage dialogue between regulators and stakeholders. As far as possible, participants in each session included EU regulators, a non-EU regulator, as well as representatives of international organisations, non-governmental organisations (NGOs), the EU institutions and industry.

Two suggestions for potential topics for future TPRs emerged from the session 1 discussions: namely fire risk and regulatory independence. The session two discussions identified a number of challenges in respect of decommissioning, including choice of an adequate methodology, knowledge management, and assessment of costs. The third session identified a number of challenges to address the obsolescence of components including the unavailability of qualified and willing suppliers, licensing of new components or more recent technologies. Observations from the fourth session include the need to attract younger people to industry and regulatory bodies, the need to foster connections with academia, and recognition of the utility of the educational programmes put in place by ENEN and the IAEA.

He concluded his presentation by identifying the main lessons learned:

- start preparations early;
- ensure a good balance of speakers while ensuring the event remains centred on the regulatory aspects of nuclear safety;
- arrange the programme to promote a dialogue with stakeholders;
- include perspectives from outside the EU;
- involve industry and NGOs;
- promote the participation of younger people to the conference.

In view of his approaching retirement, the group took the opportunity to thank Mr Matteocci for his many contributions to the work of ENSREG over the years.

7. 6th ENSREG Report to the Council and the European Parliament

The Chair introduced the subject of the preparation of the next (6th) ENSREG Report. The previous (5th) report, covered the period June 2013 through October 2017, a period of twenty seven months. The period covered by the 5th report did not include the autumn plenary and therefore at several points the report makes reference to upcoming plenary decisions, creating some uncertainty as to the final outcome.

It is proposed to align future reports with a period of two calendar years, starting on 1st January and ending on the 31st December the following year. As well as covering a clearly defined interval of two years, the reporting period would include outcomes and decisions of the year two autumn plenary meeting, avoiding leaving some points in the report “hanging”.

It is therefore proposed that the sixth ENSREG report will cover the period ending 31st December 2019. The sixth report will cover a period of 2 years plus two months, but thereafter the seventh and subsequent reports will cover two full calendar years.

As regards the drafting of the sixth report, it is proposed that the Secretariat prepare the first draft of the report, early December covering the plenary outcomes, and incorporating input from WG1, WG2 and WG3 Chairs. The first draft will be distributed to the ENSREG Chair and the WG Chairs by 31st December for review and comment. The finalised draft report will be submitted to the ENSREG Members for approval by a written procedure at the end of January 2020.

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

[Approve the proposed procedure for adopting the 6th ENSREG report by written procedure. The sixth biennial Report of ENREG should cover the period November 2017 through 31 December 2019. Thereafter, ENSREG reports should cover a period of two calendar years starting on 1st January 2020.](#)

8. Ongoing and Planned Studies by the Commission

[HLG-r\(2019-39\)_454 Ongoing and Planned Studies by the Commission_corr.pdf](#)

In line with discussions during the 38th ENSREG plenary the Commission representative presented the status of the Commission’s planned and ongoing studies.

Only one study planned for launch 2020 is related to ENSREG's work. The study is entitled "Key Performance Indicators for monitoring implementation of national programmes on safe and long term management of spent fuel and radioactive waste." The study has three main aims:

- a. Analyse the definition and implementation of KPIs key performance indicators for monitoring progress in implementation of Member States Programmes for spent fuel and radioactive waste management. The study will identify examples to be of support to Member States in their review, update and future implementation of Programmes.
- b. Analyse the Member States approaches and practices to optimisation of radioactive waste and spent fuel management at a national and licensee level.
- c. Analyse the Member States approaches and practices to keep radioactive waste to the minimum, which is reasonably practicable, as requires Article 4(3) of the Directive.

He added that as several open infringement cases concerning the waste Directive are related to the use of KPIs, the study should help Member States comply with its requirements.

He also briefly reviewed the status of the various ongoing or recently completed studies relevant to ENSREG, noting in particular, that the second workshop organised under the "Study to support the technical implementation of Articles 8a - 8c of the amended Nuclear Safety Directive - Nuclear Safety Objective" had been held the previous day, and that the feedback received was positive.

He also drew the attention of the Group to a study launched in 2018, which was nearing completion. The study is entitled "Study on Benchmarking Analysis of Member States Approaches to Definition of National Inventories Radioactive Waste and Spent Fuel".

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

Take note of the information from the Commission on planned and ongoing studies.

9. A.O.B

9.1 Relations between ENSREG and WENRA

During the meeting the representatives of France proposed that WENRA be accorded the status of Observer in ENSREG. Mr Olivier Gupta, the new Chair of WENRA made a short intervention in support of WENRA's formal participation to ENSREG. To date, WENRA has not been formally represented in ENSREG. However, since WENRA has contributed in the past to several exercises coordinated by the Commission (e.g. TPR, stress tests) and since it conducts activities in several regulatory fields where there is potential for interaction with the Commission, WENRA aims to become a strategic partner of ENSREG: receiving formal Observer status would facilitate cooperation.

The Commission representative stated that since the establishment of ENSREG in 2007, there has been an unclear overlap of the two bodies, with many persons playing a role in both. The Commission would welcome a deepening of the cooperation between ENSREG and WENRA, in order to maintain mutual information, confirm sharing of responsibilities, share results and experience, and anticipate and avoid duplication of activities. The initiative on WENRA observership is timely, particularly in view of the forthcoming preparations for the second TPR.

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

Admit WENRA as an Observer to ENSREG.

9.2 Study of EP PETI Committee on Cross Border Nuclear Safety/ Court of Auditors Audit of Nuclear Safety

The Parliament's Petitions Committee had commissioned, on its own initiative, a study entitled "Cross-Border Nuclear Safety, Liability and Cooperation in the EU". The study was published in February 2019.

[http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/608860/IPOL_STU\(2019\)608860_EN.pdf](http://www.europarl.europa.eu/RegData/etudes/STUD/2019/608860/IPOL_STU(2019)608860_EN.pdf)

COM noted that the study on cross-border issues of nuclear power had been commissioned and discussed by the previous Parliament. As far as the Commission is aware; the current Parliament has no plans to re-examine the study, although it cannot be excluded that it would do so.

He also informed the Group that the European Court of Auditors was carrying out a wide-ranging audit of how the Commission makes use of its competences in the areas of:

- nuclear safety, management of spent fuel and radioactive waste, and radiation protection;
- cross-border information exchange;
- powers under Euratom Treaty Article 41 concerning notification of investment projects.

The audit team have completed gathering evidence and prepared the draft report. They visited IAEA and NEA to collect input. Publication is expected towards the end of quarter 1 2020. The report will be discussed in the European Parliament, which may also have the effect of reawakening parliamentary interest in the PETI Committee study mentioned above.

He offered to invite the auditors to ENSREG to present the final audit report, if it is published before the next ENSREG plenary meeting.

In response to a number of concerns raised by Members about the audit and the findings of the study, the Commission representative noted that ENSREG could make its point of view known to the Parliament via the next ENSREG 2-yearly report. It had happened in the past that the ENSREG Chair had presented the report to the European Parliament. Regarding the ongoing audit, he noted that the theme of the draft report is better overall integration of the Commission's activities in the audited areas. As the Court of Auditors is not a policy-making body, any policy recommendations would need to be taken up by the EU's policy making institutions.

10. Next meetings

ENSREG's 40th plenary meeting is planned to be held in Brussels on Tuesday the 17^h March 2020.

ENSREG's 41st plenary meeting is planned to be held in Brussels on Tuesday 10th November 2020.

Annex I

Agenda 39th meeting of ENSREG

14th November 2019 (09:30 – 17:30)

Room 1D, Albert Borschette Building

36, rue Froissart, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda
2. Chairperson's introduction and report
3. Review of WG1, WG2 and WG3 activities since the previous meeting
 - WG1: (K. Alm-Lytz)
 - 3.1. ENSREG TPR Action Plan (review/follow-up of NAcP and addressing the Four Challenges)
 - 3.2. TPR questionnaire
 - 3.3. EU Stress Tests - update
 - 3.4. Subgroup on CFSI
 - WG2: (S. Laporta)
 - 3.5. Report on Activities of WG2
 - WG3: (P. Majerus)
 - 3.6. Guidance for Openness and Transparency
 - 3.7. Public Engagement on LTO and Decommissioning
 - 3.8. Status of the ENSREG website
4. Stress-Tests and NAcP outside the EU
 - 4.1. Turkey
 - 4.2. Armenia NAcP
 - 4.3. Belarus NAcP
 - 4.4. Iran
 - 4.5. Establishment of a Permanent Board
5. Licensing of SMRs
6. Review – ENSREG Conference 2019
7. 6th ENSREG Report to the Council and the European Parliament
8. Ongoing and Planned studies by the Commission
9. A.O.B
 - 9.1. Relations between ENSREG and WENRA
 - 9.2. Study of EP PETI Committee on Cross Border Nuclear Safety/ Court of Auditors Audit of Nuclear Safety
10. Next Meeting

Annex II

List of Members and Observers

(Status after 39th ENSREG plenary, 14 November 2019)

Members:

Austria:	Dr V. Ehold, Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism Mr. A. Molin, Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism
Belgium:	Mr F. Hardeman, Federal Agency for Nuclear Control Mr M. Demarche, ONDRAF-NIRAS
Bulgaria:	Mr L. Kostov, Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria Mr B. Stanimirov, Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria
Commission:	Mr M. Garribba, Acting Deputy Director-General, DG ENER vacant position
Croatia:	Ms M. Klanac, Civil protection coordinator, Ministry of the Interior Ms Z. Tečić, Head of Sector for Radiological and Nuclear Safety, Ministry of the Interior
Cyprus:	Mr A. Yiannaki, Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance Mr D. Sakkas, Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance
Czechia:	Ms D. Drabova, State Office for Nuclear Safety Mr P. Krs, State Office for Nuclear Safety
Denmark:	Ms M. Øhlenschläger, National Institute of Radiation Protection Mr J. Thomsen, Danish Emergency Management Agency
Estonia:	Ms K. Muru, Estonian Environmental Board Mr I. Puskar, Estonian Environmental Board
Finland:	Ms K. Alm-Lytz, Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority Mr P. Tiippana, Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority
France:	Mr B. Doroszczuk, Président de l'Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN) Mr A. Louis, Ministère de l'Ecologie, du Développement durable et de l'Energie
Germany:	Dr W. Cloosters, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU) Mr T. Elsner, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)
Greece:	Dr Ch. Housiadas, Greek Atomic Energy Commission Ass. Prof. G. Nikolaou, Greek Atomic Energy Commission - Board
Hungary:	Mr G. Fichtinger, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority Mr. S. Hullán, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority
Ireland:	Dr M. Lehane, Environmental Protection Agency Dr C. McMahon, Environmental Protection Agency
Italy:	Mr S. Laporta, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, ISPRA Mr U. Bollettini, Ministry of Economic Development
Latvia:	Ms D. Šatrovska, Ministry of Environment Protection and Regional Development Ms Z. Balode, Ministry of Environment Protection and Regional Development
Lithuania:	Mr M. Demčenko, State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI) Mr. S. Šlepavičius, State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)

Luxembourg:	Mr P. Majerus, Ministry of Health Mr G. Lentz, Permanent Representation of Luxembourg to the EU
Malta:	Mr P. Brejza, Occupational Health and Safety Authority (OHS) Mr J. Cremona, Occupational Health and Safety Authority (OHS)
The Netherlands:	Mr M. Brugmans, Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Mr J. van den Heuvel, Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection
Poland:	Mr L. Mlynarkiewicz, National Atomic Energy Agency Mr M. Koc, National Atomic Energy Agency
Portugal:	Mr J. Oliveira Martins, Portuguese Environment Agency Mr P. Rosário, Portuguese Environment Agency
Romania:	Mr R. Traicu, National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control Mr. H. Grama, Nuclear Agency & Radioactive Waste
Slovakia:	Mr M. Turner, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic Eng. M. Žiaková, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
Slovenia:	Mr I. Sirc, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration Mr I. Grlicarev, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
Spain:	Mr J-M Serena, Chairman of the Spanish Nuclear Safety Council Mr R. Cid, Director for Nuclear Safety of the Spanish Nuclear Safety Council
Sweden:	Ms N. Cromnier, Swedish Radiation Safety Authority Mr G. Szendrö, Ministry of the Environment
United Kingdom:	Mr M. Foy, Office for Nuclear Regulation Mr M. Finnerty, Office for Nuclear Regulation

Observers:

WENRA	Mr O. Gupta, Chair of WENRA
Council:	Mr J. Bielecki, Division for Energy and Atomic Questions
IAEA:	Mr G. Caruso, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security
OECD NEA:	Ms G. Kwong, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency
Norway:	Mr H. Mattsson, Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority
Switzerland:	Mr H. Wanner, Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
Turkey:	Mr Z. Demircan, Turkish Atomic Energy Authority

Annex III

ENSREG 39th Meeting Presence list

Members and experts

Country	Company	Surname	Name
AUSTRIA	Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism	EHOLD	Verena
AUSTRIA	Federal Ministry for Sustainability and Tourism	MOLIN	Andreas
BELGIUM	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control	HARDEMAN	Frank
CYPRUS	Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance Radiation inspection and Control Service Department of Labour inspection	SAKKAS	Demetris
CZECHIA	State Office for Nuclear Safety	KRS	Petr
FINLAND	STUK - Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority	ALM-LYTZ	Kirsi
FINLAND	STUK – Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority	TIIPPANA	Petteri
FRANCE	Autorité de sûreté nucléaire	CHANIAL	Luc
FRANCE	Autorité de sûreté nucléaire (ASN)	GUPTA	Olivier
FRANCE	Autorité de sûreté nucléaire (ASN)	DOROSZCZUK	Bernard
FRANCE	Permanent Representation of France to the EU	THEVENOT	Caroline
FRANCE	Permanent Representation of France to the EU	JOERGER	Anais
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy	OSTER	Fernando
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)	ELSNER	Thomas
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)	KUHN	Sebastian
GERMANY	Ministry of the Environment, Climate Protection and the Energy Sector of Baden-Württemberg	NIEHAUS	Gerrit

Country	Company	Surname	Name
GREECE	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC)	HOUSIADAS	Christos
HUNGARY	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA)	RETFALVI	Eszter
IRELAND	Environmental Protection Agency	MCMAHON	Ciara
ITALY	ISIN - National Inspectorate for nuclear safety and radiation protection	LAPORTA	Stefano
ITALY	ISIN - National Inspectorate for nuclear safety and radiation protection	LAMBERTO	Matteocci
LITHUANIA	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (Vatesi)	DEMCENKO	Michail
LITHUANIA	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (Vatesi)	ŠLEPAVIČIUS	Sigitas
LITHUANIA	Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU	NAVICKAITE	Jolanta
LITHUANIA	Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU	VAINUTE	Sandra
LUXEMBOURG	Ministry of Health - Directorate of Health - Department of radiation protection	MAJERUS	Patrick
THE NETHERLANDS	ANVS	BRUGMANS	Marco
THE NETHERLANDS	ANVS	JANSEN	Robert
POLAND	National Atomic Energy Agency	MLYNARKIEWICZ	Lukasz
ROMANIA	Permanent Representation of Romania to the EU	BANU	Roxana
SLOVENIA	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration	SIRC	Igor
SLOVENIA	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration	GRLICAREV	Igor
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic	ZIAKOVA	Marta
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic	TURNER	Mikulas
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	CID	Rafael
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	DE LOS REYES	Alfredo
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	SERENA	Josep Maria

Country	Company	Surname	Name
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	REDOLI	David
SWEDEN	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority	CROMNIER	Nina
SWEDEN	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority	SZENDRÖ	Gabor
UNITED KINGDOM	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)	FOY	Mark

Observers

NAME	SURNAME	COMPANY
BOOTH	Gary	International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) Department of Nuclear Energy and Security
MATTSSON	Håkan	Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority
WANNER	Hans	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
ALTEN	Serhat	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Turkey
BIELECKI	Janusz	Council of the European Union
VYBORNÝ	Dmitry	Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Belarus

European Commission

NAME	SURNAME	
Garribba	Massimo	Director/D – DG ENER
Rhein	Hans	Head of Unit D1
MacLean	Finlay	Policy officer/D1 – DG ENER
Martin Ramos	Manuel	Programme Officer – Research - JRC
Noel	Marc	Programme Officer – Research - JRC