

## **Final minutes of the 19<sup>th</sup> meeting of ENSREG**

3 July 2012  
Brussels

### **Participants**

All EU Member States, with the exception of Malta, Estonia and Denmark, as well as the European Commission, were represented in the meeting.

The Chairman introduced the new ENSREG Members:

**Mr Hassel**, acting director general from the Swedish Radiation Safety Authority, as new ENSREG Member from Sweden and **Mr de Sa Fonseca**, President of the Commission of Regulators of Nuclear Installations as new ENSREG Member from Portugal.

### ***1) Introductory address by the ENSREG Chairperson***

The Chairperson welcomed the participants and mentioned that it is the last meeting he is chairing.

### ***2) Adoption of the Agenda***

The meeting Agenda was adopted without amendments.

### ***3) Stress Tests – Task Force Implementation Plan***

Related document: HLG\_r(2012-19)\_122

ENSREG met to discuss the post-Fukushima follow-up activities.

The Task Force Implementation plan (action plan) provides for national plans to implement recommended improvements on nuclear power plants and organise regulatory peer review workshops to share lessons learned on the implementation of post-Fukushima safety improvements.

The action plan will also specify fact-finding follow-up site visits in order to better prepare for the peer review workshops. This was agreed by all regulators. The outcomes of the peer review workshops will be presented to the public in the next ENSREG conference (2013), while the country-specific plans will also be publicly available via the ENSREG web site.

In a first round of general comments, Mr Lacoste asked to make a reference to the European Council Conclusions from June 2012. Mr Hall warned that the peer reviews should not become too political, we should separate political actions from those with the aim to enhancing nuclear safety (within the remit of ENSREG). Mr Varjoranta mentioned that the output of the work of the Task Force was good, now we should turn words into real actions. Mr Molin said that while he appreciates the work of the Task Force, non-nuclear countries shall be involved at an equal footing. The stress test exercise made the work of ENSREG visible, and this momentum should be maintained.

Mr Faross highlighted that for the efficiency of work we should stick to what was agreed in the past, and not deviate from the compromise reached at the last ENSREG meeting. He also thanked the Task Force for their work on the Action Plan.

Mrs Martinez Ten underlined that the majority of countries with NPP's have developed national action plans with an own timetable. There are measures to be implemented immediately and others which need more time. This has to be taken into account in the Action Plan.

Specific comments made by ENSREG Members related to the questions discussed:

### **Q1: Compilation of main results of Peer review**

*The question was raised, if it is useful to produce a consistent compilation of Peer Review recommendations and suggestions to assist the preparation or review of National Action Plans by National regulators.*

Mr Faross mentioned that a check-list is good for the follow-up work. Austria and Spain explicitly supported this approach. Thus, the Task Force will table a compilation of the peer review recommendations.

### **Q2: Peer Review Seminars**

*The following options were tabled: No Seminar?// One Seminar in February/March 2013 synchronized with preparation of national reports for 2014 CNS Review Meeting?// Seminars synchronized with preparation of CNS national reports (every 3 years), subject to the decision of ENSREG.*

During the debate, several ENSREG Members (i.e. SI, SK, HU) were hesitant about the added value of further seminars and asked to include the topic on the next ENSREG Conference in 2013. Mr Stritar mentioned that the high number of meetings at international level absorbs high level of resources from national regulators, especially from smaller Member States.

Mr Jamet as Head of the Action Plan Task Force underlined that a serious follow-up of recommendations is needed using peer review methodologies; however different formats of seminar organization can be used.

The Chairperson proposed to integrate the current tasks of the Task Force (TF) in the work of WG1 and also to ask this Group for coordination of the Action Plan. This approach was supported by IE, CZ, SK.

Mrs McGarry proposed that the TF should continue to work until the seminar/workshop takes place, and that the transition should be managed carefully.

Mr Hassel underlined the need to have a written text of what is being discussed before approving it in order to ensure that all essential elements of the follow up are included in the action plan.

Mrs Martinez Ten asked for associating WG3 (transparency) as well to this follow-up work.

Conclusion: The agreement reached was that WG1 will organize a peer review workshop.

The Action Plan Task Force will gradually merge with the Working Group on Nuclear Safety, taking into account the abovementioned comments by ENSREG Members.

### **Q3: Follow-up Site Visits**

*The question was if ENSREG should accept the list of sites to be visited or should they result from direct discussion between EC and member states? Should the list initially proposed by EC be mentioned in the ENSREG Action Plan? What is the reason for follow-up site visits? Confidence building only? Confidence building + Technical interest?*

Several ENSREG Members (FR, SE, ES, UK) underlined that it is the responsibility of each country to make proposals in this regard. The consistency of the proposals has to be checked by the Task Force. Also technical criteria have to be taken into account. FR would propose 3 or 4 sites to be visited.

Mr Hall mentioned that UK perceives the site visits as a public relation exercise, not a technical one. The national regulator does not have the power to impose site visits.

Several Members (FR, ES, SE, UK, BE) asked to not include the list of NPP sites to be visited as annex to the Action Plan.

Mr Pouleur mentioned that it should be highlighted that the initiative comes from the Member States through the regulators. Confidence-building is the primary concern. Site visits should be seen as a follow-up in the whole process.

Mrs Martinez Ten questioned the reasoning behind the visits, the method is not clear and the purpose of the visits should not be ceremonial.

Mr Faross asked for a clear agreement on the issue of follow-up site visits itself. In a 2<sup>nd</sup> step it should be discussed, who proposes and selects the sites. In May 2011 the regulators agreed to include site visits as part of the peer review process. The additional visits should follow the same methodology as in the peer review exercise carried out to date. A reference to the initial EC proposal should be kept in an annex to the action plan.

Mr Jamet as Head of the Task Force proposed to define the visits "fact-finding mission". There should be three persons visiting one NPP site, and basic terms of reference have to be established.

The Chairperson reiterated the confidence-building aspect of the process. He summarized that these fact-finding missions will take place and will be organized in appropriate time.

Mr Jamet added that the fact-finding missions will provide elements for the future follow-up of the Action Plan. All visits should take place before 15 September 2012.

Conclusion: The action plan will specify fact-finding follow-up site visits in order to better prepare for the peer review workshops. Factors like the age of plants, proximity to borders, family of reactors, etc. will be taken into account.

National regulators will propose by 12 July candidate sites to be visited and the sites will be agreed to by the ENSREG Action Plan Task Force. The visits will take place with a time frame compatible with the reporting to the next European Council on 16 - 17 October 2012.

#### **Q4: Off-Site Emergency Preparedness - Guidance on mutual assistance between Regulators**

*Should an off-site emergency preparedness guidance on mutual assistance between Regulators be prepared by: WENRA? HERCA? WENRA and HERCA?*

Mr Majerus reported that many Working Groups are working on the issue of off-site emergency; the aim should be to centralize and share information with the key players. The task of WENRA in this regard is similar to that of HERCA.

Mr Janko mentioned that the IAEA undertook an extensive project in that field. This should be taken into account for future work. Mr Stritar again warned about the inflation of working bodies.

Mr Faross added that the situation is complex, and that is why a study is being conducted.

Conclusion: Agreement was reached that the third option should be taken forward: WENRA and HERCA should work together and coordinate.

#### **Q5: Airplane Crash**

*Question: Should airplane crash be mentioned in the ENSREG Action Plan? The ad-hoc Group on Nuclear Security is proposing follow-up activities. Should possible contribution of ENSREG, in its area of competence, be mentioned in the ENSREG Action Plan?*

Mr Decaestecker from the Council Secretariat informed the Group that there is a misleading formulation in the current proposed text.

Ms Drábová supported the inclusion of the airplane crash issue in the Action Plan.

Mr Pouleur underlined that there is a vacuum and no interface between the two groups involved in this issue (ENSREG and ad-hoc Group on Nuclear Security).

*Conclusion: Airplane crash should be mentioned in the ENSREG Action Plan.*

### **Main decisions/Actions**

Agreement was reached on all major topics of the action plan, which will be finalized by end of July 2012.

National regulators will propose candidate sites to be visited by 12 July, taking into account the proposal made by the Commission. The sites will be agreed to by the ENSREG Action Plan Task Force composed by national regulators and EC representatives.

By 13 July a new version of the Action Plan will be drafted and then circulated to ENSREG Members, followed by a silence procedure.

### **4) Election of new ENSREG Chairperson, new Vice-Chairperson and new chair of WG1**

As expected, after four and half years Mr Andrej Stritar has completed his successful chairmanship of ENSREG.

Mr Tero Varjoranta (FI) was unanimously elected as new Chairperson of ENSREG,

Mr Petr Krs (CZ) as new Vice Chair of ENSREG and

Mr Hartmut Klonk (DE) as New Chairperson of WG 1.

Mr Molin, supported by Mr Pouleur, pointed out that following the Rules of Procedure, the Chair of WG1 should be one of the ENSREG Members.

Mr Stritar and Mr Ronaky proposed to change the RoP accordingly. This approach was opposed by Mr Garribba (ENSREG Secretariat) who insisted that rules could not be changed on spot to suit specific situations.

### **5) Extraordinary CNS meeting – August 2012**

The 2nd Extraordinary Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety (CNS) to be held in Vienna from 27-31 August 2012 aims to enhance safety through reviewing and sharing lessons learned and actions taken by Contracting Parties in response to events at Fukushima and to reviewing the effectiveness and, if necessary, the continued suitability of the provisions of the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

Mr Stritar informed in this context about a side event to present the work done after Fukushima by EU national regulators.

Mr Jamet highlighted that the objective of the extraordinary CNS meeting is to collect facts after the Fukushima accident. In this context, six topics were identified; three of them match with the stress tests and peer reviews. The side event will provide this information.

Mr Caruso informed that a joint presentation by ENSREG and WENRA is foreseen (20 min foreseen for each presentation).

Mr Varjoranta warned of several risks to the process – the review could risk to be not deep enough. It should serve as sort of "show case" from the European side.

Mr Klonk informed that he is one of the six coordinators. Information will be published on the CNS website; national contact points shall download it.

*Conclusion: Mr. Philippe Jamet will present the work of ENSREG at the side event during the extraordinary CNS.*

### **6) ENSREG Conference 2013**

Related documents: HLG\_r(2012-19)\_123, HLG\_r(2012-19)\_127

Mr Pouleur expressed his preparedness to assist the Steering committee and referred to the document "lessons learnt". He highlighted that preparations should start at an early stage. On a practical issue, he spoke about the financial aspects – a legal entity would be best placed to collect the financial contributions from the regulators.

Mrs Martinez Ten raised the question how to organize social networks and planning appearance for the international media. Spain would be happy to assist in this regard. Mr Hall proposed Ms Claire Lyons to work in the Communication TF and nominated her to assist in these activities.

Mr Stritar underlined that a date and venue have to be agreed upon. He proposed Brussels as possible conference venue.

Mr Faross stated that the EC is prepared to help on organizational matters, if the Conference takes place in Brussels or Luxembourg. ENSREG decided to organise the conference in Brussels.

Mr Molin mentioned that a president of the Conference has to be found; Mr Laporta proposed Andrej Stritar as President of the Conference, which was broadly supported by the other ENSREG Members.

On the proposal of Mr Lacoste, Mr Stephane Pailler (ASN) was appointed as Head of the Conference Steering Committee.

### **Main decisions / Actions**

ENSREG Members were invited to propose candidates to the Conference Steering Committee and Communication Task Force by the date of the next ENSREG meeting (27 September 2012).

## **7) Progress made by the Working Groups**

### **WG1**

Related documents: HLG\_r(2012-19)\_128

Mr Addison reported on the progress of WG 1 in the following three main areas of work:

- Format and Guidance for MS Reports under Art. 9.1
- Self-assessment Guidance (group disbanded)
- Scheduling/resourcing of self-assessments & peer reviews

Other assignments:

- Technical opinion on the final IAEA Report on the Safety of Ukrainian NPPs
- External dimension on Nuclear Safety – ENSREG involvement in INSC

No discussion on the abovementioned points took place.

### **WG2**

Related documents: HLG\_r(2012-19)\_129

The Chairperson of the Working Group reported on progress of the Group in the following areas:

- Task 1: Format of and Guidance for MS Reports under Article 14 of Directive 2011/70/Euratom (Waste Directive)
- Task 2 - 4 on Self-assessment and Peer-review under Article 14 (3) of Directive 2011/70/Euratom
- Task 5: Implementing National Management Systems according to the Directive 2011/70/Euratom

Furthermore, he mentioned that many stakeholders and ministries are involved in waste management work, compared to the more limited number in relation to the Nuclear Safety Directive. There is not a full common view, but common understanding and differences in national organisations have to be noted.

#### **Task 6: Exchange of information**

WG2 has exchanged information with WG3 and as well with ENEF, in particular the NAPRO group working on developing guidelines for national programmes under the Waste Directive.

#### **WG3**

Related documents: HLG\_r(2012-19)\_124, HLG\_r(2012-19)\_125, HLG\_r(2012-19)\_126

The Chairperson of the Working Group on Transparency reported on the progress of the Group, the following decision were taken:

#### **Main decisions/Actions**

- ENSREG noted transparency of “stress tests” and agreed to Quarterly Updates
- ENSREG noted development of the Website
- ENSREG Members were asked to check and update Country Profiles, including maps

The Chairperson proposed a reminder –email sent out quarterly by WG3.

- ENSREG postponed decision on “Visibility” measures (photos of Chair and Vice-Chairs on the website)
- ENSREG Decided on application of RoP to Working Groups (specially in regard to minutes)
- ENSREG Adopted guidance on the implementation of Article 10 Waste Directive

#### **Any other business**

The Chairperson informed that the report from Turkey on stress tests was received and the report from Armenia is expected soon.

Mr Stritar proposed to transmit the reports for follow-up to Working Group 1.

Mr Faross underlined that on the basis of the European Council Conclusions, a peer review on these reports shall be provided.

\*

Mr Faross informed about the Asia-Europe Meeting (ASEM) Seminar on Nuclear Safety (ASNS) in June, to which he participated. The European stress test exercise is regarded as a benchmark for the Asian Region. A regional network of regulators needs to be developed. Some Asian regulators expressed the wish to attend a future ENSREG meeting as observer (2 observers).

The Chairperson stated that there is no objection on inviting them as observers.

#### **Information on the next ENSREG meeting**

The next ENSREG meeting will take place on 27 September 2012.