



Minutes of the 57th meeting of ENSREG

30 October 2025, Brussels, Belgium

Participants

ENSREG Members representing national authorities responsible for nuclear safety and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste from 22 EU Member States and the European Commission participated in the 57th ENSREG meeting, which took place on 30 October 2025 in Brussels. The meeting was attended by all ENSREG Members, except for the members from Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Malta and Romania.

Observers from Heads of European Radiological Protection Competent Authorities (HERCA), Western European Nuclear Regulators Association (WENRA), Switzerland, Ukraine and the United Kingdom participated in the open session of the meeting.

The list of all participants to the 57th ENSREG meeting is attached as Annex III.

Part I – Closed session (Members only)

1. Administrative matters and endorsement of items without objections

The Chair of ENSREG, Mr Juan Carlos Lentijo, opened the closed session of the 57th ENSREG meeting reserved for members only. He started with a minute of silence observed in memory of Ms Dana Drábová, ENSREG member from the Czech Republic's State Office for Nuclear Safety, who passed away on 6 October. Mr Michal Merxbauer (CZ) paid tribute to Ms Drábová and conveyed his gratitude for ENSREG's recognition of her contribution to nuclear safety not only in the Czech Republic but also in the EU and beyond, and thanked colleagues for honouring her memory.

1.1 New approach to Plenary proceedings – evolving agenda focusing on strategic matters

[HLG-p\(2025-57\)_216 Agenda of the 57th ENSREG Meeting](#)

[HLG-p\(2025-57\)_221 Concept paper - NSD implementation](#)

[HLG-p\(2025-57\)_222 WG2 - Lessons learned from 10 years of Implementation of RWD](#)

[HLG-p\(2025-57\)_224 WG2 - Technical Position on Radioactive Waste Classification in the EU](#)

The Chair presented the new approach to focus the work of the ENSREG Plenary on strategic topics of relevance for nuclear safety regulation in Europe. The Chair highlighted that this new approach would empower working groups (WGs) to autonomously conclude and deliver on their tasks and seek Plenary's guidance on key elements during the preparation, instead of only in the finalisation period. The documents submitted for silent endorsement (as "A points") should undergo preparation, consultations and endorsement by consensus within the lead WG and, when appropriate, with other involved WGs. The WG chair bears the responsibility for the decision to go through the silent procedure and quality of the documents submitted for silent endorsement.

The Chair clarified the new process intended for next meetings:

- [2+2 weeks process] The documents submitted by WGs for endorsement through the silent procedure will have to be sent 4 weeks prior to the plenary meeting. ENSREG members will have two (2) weeks to analyse them. If no substantial comments or objections arise by the end of the two-week period, a consensus will be considered reached and the formal endorsement of the documents will take place summarily at the start of the next Plenary meeting without discussion. The list of such documents will be marked in the agenda of the plenary meeting at least two (2) weeks before the meeting.
- If substantial comments or objections are received during the consultation period, i.e. at least two (2) weeks before the plenary, the ENSREG Chair will decide on further steps at the latest two weeks before the Plenary:
 - a) To discuss the document during the Plenary under discussion items. If consensus in principle is reached during this discussion, the document will be amended as necessary by the WG and submitted to written procedure after the Plenary (when the urgency is justified on legal grounds or other important reasons) or its adoption is postponed to next Plenary.
 - b) To return the document to the WG for further preparatory work and relay its endorsement or discussion at a future Plenary meeting.

In line with the new approach, the Chair explained the new structure of the ENSREG Plenary agenda covering three main parts:

1. *Administrative matters & endorsements of items with no objections* (a full list of the documents for endorsement in this way will be included in an annex to the agenda).
2. *Points for information* where it is easier to pass the information in the meeting itself without the previous circulation of a document or complementary to it, but a discussion is still not expected.
3. *Points for substantive discussion*: for topics not covered by part 1 or 2.

The Chair clarified that the documents for endorsement at this Plenary were made available on CIRCABC two weeks in advance. In addition, direct hyperlinks were added in the annex to the agenda.

In line with the 2+2 weeks process, the Chair requested that for future plenaries, the documents for endorsement will have to be made available at least four weeks before the Plenary date. This will give ENSREG members time (2 weeks) for consultation on the documents and signalling any substantial comments or objections. At the end of this period of 2 weeks, if some documents receive comments or objections, the Chair will decide on further steps. The period of two weeks before the plenary meeting will allow finalisation of the draft agenda as necessary and preparation for discussions at the Plenary. The Chair also pointed out that the usual scheduling of the preparatory works will have to be reviewed. For example, WG meetings will need to be scheduled earlier in order to finalise and submit the documents for endorsement 4 weeks in advance of the plenary meeting to allow a timely review by the ENSREG Members. The Chair also encouraged WGs to submit important issues, questions or requests for guidance for discussion at the Plenary before finalising document preparation in the WGs.

Following the explanation of the new approach and the evolving agenda, **the Chair** presented the amendments to the draft agenda made after its distribution to ENSREG Members.

The Chair informed that the following items for endorsement successfully went through a silent endorsement, as no objection was raised and therefore are considered adopted by the Plenary:

- Proposed follow up for Nuclear Safety Directive implementation
- Lessons learned from 10 years of Implementation of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom
- Technical Position on Radioactive Waste Classification in the EU

The Chair informed that one or more ENSREG members requested the inclusion of the following items on the agenda of the Plenary meeting itself:

- BAT Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy (WG1)
- The TPR II NAcP template (WG1)
- SMR Dashboard (SMR TF)
- Outline of the Terms of Reference for TPR Focus Group (WG3)

Therefore, further changes were made to the agenda as follows:

- BAT Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy will be presented under Information items.
- The TPR II NAcP template has been included under the agenda point dedicated to “Outcomes of TPR II”.
- The SMR Dashboard will be presented under Information items

The Chair decided that the Terms of Reference for the TPR Focus Group will be reviewed to address the comments received and a new version will be presented at the next Plenary.

Mr Thomas Augustin (AT) thanked the Chair for the efforts made to address the reservations that AT communicated prior to the meeting. Mr Augustin suggested that distributing and revising the agenda in advance of the meeting would be highly appreciated. **The Chair**

reiterated that for future plenaries there will be more time for consolidating final draft agendas, facilitating the removal, inclusion, or reassignment of specific topics before distribution.

Mr Jan Panek (Commission) expressed appreciation for the new approach focusing on strategic points over administrative issues, in line with requests received from certain ENSREG Members. Mr Panek thanked the Chair for his flexibility as this new approach will require some on-the-spot adaptation to the agenda in this meeting. Adaptations of the plenary agenda during meetings or just before them will become inevitable with the new approach, as objections to the silent endorsement might arise just before or directly at the start of the meeting, preventing a completely fixed agenda in advance of the meeting.

Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE) expressed support for the proposed changes, describing them as a positive step. **Mr Knochenhauer** recognised the potential challenges in endorsing complex documents within a short time frame and emphasised the importance of adhering to established timelines. He stressed the need for timely delivery of meeting minutes. **Mr Massimo Garribba (Commission)** reinforced the necessity to respect the deadline for circulating minutes two weeks after the Plenary. **The Chair** reminded that ENSREG Members have time up to the 6th of November to provide comments on the minutes from the 56th ENSREG Plenary.

The ENSREG Secretariat updated members on the issue of delayed travel reimbursements, primarily attributed to the transition to the new accounting tool, SUMMA, at the end of last year. The Secretariat noted the need to designate **one ENSREG member per country** that will be authorised to receive reimbursements, as this data is crucial to proceed with the payments. Members were requested to identify which ENSREG representatives from the previous two meetings will request reimbursement, by filling out the Excel file already circulated via ENSREG Microsoft Teams.

The Members present did not propose any additional amendments to the draft and adopted the amended agenda as presented in Annex I.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- adopt the new approach and associated procedures to Plenary proceedings
- adopt the draft amended agenda

1.2 Nominations

The Chair welcomed six new ENSREG members:

- Ms Renata Laknar, Head of the Radiological and Nuclear Safety Sector, at the Civil Protection Directorate of the Ministry of the Interior of Croatia
- Ms Ana Getaldić, Head of the Environment and Radioactive Waste Unit in the Nuclear Safety Department of the Radiological and Nuclear Safety Sector, at the Civil Protection Directorate of the Ministry of the Interior of Croatia

- Mr Andreas Sikorski, Director-General at the Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMUKN)
- Mr Pat Byrne, Director, Office of Radiation Protection and Environmental Monitoring, Environment Protecting Agency (EPA) of Ireland
- Mr Paweł Pytlarczyk, Vice President of the National Atomic Energy Agency in Poland (PAA)
- Ms Jana Szelecká, Director in the Division of International Relations and European Affairs at the Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Slovakia.

The list of ENSREG Members as of November 2025 is presented in Annex II.

The **ENSREG Secretariat** informed about the approaching end of term of the current Chair. Mr Lentijo expressed his willingness to continue in this position should the Plenary wish him to do so.

Mr Massimo Garribba (Commission) expressed strong support for Mr Lentijo's continuation as Chair. The floor was opened for comments or other candidatures for this role. With no expressions of interest from other attendees, the Plenary unanimously endorsed the Chair's renewal for a second term running from 1 January 2026 to 31 December 2027.

The Chair informed the Plenary that Mr Marco Brugmans and himself were invited to represent ENSREG at the 20th anniversary celebration of the European Nuclear Installation Safety Standards (ENISS). The event presents an opportunity to highlight ENSREG's pivotal role in supporting nuclear safety within Europe. The Chair sought any observations or objections from members regarding their attendance. With no objections or comments from attendees, the Chair confirmed that Marco Brugmans and himself will represent ENSREG at the event.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- **endorse the renewal of ENSREG Chair's second two-year term**
- **confirm the ENSREG Chair and Vice-Chair participation at ENISS ¹**

2. Information items

The Chair noted that, in principle, no detailed discussions are foreseen under information items. However, the possibility remains for brief interventions should members request further clarification or reaction. Members were reminded of the importance of adhering to the limited time allocated for information items.

2.0 BAT Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy

HLG-p(2025-57)_223 WG1 - BAT Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy

¹ Due to changed circumstances, the ENSREG Chair cannot participate at the ENISS event. Only Mr Brugmans will represent ENSREG at the ENISS event.

The Chair explained that the Best Available Technologies (BAT) Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy item was moved from silent endorsement to an information item, as requested by Austria.

Ms Iga Pocztarek-Tofil, the WG1 Chair, emphasised the need for careful differentiation between administrative and strategic matters in the context of proposal of new proceeding of the ENSREG meeting, using the BAT document as an example of a strategic issue, validated by the extensive discussions within WG1 that was not indicated in the first version of the meeting agenda as an item requiring a discussion. The development of ENSREG's position regarding BAT within the taxonomy took two years to reach consensus. Ms Pocztarek-Tofil presented a compromised short version of the paper, agreed upon by WG1, and asked for ENSREG's support for approval of the paper.

Ms Pocztarek-Tofil highlighted that accident-tolerant fuel (ATF) was omitted as per previous Plenary decisions, focusing instead on technical parameters relating to the BAT. She highlighted the ongoing revisions of the taxonomy within the Council, suggesting member states express additional concerns through a taxonomy expert group meeting on 20 November. Ms Pocztarek-Tofil encouraged nuclear safety regulators to relay their positions to national representatives within this group.

Mr Thomas Augustin (AT) found the outcome balanced and acceptable to the Plenary. He raised concerns about procedural aspects, namely that ENSREG should have the opportunity to discuss the position rather than merely receiving a prepared document from WG1.

Mr Marco Brugmans (NL) also welcomed the balanced approach of the document and inquired about the Commission's plans for the paper. **Mr Jan Panek (Commission)** recalled the task laid down in Commission Delegated Regulation (EU) 2022/1214 and took note of the ENSREG assessment of the technical parameters related to BAT. This paper will be made publicly available; the exact means remain to be defined – it could be published on the Commission's website.

Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE) and **Mr Thomas Augustin (AT)** emphasised the thorough process undertaken, with significant work and discussions within WG1 and a conclusive outcome.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- **endorse ENSREG's document on BAT Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy**

2.1 Outcomes of ENSREG meeting with the EESC on PINC

HLG-r(2025-57)_789 25-10 ENSREG EESC

The Chair summarised the outcomes of a recent meeting held on 10 October 2025 with the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) regarding the Nuclear Illustrative Programme (PINC). The meeting, requested by the EESC for consultation before submitting its opinion to the Commission, was attended by the Chair, WG Chairs, and Vice-Chairs of ENSREG. The interaction was described as satisfactory, focusing on discussing ENSREG's role and

opinions on PINC, specifically advocating for the development and deployment of nuclear technologies alongside strong regulatory frameworks across Europe.

During the meeting with the EESC, the Chair stressed the need for investment in capacity building in terms of regulatory frameworks and encouraged considering financial models for the management of backend activities. Finally, the PINC could be used as a driver to attract new talent to the sector. The Chair noted that a preliminary draft opinion shared during the meeting lacked comprehensive reflection of the meeting's conclusions, particularly concerning adequate financial resources and capacities for the development of regulatory frameworks and therefore expects that the EESC will enhance their focus on regulatory frameworks in their final opinion to the Commission.

ENSREG took note of:

- **the ENSREG feedback provided to the EESC on PINC**

2.2 Grant Scheme progress and next steps

Mr Jan Panek (Commission) provided an update on the Grant scheme initiative aimed at providing new form of Commission funding for regulatory activities related to nuclear safety in Europe. Four project proposals were received following a call for proposals earlier this year, with requested funds exceeding the allocated € 850 000. The proposals are under evaluation, and requests for clarification, if any, will soon be issued to applicants to determine funding viability. Mr Panek clarified that if the Commission cannot fund all of them, it will proceed in the order of evaluation scores until the exhaustion of available funding. Unsuccessful proposals may have the possibility to reapply next year under a new call; the work on project proposals not retained for funding this year would thus not be lost.

Mr Marco Brugmans (NL) congratulated the Commission on this initiative, recognising its role in enhancing nuclear safety cooperation in a coordinated way. **Mr Michal Merxbauer (CZ)** echoed these sentiments and inquired about the possibility of discussing the details of the four submitted projects. **Mr Panek (Commission)** emphasised the ongoing evaluation process, which prohibits specific project details from being disclosed, in order not to compromise the process.

ENSREG took note of:

- **the Grant Scheme progress and next steps**

2.3 Post-Fukushima Stress Tests

HLG-r(2025-57)_791 20251003 Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries Report for ENSREG Plenary

Mr Petteri Tiippana, Chair of the Stress Tests Board, provided a status update on Türkiye, Armenia, Egypt and stress tests instrument in EU countries. Mr Tiippana noted that the

appointment of two candidates from Romania, Mr Cantemir Ciurea-Ercău (CNCAN) and Ms Madalina Coca (CNCAN), are subject to Plenary approval.

Mr Tiippana raised the following points:

- At the IAEA General Conference, NDK reported a one-year construction delay in Unit 1, yet Türkiye still plans to start implementing the stress tests peer review recommendations after the commissioning licence for the Akkuyu NPP Unit 1 has been granted.
- Mr Tiippana stressed ENSREG's need for active engagement with NDK to address peer review results and request a review of the national action plan. The INSC programme and the Convention on Nuclear Safety (CNS) process serve as channels to encourage prompt action and question progress on the implementation of peer review findings.
- Preparations for a follow-up peer review scheduled for next month in Armenia are advancing smoothly, aiming to complete the report by the end of the year and seek endorsement during the spring Plenary. This is both timely and relevant, considering Armenia's intentions to extend the operational lifespan of the existing unit by an additional 10 years, and plans to construct a new unit.
- Egypt is open to a peer review but prioritises the upcoming IRRS mission next summer, with intentions to initiate preparations for the stress tests peer review afterwards, likely occurring in 2027.
- To enhance the stress tests instrument's benefits for EU countries, especially as new NPPs are being constructed and planned, the stress tests instrument requires adjustments in scope, relevant module identifications, and peer review timing. Suggestions will be presented at the upcoming spring Plenary.

Mr Demetris Sakkas (CY) raised concern over Türkiye's pattern of repeatedly affirming commitment to these reviews without progress. **Mr Sakkas (CY)** inquired whether the Commission has avenues to further encourage Türkiye to implement their commitments. Secondly, **Mr Sakkas (CY)** inquired if there are any ongoing contacts with Türkiye concerning peer review missions or stress tests for Türkiye's other nuclear projects currently under construction. Although these nuclear projects are geographically distant from Cyprus, they are of interest to other neighbouring countries.

Mr Petteri Tiippana highlighted ongoing efforts to inform Türkiye to take ENSREG recommendations into account as soon as possible.

Mr Massimo Garribba (Commission) clarified that efforts to encourage Türkiye to act upon ENSREG recommendations have been met with limited enthusiasm; however, Türkiye has maintained its position that implementation will follow Unit 1's commissioning licence.

On Armenia, **Mr Garribba (Commission)** highlighted the ongoing situation at the Metsamor plant as a significant concern. Despite the EU's longstanding position advocating Metsamor's closure since the late 90s, Armenia intends to extend the plant's operation by an additional 10-year period. Commission support has been directed towards ensuring operational safety,

despite calls for closure. However, Mr Garribba stressed that the additional 10-year extension warrants further discussion and reflection on the next steps. With Armenia agreeing to host a peer-review mission in November, there will be a report provided to ENSREG at the next ENSREG Plenary. ENSREG should then make a recommendation to the Commission on future steps.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- endorse the appointment of the new members of the STB
- maintain active engagement with Türkiye to encourage the timely implementation of peer review recommendations, by leveraging bilateral talks, INSC programme and CNS process as communication channels.
- develop recommendations for the Commission on future steps concerning Metsamor NPP
- present a proposal to develop a stress tests instrument for EU countries to be discussed during the spring Plenary in 2026

Part II – Open session

3. Administrative matters and endorsement of items without objections

3.1 New approach to Plenary proceedings – evolving agenda focusing on strategic matters

The ENSREG Chair started the open session of the 57th Plenary by welcoming the Observers. He introduced the new ENSREG Observer from the UK, Mr Colin Tait, Deputy Technical Director at the UK's Office for Nuclear Regulation. The ENSREG Chair informed observers about the new approach to Plenary proceedings.

3.2 Key outcomes from the closed session

The ENSREG Chair presented the key outcomes of the closed session. Please see above.

4. Information items

4.1 European Industrial Alliance on SMRs – Strategic Action Plan

Mr Jan Panek (Commission) provided an update on the activities of the European Industrial Alliance for Small Modular Reactors (SMRs). The Alliance has focused this year on the preparation and adoption of its strategic action plan as a first key deliverable, following the

establishment of technical working groups dedicated to enabling the timely deployment of SMRs and identification of nine projects aligned to the objective of the Alliance for deployment of SMRs by early 2030s.

This strategic action plan includes a set of ten concrete top-level actions intended to support the nine identified projects over the next four years. During the General Assembly meeting on 1 September, the strategic action plan was endorsed. The detailed plans of each technical working group are publicly accessible on the Alliance's website.

The EU IA for SMRs Governing Board conducted reviews and hearings with each of the nine projects in September and assessed whether those projects remain on track for timely deployment by early 2030. The board's assessment has been shared with the respective projects and will soon be made public.

Mr Panek welcomed the strategic action plan that is very concrete in its intended deliverables and explained that the Commission is using the plan as input into the current preparations for the European SMR Strategy that should be finalised in the coming months.

4.2 Update by ENSREG SMR Task Force Chair

[HLG-p\(2025-57\)_219 Dashboard ENSREG SMR Task Force_November 2025](#)

[HLG-r\(2025-57\)_781 ENSREG views on next steps of SMR Task Force_Plenary 30Oct2025](#)

Mr Marco Brugmans (NL) provided an update on the activities of the SMR Task Force:

- Noted exchanges with IAEA-NHSI regulatory track, efforts in compiling the first lessons learned from ENSREG members' involvement in different SMRs pre-licensing processes and clarified his role as an observer in the Industrial Alliance governing board.
- Shared insights from observing the Generic Design Assessment (GDA) process by the UK's Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR) regarding the Rolls-Royce design, noting that from the SMR Task Force's perspective, aims were generally met, but highlighted the need to balance efforts when observing such a process.
- Future tasks include reviewing industry position papers in preparation by the TWG6, continuing the compilation of lessons learned from ENSREG Members' involvement in SMRs pre-licensing processes, and updating the SMR dashboard.
- Mr Brugmans outlined the changes to the SMRs dashboard following Poland's comments.
- Mr Brugmans formulated the following questions for ENSREG Members:
 - Does the ENSREG Plenary want to continue to endorse the updates of the SMR dashboard before publication?
 - How to find the right balance between proactive/observer involvement in different new (SMR) pre-licensing initiatives and the progress and efforts needed from the regulator involved?

- How to take the maximum benefit from the Commission Grant Scheme for SMRs pre-licensing?
- How to best coordinate these efforts with the IAEA NHSI?

Mr Thomas Augustin (AT) proposed that the task force independently endorses dashboard updates without requiring Plenary approval each time, supported by **Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE)**. Mr Augustin expressed reservations about the Commission's dominant role in the Industrial Alliance, suggesting that the Commission should adopt an observational role instead. **Mr Garribba (Commission)** emphasised that discussions in ENSREG revolve around nuclear safety issues rather than policymaking. He also mentioned the Commission's treaty-enshrined right of initiative that it can use at its discretion.

Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE) questioned the necessity and the benefits of coordinating with NHSI. **Mr Brugmans** emphasised the importance of coordination with NHSI to avoid duplication and draw lessons learned from various experiences. While collaboration with NHSI is not currently strong, it is ensured that there is an understanding of what NHSI does.

Mr Pierre-Marie Abadie (FR) commented on the second question, stating that in his experience, early interaction is very useful in the pre-licensing process. However, as soon as you are entering the licensing process, the context is different, as you get back to a regulatory point of view. Therefore, one cannot have the same kind of interaction. Projects often attempt to advance too quickly, seeking to enter the licensing phase prematurely with designs that, sometimes, are not mature enough or are unstable. As a result, vendors retreat or remove part of the assessment or change their design during or just before the licensing process. Mr Abadie suggested having this discussion within the task force to exchange on experiences.

Mr Abadie also questioned how topics for position papers were selected and the potential involvement of WENRA.

Mr Brugmans (NL) noted that the task force only recently received a list of topics from TWG6, to which the task force is providing feedback. TWG6 will produce a draft position paper, the task force will reflect on this and provide its comments, on the basis of which TWG6 will finalise its paper. The task force will discuss whether and where follow-up work by regulators is needed. Mr Mark Foy, the chair of WENRA, had already agreed to have coordination with WENRA on this point, as a follow-up by WENRA may be the best way to proceed if it's a technical topic.

Mr Jan Panek (Commission) clarified that topics identified by the Alliance (and specifically its Technical Working Group for Safety and Safeguards - TWG6) are based on issues raised by the nine projects. On the ways of coordination with the NHSI, Mr Panek emphasised the importance of having discussions on this within ENSREG. Such discussions should be prepared by the Task Force and focus on explaining NHSI's activities, complementarity between the work of NHSI, IAEA and the Alliance, as well as on the initiatives of the IAEA in the context of NHSI that relate to pre-licensing or other regulatory type of activities. The aim is to prioritise collaboration within the Alliance and potentially leverage NHSI were useful, e.g., due to the benefit of involving non-European regulatory authorities.

ENSREG took note of:

- the future activities of the SMR Task Force

ENSREG took the decision:

- on no need to endorse the updates of the SMR dashboard before publication
- to continue reporting on the SMR dashboard twice a year
- to exchange within the SMRs TF on the balance between proactive/observer involvement in different new (SMR) pre-licensing initiatives and efforts needed from the regulator involved and how to take the maximum benefit from the Commission Grant Scheme for SMRs pre-licensing
- for the SMRs TF to continue coordinating activities with the IAEA NHSI

4.3 Summary report on the lessons learned of the first cycle of the peer reviews under Article 14(3) of the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Directive 2011/70/Euratom

HLG-r(2025-57)_777 WG2 - Presentation on ARTEMIS report

Mr Marc Demarche, Chair of WG2, noted that while the plan was to bring this summary report to the Plenary for endorsement, there was a minor delay in the drafting of the final report. The document will be discussed at the next WG2 meeting in February 2026 and then presented for endorsement at the next ENSREG Plenary.

Mr Demarche highlighted that the subgroup working on the 10 years of implementation of the Waste Directive will continue in another format. This subgroup aims to identify and collect elements requiring clarification or modification, contributing to the Commission's evaluation of the Waste Directive. Besides this, other topics handled by WG2 will also be incorporated, such as the European Parliament Pilot Project and the Waste Classification System.

5. Euratom Peer Reviews and synergies with IAEA reviews

5.1 Topical Peer Review

5.1.1 Outcomes of the TPR II, lessons learned, and next steps (TPR II NAcP template)

HLG-r(2025-57)_783 TPR II Board_Report to ENSREG 57th Meeting - 30 October 2025

HLG-r(2025-57)_790 WG1 Report to 57 Plenary - discussion items

HLG-p(2025-57)_220 TPR II - NAcP template

Ms Sylvie Cadet-Mercier, TPR II Board Chair, presented the main outcomes of TPR II and the lessons learned, highlighting that

- to address the identified areas for improvement and challenges, national and ENSREG action plans should be developed,
- participating countries should consider how insights from the TPR, and in particular their CSFs, are transferable to their “represented installations” when developing their NAcP.

The Board encouraged countries to examine all findings from this peer review - regardless of their categorisation (good practice, area of good performance, area for improvement) - and assess their applicability to enhance fire protection

Under Chapter 4 of the NAcP template, Ms Cadet-Mercier reiterated that reporting under this Chapter is encouraged, but voluntary. The Swedish comment on adding the word “optional” to the title was accepted for the final version of the NAcP template.

The Board provided a comprehensive questionnaire for gathering lessons learned, which resulted in 15 recommendations designed to enhance the efficiency and effectiveness of future TPRs. The Board also recognised good practices of this TPR to consider for future TPRs.

The Board invited ENSREG and WENRA to take into account the feedback when developing the future TPR exercises.

Ms Iga Pocztarek-Tofil, the WG1 Chair, emphasised WG1’s priority to take into account the lessons learned from the current TPR process. A small task force within WG1 led by Sweden has been established to prepare the guidelines for the entire TPR process, aiming to deliver the first proposal by the end of the next year. Ms Pocztarek-Tofil emphasised the importance of cooperation during the process of developing these guidelines, particularly between WG1 and 3, as well as WG3’s work in increasing stakeholder engagement in the TPR process. WG1 and 3 will work together on the Terms of Reference for the TPR Focus Group. The adoption of National Action Plans by 31 August 2026 is key for implementing TPR2 outcomes. WG1 will track and report on the progress of these plans regularly to the Plenary.

Mr João Oliveira Martins, WG3 Chair, clarified that the work of WG3 is to support the stakeholder engagement, not to do the engagement, as this responsibility rests with the TPR Board. Mr Oliveira Martins highlighted that the aim is to bring a proposal for the Terms of Reference of the TPR Focus Group at the next Plenary. In response to Italy's feedback during the written procedure on the Terms of Reference, WG3 is collaborating with Italy, the TPR Board, and WG1 to formulate a proposal suitable for approval.

Ms Christina Raith (AT), supported by **Michael Knochenhauer (SE)**, raised reservations regarding Chapter 4 of the NAcP template and inquired whether an updated document is available to confirm if comments on making it “optional” have been incorporated.

Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE) highlighted the continual challenge of effectively utilising limited resources for TPR noting that resources defined early for TPR II were either reassigned to other places in SSM or had entirely stopped working at SSM. Mr Knochenhauer questioned the necessity for actions for improvement outlined in Chapter 4.3. He argued that if a particular action for improvement is applicable to any installations reviewed in TPR II, those actions would have already been identified during the TPR II process.

Ms Sylvie Cadet-Mercier, TPR II Board Chair, clarified that some experts were nominated to review installations but were not there, meaning that there are discrepancies in the installation reviews. Ms Cadet-Mercier also emphasised that if improvement areas are absent from the National Assessment Reports (NAR), she would suggest evaluating observed improvement areas in terms of their relevance and applicability.

Ms Iga Pocztarek-Tofil, the WG1 Chair noted that WG1 is expected to devise an action plan addressing EU-wide challenges identified by TPR II. **Ms Pocztarek-Tofil** highlighted the need for volunteers to assist her in formulating the action plan and invited countries willing to assist in this task to contact her.

ENSREG took note of:

- the report of TPR Board and WG1
- WG3 Chair proposed line of action regarding ToR of TPR Focus Group
- WG1 commitment to report on the progress of the NACPs regularly to the Plenary
- WG1 Chair's call for volunteers to assist her in preparing the action plan for the EU-wide challenges

ENSREG took the decision:

- to endorse the TPR II NAcP template with agreed adjustments

5.1.1 Process and timing for the choice of TPR III topic

Ms Iga Pocztarek-Tofil, the WG1 Chair highlighted that TPR III is set to begin in 2029, therefore, the topic will have to be selected by the end of next year, as per past practice. She requested Plenary approval for seeking assistance from WENRA with the selection of the topic for the next TPR, proposing that the ENSREG Chair sends a formal invitation to the WENRA Chair to start the procedure of drafting the list of topics that can be selected for TPR III. Existing suggestions from WENRA's 2020-21 list will be reviewed for relevance in adherence to established criteria, including the topic's scope within the NSD, universality, coverage by existing safety standards, and representing an area where improvement may be expected.

As Vice-Chair of WENRA, Mr Petteri Tiippana stated that WENRA is ready and willing to take part in the selection of the TPR III topic. WENRA will be prepared to start working on this after WENRA's Plenary meeting.

Ms Iga Pocztarek-Tofil, the WG1 Chair, also noted that WG1 needs to propose the process of the TPR III review. While requesting WENRA's assistance with topic selection, WG1 will simultaneously focus on defining the review procedure (all steps needed in preparation of TPR III). This includes steps such as stakeholders' engagement, drafting of the technical specifications, selection of the TPR Board, which Ms Pocztarek-Tofil will present early next year for the Plenary's approval. The WG1 asked members to reflect on past experiences from TPR II to identify potential improvements or adjustments in the schedule. Contributions from members on organising the process are welcomed. Additionally, the drafting of technical specifications will rely on WENRA's expertise once the topic is selected.

Mr Massimo Garribba (Commission) recommended that the selection of the topic for TPR III should be finalised by mid-2026. To achieve this, he suggested the possibility of organising a dedicated side meeting during the ENSREG Conference. Reflecting on past discussions regarding TPR II, Mr Garribba highlighted the significance of resource allocation. Consequently, he recommended that multiple topics be proposed for selection, allowing for a choice among them.

Mr Petteri Tiippana (FI) informed that he will work towards providing preliminary thoughts by the spring Plenary. He suggested broadening the consultation process to include perspectives from industry operators and the safety research community to identify a reasonable and topical theme for the next peer review. **The ENSREG Chair** clarified that interaction with the industry and research could be conducted directly by WENRA before submitting proposal for future topics.

Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE) raised concerns about the tight timeframe for selecting TPR topics by mid-2026, noting the limited schedule with only one WENRA meeting and one ENSREG Plenary before the deadline. He suggested proposing candidate topics at the next ENSREG Plenary, with final selection at the autumn Plenary next year. **Mr Petteri Tiippana** clarified that whether the ENSREG spring Plenary deadline is feasible will be discussed at the WENRA Plenary.

ENSREG took note of:

- **WG1 upcoming work for defining the TPR III procedure that will be presented for ENSREG endorsement**
- **WG 1 chair's request to members to identify areas of improvement in scheduling the process**

ENSREG took the decision:

- **to proceed with the formal request to the WENRA Chair to help with the selection process**
- **to propose candidate topics for TPR III at the next ENSREG spring Plenary, with final selection at the autumn Plenary in 2026**

5.2 IRRS

5.2.1 Compatibility of the IAEA IRRS Focused Scope Guidelines with the Nuclear Safety Directive

Ms Iga Pocztarek-Tofil, the WG1 Chair, recalled the preparation process and gathered feedback.

The first conclusion was that in principle, the new proposal is in line with the requirements of the NSD, therefore the IRRS mission can still be considered as the review required every 10 years by the NSD. The second conclusion was that as countries are in different situations, not

all of them need the workshop on IRRS and SARIS - IAEA has confirmed that the workshop is optional.

- The new proposal from the IAEA is suggesting **essential technical areas** (ETAs) that should be included in every focused scope mission that is going to be implemented.
- Together with the Commission, an analysis showed these areas largely correspond to NSD requirements. However, countries had some comments on what should be added to the guidelines to be fully in line with the NSD.
- The IAEA will need ENSREG confirmation that IRRS focused scope mission guidelines should be modified to include additional ETAs for EU Member States to better reflect compliance with the NSD requirements.

ENSREG took the decision:

- **to endorse WG1 proposal to confirm with the IAEA that IRRS focused scope mission guidelines should be modified to include additional ETAs for EU Member States to better reflect compliance with the NSD requirements.**

6. ENSREG Conference

6.1 Exchanges on trends in Nuclear Safety Regulatory Authorities roles and independence

Mr Jan Panek (Commission) referred briefly to recent international developments impacting regulatory authorities, notably the White House-initiated review and reform of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC), emphasising the need for the NRC to expedite licensing processes for various nuclear investments, including large-scale reactors and SMRs.

Mr Panek highlighted that some ENSREG members expressed concerns about potential impacts of such reforms on regulatory independence. High-level dialogues between the US and EU have resulted in plans to establish closer cooperation between the Commission, US DOE, and NRC, aiming for joint approaches to SMR licensing. Mr Panek expressed interest in ENSREG Members' views on these developments.

Mr Marco Brugmans (NL) stressed the importance of maintaining the independence of regulators to ensure safety assessments align with those established in Europe, incorporating both IAEA safety standards and the requirements of the NSD and national regulations. He noted ongoing collaboration efforts during the pre-licensing phase as critical to preparing for current developments. Mr Brugmans highlighted the SMR Task Force as a valuable resource for learning from experiences.

Mr Brugmans emphasised that safety should remain a top priority in Europe, arguing it complements rather than opposes efficiency. He discussed recent perceptions that short-term

efficiency benefits the nuclear sector but advocated for addressing efficiency through proactive early-stage involvement jointly by national regulators. This approach aims to prevent design changes later in development, ensuring a smooth final implementation of new nuclear projects in the EU.

Mr Pierre-Marie Abadie (FR) expressed alignment with the Commission and emphasised that the upcoming ENSREG conference would play a critical role in addressing the new regulatory context. The steering committee integrated three core ideas into its proposal: 1) safety should not be seen as opposing efficiency; 2) a strong foundation in science-based, fact-based safety is essential; 3) stakeholders' confidence in regulators and their independence are crucial for public involvement. Mr Abadie concluded by noting the numerous upcoming conferences (IAEA International Conference on Effective Nuclear and Radiation Regulatory Systems, Vienna April 27 to 30; ENSREG Conference, Brussels June 16 and 17; and IAEA International Conference on Topical Issues in Nuclear Installation Safety, Vienna June 29 to July 3), which provide an opportunity to promote the message that safety is integral to global performance and should complement, not oppose, efficiency in achieving overall efficiency goals.

Mr Colin Tait (UK) reassured ENSREG of the ONR's commitment to maintaining regulatory independence, emphasising that ongoing engagement with the NRC will not compromise this principle. Independence, however, should not preclude the exploration of new collaborative approaches, increased efficiency, and the potential benefits of new technologies.

Mr Petteri Tiippana as WENRA Vice-Chair recalled that WENRA has previously discussed the topic of regulatory pressure due to factors such as climate change and energy security. About three years ago, a statement was issued on this topic. Given current trends, another statement is anticipated on Long-Term Operation (LTO) following the next WENRA's Plenary meeting. This statement will emphasise regulatory independence, but also the responsibility of other stakeholders, governments and operators, to ensure safety.

On behalf of HERCA, Mr Michael Knochenhauer highlighted the statement that HERCA has issued in June on the importance of maintaining trust in the international radiological protection system and regulatory independence.

The ENSREG Chair noted a strong consensus on the importance of regulatory independence and stressed that there is no inherent conflict between safety and efficiency. He acknowledged the evolution of the system post-Fukushima and suggested that now is a good time to optimise the system without compromising safety fundamentals. The Chair suggested coordinating preparation for upcoming events, advocating for clear, consistent messaging across conferences. In that sense, he proposed that the heads of the Steering Committees of these three conferences interact to ensure that the topics covered are not repeated and that Mr Abadie's proposed message on safety as an integral part of efficiency is included in the conclusions of the three events. He encouraged maintaining these discussions on agendas and using the conference to deepen dialogues on independence and efficiency.

After **Mr Brugmans (NL)** asked for the reflection of the Commission on these discussions, **Mr Jan Panek (Commission)** echoed Mr Abadie's comments that the ENSREG Conference could

be part of the response to these new trends. On contacts with the US related to SMRs, Mr Panek informed that outreach has been made to both the US DOE and NRC. The Commission will share updates if concrete outcomes follow from the discussions and will seek reflections from members on how to take this forward. He noted that advanced SMR projects based on US-originating designs exist within the EU, underscoring the value of ongoing dialogue with the US.

The ENSREG Chair concluded that ENSREG mandates Mr Brugmans to present ENSREG SMR TF activities during upcoming EU-US exchanges on SMR regulation.

ENSREG took the decision:

- to ensure clear and consistent messaging across the three upcoming conferences next year on the importance of regulatory independence and efficiency.
- Mandate Mr Brugmans to present ENSREG SMR TF activities during the upcoming EU-US exchanges on SMR regulation.

6.2 ENSREG Conference umbrella / topic & 6.3 Session topics

HLG-r(2025-57)_785 Umbrella topic and sessions_for plenary 2025-10-30

HLG-r(2025-57)_786 2025-10-30 Conference ENSREG

The ENSREG Chair invited Mr Luc Chaniel, the Chair of the Steering Committee (SC) of the ENSREG Conference to take the floor.

Mr Luc Chaniel (FR) began by expressing his appreciation for the introductory words and presented the following points:

- The conference dates have been confirmed as June 16 and 17, with a one-and-a-half-day schedule.
- The venue is expected to be in Brussels, likely at the Brey building, pending confirmation of the meeting room from the Commission.
- The proposal of the umbrella topic of the 8th European Nuclear Safety Conference is: *“Regulating nuclear safety in a rapidly changing and challenging environment”*. The current nuclear context, with its challenges and opportunities, was considered a relevant topic for the conference.
- The SC Chair presented the four proposed sessions for the conference:
 - Session 1: Performance and nuclear safety in the new nuclear context
 - Session 2: The role of research, innovation and technical assessment for continuous improvement in safety
 - Session 3: Preserving and enhancing public confidence in nuclear safety

- Session 4: How to respond collectively to risks to nuclear safety from geopolitical conflicts
- The SC Chair proposed several ideas to make the conference more engaging and interactive:
 - Having multiple moderators: one general moderator and additional moderators for each session.
 - Considering ENSREG members as potential moderators.
 - Introducing a "session zero" to set the scene, to have some keynote speakers to highlight what will be presented in the different sessions and share views on the importance of the topic.
- The next steps include taking into account comments and observations from the audience, and starting the work on session speakers. The next meeting scheduled for 18 November.

The ENSREG Chair thanked the Steering Committee for the preparation of the Conference and expressed support for the umbrella topic.

Mr Marc Demarche (BE) brought up a point that was also discussed with the EESC for the PINC, which is the importance of not forgetting the back end of the fuel cycle and nuclear safety. Specifically, he emphasised the need to consider the safe management of radioactive waste and spent fuel. Mr Demarche suggested that waste management organisations should be included as stakeholders.

Mr Massimo Garribba (Commission) sought clarification on what the term “geopolitical conflicts” means, expressing some uncertainty about the term’s clarity. **Mr Luc Chaniel** explained that the term "geopolitical conflicts" was chosen to avoid using the word "war" but acknowledged that it primarily refers to the situation during a war. **Mr Thomas Augustin (AT)** and **Mr Paweł Pytlarczyk (PL)** shared the Commission’s view, stating that we should not use harmless words when talking about the risks for nuclear safety and consider the word “war”. Mr Pytlarczyk referred to public consultations in PL, where people expressed concerns about such risks in case of a war. Therefore, changing the term to “war” addresses the concerns of people and their interests.

Mr Oleh Korikov (UA) offered the active participation of Ukraine in the Conference, given the country's current experience with war and its impact on nuclear safety. He proposed that Ukraine could share its experiences and cases related to nuclear safety during wartime, such as implementing resilience, regulating and operating nuclear facilities during war, dealing with non-compliance to nuclear safety principles during war. **Mr Chaniel** confirmed that the SC wants to invite UA for Session 4.

The ENSREG Chair suggested referring to “armed conflicts” instead of “geopolitical conflicts”, as this is the name of the task force that ENSREG has established. The ENSREG Chair also clarified that the SC has the full responsibility in selecting speakers for different sessions. If there are not enough candidates, the ENSREG Chair suggested the Chair of the Conference circulate a call for requesting candidates.

ENSREG took the decision:

- To endorse the date of the Conference
- To endorse the umbrella title of the 2026 ENSREG Conference.
- To endorse the session topics with amendments to the title of the fourth session
- To support the coordination among chairs of the three upcoming Conferences to select not more than three messages that will be consistently promoted.

7. Nuclear Safety during Armed Conflicts and alignment ahead of CNS review meeting

7.1 Major challenges to regulatory oversight in Ukraine

HLG-r(2025-57)_792 SNRIU ENSREG 57-updated

Mr Oleh Korikov (UA) provided an update on the current situation in Ukraine. Regarding the Chornobyl NPP, Mr Korikov informed that after the damage from the Russian drone at the Chornobyl NPP, the hole is covered from rain and snow. The membrane is destroyed, the confinement function is unavailable, the ventilation systems cannot manage under pressure, and the crane system is damaged and unavailable. Maintaining main goals and design functions of the NSC is not possible.

The International Chornobyl Cooperation Account (ICCA) meeting will take place in the first week of December in London. Ukraine invited supporting member states to attend the assembly and contribute to the ICCA.

Mr Korikov informed that following the IAEA monitoring activities to electrical substations, the process of developing a methodology to assess the risk of NPP operations under degraded grid conditions is ongoing.

Mr Korikov also presented the status of the damages at the different facilities and update on the ZNPP loss of offsite power, with the longest lasting 30 days. Currently, the ZNPP is connected to the UA grid and repairs to the second power line are ongoing.

According to media, the Russian regulator (Rostekhnadzor) issued a license for the operation of a dry spent nuclear fuel storage facility (DSFSF) at ZNPP. This is illegal, disregards design documentation and violates the copyrights with US vendors who are owners of the technology. Finally, the RU regulator lacks relevant expertise to perform nuclear radiation safety analysis on nuclear facilities in Ukraine.

Concerning the Joint Convention lessons learned, Mr Korikov argued that it was not possible to achieve the desired wording through consensus in the summary report, as there would always be opposition from the opposing side and final formulations were double sensing. Additionally, there is lack of information in the President's Report.

For the upcoming CNS review meeting, Mr Korikov suggested being more precise and ensuring that the wording reflects the real nuclear safety situation in UA. For this he called on members to address their questions on ZNPP to Ukraine, and not Russia, and Ukraine will reply in a way

to ensure reflection of the real situation and its illegal seizure by Russia. He also proposed having separate discussions on the possible means to achieve more productive results and correct wording.

ENSREG took note of:

- **The updates on the situation in Ukraine**

7.2 Discussion on the objectives and some preliminary conclusions from reflection on nuclear safety in the context of armed conflict

HLG-r(2025-57)_788 2025-10-30 RG NSAC for 57th ENSREG Plenary_FINAL

Mr Michael Knochenhauer (SE) provided some preliminary conclusions from the Reflection Group, by raising the following points:

- The Reflection Group (RG) started its work in February this year and the aim is to finalise the analysis within the time frame of the Work Programme (for the Autumn Plenary 2026).
- The RG looks at two cases:
 - Maintaining nuclear safety in a situation that has required shut down, e.g. due to occupation.
 - Maintaining nuclear safety in conditions where energy production at an NPP continues during an armed conflict.
- The RG presented its progress and planned outcomes:
 - Development of the analysis framework, which is a listing of preconditions to maintain nuclear safety (finalised).
 - Ongoing right now is the testing of the framework by members of RG by populating it with their own experience and national approaches.
 - The Analysis will look at the total input from the RG, looking at where there are the least common denominators and significant national differences
- The RG defined five high-level themes (conditions on national level, organisational basis, plant safety, off-site aspects and communication) and topics under these themes describing the desired state, and the aspects to explain what we want to achieve.
- This matrix provides a checklist for developing a preparedness to maintain nuclear safety.

ENSREG took note of:

- **The report on the update of the work of the Reflection Group and its next steps**
- **RG plans to present a draft of the report at the next ENSREG Plenary and present a finalised analysis at the Autumn Plenary in 2026**

7.3 Alignment of positions on the Convention on Nuclear Safety Review Meeting - EURATOM Comments on RF report on ZNPP

Mr Massimo Garribba (Commission) highlighted the importance of considering the experience of the Joint Convention, where consensus was reached, but the resulting text was almost meaningless. Therefore, Mr Garribba encouraged members to reflect on the questions posed to Ukraine so that the responses could accurately record and report on the situation at the ZNPP. In the same vein, he recommended that the Reflection Group incorporate into their considerations the requisite level of preparedness to address similar conflict situations, and the optimal timing for maintaining radiological safety while continuing electricity production.

The ENSREG Chair acknowledged the importance of lessons learned and underlined the importance of the work of Reflection Group for future considerations.

Mr Petteri Tiippana on behalf of WENRA reported that WENRA had been discussing this situation as well, and the plans of Russia to restart ZNPP at some point. WENRA's primary concern is the safety of the people. WENRA had drafted a statement on the situation. However, after reconsideration, WENRA decided not to issue the statement, as it might be used by Russia to justify the restart. WENRA believes that ENSREG may be in a better position to issue a more politically oriented statement addressing safety. The proposal was strongly supported by **Mr Garribba** and **Mr Panek (Commission)**. The timing of the next planned Plenary, just before the CNS, is ideal to issue such statement.

The ENSREG Chair suggested that the Commission helps in preparing a draft statement regarding ZNPP safety situation for discussion at the next plenary.

Mr Petteri Tiippana agreed and informed that WENRA can support the drafting as well, if ENSREG decides to consult WENRA while preparing the statement. **Mr Panek** highlighted that the ENSREG statement should be separated from the Euratom statement at the CNS which we hope will be supported by the other Delegations at the CNS. He stressed the need to find the right balance, so these two statements reinforce each other, rather than duplicate.

Mr Oleh Korikov highlighted the importance of keeping records about violations by Russia of the Convention on Nuclear Safety and standards in Ukraine. Mr Korikov suggested to share questions that UA considers relevant to raise, including technical questions, which should be addressed only to Ukraine as the legal owner of the installation.

Mr Jan Panek (Commission) highlighted the need to coordinate the questions to be asked in the respective country groups to Ukraine and Russia, in order to expose the inappropriateness of their illegal reporting of ZNPP, as it was done in previous review meetings. He also recalled the statement of IAEA's DG Grossi on Ukraine at the previous CNS Review Meeting and encouraged ENSREG Members to inform themselves on the diplomatic efforts of their governments in preparation of the upcoming Review Meeting. Mr Panek also highlighted that despite the coordination in the Council before the Joint Convention review meeting earlier this year, it was observed that the Member States representatives did not always adhere to the agreed coordinated strategy, leading to some missed opportunities. Members were urged

to ensure better alignment between preparatory efforts and on-the-ground action by enhancing communication within national delegations to the Review Meeting.

Mr Marco Brugmans (NL) stressed the importance of avoiding questions to the Russia that could contribute to justification of the situation.

The ENSREG Chair concluded that ENSREG welcomes the proposal from the Commission to centralise the interaction within the country groups of the CNS. He suggested having a draft for the ENSREG statement early next year at the latest, in order to have sufficient time in advance for internal consultations and diplomatic services and have a written procedure.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- **prepare an ENSREG statement on the ZNPP safety situation for endorsement at the next Plenary, with support from the Commission**
- **coordinate questions with the members belonging to the same country group as the Russia to highlight the illegality of their reporting on ZNPP**
- **use national or collective diplomatic channels to promote strong opening by DG Grossi at the CNS review meeting**

8. Fusion

8.1 Fusion strategy – conclusions from stakeholder consultations

HLG-r(2025-57)_795 Fusion Strategy conclusions

HLG-r(2025-57)_787 Minutes - ENSREG Meeting on EU Fusion Strategy 20250924

Ms Borislava Batandjieva presented the key outcomes of the stakeholder's consultations and thanked ENSREG for active participation in the consultation on the EU Fusion Strategy on 24 September. She highlighted that compared to fission facilities, there are no self-sustaining chain reactions, which lead to no risk of criticality, and lower radiological consequences in the event of severe accidents.

Ms Batandjieva informed that the Commission's proposal for the new multi-annual financial framework (MFF) 2028-2034 foresees over 5 billion euros for the completion of the ITER project and commissioning in 2034, and over 2 billion euros for other fusion activities, including public-private partnerships. The Commission is preparing an EU fusion strategy, expected for adoption at the beginning of 2026.

Ms Batandjieva called for endorsement of a task force on fusion energy to start the work next year after the adoption of the EU Fusion strategy, requesting ENSREG members to send nominations by 22 December. She suggested having the first meeting in the second or third quarter of next year after adoption of the EU Fusion Strategy and the endorsement of the ToR

by ENSREG in the spring Plenary. This Task Force will have the purpose of advising and supporting the Commission in enabling an EU legal framework for fusion facilities.

8.2 Views on future EU fusion regulatory framework & 8.3 ENSREG's involvement in the way forward

The ENSREG Chair thanked the Commission for this update and proposal for the next steps of the EU Fusion Strategy and assumed that the main conclusions of the ENSREG Consultation will be considered in preparing the final version of the strategy.

Mr Andreas Sikorski (DE) expressed support for the establishment of a task force and would like to take part with an expert from Germany. **Mr Panek** stressed that identifying firstly members interested in participating in the task force can then help shape the ToR. The **ENSREG Chair, Mr Juan Carlos Lentijo** stated that Spain will be interested in participating in this task force.

ENSREG took note of:

- the summary of the ENSREG consultations on 24 September 2025

ENSREG took the decision to:

- establish a task force on fusion energy in 2026
- launch a call for experts' nomination to the task force by 22 December 2025
- present a draft ToR for the task force at its next Plenary meeting, prepared by the Commission

9. Next meeting and closing remarks

The ENSREG Chair proposed the date of 26 March 2026 for the next ENSREG Plenary. He highlighted that there are not many calendar options given the many different conferences next spring. No comments were received from ENSREG Members and the date for the next ENSREG Plenary was endorsed for 26 March 2026.

The Chair concluded that the new approach worked well in this meeting and members had enough time to focus on the important discussions and make important decisions.

ANNEX I



European High-Level Group on Nuclear Safety and Waste Management

Agenda

57th meeting of ENSREG

30 October 2025 (9:00 – 17:00 Brussels time)

EP Building Altiero Spinelli, Meeting room A1G2

60 Rue Wiertz, Brussels, Belgium

Part I – Closed session

9:00 - 9:30

1. Administrative matters and endorsement of items without objections

- New approach to plenary proceedings – evolving agenda focusing on strategic matters (see the Annex with items for endorsement) (ENSREG Chair)
- Nominations (ENSREG Chair)

9:30 – 10:10

2. Information items

- BAT Technical Parameters under EU Taxonomy (WG1 Chair)
- Outcomes of ENSREG meeting with the EESC on PINC (ENSREG Chair)
- Grant Scheme progress and next steps (EC)
- Post-Fukushima Stress Tests (ST Board Chair)

10:10 – 10:25

Coffee break

Part II – Open session

10:25 - 10:40

3. Administrative matters and endorsement of items without objections

- New approach to plenary proceedings – evolving agenda focusing on strategic matters (see the Annex with items for endorsement) (ENSREG Chair)
- Key outcomes from the closed session (ENSREG Chair)

10:40 – 11:40

4. Information items

- European Industrial Alliance on SMRs - Strategic Action Plan (EC)
- Update by ENSREG SMR Task Force Chair (SMR Dashboard) (SMR TF Chair)
- Summary report of the first cycle of peer reviews under Article 14(3) of the Spent Fuel and Radioactive Waste Directive 2011/70/Euratom (WG2)

11:40 – 12:40

5. Euratom Peer Reviews and synergies with IAEA reviews

- **Topical Peer Review**
 - Outcomes of TPR II, lessons learned and next steps (TPR II NAcP template) (TPR Board and WG1 Chairs)
 - Process and timing for choice of TPR III topic (WG1 Chair)
- **IRRS**
 - Compatibility of the IAEA IRRS Focused Scope Guidelines with the Nuclear Safety Directive (WG1 Chair)

12:40 – 14:00

Lunch break

14:00 – 14:45

6. ENSREG Conference

- Exchanges on trends in Nuclear Safety Regulatory Authorities roles and independence (EC)
- ENSREG Conference umbrella / title (SC Chair)
- Session topics (SC Chair)

14:45 – 15:40

7. Nuclear Safety during Armed Conflicts and alignment ahead of CNS review meeting

- Major challenges to regulatory oversight in Ukraine (SNRIU)
- Discussion on the objectives and some preliminary conclusions from RG on nuclear safety in the context of armed conflict (RG Chair)
- Alignment of positions on the Convention on Nuclear Safety Review Meeting - EURATOM Comments on RF report on ZNPP (EC)

15:40 – 15:50

Coffee break

15:50 – 16:45

8. Fusion

- Fusion Strategy – conclusions from stakeholder consultations (EC)
- Views on future EU fusion regulatory framework (ENSREG Members)
- ENSREG's involvement in the way forward (ENSREG Chair)

16:45 – 17:00

9. Next meeting and closing remarks

Documents for endorsement of items without objections

Part I – Closed session

- Proposed follow up for Nuclear Safety Directive implementation ([Link](#)) (ENER, WG1)
- Lessons learned from 10 years of Implementation of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom ([Link](#)) (WG2)
- Technical Position on Radioactive Waste Classification in the EU ([Link](#)) (WG2)

Part II – Open session

- Summary reports (brief slides) from WG Chairs ([Link to all WG Reports](#)) (WG Chairs)

Nominations to the Stress Test Board

- Mr Cantemir CIUREA-ERCĂU, President of CNCA
- Ms Mădălina COCA, Head of Service, CNCA

List of Working Group meetings

- Reflection Group on nuclear safety in the context of armed conflict: 24 November 2025
- SMR Task Force: 1 December 2025
- WG 1: 19 February 2026
- WG 2: 19 February 2026
- WG 3: 5 March 2026
- Stress Test Board: TBC

Annex II

List of Members and Observers

(Status 28 November 2025)

Members:

Austria	Mag. T. Augustin, Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry, Climate and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management Ms C. Raith, Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry, Climate and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management
Belgium	Mr P. Absil, Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC) Mr M. Demarche, ONDRAF-NIRAS
Bulgaria	Mr T. Bachiyski, Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency (BNRA) Mr B. Stanimirov, Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency (BNRA)
Commission	Mr M. Garribba, Deputy Director-General, DG ENER Mr J. Panek, Director for Nuclear Energy, Safety and ITER, DG ENER
Croatia	Ms R. Laknar, Ministry of the Interior Ms A. Getaldić, Ministry of the Interior
Cyprus	Mr D. Sakkas, Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance (MLSI) Mr M. Tzortzis, Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance (MLSI)
Czechia	Mr M. Merxbauer, State Office for Nuclear Safety
Denmark	Mr J. Thomsen, Danish Emergency Management Agency Mr K. Breddam, Danish Health Authority
Estonia	Ms K. Muru, Estonian Environmental Bureau Mr M. Lepasson, Estonian Environmental Bureau
Finland	Mr P. Tiippana, Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)
France	Mr P.-M. Abadie, Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Authority (ASNR) Mr G. Bouyt, Ministry for the Ecological Transition
Germany	Mr A. Sikorski, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety
Greece	Dr. Ch. Housiadas, Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE) Ms E. Carinou, Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)
Hungary	Ms A. B. Kádár, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA) Mr L. Juhász, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA)
Ireland	Mr Pat Byrne, Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)
Italy	Mr F. Campanella, National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN) Mr F. Giorgianni, National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN)

Latvia	Ms D. Šatrovska, State Environmental Service Ms G. Šmerliņa, Ministry of Climate and Energy
Lithuania	Mr M. Demčenko, State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI) Mr S. Šlepavičius, State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)
Luxembourg	Ms J. Hilschmann, Ministry of Health and Social Security
Malta	Mr P. Brejza, Radiation Protection Commission (RPC) Mr J. Cremona, Radiation Protection Commission (RPC)
The Netherlands	Mr M. Brugmans, Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS) Ms A. van Bolhuis, Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)
Poland	Ms I. Pocztarek-Tofil, National Atomic Energy Agency (PAA) Mr P. Pytlarczyk, National Atomic Energy Agency (PAA)
Portugal	Mr J. Oliveira Martins, Portuguese Environment Agency (APA) Mr P. Rosário, Portuguese Environment Agency (APA)
Romania	Mr C. Ciurea Ercau, National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control (CNCAN) Mr M. Gaina, Nuclear & Radioactive Waste Agency (ANDR)
Slovakia	Eng. M. Žiaková, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic Ms J. Szelecka, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
Slovenia	Mr I. Sirc, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration Mr J. Škodlar, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
Spain	Mr J.-C. Lentijo, Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CSN) Ms T. Vázquez, Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CSN)
Sweden	Mr M. Knochenhauer, Swedish Radiation Safety Authority Mr P. Brodd, Ministry of Climate and Enterprise

Observers:

Council of the EU:	Mr J. Van Elst, Energy Policies Unit, General Secretariat
HERCA:	Mr J.-L. Lachaume, HERCA Chair
IAEA:	Ms A. Bradford, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security
Norway:	Mr H. Mattsson, Norwegian Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority
OECD NEA:	Ms R. Tadesse, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency
Switzerland:	Mr M. Kenzelmann, Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
Türkiye:	Ms O. Özdere Gülol, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Republic of Türkiye (NDK)
Ukraine:	Mr O. Korikov, State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine (SNRIU)
United Kingdom:	Mr C. Tait, Office for Nuclear Regulation of United Kingdom (ONR)
WENRA:	Mr M. Foy, WENRA Chair

Annex IIIENSREG 57th meeting presence list**Members and Experts**

Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
AUSTRIA	Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry, Climate and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management	AUGUSTIN	Thomas
AUSTRIA	Federal Ministry for Agriculture and Forestry, Climate and Environmental Protection, Regions and Water Management	RAITH	Christina
BELGIUM	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC)	ABSIL	Pascale
BELGIUM	ONDRAF-NIRAS	DEMARCHE	Marc
BELGIUM	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC)	VAN CALOEN	Cédric
BULGARIA	Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency (BNRA)	KATZARSKA	Lidia
CROATIA	Ministry of the Interior	LAKNAR	Renata
CYPRUS	Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance (MLSI)	SAKKAS	Demetris
CYPRUS	Ministry of Labour and Social Insurance (MLSI)	TZORTZIS	Michalakis
CZECHIA	State Office for Nuclear Safety	CHÁRA	Jan
CZECHIA	State Office for Nuclear Safety	MERXBAUER	Michal
DENMARK	Danish Emergency Management Agency	THOMSEN	Jimmy
FINLAND	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)	TIIPPANA	Petteri
FINLAND	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)	LÅNG	Ossi

Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Authority (ASNR)	ABADIE	Pierre-Marie
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Authority (ASNR)	CADET MERCIER	Sylvie
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Authority (ASNR)	CHANIAL	Luc
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Authority (ASNR)	ETHVIGNOT	Thierry
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	KUHN	Sebastian
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	SIKORSKI	Andreas
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Climate Action, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety	TRAPP	Marcus
GREECE	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)	CARINOU	Eleftheria
IRELAND	Environmental Protection Agency	FANNING	Andy
ITALY	National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN)	CAMPANELLA	Francesco
ITALY	National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN)	DIONISI	Mario
ITALY	National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN)	MATTEOCI	Lamberto

Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
LITHUANIA	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)	ŠLEPAVIČIUS	Sigitas
LUXEMBOURG	Ministry of Health and Social Security	HILSCHMANN	Jessica
THE NETHERLANDS	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)	BRUGMANS	Marco
THE NETHERLANDS	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)	VAN RIXEL	Vincent
POLAND	National Atomic Energy Agency (PAA)	PYTLARCZYK	Pawel
POLAND	National Atomic Energy Agency (PAA)	POCZTAREK - TOFIL	Iga
PORTUGAL	Portuguese Environment Agency (APA)	OLIVEIRA MARTINS	João
PORTUGAL	Portuguese Environment Agency (APA)	ROSARIO	Pedro
SLOVAKIA	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic	SZELECKA	Jana
SLOVENIA	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration	ŠKODLAR	Jure
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CSN)	DE LOS REYES	Alfredo
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CSN)	LENTIJO	Juan Carlos
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CSN)	MARTÍN GRANADOS	Ignacio
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CSN)	VÁZQUEZ	Teresa
SWEDEN	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority	HEDBERG	Bengt
SWEDEN	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority	KNOCHENHAUER	Michael

Observers

Organisation	Surname	Name
HERCA	KNOCHENHAUER	Michael
Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority	MATTSSON	Håkan
State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine (SNRIU)	KORIKOV	Oleh
State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine (SNRIU)	GOROSHANSKYI	Andrii
Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)	KENZELMANN	Marc
Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)	KOHLER	Loriane
United Kingdom – Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)	TAIT	Colin
WENRA	TIIPPANA	Petteri

European Commission

Surname	Name	Directorate General
Garribba	Massimo	Deputy Director General – DG ENER
Panek	Jan	Director for Nuclear Energy, Safety and ITER – DG ENER
Hübel	Michael	ESA Director-General – Euratom Supply Agency
Florea	Andrei-Ionut	Head of Unit D1 (Acting) – DG ENER
Brunetti	Gianfranco	Head of Unit D2 – DG ENER
Lopes Ramos	Ana Rita	Head of Unit D3 – DG ENER
Forestie	Benoit	Head of Unit D4 (Acting) – DG ENER
Dini	Ramune	Team Leader Unit D1 – DG ENER
Batandjieva	Borislava	Policy Officer Unit D4 – DG ENER
Volmich	Bianca	Policy Officer Unit D1– DG ENER

