



Minutes of the 35th meeting of ENSREG
 20th December 2017
 Brussels

Participants

ENSREG members from all EU Member States as well as the European Commission, with the exception of Estonia, Latvia, Romania and Malta were present in the meeting. Observers from Norway, the IAEA, the OECD-NEA were also present as well as the chairman of WENRA. On Commission side, representatives from DG JRC were also present in addition to representatives from DG ENER.

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda

The meeting was opened by the ENSREG Chairperson Mr Pierre-Franck Chevet. He recalled the objectives of the meeting and welcomed two new ENSREG members, Mr. Marc Demarche, the new Director General of ONDRAF-NIRAS for Belgium and Mr Mark Foy the new ONR Chief Inspector for the UK.

The minutes of the ENSREG 34th meeting were adopted pending a small modification raised by Germany of the text of one decision of Item 4 of the 34th ENSREG meeting agenda as no real decision was taken by ENSREG regarding the organisation of benchmarking exercise before 2020 (see below).

The agenda was adopted, however to better combined some of the presentations the order of the topics addressed during this meeting differs slightly from the agenda presented in Annex I.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Approve the 34th Minutes of Meeting with the following modification to one decision on Item 4 of the agenda "To consider organising before 2020 benchmarking exercises between EU countries on specific safety improvements to support getting a converging implementation of the Safety Objective".

2. Chairperson's introduction and report

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

[HLG_p\(2012-21\)_116 ENSREG Working Group Rules of Procedure](#)

The ENSREG Chairperson recalled that Mr. Richard Savage who was officially appointed in June 2017 as Vice Chairperson of ENSREG has left its position as Chief Inspector of ONR, end of October 2017. Mr Mark Foy has been nominated 1st of November 2017 as new ONR Chief Inspector. The Chairperson suggested to appoint Mr. Mark Foy as new Vice Chairperson of ENSREG. This was unanimously approved by the ENSREG Members.

ENSREG took the decision to

Appoint Mr Mark Foy from the UK for the position of ENSREG Vice Chairperson

3. Ru-106 releases

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_387 ASN Information notice on Ruthenium 106 \(Ru-106\)](#)

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_396 IRSN presentation RU-106 release](#)

During the period from the end of September to the beginning of October 2017 traces of the radioactive isotope Ruthenium-106 were measured in the air in a number of European countries, significant in some cases.

The ENSREG Chairperson had sent the 10 November 2017 a message to all ENSREG Members regarding this issue.

ENSREG Chairperson pointed out that ruthenium 106 is not normally detected in the air, its presence can only be linked to an uncontrolled release. The absence of any other artificial radionuclide rules out the possibility of a release from a nuclear reactor. However, a release such as this could come from a spent nuclear fuel reprocessing activity or the production of radioactive sources. ENSREG Chairperson mentioned that the French TSO carried out simulations to be presented jointly with its German counterpart that locate the potential origin of the release in the southern Urals.

ENSREG members recognized the urgency to undertake an investigation on this issue and acknowledged the invitation recently made by the Nuclear Safety Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE) to several European regulators and TSO's regarding the constitution of an Independent International Scientific Commission (IISC) on this issue.

On Request of ENSREG Chairperson, two representatives from French IRSN and German BfS made a presentation about the reverse calculations with real meteorological data that had been performed by both institutions to try to evaluate the origin and magnitude of the release. These calculations were based on the different detections of Ru-106 that have been made throughout Europe between the end of September and the beginning of October. The calculations of both institutions, despite using different methodologies, ended-up with the following results:

- Releases of Ruthenium-106 during the last week of September were estimated in the range of 100 to 300 TBq
- Event detected at the continental scale. No health or environmental impact in Europe.
- Most plausible zone of release lying in the southern Ural.

Other ENSREG Members indicated that they or their TSOs have performed similar analysis to those carried out by IRSN and BfS and that their results were similar.

The Commission representative indicated his satisfaction regarding the proactive approach taken by the ENSREG Chairperson and ENSREG Members on this issue. He emphasized that due to the low radiological significance of this situation in Europe, no information was received via the ECURIE or EURDEP systems. He indicated that the Commission is in contact with the IAEA regarding this matter and has written to the IAEA asking it to deploy all efforts to seek notification by IAEA of a related accident (IAEA responded on 6th December 2017). He stressed that despite the fact that radiation is no longer detectable, it is of the utmost importance to identify conclusively the source of the incident and its causes so as to avoid that such situation are repeated in the future. It is also important that trust in the international provisions and arrangements for emergency preparedness and response is not eroded. The Commission representative promoted the idea of having a coordinated response at EU level to the invitation sent by IBRAE and stressed that there is a certain urgency to discover the source and a need to ensure full transparency on the findings. The IAEA should be kept always in the loop.

Several ENSREG Members (e.g. SE, UK) indicated that they (or their TSO) had also received an invitation from IBRAE. A discussion took place regarding the role of the IAEA in this process, the credibility of the proposed IISC, the importance of transparency towards the public on such kind of issue, etc. ENSREG Chairperson underlined that a coordinated answer is needed prior to any individual ones.

ENSREG Members unanimously agreed that a coordinated response to this invitation should be provided by ENSREG Chairperson, which could then be complemented, based on the agreed wording, by bilateral replies from those EU regulators and TSO's that received the initial invitation.

It was agreed to prepare a letter to be sent by the ENSREG Chairperson to the regulatory authorities in the Russian Federation which are responsible for nuclear safety and radiological protection. A first draft of this letter was discussed during the meeting. An updated version of the letter was circulated to the ENSREG Members just after the meeting for a second review. The final version of the letter (see Annex III) was sent to Rostekhnadzor on the 22 December 2017.

The Netherlands representative asked that all measurement made within EU MS in September-October 2017 be made publically available. Most ENSREG Members indicated that they have no problem in providing the data. The Commission representative proposed to make the data available through EURDEP.

ENSREG took the decision to

Prepare and make open for comments until 8th of January 2018 a draft for a coordinated response under the heading of ENSREG to the regulatory authority (Rostechnadzor) regarding the constitution of an Independent International Scientific Commission (IISC) on this issue of Ruthenium-106 release (see Annex III). Due to the urgency to undertake an investigation on this issue and the fact that the draft letter was already presented at as well as discussed during the meeting a draft was circulated on 21st of December 2017 and comments were asked for to be sent not later than close of business 22nd of December 2017. Accordingly the letter was sent on 22nd of December 2017.”

Publish data on the Ru-106 measurements made in September-October 2017 on ENSREG Website

4. Topical Peer Review 2017

HLG_r(2017-35)_393 TPR Board Chair report to ENSREG Plenary

The ENSREG Chairperson introduced the 2nd key topic of this plenary meeting, namely the 1st Topical Peer Review. He gave the floor to the TPR Board Chairman who started by summarising the process, highlighting the steps already taken and the large work already ongoing and foreseen.

Following the establishment of the TPR Board during last ENSREG Plenary meeting, two Board meetings have already taken place the 19/09/2017 in Vienna and the 12/12/2017 in Brussels.

Based on the confirmation received following Board request, the final list of countries that will submit a report for this peer review was established. This list is the following (19 countries in total):

Belgium	Italy	Sweden
Bulgaria	Netherlands	United Kingdom
Czech Republic	Poland	Norway
Finland	Romania	Switzerland
France	Slovak Republic	Ukraine
Germany	Slovenia	
Hungary	Spain	

Reports from these countries are expected to be collected by the TPR secretariat and published on the ENSREG Website before the 8th January 2018. The TPR Board Chairman informed the ENSREG Members that the structure to publish the reports was already created on the ENSREG Website.

<http://www.ensreg.eu/country-specific-reports/EU-Member-States>

<http://www.ensreg.eu/country-specific-reports/Other-Countries>

Regarding the Questions/Answers process two specific webpages have also been developed on the ENSREG Website to address the questions from the public and from the peers (webpage for the peers being protected by a password). The above links will be fully activated on 8 January 2018.

The TPR Board Chairman presented the main decisions and actions taken by the Board since the Board is established. The main decisions are:

- Confirmation that the **1st public event to present the TPR process will takes place the 3 May 2018 in Brussels**
- Confirmation of the **date and place of the for the peer review workshop: 14 to 18 May 2018 in Luxembourg**
- Decouple the 2 last days of the workshop from the first week and postpone these two days to 6-7 June 2018 to finalise the work and workshop report

- Invite widely observers to the workshop to provide opportunities to learn and to disseminate information (IAEA, OECD-NEA and WANO and non EU countries with NPPs)
- Put more emphasis and resources on the Country Review Group to review to compare AMPs between participating countries "The core part of the Peer Review is Chapter 2 of national reports"
- Appointment of an additional coordinator for the Country Review Group (ASN is proposing Mrs Rachel Vaucher) and need of additional experts to work with the new coordinator and Project Manager
- Agreement at Board level on the Workshop summary report table of content, responsibilities within the Board to develop the chapters, the level of detail (final report around 50 – 70 pages), etc.
- Confirmation that as per TPR ToR the Workshop report will be generic (it will not contain country specific findings)
- Confirmation that country specific findings will be presented in a workshop presentation.

The TPR Board Chairman indicated to the ENSREG Members that to date the Board secretariat had only received 38 nominations (including project managers, rapporteurs and experts) from the different countries participating to this exercise. He highlighted that:

- Additional nomination of experts would be needed in particular for the Country Review Group which was initially composed only of a Project Manager + 4 rapporteurs
- Several ENSREG members have still not nominated any experts, rapporteurs or Project Managers
- Some ENSREG members have still not nominated points of contact for distribution purposes of all the information during the TPR preparation and review process (reports, Q/A, etc.).

He stressed that work is progressing by the countries and by the Board and although there are fine tuning to be made he is confident that everything will all be ready on time.

He concluded by highlighting the following key elements for the success of the Peer Review:

- Importance to ensure that the nominated PMs, rapporteurs and experts have time for the work during the springtime ("*it is not only the workshop that we need them*")
- Importance to participate actively during the questions and commenting period, and also during the workshop as well – necessity for the ENSREG Member to plan their resources accordingly

The Commission representative recalled that as it was already clearly stated during the 32nd ENSREG plenary meeting, the key objectives of this 1st Topical Peer Review are to comply with the Council Directive 2014/87/EURATOM, to share experience between EU Member States and to provide confidence to the public on this topic of "ageing management". To ensure the full credibility of the process, he stressed that it is extremely important to end-up not only with general recommendations for safety improvements following the TPR but also with country specific recommendations and for those of the MS which did not make it, to appoint very quickly additional experts.

The TPR Board Chairman recalled that the Workshop in May 2018 and the follow-up meeting in June 2018 are reserved for the peer reviewers without participation of the public but that according to the transparency principle included in the ToR all documents presented during the workshop will be made public on the ENSREG Website (this includes a.o. the summary report, the national presentations, the country specific recommendations).

The French Representative pointed out that additional experts have been appointed in order to strengthen the analysis process. The TPR Board Chairman acknowledged these appointments and asked for additional one's from other MS.

The representative from The Netherlands asked when the different documents (questions/answers, workshop presentations, etc.) will be published on the ENSREG Website. He also asked how research reactors presentation will be included in the workshop presentations.

The TPR Board Chairman replied that all documents will posted on the website after conclusion of the work. He also indicated that the detailed programme of the workshop is a topic to be discussed during the next Board meeting in January 2018.

The Austrian representative expressed his concern regarding the timeline for publication of TPR results after ENSREG approval (in July 2018) and the need for stakeholders to review findings and the organisation of a public event to present the findings.

The TPR Board Chairman acknowledged this constraint and indicated that it will be discussed at the next Board meeting with the possibility to organise the public event in September 2018 to present the outcome of the TPR.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Confirm the decisions taken by the TPR Board concerning the organisation of the TPR peer review exercise

Support TPR Board requests to ENSREG Members regarding the need for nomination of additional experts and the need for the nominated PMs, rapporteurs and experts nominated to have enough time for the work on the TPR during the springtime

5. Revision of the ENSREG WP 2017-2019

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_386 ENSREG WP 2017-2020](#)

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_398 WENRA Benchmark Art 8](#)

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_394 Report ENSREG Conference 2017](#)

During the last ENSREG meeting, ENSREG decided to officially launch the revision of the its Work Programme 2016-2019 to update the current task list and with Commission priorities and outcomes of the ENSREG 2017 Nuclear Safety conference which took place the 28th and 29th June in Brussels.

Before starting to discuss the ENSREG Work Programme in detail the ENSREG Chairperson invited WENRA Chairman to make a presentation on the activity that has just started by WENRA RHWG regarding "Benchmarking on safety improvements". This work has been initiated based on the decision taken by ENSREG during the 34th plenary meeting. This work started with a reflexion on how to make this benchmark comparable and comprehensive and is currently supposed to include the development of a questionnaire to countries and to look at a broad scope of specific improvements across all countries for each reactor type.

Several ENSREG Members (Fi, UK) expressed their support to this work but were concerned by the large scope. Other ENSREG Members (DE, SE) recalled about the importance of taking into account the long history of safety improvements in the different countries and not only the most recent ones.

The Commission representative recalled the report expected from the Members States in July 2020 about the implementation to the Nuclear Safety Directive. He highlighted the necessity to clarify technical criteria under the implementation of the Safety Objective. He indicated the high expectation of the public and the need to an in depth analysis of several specific safety improvements.

The ENSREG Chairperson stressed that this benchmarking exercise has to be fair, looking at "good examples" of safety improvements and that he should be for the moment mainly focused of Severe Accident aspects (containment integrity, core catcher, spent fuel pool, etc.). This was supported by the other ENSREG Members.

Before the detailed presentation of the revised ENSREG Work Programme 2017-2019, the floor was given to the President of the ENSREG CONFERENCE 2017, Petteri Tiippana, who presented the main outcomes and conclusions of this conference. He highlighted in particular the very large attendance, the quality of the organisation and of the work performed by the Steering Committee. He recalled the main outputs of the conference to the ENSREG WP (LTO, licensing and harmonisation, supply chain control) which could be inserted in the preparation phase of the ENSREG Work Programme.

The meeting continued with a presentation by the ENSREG WG1 Chairman about the proposed revised ENSREG Work Programme 2017-2019. The ENSREG WG1 Chairman was appointed during last ENSREG meeting to lead the compilation of the different Work Programme contributions from the different WGs.

To support this effort, the Commission service provided to ENSREG WG1 chairman beginning of October 2017 a note presenting its priorities for 2018-2019 in the field of nuclear safety, radioactive waste and spent fuel management and radiation protection.

The ENSREG WG1 Chairman indicated that some of the priorities proposed by the Commission service had not been taken into account based on the consideration that other institutions like OECD-NEA were already addressing these subjects in different working groups.

The Commission representative thanked the ENSREG WG1 Chairman for having taken care of leading this work. He highlighted that revising regularly the ENSREG Work Programme and ensuring that this programme remains in line with the Commission priorities and with the outcomes of the ENSREG conferences is of key importance. He in particular pointed out that some of the elements which have been excluded from this revised version of the ENSREG WP are direct outcomes of previous ENSREG conferences (e.g. CFSI).

Several ENSREG Members (NL, DE, BE, SK) then intervene and asked ENSREG WG1 to re-visit the current draft version of the ENSREG WP. Their main point was that too many tasks and actions were requested from ENSREG Members in this WP and that over the years there was an increasing trend and that this was creating a too large burden for their staff. This was supported by several other ENSREG members.

The French representative agreed that some priority should be given to certain tasks compared to others which were of less urgency.

The Commission representative recalled that the ENSREG WP is based on the legal obligations coming from the different Council Directives (nuclear safety, radwaste and spent fuel management, basic safety standards).

The UK representative called for avoiding work duplication with other organisations. This point was supported by the ENSREG Chairperson.

Several ENSREG Members indicated that they consider that the revised ENSREG WP was not ready for approval during this ENSREG plenary meeting.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Support the work initiated by WENRA RHWG on benchmarking with a special focus on Severe Accident aspects and related safety options.

Not to approve the ENSREG Work Programme 2018-2019 during this plenary meeting but aim at an approval during the next plenary meeting, following an additional review to be carried out by ENSREG Members.

Requested the ENSREG WG1 Chairman to continue his work as a coordinator to compile comments and present a revised version of the ENSREG Work Programme 2018-2019 during the ENSREG plenary meeting.

6. Review of the WGs activities since previous meeting

Review of the WG1 activities

HLG_r(2017-35)_385 ENSREG WG1 report to Plenary

ENSREG reviewed the work performed within its different Working Groups since the last meeting starting by WG1.

The WG1 chairman focused his presentation on the planning of the IRRS Missions in Europe and the expected update in 2017 by Member States of their Stress Tests National Action Plan (NACp).

Regarding the update of the NACPs, the Commission representative pointed out that, unlike the solution proposed by several MS to just refer to the information provided in their 2017 IAEA CNS report, the EC considers that NACPs and the NACp updates should be comprehensive, self-explanatory and standalone documents.

ENSREG took the decision to

Recall all ENSREG members that Stress Tests National Action Plans are expected to be update by the end of 2017 by Member States in order for WG1 to deliver a review report of them.

Review of the WG2 activities

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_391 ENSREG_WG2_report_20_December_2017](#)

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_389 Directive 2011_70_Euratom-Draft Guidelines for MS NR - 7 Dec 2017](#)

The ENSREG WG2 Chairman reported in detail about the work done by the ENSREG WG2 during the year 2017. He highlighted in particular the extensive work that has been performed throughout the year to revise the ENSREG Guidelines for reporting under the Waste Directive. The last version of this document has been submitted to ENSREG Members for approval during this meeting. Due to the length and level of detail of this document, some ENSREG Members requested more time to review it.

The indicative schedule for Peer Reviews under the 2011/70/Euratom (ARTEMIS missions) was presented and the collaboration between the ENSREG WG2 and the EC Decommissioning Funding Group (EC DFG) was also addressed.

Regarding the ARTEMIS peer review, which should take place in all EU countries before 2023, information is already available for 21 EU countries. Poland should be the first EU country to host such kind of mission, followed by France and Spain.

The ENSREG Chairperson and the Commission representative recalled the importance of scheduling ARTEMIS peer reviews, which should take place in all EU countries before 2023.

ENSREG took the decision to

Allow more time for the ENSREG Members to review the ENSREG Guidelines for reporting under the Waste Directive by launching a silence procedure on this document until the 20th January 2018.

Review of the WG3 activities

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_390 ENSREG_WG3_Plenary_20_December_2017](#)

The WG3 Chairman reported on the work done since previous ENSREG meeting. The main points presented were the WG3 contribution to the ENSREG Report to the Council and the Parliament and to the ENSREG WP 2017-2020. The last developments regarding the ENSREG Website (continuity, survey, etc) were also addressed.

7. Stress Tests in Europe (NACPs update –and abroad (Belarus))

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_388 Stress Tests Belarus practical arrangements](#)

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_392 Belarus Stress Test Board Chair report to ENSREG Plenary](#)

Following the establishment of the Belarus Stress Test Board during the last plenary meeting, the work performed so far by the Board was reported by the Board Vice Chairperson. (Chairperson has apologized but a written report of the Chairperson was distributed to ENSREG members) .

The first Board meeting took place on 21 September 2017 in Vienna. The second Board meeting took place on 19 December 2017 in Brussels. A large number of experts have been appointed (17 in total) by the ENSREG Members to participate to the Peer Review Team. This team will be led by Mark Foy.

By a letter dated 30 October 2017 the Nuclear and Radiation Safety Department of the Belarusian Emergencies Ministry (Gosatomnadzor) submitted the National Stress Test report in English and Russian language to the European Commission. The Belarus Stress Test national report was then published on the ENSREG Website the 13 November 2017 (<http://www.ensreg.eu/news/belarus-stress-test-national-report>).

According to the decision taken during the 1st Board meeting the ENSREG Members were informed that this report is now open for public consultation for a period of 2 months (until Friday 13 January 2018).

The ENSREG Members were informed that the dates of the PRT mission in Belarus had been agreed with Belarus counterpart. This mission will take place from the 12 to the 16 March 2018. Presentation of the final version of the peer review report to Belarus will be done by the Board during a visit schedule on 12-14 June 2018.

The participation of observer for this peer review was discussed during the 1st Board meeting. Following discussions with Belarus counterpart and according to practices in place during the EU peer review process in 2012 several potential observers were identified. The Belarus Stress Test Board agreed that representatives from the IAEA and from nuclear regulatory bodies coming from the Russian Federation will be invited to participate. Turkey and Iran could potentially participate in the Peer Review if willing to do so. Turkey and Iran being the potential next two countries where EU stress test peer review process could be organised. ENSREG Members were informed that the IAEA and the Russian Federation had replied positively to the invitation. Discussions about participation of Turkey and Iran were still ongoing with Belarus nuclear safety regulator at the time of the ENSREG meeting.

The Commission representative thanked the ENSREG Members to have nominated 15 experts from EU nuclear and non nuclear countries (2 additional experts coming from Switzerland and Ukraine) to participate to this peer review. He emphasized that this is a clear sign of solidarity between EU MS and will support the transparency of the process.

The Lithuanian representative stressed that any safety upgrades identified during this Peer Review should be implemented before the start-up of the plant. He also recalled that the Stress Test peer review process is a targeted safety reassessment process which is not covering all safety issues of a NPP.

8. ENSREG 2017 report to the European Parliament and to the Council

[HLG_r\(2017-35\)_384 ENSREG_REPORT_2017 DRAFT_after consultation process_30 november_rev 14-12](#)

This point was addressed at the end of the meeting.

Frederic Joureau (ASN) who had been appointed as coordinator for the preparation of the ENSREG report 2017 to the Council and the European Parliament presented the different steps of the preparation and the main comments provided by ENSREG Members during the silence procedure on the text which was just organised before the ENSREG plenary meeting.

Several ENSREG Members expressed their satisfaction about the way their comments have been taken into account in the last version of the document.

[ENSREG took the decision to:](#)

[Circulate again to the ENSREG Members the last version of the report for a final review until 9 January 2018 before considering it as final version.](#)

9. AOB - Follow-up on key topics of the ENSREG WP 2016-2019 – Topic 1 (c) Safety Objective

This point was addressed before the presentation of the ENSREG Work Programme 2017-2019. See point 5.

10. ENSREG Conference 2017

This point was addressed before the presentation of the ENSREG Work Programme 2017-2019. See point 5.

11. Next meeting

ENSREG 36th plenary Meeting

2 July 2018

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

35th meeting of ENSREG

Agenda

20th December 2017 (09:30 – 18:00)

1.A, Albert Borschette building
36, rue Froissart, 1049 Brussels, Belgium

1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda
2. Chairman's introduction and report
3. Ru-106 releases: status of the analysis performed by the regulators and their TSO's.
4. Topical Peer Reviews 2017- 2018
 - 4.1. Report from the TPR Board [P. Tiippana]
 - 4.2. Open discussion – issues encountered by countries
5. Revision of the ENSREG WP 2017-2019 [A Munuera]
6. ENSREG report 2017 to the Council and the European Parliament [F. Joureau]
7. Review of the WGs activities since previous meeting
8. Stress Tests in Europe and abroad
 - 8.1. NAcPs update [A Munuera]
 - 8.2. Belarus- report :
 - 8.2.1. from the Board [M. Ziakova]
 - 8.2.2. from the Peer Review Team [Marl Foy]
9. A.O.B: Benchmarking on safety improvements (article 8)
10. Regulators updates.
11. ENSREG Conference 2017
12. Next Meeting

Annex II

ENSREG 35th Meeting Presence list

Members and experts

Country	Surname	Name	Company
AUSTRIA	Molin	Andreas	Federal Ministry of Agriculture, Forestry, Environmental and Water Management
BELGIUM	Bens	Jan	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC)
	Demarche	Marc	National Body for Nuclear Waste and Enriched Fissile Material
CROATIA	Medaković	Saša	State Office for Radiological and Nuclear Safety
CYPRUS	Sakkas	Demetris	Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance
CZECH REPUBLIC	Krs	Petr	SUJB
DENMARK	Thomsen	Jimmy	Danish Emergency Management Agency
FINLAND	Tiippana	Petteri	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)
FRANCE	Chevet	Pierre-Franck	Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN)
	Louis	Aurélien	Ministère de la Transition Ecologique et solidaire
	Joureau	Frédéric	Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN)
	Cadet-Mercier	Sylvie	Autorité de Sûreté Nucléaire (ASN)

	Veteau	Caroline	Représentation permanente de la France auprès de l'Union européenne
	Vial	Eric	Institute of Radioprotection and Nuclear Safety
GERMANY	Elsner	Thomas	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Kuhn	Sebastian	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Mauer	Charlotte	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Niehaus	Gerrit	Ministry of the Environment, Climate Protection and the Energy Sector of Baden-Württemberg
	Weinberg	Dagmar	Federal Ministry of Economic Affairs and Energy
	Gering	Florian	Federal Office for Radiation Protection
GREECE	Housiadas	Christos	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)
	Tafili	Vasiliki	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)
HUNGARY	Hullán	Szabolcs	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority
IRELAND	McMahon	Ciara	Environmental Protection Agency
ITALY	Laporta	Stefano	Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
	Matteocci	Lamberto	Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
	Dionisi	Mario	Institute for Environmental Protection and Research
LITHUANIA	Demčenko	Michail	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)
LUXEMBURG	Majerus	Patrick	Ministry of Health

THE NETHERLANDS	Jansen	Rob	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection
	Brugmans	Marco	
POLAND	Przybycin	Andrzej	National Atomic Energy Agency
PORTUGAL	Noronha Marques Robalo	José Alberto	Comissão Reguladora para a Segurança das Instalações Nucleares
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Turner	Mikuláš	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
SLOVENIA	Stritar	Andrej	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
SPAIN	Munuera	Antonio	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CNS)
	Marti Scharfhausen	Fernando	
	de los Reyes	Alfredo	
SWEDEN	Persson	Mats	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
	Carlsson	Lennart	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
	Hedberg	Bengt	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
UNITED KINGDOM	Foy	Mark	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)
	Hart	Anthony	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)

Observers

NAME	SURNAME	COMPANY
Lercel	Bartosz	Council of the European Union
Caruso	Gustavo	IAEA, Nuclear Safety and Security Department
Mattsson	Hakan	Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority
Wanner	Hans	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
Lebedev	Vladimir	OECD-NEA

European Commission

NAME	SURNAME	
Thomas	Gerassimos	Deputy Director General – DG ENER
Garribba	Massimo	Director/D – DG ENER
Rhein	Hans	Head of Unit D1 – DG ENER
Pascal	Ghislain	Policy officer/D1 – DG ENER
Martin Ramos	Manuel	Programme Officer – Research - JRC

Annex III



Paris, December 22nd, 2017

Mr. Alexey ALESHIN
Chairman

ROSTECHNADZOR - Federal Environmental,
Industrial and Nuclear Supervision Service of Russia
Taganskaya, Str. 34
109147, Moscow
RU - RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Dear Mr. Aleshin,

I would like to thank you for the letters IBRAE has sent to several EU Member States and TSOs regarding the constitution of an Independent International Scientific Commission (IISC), which is proposed to be tasked with investigating the Ru-106 release detected in various EU Member States in late September and early October this year.

As you know, ENSREG represents those European regulators in EU Member States (MS) responsible for the regulation of nuclear safety and radiological protection and was established following the European Commission Decision (2007/530/Euratom) dated 17 July 2007. IBRAE's invitation to several ENSREG members to participate in this IISC was discussed during our plenary meeting on December 20th. ENSREG appreciates IBRAE's willingness to create such an IISC and to invite scientific experts from the EU.

The meeting unanimously agreed that a coordinated response to this invitation should be provided by ENSREG, complementary to the individual responses from those EU regulators and TSOs that received the initial invitation. ENSREG also agreed that IAEA should be involved, along those organizations already invited and interested in participating.

It is recognized that IAEA's IEC has also been looking into this incident. However, we noted with concern that no official notification of this event has yet taken place at an international level, either under or within the spirit of the 1986 Convention on Early Notification of a Nuclear Accident.

ENSREG members recognize the urgency to undertake an investigation on this issue. To ensure that the IISC is fully informed at the outset, we would ask that you and IBRAE swiftly provide additional information (beyond that contained in the original invitation) regarding the objectives and tasks of the proposed IISC, in particular:

- to confirm that the scope of the IISC will include an assessment of the safety and health risks to the local population;
- whether the IISC will have the mandate to undertake in-situ investigations;
- to clarify how the findings of the IISC will be communicated.

.../...

In our view, it is essential to identify conclusively the source of this incident and its causes in order to avoid a similar situation being repeated in the future. In addition, it is important that the details of the incident are established and communicated in an open and transparent manner that maintains public trust in our common efforts to ensure highest nuclear safety standards and in the international provisions and arrangements for emergency preparedness and response.

Yours sincerely,

Pierre-Franck CHEVET
ENSREG Chairman

Copies:

Mr. Juan-Carlos LENTIJO (DDG IAEA)
Mr. Gerassimos THOMAS (DDG DG-ENER - EC)
Mr. Leonid A. BOLSHOV (IBRAE)