



Minutes of the 36th meeting of ENSREG
02nd July 2018
Brussels

Participants

ENSREG members from all EU Member States as well as the European Commission, with the exception of Austria, Czech Republic, Estonia, Latvia, Malta, Portugal and Romania were present in the meeting. Hungary and Slovenia were represented by alternates nominated by ENSREG members. Observers from Norway, the OECD-NEA and WENRA were also present. For the part of the agenda related to the Belarus Stress Test, the head of Belarus Nuclear Regulatory Authority (Gosatomnadzor), Mrs Lugovskaya was also invited as an observer. On Commission side, representatives from DG JRC and EEAS 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 one new ENSREG member, Mr. Franck Hardeman, the new Director General of AFCN/FANC for Belgium. He indicated as well that two ENSREG Members from Hungary and Slovenia have indicated their unavailability to participate to this meeting and nominated official representatives to replace them. The minutes of the ENSREG 35th meeting were adopted without remarks.

The agenda was adopted, however, due to the unavailability of the Belarus Peer Review team Leader in the morning, this agenda item was moved to the beginning of the afternoon. The agenda is presented in Annex I.

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 informed the audience that his mandate as President of ASN will end in November 2018 and that therefore he will not be in a position to remain as ENSREG Chairperson after this date. He indicated that preparations should start to elect a new ENSREG Chairperson, and consider the organisation of an extraordinary meeting to designate his replacement.

3. Topical Peer Review 2017

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_413 1st TPR - report to ENSREG](#)

The ENSREG Chairperson introduced the 1st key topic of this plenary meeting, namely the 1st Topical Peer Review on ageing management. 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.

Since last ENSREG plenary meeting, key steps of this 1st TPR have been taken. All national reports were published in January 2018 and submitted for public consultation (from 8 January to 28 February 2018). The expert review was conducted by 5 Project Managers, 5 Rapporteurs and 41 Experts subsidised in 5 groups according to the different topics (Ageing Management Programmes, Electrical cables, Concealed pipework, Reactor Pressure Vessels, Concrete containment structures). Altogether the "desktop review" generated more than 2300 questions which were submitted to relevant national contact points. The TPR workshop was successfully organised from the 14 to the 18 May in Luxembourg and was attended by around 140 experts each day. The Workshop sessions were also webstreamed for members of regulatory authorities, TSOs and utilities which could not physically participate to the workshop. At the end of the workshop more than 50 generic findings (Good Practices, Area For improvement, Challenges) were identified. A public event to present the process of the TPR was also organised the 3rd May in Brussels.

The TPR Board Chairman emphasized that the exercise allowed sharing experience, identifying "Good Practices" but also "Areas for Improvement" and "Challenges" at EU and/or at country specific level for each topic. He stressed that the TPR report is not yet ready to be submitted to ENSREG. He indicated that the Board will continue to finalise Summary report and recommendations for approval by ENSREG Plenary. A meeting of Board, Rapporteurs supported by EC staff took already place the 6-7 June to continue the work and will be followed by another one the 3 July. It is expected that other meetings will be needed at the end August/early September to finalise the Summary report and the allocation of country findings. The TPR Board Chairman also shared his insights on the first TPR process.

The ENSREG Chairperson recognized the very large efforts of all members of the TPR Board, the country experts and the national regulators in reaching this stage of the review. He highlighted that TPR was a very demanding exercise and currently a first of the kind in the frame of the amended nuclear safety Directive.

The European Commission representative recalled that the TPR is a requirement of the amended nuclear safety Directive and that the Directive is "objective" driven. He reconfirmed that the Commission services are closely supporting the exercise and will continue to provide full dedication until its finalisation. He pointed out that despite the fact that the exercise is not finished it was already possible to identify some weaknesses of the current organisation which should be addressed in a future TPR, relating to:

- the process of appointing experts (very few experts appointed by ENSREG members until beginning of January 2018 and then too large demand from participating countries to attend the workshop making work organisation very complicated),
- the absence of country and/or facilities visits; with no visits foreseen in the TPR process, this makes information reported by countries sometimes very difficult to verify by the peer reviewers,
- the reduced timeframe for the different steps since beginning of January 2018, allowing limited time for the experts to review the national reports and for the countries to provide replies to the questions.

He also expressed his concern regarding the very limited participation of the civil society in the public event which took place on 3 May. He highlighted that efforts should be made to ensure the success of the final public event.

Regarding the public event, the ENSREG chairperson pointed out that ageing management is a very technical subject which limits the possibilities for the public to provide technical inputs. He stressed that the category of findings called "Challenges" are of key importance for this peer review as this category highlights areas where issues have been identified for most of the EU countries and where work should be initiated to address these issues at EU level.

Several ENSREG members took the floor (HU, DE, NL, ES, SE, LUX, IT). All ENSREG members agreed that a very large work has been necessary to prepare the national reports and to participate to this TPR exercise and that additional work is necessary to finalise the report with the expected level of quality. Several indicated that improvements were needed at the level of communication and transparency around this exercise (in particular regarding country specific findings) and that an additional opportunity should be given to the participating countries to review the TPR report and the country findings before both documents are presented to ENSREG. It was again clarified that the TPR report will be generic and country specific findings will be presented in a separate document.

The Commission representative stressed that this European TPR was highlighted as one of the 'good practices' at the 7th IAEA CNS review meeting. Therefore it carries a high visibility and high expectations in terms of the outcome of the exercise and follow-up actions both at European and international level. He stressed the importance of ending with a high quality report as well as the importance of presenting the results to the public in an appropriate way to ensure transparency and clear understanding of the findings. He also indicated that the target is to have Council conclusions on this exercise still under Austrian presidency.

A detailed discussion took place on how to achieve these targets and ENSREG decided to postpone the endorsement of the report to an "extraordinary" ENSREG plenary meeting which will take place the 4th October in Brussels. The TPR Board will be in charge of putting in place an appropriate schedule to reach this target.

Regarding public participation to the last phase of the TPR report preparation, ENSREG WG3 chairman recalled that according to the "stakeholder engagement plan" prepared for this TPR no public consultation was

foreseen until the report is endorsed by ENSREG. A public event should be organised after the report has been endorsed and published on the ENSREG Website.

The TPR Board chairman indicated that the timing for completion of the TPR report will be very tight and therefore each participating country is expected to react very quickly when the report and country findings will be submitted for a last review.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Confirm that the finalisation of the report will take place during summer 2018 and that an additional round of comments on the report itself and on the country findings will be possible for the participating countries before the report is submitted to ENSREG members (with a timeframe of 1-2 weeks for providing comments at the beginning of September).

Organise an "extraordinary" ENSREG Plenary meeting the 4 October 2018 in Brussels. This meeting will be mostly devoted to the decision by ENSREG of the TPR report on "Ageing Management".

Organise a public event at least one month after publication of the results on the ENSREG website to present the results of the TPR.

Allow until spring 2019 for ENSREG and participating countries to prepare action plans following publication of the TPR report.

4. Review of the WG1 activities

1. Stress Tests in Europe (NAcPs update)

HLG_r(2018-36)_404 ENSREG WG1 Report to ENSREG36

HLG_r (2018-36)_401 NAcP Status Report draft 4 18-06-2018

According to the commitment taken in 2015, all countries participating to the EU Stress Test NAcP peer review in May 2015 were to update their NAcPs by the end of 2017. WG1 was tasked to set-up a simplified peer review process to present to ENSREG members a good overview of the situation. Most of these updated NAcPs were received on time and published on the ENSREG Website.

ENSREG reviewed the summary report prepared by WG1 to present the status at EU level of Stress Test National Action Plan (NAcP) implementation in 2017. ENSREG Members discussed the approach taken by WG1 in preparing the summary report.

At the end of the presentation by WG1 chairman, the ENSREG Chairperson asked to complete the hearings round in order to "challenge" the different countries regarding NAcP implementation and potential delays of some of the actions. WG1 chairman replied that some countries have made their presentation within the WG meetings, but the report prepared was mostly a compilation of information provided by the countries themselves.

The Commission representative recalled the ENSREG statement of November 2015 where it was already indicated that delays were encountered by several countries in safety upgrades implementation. Based on the information available in these updated NAcPs it appears that further delays have accumulated in some countries, in some cases for non-technical reasons. He stressed that the process to be put in place by WG1 to prepare a summary report should retain the idea of a "peer review" process to assess independently the progress of the different countries. He considered that, as a minimum, hearings of the different countries should be organised. This point was supported by other ENSREG members. He also pointed out the collective commitment of ENSREG members in this field and the potential consequences of an endorsement by ENSREG of the delays in safety upgrade implementation.

Several ENSREG Members (FL, SK, SE, NL) indicated that some countries are dealing with more complicated safety upgrades than others and that a risk-based approach to safety may justify to give priority to other issues than remaining Stress Test safety upgrade implementation.

ENSREG took the decision to

Not approve the WG1 report in its current status and to ask the report to be updated based on "hearings" of the different countries to be completed by WG1 to understand more clearly why some countries seem to have experienced further delays in their implementation plan in comparison to 2015

2. Revision of the ENSREG WP 2018-2020

HLG_r(2018-36)_403 ENSREG WP revision 2018-2020

HLG_r(2018-36)_412 ENSREG Chairman letter to ETSON

During the ENSREG meeting, June 2017, ENSREG decided to launch the revision of the its Work Programme 2018-2020 to update the current task list and align it with Commission priorities and outcomes of the ENSREG 2017 Nuclear Safety conference.

During the previous meeting in December 2017, ENSREG Members did not reach a consensus on the different tasks and priorities for this Work Programme (WP) and decided to continue refining the document. WG1 Chairman presented the process followed since this meeting to compile the ENSREG priorities for the different tasks of the Work Programme 2018-2020.

The European Commission representatives stated that the proposed Work Programme was not ambitious enough and that several priorities of the Commission were not reflected or reflected with too low priorities in this Work Programme. This is in particular the case for the questions of:

- Follow-up of the Topical Peer Review
- Counterfeit, Fraudulent and Suspect Items (CFSI) issues which is a direct outcome of the ENSREG 2017 conference,
- Implementation of the Articles 8a-8c of the amended nuclear safety Directive

Regarding the implementation of the Articles 8a-8c, the ENSREG Chairperson indicated that he considers that ENSREG and WENRA have done their part of the job on this topic and that it should now be extended by more technical criteria which should be defined by ETSON.

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 and the IAEA were already addressing these subjects in different working groups.

Several ENSREG members (DE, FL, NL) argued that until 2020 they were facing a very high workload and that duplication of work should be avoided pointing out that WENRA RHWG is already working on safety upgrades. They indicated that they support the proposed ENSREG WP 2018-2020 with associated priorities.

A detailed discussion took place on several items and in particular on the one related to the implementation of the Articles 8a-8c of the amended nuclear safety Directive. Several ENSREG Members questioned the study launched by the Commission on this topic. The Commission representative clarified that this is a technical study to provide insights into European and international guidance on the topic, national approaches and implementation aspects of the new safety requirements (articles 8a to 8c). Following a tender exercise in 2017, a contract was awarded to GRS and a consortium of TSO's composed of 10 ETSON partners. The work being undertaken by GRS/ETSON is complementary to other Commission activities, and to the activities of ENSREG/WENRA. Work has also been performed by the JRC to support this activity. The ENSREG Chairperson reminded that such a task should have been coordinated with WENRA and ENSREG Members prior to any request, especially as WENRA already delivered a report on article 8 that has been endorsed by ENSREG, and that RHWG of WENRA is pursuing its benchmarking on safety enhancements.

The Commission representative 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 stressed that ENSREG is an advisory body of the Commission and if ENSREG is not able to provide the expected support this would have institutional implications forcing the Commission to find other bodies to perform the necessary work.

The ENSREG Chairperson indicated that there are a large number of subjects still to be addressed by ENSREG but that among them the issue of CFSI and supply chain was certainly a key topic. He also recommended that ETSON extend his work on the articles 8a to 8c with a view to present it first to WENRA and then to ENSREG. The Commission also stated that it will pursue work over alternative channels.

ENSREG took the decision to:

Approved the ENSREG WP 2018-2020 as presented with modifications as indicated by WG1; WG2 and WG3 chairman during the discussions

Include in the WP 2018-2020 a special item on Counterfeit, Fraudulent and Suspect Items (CFSI) issues with the target of having a technical meeting of 1-2 days between EU regulatory authorities, TSOs and industry sometimes in 2019

3. Other WG1 activities

Review of the WG1 activities

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_404 ENSREG WG1 Report to ENSREG36](#)

The WG1 chairman focused his presentation on the planning of the IRRS Missions in Europe.

5. Review of the WGs activities since previous meeting

Review of the WG2 activities

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_410 ENSREG_WG2_Plenary_02_July_2018](#)

The ENSREG WG2 Chairman reported in detail about the work done by the ENSREG WG2 since last ENSREG meeting. He acknowledged the approval by ENSREG Members of the ENSREG Guidelines for reporting under the Waste Directive on 20th January 2018 and the subsequent publication of these guidelines on the ENSREG website.

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. He presented as well the WG2 contribution to the ENSREG WP 2018-2020.

ENSREG took the decision to

Approve the proposed WP WG2 actions:

- a) Development of an ENSREG position concerning the radioactive waste and spent fuel inventories reporting.
- b) Analysis and development of an ENSREG position on specific common issues regarding the relation of National Programmes and National Reports under Directive 2011/70/Euratom (e.g. special focus will be put on definition and implementation of key performance indicators (KPI)).

Review of the WG3 activities

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_409 ENSREG_WG3_Plenary_02_July_2018](#)

The WG3 Chairman reported on the work done since previous ENSREG meeting. The main points presented were related to the ENSREG WP 2018-2020, in particular the development of guidance documents and the development of a questionnaire related to the implementation of the ENSREG Principles for Openness and Transparency. The last developments regarding the ENSREG Website (continuity, survey, etc) were also addressed.

Regarding the development of a position paper on the topic of transparency-security balance in NROs, the ENSREG Chairperson pointed out that in several countries the nuclear regulatory authorities do not deal with security issues.

ENSREG WG3 proposed also a specific text on transparency issues to be included in the ENSREG communication on Ru-106.

ENSREG took the decision to

Encourage MSs to provide feedback on the implementation of the transparency principles by completing the questionnaire.

Include the transparency related statement on Ru-106 case in the ENSREG communication on this topic (see Ru-106 specific item)

6. Stress Tests in Belarus

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_402 Belarus Stress Test Peer Review Report](#)

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_414 Lithuanian position on Peer Review Report_final](#)

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_415 Lithuanian proposal on implementation_final](#)

ENSREG discussed the results of the Stress Tests peer review process in Belarus. The main steps and actions taken since the last ENSREG plenary meeting were presented by the Belarus Stress Test Board chairperson Mrs M. Ziakova and by the Peer review Team leader, Mr M. Foy.

The Peer Review took place in Belarus from the 12 to 16 March 2018. The Belarus Stress test Board presented the results of the peer review to Belarus counterpart during a visit which took place from the 12 to the 14 June 2018. For this ENSREG plenary meeting the head of Belarus Nuclear Regulatory Authority (Gosatomnadzor), Mrs Lugovskaya, was invited to attend the presentation of the peer review results as an observer. She thanks the review team and ENSREG for being invited to this meeting and highlighted that going through this peer review exercise was a challenge for an embarking country like Belarus.

It was highlighted that the Peer Review of the Belarusian Nuclear Power Plant stress-tests was conducted in a constructive and collaborative atmosphere and fully in line with specifications for EU stress test, including on transparency.

The PRT Leader indicated that the peer review report highlights various good practices but presents further potential improvement that have been identified during the review exercise performed in Belarus with a view to ensuring continuous safety improvement. The Peer Review Team (PRT) recommends that Gosatomnadzor in accordance with the principle of "intelligent ownership", should identify the necessary safety improvements in response to the recommendations made in this report by the PRT and those by Gosatomnadzor itself, and incorporate them into a National Action Plan containing all relevant safety improvement measures and associated implementation schedules.

The Commission representative congratulated the peer review team and peer review Board as well as Belarus counterpart for the extensive and in depth technical work performed during this peer review. He stressed that concrete recommendations from Regulator to Regulator came out of this peer review and called on the Belarusian authorities to develop a National Action Plan, to ensure timely implementation of all safety improvement measures in accordance with their safety significance. The Action Plan should be subject to a future independent review. This was done by all EU and non EU countries which voluntarily participated to the stress test process since Fukushima. The Commission representative recalled as well that the EU has been providing the Belarusian nuclear regulatory authority with technical assistance by transferring EU best practices on the regulatory process since 2011 and proposed to increase this technical assistance in the coming years to ensure that the highest possible safety standards are followed in Belarus.

Following two statements made by the Lithuanian ENSREG Member regarding the report and the follow-up, a detailed discussion took place (without the presence of the Belarus delegation) about the results of this peer review. The discussion focused mainly on seismic issues, necessary safety improvements and timing for safety improvements implementation. The ENSREG Chairperson highlighted the fact the LT has been associated to all the process of Review and part of the PRT. This should mean that all technical assessments have been heavily discussed and that the report reflects the outcome of PRT assessment. He mentioned also that the public event on the results is planned the day after, and that it should send a wrong signal if the report is not adopted.

After the discussion additional information were provided by the Belarus Stress test team leader to the Lithuanian ENSREG member, ENSREG Chairperson asked all ENSREG Members to endorse the report, which has been done.

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

[Endorse the peer review report with a view to have this report presented to the public during a public event the 3rd July in Brussels. The peer review report was subsequently published on the ENSREG website with an executive summary the 4th July.](#)

[Invite Gosatomnazor to apply for Observer status in ENSREG](#)

7. Ru-106 releases

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_406 Letter to Chairman of Rostechnadzor - Ru106 – 171217](#)

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_407 Reply from Rostechnadzor to ENSREG Chairman 060218](#)

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_408 Letter to Chairman of Rostechnadzor - Ru106 050318](#)

[HLG_r\(2018-36\)_411 ENSREG Communication on Ru-106](#)

The last key point of discussions during this meeting was the issue of radioactive isotope Ruthenium-106 which were measured in the air in a number of European countries during the period from the end of September to the beginning of October 2017.

ENSREG Members provided since last ENSREG meeting a coordinated response targeting the regulatory authorities of the Russian Federation regarding this issue. In the exchange of letters, ENSREG members clearly express their expectations regarding participation of several European regulators and TSO's in an Independent International Scientific Commission (IISC) recently set-up by the Nuclear Safety Institute of the Russian Academy of Sciences (IBRAE). These expectations included an assessment of the safety and health risk to the local population, the mandate to undertake in-situ investigations and public disclosure of the findings of the IISC. This IISC gathered two times in January and April 2018, but no joint conclusions have been drawn on the source release to date.

ENSREG recognizes that cooperative efforts thanks to the international commission have been a good basis for exchanges on this event of Ruthenium releases and await the answers to the open technical questions submitted by four European members in the international commission to IBRAE. However, ENSREG regrets that no joint conclusion was possible and maintains its analysis about the possible geographical source location.

The European Commission representative stressed that 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 European Commission representative supports ENSREG communication prepared.

ENSREG members recalled the importance of transparency in building trust among the various stakeholders involved in nuclear safety and the safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste.

Based on these considerations, ENSREG Chairperson proposed a draft ENSREG communication on Ruthenium release was circulated to the ENSREG members before the meeting. This communication was revised during the meeting, the statement on transparency coming from WG3 being included and several text made based on ENSREG members proposals

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

[Issue a communication on Ru-106 and to publish this communication and the links to measurement data collected by ENSREG Members on the ENSREG website.](#)

8. ENSREG Conference 2019

The ENSREG Chairperson reminded ENSREG Members that it is time to start preparing the next ENSREG Conference (target date: Spring-Summer 2019), he asked for ENSREG Members contributions, discuss potential topic, etc.

[ENSREG took the decision to](#)

[Start preparing the next ENSREG conference in Spring-Summer 2019 – candidates for leading this organisation should inform the ENSREG secretariat before next ENSREG plenary meeting](#)

9. Next meeting

ENSREG 37th plenary Meeting – Extraordinary meeting – TPR on "Ageing Management"

4 October 2018

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

36th meeting of ENSREG

Agenda

2nd July 2018 (08:30 – 17:00)

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. Topical Peer Reviews 2017- 2018
 - 3.1. Detailed report from the TPR Board [P. Tiippana]
 - 3.2. Next Steps (public event, follow-up) [P. Tiippana]
4. WG1 :
 - 4.1. EU-countries NAcPs update [Antonio Munuera]
 - 4.2. Revision of the ENSREG WP 2018-2020 [A Munuera]
 - 4.3. Other activities
5. Review of the WG2 and 3 activities since previous meeting
6. Stress-tests in Belarus : approval of the report and follow-up [M. Ziakova/ M. Foy]
7. Ru-106 releases – Outcomes of the different meetings of the IISC – follow-up actions [France]
8. A.O.B :
 - 8.1. ENSREG Conference 2019
9. Next Meeting

Annex II

ENSREG 36th Meeting Presence list

Members and experts

Country	Surname	Name	Company
BELGIUM	Hardeman	Franck	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control (FANC)
	Demarche	Marc	National Body for Nuclear Waste and Enriched Fissile Material
BULGARIA	Stanimirov	Borislav	Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency
	Katzarska	Lidia	Bulgarian Nuclear Regulatory Agency
CROATIA	Medaković	Saša	State Office for Radiological and Nuclear Safety
CYPRUS	Sakkas	Demetris	Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance
DENMARK	Øhlenschläger	Mette	Danish Health Authority Radiation Protection
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)
	Thevenot	Caroline	Représentation permanente de la France auprès de l'Union européenne
	Joerger	Anais	Représentation permanente de la France auprès de l'Union européenne

GERMANY	Elsner	Thomas	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Stoppa	Gisela	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
	Maurer	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
	Stegemann	Ralf	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation, Building and Nuclear Safety
GREECE	Housiadas	Christos	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)
	Tafili	Vasiliki	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)
HUNGARY	Rétfalvi	Eszter	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
LITHUANIA	Demčenko	Michail	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)
	Šlepavičius	Sigitas	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)
	Vainuté	Sandra	Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU
LUXEMBURG	Majerus	Patrick	Ministry of Health

	Lentz	Guy	Coordinator for EU & International Affairs
THE NETHERLANDS	Jansen	Rob	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection
	Boom	Jurrian	
	Brugmans	Marco	
POLAND	Przybycin	Andrzej	National Atomic Energy Agency
ROMANIA	Moisii	Roxana	Permanent Representation of Romania to the EU
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Žiaková	Marta	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
	Pavlovic	Peter	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
SLOVENIA	Grlicarel	Igor	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
SPAIN	Munuera	Antonio	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council (CNS)
SWEDEN	Knochenhauer	Michael	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
	Carlsson	Lennart	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority
UNITED KINGDOM	Foy	Mark	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)
	Holmes	Josephine	Office for Nuclear Regulation (ONR)

Observers

NAME	SURNAME	COMPANY
Mattsson	Hakan	Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority
Nilsson	Hugo	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
Lugovskaya	Olga	Gosatomnadzor (Belarus) – only for the item on Belarus ST
Sobolev	Oleg	Gosatomnadzor (Belarus) – only for the item on Belarus ST
Vyborny	Dmitry	Belarus delegation to the EU

European Commission

NAME	SURNAME	
Thomas	Gerassimos	Deputy Director General – DG ENER
Garrriba	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
Noel	Marc	Programme Officer – Research - JRC
Lubomirova	Katia	Programme Officer – Research - JRC
Rangelova	Vesselina	EEAS - Vienna