



**Minutes of the 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting of ENSREG**  
3-4 March 2021  
Virtual meeting

## **Participants**

With the exception of Ireland, ENSREG Members representing all EU Member States as well as the European Commission participated to the meeting. Hungary and Romania were represented by officials nominated by an ENSREG Member. Observers from Belarus, Norway, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, the IAEA, WENRA and the EU Council also participated.

### **1. Opening of the meeting and adoption of the agenda**

HLG-r(2021-42)\_528 Draft Agenda of the 42nd ENSREG Meeting

The ENSREG Chairperson, Ms Marta Žiaková, opened the 42<sup>nd</sup> ENSREG meeting, which was spread over two afternoon sessions. The meeting took place virtually and without interpretation due to the constraints imposed by the Covid-19 pandemic.

Ms Žiaková expressed her condolences about the sad death of the Irish Member Ms Ciara McMahon.

Ms Žiaková welcomed two new ENSREG Members, Mr Bachyiski, representing the Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria, and Ms Tafili, representing the Greek Atomic Energy Commission, and one new Observer, Mr Plachkov, representing the State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine. Mr Jan Panek, the new Director for Nuclear Energy, Safety and ITER, DG Energy, was introduced as the second representative of the European Commission during the meeting. The list of Members and Observers at the time of the meeting is attached as Annex II.

Two additional points were added to the agenda: “WG1 contribution to TPR-II” under item 3 “Second Topical Peer Review (TPR-II)” and “ENSREG approval of Preliminary Report” under item 4. 3 “Astravets – Preliminary Report – Peer Review of National Action Plan”. The adopted agenda is attached as Annex I.

### **2. Chairperson’s introduction and report**

HLG-r(2021-42)\_537 Draft Minutes of the 41st ENSREG Meeting

The Chair informed that the draft minutes of the 41<sup>st</sup> ENSREG meeting of 10-11 November 2020 were uploaded under the meeting documents on CIRCA BC. Members were invited to send their comments to the ENSREG Secretariat by 19 March 2021. Depending upon the nature of the comments received, the record will be submitted for approval by Written Procedure, or recirculated for a second round of comments in case of substantial comments.

The Chair reported on the main activities since last ENSREG meeting.

### 3. Second Topical Peer Review (TPR-II)

#### - Report by Chair of TPR-II Board

##### HLG-r(2021-42)\_538 TPR II Board - Report to ENSREG 42nd Meeting

The ENSREG Chair reported that the first call for nominations for the positions of TPR-II team leaders, rapporteurs and experts was sent on 14 December 2020 with an initial deadline of 31 January 2021, subsequently extended to 19 February 2021.

The Chair of the TPR-II Board gave an overview of the ongoing activities of the Board and especially of the ones related to the drafting of the Terms of Reference (ToR).

At the 41st ENSREG meeting, the topic of fire protection for the TPR-II was selected, the TPR-II Board nominated and the overall TPR-II process adopted. The members confirmed that the main actors in TPR-II are the Board, WENRA and ENSREG WG1.

The Board initiated nomination of experts and analysed the lessons learnt from TPR-I as provided by WG1.

The Board defined the competencies expected from team leaders, rapporteurs and thematic experts. On this basis, ENSREG Secretariat has launched a call for nominations for the initial pool of experts. 13 EU members nominated 10 team leaders, 4 rapporteurs and 18 experts. The Chair of the Board emphasised the importance of having enough qualified experts. At least 30 experts would be needed if there are 5 thematic groups. If it would be decided to have one report per country, even more experts would be needed.

The next step will be drafting of ToR, which will clarify responsibilities between the Board and WG1. It will define the scope of TPR and describe the TPR objectives, process and outputs.

The Board can provide criteria to help WENRA define the scope of the exercise, which should be manageable in terms of workload. Based on experience from TPR-I, it was advised to propose objective criteria for the assessment and therefore to consider the use of safety reference levels of WENRA as a reference basis.

The orientation of the ToR will be defined on the basis of lessons learnt from TPR-I. The Chair of the Board asked the ENSREG members to provide their opinion, in particular, on the issue of site visits and country specific reports. The orientation would be presented for approval in the next ENSREG plenary.

The Board suggested that ENSREG takes early contact with the licensee associations to inform on the TPR-II process prior to the foreseen stakeholder consultation on the technical specifications in 2022.

This year the Board will work on elaborating the ToR, afterwards the peer review templates, guidance, and finally the peer review itself will be prepared.

The Commission representative reminded of the obligations and process in the Nuclear Safety Directive and to use the experience from TPR-I as a basis for the preparation of TPR-II. He emphasised the importance of a rigorous exercise and clear conclusions that would lead to tangible safety improvements. Recital 23 of the Directive describes the process to be followed: national self-assessments, peer reviews by other MS, reports on the findings of the peer reviews as a basis for any following summary reports and country specific action plans and reviews. He reminded of the importance of very stringent standards for compliance for EU Member States to be able to keep carrying out similar stringent reviews in the neighbouring countries; in this regard country visits should be an important element of the TPR II, based upon the lessons learned from TPR-I.

German and Swedish members, as well as a representative of the Commission, expressed support for site visits to give credibility to the exercise, but noted that site visits should be limited in numbers to keep the workload manageable.

German, Swedish and French members expressed support for inviting more experts. German and Swedish members stated their readiness to nominate such experts. French member reminded that the exercise of TPR-II is important for sharing expertise among the experts and making progress in the area of nuclear safety.

One ENSREG member indicated that country specific reports would be useful, however invited the Board to analyse further the advantages and disadvantages for including them to the exercise.

##### ENSREG took note of:

- The TPR-II Board's report to the plenary.

## - WG3 contribution to TPR-II

### HLG-r(2021-42)\_536 WG3\_Transparency Arrangements

The Chair of WG3 presented the proposals for the stakeholder involvement and public information during the next Topical Peer Review (TPR), due the obligation to inform the public about nuclear safety of nuclear installations, as laid down in the Art. 8 of the Nuclear Safety Directive. WG3 intends to develop a new stakeholder involvement plan before autumn.

WG3 suggested to differentiate between the general public which needs to be informed using clear and simple language and the stakeholders who should be consulted in the process as experts. Stakeholders were further grouped into 3 categories:

1. organisations with expertise in nuclear safety, typically, operator groups, but also TSOs and international organisations, etc.;
2. organisations interested in nuclear, esp., in nuclear safety, typically, NGOs, local information committees, also networks and associations, like Nuclear Transparency Watch;
3. fire protection organisations, which have specific TPR-II topic related expertise.

WG3 Chair invited the ENSREG Members to comment on the following proposals:

1. Factsheets for the media describing the TPR process in general and explaining how and why the topic of fire protection was selected for the TPR-II. WG1 and WENRA would provide input for the 1st draft which would be ready by June.
2. Early stakeholder meeting in June, to be held virtually, to collect feedback on following TPR-II related issues: subject and scope in order to help WENRA improve technical specifications; Terms of Reference; stakeholder engagement plan (information dissemination actions, in particular, the factsheets). A report of the meeting would be drafted to be used for the preparation of the TPR-II. The national regulators were invited to propose relevant stakeholders.
3. Set up of TPR focus group. A standing stakeholder group with the focus of TPR could be launched as a result of the June meeting. The focus group would strengthen participation and help collect relevant qualitative contributions, increase knowledge among stakeholder groups, create continuity and benefit the transparency of the exercise. The practicalities of organising such a group (procedure of nominations, length of term, expected outputs) still need to be decided.

Four ENSREG Members, including the Commission, expressed support to all the proposals. Regarding the TPR focus group, the German member suggested to invite NGOs as well and to decide who will be the permanent and non-permanent members of the group. He proposed that the TPR Board Chair and a Commission representative should participate in the group. EC expressed readiness to participate if requested by ENSREG.

#### ENSREG took the decision to:

- **Invite WG3 to continue work on the Stakeholder Involvement Plan as described in WG3's presentation to the plenary also taking into account the comments proposed.**

## - WENRA contribution to TPR-II

### HLG-r(2021-42)\_539 WENRA proposals scope TPR II

### HLG-r(2021-42)\_541 WENRA-TPR scope

WENRA Chair presented the progress on defining the scope of the TPR-II. The scope was discussed inside WENRA including all working groups (RHWG – Reactor Harmonization Working Group, WGRR – the new Working Group on Research Reactors and WGWD – the Working Group on Waste and Decommissioning) and incorporating informal inputs from ETSON.

As a result, key principles for defining the scope were identified:

1. Include only the installations covered by the Nuclear Safety Directive, and as many of them as possible, but applying a generic or thematic approach to maintain the exercise manageable.
2. Choose existing safety reference levels (SRLs). Most reference levels that are developed for nuclear power plants seem to be applicable to many types of installations and to their whole lifecycle.

3. Apply a graded approach – focusing on facilities with higher potential radiological risk in case of fire. To maintain the exercise manageable it would be necessary to proceed with sample check rather than verify every single provision against fire.

WENRA Chair also emphasised the importance of availability of sufficient knowledgeable experts.

WENRA Chair invited ENSREG to endorse the presented proposals and to mandate WENRA to draft technical specifications in accordance.

Three ENSREG Members, including the Commission, expressed support to the graded approach.

German ENSREG member suggested to limit the scope on focus on main issues only. He expressed support to the idea of sample checks.

Austrian ENSREG Member invited WENRA to verify if generic SRLs in terms of fire protection are applicable to all types of installations covered by the Nuclear Safety Directive.

Regarding the topic of fire protection, WENRA Chair clarified that it would include not only fire mitigation, but also fire prevention, and assured that WENRA has safety reference levels referring to fire protection.

#### ENSREG took the decision to:

- **Endorse WENRA's proposal for the scope of installations to be covered by TPR-II:**
  - **all installations under the NSD are considered**
  - **all stages in the lifecycle are considered (facilities under construction, operation and decommissioning)**
  - **exclude from the scope facilities for which the radiological inventory that could be spread in case of fire would not potentially create a significant radiological risk**

#### ENSREG took note of:

- **the discussion and future decision points for ENSREG.**
  - **WG1 contribution to TPR-II**

HLG-r(2021-42)\_529 Lessons learnt from the 1st TPR

HLG-r(2021-42)\_531 WG1 - Report to ENSREG 42nd Meeting

WG1 Chair presented the outcomes of the discussion on TPR-I lessons learnt during the WG1 meeting in early February 2021. TPR-II Board members, Chairs of WG2 and WG3, as well as WENRA participated in the meeting. WENRA presented the development of the technical specifications, WG3 – the stakeholder involvement plan. It was agreed that the Board will take the lead of the exercise, whereas WG1 will support and draft the Terms of Reference (ToR) based on lessons learnt from TPR-I.

WG1 has created a subgroup dealing with TPR related issues, where representatives from WG2 and WG3 are participating.

WG1 Chair presented the summary of the Report on the lessons learnt from the 1st TPR process prepared by WG1 and asked ENSREG members to take note of it. The Report is uploaded on CIRCA BC.

The Report includes summaries of: the findings of the questionnaire submitted to all countries which participated in TPR-I, the self-assessment of TPR-I Board as recorded in the last meeting memorandum, EC views, and feedback on technical specifications as analysed by WENRA.

Overall the TPR-I was considered satisfactory with the main goals reached. The Report however identifies areas for improvement.

The need to further discuss site and country visits was identified. Several ENSREG members had expressed concerns in this regard in the questionnaire due to resources related concerns. WG1 will analyse the advantages and disadvantages and make a proposal for TPR-II ToR.

Workshop format needs to be decided. There is a need to optimise specific and thematic approaches, but country specific reports will need to be discussed. The restrictions in country delegations will be discussed as

well. The need to improve coordination between Board members, team leaders, rapporteurs, experts and participating countries was identified. Videoconference possibilities will be used more in TPR-II process.

Some of the observations were already taken into account, e.g. defining the scope of installations early in the process, setting reasonable time schedules for all phases in the process, defining the roles and tasks for different organisations in the process description, nominating Board members much earlier. Following the TPR-I experience, WG1 developed criteria for topic selection and they were used by WENRA when discussing the topic candidates.

**ENSREG took note of:**

- **The Report on the lessons learnt from the 1st TPR process.**

**ENSREG took the decision to:**

- **Hold an extraordinary ENSREG plenary on 7 July 2021 to discuss preparations for TPR-II (e.g. on site visits).**

## **4. Stress-Tests and NAcP outside the EU**

### **- Report from the Chair of Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries**

**HLG-r(2021-42)\_544 Stress Test Board Report**

**HLG-r(2021-42)\_530 Peer Review\_Practical Arrangements\_Update to extension**

ENSREG Chair informed about the replacement of Mr Latchesar Kostov with the new Bulgarian ENSREG Member Mr Tsanko Bachyiski as a member of the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries, following ENSREG's approval by Written Procedure expiring on 19 January 2021.

The Chair of the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries presented the Board's activities since last 41<sup>st</sup> ENSREG plenary which took place on 9-10 November 2020.

He reminded that the 41<sup>st</sup> ENSREG meeting decided to approve the Terms of Reference of the Board. ENSREG took note of the Board's preliminary report to the plenary, the extension of the Practical Arrangements document covering the ongoing peer review in Belarus, the discussions regarding the arrangements for completion of the peer review in case of pandemic related difficulties.

Since then the Board had 6 meetings. Most of the discussions were devoted to Belarus peer review, deliberations on how to proceed with Turkey peer review started as well. Next meeting is foreseen for 12 April 2021.

Regarding the Belarus peer review, the Chair of the Board explained the choice of the concept of priority issues for Belarus peer review.

He reported on the complications in carrying out the peer review mission to Belarus. As some of the PRT members were not able to travel to Belarus due to pandemic related reasons, in her letters to ENSREG Chair, Chair of the Board, Peer Review Team (PRT) leader and a number of ministers of countries participating in the PRT, European Commissioner for Energy Ms Simson underlined the importance of the exercise and invited countries to nominate more experts. In reply to questions by VATESI, the Chair of the Board clarified procedural aspects of the mission. The Team Leader presented the state of play of the whole peer review process and the Preliminary EU Peer Review Report on the Implementation of Belarusian Stress Test National Action Plan (see below).

ENSREG Chair informed that, because of the considerable external interest in the preliminary Belarus peer review report, after approval, it will be published on the ENSREG website, together with an explanatory statement from the Chair. She expressed gratitude to the whole peer review team and its leader Mr Tiippana for their efforts to continue the exercise in difficult circumstances, as well as to ENSREG members who provided additional experts.

**ENSREG took note of:**

- **The report of the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries;**
- **The updated Practical Arrangements to covering the Peer Review of Belarus National Action Plan.**

## - Akkuyu – peer review of stress test national report

Regarding the Turkey peer review, the Chair of the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries recalled that the Turkish Stress Tests National Report was received in 2018. The 38<sup>th</sup> ENSREG meeting endorsed the two-phase approach. As the construction of the Akkuyu NPP has now progressed significantly, the Board suggest to move back to a one-phase approach.

The planning for Turkey peer review is to launch the calls for nomination of PRT experts, topic leaders and team leaders in June 2021, to have the Practical Arrangements document in summer 2021, to have a decision on the PRT composition and to launch the desktop peer review at the end of 2021.

The Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Republic of Turkey supported the overall planning, but expressed some concerns that they will not be ready to provide all the necessary information during one-phase exercise.

The Chair of the Board, as well as the ENSREG Chair and the Commission representative assured that the issue will be discussed with Turkey further while discussing the Practical Arrangements in order to find the best compromise.

ENSREG Chair thanked Turkey for their openness to the process which should lead to the upgrade of safety and expressed happiness over the engagement of non-EU countries.

### ENSREG took note of:

- **The preparation of the stress test for Turkey.**

### ENSREG decided to:

- **Mandate EC to start negotiating Practical Arrangements with Turkey;**
- **Mandate the Secretariat to launch a call for experts, topic leaders and team leaders, in view of their appointment under a Written Procedure.**

## - Astravets – Preliminary Report – Peer Review of National Action Plan o Presentation of preliminary Peer Review Report

HLG-r(2021-42)\_527 Astravets NPP Preliminary Report NAcP Review

HLG-r(2021-42)\_547 Belarus NAcP Peer Review

The Peer Review Team (PRT) leader presented the state of play on the Belarus peer review and justified the reasons for conducting the review in two missions as well as the choice of high priority issues for the first phase. He informed about the conclusions of the Preliminary EU Peer Review Report on the Implementation of Belarusian Stress Test National Action Plan (Preliminary Report) and underlined the importance of Belarus addressing all remaining recommendations which will be reviewed in the second phase of the review.

The Team Leader explained that the concept of high priority issues was applied in all peer reviews so far. For the first time the Belarus NAcP was discussed in ENSREG meeting in 2019, where ENSREG members stressed the need to focus on most important issues first and to take actions on them in proper time, but acknowledging that all recommendations are important. He noted that the concept of focusing on high priority issues was discussed between the PRT leader and the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries in the meeting of the Board in October 2020 and was presented by the Chair of the Board in the 41<sup>st</sup> ENSREG meeting in November 2020. PRT leader together with topical leads identified then seven high priority issues as important to enhancement of safety and requiring early implementation. The seven high priority issues addressed in phase one are linked to 8-9 recommendations from 2018 EU Peer Review Report of the Belarus Stress Tests (1/3 of the total number of approximately 20 recommendations to be addressed in phase two). The Practical Arrangements' document was updated accordingly and formally agreed with Belarusian counterparts in January 2021. As a result, a hybrid mission with only part of the team travelling to Belarus and focusing on high priority issues and related recommendations was conducted in late January-early February 2021.

In January, PRT submitted to GAN a list of additional questions, requests for information/documents and lists of locations for the site visit. Last week of January three online meetings took place, one for each topical area, to discuss open items and review the documents in preparation for the site visit. As per revised plan, the site visit



of a smaller team took place on 9-10 February. To complement the team, EC and countries participating in the peer review nominated additional experts. At the site all documents and all the locations requested to be seen were presented, as well as some additional places. Expert discussions continued on site. The visit was very well prepared from the Belarusian side and took place in a very open and constructive manner.

After the site visit, PRT drafted the Preliminary Report and submitted to GAN for factual checking on 15 February. Subsequently, it was submitted to GAN and the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries on the same day, and to ENSREG on 19 February.

The Preliminary Report concluded that the Belarus NAcP addresses all recommendations related to high priority issues and that all high priority issues are adequately addressed, however some of them with provisions to be followed up in phase 2 (related to verification of the adequacy of the Design Basis Earthquake and loss of safety functions, enhancement of habitability of control areas, prevention and mitigation measures for severe accidents under open reactor conditions). Full list of recommendations and the conclusions on their implementation can be found in the Preliminary Report under the following link: <http://ensreg.eu/news/preliminary-peer-review-report-belarus-stress-test-national-action-plan>.

In the next phase the PRT will evaluate the comprehensiveness of the Belarus NAcP with regards to all remaining recommendations from 2018 EU Peer Review Report, self-assessment results and other relevant sources (e.g. ENSREG 2012 report, CNS extraordinary meeting summary) and the implementation of all remaining PRT recommendations. Technical online meetings are foreseen to take place during spring 2021 to discuss specific questions related to implementation of recommendations. Full mission to Belarus is planned for spring/summer 2021 to verify received information related to implementation of recommendations. Final Report for ENSREG will be drafted and issued afterwards.

PRT underlines the safety significance of all recommendations and encourages Belarus to continue working on them to ensure and enhance the safety of Belarus NPP in a timely manner.

PRT leader expressed gratitude to all parties involved: PRT members, additional experts, Belarus counterparts, EC staff and the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries. He encouraged not to politicise nuclear safety to allow maintaining open and cooperative approach in discussing safety issues.

The Chair of the Board for Stress Tests in Third Countries thanked the PRT and its leader for their work under challenging circumstances, EC for providing additional experts and ensuring secretarial support, GAN for their cooperation, and members of the Board.

Commission representative thanked the PRT and its leader, EC colleagues for their work and GAN for their collaboration. He emphasised the importance of finalising the exercise in the second phase and addressing the remaining recommendations. He reiterated the importance of maintaining the exercise on technical level. Commission representative informed that European Parliament would like to hear the technical conclusions of the Preliminary Report, which the Board and the PRT leader will present them. He informed as well about a letter that he recently received from the Deputy Minister of Foreign Affairs of Belarus expressing the intention of Belarus to continue technical discussions on their accession to ECURIE system and the formalisation of the provision of data to EURDEP system.

Representative of Gosatomnadzor conveyed thankfulness for the cooperation in the process of peer review. She reminded that Belarus, as an emerging nuclear country, have joined the European stress tests procedure on voluntary basis. She expressed their willingness to learn from recognised international experts and take their suggestions into account with the important aim of enhancing nuclear safety, as well as their readiness to continue the constructive work in the second phase.

- o ENSREG Members only – discussion of Peer Review Report
- o ENSREG Members only – ENSREG approval of Preliminary report

HLG-r(2021-42)\_527 Astravets NPP Preliminary Report NAcP Review

HLG-r(2021-42)\_546 Chair's draft Statement Belarus prelim PRT Report

HLG-r(2021-42)\_543 Lithuanian position - PRT recommendations in Belarus

In the closed session for Members only, ENSREG Members discussed and agreed on the Preliminary EU Peer Review Report on the Implementation of Belarusian Stress Test National Action Plan and the explanatory Chair's Statement on the finalisation of the Preliminary Report.

ENSREG Members agreed to highlight the following points in the Chair's Statement and in the minutes of the present meeting:

- As laid down in the European Stress Tests specifications, stress tests are not a complete safety assessment and cannot conclude if a nuclear power plant is safe or not, but identify areas for further improvements of nuclear safety.
- Stress tests and the implementation of follow-up actions should not be used to justify or authorise the safe operation of a nuclear power plant nor its long-term operation or lifetime extension.
- The Preliminary EU Peer Review Report on the Implementation of Belarusian Stress Test National Action Plan covers the evaluation of the implementation of seven priority issues as verified during phase one of the peer review. The remaining recommendations will be evaluated during the second phase.
- It is the responsibility of Belarus to implement all the recommendations identified by the EU Peer Review Report of the Belarus Stress Tests of July 2018 in a timely manner.

**ENSREG decided to:**

- **Approve the Preliminary EU Peer Review Report on the Implementation of Belarusian Stress Test National Action Plan and its immediate publication;**
- **Approve the explanatory Chair's Statement on the finalisation of the Preliminary Report and its immediate publication.**

## **5. Review of WG1, WG2 and WG3 activities since the previous meeting.**

### **5.1 WG1 (K. Alm-Lytz)**

**HLG-r(2021-42)\_531 WG1 - Report to ENSREG 42nd Meeting**

WG1 Chair presented the activities of the group since last ENSREG meeting, except the preparations for TPR-II already discussed under item 3 of the agenda.

WG1 held a virtual two-day meeting in early February 2021, where following activities were discussed:

#### **1. Preparation of ENSREG Status Report for TPR-I.**

ENSREG Status Report will include a summary of the updated National Action Plans (NACPs), the follow-up of the four European level challenges identified in TPR-I (WG1 taking contact with IAEA, WENRA, JRC, NEA), a brief summary of lessons learnt from TPR-I. The draft Report will be discussed in WG1 meeting in September and then presented for approval for ENSREG meeting in November. The objective is to publish the Report by the end of the year.

Countries participating in TPR-I were reminded to update their NACPs by the end of May 2021.

#### **2. Following the Stress Tests National Action Plans.**

Countries having finalised their measures present them in WG1 meetings. France and Finland made presentations in February. Countries, which have not yet finalised the activities under Stress Tests NACPs, were reminded to update their NACPs by the end of 2021. WG1 will update the status report in March 2022.

#### **3. Following the IRRS programme in EU countries.**

A new subgroup, including members from WG1 and WG2 and led by the Netherlands, was created for analysing the optimisation of synergies between IRRS and ARTEMIS missions, as there are several EU countries planning to have both missions very close to each other within next years. The subgroup had a kick-off meeting in January 2021. They also met IAEA at the end of February to discuss developing an integrated mission for EU countries in the long term. IAEA is developing guidance for back-to-back missions, the first draft of which should be available end of the year/beginning of next year.

Next meeting of the subgroup is foreseen for May/June, 2021.

Spain have shared their experience on a combined mission, Germany – on back-to-back mission. Four EU countries having back to back missions end of 2022/early 2023 will share their experiences during preparatory phase.



The choice on the type of mission to be held lies within the Member States.

4. **CFSI subgroup (Counterfeit, fraudulent and suspect items).**

The objective of the subgroup, led by France, is to share good practices and practical inspection tools in the area. An active UK member had to leave the subgroup after Brexit. It was not possible to organise a workshop due to Covid-19, but a limited-scope workshop for subgroup members is planned for this year and a CFSI paper will be produced afterwards.

5. **Multiannual Indicative Programme of European Instrument for Nuclear Safety (EI-EINS).**

WG1 members were asked to provide comments.

Commission representative invited the WG1 to prepare a statement for the ENSREG meeting in July on the significance of finalising the Stress Tests National Action Plans in the light of the 10-year Fukushima anniversary.

## 5.2 WG2 (S. Laporta)

HLG-r(2021-42)\_542 WG2 report

The Chair of WG2 presented the activities of the working group since last ENSREG meeting. An online WG2 meeting took place on 10-11 February. The next online meeting is foreseen for June.

The Chair highlighted the following topics:

- **Involvement of WG2 in Topical Peer Reviews** – the scope of 2<sup>nd</sup> Topical Peer Review (TPR II) relates to WG2 competencies, as fire safety is important for the waste of nuclear installations. WG2 representatives participate in the WG1 TPR subgroup and WENRA working group developing the Terms of Reference of TPR II.
- Scope and objectives of reviews of **Member States' approaches to defining starting point and end state of decommissioning and regulation management and radioactive waste arising from non-energy issues**. The work plan will be discussed in the next WG2 meeting and presented to the next ENSREG plenary.
- On 23-24 February WG2 participated actively in the EC workshop where preliminary findings of the **study on Key Performance Indicators (KPIs) for monitoring implementation of national programmes** have been presented and discussed. Once the final report of the EC study is available, WG2 will finalise its technical position document in the form of guidance on the use of KPIs in national programmes.
- Regarding the **status of the peer reviews under the Directive 2011/70/Euratom**, WG2 Chair reminded participants that some missions have had to be postponed due to the Covid-19 pandemic. It is hoped that the countries for which missions are already planned will still be able to host them in the coming years. Some non-EU member states intend to host ARTEMIS missions in the coming years as well: Japan in April 2021, Uzbekistan and Australia in 2022-2023.  
WG2 has sent to IAEA the updated list of ARTEMIS experts identified by ENSREG for peer reviews under the Directive 2011/70/Euratom in October, 2020. An online training course was organised for them on 30 November – 4 December, 2020.
- WG2 participation in the ENSREG WG1/WG2 subgroup on **the improvement of IRRS-ARTEMIS efficiency and effectiveness**, already discussed under agenda item 5.1 (WG1 report).

Commission representative stressed the importance of WG2 work in two areas. Firstly, defining the starting point and end state of decommissioning would help in determining the timing and the cost of decommissioning. Secondly, he emphasised the significance of the management of radioactive waste arising from non-energy uses. The EC has adopted the Cancer Action Plan beginning of 2021. Associated to it is the SAMIRA programme which evaluates the extent to which nuclear and radiation technologies can contribute to diagnosis and cure of cancer. It is very important to minimise and characterise the waste stemming from the above-mentioned activities.

### 5.3 WG3 (P. Majerus)

#### HLG-r(2021-42)\_536 WG3\_Transparency Arrangements

WG3 Chair reported on the working group's main activities since last ENSREG meeting, except the preparations for TPR-II already discussed under item 3 of the agenda:

- The paper „**Survey of ENSREG Member Organisations on the application of the ENSREG principles for Openness and Transparency**” has been published on ENSREG website.
- During the last ENSREG meeting it was decided to publish the link to **the IAEA document, entitled Status of Measurements of Ru-106 and Ru-103 in Europe**, on ENSREG website. However, it appeared that the link was not accessible to the public. IAEA informally agreed that the document itself could be published. WG3 Chair requested ENSREG's approval to publish the document.
- **The ENSREG communication policy** has been published on ENSREG website. A small subgroup of 4 people was set up to begin the work on **the communication strategy**, based on the discussion paper done in 2014. Though priority will be given to the work related to TPR-II, the subgroup will start exchanging the ideas. WG3 Chair invited more people to join the group.
- **Update of country profiles** is ongoing.
- Regarding the question of **ensuring constructive and effective public engagement in decision making process, primarily on LTO and decommissioning**, countries participating in WG3 started exchanging their experiences before the outbreak of Covid-19 crisis. The last meeting took place in February 2020. WG3 Chair informed on the decision to restart country presentations in online meetings.
- EC have prepared a new contract for **the ENSREG website**. Towards the end of the year WG3, in cooperation with EC communication experts, is planning to start working on improving the layout and modernising the website while maintaining its user-friendliness.
- WG3 will draft an opinion on transparency issues within the **Multiannual Indicative Programme of European Instrument for Nuclear Safety (EI-EINS)**.

Italian ENSREG Member expressed his concern that ENSREG communications should be clear and understandable to the general public. WG3 Chair confirmed that WG3 communication experts take clarity into account in their work.

ENSREG Chair invited the Member States to check and update their profiles on ENSREG website.

#### ENSREG took the decision to:

- **Send an official request by the ENSREG Chair to IAEA to publish the IAEA document “Status of Measurements of Ru-106 and Ru-103 in Europe” on the ENSREG web site.**

## 6. Presentation of European Instrument for International Nuclear Safety Cooperation

#### HLG-r(2021-42)\_532 EI INSC Multiannual Indicative Programme

#### HLG-r(2021-42)\_533 INSC - EIINSC

EC Directorate General for International Partnerships' (DG INTPA) representatives Mr Pascal and Mr Daures presented the European Instrument for International Nuclear Safety Cooperation (EI INSC), where three main pillars are:

1. Nuclear safety and radiation protection,
2. Safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste,
3. Effective safeguards.

The new instrument aims to provide assistance and training to non-EU countries, but mainly EU neighbours, by transferring EU approaches and knowledge rather than providing equipment as in preceding instruments. The Member States will be asked to agree on the projects to be developed.

Mr Pascal reported on the means of cooperation (calls for tenders, contribution agreements, international organisations, team-up with member states, budget support, TAIEX/TWINNING), eligibility criteria (participation

to international treaties and convention, transparency, fair peer reviews) and provided examples of their activities under the framework of EI INSC.

DG INTPA is coordinating with IAEA to make sure that their activities are complementary and not overlapping.

ENSREG Members generally expressed support to the EI INSC as a useful tool for promoting nuclear safety culture outside EU with the focus on capacity building. Several questions were discussed:

**Criteria of conditionality:** It was suggested to find balance between the need of strict conditionality and the means of evaluating the correspondence to them. The conditions should not be too strict as to hinder EC possibilities to enhance nuclear safety in the beneficiary countries.

**Transparency:** Austrian member emphasised the need for transparency not only in receiving countries, but also within EU, in respect of the tax payers' money spent, and suggested to add the point to the ENSREG statement. Regarding transparency in receiving countries, DG INTPA explained that asking for too much information could limit EC possibilities to enhance nuclear safety in the countries, thus the EI INSC sticks to the requirement to make peer review missions publicly available. Regarding transparency within the EU, DG INTPA is in the process of taking over the JRC website and updating the information. Mr Daures invited the Member States to inform of their needs.

**Calls for tenders:** French member asked EC to provide information once per year to ENSREG on future calls for tenders and on missions undertaken. DG INTPA expressed readiness to provide the information within the limits of the financial regulation, denying access to any privileged information.

**Team-ups with Member States:** DG INTPA encouraged Member States to inform about countries where they are cooperating, but also where assistance is potentially needed. However, Mr Daures noted that the legal basis providing eligibility does not allow cooperation with countries which are not party to the Non-Proliferation Treaty.

**Link to United Nations Sustainable Development Goals (SDG):** The main SDGs implemented through the EI INSC are number 3 (good health and wellbeing) and number 15 (life on land), in particular, through the remediation activities in Central Asia being currently implemented. Goal 16 (peace, justice and strong institutions) is also taken into account through contributing to the establishment of independent, competent and financially sustainable regulatory authorities in various countries.

**Programmes for non-energy nuclear use:** DG INTPA informed that any activities that are non-energy related, e.g. medical and agricultural, are covered by the Neighbourhood Development and International Cooperation Instrument (NDICI) which will be adopted soon and to which the EI INSC is complementary. As an example, waste arising from medical uses can be taken into account under waste envelope of EI INSC, but production of radioisotopes for medical application falls within the scope of NDICI.

**Coordination with the EU Chemical, Biological, Radiological and Nuclear (CBRN) Risk Mitigation Centres of Excellence Initiative:** Mr Daures assured that there is no risk of duplication of activities, because CBRN focuses on security aspects, whereas EI INSC focuses on the aspects of safety and safeguards.

The three ENSREG working groups were invited to send comments to the Multiannual Indicative Programme (MIP) for the EI INSC.

#### ENSREG took the decision to:

- **Prepare for adoption of an ENSREG Opinion on the MIP by Written Procedure.**

## **7. ENSREG Work Programme 2021-2023**

### **HLG-r(2021-42)\_535 Draft ENSREG Work Programme 2021-23**

The first draft of the ENSREG Work Programme 2021-2023 was prepared for the last ENSREG plenary and afterwards circulated for comments, which were incorporated and discussed with the working groups. The second draft was circulated under the silence procedure with the deadline of 14 February, 2021. Minor editorial

comments, as well as the suggestion to clearly separate the first and the second Topical Peer Reviews (TPR) were taken into account. Three substantial comments required ENSREG's decision:

1. Following ENSREG's decision on the postponement of ENSREG's Conference under agenda item 8, it was agreed to introduce the new date of 2022 into the Work Programme.
2. The suggestion to better reflect the WG2 work in TPR-II was taken into account.
3. Austrian ENSREG member suggested to inform the public on ENSREG's activities related to Covid-19 pandemic. ENSREG agreed not to add a point in the Work Programme, but publish a related news item on ENSREG website.

**ENSREG took the decision to:**

- **Approve its Work Programme for 2021 – 2023, incorporating comments received, as described above.**

## **8. ENSREG Conference 2021**

### **HLG-r(2021-42)\_534 Considerations on rescheduling ENSREG Conference**

The Chair of the ENSREG Conference Steering Committee requested ENSREG's approval for the postponement of the 6th ENSREG Conference from 2021 to 2022 for following reasons:

- Even if EC would agree to hold a physical event, it would take place under severe restrictions, such as substantially decreased number of participants allowed in the conference room. Thus only a hybrid or fully virtual meeting would be possible. However, meeting in person and having informal discussions is a crucial part of ENSREG Conference's character.
- Due to various time zones, only afternoon sessions would be possible and thus three afternoons would be needed to fulfil the ambitious programme.
- A virtual event would increase the risk of selective participation.

Nonetheless, the Steering Committee already had four constructive meetings, have almost finalised an interesting programme with a broad variety of panellists, who have all agreed to participate in the postponed Conference. The Committee would resume the work in autumn and would modify the draft programme as necessary.

The Chair of the Steering Committee invited colleagues to join and support the work of the Committee.

**ENSREG took the decision to:**

- **Postpone the 2021 ENSREG Conference until 2022 due to the continuing pandemic and resume the biennial frequency after that;**
- **Request the Steering Committee to continue the organisation of the 2022 edition of the ENSREG conference.**

## **9. 6th ENSREG Report to the Council and the European Parliament**

### **HLG-r(2020-41)\_507 6th ENSREG report for approval by the 41st ENSREG plenary**

Secretariat of ENSREG reported that the 6th ENSREG report to the Council and the European Parliament covering the period of the years 2018-2019, as approved in the last ENSREG plenary, was transmitted by ENSREG Chair to the Director-General of DG Energy of the European Commission, who has further transmitted to the Secretary Generals of the Council of the EU and the European Parliament. The Council took note of the report, the Parliament provided no feedback yet.

Regarding the preparations of the 7th ENSREG report covering the years 2020-2021, the ENSREG Secretariat proposed for WG chairs to submit their contributions to be covered in the report after the summer break. The Secretariat would consolidate the inputs into a draft to be circulated for the next plenary. The contributions can be updated towards the end of the year and a consolidated draft would be circulated for approval by written procedure or in the following plenary beginning of 2022.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- Approve the procedure for the preparation and adoption of the next (7th) ENSREG report covering 2020 and 2021.

## 10. Ongoing and Planned Studies by the Commission

### HLG-r(2021-42)\_540 Commission Studies

The EC presented the ongoing and planned studies contracted by the Commission.

Studies already published:

- On the market for decommissioning nuclear facilities in the European Union;
- On the risk profile of the funds allocated to finance the back-end activities of the nuclear fuel cycle in the EU;
- The mid-term evaluation of the nuclear decommissioning assistance programmes in Lithuania, Bulgaria, and Slovakia;
- Study on the insurance, private and financial markets in the nuclear third party liability field;
- Methodologies of cost assessment for radioactive waste and spent fuel management providing an overview of the practices adopted in the EU;
- Benchmarking analysis of Member States approaches to definition of national inventories radioactive waste and spent fuel;
- Comprehensive examination and analysis of the situation of transport of nuclear materials.

Studies in the process of publication:

- Analysis to Support Implementation in Practice of Articles 8a-8c of Directive 2014/87/Euratom;
- Study on Key Performance Indicators for monitoring implementation of national programmes on safe and long-term management of spent fuel and radioactive waste;
- Study to support the ex post evaluation of the nuclear decommissioning assistance programme 2014-2020.

Studies ongoing / in preparation:

- Study on radioactive waste classifications schemes in the EU;
- Implementation of Nuclear and Radiological Emergency Preparedness and Response Requirements in EU Member States and Neighbouring Countries;
- Resilience of the Nuclear Sector in Europe in the Face of Pandemic Risks;
- Implementation of Nuclear and Radiological Emergency Preparedness and Response Requirements in EU Member States and Neighbouring Countries, *where ENSREG members were invited to participate actively.*

ENSREG Chair requested to provide easily accessible links to the presentation and the studies themselves on the ENSREG website.

## 11. A.O.B

### - United Kingdom – Future Observership

EC reported on the cooperation between European Union and United Kingdom following UK's withdrawal from the European Union, Euratom and ENSREG on 31 January, 2020.

Three agreements have been negotiated with the UK:

- the overall Agreement on Trade and Cooperation;
- Security of Information Agreement;
- the Euratom-UK Agreement.

Based upon the Euratom-UK Agreement now provisionally in force, the EC representative and the ENSREG Chair invited ENSREG members to support UK's return to ENSREG in their status of observers to be able to continue the fruitful collaboration, also through their participation in the working groups.

ENSREG took the decision to:

- To invite United Kingdom to become Observers to ENSREG.

- Presentation by ENISS

HLG-r(2021-42)\_545 ENISS Presentation

Representative of ENISS (the European Nuclear Installations Safety Standards Initiative) presented the organisation and its' main activity fields. ENISS's work is focused on nuclear safety, radioprotection, and security for the whole life cycle of nuclear installations covering long-term operation, waste management and decommissioning, with the aim to develop common views on nuclear safety standards. ENISS represents nuclear installation licence holders from 16 European countries (including Switzerland, Ukraine and United Kingdom) and interacts with WENRA, the EU institutions, IAEA and other stakeholders.

ENISS expressed their interest to cooperate with ENSREG within the framework of ENSREG's Work Programme.

EC representative commended the importance of ENISS's work, especially in the areas overlapping with ENSREG activities, such as related to risk-informed decision making, transition from operation to decommissioning, as well as welcomed ENISS's participation in TPR-II process. He encouraged working groups of ENSREG to cooperate with ENISS in above-mentioned fields. Furthermore, he reported about an EC organised workshop in January 2021 to discuss potential uses and types of SMRs with representatives of industry. Another workshop will take place aiming to develop the SMR strategy in Europe.

Representative of WENRA assured that they will continue TPR-II related consultations with ENISS when drafting the technical specifications. He informed about WENRA's review of applicability of safety objectives and safety reference levels for SMRs.

The Chair of WG1 expressed interest in cooperation with ENISS in relation to TPR-II organisation.

The Chair of ENSREG stressed the importance of having common requirements for the new technology of SMRs in order to ensure security and safety. She requested to share the information for the purpose of harmonisation of positions.

## 12. Next meeting

An extraordinary ENSREG plenary is planned to take place virtually on 7 July 2021 to discuss TPR-II related questions and to approve the final EU Peer Review Report on the Implementation of Belarusian Stress Test National Action Plan, if ready by the date.

Depending on the development of the Covid-19 pandemic situation, ENSREG's 43rd plenary meeting is planned to be held either virtually on two afternoons of 22 and 24 November 2021 or physically on 24 November 2021 in Brussels. ENSREG Members and Observers will be informed on the final decision later.



## **Annex I**

### **Agenda 42<sup>nd</sup> meeting of ENSREG**

#### **Meeting held by Webex conference call**

***3 March 13:30 – 17:30 Brussels time***

***4 March 12:00 – 16:00 Brussels time***

#### **Wednesday 03 March 2021**

1. Opening of the meeting, adoption of the agenda
2. Chairperson's introduction and report
3. Second Topical Peer Review (TPR-II)
  - - Report by Chair of TPR-II Board
  - - WG3 contribution to TPR-II
  - - WENRA contribution to TPR-II
  - - WG1 contribution to TPR-II
4. Stress-Tests and NAcP outside the EU
  - Report from Chair of Stress Test Board
  - Akkuyu – peer review of stress test national report
  - Astravets – Preliminary Report – Peer Review of National Action Plan
    - o Presentation of preliminary Peer Review Report
    - o ***ENSREG Members only*** – discussion of Peer Review Report
    - o ***ENSREG Members only*** - *ENSREG approval of Preliminary report*

#### **Thursday 04 March 2021**

5. Review of WG1, WG2 and WG3 activities since the previous meeting:
  - WG1: (K. Alm-Lytz)
  - WG2: (S. Laporta)
  - WG3: (P. Majerus)
6. Presentation of European Instrument for International Nuclear Safety Cooperation
7. ENSREG Work Programme 2021 – 2023
8. ENSREG Conference 2021
9. 6th ENSREG Report to the Council and the European Parliament
10. Ongoing and Planned studies by the Commission
11. A.O.B.
  - United Kingdom – Future Observership
  - Presentation by ENISS
12. Next Meeting

## **Annex II**

### **List of Members and Observers**

(Status 3 March 2021)

#### **Members:**

Austria:	Mr A. Molin, Federal Ministry for Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology Dr V. Ehold, Federal Ministry for Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology
Belgium:	Mr F. Hardeman, Federal Agency for Nuclear Control Mr M. Demarche, ONDRAF-NIRAS
Bulgaria:	Mr T. Bachiyiski, Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria Mr B. Stanimirov, Nuclear Regulatory Agency of the Republic of Bulgaria
Commission:	Mr M. Garribba, Deputy Director-General, DG ENER Mr J. Panek, Director for Nuclear Energy, Safety and ITER, DG ENER
Croatia:	Ms M. Klanac, Ministry of the Interior Ms Z. Tečić, Ministry of the Interior
Cyprus:	Mr A. Yiannaki, Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance Mr D. Sakkas, Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance
Czechia:	Ms D. Drabova, State Office for Nuclear Safety Mr P. Krs, State Office for Nuclear Safety
Denmark:	Ms M. Øhlenschläger, National Institute of Radiation Protection Mr J. Thomsen, Danish Emergency Management Agency
Estonia:	Ms K. Muru, Estonian Environmental Board Mr I. Puskar, Estonian Environmental Board
Finland:	Ms K. Alm-Lytz, Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority Mr P. Tiippana, Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority
France:	Mr B. Doroszczuk, Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN) Mr A. Louis, Ministry for the Ecological and Inclusive Transition
Germany:	Dr W. Cloosters, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU). Mr T. Elsner, Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)
Greece:	Dr Ch. Housiadas, Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE) Ms V. Tafili, Greek Atomic Energy Commission (EEAE)
Hungary:	Mr G. Fichtinger, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority Mr S. Hullán, Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority
Ireland:	Dr M. Lehane, Environmental Protection Agency
Italy:	Mr S. Laporta, Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, ISPRA Mr U. Bollettini, Ministry of Economic Development
Latvia:	Ms D. Šatrovska, Ministry of Environment Protection and Regional Development Ms Z. Balode, Ministry of Environment Protection and Regional Development

Lithuania:	Mr M. Demčenko, State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI) Mr S. Šlepavičius, State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (VATESI)
Luxembourg:	Mr P. Majerus, Ministry of Health Mr G. Lentz, Permanent Representation of Luxembourg to the EU
Malta:	Mr P. Brejza, Occupational Health and Safety Authority (OHS) Mr J. Cremona, Occupational Health and Safety Authority (OHS)
The Netherlands:	Mr M. Brugmans, Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection Ms A. van Bolhuis, Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection
Poland:	Mr L. Mlynarkiewicz, National Atomic Energy Agency Mr M. Koc, National Atomic Energy Agency
Portugal:	Mr J. Oliveira Martins, Portuguese Environment Agency Mr P. Rosário, Portuguese Environment Agency
Romania:	Ms C. Paraschiv, Nuclear & Radioactive Waste Agency
Slovakia:	Eng. M. Žiaková, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic Mr M. Turner, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic
Slovenia:	Mr I. Sirc, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration Mr I. Grlicarev, Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration
Spain:	Mr J-M Serena, Spanish Nuclear Safety Council Mr R. Cid, Spanish Nuclear Safety Council
Sweden:	Ms N. Cromnier, Swedish Radiation Safety Authority Mr G. Szendrő, Ministry of the Environment

## Observers:

Belarus:	Ms O. Lugovskaya, Gosatomnadzor
Council:	Mr J. Bielecki, Division for Energy and Atomic Questions
IAEA:	Mr G. Caruso, Department of Nuclear Safety and Security
Norway:	Mr H. Mattsson, Norwegian Radiation Protection Authority
OECD NEA:	Ms R. Tadesse, OECD Nuclear Energy Agency
Switzerland:	Mr M. Kenzelmann, Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
Turkey:	Mr. Dr. Z. Demircan, Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Republic of Turkey (NDK)
Ukraine:	Mr. H. Plachkov, State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine (SNRIU)
WENRA	Mr O. Gupta, WENRA Chair

## **Annex III**

### ENSREG 41<sup>st</sup> Meeting Presence list

#### **Members and experts**

Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
AUSTRIA	Federal Ministry for Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology	EHOLD	Verena
AUSTRIA	Federal Ministry for Climate Action, Environment, Energy, Mobility, Innovation and Technology	MOLIN	Andreas
BELGIUM	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control	HARDEMAN	Frank
BELGIUM	Federal Agency for Nuclear Control	DEMARCHE	Marc
BULGARIA	Nuclear Regulatory Agency	BACHIYSKI	Tsanko
CROATIA	Ministry of the Interior	TEČIĆ	Zdravka
CYPRUS	Ministry of Labour, Welfare and Social Insurance	SAKKAS	Demetris
CZECHIA	State Office for Nuclear Safety	KRS	Petr
CZECHIA	State Office for Nuclear Safety	DRABOVA	Dana
CZECHIA	State Office for Nuclear Safety	CHARA	Jan
DENMARK	Danish Emergency Management Agency	THOMSEN	Jimmy
DENMARK	National Institute of Radiation Protection	ØHLENSCHLÆGER	Mette Karin
ESTONIA	Estonian Environmental Board	MURU	Karin
FINLAND	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)	ALM-LYTZ	Kirsi
FINLAND	Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority (STUK)	TIIPPANA	Petteri
FRANCE	Ministry for the Ecological and Inclusive Transition	LOUIS	Aurélien

Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN)	DOROSZCZUK	Bernard
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN)	CHANIAL	Luc
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN)	ETHVIGNOT	Thierry
FRANCE	Nuclear Safety Authority (ASN)	CADET-MERCIER	Sylvie
FRANCE	Permanent Representation of France to the EU	THEVENOT	Caroline
FRANCE	Permanent Representation of France to the EU	MARABEAU	Gwladys
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)	ELSNER	Thomas
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)	KUHN	Sebastian
GERMANY	Ministry of the Environment, Climate Protection and Energy Sector of Baden-Württemberg	NIEHAUS	Gerrit
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)	STOPPA	Gisela
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for the Environment, Nature Conservation and Nuclear Safety (BMU)	WEIDENBRÜCK	Kai
GERMANY	Federal Ministry for Economic Affairs and Energy	OSTER	Fernando
GREECE	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC)	HOUSIADAS	Christos
GREECE	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC)	TAFILI	Vasiliki
GREECE	National Technical University of Athens	MITRAKOS	Dimitris
GREECE	Greek Atomic Energy Commission (GAEC)	CARINO	Eleftheria
HUNGARY	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA)	BALLER	Barbara
HUNGARY	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA)	LÓRÁND	Ferenc

Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
HUNGARY	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA)	NAGY	Szilvia
HUNGARY	Hungarian Atomic Energy Authority (HAEA)	RETFALVI	Eszter
ITALY	Institute for Environmental Protection and Research, ISPRA	LAPORTA	Stefano
ITALY	National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN)	LAMBERTO	Matteocci
ITALY	National Inspectorate for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ISIN)	DIONISI	Mario
LATVIA	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development	ŠATROVSKA	Dace
LATVIA	Ministry of Environmental Protection and Regional Development	SLAIDINA	Natalija
LITHUANIA	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (Vatesi)	DEMČENKO	Michail
LITHUANIA	State Nuclear Power Safety Inspectorate (Vatesi)	ŠLEPAVIČIUS	Sigitas
LITHUANIA	Permanent Representation of Lithuania to the EU	NAVICKAITĖ	Jolanta
LUXEMBOURG	Ministry of Health - Directorate of Health - Department of radiation protection	MAJERUS	Patrick
MALTA	Commission for the Protection from Ionising and Non-Ionising Radiation	BREJZA	Paul
NETHERLANDS	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)	BRUGMANS	Marco
NETHERLANDS	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)	JANSEN	Robert
NETHERLANDS	Authority for Nuclear Safety and Radiation Protection (ANVS)	BOOM	Jurrian
POLAND	National Atomic Energy Agency	MLYNARKIEWICZ	Lukasz



Country	Organisation	Surname	Name
POLAND	National Atomic Energy Agency	KOC	Michal
POLAND	National Atomic Energy Agency	GLOWACKI	Andrzej
PORTUGAL	Portuguese Environment Agency	OLIVEIRA MARTINS	João
PORTUGAL	Portuguese Environment Agency	ROSÁRIO	Pedro
ROMANIA	National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control (CNCAN)	COCA	Madalina
ROMANIA	National Commission for Nuclear Activities Control (CNCAN)	ION	Mihaela
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic	ŽIAKOVÁ	Marta
SLOVAK REPUBLIC	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of the Slovak Republic	TURNER	Mikulas
SLOVENIA	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration	SIRC	Igor
SLOVENIA	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration	GRLICAREV	Igor
SLOVENIA	Slovenian Nuclear Safety Administration	DOLINŠEK	Urška
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	CID	Rafael
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	SERENA	Josep María
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	DE LOS REYES	Alfredo
SPAIN	Spanish Nuclear Safety Council	APARICIO	Manuel
SWEDEN	Swedish Radiation Safety Authority	CROMNIER	Nina
SWEDEN	Ministry of the Environment	SZENDRŐ	Gabor

## Observers

---

NAME	SURNAME	ORGANISATION
LUGOVSKAYA	Olga	Gosatomnadzor, Belarus
MATTSSON	Håkan	Norwegian Radiation and Nuclear Safety Authority
MAILÄNDER	Reiner	Swiss Federal Nuclear Safety Inspectorate (ENSI)
OZDERE	Gulol Oya	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Republic of Turkey (NDK)
UNVER	Latife Ozge	Nuclear Regulatory Authority of Republic of Turkey (NDK)
PLACHKOV	Hryhorii	State Nuclear Regulatory Inspectorate of Ukraine (SNRIU)
BIELECKI	Janusz	Council of the European Union
LERCEL	Bartosz	Council of the European Union
CARUSO	Gustavo	International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA)
GUPTA	Olivier	WENRA

## European Commission

---

NAME	SURNAME	
<b>Garribba</b>	Massimo	Deputy Director General – DG ENER
<b>Panek</b>	Jan	Director for Nuclear Energy, Safety and ITER – DG ENER
<b>Wächter</b>	Gerhard	Assistant to the Deputy Director General – DG ENER
<b>Naudužaitė</b>	Monika	Assistant to the Deputy Director General – DG ENER
<b>Rhein</b>	Hans	Head of Unit/D1 – DG ENER
<b>MacLean</b>	Finlay	Team Leader/D1 – DG ENER
<b>Kravos</b>	Marko	Policy Officer/D1 – DG ENER
<b>Asikainen</b>	Aila	Policy Officer/D1 – DG ENER
<b>Stanevičienė</b>	Rūta	Legal Officer/D1 – DG ENER
<b>Kumžaitė</b>	Eglė	Policy Assistant/D1 – DG ENER
<b>Petrovičová</b>	Zuzana	Head of Unit D2 – DG ENER
<b>Brunetti</b>	Gianfranco	Deputy Head of Unit D2 – DG ENER
<b>Hübel</b>	Michael	Head of Unit D3 – DG ENER
<b>Jilek</b>	Jan	Deputy Head of Unit D3 – DG ENER
<b>Murphy</b>	Simon	Policy Officer/D3 – DG ENER
<b>Patel</b>	Bharat	Policy Assistant/D3 – DG ENER
<b>Martín Ramos</b>	Manuel	Programme Officer – Research - JRC
<b>Noel</b>	Marc	Project Manager - Scientific / Technical Project Manager - JRC
<b>Carvajal</b>	Ursula	Project Officer - Scientific / Technical Officer - JRC
<b>Daures</b>	Pascal	Senior Expert - DG INTPA
<b>Pascal</b>	Ghislain	Programme Manager – EU Policies – DG INTPA
<b>Thormaehlen</b>	Christina	Policy Senior Assistant - EU policies – DG INTPA

---

## Other

---

NAME	SURNAME	
Rozmer	Andras	European External Action Service
Lundmark	Roger	ENISS
Ranval	William	ENISS
Ogle	David	ENISS
Bassing	Gerd	ENISS
Ensuque	Alain	ENISS