



**Minutes of the 24<sup>th</sup> meeting of ENSREG**  
28<sup>th</sup> May 2013  
Luxembourg

**Participants**

Members from all EU Member States as well as the European Commission, with the exception of Austria, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Latvia, and Malta, were represented in the meeting. Observers from Switzerland, IAEA and the JRC were also present.

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

The Chairperson welcomed the participants to the first ENSREG meeting held in Luxembourg.

**2) Adoption of the Agenda**

A proposal was received to take item 9.1) New ENSREG Chairman directly after item 6) ENSREG Conference. The proposal was accepted and the modified agenda approved.

**3) Debate on Design Pre-licensing**

*HLG\_r(2012-21)\_145 ERDA Roadmap FINAL 31 July 2012*

*HLG\_r(2013-23)\_186 ERDA for meeting with ENSREG 6 mars 2013 main version*

*HLG\_r(2013-23)\_187 ERDA for meeting with ENSREG 6 mars 2013 short version*

Mr. Krs explained that there had been insufficient time to debate the concept of European Reactor Design Acceptance (ERDA) presented at the previous meeting. There was some confusion from some members as to exactly what the proposal entailed and how far reaching it was.

The EC recalled that the European Reactor Design Acceptance (ERDA) concept was based on the idea that a nuclear reactor design needs not be reviewed and approved independently by each national regulator in each EU Member State where an operator applies for permission to build a nuclear power plant of that design, as is currently the case. The ERDA proposal aims at a common design review and acceptance, the results of which would be shared among several EU Member States allowing the reactor design to be acceptable to all participating countries, except for necessary adaptation to specific local conditions, leading to effective European standardisation of reactor designs. This would also allow a broader basis for sharing experience feedback with a corresponding safety benefit. Furthermore construction of a series of nearly identical units would have economic benefits.

It was emphasised that design standardisation shall not mean establishing a European supranational authority issuing reactor licenses that would apply all over Europe nor taking the licensing procedure of nuclear power plants away from Member States.

The design review and acceptance cannot be more than one part of the licensing process for a nuclear power plant, albeit a very important one for the deployment of standardised designs. National regulators would still have to accept the standardized designs and make a full assessment of the suitability of the site and of the operators' capabilities. Such European Reactor Design Acceptance would leave enough room for site-specific adaptations, which will have to be under the full control of the national regulator.

Finally, every national regulator concerned should be fully involved in any element of ERDA. The aim is not to erode national sovereignty but to reap benefits from stronger and more efficient cooperation.

Members considered that cooperation and shared work were very important and desirable issues but they were generally concerned about the obligation to "accept" a pre-licensed design. In principle common design assessment would be acceptable, but not approval.

Small countries voiced their concerns that with limited resources they would have difficulties to assess which exercises to participate in. Others considered that the concept could be beneficial to small countries, which could benefit greatly from the work performed by larger countries with greater resources.

It was considered important to draw the distinction between the regulatory and the vendor parts of the process. Sharing of experience was commendable and beneficial, but the concept of "agreed" design was far more difficult. The question was asked as to whether such standardised design would limit a country's desire to implement higher safety standards for a given reactor design.

From a legal perspective, approval would have to remain with the national regulator. As such it was imperative to avoid the issue of formal approval. However, the performance of joint work to establish the requirements for a reactor design was deemed beneficial as had been the case of the cooperation between FR and DE in determining the joint requirements of the EPR.

In summary ENSREG considered it premature to take a final position, either for or against the proposal, but recommended the issue for follow-up in order to establish in detail the added value and potential obstacles which such a proposal might deliver. The further research needed could potentially be taken up by ENSREG WG 1.

#### **4) ENSREG NAcP Workshop**

##### **4.1) Feedback from ENSREG NAcP Workshop**

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_201 Statement from Mr Hartmut Klonk-final*  
*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_202 NAcP\_Wshop\_Presentation to ENSREG*

Mr Klonk the Workshop president reported that the **ENSREG NAcP Workshop** had been a very successful and unique event and thanked all involved who had contributed to its smooth running.

##### Main findings

- All countries addressed the findings, recommendations and suggestions from the stress test.
- All countries identified analysis needs, hardware improvements, procedural modifications and regulatory actions, and corresponding implementation schedules in their NAcPs.
- All participating countries reported their analyses of safety margins under extreme natural hazards. Measures to further increase the robustness of the NPPs are planned or have already begun.
- All participating countries have introduced the general requirement for Periodic Safety Review (PSR) in their national regulations, although the PSR methodology varies between countries.
- A number of countries presented concepts of bunkered or hardened systems.
- The design requirements for specialized mobile equipment were also discussed during the workshop.
- Maintaining containment integrity under severe accident conditions remains an important issue for accident management. This was well recognized and discussed. Related activities are included in most NAcPs.
- New installation or improvement of existing filtered containment venting and of passive autocatalytic re-combiners (PAR) was reported.

##### Implementation schedule

- Analyses and reviews will mainly be finalized by 2014.
- Major modifications are expected to be implemented by 2015-2018.
- Latest date mentioned 2020.

##### Remaining challenges

- Completing the studies necessary to re-evaluate the strategy for severe accident management.
- Reassessing natural hazards systematically in the PSR process.
- Developing requirements for design, qualification and maintenance of mobile equipment that is not regularly used.
- Keeping the schedule for the implementation of appropriate hardware measures.
- Enhancing international exchange on research and solutions on molten core cooling and stabilisation (in/ex-vessel).

- Ensuring all aspects of installation safety (e.g. operational safety, safety culture) while performing ambitious programmes specifically originated from the Fukushima Dai-ichi accident is a key element in nuclear safety.

A follow-up peer review of national action plans and safety achievements was recommended for 2015 or later.

Some countries made the point that they had expected, and would have greatly appreciated, more detailed and more constructive critical feedback on their NAcP proposals and that while they supported a follow-up PR in 2015 it was important that the procedure for such a PR be re-designed and adapted to be tougher, in order to achieve maximum benefit and to fully justify the resources to be invested in the exercise. In this respect one possibility might be to restrict the scope of the exercise and to target it to specific issues, to give more detailed feedback. There was a need to stay 'ahead of the game' and to remain proactive and not reactive to events.

The EC highlighted its obligation to prepare an interim report on the stress test exercise to Council and the EP in 2014 and indicated that it would greatly appreciate early feedback from countries who were already implementing changes as a result of the review. Several countries offered their support to this objective.

The EC had already reminded countries that any significant investments resulting from the stress test review and national action plans required EURATOM Art 41 notification to the EC in due time.

EC would report the Workshop findings to ENEC plenary in Prague this week.

Regarding the time period foreseen for the implementation of measures identified in the NAcP, members reminded the EC that implementation delays were regrettably a reality and that it was important to control the implementation process in detail to avoid implementing poor quality.

Small countries again highlighted their limited resources emphasising that for them, additional Peer Review (PR) exercises were not a priority. Instead they would prefer to use existing reporting obligations contained in the existing directives.

Others emphasised the improved quality of work which had been achieved through cooperation and strongly recommended the creation of a Master Plan / Agenda of issues for future years. In a similar way WENRA reported that it had identified a need to coordinate and exchange its plans and ideas. WENRA had envisaged the creation of an Action Plan to prioritise issues beyond those addressed by the stress tests. To support this agenda it was considering to strengthen its technical secretariat and emphasised that it would be interested to discuss/communicate such issues with ENSREG .

IAEA considered the NAcP workshop to have been a very useful exercise and fully agreed with the need for more detailed critical feedback. They reported that for the first time Japan and TEPCO had admitted that the Fukushima accident could have been avoided if human and organisational factors had been addressed. As such the Agency would be adopting a more integrated approach considering human and organisational factors.

The Chairman summarised by again thanking all who had contributed to the success of the NAcP Workshop event. He emphasised that individual plants exhibit individual and specific risk profiles and that it was important to maintain a holistic view while targeting changes/improvements for maximum improvement.

ENSREG endorsed the concept of a follow-up PR in 2015 on the explicit condition that the exercise be designed critically for maximum benefit and efficiency.

#### **4.2) Approval of the ENSREG NAcP Workshop summary report**

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_200 Workshop final draft Summary Report Workshop 20130426*

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_211 Draft ENSREG press release*

Mr Klonek reported that the draft Workshop report had been prepared and circulated for comments. Small changes had been implemented on the request of LT and an elaborated participants list added. The EC had agreed to assist with the formal publication of the report.

The Summary Report was endorsed by ENSREG.

The EC recommended that the report should be available on the ENSREG website before conference and supported by a press release. Mr Klonk confirmed that this would be the case and that a draft press release had already been prepared.

### **5) ENSREG Report**

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_203 Draft ENSREG Report v0*

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_203 ENSREG\_REPORT\_2013\_(Draft 2) clean*

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_203 ENSREG\_REPORT\_2013\_(Draft 2) track changes*

The chairman thanked Mr.Molin and his co-editors for their work in preparing the first draft of the report.

Comments were received that the report was well structured but that the executive summary would benefit from being slimmed down and that references might be added. The EC volunteered its editorial services to bring the report to a final publication standard and would liaise with Mr.Molin to this end.

The targeted date of publication should be ASAP and if possible before the ENSREG conference.

### **6) ENSREG Conference**

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_209 European Safety Conference Programme 2013*

Mr. Pallier outlined the final programme and speakers as detailed in the programme document above and indicated that there would be a cohesion dinner to thank the speakers on the evening of the first day. He also requested ENSREG members to encourage individuals in their countries to register for the conference.

Regarding the press conference Mr. Pallier outlined a number of likely issues or questions which the press may address such as

- Has anything really changed post Fukushima?
- Are regulators independent?
- Do we need a European regulator? Would it be more or less independent?
- Should more be done to improve nuclear safety?
- Did anything really change following the stress test outcomes? I.e. no plants were shut down....
- What has ENSREG achieved and what more can be done?
- What would be challenging to European NPPs after Fukushima accident?
- Are Europe's NPPs safe and what does that really mean?

And potential messages which ENSREG should transmit

- ENSREG has learnt from Fukushima and is continuously improving nuclear safety.
- ENSREG adopts a common approach to safety to ensure consistency and adoption of best practices.
- Important to engage stakeholders and the public to explain safety and nuclear issues.
- What's next after the Stress Tests?
- Views on the new Safety directive?

WENRA indicated that it had new published positions on a number of related issues such as

- Safety assessment of new reactor designs taking into account the experiences of Fukushima.
- Position on periodic safety reviews.
- Topical groups.

WENRA indicated that it would appreciate to participate in the press conference.

ENSREG approved the WENRA request to participate in the press conference to share these messages and was in agreement with the proposed messages which ENSREG should endeavour to transmit.

### **9.1) New ENSREG Chairman**

For the designation of the next chairperson, it was proposed that particular criteria might first be established to guide ENSREGs decision making process. It was considered that the candidate should be a current Head of a National Regulatory Office, with long standing experience of ENSREG. There was general agreement that the candidate should be from a prominent nuclear country. The promotion of an existing Vice-chairman of ENSREG, such as Mr. Krs, was raised. Regrettably Mr. Krs indicated that he could not accept due to existing short and medium term commitments.

It was proposed that an interim appointment might be appropriate in order to give time for the correct candidate to come forward. Spain proposed Mr. Hennenhöfer of Germany who indicated that he would be proud to serve as Chairman of ENSREG. He agreed to take post in an interim period until there was clarity on his employment at the German regulatory authority.

### **7) Summary of ENSREG position on the proposed revised nuclear safety directive**

ENSREG reported that a consolidated directive text had been prepared from the intensive work of the ENSREG AHWG as an alternative to the EC directive proposal.

The EC considered that it had taken into account many of the ideas developed by ENSREG and that in addition it had gained valuable insight from the ENSREG AHWG meetings, as well as from bilateral meetings with MS. These interactions had assisted greatly in understanding the specific requirements of MSs as well as “red lines”/ limits beyond which the EC should not go.

The Draft Directive Proposal was currently foreseen for adoption by the Commissions on 11<sup>th</sup> June, although this could be subject to a finalisation procedure which would delay the formal adoption by up to 1 or 2 days. Following the adoption Commissioner Oettinger foresees to stage an extensive press conference on the proposal. The draft directive would then go forward for consultation with the European Economic and Social Committee (ESSC) which is expected to give its opinion around the 18-19<sup>th</sup> September. The ECs final proposal to the Council would then follow at the beginning of October.

The EC expressed its desire that the depth and extent of the consultation process would facilitate the eventual adoption of the directive in the Council. Some ENSREG members cautioned, that while there had been an extensive consultation process between ENSREG and the EC, there remained significant differences in opinion and position between some regulators and the EC on the best approach towards improved Nuclear Safety in Europe.

## 8) Progress made by ENSREG WGs

### 8.1) WG1 Progress Report

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_208 ENSREG IRRS feedback\_Wshop\_Proposal*

Mr Klonek, Chairman of WG1 reported that the work on the NAcP Workshop had been completed and addressed the topics for future work to be performed by WG1. He reported that Article 8 of the MoU with the IAEA on the IRRS visits highlighted the organisation of a joint ENSREG/IAEA workshop every 2 years, starting in 2013, in order to discuss issues and trends arising from the European IRRS missions. This joint workshop should be alternated with the existing International IRRS Workshops on Lessons Learned (already foreseen to be organized by the IAEA every two years).

In light of the recent and future missions from 2011 to end 2013,

- 2011 Romania, Slovenia, Germany (fu), Spain (fu)
- 2012 Sweden, Slovakia, Finland (part. scope), Greece (part. scope)
- 2013 Poland, Czech Republic, Bulgaria, Belgium UK (fu)
- 2014 France, Netherlands, Romania (fu), Slovenia (fu), Slovakia (fu)

and the next international IAEA IRRS Lessons Learned Workshop which was planned to be organized with the Russian Regulator in autumn 2014, it was proposed that ENSREG should plan a joint ENSREG/IAEA workshop on issues and trends arising from the European IRRS missions in March 2014. This meeting should have a maximum duration of 3 days (as a function of the programme content) and should be held in the EC premises. It was proposed that work on the preparations for this workshop be initiated by WG1 at its next meeting 22 October 2013.

The proposal was agreed by ENSREG.

### 8.2) WG2 Progress Report

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_207 ENSREG WG2 - draft report back for ENSREG 24*

On the issue of format and guidance for MS Reports under Art 14.1 of the Waste Directive, WG2 requested and was granted approval, for Spain, UK and France to trial the draft guidelines and report back on their experiences by end 2013.

On the subject of self-assessment and Peer Reviews under Art 14.3 of the Waste Directive WG2 reported that they were progressing with the work towards a simplified system for the use of one integrated IAEA Peer Review service to cover requirements of both Directive 2009/71/Euratom and Directive 2011/70/Euratom and were in discussions with IAEA to extend the existing MoU between ENSREG and IAEA to accommodate requirements for SA and PR also under the Waste Directive. The EC was in agreement with the proposal on the condition that the requirements of the Safety and Waste Directive would be fully respected.

### 8.3) WG3 Progress Report

No presentation

#### 8.4) WG4 Progress Report

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_205 ENSREG WGIC 20130528*

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_206 ToR ENSREG WG IC draft 20130524*

Mr. Pouleur chair of WG4 presented the activities of the recently established Working Group on International Cooperation (WG4). The group members from DE, FR, ES, AT, LT, BE, and DG DEVCO held a first preparatory meeting in April and a follow-up meeting on the 24<sup>th</sup> May. The meetings focused on the finalisation of the ToR based on the detailed first proposal prepared by WG1, discussions on the advisory tasks for the DG DEVCO and other potential International activities.

Key topics identified were

- the assessment of the needs of third countries' regulatory authorities;
- the prioritisation of such needs and the definition of high-level programming documents,
- the availability of staff resources in the EU nuclear regulatory authorities to implement the foreseen cooperation and
- the policies aimed at promoting international cooperation (e.g. through contributing to the activities of international organisations, particularly the IAEA).
- ENSREGs plan to advise the EC on its Strategy paper and multiannual indicative programme and will participate to exploratory and follow-up missions convened by the Commission.
- ENSREGs own international activities.

#### INSC – Strategy and multiannual indicative programme (ST&MAIP)

At the present time, a significant reduction in the budget of INSC has been proposed from 631 MEuro to approx. 220 MEuro which, if realised, would impact severely on the INSC planning. Until a final budget decision is taken the strategy paper and the multiannual programme cannot be finalised. It was proposed that ENSREG addresses a message to EP and Council highlighting the need to ensure for sufficient resources to support third countries consistent with EU mandate, to present nuclear safety challenges (i.e. Fukushima) and to consider the needs to enhance safety of European neighbours.

ENSREG members were concerned by the proposed budget cuts which risked generating a 2-speed approach to Nuclear Safety, and appeared to be in contradiction with the Council consensus to work closely with neighbouring countries to improve Nuclear Safety.

As such they expressed a desire to understand better what the appropriate budget level should be to facilitate the required Nuclear Safety actions.

This proposal was endorsed by ENSREG.

Regarding the future planning, a final decision on the budget is anticipated towards the end of June, with the ST&MAIP being available during the summer. As such it could be appropriate for ENSREG to offer its guidance in October. On this basis a planning would be established, including resources estimates. In the meantime, ad hoc participation to exploratory missions could be submitted by EC.

Beyond cooperation in the scope of the INSC, ENSREG intends to promote its activities in such areas as

- Ensuring the participation of third countries in the stress test action plan review process
- Implementation of WENRA RL's (as a follow-up of the stress test or others)
- Proactive promotion of ENSREG activities in important fora (IAEA, ENSREG conference...)
- Compilation of International trends for EU use
- Organisation of bilateral meetings with other regional associations of nuclear safety regulators i.e. FORO.

## 9) AOB

### 9.2) ENSREG Public documents

*HLG\_r(2013-24)\_204 ENSREG public documents*

The secretariat reported that the current ENSREG rules on promotion of restricted documents to PUBLIC status were unclear and requested guidance on which documents to make public. An action was raised on members to react to the list of documents to be circulated by the secretariat indicating which documents should be made public.

### 9.3) AOB

The Chair noted the BE regulatory decision to restart Tihange NPP and invited BE to report on the background to this decision.

Following inspections in the Tihange vessel, an International expert group on Hydrogen flake issues had been assembled. A workshop was held on the topic in November 2012 and following its outcomes the regulator issued its permission for restart in January 2013 under specific conditions. The operator satisfied the regulator on these specific conditions and a restart of the reactor has been authorised. All technical reporting on the matter is available on the BE regulator's website and in addition the regulator is preparing a workshop to present the incident and the findings to a wider audience.

## 10) Next meeting

**Next meeting will be held on 10<sup>th</sup> October in Brussels**

Meeting documents
HLG_r(2012-21)_145 ERDA Roadmap FINAL 31 July 2012
HLG_r(2013-23)_186 ERDA for meeting with ENSREG 6 mars 2013 main version
HLG_r(2013-23)_187 ERDA for meeting with ENSREG 6 mars 2013 short version
HLG_r(2013-24)_200 Workshop final draft Summary Report Workshop 20130426
HLG_r(2013-24)_201 Statement from Mr Hartmut Klönk-final
HLG_r(2013-24)_202 NAcP_Wshop_Presentation to ENSREG
HLG_r(2013-24)_202 NAcP_Wshop_Presentation to ENSREG V2
HLG_r(2013-24)_203 Draft ENSREG Report
HLG_r(2013-24)_203 ENSREG_REPORT_2013_(Draft 2) clean
HLG_r(2013-24)_203 ENSREG_REPORT_2013_(Draft 2) track changes
HLG_r(2013-24)_204 ENSREG public documents
HLG_r(2013-24)_205 ENSREG WGIC 20130528
HLG_r(2013-24)_206 ToR ENSREG WG ICdraft 20130524
HLG_r(2013-24)_207 ENSREG WG2 - draft report back for ENSREG 24
HLG_r(2013-24)_208 ENSREG IRRS feedback_Wshop_Proposal
HLG_r(2013-24)_209 European Safety Conference Programme 2013
HLG_r(2013-24)_211 Draft ENSREG press release