



Minutes of the 25th meeting of ENSREG
 10th October 2013
 Brussels

Participants

Official ENSREG members from all EU Member States as well as the European Commission, with the exception of Bulgaria, Croatia, Estonia, Malta, and Romania were represented in the meeting.

Observers from Switzerland, IAEA, Norway and the JRC were present.

1.0) Introductory address by the ENSREG Chairperson

The chairman opened the meeting and welcomed the new members to ENSREG

Mr Pedatteri Tiippana from Finland,
 Mr Gyula Fichtinger from Hungary,
 Mr Mats Persson from Sweden,
 Mr Colin Patchett from the UK
 Mr Peter Addison from the UK

The chairman informed the group that this would be the last meeting for Mr Hassel and he expressed his thanks on behalf of ENSREG for the excellent contribution in the context of the ad hoc group on the drafting of the ENREG position to the revised safety directive. The chair also reported that Mr Peter Faross had retired from the EC on the 1st October and expressed his thanks for the support which he had afforded to ENSREG. Mr Massimo Garribba would represent the EC on ENSREG in his capacity as acting director of ENNER D.

2.0) Adoption of agenda

The agenda was adopted without change.

3.0) Revised nuclear safety directive

The EC reported that the revised nuclear safety directive had been reviewed by the European Economic and Social Committee (EESC) and had been approved by a large majority. The Commission was about to transmit its final proposal to the Council on the 17th October, without changes with respect to the 13 June version. To date two rounds of general discussion on the proposal had taken place within the AQG of the Council. The Commission emphasised that the proposal had been strongly influenced by the paper of the ENSREG ad hoc group, as well as by the public consultation exercise and other stakeholder contributions. Detailed discussions will now follow in the AQG. The EC emphasised that it remained open to constructive suggestions with a view to improving and clarifying the legal text of the proposal.

Several countries expressed an interest in establishing an informal group to advise their national delegations at the AQG with a view to understanding the positions of different countries. Caution was expressed against overstepping the line of independence between regulators and government. Others considered that adequate communication channels already existed between safety authorities and government. Mr Molin indicated that he would invite the interested members to such informal exchange of views on occasion of an IAEA meeting in Vienna.

4.0) ENSREG report

HLG_p(2013-24)_117 ENSREG_REPORT_2013

Mr Molin reported that the third ENSREG report had been published on ENSREG website on the 24 July 2013. The chairman thanked Mr Molin and the Secretariat for the completion, publication and transmission of the report to the EP and Council.

Mr Molin considered that there were important lessons to be learnt from the process. He argued that the report constituted a valuable stocktaking of the past work of ENSREG, but that it lacked a certain degree of outlook and ambition in respect of the content and direction of ENSREG's future programme. He emphasised the need for a clear identification of responsibilities for the preparation of the next report, which requires strong leadership from the ENSREG Chairman. It was also proposed to align the ENSREG WP period with reporting intervals to facilitate reporting.

- [ENSREG noted the recommendations in regard to the editorial procedure for the next ENSREG Report](#)

5.0) ENSREG WP 2014-2016

Mr Molin presented a proposal for a 3 year WP (2014-2016) in order to better synchronise with the ENSREG reporting cycle to EP and Council and thereafter to return to a biennial rhythm. He requested that contributions to the next ENSREG WP be prepared by January 2014.

Mr Klonek reported that he had collaborated with the chair of WG2 to prepare a draft ENSREG masterplan for the period 2013-2018, but emphasised that it had not yet been presented to the WGs for discussion. The plan highlighted issues, linkages, regular reporting obligations to the waste and safety directives, IRRS peer review missions as well as follow-up activities from stress tests as well as the opportunity for ENSREG and WENRA to cooperate more closely. He indicated that there would be a requirement to renew the current EC support contract to the IAEA for the IRRS mission by March 2014.

The Chairman welcomed the masterplan initiative which gave an overview of the complexity and scale of the tasks at hand. This offered the opportunity to work more efficiently, to facilitate decision making and to avoid duplication and double reporting. WG1 and WENRA's close collaboration is vital and should be continued.

On the issue of reporting Slovenia strongly supported all action which would lead in the direction of a simplification and minimisation of reporting requirements and emphasised the importance of understanding, WHO would be reading the reports, WHY they were being produced and WHAT actions would be taken. The EC acknowledged that there was a generic problem associated with reporting which DG ENER and DG REGIO were currently analysing through a pilot. As such the Masterplan represented an excellent starting point for reflection.

Finland considered the masterplan to be an excellent demonstration of the complexity of the task at hand which clearly identified the two strands of ENSREG's technical work. In the first, WG1 technical status reports on Nuclear Safety and on the second, status reporting on safety improvements in NPs based on the stress test follow-up. He emphasised that WENRA were also working on the revision of their safety reference levels based on the experience of Fukushima, an area of work which was potentially very close to that of ENSREG on stress test follow-up. As such these two action lines merited some synchronisation for greater efficiency and effectiveness.

WENRA announced that it appreciated the discussions and was open to discuss to improve effectiveness and efficiency of the work. WENRA accepts the invitation from WG1 to develop a concept and help identify topics for the topical reviews in the context of the revised safety directive. WENRA will also consider the request by WG1 to check the implementation of safety reference levels in the facilities.

WG4 were also encouraged to add their contribution to the table, but announced that their contribution was for the moment delayed. A report on this issue would be presented under Agenda Point 7.4

- [ENSREG approved the proposal for a 3 year work programme between 2014 and 2016.](#)
- [ENSREG agreed that WGs would present their draft contributions to the next work programme by January 2014.](#)
- [ENSREG were supportive of the MASTERPLAN initiative and invited WG1 and WG2 to discuss and develop it further.](#)

6.0) ENSREG Conference

The chairman thanked the members of the ENSREG Conference steering committee for delivering a highly successful conference. The event had been well prepared and attended by more than 340 delegates with good International participation. There was a shared opinion that the 2nd ENSREG conference had been a clear improvement on the 1st conference, largely based on the extended opportunity for discussions. Even so it was felt that the issue of discussions format could still be enhanced.

The proposal from the Chairman for a follow-up conference in 2015 was well received, with the recommendation that the issue should be placed on the agenda of the next ENSREG meeting for further discussion and further development.

7.0) ENSREG Working Groups

7.1) WG1 Report

HLG_r(2013-25)_212 ENSREG Master Plan network

HLG_r(2013-25)_213 WG1 Report to ENSREG25

HLG_r(2013-25)_223 Memorandum of Understanding for a partnership between the EAEC and the IAEA on nuclear safety cooperation

HLG_r(2013-25)_222 ENSREG Taiwan peer review main conclusions

Mr Klonek indicated that no WG1 meetings had been held since April 2013, but that the next meeting was foreseen for the 22nd October in Bonn to

- discuss preparations for the ENSREG/IAEA workshop on IRRS missions in EU member states
- debate the design pre-licensing proposal presented by ERDA
- discuss the ENSREG masterplan on nuclear safety.

He requested the permission of ENSREG to publish the Rapporteur reports of the NAcP workshop held in April on the ENSREG Website.

In addition to the International IAEA IRRS lessons learned workshop foreseen with the Russian Regulator in Autumn 2014, the IAEA and ENSREG would organise a workshop on lessons learned from **European** missions. The IAEA emphasised that European workshop needed to focus specifically on the European issues to avoid overlap with the International event. The UK expressed a strong desire for the European and International IRRS Peer Review workshops to be combined so as to provide a broader exchange of views and a richer learning experience.

The European workshop would be combined with the next WG1 meeting in Brussels. A tentative 2 day programme had been proposed which would be developed at the meeting in Bonn, based on the following outline proposal

- WG1: Context, EU IRRS program, MoU, Pool of experts
- EU COM: IRRS-process under the NSD
- IAEA: Trends in findings from recent IRRS missions (EU and world), future developments
- EU MS (2 MS each) feedback on:
 - preparing for IRRS,
 - results of recent missions,
 - results of recent follow-up missions

He highlighted that in the context of the IRRS mission support the current contract between the EC and IAEA would expire in April 2014 and it would be of great benefit if this contract could be renewed and extended to include the Peer Review requirements of the waste directive. The EC thanked Mr Klonek and confirmed that financial support for the extended concept of IRRS missions is in the process of being secured and that the EC had already written to IAEA on this issue. It was emphasised, however, that there was an urgent need to establish the technical annex to this support contract which as the Commission understood, required urgent input from WG2.

For clarity the EC emphasised the difference between the

- MoU signed by ENSREG with agency for IRRS

- And the support contract of the EC with the IAEA in support of IRRS missions

On the issue of stress tests, a peer review of Taiwan stress test reports had been performed and early results had been included in the meeting documents. The full peer review summary report was foreseen Mid Nov 2013. The early feedback was that exercise had been conducted in a very cooperative and transparent manner but that significant challenges existed.

Concerning Armenia, their Stress test project was reported to be on-going, with a draft stress test report foreseen to be finalised in September 2013, and the country review report expected May 2014.

Mr Klonek reminded countries that the first MS reports to the safety directive would be due by the 22nd July 2014 and that reporting guidelines had been published on CIRCABC.

The EC informed the delegates that they were hosting a meeting of Neighbouring Countries on the 29th October in Luxembourg. On the issue of the motivation for the action, the EC indicated that while Ukraine and Switzerland had voluntarily participated to the stress test exercise the mandate afforded to the EC by the Council covered the neighbouring countries initiative. Russia had recently demonstrated an increased openness in their presentation of what had been done for their NPPs and the meeting would allow a comparison with the level to the EU stress tests. In the case of Armenia the EC had paid for their ST exercise and were therefore obliged to check the quality of the work performed. Russia, Turkey and Armenia had confirmed their participation. All were welcome to attend.

WG2 TF had been established to examine the potential enlargement of the IRRS Peer Review missions in support of the reporting to the waste directive. The next meeting was foreseen for the middle of November to work on the topic with a view to providing more details by the end of November.

Austria suggested that the volume of Taiwan Stress Test documentation on the Website was rather unbalanced compared to other countries. While the EC agreed, it reminded that the editorial responsibility for the website rested with the WG3 chair and encouraged him to exercise stricter editorial control.

The chairman cautioned that the waste and safety directives had different aims and addressed different institutions. As such combining the requirements of the waste and safety directives into a single IRRS mission would be challenging.

IAEA indicated that there existed common frameworks in every country for

- Waste management at national level
- Emergency preparedness at the national level

As such the waste management at national level was already included in all existing IRRS missions by default. It accepted that the procedure may need additional emphasis or minor adjustment, but considered that it should be possible to accommodate the needs of the waste directive reporting.

The UK reported that it had recently completed its IRRS follow-up mission, in which waste directive issues had been included. Early indications were that most, if not all, issues relating to reporting to the waste directive appeared to have been covered. The exercise had reached out into government and policy areas and appeared to demonstrate that the IRRS missions did have the potential to address the issue and that it was perhaps not the huge hurdle that some imagined.

- **ENSREG approved the request to publish the Rapporteur reports of the NAcP workshop held in April**

7.2) WG2 report

HLG_r(2013-25)_217 ENSREG 25 - WG2 draft report

WG2 had met in Sweden on the 18th June 2013 and discussed the current situation in relation to the waste directive, national programmes, and the National approach for managing SF and NW. It reported that three countries, FR, ES, UK were currently trialling guidelines for reporting and would share experiences towards the end of 2013. The development of draft guidelines would then be foreseen for the 1st quarter of 2014. In addition, a preliminary work plan for the self-assessment and peer reviews relating to Art 14.3 of the waste directive had been developed.

A task force meeting was foreseen for mid Nov to develop the IRRS mission requirements for the waste directive reporting. The IAEA had identified a framework for IRRS Peer Review services for SF and NW management, decommissioning and remediation in order to satisfy the Peer Review requirements of the waste directive and were currently detailing a proposal.

It was foreseen to present a proposal for an extended ENSREG-IAEA MoU to the next ENSREG meeting.

On the topic of national SF and RW management systems Austria, Belgium, Spain and UK would present their national approaches at the next WG2 meeting on 18th October.

Italy appreciated the work of WG2 but questioned whether WG2 was starting to develop its own separate identity from ENSREG based on the rather significant number of meetings. The WG2 chairman confirmed that the number of meetings performed were as a direct consequence of the work volume of work requested by ENSREG in respect of the waste directive.

7.2.1) Request from OECD-NEA for observer status in ENSREG WG2

HLG_r(2013-25)_214 OECD NEA Request for observer status in WG2

After a considered discussion the value of the presence of NEA as an observer in WG2 was fully recognised on the basis of their high level of experience in the field of waste management. The decision was taken by ENSREG to offer NEA, in consistency with the ENSREG rules of procedure, observer status within the ENSREG plenary which includes the requested observer status in ENSREG WG2.

- **ENSREG approved the request of NEA for observer status on the ENSREG plenary which includes the requested observer status in ENSREG WG2 .**

Action : Secretariat to draft letter for signature of chair inviting NEA to participate as an observer in WG2 and the ENSREG plenary

7.3) WG3 report***HLG_r(2013-25)_218 Audience overview 1Jan13_31Aug13******HLG_r(2013-25)_219 Country overview 1Jan13_31Aug13******HLG_r(2013-25)_220 Summary of updates to website since 16 January 2013 revised******HLG_r(2013-25)_224 WG3 Report***

WG3 Chair A. Molin was happy to report that the WG3 programme, established for 2012-2013, had been largely completed, with the only outstanding issue being to find an appropriate balance between the competing concerns for security and transparency.

Regarding ENSREG Website developments, on the issue of Transparency of Stress Tests Follow-up, a new sub-page had been created under "Follow-up" entitled "International outreach" – Taiwan. Pages for Turkey and Armenia would follow in due course as a function of material availability. A "News Alert" request function had been implemented together with a sub-page entitled "About us" depicting the organizational structure of ENSREG together with photos, together with a graphic identifying the key institutions and actors in the nuclear field such as ENSREG and WENRA. A new main menu section entitled "WG4 - International cooperation" was foreseen to be created in the next months.

Web access statistics were presented highlighting a peak activity coinciding with the ENSREG conference in June 2013. WG3 were currently in the process of developing a concept paper for further improvements/modifications of the Website and the EC was requested to consider a continued funding window to meet future needs.

The issue of the 3rd ENSREG report had been treated under Agenda point 4.0

Concerning the WG3 Work Programme for the period 2014-2016 the following issues were presented for consideration and potential inclusion

- Update of the document "Current and International Law with relevance to Transparency"
- Review of the rulings of the ACCC (Aarhus) and the ECIC (Espoo), develop guidance
- Peer review regarding the national implementation of the "ENSREG principles for openness and transparency"
- Transparency in NSD, Survey in the light of the 2014 reporting date
- Future developments of the ENSREG website (based on survey/feedback)
- *Prepare concept paper on the right balance between transparency and security*
- Continuous improvement of the Website,

On the issue of WGTA membership the chair requested countries to consider nominations to replace recently retired members and motivated countries not yet represented in WGTA to participate. The UK and ES responded positively to the request.

NL highlighted the fact that peer reviews of national transparency plans already formed an element of the IRRS missions. Some countries expressed their doubts as to whether peer reviews on transparency were necessary or appropriate.

It was suggested that feedback, perhaps organised through a workshop, would be more appropriate than a peer review. WG3 members reminded that the group had made an effort to identify generate and promote best practises and standards and that it remained relevant to establish if these were making a difference

7.3.1) Public Documents

HLG_r(2013-25)_221 ENSREG Discussion Paper ENSREG Public Documents (WGTA proposal)

A framework identifying 3 groupings of documents was proposed in the above document as a basis for discussion.

Group 1 – It was agreed that Final ENSREG docs should receive the "public" classification

Group 2 – There was wide consensus that WG level documents and WG reports did not represent an agreed and final ENSREG position, as these were frequently explorative in nature. The EC supported this position, which was consistent with the "exceptional case" rules on access to docs. As a compromise towards transparency, it was accepted that the plenary minutes – which are published – should contain a short indication as to the nature and status of the work being undertaken by each WG.

Group 3 - Relating to letters received, it was agreed that, since ENSREG was not the author or owner of such documents, it did not have the authority to publish them.

- ENSREG decided that only Final documents approved by the ENSREG Plenary meeting should be attributed the "p" status.
- ENSREG decided that the plenary minutes should present a short report on the activities and status of the WGs

7.4) WG4 Report

WG4 met in May 2014 and approved their ToR. During the summer period [Mr. Šeštokas](#), the Lithuanian member of WG4, participated to an exploratory mission on the subject of establishing a regional centre in Asia to react to radiological events.

The next WG4 actions foreseen would be the development of a strategy paper and a multiannual programme of work. That said certain particular obstacles to the approval of the INSC programme exist which appear to be linked to the establishment of the common implementing regulations. It is therefore currently difficult to identify a clear start date for the work.

At the recent AQG a non-paper was circulated which by the EC which stated that

- It was difficult to anticipate when the INSC would be approved
- The budget reduction from 630m euro to 200 ME was confirmed
- First ideas on how the objectives of the INSC could be respected in the context of the limited budget could be
 - Priority to safety (60%)
 - Management of spent fuel and radioactive waste and decommissioning and remediation of former nuclear sites and installations will have the budget reduced and will be phased out by 2017
 - Safeguards maintained up to 10%
 - A reduction in the scope of potential supported countries/regions limited to neighbouring countries and Africa

The situation raised several questions both at the AQG and from ENSREG members mainly focused on the following aspects:

- Related to the decision making process for implementation of the INSC; would the planning provide for sufficient time to consult with and obtain advice from ENSREG and its committees?
- Related to the definition of priorities; should ENSREG offer proposals for a high level strategy, especially in absence of a strategy paper proposal?

WG4 considered that it was appropriate for ENSREG to move forward and that WG4 would prepare its position during its next meeting on the 12th November in Brussels, based on the material currently available (and potentially available) focusing on:

- ENSREG views on the INSC main objectives
- The need to focus on efficient nuclear safety according to budget reduction (scope of cooperation, regions...)
- Strategy axes
- Identification of specific cases requiring support

Slovenia underlined its satisfaction for the budget reduction.

Several members were unclear as to the real strategy behind the action. Was it

- to increase nuclear safety in EU?
- to protect the EU by enhancing nuclear safety at its borders?
- an EU foreign policy instrument?
- intended for soft or hard assistance?
- to enable the EU to promote its nuclear safety philosophy worldwide?

The UK highlighted the fact that significant budget remained and that WG4 should work intensively towards developing a strategy options paper for discussion at the next plenary.

- **ENSREG agreed that WG4 should work towards developing a strategy options paper on the INSC topic for discussion at the next plenary**

8.0) ENSREG chairmanship

Mr. Hennenhöfer agreed to continue as chair of ENSREG at least until the next ENSREG meeting. He would take a decision on his continued chairmanship at the time of the next meeting, when there would be more clarity in Germany following the recent elections.

9.0) AOB

9.1 Taiwan Stress Tests

HLG_r(2013-25)_222 ENSREG Taiwan peer review main conclusions

The chairman reported that a stress test peer review exercise had taken place between 23rd Sept – 3rd October 2013 in Taiwan, under the leadership of Mr. Oskar Grotzinger. A short interim report had been included with the meeting documents. The exercise had been conducted in a highly transparent manner, but had identified particular challenges to be overcome due to the characteristics of the local geology which was similar to that of Japan. A full report would be available by mid-November 2013.

9.2 Representation of ENSREG

The issue of individuals representing ENSREG in a formal capacity was raised and whether there were specific rules on the issue. It was explained that the rules of ENSREG stipulate that under normal conditions the Chairperson represents ENSREG. The Commission proposed that other ENSREG members should be able to represent ENSREG at official events or occasions with the prior approval of the Chairperson but that for normal business, flexibility should be the order of the day. ENSREG were in agreement with this position.

9.3 Offsite emergency preparedness and response

The EC reported that it had instigated a study contract on the subject of offsite emergency preparedness and response. The contractor had consulted widely and had presented its interim findings to a stakeholder meeting on the 1st October. It was currently preparing its final report and recommendations. The Commission foresaw to present a communication on the subject before the end of the year and would greatly appreciate the views of ENSREG.

The chairman reported that there was an urgent need for a common position of nuclear regulators towards emergency preparedness and response and that the issue would be discussed at a senior level at the next WENRA meeting. The issue had been discussed over many years without the evolution of a consensus view.

10.0 Next Meeting

Next meeting 16th January

The subjects of the

- Revised Safety Directive
- Offsite emergency preparedness and response
- ENSREG WP 2014-2016
- Next ENSREG Conference

would be included on the agenda of this meeting.

Agenda Point	Document	ENSREG Approval
4.0	HLG_p(2013-24)_117 ENSREG_REPORT_2013	
7.1	HLG_r(2013-25)_212 ENSREG Master Plan-network	
7.1	HLG_r(2013-25)_213 WG1 Report to ENSREG25	
7.2.1	HLG_r(2013-25)_214 OECD NEA Request for observer status in WG2	
7.2	HLG_r(2013-25)_217 ENSREG 25 - WG2 draft report back	
7.3	HLG_r(2013-25)_218 Audience overview 1Jan13_31Aug13	
7.3	HLG_r(2013-25)_219 Country overview 1Jan13_31Aug13	
7.3	HLG_r(2013-25)_220 Summary of updates to website since 16 January 2013 revised	
7.3	HLG_r(2013-25)_224 WG3 Report	
7.3.1	HLG_r(2013-25)_221 ENSREG Discussion Paper ENSREG Public Documents (WGTA proposal)	
7.4	HLG_r(2013-25)_222 ENSREG Taiwan peer review main conclusions	
7.1	HLG_r(2013-25)_223 Memorandum of Understanding for a partnership between the EAEC and the IAEA on nuclear safety cooperation	