



Agenzia nazionale per le nuove tecnologie, l'energia
e lo sviluppo economico sostenibile



Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico

RICERCA DI SISTEMA ELETTRICO

Stress test for the nuclear power plants of European and neighboring Countries

Konstantina Voukelatou, Paolo Turrone

STRESS TEST FOR THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS OF EUROPEAN AND NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES

Konstantina Voukelatou, Paolo Turrone ENEA

Settembre 2012

Report Ricerca di Sistema Elettrico

Accordo di Programma Ministero dello Sviluppo Economico - ENEA

Area: Governo, Gestione e Sviluppo, del Sistema Elettrico Nazionale

Progetto: Nuovo Nucleare da Fissione: Collaborazioni Internazionali e sviluppo Competenze in Materia Nucleare

Responsabile del Progetto: Massimo Sepielli, ENEA

Titolo

STRESS TEST FOR THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS OF EUROPEAN AND NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES

Descrittori

Tipologia del documento: Rapporto Tecnico

Collocazione contrattuale:

Accordo di programma ENEA-MSE: Piano Annuale di Realizzazione 2011, Linea Progettuale 1: Partecipazioni Internazionali

Argomenti trattati:

Sicurezza Nucleare

Analisi Incidentale

Sommario

The reaction of the Nuclear Industry Operators in Europe after the accidental events of Fukushima, that staggered worldwide the people trust toward the peaceful access to the nuclear energy, has been to obtain a prompt and immediate reading of the exact sequence of accidental events. After that, a very important job was to go back to the design files and to the real configuration status of the NPPs (Nuclear Power Plants) in operation to check and verify their consistency with the upgraded safety. This process, in the European contest, has been indicated, under an emotional mood that linked to the coincident but very independent "shake" of the bank and financial system, as "Stress Test".

Note

Questo documento è stato preparato col contributo congiunto del seguente personale di ricerca ENEA: Konstantina Voukelatou, Paolo Turrone.

Copia n.

In carico a:

| | | | | | | |
|------|-------------|---------|-----------|-------------------|-------------------|--------------------|
| 2 | | | NOME | | | |
| | | | FIRMA | | | |
| 1 | | | NOME | | | |
| | | | FIRMA | | | |
| 0 | EMISSIONE | 18.9.11 | NOME | P. Turrone | F. De Rosa | M. Sepielli |
| | | | FIRMA | <i>P. Turrone</i> | <i>F. De Rosa</i> | <i>M. Sepielli</i> |
| REV. | DESCRIZIONE | DATA | REDAZIONE | CONVALIDA | APPROVAZIONE | |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 2 | 22 |

INDEX

| | |
|---|----|
| 1. SUMMARY | 3 |
| 2. "STRESS TEST" FOR THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS - CONTEXT FOR THEIR ESTABLISHMENT AND MEANING | 3 |
| 3. THE "STRESS TEST" NATIONAL REPORTS..... | 5 |
| 3.1 EU MEMBER STATES | 5 |
| 3.2 EU NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES..... | 7 |
| 4. SHORT TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF THE NATIONAL PROGRESS REPORTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPREHENSIVE RISK AND SAFETY ASSESSMENTS OF THE EU NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS | 8 |
| 4.1 SUMMARIES OF MEMBER STATE REPORTS | 8 |
| 4.2 SUMMARIES OF NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES' REPORTS..... | 16 |
| 5. GLOSSARY | 17 |
| 6. PEER REVIEW ON THE NATIONAL REPORT | 18 |
| 7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE NATIONAL COUNTRIES..... | 18 |
| 7.1 ACTION PLAN | 18 |
| 7.2 PEER REVIEW FOLLOW-UP | 18 |
| 7.3 ADDITIONAL ACTIONS..... | 19 |
| 8. ANNEX - BACKGROUND INFORMATION | 20 |
| REFERENCES..... | 22 |

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 3 | 22 |

1. SUMMARY

The reaction of the Nuclear Industry Operators in Europe after the accidental events of Fukushima, that staggered worldwide the people trust toward the peaceful access to the nuclear energy, has been to obtain a prompt and immediate reading of the exact sequence of accidental events. After that, a very important job was to go back to the design files and to the real configuration status of the NPPs (Nuclear Power Plants) in operation to check and verify their consistency with the upgraded safety. This process, in the European contest, has been indicated, under an emotional mood that linked to the coincident but very independent “shake” of the bank and financial system, as “Stress Test”.

We will report here how the “Stress Tests” were endorsed by ENSREG as unified and common procedures among European Community and some neighboring countries. The key milestones of the procedures will be indicated and the current results will be presented.

Up to now, the process has reached an important level of achievement having found the urgent and important provisions to be implemented for different NPPs of different countries, making them adequate to a more appropriate safety and security level, required after the Fukushima lessons learned. The most urgent provisions have just been implemented. A survey of an independent and international “Peer Review” team, issuing own recommendations, has overlooked the work carried out by the Nuclear Plant Owners and National Authorization Agencies. The “Stress Test” process is now entering in the phase where nations will deploy their plans to implement the provisions they have found necessary for the future, according to the recommendations of the international “Peer review” team.

2. “STRESS TEST” FOR THE NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS - CONTEXT FOR THEIR ESTABLISHMENT AND MEANING

The aftermath of the emotional stress, that shaken the Nuclear Industrial Operators, sedimented into the need to look back, checking through “Stress Test”, which of the existing NPPs could exclude the repetition of the unexpected disaster which took place in Japan. The name of “Stress Test” was then “fire-impressed” while what kind of interaction should be done was still to be discerned. First of all, it must be carefully reconsidered what really happened and discriminate what really was unforeseen in the Safety Design of the plant and what misconducted into the plant Operation or the plant Regulatory follow-up. After that, the step forward was to identify and recover what subjects were missing or mistaken during the common practice actuated up to now in order to implement the safety of the NPPs design.

The western nations in Europe, knowing that the national borders are inconsistent against the effects of a severe accident in a NPP, already gathered into ENSREG as an international common institution to coordinate and share the knowledge advancement for the Safety of the NPP. So the task to put to worth the lessons from the Fukushima events naturally felt to ENSREG, that also established procedures for

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 4 | 22 |

carrying out the “Stress Test” for the NPP scattered into the several EC Nations and other voluntary adhering vicinity Nations.

Responding to a EU Council request for a first document, on December 2011, ENSREG issued the ENSREG Declaration of Ref. [1] with annexed ‘EU “Stress Test” specifications’.

According to the specifications:

- the NPP Operators had to report about (final due date: October 2011):
 - Earthquake, flooding and other external events on their plant
 - Loss of Power, of Ultimate Heat Sink or a combination of both
 - Severe accident management and preparedness
- The National regulators had to summarize, as national reports, all NPP operators reports (final due date: December 2011)
- EC to report to the Council (by December 2011)
- Publication of the “Stress Test” results on June 2012
- Terrorist issues have to be considered separately

The aim of the test stress, just as an example, includes the reassessment of the safety margins of the NNP in front to the extreme events. For the Earthquake and Flooding, the Design Basis (DBE and DBF) level and determination methodology should be indicated; the provisions and key SSC making the NPP stronger in front of DBE and DBF; the compliance with the current licencing basis that may be different from the historical basis of its origin. Considering more severe events, then the DBE or DBF must be assessed if the situation can physically be possible, identify the weak points of the plant, and “cliff edges”, identify if any provisions can be envisaged to reinforce weak point or smooth “cliff edges”.

Consideration in the Test Stress verification should be given in a deterministic approach analyses of what will be the consequence of the loss of Safety Functions as LOOP (Loss Of Off-site Power) with a scenario in which: a) the Plant site remains Isolated from the delivery of heavy material for 72 hours, b) portable light equipment can arrive only after 24 hours and c) multiple reactor on the site are at the same status (how the situation is considered in the design, what will be the back-up power source, how long it will last before any other external support, what could help to prolong the duration, and what if even the back-up solution is missing, what will be the battery functions and duration, what will be the plant evolution, what may be external actions to prevent fuel degradation). In order to go deeper on how the stress test should be conducted, one may take a look on the format indicated by ENSREG for the NPP Operators at Ref. [2].

The European nuclear safety regulators group (ENSREG) and the European Commission have adopted on 26 April 2012 a report on the results of the stress tests on European nuclear power plants. In this report is identified that all countries have taken significant steps to improve the safety of their plants. Significant measures to increase robustness of plants have already been decided or are considered. The measures include provisions of additional mobile equipment to prevent or to mitigate severe accidents and the improvement of severe accident management with appropriate staff training measures. The report also identifies other areas for improvement and formulates recommendations. ENSREG and the European Commission also stressed the valuable improvements that the stress tests report will help achieve in the field of nuclear safety.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 5 | 22 |

ENSREG and the European Commission now intend to set up an “action plan” which would include a follow-up process to the recommendations expressed in the ENSREG and in the country reports. They also consider that the setting up of work in areas such as emergency preparedness and response would be useful.

This exercise, starting from March 2011, mobilised thousands of various actors including operators of European nuclear power plants, national safety authorities and their technical support organisations (TSO) and the European Commission. For the peer review phase alone, which was organised in the period between January and April 2012, the reports established by the 17 participating states and dealing with more than 140 nuclear power plants built in Europe were assessed by more than 80 experts coming from 24 various countries as well as by the European Commission.

Several public events were organised in order to present the stress test process. The reports drafted by the national regulatory authorities, the endorsed final report and its annex consisting of the 17 country reports are available on the ENSREG website (www.ensreg.com).

3. THE STRESS TEST” NATIONAL REPORTS

The reports are made available through the WEB site of ENSREG at Ref. [3] and [4] where the report referred to any single plant site and the final national report are available for any participating nation.

3.1 EU MEMBER STATES

BELGIUM:

http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/National_report_Master_2011.12.29.pdf

National_report_Master_2011.12.29.pdf

Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

BULGARIA:

http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/BG_Report_EN.pdf

BG_Report_EN.pdf

Publishing date: Thursday, 5 January 2012

CZECH REPUBLIC:

http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/CZ%20-%20National_Report_CZ.pdf

CZ - National_Report_CZ.pdf

Publishing date: Tuesday, 3 January 2012

FINLAND:

http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU_Stress_Tests_-_National_Report_-_Finland.pdf

EU_Stress_Tests_-_National_Report_-_Finland.pdf

Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

FRANCE:

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 6 | 22 |

[http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/FR%20-%20RapportASNECS2011%20\(French%20version\).pdf](http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/FR%20-%20RapportASNECS2011%20(French%20version).pdf)
<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/120106%20Rapport%20ASN%20ECS%20-%20ENG%20validated.pdf>
http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Avis%20ASN%20Stress%20tests%20ENG_0.pdf
<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Avis%20ASN%20Stress%20tests.pdf>
 Attachments: FR - RapportASNECS2011 (French version).pdf
 120106 Rapport ASN ECS - ENG validated.pdf
 Avis ASN Stress tests ENG.pdf
 Avis ASN Stress tests.pdf
 Publishing date: Thursday, 5 January 2012

GERMANY:
http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU_Stress_test_national_report_Germany.pdf
 EU_Stress_test_national_report_Germany.pdf
 Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

HUNGARY:
http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/HUN_Nat_Rep_eng_signed.pdf
 HUN_Nat_Rep_eng_signed.pdf
 Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

LITHUANIA:
http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/National_Final_Report_on%20stress%20tests%20Lithuania.pdf
 National_Final_Report_on stress tests Lithuania.pdf
 Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

NETHERLANDS:
<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/NetherlandsNatRep-StressTest2011-sec-v2.pdf>
 NetherlandsNatRep-StressTest2011-sec-v2.pdf
 Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

ROMANIA:
<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/ROMANIA%20-%20National%20Report%20on%20NPP%20Stress%20Tests%20-%20December%20%202011.pdf>
 ROMANIA - National Report on NPP Stress Tests - December 2011.pdf
 Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

SLOVAK REPUBLIC:
<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Slovakia%20Final%20national%20report%20.pdf>
 Slovakia Final national report.pdf
 Publishing date: Monday, 2 January 2012

SLOVENIA:

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 7 | 22 |

<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Slovenian%20Stress%20Test%20Final%20Report.pdf>
 Slovenian Stress Test Final Report.pdf
 Publishing date: Wednesday, 28 December 2011

SPAIN:

http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Spain_Stress-Tests.pdf
http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Pruebas%20de%20resistencia%20final_0.pdf
 Attachments: Spain_Stress-Tests.pdf
 Pruebas de resistencia final.pdf
 Publishing date: Friday, 30 December 2011

SWEDEN:

<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Swedish%20national%20report%20EU%20stress%20tests%20111230.pdf>
 Swedish national report EU stress tests 111230.pdf
 Publishing date: Friday, 30 December 2011

UNITED KINGDOM:

<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/UK%20-%20Fukushima%20Stress%20Tests%20-%20National%20Final%20Report%20on%20European%20Council%20Stress%20Tests%20for%20UK%20Nuclear%20Power%20Plants%20-%20ONR-ECST-REP-11-002%20Revision%200.pdf>
 UK - Fukushima Stress Tests - National Final Report on European Council Stress Tests for UK Nuclear Power Plants - ONR-ECST-REP-11-002 Revision 0.pdf
 Publishing date: Wednesday, 4 January 2012

3.2 EU NEIGHBOURING COUNTRIES

SWITZERLAND:

http://static.ensi.ch/1326182677/swiss-national-report_eu-stress-test_20111231_final.pdf
 Swiss-national-report_eu-stress-test_20111231_final.pdf
 Publishing date: 29 December 2011

UKRAINE:

<http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Country%20Report%20UA%20Final.pdf>
 Country Report UA Final.pdf
 Publishing date: Thursday, 26 April 2012

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 8 | 22 |

4. SHORT TECHNICAL SUMMARY OF THE NATIONAL PROGRESS REPORTS ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF COMPREHENSIVE RISK AND SAFETY ASSESSMENTS OF THE EU NUCLEAR POWER PLANTS

This summary is a commission staff working paper accompanying the document “COMMUNICATION FROM THE COMMISSION TO THE COUNCIL AND THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT” on the interim report on the comprehensive risks and safety assessments ("stress tests") of nuclear power plants in the European Union, issued by the European Commission in Brussels in November 24, 2011.

Received by all 14 European Union Member States (Belgium, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Netherlands, Romania, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, United Kingdom) currently operating NPPs their progress reports by the given deadline of September 15, 2011, as well as Lithuania despite closure of the last NPP unit in Ignalina in 2009 in fulfillment of the Lithuanian EU Accession obligations, there are still site-specific operating licenses in place as well as significant amounts of spent fuel stored on-site. From neighboring countries, Switzerland and Ukraine, sent progress reports. All national progress reports are published on the internet (www.ensreg.eu), except the Ukrainian national report. These reports are different in the approaches chosen by Member States, but despite these differences, it was possible to make a basic comparison, summarize the country-specific situations and extract some first cross-country findings.

4.1 SUMMARIES OF MEMBER STATE REPORTS

On the basis of the national progress reports, the country-specific short summaries can be given as follows:

Belgium

Context: Belgium has 7 reactors (all PWRs) on 2 sites (Doel, Tihange), generating more than half of its electricity.

Scope of Stress Tests: Stress tests are also foreseen for nuclear facilities other than operating NPPs (fuel fabrication plant, waste treatment and storage facilities, radioisotope production facility, research centres), and include man-made events (terrorist attacks, aircraft crash, cyber attack, toxic and explosive gases, blast waves).

Short Summary: Limited amount of technical details, but work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Overall, the regulator considers that the process engaged by the licensee to prepare its stress tests report is appropriate and efficient. Working groups set up are considered well suited and sufficiently staffed. Planned tasks are performed on schedule and a substantial amount of technical data is now available for synthesis in the final reports. The regulator considers the effort mobilized so far by the licensee well suited to successfully complete the task. The report mentions several improvements already implemented in the areas of additional cooling water supplies for the SFPs during SBO and the reinforcement of the seismic resistance of some parts of the facilities. The inspections conducted by the regulator showed that some

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 9 | 22 |

of the improvements are already operational and the formal implementation of the other improvements is still ongoing.

Bulgaria

Context: Bulgaria has 2 reactors (all VVER-1000) on 1 site (Kozloduy) generating about 35% of its electricity.

Construction of a new plant in Belene is planned.

Scope of Stress Tests: In addition to the two operating units in Kozloduy, the report covers also Unit 3 and 4 (permanently shut down with fuel still stored in SFPs).

Short Summary: Limited amount of technical details and limited amount of information on actions taken or preliminary results. Progress report covers mostly existing design features. However, work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress globally as planned even though in some areas there seems to be some delay at this stage (still ongoing work for the licensee to submit the progress report to the regulator for some areas). Review of licensee's report is ongoing, both with regard to design basis events and evaluation of safety margins.

Czech Republic

Context: The Czech Republic has 6 reactors (4 VVER-440, 2 VVER-1000) at 2 sites (Dukovany, Temelín) generating about one-third of its electricity. In August 2009 a public tender for contractors to build 2 new reactors in Temelín was opened, planning to bring them online in 2020.

Short Summary: Very limited amount of technical details, but work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. So far, no immediate actions have been identified or taken.

Specific Issues: The licensee's reports on NPP stress tests at the two sites include evaluations based on BDBA analyses carried out in the past, covering specified accidents caused by natural disasters and their potential impact on the operability of important safety systems, such as LOOP, SBO and LUHS. According to the report, even first evaluations clearly confirm that the sites are not exposed to extreme natural hazards which could pose a significant risk to a NPP. It is mentioned that risk of LOOP is a relevant issue in the Czech Republic, especially with respect to the installed output of renewable power sources.

Finland

Context: Finland has 4 reactors (2 VVER-440, 2 BWRs) on 2 sites (Loviisa, Olkiluoto) providing nearly 30% of its electricity. A fifth reactor (EPR) is now under construction and 2 more are planned.

Short Summary: Detailed and technically informative report, work to be performed is clearly defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Based on evaluations carried out after Fukushima, it has been concluded that deficiencies demanding immediate plant modifications do not exist. However, some modifications to further improve safe plant operation are envisaged.

Specific Issues:

– Earthquake: The seismic PSA from 2010 resulted in introducing some safety improvements to further decrease the risk. The latest PSA shows that only about 2%

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 10 | 22 |

of the CDF is due to earthquakes. Additional studies on seismic robustness of the fuel pools and the fire water systems are being conducted.

- Other: Some areas for possible improvements are already identified in some plants, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness:
 - Against LOOP, SBO and LUHS (ongoing investigations namely related to the possible use of transportable AC power sources, additional diesel driven emergency feed water pumps, analysis of alternative heat transfer means to the atmosphere, injection of fire fighting water into reactor pressure vessel, water supply from independent sources), and of SFPs (ongoing investigations namely related to the reliability increase of SFP inventory makeup using reliable electric power and permanent piping).
 - SAM analysis and implementation of strategies for the SFPs including hydrogen management, enhancement of SFP water level and temperature measurements).

France

Context: France has 58 reactors (PWRs of 3 standard types) at 19 sites (Belleville, Blayais, Bugey, Cattenom, Chinon, Chooz, Civaux, Cruas, Dampierre, Fessenheim, Flamanville, Golfech, Gravelines, Nogent, Paluel, Penly, St. Alban, St. Laurent, Tricastin) generating over 75% of its electricity from nuclear energy. 1 EPR is under construction, another one is planned.

Scope of Stress Tests: The French stress tests concern virtually all the 150 nuclear installations and not just the power reactors, including for example the EPR reactor currently under construction and the La Hague fuel reprocessing plant. The final report will cover 80 priority installations, including all NPPs. On some topics (industrial hazards, nearby roads and railways) the report goes beyond ENSREG specifications.

Short Summary: No technical information included in the progress report, but work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. To ensure full transparency of the French stress tests, France is broadly involving stakeholders (non-governmental organizations, elected officials, union representatives, etc) in different steps of the process. Additionally, some foreign experts from Germany, Switzerland, Belgium and Luxembourg participated on their request. According to the report, a large number of analyses will apply generically to all reactors since the French nuclear fleet is largely standardized. Consideration of specific scenarios for given sites is requested by the French regulator. An initiative to establish a national “Rapid Action Force” in charge of bringing in a timely manner human and material support to the affected site in case of an accident is also under consideration.

Germany

Context: Germany until March 2011 obtained about one quarter of its electricity from nuclear energy, using 17 reactors (11 PWRs, 6 BWRs) at 12 sites (Brunsbüttel, Brokdorf, Krümmel, Unterweser, Emsland, Grohnde, Grafenrheinfeld, Biblis, Philippsburg, Neckarwestheim, Gundremmingen, Isar). The government formed after the 1998 federal elections had the phase-out of nuclear energy as an element of its policy. With a new government formed in 2009, the phase-out was pushed back by around 10 years in 2010, but confirmed for 2021–2022 in 2011 as a direct political consequence of Fukushima.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 11 | 22 |

Scope of Stress Tests: German stress tests are broader than the ENSREG specification, covering also several man-induced events, such as aircraft crash, blast wave, toxic gases, terrorist and cyber attacks.

Short Summary: Detailed and technically informative report, work to be performed is clearly defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Germany has launched a domestic safety review before the start of the EU stress tests, based on the German Reactor Safety Commission approach using the concept of robustness levels. To assess robustness, three levels have been proposed for all the topics to be analysed. These levels reflect the assurance of the required safety functions to prevent “cliff edge” effects. The report states that the stress tests are progressing according to the agreed schedule. According to the report, the current findings show a high level of robustness.

Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of NPPs against SBO and LUHS, and improving plant-specific SAM and implementing SAMG. Quantitative assessment criteria and their consistency for beyond design basis events and postulated unavailabilities of safety systems are still under development.

Hungary

Context: Hungary has 4 reactors (all VVER-440) at 1 site (Paks) generating more than onethird of its electricity. New nuclear capacity is under consideration, and 2 new units for Paks are proposed.

Short Summary: Detailed and technically informative report, work to be performed is clearly defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of NPPs against BDBE, dynamic effects of flooding and SBO, increasing the robustness of the SFPs, and introducing plant-specific SAMG.

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: Regarding the ongoing BDBA investigations, some findings which require detailed safety assessment and possibly corrective actions were already identified.
- Severe accident management & emergency management: In Unit 1, technical modifications have already been completed, and the introduction of SAMGs will begin at the end of 2011. Technical modifications and introduction of SAMGs regarding the other units will be completed by 2014. The report highlights some areas for improvement under evaluation, mainly concerning the containment integrity through:
 - Installation of passive autocatalytic recombiners by end of 2011 at all 4 units;
 - Installation of a containment filtered venting system;
 - Analyses of hydrogen generation and distribution when a nuclear accident involves several reactors and/or SFPs simultaneously;
 - Analysis of possible mitigation measures after a severe accident in the SFP.

Lithuania

Context: As part of its EU Accession commitments, Lithuania closed the last of its 2 reactors (all RBMK) at the Ignalina site at the end of 2009. Despite closure of Ignalina, there are still several site-specific valid licenses, for example to operate the

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 12 | 22 |

storage facility for the significant amounts of spent fuel. Plans for a new plant with or without involving neighbouring countries are in place.

Short Summary: Limited amount of technical details and reference to the final report, but work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of the SFPs against BDBE. Several potential corrective measures are identified, such as the provision of alternative means to makeup water inventory to Unit 2 reactor core and the SFPs, means to supply neutron absorbers to the SFPs, and alternative power supply in case of SBO. A number of preliminary conclusions and recommendations identified for the new interim spent fuel storage include the analysis of BDBE, scenarios of cask turnover and tightness failure during transportation, cask blockage by debris after collapse of the storage hall, and cracks or collapse of the hot cell while spent fuel is being handled. The possible installation of new mobile diesel generators has been identified as a preliminary recommendation.

Netherlands

Context: The Netherlands has 1 reactor (PWR) at 1 site (Borssele) generating about 4% of its electricity. A large new unit is proposed.

Scope of Stress Tests: The scope of the Dutch stress tests has been broadened to cover also other nuclear facilities in addition to the NPP. Research reactors in Petten and Delft, the URENCO enrichment plant in Almelo, and the COVRA radioactive waste storage facility in Vlissingen will be covered as well. However, the results on these facilities will not be presented in the final report. The implementation of the stress test is also enhanced by bilateral collaboration with the Belgian regulator. The scope of the stress tests has also been extended to include additional initiating events, such as large grid disturbances, airplane crash, explosion pressure wave, electromagnetic pulse, toxic gasses, running aground of a ship, cyber attack and biological phenomena.

Short Summary: Limited amount of technical details, no details about the preliminary results, but work to be performed is defined, and seems to progress. The regulator informed the licensee that the progress report contains too little information and requested complementary information about the adopted scenarios and methodologies, the progress so far and the quality assurance. Further, it was noted that the licensee's progress report only considers the NPP as it is built and operated on 30.6.2011, i.e. with only U-fuel. Since a license has already been given for the use of MOX-fuel, regulator informed licensee that also MOX-fuel should be included in the analysis. Further, it is stated that actions will follow-up on the short term measures undertaken by the licensee immediately after Fukushima, including verification of the NPP's capability to cope with BDBA, SBO, internal and external flooding, as well as its capability to mitigate fire and flooding after a seismic event.

Romania

Context: Romania has 2 reactors (CANDU 6) at 1 site (Cernavoda) generating almost 20% of its electricity. Plans are advanced for completing 2 more units at Cernavoda. The regulator agreed that any potential design changes resulting from the stress tests will be implemented in the designs of Cernavoda Units 3 and 4. More plants are proposed at different sites.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 13 | 22 |

Short Summary: The report shows good progress, provides preliminary results and technical design information, and mentions possible safety improvements. Several concrete areas for improvement are identified in order to increase the robustness of the plant, such as measures against hydrogen build up and slow containment over-pressurisation. Installations of passive autocatalytic hydrogen re-combiners and containment emergency filtered venting systems are planned. The report highlights also technical improvements in the field of SAM that are already in place, such as the procurement of mobile diesel generators and specific EOP to cope with SBO and loss of SFP cooling events. Special attention has been paid to improve the existing SAM communication systems. Improvements are also planned for the survivability of key instrumentation inbdba conditions.

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: First, a seismic design basis review was performed, and both the level of earthquake against which the NPP is designed and the methodology used to evaluate the DBE have been found adequate. Preliminary seismic margin assessment showed that in comparison with the original DBE of 0.2 g (at 10⁻³ per year), all SSCs which are part of the safe shutdown path after an earthquake would continue to perform their safety function up to 0.4 g (at 5×10⁻⁵ per year). This margin is considered adequate by the regulator.
- Severe accident management & emergency management: The main challenges identified are due to hydrogen build up, slow containment over-pressurization and molten core–concrete interaction. Safety improvement measures already planned comprise, among other, hydrogen re-combiners, containment emergency filtered venting systems and mobile diesel generators.

Slovakia

Context: Slovakia has 4 reactors (all VVER-440) on 2 sites (Bohunice, Mochovce) generating about half of its electricity and 2 more under construction in Mochovce. The 2008 national Energy Security Strategy aims to maintain the proportion of electricity generated by NPPs at around 50% by means of power uprates and construction of a new reactor at Bohunice in addition to completing Mochovce 3-4.

Short Summary: Limited amount of technical details, but work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Although the report does not identify any needs for immediate actions, additional safety upgrades are being studied to increase the existing safety margins against beyond design basis events. Although with a focus on the two units currently under construction in Mochovce, some areas for improvement possibly relevant also for other units have already been identified, such as measures to increase the robustness of plants against BDBE and external flooding.

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: Earthquakes are relevant safety issues considered in the plant design at both sites (max. horizontal acceleration in Mochovce is 0.143 g and 0.344 g in Bohunice at 10⁻⁴ per year). Seismic margin assessment is ongoing and will be summarized in the final national report.
- Severe accident management & emergency management: The progress report highlights that some improvements have already been implemented in the last few years to extend the capabilities of the NPPs to cope with severe accidents. Additional safety improvement measures are currently under evaluation, such as:

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 14 | 22 |

- Adoption of measures to flood the reactor cavity in order to ensure the outside cooling of the reactor pressure vessel;
- Protection of the containment against uncontrollable hydrogen burning by means of passive autocatalytic recombiners and igniters;
- Protection of the containment against overpressure and high temperature by containment spray using a dedicated borated water tank;
- Setting up an offsite plant control center for SAM.

Slovenia

Context: Slovenia has 1 reactor (PWR) at 1 site (Krško) generating about 40% of its electricity. New nuclear capacity is under consideration.

Short Summary: The report is very comprehensive, well-structured and provides valuable technical details. It indicates that the stress test is well ahead of schedule, as most of the specified requirements have already been dealt with. The work to be performed is clearly defined and seems to correspond to the required scope. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of the NPP against BDBE, flooding, LOOP and LUHS. Several safety improvements are already implemented as result of the stress tests. Critical disruption of plant supplies due to infrastructure destruction has been considered.

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake - NPP: According to the report, a number of measures have already been implemented at the plant to increase its seismic robustness – no need for further work/measures mentioned.
- Earthquake - SFP: SFP was not evaluated in the context of the Krško SPSA, only NPP. For earthquakes up to about 0.9 g, it is considered that SFP integrity would not be challenged. For earthquakes >0.9 g, gross structural failures of SFP cannot be excluded. It is considered likely that fuel uncovering would then occur (i.e. at ≤10⁻⁵ per year). No further work mentioned.
- Severe accident management & emergency management: SAM evaluations were performed (for NPP and SFP) as well as emergency management evaluations. Updated SAMG are in place. No further work/measures mentioned in the report.

Spain

Context: Spain gets about one fifth of its electricity from nuclear energy, using 8 reactors (6 PWRs, 2 BWRs) at 6 sites (Almaraz, Ascó, Cofrentes, Sta. Maria de Garoña, Trillo, Vandellós). By government decision Sta. Maria de Garoña has been granted a life extension of 2 years and will be shutdown in 2012, although the regulator had accepted the extension for 10 years as submitted by the operator.

Scope of Stress Tests: Stress tests are also foreseen for a nuclear fuel manufacturing facility.

Short Summary: Detailed and technically informative report, work to be performed is clearly defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. All sites have addressed almost all points of the stress test requirements, and the regulator considers the progress reports as complete and appropriate. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of the NPPs against BDBE, flooding, LOOP and LUHS, as well as SAM.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 15 | 22 |

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: According to the report, the existing DBEs were re-assessed for all sites, and seismic margins are being reviewed for a horizontal acceleration of 0.3 g, from 1.5 to 3 times the design basis.
- Severe accident management & emergency management: The licensees propose to set up a common support centre for all the plants equipped with all necessary human and material resources to intervene in any plant within a maximum of 24 hours.

Sweden

Context: Sweden has 10 reactors (7 BWRs and 3 PWRs) at 3 sites (Oskarshamn, Forsmark, Ringhals) providing over 40% of its electricity. In June 2010, the abolishment of the act banning construction of new reactors was approved by Parliament, with construction being possible at existing sites and to replace the present 10 units. This is part of the government's climate program, which, among other targets, stipulates that the country should be carbonneutral by 2050.

Short Summary: Detailed and technically informative report, work to be performed is clearly defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of NPPs against DBE and flooding, as well as to further improving some SAM measures. Assessment of hydrogen accumulation and combustion needs further studies.

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: According to the report, assessments are proceeding according to schedule. Remaining work includes renewed verification of plant design against DBE and DBE analysis. DBE characterized by a set of ground response spectra corresponding to an exceedance frequency of 10⁻⁵ per site and year. The 8 oldest NPPs were initially not analyzed and designed to withstand a specified earthquake and are thus not fully verified against DBE. Analyses will be limited to a seismic load level of 10⁻⁷ per site and year.

United Kingdom

Context: The UK has 18 reactors (MAGNOX, AGR, PWR) at 9 sites (Oldbury, Wylfa, Dungeness, Hartlepool, Heysham, Hinkley Point, Hunterston, Torness, Sizewell) generating about 15% of its electricity, and all but one will be shut down by 2023. The government assumes that there will be a requirement of 60 GWe of net new generating capacity by 2025, of which 35 GWe is to come from renewables and the expectation is for "a significant proportion" of the remaining 25 GWe to come from new nuclear.

Short Summary: Limited amount of technical details, but work to be performed is defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. The report describes the progress of the licensees' reassessments, the organization set up by those licensees and the works still to be done by both licensees and the regulator. The report provides only very little information about the contents and the preliminary results. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing robustness of NPPs against flooding and LUHS.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 16 | 22 |

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: Work is ongoing. The exact nature of modifications and additional equipment to further improve resilience where reasonably practicable has not yet been fully developed for any of the licensees or sites.
- Flooding: Work is ongoing. As an example, one licensee has indicated that resilience enhancements under consideration include provision of additional local flood protection to key equipment and provision of further emergency back-up equipment to provide cooling and power. Additional studies are being prepared to re-consider flood modelling for specific sites and to review recent climate change information.

4.2 SUMMARIES OF NEIGHBORING COUNTRIES' REPORTS

Several neighboring countries expressed an interest to participate in the stress tests. So far, Switzerland and Ukraine sent their progress reports.

Switzerland

Context: Switzerland has 5 reactors (3 PWRs, 2 BWRs) on 4 sites (Beznau, Leibstadt, Gösgen, Mühleberg) generating about 40% of its electricity. Two large new units were planned. A national vote had recently confirmed nuclear energy as part of Switzerland's electricity mix. However, following Fukushima, in June 2011 parliament resolved not to replace any reactors, and hence to phase out nuclear power by 2034. Short Summary: Detailed and technically informative report, work to be performed is clearly defined, seems to correspond to the required scope, and to progress as planned. Some areas for possible improvements are already identified, such as measures in relation to increasing the robustness of the NPPs against BDBE and flooding.

Specific Issues:

- Earthquake: Regarding seismic risk, in 1999 the operators were requested to perform re-evaluations in accordance with the most advanced methods, including comprehensive quantification of uncertainties. It was shown that in the past the seismic hazard had been underestimated. On the basis of this insight, the regulator required the PSAs of all NPPs to be reassessed. The new PSA results demonstrate that all Swiss plants satisfy the IAEA criterion on CDF.
- Flooding: It is stated that several hazard levels for external flooding are considered. Regarding analysis of safety margins, a need for harmonization of procedures for all operators has been identified. Furthermore, it is considered necessary that sensitivity studies on potential cliff-edge effects are undertaken.
- Other: In June 2011, an external storage facility for emergency equipment shared by all NPPs was set up as requested by the regulator.

Ukraine

Context: Ukraine has 15 reactors (all VVER) in operation at 4 sites (Khmelnitski, Rovno, South Ukraine, Zaporozhe) generating about half of its electricity. Completion of 2 VVER units at Khmelnitski as well as construction of new nuclear capacity is planned.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 17 | 22 |

Short Summary: Very limited amount of technical details, but work to be performed is defined, and seems to progress according to the agreed schedule. For the operating plants, preliminary results are available. Walkdowns in all plants performed. Ukraine, as a neighboring country, has adopted a different timing for the stress tests, with progress reports to be presented by the licensees to the regulator by 15.10.2011.

Specific Issues:

- External initiating events: Based on the preliminary assessments, the NPPs must continue improving seismic qualification of SSCs important to safety. As for flooding, the implementation of technical and organizational measures to cope with possible damages of dams at the Dnieper, mostly for Zaporozhe site, is one of the priority actions. Regarding extreme weather conditions, the report states that specific measures have to be implemented to strengthen NPP resistance to tornadoes.
- Severe accident management & emergency management: The following areas for improvement have been identified at this stage: Absence of mobile devices to supply power to equipment and water, absence of design features for containment protection against overpressure, as well as absence of hydrogen concentration control features under severe accident conditions.
- Other: Priorities for safety enhancement defined. Shortcomings in electrical power supply identified. Evaluations on hydrogen hazards and containment overpressure performed, impact analysis ongoing.

5. GLOSSARY

- AC Alternating Current
- AGR Advanced Gas Cooled Reactor
- BDBA Beyond Design Basis Accident
- BDBE Beyond Design Basis Earthquake
- BWR Boiling Water Reactor
- CANDU Canada Deuterium Uranium (Pressurised Heavy Water) Reactor
- CDF Core Damage Frequency
- DBE Design Basis Earthquake
- ENSREG European Nuclear Safety Regulators Group
- EOP Emergency Operating Procedure
- EPR Evolutionary Power Reactor
- LOOP Loss Of Offsite Power
- LUHS Loss of Ultimate Heat Sink
- NPP Nuclear Power Plant
- PSA Probabilistic Safety Assessment
- PWR Pressurised Water Reactor
- SAM Severe Accident Management
- SAMG Severe Accident Management Guidelines
- SBO Station Blackout
- SFP Spent Fuel Pool / Pit
- SPSA Seismic Probabilistic Safety Assessment
- SSC Structures, Systems and Components

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 18 | 22 |

- UHS Ultimate Heat Sink
- VVER (Russian) Water Water Energetic Reactor

6. PEER REVIEW ON THE NATIONAL REPORT

The peer review on the national report has been carried out with a panel of 80 Regulatory Agency Experts from over 20 countries with the CE National, European Commission and other country as observers, divided in six teams each specifically dedicated to a sub group of countries and further three team dedicated to specific topical reviews Rif. [5]. The reviews activity also included the visit at some nuclear site.

The peer review teams have produced in time after any national report their own Country review report Rif. [3] and [4] and a final full comprehensive Peer Review Summary Report Rif. [6].

Recommendations from the Peer Reviews directed to each specific nuclear country object of the review are reported within each Country Review Report.

7. IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PEER REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE NATIONAL COUNTRIES

7.1 ACTION PLAN

Follow-up of the peer review of the stress tests performed on European nuclear power plants Vision. In March 2011, ENSREG and the European Commission requested by the European Council should review all EU nuclear plants on the basis of a risk and safety assessment “stress tests”.

European and neighboring countries were invited to participate and in such process, the stress tests were reviewed by the national regulators who prepared national reports. These reports were peer reviewed through a process organized by ENSREG. The national European regulators and the European Commission as ENSREG have endorsed the peer review report and the recommendations that finalized the stress test review and published a statement in April 2012, which concluded that follow-up activities would occur through an action plan.

7.2 PEER REVIEW FOLLOW-UP

Member States and ENSREG Actions

The national regulators will consider the results of the peer review as they are published in the ENSREG main and national reports.

Each national regulator will develop and make public its national action plan and such plan will provide an update on the implementation status of:

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 19 | 22 |

- National regulator conclusions from their national stress tests as documented in their national reports;
- Recommendations in the ENSREG main and country peer review reports;
- Additional recommendations arising from the CNS; and,
- Additional activities derived from national reviews and related decisions.

ENSREG will prepare by September 2012, a compilation of stress test peer review recommendations and suggestions. An ENSREG workshop with European countries that participated in the peer review will be held in February/March 2013 to discuss contents and status of implementation of the national action plans. The main goal of this workshop is to present national action plans and to peer review via a common discussion with further details.

WENRA Actions

Actions defined in the WENRA Conclusions published on the 24 May 2012 (<http://www.WENRA.org>).

These conclusions are in line with the conclusions of the European stress tests and peer review. ENSREG invites WENRA to provide an update on a basis regarding progress of the work.

ENSREG encourages WENRA, involving the best available expertise from Europe, to focus on developing actions from its conclusions on the following items:

- natural hazards
- containment in severe accident
- accident management
- mutual assistance amongst regulatory bodies in responding to nuclear accidents in one of its member states.

ENSREG highlights the importance of WENRA making the results of the above mentioned actions publicly available. In the context of this action plan, ENSREG will organize a set of follow-up fact finding site visits which will focus on information exchange with respect to measures taken, planned or under consideration to improve safety as part of the national action plans. The information received during these site visits will be used as input to the workshop in 2013 by which ENSREG will follow-up the national action plans.

7.3 ADDITIONAL ACTIONS

Off-site Emergency Preparedness

After the Fukushima accident was highlighted the need for robust off-site emergency preparedness arrangements and ENSREG places a high priority on this topic. For improvements are proposed the following activities:

- ENSREG will ask HERCA and WENRA to develop improved guidance on mutual assistance between regulators.
- ENSREG recommends that a joint European study including EC, ENSREG and others, as appropriate, be performed to identify issues to be treated in order to implement effective off-site emergency preparedness (beyond mutual assistance)

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 20 | 22 |

at the European level in the event of a severe accident which has radiological consequences in several European countries.

ENSREG also notes that the EC is commissioning a study to review off-site emergency preparedness arrangements across the EU member states and recognizes the relevance of the IAEA Emergency Preparedness

Aircraft Crash

Information from the public interactions has shown interest in the topic of deliberate aircraft impact. The topic was treated by the Ad-Hoc Group on nuclear security with already existing work. The Ad-Hoc Group proposed additional follow-up activities by operators and/or competent authorities.

IAEA Action Plan on Nuclear Safety

This ENSREG action plan will contribute to the IAEA action plan on nuclear safety in the following number of areas:

- Assessments of new learning from Fukushima
- Emergency preparedness standards and guidance
- IAEA safety standards
- Communication and dissemination of information
- IAEA peer review process development and implementation
- Research and development.

Transparency and Public Involvement

All national action plans and the ENSREG action plan shall be made available to the public in accordance with national legislation and international obligations.

The links to the national action plans will be provided on the ENSREG website.

The results of the regulatory workshop will be made public and will be discussed in the subsequent ENSREG conference which will take place later in 2013 and cover developments in a number of regulatory areas including the ENSREG action plan.

Implementation of the Action Plan

The ENSREG working group on nuclear safety will coordinate the activities in delivery of the action plan.

8. ANNEX - BACKGROUND INFORMATION

This annex provides information on the different organizations which are involved in the action plan, the outputs of the stress tests and peer review and the meeting of the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

Interested Organisations

ENSREG - European Nuclear Safety Regulator's Group - An independent authoritative expert body composed of nuclear safety authorities from all 27 European member states and from the European Commission.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 21 | 22 |

HERCA – Heads of the European Radiological protection Competent Authorities - voluntary association in which the heads of radiation protection authorities work together in order to identify common issues.

IAEA - International Atomic Energy Agency - An organisation within the structure of the United Nations Organisation which, among other functions, develops safety standards, performs international safety peer reviews and provides secretariat for the Convention on Nuclear Safety.

WENRA -Western European Nuclear Regulators Association - European network of chief regulators of EU countries with nuclear power plants and Switzerland as well as other interested European countries which have been granted observer status.

Outputs of the Stress Tests and Peer Review

several types of reports were prepared which are publicly available and linked to the ENSREG website.

- Licensees prepared reports on their assessments,
- Regulators prepared national reports based on their review of the licensee reports,
- ENSREG prepared a peer review report that includes a main report with European-level conclusions and country reports with country-specific conclusions.

Convention on Nuclear Safety

In August 2012 has been organised an extraordinary meeting of the CNS and the outcome was to identify actions taken by the Contracting Parties and to include post-Fukushima topics so to be addressed and considered in the next Review Meeting of the CNS, planned for 2014.

| | | | | | |
|--|---------------------------------|-------------|-----------------|-------------|-----------|
|  Ricerca Sistema Elettrico | Sigla di identificazione | Rev. | Distrib. | Pag. | di |
| | PAR2011-ENEA-L1A1-015 | 0 | L | 22 | 22 |

REFERENCES

1. www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20tests%20specifications_1.pdf
2. [www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/HLG_p\(2011-16\)_85%20Post%20Fukushima%20Stress%20Tests%20-%20Contents%20and%20Format%20of%20National%20Reports.pdf](http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/HLG_p(2011-16)_85%20Post%20Fukushima%20Stress%20Tests%20-%20Contents%20and%20Format%20of%20National%20Reports.pdf)
3. www.ensreg.eu/EU-Stress-Tests/Country-Specific-Reports/EU-Member-States
4. www.ensreg.eu/EU-Stress-Tests/Country-Specific-Reports/EU-Neighbouring-Countries
5. www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/Peer%20Review%20Topical%20Teams.pdf
6. http://www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/EU%20Stress%20Test%20Peer%20Review%20Final%20Report_0.pdf
7. www.ensreg.eu/sites/default/files/ENSREG%20Action%20plan.pdf