

# EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2004



2009

---

*Session document*

FINAL  
**A6-0282/2005**

4.10.2005

**\***

## **REPORT**

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the implementation of Protocol No 9 on the Bohunice VI nuclear power plant in Slovakia, as annexed to the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia  
(COM(2004)0624 – C6-0205/2004 – 2004/0221(CNS))

Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

Rapporteur: Rebecca Harms

### ***Symbols for procedures***

- \* Consultation procedure  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*I Cooperation procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*II Cooperation procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\* Assent procedure  
*majority of Parliament's component Members except in cases  
covered by Articles 105, 107, 161 and 300 of the EC Treaty and  
Article 7 of the EU Treaty*
- \*\*\*I Codecision procedure (first reading)  
*majority of the votes cast*
- \*\*\*II Codecision procedure (second reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the common position  
majority of Parliament's component Members, to reject or amend  
the common position*
- \*\*\*III Codecision procedure (third reading)  
*majority of the votes cast, to approve the joint text*

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the Commission)

### ***Amendments to a legislative text***

In amendments by Parliament, amended text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Highlighting in *normal italics* is an indication for the relevant departments showing parts of the legislative text for which a correction is proposed, to assist preparation of the final text (for instance, obvious errors or omissions in a given language version). These suggested corrections are subject to the agreement of the departments concerned.

## CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION .....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT .....	20
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS .....	23
PROCEDURE.....	27



## DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

**on the proposal for a Council regulation on the implementation of Protocol No 9 on the Bohunice VI nuclear power plant in Slovakia, as annexed to the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia (COM(2004)0624 – C6-0205/2004 – 2004/0221(CNS))**

### **(Consultation procedure)**

*The European Parliament,*

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2004)0624)<sup>1</sup>,
  - having regard to Article 203 of the Euratom Treaty, pursuant to which the Council consulted Parliament (C6-0205/2004),
  - having regard to Rule 51 of its Rules of Procedure,
  - having regard to the report of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy and the opinion of the Committee on Budgets (A6-00282/2005),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
  2. Specifies that the appropriations indicated in the proposal for a regulation are purely for guidance until agreement is reached on the financial perspective for the period 2007 and the following years,
  3. Calls on the Commission to confirm, once the next financial perspective has been adopted, the amounts indicated in the proposal for a regulation or, should the case arise, to submit the adjusted amounts for approval by the European Parliament and the Council, thereby ensuring their compatibility with the ceilings,
  4. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, pursuant to Article 119, second paragraph, of the Euratom Treaty;
  5. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
  6. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to amend the Commission proposal substantially;
  7. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and Commission.

---

<sup>1</sup> Not yet published in OJ.

Amendment 1  
Recital 3

(3) In the Protocol the European Union has also recognised that decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant will have to continue beyond the current Financial Perspectives and that this effort represents a significant financial burden for Slovakia. Decisions on the continuation of assistance from the Union in this field after 2006 will take account of this situation.

(3) In the Protocol the European Union has also recognised that decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant will have to continue beyond the current Financial Perspectives and that this effort represents a significant financial burden for Slovakia. ***Furthermore, the European Union is aware that owing to the nature and the extent of decommissioning, efforts in that regard will continue for several years after the 2007-2013 Financial Perspective.*** Decisions on the continuation of assistance from the Union in this field after 2006 will take account of this situation.

*Justification*

*It must be recalled that decommissioning will last not only beyond the current, but also after the next (2007-2013) Financial Perspectives.*

Amendment 2  
Recital 4 a (new)

***(4a) The European Parliament, the Council and the Commission recognise the efforts made by Slovakia to increase the safety of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant before accession, and the fact that Slovakia invested approximately EUR 250 million in safety measures between 1993 and 2000 and will take this into consideration when making the decision on the level of financial assistance to be granted to Slovakia.***

*Justification*

*The provision is self explanatory. Slovakia has invested approximately 250 million euro in*

*modernisation of safety standards of the NPP in question. The amount of money is considerable comparing to the resources of the country in the transition process and will be irrevocably lost once the two reactors are shut down. It should be therefore taken into account by the EU authorities while fixing the amount of assistance for Slovakia.*

Amendment 3  
Recital 4 b (new)

***(4b) Provision in the Community budget for assistance from the Union should continue to be made after 31 December 2013.***

*Justification*

*As decommissioning of the nuclear power plant is a long lasting process, going far beyond 2013, the Community assistance should last appropriately in order to secure safety of European citizens and sufficient power supply.*

Amendment 4  
Recital 4 c (new)

***(4c) The European Union also recognises and takes due account of the fact that as a result of the early closure of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant, Slovakia will not be in a position to collect all the required decommissioning funds, the gradual provision of which was scheduled in accordance with the initial life-time of the plant.***

*Justification*

*Slovakia prepared to gather the decommissioning funds for the initially set end of life of the NPP. It must be recognised that this long-term financial effort, however scheduled and well prepared, cannot be delivered on the shorter notice of the early closure.*

Amendment 5  
Recital 5

(5) Consequently, provision should be made for a sum of **€237** million from the Community budget to fund the

(5) Consequently, provision should be made for a sum of **€400** million from the Community budget to fund the

decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant over the period from 2007 to 2013.

decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant over the period from 2007 to 2013.

*Justification*

*The estimated costs of the early closure and decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 NPP Units 1 and 2 are much higher than the basis used for the Commission's calculation. Furthermore, due account should be taken of the considerable efforts Slovakia delivered between 1993 and 2000 in order to bring the to-be-shut-down units into conformity with all relevant security and safety standards.*

Amendment 6  
Recital 5 a (new)

***(5a) Recent proposals by the Slovak authorities to increase the amount of State Aid made available to the Slovak nuclear sector by way of the national decommissioning fund should be examined by the Commission in accordance with Community law;***

*Justification*

*The national nuclear decommissioning fund in Slovakia currently contains only approximately ten percent of the total funds needed to meet the post-closure liabilities of all the nuclear reactors located on Slovak territory. In order to address this situation, the Slovak authorities have proposed a new state aid measure that would, if implemented, increase the levy which is presently added to all end-user electricity bills in the country. For the purposes of the Council Regulation being considered here, it is necessary to recognise that other funding instruments are also to be taken properly into account by the appropriate Community institution in accordance with Community law.*

Amendment 7  
Recital 5 b (new)

***(5b) Community budget appropriations for decommissioning should not lead to distortions of competition in relation to power supply companies on the energy***



**market in the European Union. These appropriations should also be used to finance measures to compensate the loss of production capacity in line with the relevant acquis concerning:**

**(i) renewable energy sources;**

**(ii) energy end-use efficiency;**

**(iii) the security of electricity supply.**

#### *Justification*

*Follows amendments Nr 3 and 4 by the Rapporteur, but:*

*- is less restrictive: distortion of competition should be avoided not specifically and only in relation to companies from other Member States, but on the whole of the energy market;*

*- contains, as regards the complementary measures to develop compensatory production capacity in replacement of the decommissioned facilities, explicit reference to the applicable European legislative and regulatory tools concerning renewable sources, energy efficiency measures and security of energy supply.*

#### Amendment 8 Recital 8 a (new)

***(8a) In order to compensate for the consequences of the early closure, the decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant should be carried out in the manner which best helps to sustain development and growth in Slovakia in line with the Lisbon Strategy.***

#### *Justification*

*With regard to the significant effort and sacrifice Slovakia accepted to commit itself to, it must be underlined that the decommissioning of the NPP has to be a compensatory contribution to the sustainable development of Slovakian economy.*

Amendment 9  
Recital 8 b (new)

***(8b) In order to ensure the highest possible efficiency, the decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant should be carried out with recourse to the best available technical expertise, and with due regard to the nature and technological specifications of the units to be shut down.***

*Justification*

*Various reactors exist in the European Union, with various technological and industrial options and specifications. In order to secure the highest possible efficiency, it must be ensured that the decommissioning tasks will be achieved by those operators that have the most appropriate expertise.*

Amendment 10  
Article 2

The Community contribution to the programme under this Regulation shall be granted for the purpose of providing financial support for measures connected with the decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant, measures for environmental upgrading in line with the acquis and for modernising **conventional** production capacity to replace the production capacity of the two reactors at the Bohunice V1 power plant **and** other measures which stem from the decision to close and decommission this plant and which contribute to the necessary restructuring, upgrading of the environment and modernisation of the energy production, transmission and distribution sectors in Slovakia as well as to enhancing security of supply and energy efficiency in Slovakia.

The Community contribution to the programme under this Regulation shall be granted for the purpose of providing financial support for measures connected with the decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant, **including:**

**(i)** measures for environmental upgrading in line with the acquis

**(ii) measures for setting up new production capacity** and for modernising **existing** production capacity to replace the production capacity of the two reactors at the Bohunice V1 power plant;

**(iii)** other measures which stem from the decision to close and decommission this plant and which, **in compliance with, and by implementing the applicable acquis**, contribute to the necessary restructuring, upgrading of the environment and modernisation of the energy production, transmission and distribution sectors in Slovakia as well as to enhancing security of supply and energy efficiency in Slovakia.

#### *Justification*

*This amendments aims at defining in a more obvious fashion the scope of the Community contribution. In point (ii), there should be no reference to "renewable", "conventional" or any other type of specific production capacity: the currently/soon applicable European legal provisions concerning renewables, energy efficiency and security of supply will in any case be applicable and should suffice, as recalled in point (iii).*

#### Amendment 11 Article 2, paragraph 1 a (new)

**1a. The measures to be supported under the Community budget shall be defined in more detail by the Commission in 2006 after it has received the relevant Decommissioning Plan, comprising all the necessary information on the decommissioning process, from the Slovak authorities. The Commission shall take its annual decision on whether to approve the measures to be financed on the basis of that plan.**

#### *Justification*

*In order to ensure transparency and efficacy of expenditure from the EU budget, the measures to be financed need to be defined more in detail by the Commission. All the background information for further specification should be provided by the Slovak authorities in so called Decommissioning plan by the beginning of 2006. The Decommissioning plan will provide the*

*Commission with the basis for its yearly decisions on budgetary allocations.*

Amendment 12  
Article 3, paragraph 1

The amount necessary for implementation of the action provided for in Article 2 for the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013 shall be **€237** million.

The amount necessary for implementation of the action provided for in Article 2 for the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013 shall be **€400** million.

*Justification*

*The estimated costs of the early closure and decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 NPP Units 1 and 2 are much higher than the basis used for the Commission's calculation. Furthermore, due account should be taken of the considerable efforts Slovakia delivered between 1993 and 2000 in order to bring the to-be-shut-down units into conformity with all relevant security and safety standards.*

Amendment 13  
Article 3, paragraph 3

The amount of **the** appropriations allocated may **be reviewed** in the course of the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013 to take account of the progress made with implementation of the programme and ensure that the programming and allocation of the resources are based on actual payment needs and absorption capacity.

The amount of **annual** appropriations allocated may **vary** in the course of the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013 to take account of the progress made with implementation of the programme and ensure that the programming and allocation of the resources are based on actual payment needs and absorption capacity.

*Justification*

*The amendment intends to make clearer that year by year needs of funding vary in the course of decommissioning process, also because in 2008 the second reactor will be shut down and main works on the decommissioning of parts common to both reactors will begin. The absorption capacity should also be increasing during the decommissioning period.*

Amendment 14  
Article 3, paragraph 3 a (new)

***3a. Provision for financial assistance from the Community budget for the purposes set out in Article 2 of this Regulation shall continue to be made after 31 December***

**2013.**

*Justification*

*As decommissioning of the nuclear power plant is a long lasting process, going far beyond 2013, the Community assistance should last appropriately in order to secure safety of European citizens and sufficient power supply.*

Amendment 15  
Article 4

The contribution for certain measures may amount to up to 100% of the total expenditure. Every effort shall be made to continue the co-financing practice established under the pre-accession assistance and the assistance given over the period 2004-2006 for Slovakia's decommissioning effort as well as to attract co-financing from other sources, as appropriate.

The **Community** contribution for certain measures may amount to up to 100% of the total expenditure. Every effort shall be made to continue the co-financing practice established under the preaccession assistance and the assistance given over the period 2004-2006 for Slovakia's decommissioning effort as well as to attract co-financing from other sources, as appropriate.

*Justification*

*For the sake of clarity and consistency, the financial assistance to be made available under this regulation must be referred to as the Community contribution.*

## EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The purpose of the proposal for a regulation is to continue financial assistance for decommissioning of units 1 and 2 of the Bohunice VI nuclear power plant in Slovakia, as originally provided for in Article 3 of Protocol No 9 to the Act concerning the conditions of accession of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia, and Slovakia.

The Commission states that its proposal is necessary because Slovakia, for historical reasons, does not have sufficient reserves to cover the cost of dismantling the reactors and because commitments have been entered into under the Act of Accession regarding the early shutdown of the Bohunice VI reactors.

The rapporteur accepts these grounds and stresses that both partners must comply with the provisions laid down in the Act of Accession.

The decision to decommission Bohunice VI stemmed from a detailed safety review of the reactors in 1999. International experts came to the conclusion that the design flaws in the reactors were so serious that they could not be remedied effectively at a reasonable cost. Having established that Bohunice units 1 and 2 could not ‘reasonably achieve a high level of nuclear safety’, the Commission again confirmed in 2002 that they would have to be decommissioned<sup>1</sup>.

Bohunice VI is a twin-unit facility with WWER 440/230 reactors. In order not to jeopardise security of energy supply, it has been agreed that Unit 1 will begin to be decommissioned at the end of 2006 and Unit 2, at the end of 2008. Because of interactions that might have a bearing on safety, the relatively cramped conditions in the pressure vessel system, and radiation from the second reactor, which will still be in operation, essential decommissioning operations will be impossible to undertake immediately after Unit 1 has been shut down. Initially, therefore, after the fuel elements have been removed and the water circuits and the vessels – as far as possible – emptied, the reactor should be mothballed so as to be brought into as safe a quiescent condition as possible. Once Unit 2 has likewise been shut down, the major structural decommissioning operations can be started.

According to the information currently available, the two units are to be decommissioned in stages<sup>2</sup> and remain ‘in mothballs’ for 30 years.

The Slovak Government estimates that, at 2000 prices, decommissioning of the twin-unit facility, including waste disposal and final storage of the fuel elements, will cost €750 m<sup>3</sup>.

As regards a twin-unit facility with the same WWER 440/230 reactor type, the figure, purely for decommissioning up to the ‘green field’ stage, quoted by the Greifswald-based German

---

<sup>1</sup> COM(2002)0605.

<sup>2</sup> COM(2004)0719.

<sup>3</sup> COM(2004)0719.

state-controlled company Energiewerke Nord is €434 m<sup>1</sup>. From a total figure of approximately €3.1 bn for seven WWER reactors (4 x WWER 440/230, 1 x WWER 440/213, 1 x WWER-70), including waste disposal and final storage of fuel elements, it can be inferred that the cost for a twin-unit WWER 440/230 facility would amount to some €890 m. These costs were calculated according to a somewhat older price basis than the one used for Bohunice and from that point of view are consequently more of an understatement than not; on the other hand, because of site conditions, they cover treatment of fuel elements of a kind not needed in Bohunice. Without drawing any conclusions beyond a rough approximation, therefore, the figure of €750 m quoted for Bohunice can be considered fairly realistic.

The appropriations proposed by the Commission for the period from 2007 to 2013 amount to €237 m. Assuming that the total EU appropriations granted to date for the period up to 2006 have been and are continuing to be used for the decommissioning of the older Bohunice A1 reactor, which has already been in progress for some time, the EU financial contribution for Bohunice VI will account for just under a third, a figure that will apply only if it is used entirely to fund decommissioning and disposal. On the other hand, it should also be borne in mind that the EU contribution will be payable up to 2013, in other words while decommissioning is still in its early stages.

The initially high level of support will enable purposeful steps to be taken at the start of decommissioning, and that is a sensible approach because, for historical reasons, Slovakia did not begin to pay into a fund until 1995 and only €320 m has consequently been amassed so far<sup>2</sup>. That said, the financial requirements mentioned are based on estimates. The costs of all the measures to be financed wholly or partly by EU appropriations need to be calculated more accurately so as to prevent infringements of the rules of competition on the liberalised energy market.

On the whole, the Commission proposal appears to be sound:

- Continuation of the aid from the EU budget is in keeping with the commitments entered into when Slovakia joined the Union.
- If no support were provided, the fear would be that the Bohunice VI reactors might remain in operation, posing considerable risks of incidents that would not affect Slovakia alone.
- In Slovakia there are as yet no sufficient reserves to finance the decommissioning. If one or both reactors were to be shut down and there were no EU appropriations, it might not be possible to guarantee that decommissioning operations would be undertaken without delay in order to protect people and the environment. Be that as it may, Protocol No 9 does not stipulate completely beyond doubt that shutdown has to be followed immediately by decommissioning.

---

<sup>1</sup> BFS 2000: Federal Radiation Protection Office, Nuclear Safety Department: Ermittlung von Einsparpotenzialen bei Stilllegung und Rückbau deutscher kerntechnischer Anlagen (Calculation of potential savings in the decommissioning and dismantling of German nuclear facilities), project O2 S 7778, commissioned by the Federal Ministry for Education and Research.

<sup>2</sup> COM(2004)0719.

- Given the presently low volume of funding, the EU appropriations will make for a high degree of safety in the decommissioning operations, thus protecting people and the environment.

However, the requirements arising from the need to protect people and the environment when dealing with Bohunice VI at later stages will be impossible to meet under the regulation unless the proposed amendments are likewise taken into account.

EU appropriations must be used only for decommissioning of the Bohunice VI reactors and measures directly connected with it. Article 2 of the Commission proposal is worded in such general terms that there is no guarantee that this will happen. The changes/additions to the recitals and Article 2 clarify the use to be made of the appropriations and link it to the EU's three priority objectives of ensuring compliance with stringent safety standards in the decommissioning, achieving the aim of climate protection by promoting renewable energy sources, and implementing the liberalised energy market by averting distortions of competition in the longer term.

Article 6 of the regulation is intended to enable effective scrutiny to be brought to bear on the use of EU appropriations and ensure that they are used at the right time. Information on the state of the authorisation procedure at any given moment would be helpful from that point of view. In addition, regular checks will be needed in order to determine whether the use of EU appropriations is distorting competition.



15.9.2005

## OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON BUDGETS

for the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

on the proposal for a Council regulation on the implementation of Protocol No 9 on the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant in Slovakia, as annexed to the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia (COM(2004)0624 – C6-0205/2004 – 2004/0221(CNS))

Draftsman: Janusz Lewandowski

### SHORT JUSTIFICATION

The Committee on Budgets examined the proposals for two Council regulations on the implementation of Protocols Nos 4 and 9 on the nuclear power plants in Ignalina (Lithuania) and Bohunice V1 (Slovakia), as annexed to the 2004 Act of Accession (COM(2004)0624).

The amount proposed for implementation of the action of decommissioning Ignalina is EUR 815 million, and Bohunice V1 EUR 237 million.

Your draftsman is concerned that the European Parliament has only been consulted by the Council on the regulation on Bohunice V1 (Slovakia) and not on the regulation on Ignalina (Lithuania), although the financial implications for the latter are much more important.

The reason for this is the difference in legal basis put forward by the Commission in its two proposals:

- in the case of Ignalina, Article 56 of the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia and Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Protocol No 4 on the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania, as annexed to this Act is cited, whereas
- in the case of Bohunice V1, Article 203 of the Euratom Treaty is supposed to be the legal base.

The Protocol on Ignalina does **not** foresee consultation of the European Parliament,, whereas

according to Article 203 of the Euratom Treaty, Parliament has to be consulted by Council. The proposed amount of EUR 815 million for the period after 31 December 2006 is not foreseen in Protocol No 4 on Ignalina, which means that the proposed expenditure would be **non-compulsory**. Parliament should therefore have been consulted also on the proposal on Ignalina.

The Committee on Budgets has suggested that the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, in accordance with Rule 35 of Parliament's Rules of Procedure, request the opinion of the Committee on Legal Affairs on the validity or the appropriateness of the legal basis of the proposed Council regulation on the implementation of Protocol No 4 on the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania, as annexed to the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia -“Ignalina Programme”.

Pending a decision, your draftsman proposes three standard amendments, in an attempt to avoid any inconsistency between the amounts decided in the present basic legal act and a possible agreement on the Financial Perspective beyond 2006, taking into account the recent resolution by the European Parliament of 8 June 2005 on Policy Challenges and Budgetary Means of the enlarged Union 2007-2013<sup>1</sup>.

## AMENDMENTS

The Committee on Budgets calls on the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following amendments in its report:

### Draft legislative resolution

#### Amendment 1 Paragraph 1 a (new)

- 1a.** *Specifies that the appropriations indicated in the proposal for a regulation are purely for guidance until agreement is reached on the financial perspective for the period 2007 and the following years;*

#### Amendment 2 Paragraph 2 a (new)

- 2a.** *Calls on the Commission to confirm, once the next financial perspective has been adopted, the amounts indicated in the proposal for a regulation or, should the case arise, to submit the adjusted amounts for approval by the European Parliament and the Council, thereby ensuring their compatibility with the ceilings;*

---

<sup>1</sup> P6\_TA-PROV(2005)0224.

### *Justification*

*The financial amounts cannot be established before agreement is reached on the financial perspective. Once a decision has been adopted, the Commission should submit a legislative proposal to establish the financial amounts while keeping within the relevant ceiling of the financial framework concerned.*

### **Proposal for a regulation**

Text proposed by the Commission

---

Amendments by Parliament

---

#### Amendment 1 Article 3, paragraph 1

The amount necessary for implementation of the action provided for in Article 2 **for the period from 1 January 2007 to 31 December 2013** shall be EUR 237 million..

The amount necessary for implementation of the action provided for in Article 2 shall be **fixed on an indicative basis, under the terms of paragraph 34 of the Interinstitutional Agreement of 6 May 1999 between the European Parliament, the Council and the Commission on budgetary discipline and improvement of the budgetary procedure<sup>1</sup>, at EUR 237 million, for a period of seven years beginning on 1 January 2007.**

---

<sup>1</sup> **OJ C 172, 18.6.1999, p. 1. Agreement as amended by Decision 2003/429/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council (OJ L 147, 14.6.2003, p. 25).**

### *Justification*

*The financial amounts are indicative until such time as the financial perspective for the period 2007-2013 is adopted. Once a decision has been taken in that regard, the Commission should submit a legislative proposal that takes into account the corresponding ceiling of the financial framework in question.*

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Proposal for a Council regulation on the implementation of Protocol No 9 on the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant in Slovakia, as annexed to the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia
<b>References</b>	COM(2004)0624 – C6-0205/2004 – 2004/0221(CNS)
<b>Committee responsible</b>	ITRE
<b>Opinion by</b> Date announced in plenary	BUDG 14.12.2004
<b>Enhanced cooperation – date announced in plenary</b>	
<b>Draftsman</b> Date appointed	Janusz Lewandowski 26.10.2004
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	14.7.2005      14.9.2005
<b>Date adopted</b>	14.9.2005
<b>Result of final vote</b>	+: 22 –: 0 0: 1
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Laima Liucija Andrikienė, Reimer Böge, Herbert Bösch, Szabolcs Fazakas, Salvador Garriga Polledo, Ingeborg Gräßle, Catherine Guy-Quint, Jutta D. Haug, Ville Itälä, Sergej Kozlík, Wiesław Stefan Kuc, Zbigniew Krzysztof Kuźmiuk, Vladimír Maňka, Mario Mauro, Gérard Onesta, Antonis Samaras, László Surján, Helga Trüpel, Kyösti Tapio Virrankoski, Ralf Walter
<b>Substitute(s) present for the final vote</b>	Jean-Claude Martinez, José Albino Silva Peneda, Peter Šťastný
<b>Substitute(s) under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	
<b>Comments (data available in one language only)</b>	

## PROCEDURE

<b>Title</b>	Proposal for a Council regulation on the implementation of Protocol N° 9 on the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant in Slovakia, as annexed to the Act concerning the conditions of accession to the European Union of the Czech Republic, Estonia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Hungary, Malta, Poland, Slovenia and Slovakia		
<b>References</b>	COM(2004)0624 - C6-0205/2004 - 2004/0221(CNS)		
<b>Legal basis</b>	Article 203 EC		
<b>Basis in Rules of Procedure</b>	Rule 51		
<b>Date of consulting Parliament</b>	25.11.2004		
<b>Committee responsible</b> Date announced in plenary	ITRE 14.12.2004		
<b>Committee(s) asked for opinion(s)</b> Date announced in plenary	AFET 14.12.2004	BUDG 14.12.2004	ENVI 14.12.2004
<b>Not delivering opinion(s)</b> Date of decision	AFET 30.3.2005	ENVI 30.11.2004	
<b>Enhanced cooperation</b> Date announced in plenary			
<b>Rapporteur(s)</b> Date appointed	Rebecca Harms 15.3.2005		
<b>Previous rapporteur(s)</b>			
<b>Simplified procedure</b> Date of decision			
<b>Legal basis disputed</b> Date of JURI opinion	/		
<b>Financial endowment amended</b> Date of BUDG opinion	/		
<b>European Economic and Social Committee consulted</b> Date of decision in plenary			
<b>Committee of the Regions consulted</b> Date of decision in plenary			
<b>Discussed in committee</b>	20.6.2005	13.7.2005	
<b>Date adopted</b>	26.9.2005		
<b>Result of final vote</b>	for:	25	
	against:	6	
	abstentions:	7	
<b>Members present for the final vote</b>	Ivo Belet, Šarūnas Birutis, Jan Březina, Renato Brunetta, Jerzy Buzek, Joan Calabuig Rull, Lorenzo Cesa, Jorgo Chatzimarkakis, Giles Chichester, Den Dover, Adam Gierek, András Gyürk, Fiona Hall, David Hammerstein Mintz, Rebecca Harms, Ján Hudacký, Romana Jordan Cizelj, Werner Langen, Anne Laperrouze, Nils Lundgren, Angelika Niebler, Reino Paasilinna, Herbert Reul, Teresa Riera Madurell, Mechtild Rothe, Paul Rübig, Britta Thomsen, Patrizia Toia, Catherine Trautmann, Claude Turmes, Nikolaos Vakalis, Alejo Vidal-Quadras Roca, Dominique Vlasto		
<b>Substitutes present for the final vote</b>	Edit Herczog, Francisca Pleguezuelos Aguilar, Vittorio Prodi, Esko		

	Seppänen
<b>Substitutes under Rule 178(2) present for the final vote</b>	Ulrich Stockmann
<b>Date tabled – A6</b>	4.10.2005 A6-0282/2005
<b>Comments</b>	...