



EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT

2009 - 2014

Plenary sitting

A7-0054/2011

14.3.2011

REPORT

on the efficiency and effectiveness of EU funding in the area of
decommissioning nuclear power plants in the new Member States
(2010/2104(INI))

Committee on Budgetary Control

Rapporteur: Marian-Jean Marinescu

CONTENTS

	Page
MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION.....	3
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT	10
OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, RESEARCH AND ENERGY	13
RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE.....	16

MOTION FOR A EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT RESOLUTION

on the efficiency and effectiveness of EU funding in the area of decommissioning nuclear power plants in the new Member States (2010/2104(INI))

The European Parliament,

- having regard to Accession Treaty Protocol No 4 on the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania¹, and Protocol No 9 on unit 1 and unit 2 of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant in Slovakia², and Article 30 of the Protocol concerning the conditions and arrangements for admission of the Republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union³,
 - having regard to the Council Regulations on the implementation of Protocol No 4 on the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania⁴, on the implementation of Protocol No 9 on Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the Bohunice V1 nuclear power plant in Slovakia⁵ and on financial assistance of the Union with respect to the decommissioning of Units 1 to 4 of the Kozloduy Nuclear Power Plant in Bulgaria (Kozloduy Programme)⁶,
 - having regard to the Communication from the Commission to the European Parliament and the Council on the use of financial resources earmarked for the decommissioning of nuclear installations (COM(2007)0794) and the accompanying document ‘EU decommissioning funding data’ (SEC(2007)1654),
 - having regard to the Commission Recommendation of 24 October 2006 on the management of financial resources for the decommissioning of nuclear installations⁷,
 - having regard to Rule 48 of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Budgetary Control and the opinion of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (A7-0054/2011),
- A. whereas the three EU candidate countries, Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria, operated old nuclear power plants (NPPs) which were agreed to be closed, and the accession negotiations led to early fixed closure dates for the units in the three NPPs concerned,
- B. whereas the EU recognised that the early shut-down and subsequent decommissioning of these units in the three NPPs represented a significant financial and economical burden which could not be fully covered by the Member States concerned, and therefore the Treaties of Accession, as well as subsequent Council Regulations for the implementation

¹ OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p. 944.

² OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p. 954.

³ OJ L 157, 21.6.2005, p. 29.

⁴ OJ L 411, 30.12.2006, p. 10

⁵ OJ L 131, 23.5.2007, p. 1

⁶ OJ L 189, 13.7.2010, p. 9

⁷ OJ L 330, 28.11.2006, p. 31

of these Treaties, provided for financial assistance to the respective Member States; whereas, however, it was not clearly decided whether the assistance should cover the full cost of decommissioning or compensate for all economic consequences; notes that both Bulgaria and Slovakia for the time being remain net exporters of electricity,

C. whereas the assistance provides for measures in the following areas:

- decommissioning (preparatory work for shutdown, support to the regulator, drawing up of documentation necessary for decommissioning and licensing, safe maintenance and surveillance after shutdown, waste treatment, waste and spent fuel storage and decontamination, and dismantling work),
- energy (modernisation and environmental upgrading of existing facilities, replacement of the production capacity of shut-down units, improving security of energy supply and energy efficiency and other measures contributing to the necessary restructuring and upgrading of the energy infrastructure),
- social consequences (support for plant personnel in maintaining a high level of safety in the periods prior to dismantling after closure, and re-training of staff for new tasks in decommissioning),

D. whereas the assistance started before accession and before the respective units were shut down, and funds accumulated within the International Decommissioning Support Funds (IDSFs) while administrative preparations continued,

E. whereas the decommissioning of nuclear facilities and the management of their waste is a technically complex operation requiring substantial financial resources and involving environmental, technical, social and financial responsibilities,

1. Notes that Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria have fulfilled their accession treaty commitments to close the respective units in the three NPPs in a timely manner: Ignalina NPP Unit 1 was shut down on 31 December 2004 and Unit 2 on 31 December 2009; Bohunice V1 NPP Unit 1 was shut down on 31 December 2006 and Unit 2 on 31 December 2008; Kozloduy NPP Units 1 and 2 were shut down on 31 December 2002 and Units 3 and 4 on 31 December 2006;
2. Notes also that all three Member States tried to re-negotiate their political commitments regarding closing the reactors and this led to delays in the process;
3. Notes the existence of a legal basis for granting the financial assistance; notes that the amounts are established annually through a Commission decision, based on individual annual combined programming documents, permitting control over the development and financing of the approved projects;
4. Notes that due to the limited EU experience and data in the field of decommissioning, the financial assistance was decided without the possibility of defining a financial ceiling; notes that there were still no clear conditions for specification on ceilings even after the

plans and strategies for decommissioning had been drawn up, which meant that further financial assistance had to be decided on a stage-by-stage and case-by-case basis;

5. Considers that the purpose of the Community assistance is to support these three Member States in coping with the financial and economical burden caused by early fixed closure dates, and to cover the cost of many important decommissioning activities, invest in energy projects with the aim of reducing energy dependency and help to mitigate the social impact of the decommissioning of the power plants; notes, however, that in all three cases the costs for decommissioning of the power plants have exceeded the planned EU assistance, and are also likely to exceed the initial estimates; notes also that a high share of the funds was used for energy projects and not for the main aim of the financial assistance, namely NPP decommissioning;
6. Believes that the concept of European Union solidarity contributes effectively to mitigating the economic consequences of early closure in the energy sector; notes, however, that at the time of preparation of this report, the decommissioning itself is still in its initial stage;
7. Notes that the decommissioning of the nuclear power plants concerned should be assigned the highest priority in the interests of the safety and health of all the people of Europe;
8. Fears that a lack of financial resources for decommissioning measures will delay the decommissioning of nuclear power plants and threaten the environment and human health;
9. Stresses that the issue of safety is of the utmost importance for the decommissioning of early closed units in the three NPPs in question; invites, therefore, the Council, the Commission and the Member States to bear that in mind in any future decisions concerning nuclear decommissioning in general and these three decommissioning programmes in particular; calls on the Commission to arrange for adequate coordination with the Member States and to establish precise timetables for the completion of the projects;
10. Notes with concern that the detailed decommissioning plans of the three decommissioning programmes in question have not yet been finalised and, as a consequence, that there is insufficient information on the timetables, the costs of particular projects, and their sources of funding; urges therefore the relevant national bodies to finalise the plans and the Commission to report on this process and to provide a detailed long-term financial planning of the decommissioning projects; invites the Commission to clearly describe the scope of the EU financing required to accomplish these plans;
11. Calls on the Commission to study ways of altering the EU's methods of financing decommissioning operations in view of the strategies employed in the Member States and their national administrative structures, and simplifying the rules on management of the funds in such a way that they do not affect the safety and security of the decommissioning operations;
12. Notes the lack of a clear distribution of responsibility among the participants in the financing and the participants in the process of decommissioning; believes that the Commission should bear the main responsibility for the implementation of the EU assistance and that a joint management with the EBRD should be put in place;

13. Considers that, for the purpose of awarding contracts, it would be desirable to apply a criterion of Community reciprocity for the benefit of European enterprises, with the application in particular of the principles set forth in Article 58 of Directive 2004/17/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 coordinating the procurement procedures of entities operating, inter alia, in the energy sector;
14. Notes that the total financial assistance from the European Union to the three Member States until the end of 2013 comes to EUR 2 847.78 million; points out that, although differences among the NPPs exist, especially as regards fuel storage, in principle the programmes share the same technology; notes, however, that there are considerable differences in the allocated amounts: Ignalina (2 units) EUR 1 367 million; Bohunice (2 units): EUR 613 million; and Kozloduy (4 units) EUR 867.78 million;
15. Notes, according to data available at the end of 2009, the differing situations among the Member States regarding the amounts disbursed: Ignalina: total EUR 1 367 million, committed EUR 875.5 million (64.04 %), disbursed EUR 760.4 million (55.62%); Bohunice: total EUR 613 million, committed EUR 363.72 million (59.33 %), disbursed EUR 157.87 million (25.75 %); Kozloduy: total EUR 867.78 million, committed EUR 567.78 million (65.42 %), disbursed EUR 363.149 million (41.84%), mostly due to the different timing of the closure;
16. Considers it necessary for the funds to be managed and their resources to be used with absolute transparency; recognises the importance of sound and transparent management of financial resources, with appropriate external supervision, to ensure fair competition on the energy market; recommends transparency and public participation in this field;
17. Takes note of the following completed audits and evaluations: 'Midterm Evaluation of the Decommissioning Assistance to Lithuania and Slovakia' (2007); EC internal audits of all three programmes in 2007; European Court of Auditors (ECA) audits of CPMA in 2008 and 2009 regarding Ignalina; ECA audit for preparation of DAS 2008; ECA feasibility study in 2009; and notes the following ongoing activities: Communication from the Commission expected in early 2011; EC external financial audit for BIDSF, ECA; full performance audit for all three programmes;
18. Considers that, taking into account the large amounts of money involved, the novelty regarding the utilisation of funds, the unknown factors which emerged throughout the process, and the numerous subsequent alterations, adaptations and allocation of additional amounts, the number and scope of the audits performed appear to be insufficient; regrets that the Commission's September 2007 Mid-term evaluation of the decommissioning assistance to Lithuania and Slovakia did not cover Bulgaria (which was already receiving assistance at the time);
19. Regrets the lack of annual reports from the Commission to the European Parliament on the use of financial resources earmarked for the decommissioning of nuclear power plants; calls therefore on the Commission to monitor and report annually to the Parliament on the improvements in use of the funds and on the likelihood that the accumulated funds for the decommissioning of these specific units in the three NPPs will be absorbed over the next three years;

20. Invites the Commission to conduct an analysis in order to ascertain that the possibility of allocating amounts for upcoming decommissioning projects until 2013 exists, especially since the decommissioning licences will be released for Bohunice in July 2011 and for Kozloduy at the end of 2011 and the end of 2012;
21. Invites the Commission to provide comparative information on the implementation of the initial and revised schedules for different stages of the decommissioning processes, as well as on measures in the energy and social domains, prior to any further allocation of EU funds;
22. Invites the Commission to report on the particular improvements stemming from the establishment of a Member State Management Committee in 2007 to assist it in the implementation of the assistance programmes, and to give an account of the procedural changes since that time;
23. Notes that the ECA audit is still ongoing; suggests that this should help to reveal the objectives of the use of the funds and their effectiveness, as well as viable proposals for the future, and assess the additional funding required in order to perform the decommissioning; suggests that, being a full performance audit, it should clarify the following:
 - whether the funds were used for the purposes for which they were intended,
 - whether procurement procedures were properly drawn up and respected,
 - whether the money allocated contributed to increasing safety in the decommissioning activity;
 - whether the procurement procedures ensured that the companies involved will provide safety to EU standards,
 - whether there are activities where OLAF is involved,
 - whether proper coordination among the three existing programmes occurred, in order to make efficient use of experience gained and of previously prepared and financed projects, and in what regards the decommissioning programmes overlapped (given, for example, that there are several similar projects related to storage, personnel qualification, etc which could have been adapted from one NPP to another, leading to savings);
24. Suggests that, as regards future activities to be financed from EU allocated amounts within the 2007-2013 period, further issues need clarifying:
 - whether the already existing plans and strategies are complete or whether the possibility of adding new activities and subsequently additional funds still exists,
 - whether the overall temporary storage capacity, and a procedure to select a final domestic disposal site for final radioactive waste, are complete or not,
 - whether there is still a need for further amounts to be allocated for energy projects or whether it is necessary to focus on the decommissioning projects,

- whether, in the event that this has not been the case so far, the experience and projects used for one NPP should be carried over to the others as well;
25. Notes with concern the lack of an EU team of coordinators and experts of all three projects, which would have enabled the decommissioning programme to be treated as a whole package based on EU experience, thus enabling synergies between the three cases;
26. Stresses that enhanced coordination between the three programmes is needed in order to ensure better planning of activities and sharing of experience gained amongst them; considers that the European Union as a whole can also benefit from this experience as reactors are taken out of service at the end of their economic lives; therefore invites all parties involved to develop and collect best decommissioning practices and to ensure the best use of the experience and data gained amongst the other Member States with nuclear power plants;
27. Calls on the Commission to set up a Coordination Team, which should be in charge of:
- supervising the elaboration of a final plan with a clear timetable,
 - supervising the use of money allocated so far,
 - establishing whether there is further need for an EU role and if so, determining the exact level of EU involvement,
 - deciding upon responsibilities, including the role of the EBRD, and overseeing the finalisation of the decommissioning process;
28. Notes that the polluter-pays principle should be applied to the financing of decommissioning operations and that nuclear operators should ensure that adequate financial resources to cover future decommissioning costs are set aside during the productive life of nuclear installations;
29. Notes that the early closure of the reactors prevented the planned accumulation of needed amounts in the respective national funds designed to cover all costs associated with the decommissioning of the plants;
30. Calls on the Commission, taking into account the various strategies employed by the Member States, to explore possible ways of harmonising approaches to the funding of decommissioning in the EU in order to ensure timely accumulation of the necessary financial resources without compromising the safety and security of the decommissioning process;

Ignalina NPP

31. Welcomes the fact that most of the Ignalina programme's projects for energy efficiency and securing of the electricity supply are currently under implementation or have already been implemented;
32. Notes with concern that key waste infrastructure management projects (spent fuel storage and waste repository project) have experienced serious delays that incurred additional costs with respect to original estimates; notes that available slack in the system is almost

exhausted and that delays may start to impinge upon the critical path for the whole decommissioning plan, with a commensurate increase in cost; calls on the Commission to report on the results of the reassessment of the project timeline;

33. Notes that a large part of the funds was allocated to energy projects, that considerable financing is still required for decommissioning and that national funds are not sufficient to cover this: the State Ignalina NPP Decommissioning Fund has so far accumulated just over EUR 100 million (while the technical costs of decommissioning alone range from EUR 987 million to EUR 1 300 million), and a significant proportion of that has been used on non-decommissioning projects; calls for appropriate measures to be taken in this respect, particularly by the Member State;

Bohunice NPP

34. Welcomes the progress on the Bohunice programme;
35. Notes that while Community assistance is projected for the decommissioning of nuclear facilities, in particular V1 reactors, as well as for security of supply, the national Nuclear Fund did not set aside any specifically earmarked source of funding for the ongoing A1 decommissioning project;
36. Notes that some decommissioning projects, such as the reconstruction of the area's physical protection system, the historical waste treatment project and construction of the interim storage of RAW at the Bohunice site, have experienced significant delays in their implementation; urges the Commission and the Slovakian side to take steps to prevent the delays and to avoid jeopardising the scheduled progress of decommissioning work;

Kozloduy NPP

37. Welcomes the overall good technical and financial performance of the Kozloduy programme, and the review of the decommissioning strategy for Units 1 to 4, which was changed from an initial deferred dismantling strategy to an immediate continuous dismantling strategy;
38. Notes with concern a rather high share of energy projects in the distribution of allocated public funds; calls on the Commission to monitor the implementation of the remaining energy projects and to report on the results; calls for an increase in the proportion of 'Decommissioning and Waste' projects in the remaining period of the Kozloduy programme;
39. Stresses the need for comprehensive administrative coordination between the State Enterprise for Radioactive Waste (SERAW) and Kozloduy NPP, now responsible for Units 1-2 and Units 3-4 respectively; invites the Bulgarian side to analyse and promptly implement necessary improvement measures with regard to this divided management, and/or to bring together Units 1-4 under a common management;
40. Instructs its President to forward this resolution to the Council and the Commission, and to the governments of Bulgaria, Lithuania and Slovakia.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

The three countries, Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria, operated old soviet design nuclear reactors which the international community, in line with the G7 multilateral programme of action adopted at the Munich G7 summit in 1992, concluded could not be upgraded to meet the minimum required safety standards at an economically acceptable cost. In the context of the negotiations for accession to the European Union, the three countries took the commitment to close and subsequently decommission these nuclear reactors on fixed dates. In recognition of the fact that the early closure represented an exceptional financial burden, and as act of solidarity the European Union committed itself to provide adequate additional financial assistance for decommissioning of these reactor units until the end of 2013.

In the pre-accession period assistance was provided to Lithuania and Slovakia through the PHARE¹ programme, between 2004-2006 assistance was provided under the Protocols to the Act of Accession and since 2007, Council Regulations for Lithuania² and Slovakia³ ensure that the assistance continues for the period 2007-2013.

For Bulgaria in the pre-accession period up to 2007 the EU had contributed to the decommissioning of the Kozloduy NPP (KNPP) through the PHARE programme, assistance for the period 2007-2009 was provided under the Protocol to the Treaty of Accession (based upon the deferred decommissioning strategy chosen at the time); in 2009 Bulgaria requested a prolongation of the funding assistance in order to proceed with a revised immediate decommissioning strategy, and the Council Regulation⁴ ensures that the assistance continues for the period 2010-2013.

Overview of the financial assistance to the Member States from 1999 to 2013 (€ million) as anchored in the basic legal acts (actual yearly commitments adjusted for inflation):

	1999-2003	2004-2006	2007-2013	Total
Lithuania	210	285	837	1332
Slovakia	90	90	423	603
Bulgaria	155	185	510	850
Subtotal	455	560	1770	2785

By the end of 2009 the actual committed amounts to the three countries were: €878,5 million for Lithuania, €363,7 million for Slovakia and €567,8 million for Bulgaria.

Legal basis

In Accession treaty Protocol No 4⁵ Lithuania committed to close Unit 1 of the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant (NPP) before 2005 and Unit 2 by 31 December 2009 at the latest and to the subsequently decommission these units. During the period 2004-2006, the Community had to provide Lithuania with additional financial assistance in support of its efforts to decommission and to address the consequences of the closure and decommissioning.

¹ Programme of aid to central and east European countries

² OJ L 411, 30.12.2006, p.10

³ OJ L 131, 23.5.2007, p.1

⁴ OJ L 189, 13.7.2010, p.9

⁵ OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p. 931

The assistance had to amount to EUR 285 million for the period 2004-2006 (€320 million after adjustments for inflation).

The assistance was to cover measures in support of the decommissioning ; measures for the environmental upgrading in line with the acquis, modernisation measures of conventional production capacity to replace the production capacity, and other measures which were consequential to the decision to close and decommission this plant, contributing to the necessary restructuring, environmental upgrading and modernisation of the energy production, transmission and distribution sectors and enhancing the security of energy supply and improving energy efficiency in Lithuania.

Assistance was to include measures supporting plant personnel in maintaining a high level of operational safety at the Ignalina NPP in the periods prior to the closure and during the decommissioning. The contribution for certain measures under the Ignalina Programme might amount to up to 100 % of the total expenditure. The Union committed to provide adequate additional Community assistance to the decommissioning effort beyond 2006 based on the same elements and principles.

In Accession treaty Protocol No 9¹ Slovakia commits to close Unit 1 of the Bohunice V1 NPP by 31 December 2006 and Unit 2 by 31 December 2008 at the latest and to subsequently decommission these units. During the period 2004-2006, the Community had to provide Slovakia with financial assistance in support of its efforts to decommission and to address the consequences of the closure and decommissioning.

The assistance had to amount to EUR 90 million for the period 2004-2006.

The assistance had to be decided and implemented in accordance with the provisions laid down in Council Regulation (EEC) No 3906/89 of 18 December 1989 on economic aid to certain countries of Central and Eastern Europe²

Decisions on the continuation of EU assistance in this field after 2006 were to take into account that the decommissioning of the Bohunice V1 NPP would have to continue beyond the financial perspective of that time and that it represented a significant financial burden for Slovakia.

Article 30 of the Protocol concerning the conditions and arrangements for admission of the republic of Bulgaria and Romania to the European Union³ specifies that Bulgaria had definitively closed for subsequent decommissioning Units 1 and 2 of the Kozloduy NPP, and commits to definitively close (in 2006) and subsequently decommission of Units 3 and 4 of this plant. During the period 2007-2009, the Community had to provide Bulgaria with financial assistance in support of its efforts to decommission and to address the consequences of the closure and decommissioning of Units 1 to 4 of the Kozloduy NPP.

The assistance had to amount to EUR 210 million (2004 prices), to be committed in equal annual tranches of EUR 70 million (2004 prices) for the period 2007-2009.

The assistance was to cover measures in support of the decommissioning, measures for environmental upgrading in line with the acquis; measures for the modernisation of the conventional energy production, transmission and distribution sectors, measures to improve energy efficiency, measures enhancing the use of renewable energy sources and improving security of energy supply in Bulgaria.

¹ OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p. 931

² OJ L 375, 23.12.1989, p. 11

³ OJ L 157, 21.6.2005, p. 29

In 2006 and 2007 the European Council adopted a new Regulation for Lithuania¹ and Slovakia² which formed the legal basis for the continuation of the European Union assistance in these countries. Since mid 2010 a new Council Regulation³ provides the legal basis for additional European Union assistance to Bulgaria for 2010 – 2013.

Management, audit and control

The European Union financial assistance has been made available in the form of contributions to three International Decommissioning Support Funds managed by the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development. In addition, since 2004, part of the financial assistance for Lithuania has also been made available as a direct support to the country in order to implement provisions of Art. 2.4⁴ of the Accession Protocol through a National Agency (Central Project Management Agency).

In 2007 a Member State Management Committee was put in place to assist the Commission in the implementation of the assistance programmes, and the Commission procedures were modified. A Memorandum of Understanding has been signed between the Commission and the European Bank for Reconstruction and Development and a Joint Steering Committee has been set up with the beneficiary countries to improve the coordination of the programme.

The assistance programme has been subject to regular audits and evaluations: mid-term evaluation for Lithuania and Slovakia finalised in 2007, European Commission's internal audits of all three programmes in 2007, audit of the Central Project Management Agency by the European Commission and the European Court of Auditors, audit for the statement of assurance (DAS2008) by the European Court of Auditors, as well as a feasibility study from the European Court of Auditors regarding a full performance audit. The European Court of Auditors is currently conducting performance audits of all three programmes, and an ECA Special Report is awaited in the autumn of 2011.

Future outlook

With an outlook towards 2013 – the end of the current financial perspective – based on the current achievements, it is assumed that major investment projects would be completed or near to completion and the new decommissioning organisation and management structures would be in place and operational.

Although the delays in the programmes are close to the limits where they might affect the decommissioning schedules, current assumption remains that by 2013 dismantling activities and management of decommissioning waste and execution of works by plant staff would have started.

The last commitment of the European Commission will be made in 2013; however, the implementation of these works financed from those commitments will extend beyond this date.

¹ OJ L 411, 30.12.2006, p.10

² OJ L 131, 23.5.2007, p.1

³ OJ L 189, 13.7.2010, p.9

⁴ "The Ignalina Programme shall include measures to support plant personnel in maintaining a high level of operational safety at the Ignalina Nuclear Power Plant in the periods prior to the closure and during the decommissioning of the said reactor units."

1.3.2011

OPINION OF THE COMMITTEE ON INDUSTRY, RESEARCH AND ENERGY

for the Committee on Budgetary Control

on the efficiency and effectiveness of EU funding in the area of decommissioning nuclear power plants in the new Member States
(2010/2104(INI))

Rapporteur: Zigmantas Balčytis

SUGGESTIONS

The Committee on Industry, Research and Energy calls on the Committee on Budgetary Control, as the committee responsible, to incorporate the following suggestions in its motion for a resolution:

- A. whereas during the accession negotiations the Lithuanian, Slovak and Bulgarian governments agreed, as part of their Accession Treaties, to close some of the older nuclear reactors with fixed early closure dates,
- B. whereas the shut-down and subsequent decommissioning of these NPPs represented a significant financial and economic loss and an ongoing burden which could not be fully covered by the Member States concerned,
- C. whereas the decommissioning of nuclear facilities and the management of their waste is a technically complex operation requiring substantial financial resources and involving environmental, technical, social and financial responsibilities,
 1. Notes that the polluter-pays principle should be applied to the financing of decommissioning operations and that nuclear operators should ensure that adequate financial resources to cover future decommissioning costs are set aside during the productive life of nuclear installations; in these three cases, however, denial of the full operational life of NPPs that were shut down early prevented the necessary funds from being set aside;
 2. Notes that decommissioning operations can pose risks to public health and the environment if the necessary measures are not taken in time and that sufficient financial

resources should therefore be generated and set aside during the operation of the facility to ensure that the decommissioning of nuclear installations is carried out in conformity with safety standards;

3. Notes that there is limited EU experience in the field of nuclear decommissioning, and therefore stresses that the issue of safety is of the utmost importance in the decommissioning of the early-closed NPPs in question and that this should be borne in mind in any future decisions by all parties involved;
4. Recognises the importance of sound and transparent management of financial resources, with appropriate external supervision, to ensure fair competition on the energy market; recommends transparency and public participation in this field; considers that, for the purpose of awarding contracts, it would be desirable to apply a criterion of Community reciprocity for the benefit of European enterprises, with the application in particular of the principles set forth in Article 58 of Directive 2004/17/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 31 March 2004 coordinating the procurement procedures of entities operating, inter alia, in the energy sector;
5. Underlines the necessity for the three NPPs to submit a detailed final decommissioning plan, which is indispensable in drawing up a financial scheme capable of avoiding risks and uncertainties;
6. Notes that premature decommissioning has a direct impact on the energy resources (and their prices) of the Member States concerned; believes that the development of alternative, low-emission, competitive energy resources should be promoted in coping with the negative consequences, and that due consideration should be given to establishing appropriate compensation mechanisms to cover the costs of decommissioning and waste disposal up to the definite stage from where the three countries can bear the remaining costs by themselves;
7. Stresses that enhanced coordination between the three programmes is needed in order to ensure better planning of activities and sharing of the experience gained; the European Union as a whole could also benefit from this experience as reactors are taken out of service at the end of their economic lives; invites all parties involved, therefore, to ensure that best decommissioning practices are applied and collected, and that the best use is made by Member States with nuclear power plants of the experience and data gained;
8. Calls on the Commission, taking into account the various strategies employed by the Member States, to explore possible ways of harmonising approaches to the funding of decommissioning in the EU in order to ensure timely accumulation of the necessary financial resources without compromising the safety and security of the decommissioning process;
9. Considers that, if the decommissioning procedure is harmonised, account should be taken of the relevant administrative structures of the Member States, and that the resource management procedure as such should be simplified.

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	28.2.2011
Result of final vote	+: 39 -: 0 0: 1
Members present for the final vote	Jean-Pierre Audy, Zigmantas Balčytis, Ivo Belet, Bendt Bendtsen, Jan Březina, Maria Da Graça Carvalho, Giles Chichester, Pilar del Castillo Vera, Christian Ehler, Robert Goebbels, Fiona Hall, Jacky Hénin, Edit Herczog, Romana Jordan Cizelj, Arturs Krišjānis Kariņš, Lena Kolarska-Bobińska, Béla Kovács, Philippe Lamberts, Marisa Matias, Judith A. Merkies, Angelika Niebler, Jaroslav Paška, Herbert Reul, Paul Rübig, Amalia Sartori, Konrad Szymański, Patrizia Toia, Ioannis A. Tsoukalas, Claude Turmes, Marita Ulvskog, Vladimir Urutchev, Kathleen Van Brempt, Alejo Vidal-Quadras
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Antonio Cancian, Francesco De Angelis, Françoise Grossetête, Jolanta Emilia Hibner, Ivailo Kalfin, Mario Pirillo, Catherine Trautmann

RESULT OF FINAL VOTE IN COMMITTEE

Date adopted	3.3.2011
Result of final vote	+: 22 -: 0 0: 1
Members present for the final vote	Inés Ayala Sender, Andrea Češková, Jorgo Chatzimarkakis, Luigi de Magistris, Martin Ehrenhauser, Jens Geier, Gerben-Jan Gerbrandy, Ville Itälä, Iliana Ivanova, Elisabeth Köstinger, Monica Luisa Macovei, Christel Schaldemose, Bart Staes, Georgios Stavrakakis
Substitute(s) present for the final vote	Zuzana Brzobohatá, Derk Jan Eppink, Christofer Fjellner, Monika Hohlmeier, Ivailo Kalfin, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Véronique Mathieu, Barbara Weiler
Substitute(s) under Rule 187(2) present for the final vote	Adam Gierek