



Plenary sitting

A8-0413/2018

29.11.2018

REPORT

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing the nuclear decommissioning assistance programme of the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania (Ignalina programme); and repealing Council Regulation (EU) No 1369/2013
(COM(2018)0466 – C8-0394/2018 – 2018/0251(NLE))

Committee on Industry, Research and Energy

Rapporteur: Rebecca Harms

Symbols for procedures

- * Consultation procedure
- *** Consent procedure
- ***I Ordinary legislative procedure (first reading)
- ***II Ordinary legislative procedure (second reading)
- ***III Ordinary legislative procedure (third reading)

(The type of procedure depends on the legal basis proposed by the draft act.)

Amendments to a draft act

Amendments by Parliament set out in two columns

Deletions are indicated in ***bold italics*** in the left-hand column. Replacements are indicated in ***bold italics*** in both columns. New text is indicated in ***bold italics*** in the right-hand column.

The first and second lines of the header of each amendment identify the relevant part of the draft act under consideration. If an amendment pertains to an existing act that the draft act is seeking to amend, the amendment heading includes a third line identifying the existing act and a fourth line identifying the provision in that act that Parliament wishes to amend.

Amendments by Parliament in the form of a consolidated text

New text is highlighted in ***bold italics***. Deletions are indicated using either the **■** symbol or ~~strikeout~~. Replacements are indicated by highlighting the new text in ***bold italics*** and by deleting or striking out the text that has been replaced.

By way of exception, purely technical changes made by the drafting departments in preparing the final text are not highlighted.

CONTENTS

	Page
DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION.....	5
EXPLANATORY STATEMENT.....	17
PROCEDURE – COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE.....	20
FINAL VOTE BY ROLL CALL IN COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE.....	21

DRAFT EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT LEGISLATIVE RESOLUTION

on the proposal for a Council regulation establishing the nuclear decommissioning assistance programme of the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania (Ignalina programme); and repealing Council Regulation (EU) No 1369/2013 (COM(2018)0466 – C8-0394/2018 – 2018/0251(NLE))

(Consultation)

The European Parliament,

- having regard to the Commission proposal to the Council (COM(2018)0466),
 - having regard to the 2003 Act of Accession, and in particular Article 3 of Protocol No 4 attached thereto,
 - having regard to the request for an opinion received from the Council (C8-0394/2018),
 - having regard to Rule 78c of its Rules of Procedure,
 - having regard to the report of the Committee on Industry, Research and Energy (A8-0413/2018),
1. Approves the Commission proposal as amended;
 2. Calls on the Commission to alter its proposal accordingly, in accordance with Article 293(2) of the Treaty on the Functioning of the European Union;
 3. Calls on the Council to notify Parliament if it intends to depart from the text approved by Parliament;
 4. Asks the Council to consult Parliament again if it intends to substantially amend the Commission proposal;
 5. Instructs its President to forward its position to the Council and the Commission.

Amendment 1

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 1

Text proposed by the Commission

(1) In accordance with Protocol No 4 of the 2003 Act of Accession on the Ignalina nuclear power plant¹ Lithuania committed itself to the closure of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the Ignalina nuclear power

Amendment

(1) In accordance with Protocol No 4 of the 2003 Act of Accession on the Ignalina nuclear power plant¹ Lithuania committed itself to the closure of Unit 1 and Unit 2 of the Ignalina nuclear power

plant by 31 December 2004 and 31 December 2009 respectively, and to the subsequent decommissioning of those units.

¹ OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p. 944.

plant by 31 December 2004 and 31 December 2009 respectively, and to the subsequent decommissioning of those units. ***Protocol No 4 remains the legal basis of the Ignalina Programme.***

¹ OJ L 236, 23.9.2003, p. 944.

Justification

It is important to emphasise that the provisions of the Protocol 4 as the basis of the programme remain valid.

Amendment 2

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 2

Text proposed by the Commission

(2) In line with its obligations under the Act of Accession and with Union assistance, Lithuania shut down the two units within the respective deadlines and made significant progress towards their decommissioning. Further work is necessary in order to continue the decrease of the level of radiological hazard. Based on the available estimates, additional financial resources are required for this purpose post 2020.

Amendment

(2) In line with its obligations under the Act of Accession and with Union assistance, Lithuania shut down the two units within the respective deadlines and made significant progress towards their decommissioning. Further work is necessary in order to continue the decrease of the level of radiological hazard. Based on the available estimates ***and the planned final closure date in 2038, substantial additional financial resources are required for this purpose post 2020. To allow for completion of the decommissioning plan by 2038, the financial gap of EUR 1 548 million will need to be addressed.***

Amendment 3

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 3

Text proposed by the Commission

(3) The activities covered by this Regulation should comply with applicable Union and national law. The

Amendment

(3) The activities covered by this Regulation should comply with applicable Union and national law. The

decommissioning of the nuclear power plant covered by this Regulation should be carried out in accordance with the legislation on nuclear safety, namely Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom⁽¹⁾ and waste management, namely Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom⁽²⁾. The ultimate responsibility for nuclear safety and for the safety of spent fuel and radioactive waste management remains with Lithuania.

decommissioning of the nuclear power plant covered by this Regulation should be carried out in accordance with the legislation on nuclear safety, namely Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom⁽¹⁾ and waste management, namely Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom⁽²⁾. The ultimate responsibility for nuclear safety and for the safety of spent fuel and radioactive waste management remains with Lithuania.

However, Directive 2011/70/Euratom allows for the Union's contribution to a broad range of decommissioning projects, including storage and disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste. While Directive 2011/70/Euratom states that the cost of the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste shall be borne by those who generated those materials, that provision cannot be applied retroactively to Lithuania, which closed the Ignalina nuclear power plant before the adoption of that Directive and thus was not in a position to accumulate sufficient funds for the storage and disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste.

¹ Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (OJ L 172, 2.7.2009, p. 18).

² Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste (OJ L 199, 2.8.2011, p. 48).

¹ Council Directive 2009/71/Euratom of 25 June 2009 establishing a Community framework for the nuclear safety of nuclear installations (OJ L 172, 2.7.2009, p. 18).

² Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom of 19 July 2011 establishing a Community framework for the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste (OJ L 199, 2.8.2011, p. 48).

Justification

Recital 13 of Directive 2011/70/Euratom clearly indicates that the Community has taken part in providing financial support for various decommissioning activities, including management of spent fuel and radioactive waste. The definitions of "radioactive waste management" include, inter alia, storage and disposal.

Amendment 4

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 4

Text proposed by the Commission

(4) Recognising that the premature shutdown and consequent decommissioning of the Ignalina nuclear power plant with two 1 500 MW RBMK type reactor units inherited from the Soviet Union was of an unprecedented nature and represented for Lithuania an exceptional financial burden not commensurate with the size and economic strength of the country, Protocol No 4 stated that the Union assistance under the Ignalina programme is to be seamlessly continued and extended beyond 2006, for the period of the next Financial Perspectives.

Amendment

(4) Recognising that the premature shutdown and consequent decommissioning of the Ignalina nuclear power plant with two 1 500 MW RBMK type (*graphite moderated, channel-type*) reactor units – *similar to those used in Chernobyl* – inherited from the Soviet Union was of an unprecedented nature, *given that there have been no cases in practice anywhere in the world of a reactor of a similar design being dismantled*, and represented for Lithuania an exceptional financial burden not commensurate with the size and economic strength of the country, Protocol No 4 stated that the Union assistance under the Ignalina programme is to be seamlessly continued and extended beyond 2006, for the period of the next Financial Perspectives *until the final closure date which is currently planned for 2038*.

Amendment 5

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 10

Text proposed by the Commission

(10) The Programme should also ensure dissemination of knowledge gained from the Programme to all Member States, in coordination and synergy with the other relevant Union programme for decommissioning activities in Bulgaria, Slovakia and the Commission's Joint Research Centre; *as such* measures bring the greatest Union added value.

Amendment

(10) The Programme should also ensure dissemination of knowledge gained from the Programme to all Member States, in coordination and synergy with the other relevant Union programme for decommissioning activities in Bulgaria, Slovakia and the Commission's Joint Research Centre. *In order for those measures to bring the greatest Union added value, the funding for dissemination of knowledge should not be part of the funding for decommissioning works, but should come from other financial sources of the Union.*

Amendment 6

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 11

Text proposed by the Commission

(11) The decommissioning of the Ignalina 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 installations to be decommissioned, in order to ensure safety and the highest possible efficiency, thus taking into account international best practices.

Amendment

(11) The decommissioning of the Ignalina 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 installations to be decommissioned, in order to ensure safety and the highest possible efficiency, thus taking into account international best practices ***and ensuring competitive salaries for qualified personnel.***

Justification

One of the challenges faced in Ignalina is that the salaries are often not attractive to specialists who often seek employment elsewhere. This might affect the quality of decommissioning works.

Amendment 7

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 12

Text proposed by the Commission

(12) An effective monitoring and control of the evolution of the decommissioning process should be ensured by the Commission and Lithuania in order to assure the highest Union added value of the funding allocated under this Regulation, ***although the ultimate responsibility for the decommissioning rests with Lithuania.*** This includes effective measurement of progress and performance, and the enacting of corrective measures where necessary.

Amendment

(12) An effective monitoring and control of the evolution of the decommissioning process should be ensured by the Commission and Lithuania in order to assure the highest Union added value of the funding allocated under this Regulation. This includes effective ***monitoring*** of progress and performance ***and, where necessary,*** the enacting of corrective measures ***together with Lithuania and the Union.***

Amendment 8

Proposal for a regulation Recital 16

Text proposed by the Commission

(16) The programme should be conducted with a joint financial effort of the Union and Lithuania. **A maximum** Union co-financing threshold should be established in line with the co-financing practice established under the predecessor programmes. Taking into account the **practice of comparable Union programmes and the strengthened Lithuanian economy**, from the inception of the Ignalina decommissioning programme until the end of the implementation of the activities financed under this Regulation, **the Union co-financing rate** should be **no higher than 80 %** of eligible costs. The remaining co-financing should be provided by Lithuania and sources other than the Union budget, notably from international financial institutions and other donors.

Amendment

(16) The programme should be conducted with a joint financial effort of the Union and Lithuania. **Protocol 4 of the 2003 Act of Accession stipulates that the Union contribution under the Ignalina Programme may, for certain measures, amount to up to 100 % of total expenditure.** A Union co-financing threshold should be established in line with the co-financing practice established under the predecessor programmes. Taking into account the **findings of the 2018 Commission report on the evaluation and implementation of the EU nuclear decommissioning assistance programmes in Bulgaria, Slovakia and Lithuania and the political commitment by Lithuania to contribute 14 % of the overall decommissioning cost, the Union co-financing rate**, from the inception of the Ignalina decommissioning programme until the end of the implementation of the activities financed under this Regulation, should be **86 %** of eligible costs. The remaining co-financing should be provided by Lithuania and sources other than the Union budget. **Efforts to attract funding from other sources**, notably from international financial institutions and other donors, **should be made.**

Amendment 9

Proposal for a regulation Recital 16 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(16a) Outside the scope of the Ignalina Programme, Lithuania continues to be ultimately responsible for developing and

investing in the Ignalina region which is characterised by low incomes and the country's highest unemployment rates, mainly due to the closure of the Ignalina nuclear power plant as the region's largest employer

Justification

The gravity of socio-economic problems in Ignalina region and particularly in the multi-ethnic town of Visaginas should not be underestimated. It is a considerable challenge for Lithuania both financially and politically.

Amendment 10

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 19

Text proposed by the Commission

(19) The Programme falls within the scope of the Lithuanian National Programme under the Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom.

Amendment

(19) The Programme falls within the scope of the Lithuanian National Programme under the Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom ***and may contribute to its implementation without prejudice to this Directive.***

Amendment 11

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 23 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(23 a) For historical reasons, Union financial support in decommissioning the Ignalina nuclear reactor is fully justified, but the programme should not set a precedent for the use of Union funds in the decommissioning of other nuclear reactors. It should be an ethical obligation for each Member State to avoid any undue burden on future generations in respect of spent fuel and radioactive waste, including any radioactive waste expected from decommissioning of existing nuclear installations. National

policies have to be based on the ‘polluter pays’ principle.

Justification

Recital 24 of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom. Member States have to make sure that the prime responsibility for the safety of spent fuel and radioactive waste management facilities and/or activities rests with the licence holder, while bearing ultimate responsibility for the management of the spent fuel and radioactive waste generated on their territory. Article 4(3)(e) of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom.

Amendment 12

Proposal for a regulation

Recital 23 b (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

(23 b) Commission Recommendation 2006/851/Euratom indicates that in accordance with the ‘polluter pays’ principle, nuclear operators should set aside adequate financial resources during the productive life of the installations for the future decommissioning costs.

Amendment 13

Proposal for a regulation

Article 3 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

1. The general objective of the Programme is to assist Lithuania in implementing Ignalina nuclear power plant decommissioning, with specific emphasis on managing the radiological safety challenges of the decommissioning of the Ignalina nuclear power plant, *whilst* ensuring *broad dissemination to all EU Member States of knowledge thereby generated on nuclear decommissioning.*

1. The general objective of the Programme is to *adequately* assist Lithuania in *safely* implementing Ignalina nuclear power plant decommissioning, with specific emphasis on managing the radiological safety challenges of the decommissioning of the Ignalina nuclear power plant, *including* ensuring *safety of the interim spent fuel storage.*

Amendment 14

Proposal for a regulation

Article 3 – paragraph 2

Text proposed by the Commission

2. The Programme has the **specific** objective to carry out the dismantling and decontamination of the Ignalina equipment and reactor shafts in accordance with the decommissioning plan, continue with the safe management of the decommissioning and legacy waste **and disseminate the generated knowledge among EU stakeholders**.

Amendment

2. The Programme has the **main** objective to carry out the dismantling and decontamination of the Ignalina equipment and reactor shafts in accordance with the decommissioning plan **and to** continue with the safe management of the decommissioning and legacy waste.

Amendment 15

Proposal for a regulation

Article 3 – paragraph 2 a (new)

Text proposed by the Commission

Amendment

2 a. The Programme also has the complementary objective to ensure broad dissemination in all Member States of the generated knowledge on nuclear decommissioning. The complementary objective shall be funded by the financial assistance programme for decommissioning of nuclear facilities and management of radioactive waste (COM (2018)467).

Amendment 16

Proposal for a regulation

Article 3 – paragraph 3

Text proposed by the Commission

3. The detailed description of the **specific** objective is set out in the Annex I. **The Commission may modify, by means of implementing acts, the Annex I, in accordance with the examination**

Amendment

3. The detailed description of the **main** objective is set out in the Annex I.

procedure referred to in Article 12(2).

Justification

Annex I is an essential part of the regulation and should therefore not be modified after the regulation has been adopted.

Amendment 17

Proposal for a regulation Article 4 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

1. The financial envelope for the implementation of the Programme for the period 2021 - 2027 shall be EUR **552 000 000** in current prices.

Amendment

1. The financial envelope for the implementation of the Programme for the period 2021 - 2027 shall be EUR **780 000 000** in current prices *for the implementation of the main objective of the programme (decommissioning activities).*

Amendment 18

Proposal for a regulation Article 7 – paragraph 1

Text proposed by the Commission

The overall *maximum* Union co-financing rate applicable under the Programme shall be *no higher than 80%*. The remaining financing shall be provided by Lithuania and additional sources other than the Union budget.

Amendment

The overall Union co-financing rate applicable under the Programme shall be **86 %**. The remaining financing shall be provided by Lithuania and additional sources other than the Union budget.

Amendment 19

Proposal for a regulation Annex 1 – paragraph 4

Text proposed by the Commission

4. Key radiological safety challenges in the financing period 2021-2027 are tackled through activities under items P.1,

Amendment

4. Key radiological safety challenges in the financing period 2021-2027 are tackled through activities under items P.1,

P.2 and P.4. In particular the dismantling of the reactors' cores is covered under item P.2. **Lesser challenges are tackled under item P.3, while** items P.0 and P.5 cover decommissioning support activities.

P.2, **P.3** and P.4. In particular the dismantling of the reactors' cores is covered under item P.2. **Items** P.0 and P.5 cover decommissioning support activities.

Justification

Safe handling and storage of spent nuclear fuel is a critical nuclear safety issue. It can not be relegated to the category of “lesser challenges”.

Amendment 20

Proposal for a regulation

Annex 1 – paragraph 5 – table 1 – item P.3

Text proposed by the Commission

TABLE 1

#	Item	Priority
P.3	Spent Nuclear Fuel handling	II

Amendment

TABLE 1

#	Item	Priority
P.3	Spent Nuclear Fuel handling	I

Justification

Safe handling of spent nuclear fuel is a critical nuclear safety issue. It cannot be relegated to the category of “lesser challenges”.

Amendment 21

Proposal for a regulation
Annex 1 – paragraph 7

Text proposed by the Commission

7. The disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste in a deep geological repository *is* excluded from the scope of the Programme, ***and has to be developed by Lithuania in its national programme for the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste as required by Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom.***

Amendment

7. ***While*** the disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste in a deep geological repository *is* excluded from the scope of the Programme ***in the period of 2021-2027, Lithuania and the Union shall begin, in due time, consultations regarding the potential inclusion of those activities in the scope of the Programme under the subsequent Multiannual Financial Framework.***

Justification

Lithuania could not accumulate funding for the final disposal of spent nuclear fuel due to the early closure of Ignalina NPP as precondition for the EU membership. The Union, in solidarity with Lithuania, should include the disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste in to the scope of the Ignalina programmes in the future Multiannual Financial Frameworks to at least co-finance the beginning of these tremendously expensive works, such as the search for the suitable site, research and excavation.

EXPLANATORY STATEMENT

Background

Closing the Ignalina nuclear power plant is a unique challenge for the European nuclear safety, both due to the size of the plant and the technical characteristics of the reactors. The Ignalina power plant operated two Soviet-era RBMK 1500 water-cooled reactors. The plant was imposed on Lithuania during the Soviet occupation and was designed to serve a much broader region. The task of closing the plant safely and efficiently is far too arduous for a country of the size and economic capacity of Lithuania. Protocol No 4 of Lithuania's EU Accession treaty required Lithuania to close both reactors prematurely due to severe safety concerns. The Chernobyl-type reactors were graphite-moderated and lacked a full containment structure. It was concluded that the reactors were inherently unsafe as the design was fundamentally flawed. In turn, the Union committed itself to providing crucial assistance to the decommissioning programme as well as to helping Lithuania address resulting energy security challenges.

Proposed Regulation

The Rapporteur welcomes the proposed Regulation as the manifestation of the Union's continued commitment to the endeavour. However, she believes that some important adjustments need to be made, particularly as regards ensuring the adequate funding for the programme.

Requested funding

The Rapporteur calls for the EU's contribution in the next MFF to be increased to EUR 780 million. All relevant interlocutors the rapporteur met – from Lithuanian government officials, nuclear power plant management and independent experts to Commission and EBRD representatives – were in agreement regarding this amount, although there were discussions on the timeframe of allocations. Namely, the current proposal (to allocate EUR 552 million between 2021-2027) fails to take into account that the process of dismantling the Unit 2 will start in 2026 and last beyond 2027, whereas sufficient funding for this task must be accumulated before the start of the works. Otherwise, the national regulator will not be in a position to authorize the commencement of the dismantling of the Unit 2 reactor.

One must bear in mind that the Ignalina decommissioning programme is approaching a highly challenging stage – dismantling of the graphite reactor core Unit 1 and Unit 2. It is an irreversible state: the dismantling and decontamination activities need to continue orderly and without interruption to prevent risks and radiological hazards. Failure to guarantee sufficient funding would result in the 4-year suspension of the Unit 2 dismantling, would eventually increase significantly the overall cost of the entire project and jeopardise the nuclear safety of

Europe. Skilled workforce would be lost and the finalization of the decommissioning, currently scheduled for 2038, would have to be postponed. Moreover, the suspension would result in a socio-economic crisis in this – already relatively poor – region of Lithuania. It would also affect the reputation of the EU in Lithuania, which implemented diligently its own end of the accession treaty by closing prematurely the Ignalina NPP, and by conducting the decommissioning activities in an exemplary fashion.

It must be noted that – outside the scope of the Ignalina Programme – Lithuania continues to be ultimately responsible for developing and investing in the Ignalina region, characterised by low incomes and the countries' highest unemployment rates, mainly due to the closure of the NPP as the region's largest employer. This is a serious burden for the country. This is also a politically sensitive issue, since the region – and particularly the town of Visaginas where the nuclear power plant is located – is dominated by ethnic minorities.

The Rapporteur also suggests ensuring that activities relating to the dissemination of knowledge, while important, should not divert too many resources from the main objective – safe and timely decommissioning of the nuclear power plant. Dissemination of knowledge is a complementary objective (it is not mentioned in the Protocol No 4 which created the Ignalina programme) and its funding is not calculated into the existing Decommissioning plan. Therefore, it would be appropriate to introduce a separate funding for this objective in order to ensure that resources are not diverted from the decommissioning works.

Co-financing rates

The current proposal to set the maximum threshold of the EU co-financing rate at 80% introduces a new requirement that is not in line with the Protocol No 4 (which provides for 100% EU financing for certain measures) nor with the existing practice (the current ratio of EU-Lithuanian co-financing is approximately 86%-14%). Despite the claim that higher input by a member state would result in higher performance, the Commission's own assessment of the decommissioning activities in Lithuania, Slovakia and Bulgaria found no evidence for such claim and concluded that the Ignalina programme under the current co-financing practice is proceeding efficiently and effectively and that “the national contribution levels achieved appear suitable for sustaining proper efficiency”.

Since the inception of the programme, Lithuania contributed about 14% to direct decommissioning activities. However, given that certain related activities (such as physical and fire safety of the plant) are not covered by the Ignalina programme, the actual contribution by Lithuania is higher. The proposal to increase Lithuania's share to 20% would present a significant financial burden for Lithuania and would be considered unfair by the population, especially considering that Lithuania has dutifully implemented its obligations under the accession treaty. The existing ratio (86-14) is optimal and could serve as guidance for future projects.

Another argument for greater national contribution, namely the references to the European Court of Auditors report and the “polluter pays” principle, cannot be applied to Lithuania, because the Ignalina nuclear power plant was imposed on it by the Soviet Union and was designated to serve a much broader region. The Lithuanian citizens have also incurred higher costs on energy for years as a result of the premature closure of the NPP and the need to increase energy imports.

The scope of the programme

The current Commission proposal excludes the disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste in deep geological repository and identifies the crucial task of storing and disposing spent fuel and waste as essentially Lithuanian responsibility.

The Rapporteur believes that eventually, in the future Multiannual Financial Framework (MFF), the Ignalina programme should also be contributing to the preparation of the final repository of the nuclear waste.

The Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom that the proposal refers to does, in fact, allow for the Union’s contribution to a broad range of decommissioning projects, including storage and disposal of radioactive waste spent fuel. Recital 13 of that Directive clearly indicates that the Community has taken part in providing financial support for various decommissioning activities, including management of radioactive waste and spent fuel. The definitions of “radioactive waste management” include, inter alia, storage and disposal.

While Directive 2011/70/Euratom states that the cost of the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste shall be borne by those who generated those materials, this provision cannot be applied retroactively to Lithuania, which closed the Ignalina nuclear power plant before the adoption of the Directive and thus was not in a position to accumulate sufficient funds for the storage and disposal of spent fuel and radioactive waste.

PROCEDURE – COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE

Title	Proposal for a Council regulation establishing the nuclear decommissioning assistance programme of the Ignalina nuclear power plant in Lithuania (Ignalina programme); and repealing Council Regulation (EU) No 1369/2013	
References	COM(2018)0466 – C8-0394/2018 – 2018/0251(NLE)	
Date of consultation / request for consent	23.8.2018	
Committee responsible Date announced in plenary	ITRE 10.9.2018	
Committees asked for opinions Date announced in plenary	BUDG 10.9.2018	
Not delivering opinions Date of decision	BUDG 13.9.2018	
Rapporteurs Date appointed	Rebecca Harms 30.8.2018	
Discussed in committee	8.10.2018	5.11.2018
Date adopted	21.11.2018	
Result of final vote	+	61
	-	2
	0	0
Members present for the final vote	Zigmantas Balčytis, Bendt Bendtsen, Xabier Benito Ziluaga, David Borrelli, Jonathan Bullock, Cristian-Silviu Buşoi, Jerzy Buzek, Edward Czesak, Jakop Dalunde, Christian Ehler, Fredrick Federley, Ashley Fox, Adam Gierek, Igor Gräzin, Theresa Griffin, András Gyürk, Rebecca Harms, Barbara Kappel, Krišjānis Kariņš, Jaromír Kohlíček, Peter Kouroumbashev, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, Christelle Lechevalier, Janusz Lewandowski, Paloma López Bermejo, Edouard Martin, Tilly Metz, Angelika Mlinar, Csaba Molnár, Nadine Morano, Dan Nica, Angelika Niebler, Morten Helveg Petersen, Miroslav Poche, Carolina Punset, Paul Rübig, Massimiliano Salini, Algirdas Saudargas, Neoklis Sylikiotis, Dario Tamburrano, Patrizia Toia, Evžen Tošenovský, Vladimir Urutchev, Kathleen Van Brempt, Henna Virkkunen, Lieve Wierinck, Hermann Winkler, Anna Záborská, Flavio Zanonato, Carlos Zorrinho	
Substitutes present for the final vote	Amjad Bashir, Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, Françoise Grossetête, Werner Langen, Olle Ludvigsson, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Clare Moody, Dennis Radtke, Davor Škrlec	
Substitutes under Rule 200(2) present for the final vote	Michael Detjen, Bolesław G. Piecha, Bronis Ropé	
Date tabled	29.11.2018	

FINAL VOTE BY ROLL CALL IN COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE

61	+
ALDE	Fredrick Federley, Igor Gräzin, Angelika Mlinar, Morten Helveg Petersen, Carolina Punset, Lieve Wierinck
ECR	Amjad Bashir, Edward Czesak, Ashley Fox, Zdzisław Krasnodębski, Bolesław G. Piecha, Evžen Tošenovský
EFDD	Dario Tamburrano
ENF	Christelle Lechevalier
GUE/NGL	Xabier Benito Ziluaga, Jaromír Kohlíček, Paloma López Bermejo, Neoklis Sylikiotis
NI	David Borrelli
PPE	Bendt Bendtsen, Cristian-Silviu Buşoi, Jerzy Buzek, Christian Ehler, Françoise Grossetête, András Gyürk, Krišjānis Kariņš, Werner Langen, Janusz Lewandowski, Marian-Jean Marinescu, Nadine Morano, Angelika Niebler, Dennis Radtke, Paul Rübig, Massimiliano Salini, Algirdas Saudargas, Vladimir Urutchev, Henna Virkkunen, Hermann Winkler, Anna Záborská
S&D	Zigmantas Balčytis, Soledad Cabezón Ruiz, Michael Detjen, Adam Gierek, Theresa Griffin, Peter Kouroumbashev, Miapetra Kumpula-Natri, Olle Ludvigsson, Edouard Martin, Csaba Molnár, Clare Moody, Dan Nica, Miroslav Poche, Patrizia Toia, Kathleen Van Brempt, Flavio Zanonato, Carlos Zorrinho
VERTS/ALE	Jakop Dalunde, Rebecca Harms, Tilly Metz, Bronis Ropė, Davor Škrlec

2	-
EFDD	Jonathan Bullock
ENF	Barbara Kappel

0	0

Key to symbols:

+ : in favour

- : against

0 : abstention