

Public consultation on Evaluation of Council Directive 2011/70/Euratom and Council Directive 2006/117/Euratom

Fields marked with * are mandatory.

Introduction

About you

* Language of my contribution

- Bulgarian
- Croatian
- Czech
- Danish
- Dutch
- English
- Estonian
- Finnish
- French
- German
- Greek
- Hungarian
- Irish
- Italian
- Latvian
- Lithuanian
- Maltese

- Polish
- Portuguese
- Romanian
- Slovak
- Slovenian
- Spanish
- Swedish

* I am giving my contribution as

- Academic/research institution
- Business association
- Company/business
- Consumer organisation
- EU citizen
- Environmental organisation
- Non-EU citizen
- Non-governmental organisation (NGO)
- Public authority
- Trade union
- Other

* First name

Ursula

* Surname

Caturla

* Email (this won't be published)

ursula.caturla.rodriquez@nucleareurope.eu

* Organisation name

255 character(s) maximum

nucleareurope

* Organisation size

- Micro (1 to 9 employees)
- Small (10 to 49 employees)
- Medium (50 to 249 employees)
- Large (250 or more)

Transparency register number

Check if your organisation is on the transparency register. It's a voluntary database for organisations seeking to influence EU decision-making.

42433582-82

* Country of origin

Please add your country of origin, or that of your organisation.

This list does not represent the official position of the European institutions with regard to the legal status or policy of the entities mentioned. It is a harmonisation of often divergent lists and practices.

- | | | | |
|---|--|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="radio"/> Afghanistan | <input type="radio"/> Djibouti | <input type="radio"/> Libya | <input type="radio"/> Saint Martin |
| <input type="radio"/> Åland Islands | <input type="radio"/> Dominica | <input type="radio"/> Liechtenstein | <input type="radio"/> Saint Pierre and Miquelon |
| <input type="radio"/> Albania | <input type="radio"/> Dominican Republic | <input type="radio"/> Lithuania | <input type="radio"/> Saint Vincent and the Grenadines |
| <input type="radio"/> Algeria | <input type="radio"/> Ecuador | <input type="radio"/> Luxembourg | <input type="radio"/> Samoa |
| <input type="radio"/> American Samoa | <input type="radio"/> Egypt | <input type="radio"/> Macau | <input type="radio"/> San Marino |
| <input type="radio"/> Andorra | <input type="radio"/> El Salvador | <input type="radio"/> Madagascar | <input type="radio"/> São Tomé and Príncipe |
| <input type="radio"/> Angola | <input type="radio"/> Equatorial Guinea | <input type="radio"/> Malawi | <input type="radio"/> Saudi Arabia |
| <input type="radio"/> Anguilla | <input type="radio"/> Eritrea | <input type="radio"/> Malaysia | <input type="radio"/> Senegal |
| <input type="radio"/> Antarctica | <input type="radio"/> Estonia | <input type="radio"/> Maldives | <input type="radio"/> Serbia |
| <input type="radio"/> Antigua and Barbuda | <input type="radio"/> Eswatini | <input type="radio"/> Mali | <input type="radio"/> Seychelles |

- Argentina
- Armenia
- Aruba
- Australia
- Austria
- Azerbaijan
- Bahamas
- Bahrain
- Bangladesh

- Barbados
- Belarus
- Belgium
- Belize
- Benin
- Bermuda
- Bhutan

- Bolivia
- Bonaire Saint Eustatius and Saba
- Bosnia and Herzegovina
- Botswana
- Bouvet Island
- Brazil
- British Indian Ocean Territory
- British Virgin Islands

- Ethiopia
- Falkland Islands
- Faroe Islands
- Fiji
- Finland
- France
- French Guiana
- French Polynesia
- French Southern and Antarctic Lands
- Gabon
- Georgia
- Germany
- Ghana
- Gibraltar
- Greece
- Greenland
- Grenada
- Guadeloupe
- Guam
- Guatemala
- Guernsey
- Guinea
- Guinea-Bissau
- Guyana

- Malta
- Marshall Islands
- Martinique
- Mauritania
- Mauritius
- Mayotte
- Mexico
- Micronesia
- Moldova

- Monaco
- Mongolia
- Montenegro
- Montserrat
- Morocco
- Mozambique
- Myanmar/Burma

- Namibia
- Nauru

- Nepal
- Netherlands
- New Caledonia
- New Zealand
- Nicaragua
- Niger

- Sierra Leone
- Singapore
- Sint Maarten
- Slovakia
- Slovenia
- Solomon Islands
- Somalia
- South Africa
- South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands
- South Korea
- South Sudan
- Spain
- Sri Lanka
- Sudan
- Suriname
- Svalbard and Jan Mayen
- Sweden
- Switzerland

- Syria
- Taiwan
- Tajikistan
- Tanzania
- Thailand
- The Gambia

- Brunei
- Bulgaria
- Burkina Faso
- Burundi
- Cambodia
- Cameroon
- Canada
- Cape Verde
- Cayman Islands
- Central African Republic
- Chad
- Chile
- China
- Christmas Island
- Clipperton
- Cocos (Keeling) Islands
- Colombia
- Comoros
- Congo
- Cook Islands
- Costa Rica
- Côte d'Ivoire
- Croatia
- Haiti
- Heard Island and McDonald Islands
- Honduras
- Hong Kong
- Hungary
- Iceland
- India
- Indonesia
- Iran
- Iraq
- Ireland
- Isle of Man
- Israel
- Italy
- Jamaica
- Japan
- Jersey
- Jordan
- Kazakhstan
- Kenya
- Kiribati
- Kosovo
- Kuwait
- Nigeria
- Niue
- Norfolk Island
- Northern Mariana Islands
- North Korea
- North Macedonia
- Norway
- Oman
- Pakistan
- Palau
- Palestine
- Panama
- Papua New Guinea
- Paraguay
- Peru
- Philippines
- Pitcairn Islands
- Poland
- Portugal
- Puerto Rico
- Qatar
- Réunion
- Romania
- Timor-Leste
- Togo
- Tokelau
- Tonga
- Trinidad and Tobago
- Tunisia
- Türkiye
- Turkmenistan
- Turks and Caicos Islands
- Tuvalu
- Uganda
- Ukraine
- United Arab Emirates
- United Kingdom
- United States
- United States Minor Outlying Islands
- Uruguay
- US Virgin Islands
- Uzbekistan
- Vanuatu
- Vatican City
- Venezuela
- Vietnam

- Cuba
- Curaçao
- Cyprus
- Czechia
- Democratic Republic of the Congo
- Denmark
- Kyrgyzstan
- Laos
- Latvia
- Lebanon
- Lesotho
- Liberia
- Russia
- Rwanda
- Saint Barthélemy
- Saint Helena
- Saint Kitts and Nevis
- Saint Lucia
- Wallis and Futuna
- Western Sahara
- Yemen
- Zambia
- Ascension and Tristan da Cunha
- Zimbabwe

The Commission will publish all contributions to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would prefer to have your details published or to remain anonymous when your contribution is published. **For the purpose of transparency, the type of respondent (for example, ‘business association’, ‘consumer association’, ‘EU citizen’) country of origin, organisation name and size, and its transparency register number, are always published. Your e-mail address will never be published.** Opt in to select the privacy option that best suits you. Privacy options default based on the type of respondent selected

* Contribution publication privacy settings

The Commission will publish the responses to this public consultation. You can choose whether you would like your details to be made public or to remain anonymous.

Anonymous

Only organisation details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published as received. Your name will not be published. Please do not include any personal data in the contribution itself if you want to remain anonymous.

Public

Organisation details and respondent details are published: The type of respondent that you responded to this consultation as, the name of the organisation on whose behalf you reply as well as its transparency number, its size, its country of origin and your contribution will be published. Your name will also be published.

I agree with the [personal data protection provisions](#)

Preliminary Public Consultation Questions

Introductory questions

Do you have professional or personal experience related to radioactive waste or spent fuel management and shipments?

- Yes
- No

Radioactive Waste Directive

How aware are you of your Member State's policies for managing radioactive waste and spent fuel?

- Very aware
- Aware
- Somewhat aware
- Slightly aware
- Not at all aware
- Not applicable

In your opinion, what are the key strengths or weaknesses of the management of spent fuel and radioactive waste in your Member State?

We do not represent a single EU MS.

Strengths: In general, however, the Directive is fit for purpose. It establishes a coherent and sufficient framework that clearly defines responsibilities, ensures high levels of safety, and provides legal certainty for operators and regulators alike. It successfully sets out the requirement for national programmes covering the full lifecycle of radioactive waste.

Weaknesses: The Directive already provide a solid basis, but its implementation could be further strengthened by better recognising the role of reprocessing-recycling and as any other Directive, the effectiveness of these legal instruments relies on their transposition and implementation by Member States. The evidence from infringement procedures under both Directives demonstrates that the legal framework itself is not the primary limiting factor. Rather, differences in the pace and completeness of national implementation have led to varying levels of compliance across the European Union.

In your view, has your Member State made progress in ensuring the responsible and safe management of spent fuel and radioactive waste since the entry into force of the Directive?

- Significant progress
- Some progress
- No change
- Some regression
- Significant regression
- Don't know

Why/why not?

Question may have various answers depending on a specific MS. nucleareurope represents the nuclear industry across EU MS.

How would you rate altogether radioactive waste and spent fuel management efforts in the EU ?

- Excellent
- Very good
- Moderate
- Fair
- Poor
- Don't know

In your view, what are the main challenges related to spent fuel and radioactive waste management with which your Member State is still confronted ?

The priority should be to support Member States in fully implementing existing obligations, rather than performing a revision of the Directives. This could include facilitating the exchange of best practices between governments, strengthening cooperation between national authorities (regulators), and guaranteeing resources and governance structures for long-term programme delivery.

Would you consider that the publicly available information on radioactive waste and spent fuel management is sufficient and clear/easy to understand?

- Yes
- No
-

Don't know

Other

Do you agree that the Directive contributed to increased safety, transparency and public accountability in your Member State?

To a great extent

To a considerable extent

To some extent

Very little

Not at all

Don't know

Why/why not?

Question is not applicable. nucleareurope represents the nuclear industry across EU MS.

In your view, how could transparency, public awareness, public involvement in decision making and trust be improved in relation to national radioactive waste and spent fuel management policies?

Throughout the years, the nuclear industry has fulfilled its responsibilities within this framework whilst respecting the principles of transparency, public awareness and public involvement and trust in decision making. Operators and supply chain actors have developed and implemented technical solutions for the safe management, treatment, conditioning and storage of radioactive waste, in full compliance with national and European requirements.

As mentioned before, the exchange of best practices between governments could be facilitated, strengthening cooperation between national authorities (regulators), and guaranteeing resources and governance structures for long-term programme delivery. Reducing unnecessary administrative burden where possible, while preserving high safety standards, would also contribute to greater efficiency within the industry and economic actors participating in nuclear operations and activities.

Are there any aspects of the Directive that you believe need clarification, simplification or other improvement?

No, it is inherent to Directive transposition to national legislation.

Do you have any further remarks on the Directive?

No.

Shipment Directive

In your opinion, does the Directive ensure safe shipments of radioactive waste and spent fuel in the EU?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/Don't know

In your view, are the current EU rules on the supervision and control of shipments of radioactive waste and spent fuel adequate?

- Yes, fully adequate
- Partially adequate
- Inadequate
- Don't know

Why/why not?

The Directive provides a sound and adequate framework and broadly supports its continued application without major revision.

In your view are there any issues with the supervision and control of shipments of radioactive waste and spent fuel?

- Yes
- No
- No opinion/Don't know
- Other

Are there any aspects of the Directive that you believe need clarification, simplification or other improvement?

The Shipment Directive has proved effective in managing cross-border movements of radioactive materials are strictly controlled and authorised. The existing system of prior authorisation provides a high level of safety and transparency, while enabling necessary movements for treatment, conditioning or disposal. The industry supports maintaining this system, as it ensures both safety and operational flexibility within the internal market.

Do you have any further remarks on the Directive?

nucleareurope broadly supports the continued application of the Shipments Directive without major revision.

Contact

David.SILVA-HERMIDA@ec.europa.eu