

7th Review Meeting of the Contracting
Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety

27 March – 7 April, 2017
Vienna, Austria

Report of the President of the Review Meeting

A. Introduction

1. The 7th Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the Convention on Nuclear Safety (the Convention), was held, pursuant to Article 20 of the Convention, at the Headquarters of the International Atomic Energy Agency (IAEA) in Vienna, Austria, from 27 March to 7 April 2017. The President of the Review Meeting was Mr. Ramzi Jammal, from Canada. The Vice-Presidents were Mr. Georg Schwarz, from Switzerland, and Mr. Geoffrey Emi-Reynolds, from Ghana.
2. This report supplements the Summary Report CNS/7RM/INF/2017/08 by providing additional information on the business conducted at the Plenary Session, as well as the President's views. Information on review meeting participation, the development of national reports and presentations is provided in the Summary Report.

Participation

3. Seventy seven of the 80 Contracting Parties to the Convention participated in the Review Meeting, which represents the highest level of participation to date. The following Contracting Parties were in attendance: Albania, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, Germany, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Ireland, Italy, Japan, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Republic of Korea, Kuwait, Latvia, Lebanon, Libya, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mali, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Myanmar, Netherlands, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Singapore, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sweden, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United States of America, Uruguay, Vietnam; and Euratom.
4. Three Contracting Parties, namely Cambodia, Paraguay and the Republic of Moldova, did not attend the Review Meeting but submitted a National Report. Three Contracting Parties, namely Lebanon, Libya and Uruguay, did not attend the Country Group sessions.
5. It was noted during the Review Meeting that for Myanmar and Niger, the Convention entered into force shortly before the Review Meeting and after the deadline for posting comments and questions had lapsed.
6. Pursuant to Article 24.2 of the Convention, the OECD Nuclear Energy Agency (NEA) was invited by the Contracting Parties to attend the Review Meeting as an observer and committed to do so at the October 2015 Organizational Meeting. However, the OECD NEA did not attend the Review Meeting.

National Reports and Peer Review Process

7. Seventy nine Contracting Parties submitted a National Report for this Review Meeting. Only one Contracting Party, namely Libya, did not submit a National Report. This represents the highest submission rate of National Reports to date. It also demonstrates that the Contracting Parties' collective commitment to nuclear safety is growing. It is worth noting that Niger and Myanmar, which became Contracting Parties in December 2016, each submitted a National Report and participated in the 7th Review Meeting.
8. Even though all Contracting Parties apart from Libya submitted a National Report, twenty one Contracting Parties submitted their report later than the 15 August 2016 deadline. Twenty one Contracting Parties did not post any questions or comments, which Contracting Parties are expected to do; however, this number represents an improvement from previous review meetings.
9. At the time of the Review Meeting, 21 Contracting Parties had made their National Report publicly available on the IAEA website via a link to their national public website, and several other Contracting Parties had published their National Report on their national public website. Similarly, two Contracting Parties had made their questions and answers publicly available on the IAEA website, while some had published them on their national public website.
10. The Contracting Parties which had not yet made their National Report and their questions and answers public were encouraged by the President to do so following the Review Meeting.

Late Ratifiers

11. According to the records of Convention's Secretariat, Madagascar deposited its instrument of accession to the Convention on 3 March 2017 and therefore qualifies as a late ratifier. However, Madagascar was unable to attend the Review Meeting.

B. Opening Plenary (27 March 2017)

12. The Review Meeting was opened by Mr. Ramzi Jammal, who was elected as President of the 7th Review Meeting at the Organizational Meeting in Vienna, in October 2015. The President welcomed over 900 participants to the Review Meeting.
13. In his opening remarks, Mr. Jammal, highlighted the need to demonstrate the effectiveness of the Convention and reinforced the common goal of Contracting Parties to ensure nuclear safety for the protection of the public and the environment while maintaining an apolitical environment. He also noted that, for the first time, following the agreement of the Contracting Parties, countries which had signed the Convention but not yet ratified it had been invited to attend the opening plenary, part of the closing plenary where the Summary Report is approved and the press conference where key findings from the Review Meeting are shared.

14. Mr. Jammal also noted that this Review Meeting was the first opportunity for Contracting Parties to discuss developments in their respective countries since the publication of the IAEA Director General's Report on the Fukushima Daiichi Accident and its five technical volumes in 2015. He also noted that there would be a discussion on how Contracting Parties have addressed the Vienna Declaration on Nuclear Safety (VDNS), which was adopted in 2015.
15. At the Opening Plenary, the Director General of the IAEA, Mr. Yukiya Amano, welcomed the delegates to the 7th Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties to the *Convention on Nuclear Safety*. Mr. Amano emphasized that every country that uses nuclear technology has a responsibility to create a robust framework for safety and security and that this is a national responsibility that cannot be outsourced. Effective international cooperation is also essential and the IAEA has a vital role to play in enabling countries to share experiences and best practices. Mr. Amano closed by noting that the Convention is a very important mechanism that has contributed significantly to strengthening nuclear safety and encouraged all IAEA Member States, which have not done so to become parties to the Convention.
16. Mr. Jammal also delivered a statement. As President, he recalled his primary objectives of increased participation and transparency in the Review Meeting. As were the non-ratifier countries, representatives of the media were also invited to attend the opening session, part of the closing session, and the press conference. These sessions were also to be webcast to the public and archived on the public IAEA website. This is the first time that any part of the Review Meeting was webcast, which contributes to increasing accessibility to the public and to those who otherwise would be unable to attend.
17. The President encouraged Country Group participants to ask challenging questions and provide open responses during their sessions. He asked Contracting Parties to be clear on improvements made since the last Review Meeting in 2014, and noted that at this Review Meeting, Country Groups were now able to identify Areas of Good Performance and truly unique Good Practices as well as Challenges to be followed up on at the next Review Meeting in 2020. Mr. Jammal also encouraged participants to attend the Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) sessions that are directed at further improving the openness, transparency and effectiveness of the Convention's processes.
18. Mr. Jammal stated that for the first time, with the goal of transparency in mind, all National Reports will be posted on the Convention's public website 90 days following the adjournment of the Review Meeting, unless an objection is received from a Contracting Party in respect to its National Report. The President noted that each Contracting Party could further demonstrate its commitment to transparency by proactively posting their questions and answers on the Convention's or their national public website.
19. The President then reviewed several official documents relating to the 7th Review Meeting, which included the Agenda and the List of Officers.

Officers of the Meeting

20. Mr. Jammal recalled that the Organizational Meeting had elected Officers who established seven Country Groups for the Review Meeting. The Officers were then allocated to Country Groups in such a manner that no Officer was assigned to the Country Group to which their own country was a member. Noting that since the Organizational Meeting some Contracting Parties had notified the CNS Secretary of changes to the names of Officers, the Review Meeting confirmed the List of Officers..

Adoption of the Agenda

21. The Review Meeting adopted the Provisional Agenda CNS/7RM/2017/01 as well as the Annotated Agenda and the Timetable.

Credentials of Participants

22. Based on a report by the Office of Legal Affairs, the Review Meeting accepted the credentials of the delegates as presented by the Contracting Parties participating in the Review Meeting on the understanding that those delegations that had so far only submitted provisional credentials would provide the Secretary with formal credentials as soon as possible.

Organization of Work

23. The President provided an overview of the planned sessions for the first week including the Country Group sessions, meetings of the Open Ended Working Group and the planned plenary sessions for the second week.

Open Ended Working Group

24. The Review Meeting established an Open Ended Working Group (OEWG). Vice-President Georg Schwarz, Chairperson of the OEWG, informed the delegates of the organization of the OEWG sessions. Mr. Schwarz recalled that proposals were put forward for discussion at the 7th Review Meeting and therefore included on the Agenda of the OEWG. The three proposals received focused on enhancing the participation, the transparency and the effectiveness of the Review Meeting, and on effectively addressing the VDNS in the Convention's guidelines.
25. Germany submitted a proposal to amend the guidance documents supporting the review process of the Convention on Nuclear Safety (INFCIRCS 571 and 572) in order to add reference to and alignment with the VDNS. The United States of America submitted a joint proposal co-sponsored by several Contracting Parties that included nine specific actions to enhance participation, effectiveness and transparency with respect to the Convention on Nuclear Safety. Canada also submitted a proposal to webcast parts of the plenary sessions and post videos of national presentations (on the IAEA website), as well as a follow-up on a proposal from the 6th Review Meeting to develop a template for National Reports.

C. Country Group Discussions (27–31 March 2017)

26. During the Review Meeting, the Country Groups met for four and a half days. Each Contracting Party that gave a presentation in its Country Group received questions. The Contracting Parties provided answers to the supplementary questions raised in the discussion. The level of participation during the discussions in the Country Group sessions was generally good; exchanges were open, constructive and frank.
27. The General Committee (President and Vice-Presidents, Chairs of Country Groups and IAEA Officers) met daily to discuss issues raised in Country Groups, Good Practices suggested and awarded, experience in preparing Country Review Reports and procedural matters. One recurring matter was the absence of a number of Contracting Parties (including some which had registered to attend), and it was noted that some only attended parts of the Country Group sessions. Nonetheless, in each case a Country Review Report was still prepared. Another recurring issue was the absence in some Contracting Party delegations of representatives of the regulatory body and operators (including Mexico, Peru¹ and Niger). Each of their presentations was instead delivered by a diplomat from the local Mission without sufficient technical support. This is not consistent with paragraph 21 of INFCIRC/571/Rev.7, and it also made the question and answer sessions less effective.
28. The General Committee noted that Contracting Parties adopted differing approaches to identifying Good Practices and Challenges; some offered proposals whereas others preferred to wait for the Country Group members to propose them instead. A definition of “Good Practice” had been set out prior to the 6th Review Meeting, as provided in the guidelines (INFCIRC/571/Rev.7, Annex IV), and some Contracting Party proposals for Good Practices were not consistent with this definition. Where this occurred, the proposals were rejected within their Country Group, mainly on the grounds that they were not unique or that they did not make a significant contribution to nuclear safety. All candidate Good Practices were subject to robust challenges and discussions, and most were re-categorised as Areas of Good Performance. As per the definition included in Country Group Reports, an Area of Good Performance is "a practice, policy or programme that is worthwhile to commend and has been undertaken and implemented effectively. An Area of Good Performance is a significant accomplishment for the particular CP although it may have been implemented by other CPs." Following the discussions, the Country Groups subsequently finalized and approved by consensus each Country Review Report.
29. The General Committee also noted that some Contracting Parties delivered a presentation that was very similar to the one they had delivered at the 6th Review Meeting in 2014. It was suggested that Contracting Parties consider the elements outlined in paragraph 22 of INFCIRC/571/Rev.7 when planning the content of their presentations.

¹ Due to a natural disaster in Peru, the regulatory body was unable to attend the 7th Review Meeting.

30. The General Committee also raised the fact that some Country Review Reports took much longer than anticipated to finalize. Some Country Group Chairs adopted the approach of deferring finalization to the end of the day's Country Group session, in order not to disrupt subsequent presentations, which meant that sometimes not all Contracting Parties were present when a Country Review Report was finalized. Following discussion in the General Committee, it was decided that, as paragraph 25 of INFCIRC/571/Rev.7 does not indicate that a quorum is required, consensus among those Contracting Parties present was appropriate.

D. Final Plenary (3–7 April 2017)

Presentation by the Country Group Rapporteurs

31. Pursuant to Section XII(C) of the Guidelines Regarding the Review Process, the Review Meeting heard and discussed oral reports from each of the seven Country Group Rapporteurs.

Credentials of Participants

32. Based on the decision made during the Opening Plenary, a report by the Office of Legal Affairs on the credentials of the delegates who participated in the Review Meeting was presented at the Final Plenary. Based on this report, the Review Meeting accepted the credentials of the delegates. The President reiterated to Contracting Parties the importance of the timely submission of credentials.

Major Common Issues Arising From Country Group Discussions

33. A number of Major Common Issues emerged from the Country Group discussions. These were presented for discussion in plenary. The President recommended that Contracting Parties report on the progress made against these Major Common Issues at the 8th Review Meeting. The issues included:

- Safety culture
- International peer reviews
- Legal framework and independence of regulatory body
- Financial and human resources
- Knowledge management
- Supply chain
- Managing the safety of ageing nuclear facilities and plant life extension
- Emergency preparedness
- Stakeholder consultation and communication

34. Several Contracting Parties reported, with due consideration to enhance safety, on the evaluation and response to other issues such as cyber security threat, while recognizing the distinction between nuclear safety and nuclear security.

Report on the Challenges from the 6th Review Meeting

35. At the 6th Review Meeting of the Convention in 2014, five challenges were identified as a result of the lessons learned following the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant accident. The Summary Report for the 6th Review Meeting requested Contracting Parties to report on the way that they have addressed these challenges at the 7th Review Meeting. The challenges were:

- How to minimise gaps between Contracting Parties' safety improvements
- How to achieve harmonised emergency plans and response measures
- How to make better use of operating and regulatory experience and international peer review services
- How to improve regulators' independence, safety culture, transparency and openness
- How to engage all countries to commit and participate in international cooperation

36. Most Contracting Parties with NPPs addressed these challenges explicitly in the summary of their National Report, and the remaining Contracting Parties with NPPs did so implicitly under relevant articles of the Convention. However, only a few Contracting Parties without NPPs addressed the challenges explicitly in the Summary of their National Reports. A number of good initiatives were reported, including: enhanced international cooperation, sharing of experience including Good Practices, strengthening the role of Owners' Groups and regulatory forums, and use of IAEA standards and more extensive use of peer review missions.

37. The Contracting Parties agreed that these challenges no longer need to be reported on as standalone items as they are addressed through IAEA peer review services and other instruments, and Contracting Parties are required to report on these matters as appropriate in their National Reports. However, since these challenges are not yet fully resolved, it is recommended that continued attention be given to them by Contracting Parties, including the implementation of IAEA standards and the use of IAEA peer review services and enhanced international cooperation to share and use relevant international experience more effectively. Measures to engage embarking countries in these activities are encouraged.

Report on the *Vienna Declaration on Nuclear Safety*

38. In accordance with decision (1) of Contracting Parties contained in the Vienna Declaration on Nuclear Safety, the Agenda of the 7th Review Meeting included a peer review of the incorporation of appropriate technical criteria and standards used by Contracting Parties for addressing the principles of the Vienna Declaration on Nuclear Safety in national requirements and regulations. Mr. Craig Lavender, Special Advisor to the President of the 7th Review Meeting, led a discussion of information provided by Contracting Parties through their National Reports, responses to questions posed during the review process, and national presentations at the 7th Review Meeting. Although the

level of detail in reporting varied, a majority of Contracting Parties stated that they currently reflect the principles in their national requirements or will address them when embarking on a nuclear power programme. A majority of Contracting Parties with nuclear power programmes did not face or expect issues in addressing the principles of the VDNS. Few Contracting Parties reported some technical issues as well as the lack of guidance in addressing the principles of the VDNS to their existing fleet.

39. The Contracting parties reaffirmed that the principles contained in the Vienna Declaration on Nuclear Safety should continue to be reflected in the actions of Contracting Parties to strengthen nuclear safety, and in particular when preparing National Reports on the implementation of the Convention, with special focus on Article 18 as well as other relevant articles, such as 6, 14, 17 and 19.
40. The Contracting Parties noted that a number of IAEA Safety Requirements had been revised to incorporate lessons-learned from the Fukushima Daiichi Nuclear Power Plant accident. The Contracting Parties also noted that the Commission on Safety Standards (CSS) had confirmed that “the technical elements of the Vienna Declaration are already reflected in the relevant Safety Requirements of the IAEA”. The Contracting Parties further noted that the Agency continues to reflect the principles of the Convention in its relevant documents and requested the Secretariat of the Agency to brief about these at the next Organizational Meeting. It was also noted that for some of the Contracting Parties, the topic of the identification of technical criteria and standards for nuclear power plant safety improvements is a key area to be discussed at the 8th Organizational Meeting of the Convention as a topic that could warrant special attention at the 8th Review Meeting. The Contracting Parties seeking additional guidance could explore the possibility to leverage bilateral cooperation agreements and regional organisations of regulators to address their needs.
41. During the Plenary Meeting, the Contracting Parties engaged in a significant amount of discussion regarding the principles of the VDNS and the extent to which their application should be discussed in future Review Meetings. There were three break out sessions organized to further discuss this issue. In an attempt to gain consensus, the President suggested the creation of a small working group to focus on the issues. In the end, consensus was reached.

Report on Challenges Faced by Non-NPP and Embarking Countries

42. The 6th Review Meeting noted that there had been no improvements in the level of participation of non-NPP and embarking countries in the Convention review process. To tackle this situation, in June 2016, the President of the 7th Review Meeting asked Mr. Geoffrey Emi-Reynolds to lead a special session at the 7th Review Meeting to discuss how to secure improved participation by these Contracting Parties, including the particular challenges faced by non-NPP and embarking countries in complying with the obligations of the Convention.

43. The discussions found that key challenges included limited national government support or commitment due to competing demands for resources and, in some instances, a lack of understanding of the obligations that Contracting Parties have to the Convention review process. The absence of a legal infrastructure that established an independent regulatory body was also identified as a major factor. Related to this, for non-NPP and embarking countries, a shortage of suitably qualified and experienced personnel contributed both to difficulties in preparing the country reports and the capability to comment on National Reports from other Contracting Parties.
44. Measures identified to address these issues included enhanced support through IAEA and Regional Groupings. Contracting Parties proposed that these groupings should be encouraged to organize workshops and expert missions that do not duplicate other activities, to enhance awareness of the requirements of the Convention and the review process amongst national policy and decision makers. These groupings should also seek to support development of the capabilities of personnel involved in the review process. Bilateral arrangements, whereby Contracting Parties with more experience could help non-NPP and embarking countries were also advocated. It was proposed that non-NPP and embarking countries could support each other at the Review Meeting by sharing questions and answers from Country Group sessions they attended to palliate the limited number of representatives attending the Review Meeting.

Proposals to Improve the Processes of the Convention

45. The Open Ended Working Group (OEWG) was established at the opening plenary session and was chaired by Mr. Georg Schwarz.
46. Three proposals were submitted by the Contracting Parties and discussed during the OEWG meetings. The discussions of the OEWG resulted in six recommendations, which were presented to Contracting Parties in Plenary session and approved.
47. Mr. Schwarz reminded the OEWG participants that the 7th Review Meeting would be the first Review Meeting in which the Contracting Parties are required to report on addressing the VDNS and the modifications made to the guidance documents of the Convention on Nuclear Safety agreed on at the 6th Review Meeting in 2014. The OEWG was therefore encouraged to focus on proposals that added clear value to the Convention on Nuclear Safety Review Process. Mr. Schwarz requested that the discussions be effective and constructive. The meetings were well attended and the working methodology of the OEWG sessions included presentation and discussion of the proposals leading to agreement on the wording of recommendations to be submitted for approval by Contracting Parties during the Plenary Session.

48. The OEWG recommendations approved by the Contracting Parties can be found in the Chairman's Report on the Meeting of the OEWG.

49. During the OEWG, it was also confirmed that Contracting Parties can make publicly available their Country Review Report should they choose to do so.

Agenda for the 8th Review Meeting

50. Pursuant to Article 21(3) of the Convention, the Review Meeting determined that the 8th Review Meeting of the Convention shall start on 23 March 2020. .

51. Pursuant to the revised schedule, the Review Meeting decided that the Organizational Meeting for the 8th Review Meeting shall be held on 17 October 2018, that a short officer turnover meeting shall be held on 12 March 2019 and that Officers' Meeting shall be held on 12–13 February 2020.

52. The Review Meeting also determined, pursuant to Rule 39(2) of the Rules of Procedure and Financial Rules, that National Reports for the 8th Review Meeting shall be submitted to the Secretariat no later than 15 August 2019, taking into account the provisions of INFCIRC/572. The Review Meeting noted that, as a consequence of the decisions made, questions and comments on the National Reports must be received no later than 24 November 2019, and answers to questions must be received no later than 24 February 2020.

Approval of the Summary Report on the 7th Review Meeting

53. Pursuant to Article 25 of the Convention, the Review Meeting discussed, finalized and adopted in English a Summary Report, based on a draft available in Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish and prepared according to Section XV of the Guidelines Regarding the Review Process. In doing so, it was understood that corresponding final texts would be produced in Arabic, Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish, taking account of any linguistic comments from Contracting Parties.

Acceptance of the President's Report on the 7th Review Meeting

54. The Review Meeting took note of this Report of the President of the 7th Review Meeting, and requested the Secretary to transmit this report and its Annexes to the Director General of the IAEA, thereby informing him of the decisions made at the Review Meeting for consideration in the IAEA budgetary process, as contemplated in Article 28 of the Convention, and to the Contracting Parties and the Signatory States.

55. Contracting Parties at the 7th Review Meeting call on all Contracting Parties to commit to the effective implementation of the Convention review process. Full participation in the review process of the obligations under this international legal instrument benefits all Contracting Parties.

Recommendations from the President of the 7th Review Meeting

56. The President recommends that Contracting Parties report at the 8th Review Meeting on the progress made against the Major Common Issues identified at this Review Meeting (as listed in paragraph 33 of this report).
57. Keeping in mind that the operators have prime responsibility for nuclear safety and further to the interest expressed by several Contracting Parties, the President recommends that the World Association of Nuclear Operators (WANO) be invited as Observer to the 8th Review Meeting in accordance with Article 24(2), noting that this article does not preclude non-governmental organizations from observing. If the request is made by WANO, the President recommends that consideration be given at the Organizational Meeting for the 8th Review Meeting to invite them this association as Observer.
58. The President recommends that the Officers of the 7th Review Meeting consider the experiences of the Contracting Parties in reporting on the principles of the VDNS and provide a report to the Organizational Meeting of the 8th Review Meeting for consideration and identification of possible action for the 8th Review Meeting.
59. With the objective of increasing transparency, the President recommends that Contracting Parties make publicly available their Country Review Report as soon as possible following the 7th Review Meeting.
60. To assist Contracting Parties without nuclear power programmes or embarking on nuclear programmes to become fully engaged in the Convention's review process, the President recommends that Contracting Parties and the Secretariat take action on the measures identified at the 7th Review Meeting (as included in paragraph 44 of this report).
61. The President recommends that Contracting Parties reach out to non-signatory countries and non-Contracting Parties to enhance their knowledge of the Convention's activities and benefits, with the aim of increasing adherence to the Convention.
62. The President recommends that Contracting Parties consider the implementation of the four Good Practices that were identified during the 7th Review Meeting .

Closing Remarks

63. In his closing remarks, Mr. Jammal thanked all Contracting Parties for their active participation in the review process and their dedication to improving global nuclear safety. He also thanked the Vice-Presidents, the Officers of the Review Meeting and the IAEA Secretariat for their work and contribution to the success of this Review Meeting.
64. Mr. Jammal referred to his primary objective for this Review Meeting, which was to increase participation and transparency. This was successfully achieved, as this Review Meeting saw an increase in the number of Contracting Parties and their active participation in the process. The process has also become more transparent with the webcasting of specific sessions of the Review Meeting and the publication of a higher number of National Reports and Questions and Answers from the review process.
65. The President also recalled his outreach efforts to non-signatory countries with nuclear power plants and with countries that have signed but not ratified the Convention. The latter countries were also for the first time invited to attend as observers in specific sessions of the Review Meeting. Additional broader outreach efforts were conducted by the President and other Contracting Parties. This resulted in three countries becoming new Contracting Parties and only one Contracting Party failing to submit its National Report for this review cycle.
66. The President emphasized the fact that nuclear safety is a shared national responsibility and that government, regulator and industry, as separate components, each play an important role. During the Review Meeting, it was acknowledged that contribution from the delegation of a Contracting Party is enhanced when it is composed of members of the government, the regulator and the industry.
67. In the review interval, the President encouraged all Contracting Parties to make use of other mechanisms, such as IAEA and WANO peer reviews and regulatory exchange of information and experiences, to continue assessing its nuclear safety framework in between review cycles and ensure the implementation of improvements. The President also encouraged all Contracting Parties to remain engaged and continue to evaluate the improvements and changes to the review process to ensure that they meet the goal of improving nuclear safety globally.

Mr. Ramzi Jammal

President

7th Review Meeting of the Contracting Parties
to the Convention on Nuclear Safety