



NPP Mochovce 34
Slovakia



2010

- Two units VVER 440/213 under construction – (since 2008)
- No EIA (Environmental Impact Assessment)
- Case pending before Aarhus Convention Committee

Safety

- VVER 440/213 is 70ies design, construction started 1986
- No full pressure containment, Bubbler condenser does not necessarily withstand external hazards (Loviissa 1974)
- No sufficient protection against airplane crashes
- Some old components are used, some new, e.g. new I&C
- Safety changes still seem to be under development
- Commission opinion: containment is not comparable to current NPP like EPR, a corresponding safety level needs to be reached – unclear status

Airplane crash

- Confinement / Bubbler condenser tower
- Only small not big airplanes, no Boeing 777 for Slovakia!
- Cessna? Commission opinion
- No explanation– no plan was presented at the hearings nor to the EU Commission

EIA

- Construction started officially 2008
- After protest from NGOs and clear „hints“ from the EU Commission EIA started
- Not finished yet
- „voluntary?“
- no alternative to the NPP, construction ongoing so no changes are possible any more
- New fuel, higher burn-up, accident sequences change....
- Slovak EIA law under constant amendment, now: from bad to worse
- Complaint to EU Commission by FoEE on status of EIA

Aarhus

- Were permits of 2008 “significant” to nuclear safety, or “very minor” as the Slovak state representative stated, or perhaps not even necessary for completion of Mochovce 34?
- Re-start or Continuation?

Aarhus

- “5. In May 2008 the operator submitted three applications to the **nuclear regulatory authority (UJD)** that were approved in **August 2008**:
- **Construction permit** for the modified plant, UJD Decision 246/2008 of August 2008 (list of permitted modifications included)
- Permit to realize **safety relevant modifications** during completion (120 items listed, where changes are to be undertaken), UJD decision 266/2008, issued August 2008
- Permit to implement Changes in the **Preliminary Safety Analysis Report** 267/2008
-
- 7. The **public concerned** was not informed about the three **procedures** and could not participate. It was also not possible to appeal against the three decisions. Standing was rejected.”
– Decision not before summer 2010



Thank you for your attention.