

(English version)

**Question for written answer E-001039/26
to the Commission
Joachim Streit (Renew)
(12 March 2026)**

Subject: Special report by the European Court of Auditors on international nuclear safety cooperation

In its special report on international nuclear safety cooperation, the European Court of Auditors (ECA) found that while the EU was an important global player, the effectiveness of its measures was being hampered by the lack of a comprehensive strategy. In their reply, the Commission and the European External Action Service concede the need for improvement.

1. Given the ECA's finding that project monitoring is often focused on outputs rather than actual improvements in nuclear safety, what specific outcome indicators is the Commission thinking of using in future to ascertain whether EU-funded measures are actually delivering demonstrable improvements in nuclear safety?
2. What criteria is it thinking of applying in future to select projects in the area of international nuclear safety, and how is it making sure that nuclear safety risks are assigned greater weight than geopolitical or foreign policy interests, especially as certain measures might have been primarily driven by geopolitical considerations?
3. How is it planning on making sure in future that the cost burden of large-scale nuclear safety projects is split fairly and transparently between the EU and other international donors, particularly in view of the ECA finding that, in some cases, the EU shouldered a larger share of the financial burden than originally planned, in part replacing contributions from other international donors?

Submitted: 12.3.2026

**Answer given by Mr Síkela on behalf of the European Commission
(30 April 2026)**

The Commission refers to its replies to recommendations 2 (a), 3 (c) and 4(c) of the Special report 08/2026 of the European Court of Auditors ⁽¹⁾.

The Multiannual Indicative Programme ⁽²⁾ for the European Instrument for International Nuclear Safety Cooperation ⁽³⁾ specifies that improvements in nuclear safety will be monitored and evaluated with performance indicators, including impact, implementation and project-specific indicators.

At the design stage, the Commission checks those performance indicators for inclusion in the project's results framework. Implementing partners report on a regular basis to the Commission on progress against indicators of the results framework during project implementation.

The initial selection of cooperation proposals is informed by the assessment of criteria such as budget, duration, maturity, partnership track record, magnitude of nuclear safety risk, political priority, added value for EU policies, sustainability and urgency. Geopolitical or foreign policy interests are important and embedded in some of these criteria but are not the only ones.

Each donor decides independently on the size and fairness of their contribution to multi-donor funds while all donors aim to ensure that the total of their contributions covers the full estimated project budget.

However, when there is an expected shortfall in contributions from other international donors, the Commission may decide to contribute a larger share of the cost burden than originally planned due to urgency, priority, relevance for EU and to prevent additional nuclear safety risks and cost escalation linked to delayed project implementation.

⁽¹⁾ European Court of Auditors, Special report 08/2026 'International nuclear safety cooperation — The Commission remains an important global player but lacks a comprehensive strategy and robust monitoring', <https://www.eca.europa.eu/en/publications?ref=SR-2026-08>.

⁽²⁾ https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/document/download/7b5eaa6a-14df-4634-8677-18d51fc55c37_en?filename=insc-mip-2021-2027_en.pdf.

⁽³⁾ Annex of C(2021) 8687 final of 3 December 2021. https://international-partnerships.ec.europa.eu/policies/climate-environment-and-energy/nuclear-safety_en.