AJSIHD
GLOBAL RESEARCH NETWORK

AMERICAN Journal of Science on Integration and Human Development
Volume 3, Issue 6, 2025 ISSN (E): 2993-2750

Legal Analysis of the Vienna and Paris Conventions in the Context of International Liability for Nuclear Damage

Erkinov Bobojon Bakhtiyor ogli
Master's student of Tashkent State University of Law

Abstract: This article presents a comparative legal analysis of the Vienna and Paris Conventions on civil liability for nuclear damage. It examines key principles of the international legal regime: strict liability, exclusive jurisdiction, centralized operator liability, and compensation mechanisms. Differences in the scope of compensable damage and financial security requirements are analyzed. Particular attention is paid to applicable protocols and gaps in international coverage. The study is based on materials from the IAEA and OECD and is intended for a legal academic audience.

Keywords: nuclear liability, Vienna Convention, Paris Convention, strict liability, international law, damage compensation, nuclear installation operator, IAEA, OECD.

Introduction. The peaceful use of nuclear energy carries the risk of catastrophic accidents with potential transboundary consequences. In response to this risk, States have adopted special international regimes to provide compensation for victims of nuclear incidents. Two cornerstone treaties are the **1960 Paris Convention** on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy (OECD) and the **1963 Vienna Convention** on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage (IAEA). Both Conventions aim to harmonize domestic laws and ensure adequate financial protection for victims of nuclear accidents. They establish principles of **strict liability** (no-fault liability) of the nuclear operator, exclusive jurisdiction of a single forum, and clearly defined categories of compensable damage.[1]

Despite these regimes, global coverage remains incomplete. As of the early 21st century only roughly half of the world's nuclear power plants are in States that belong to one of the liability Conventions. Many major nuclear countries (for example, the USA, India, and Japan) have not ratified either convention. In practice, this fragmentation has motivated supplementary instruments – notably the 1988 *Joint Protocol* linking Paris and Vienna parties and the 1997 *Convention on Supplementary Compensation* (CSC) – to bridge gaps in the international regime.[2]

This article conducts a comparative legal analysis of the Paris and Vienna Conventions, focusing on their core liability rules. Using doctrinal methods (treaty text analysis and legal commentary), it examines key principles – strict liability, exclusive jurisdiction, channelling of liability, categories of nuclear damage, and financial security requirements – and considers the challenges of limited global participation. After outlining the methodology, the **Results** section highlights

[1] International Atomic Energy Agency. (1963). Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage. IAEA.
[2] International Atomic Energy Agency. (1997). Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage. IAEA.

the main features and differences of the two regimes. The **Discussion** section assesses the implications of these findings, including the practical disadvantages for victims and the prospects for a more universal liability framework. A brief **Conclusion** synthesizes the conclusions.

This study employs a qualitative, comparative legal approach. Primary sources include the texts of the Paris Convention (1960) and the Vienna Convention (1963) (as amended by subsequent protocols), as well as related instruments (Joint Protocol 1988, Brussels Supplementary Convention 1963, etc.). Supplementary analysis draws on official treaty guides and academic commentary (e.g. IAEA and OECD Nuclear Law Bulletins, World Nuclear Association materials). The author systematically reviewed the Conventions' provisions on liability, jurisdiction, covered damages, limitation periods, and financial guarantees. Where relevant, amendments (e.g. 1997 Vienna Protocol, 2004 Paris Protocol) and national practice are noted to contextualize the treaties. The comparative focus is on highlighting both the convergences and divergences in how the two Conventions allocate nuclear liability.

The analysis of the Paris and Vienna Conventions yields the following key findings:

- **Strict Liability and Channelling to the Operator:** Both Conventions channel liability *exclusively* to the nuclear installation operator and impose **strict (absolute) liability**. In other words, only the operator can be held liable for nuclear damage, regardless of fault. Third parties (e.g. contractors or suppliers) are legally protected and generally exempt from liability. This channelling principle means a claimant need not (and cannot) pursue any entity other than the operator. Because strict liability removes the need to prove negligence, it simplifies victim compensation: claimants are relieved of proving how an accident occurred.[3]
- **Exclusive Jurisdiction:** Both Conventions concentrate jurisdiction in a single forum. Under each regime, only the courts of the State where the nuclear incident occurs (or, in a transport accident outside any party's territory, the State of the operator's installation) have the authority to adjudicate claims. No parallel lawsuits in other countries are permitted.[4] This exclusive jurisdiction rule aims to prevent "forum shopping" and ensures that all claims from a given accident are litigated together in one competent court.
- **Categories of Compensable Damage:** The Paris and Vienna Conventions define *nuclear damage* to include bodily injury and property damage caused by ionizing radiation. The Paris Convention explicitly covers **loss of life or personal injury** and **loss of or damage to property**, whether occurring at the installation or during transport of nuclear material.[5] It also allows recovery of certain economic losses (e.g. loss of income) and environmental restoration costs resulting from a nuclear accident. Notably, the Paris Convention (as revised) includes environmental remediation and loss-of-income from a contaminated environment among compensable losses.

The original Vienna Convention likewise covered personal injury and property damage. As first adopted, it did *not* explicitly include environmental damage or pure economic losses. (The 1997 Protocol amending the Vienna Convention later broadened its definition of nuclear damage to match or approach the Paris scope by including environmental harm and preventive measures) In both Conventions, damage to the nuclear installation itself is *excluded* from compensation (the operator's facility is not a recoverable loss).[6] The conventions generally forbid discrimination against victims: claims must be processed without regard to nationality, residence or domicile.

[3] World Nuclear Association. (2022). Nuclear Liability Conventions: Overview and Developments.
[4] International Atomic Energy Agency. (1997). Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage. IAEA.
[5] OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (1960). Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy. OECD.
[6] International Atomic Energy Agency. (2007). Explanatory Text on the 1997 Vienna Convention and the Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage (Legal Series No. 3). Vienna: IAEA.

- **Financial Security and Limits:** Both Conventions require the operator to maintain financial security (typically insurance or bank guarantee) sufficient to cover its liability. The Conventions set minimum liability amounts, which each operator's insurance must at least equal. Originally, the Paris Convention mandated a **fixed liability range**: not less than SDR 5 million and originally not more than SDR 15 million per incident.[7] (these ceilings were later raised by amending protocols). The Vienna Convention, by contrast, did not fix an upper limit; each Party could legislate its own cap above a minimum (e.g. at least $5 million). In both regimes, States are obligated to ensure that claims are paid even if the operator's funds are exhausted. For example, Paris and Vienna parties commit to contribute public funds beyond the operator's insurance up to the Convention ceiling Both Conventions also impose statutes of limitation: generally claims must be brought within ten years of the accident (with discovery rules that allow a few additional years to file).
- **International Scope and Participation:** The Paris Convention is limited to OECD member countries and is predominantly Western European in composition. Virtually all major Western European nuclear powers (France, Germany, Italy, etc.) joined Paris (usually with the Brussels Supplementary Convention). Notable exceptions include Ireland, Austria, Luxembourg, and Switzerland. The Vienna Convention is open to any State and has many Parties outside Western Europe (for example, Argentina, Brazil, Hungary, Poland, Russia, South Africa, etc.) Due to legal and structural incompatibilities, no State is a party to both the Paris and Vienna Conventions simultaneously. To bridge this divide, the 1988 Joint Protocol enables mutual recognition of liability regimes, thereby granting rights and obligations under one convention to parties of the other.[8] Under the Joint Protocol, a victim in a Vienna Convention State suffering damage from a Paris Convention State's nuclear accident (or vice versa) is entitled to compensation as if the victim's country were also party to the accident's Convention.

Discussion

The above findings highlight both strengths and weaknesses of the Paris and Vienna liability regimes. On one hand, their uniform legal framework offers significant advantages. Victims need not prove fault; any person or property harmed by a nuclear incident can recover from a single responsible party (the operator) under clearly defined rules. [9] This reduces litigation complexity and ensures predictability. The mandatory insurance requirement increases the likelihood that adequate funds will be available immediately after an accident. The non-discrimination rule guarantees equal treatment of victims across borders.

On the other hand, several disadvantages have been noted. Most prominently, because jurisdiction is exclusive, foreign victims are compelled to sue in the operator's country. In a transboundary accident this means that claimants from other States often must litigate in a foreign legal system – a burden of travel, unfamiliar law, and potential language barriers. As one expert group observed, "victims of a transboundary accident will often be forced to sue in a foreign State because of the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of that State". The need to proceed in a single forum is the "price" paid for channelling liability, but it may delay compensation and deter some claims.

Moreover, the original liability limits and damage definitions were modest. Under the early Paris Convention, an operator's maximum liability of just 15 million SDR was relatively low (approximately $21 million). If damages exceed this cap, victims had to seek supplemental compensation via the Brussels Convention or national law, which adds layers of complexity. In

[7] OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (1960). Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy. OECD.
[8] International Atomic Energy Agency. (1988). Joint Protocol Relating to the Application of the Vienna and the Paris Conventions. IAEA.
[9] International Atomic Energy Agency. (2007). Explanatory Text on the 1997 Vienna Convention and the Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage (Legal Series No. 3). Vienna: IAEA.

the Vienna regime, leaving the ceiling to national legislation has produced wide variation in protection levels. Some States limit operator liability more strictly, potentially leaving victims undercompensated. Indeed, studies have noted that only a few non-Convention countries (e.g. Japan, Switzerland, South Africa) set liability limits above the levels later adopted by the revised Conventions.

Another concern is that both Conventions immunize all third parties (except the operator). In principle this channels responsibility and simplifies recovery. But in practice it can limit total compensation: if the operator is bankrupt or insured for only the minimum, victims cannot sue suppliers, property owners, or governments for additional loss. As INLEX experts noted, exclusion of third-party claims "would affect victims where the liable operator and the further available means would not be able to fully satisfy the claims of the victims". [10] In such a case, the statutory cap on operator liability essentially socializes excess loss (with States ultimately bearing residual costs via public funds).

The coverage of damage types has also evolved. By modern standards, the original definitions were narrow. Environmental damage (contamination of land, water, air) and pure economic loss (e.g. loss of profits) were largely uncompensated under the 1960s Conventions . Victims of Chernobyl and Fukushima, for instance, suffered extensive economic and ecological harm that exceeded these classic definitions. Recognizing this gap, States adopted the 1997 *Protocol to Amend the Vienna Convention* and the 2004 *Protocol to Amend the Paris Convention*. These amendments (once in force) greatly widened the scope: for example, the revised Paris Protocol of 2004 would raise the operator's base liability to €700 million, require up to €1.5 billion total per accident (including state contributions), and explicitly include environmental damage and loss of income in the definition of "nuclear damage".[11] (As of 2025, the revised Paris and Brussels Protocols have only been ratified by a few countries and are not yet in effect, but their content illustrates the intended trend.)

Perhaps the most significant challenge is the *incomplete international participation*. As noted, many key nuclear technology States are not parties to either Convention. The result is a patchwork liability regime: a nuclear plant built by a Paris-Convention vendor in a non-Convention State may fall outside international cover, requiring ad hoc solutions. The 1988 Joint Protocol provides some relief by allowing cross-coverage between Paris and Vienna parties.[12] Likewise, the 1971 Brussels Supplementary Convention (for Paris parties) and the 1997 CSC (open globally) create additional compensation tiers when operator funds are insufficient. Nevertheless, the existence of multiple overlapping treaties still complicates outcomes. As one analysis put it, "the existence of several nuclear liability conventions which are in force in only a few States" remains a disadvantage.[13] To illustrate, even if an accident triggers compensation under the Paris or Vienna rules, any State outside those Regimes is not obligated to recognize or enforce the award unless it has implemented similar domestic legislation. In short, victims' right to compensation depends heavily on the contractual nexus of States and the accident location.

Another nuance is that no State can normally join both Conventions simultaneously, due to irreconcilable legal differences. This rigid separation means that, for example, a country cannot opt into both to maximize victims' rights. Instead, the Joint Protocol treats its Parties "as if they are Parties to both Conventions" in applicable cases. Even so, the Joint Protocol itself has only been ratified by a subset of Convention States. (A 2014 bilateral arrangement between Russia and Finland essentially substitutes for the Joint Protocol between those countries.)

---

[10] Tonhauser, W., & Shapiro, S. (2011). *The IAEA's Work on Nuclear Liability: Developments and Current Challenges*. *Nuclear Law Bulletin*, (87), 105–117.

[11] OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (2004). Protocol to Amend the Paris Convention. OECD.

[12] World Nuclear Association. (2022). Nuclear Liability Conventions: Overview and Developments.

[13] IAEA. (2020). The 1997 Vienna Convention and the 1997 CSC: Overview and Implementation Challenges. IAEA Legal Series Bulletin No. 106.

In summary, while the Paris and Vienna Conventions embody progressive liability principles (strict, channeled, mandatory insurance), the combination of limited membership and capped compensation can undermine victim protection in practice. The regimes succeed in providing a **uniform legal framework** within their respective communities.[14], but they leave coverage gaps globally. This reality has driven efforts like the CSC to create an "all-encompassing" global regime that can operate alongside or above the Paris/Vienna architecture. Those efforts continue, but as of now the Vienna and Paris systems remain the main tools of international nuclear liability.

Conclusion. The Vienna (1963) and Paris (1960) Conventions establish a coordinated legal regime for nuclear damage liability by imposing strict, exclusive liability on nuclear operators and setting uniform rules on coverage. This analysis shows that they share core features – an "absolute" liability regime, single responsible party, compulsory financial security, and an exclusive forum rule – which greatly facilitate compensation claims in the countries that have adopted them. They also define clear categories of compensable loss and protect victims from discrimination.

However, key differences remain. The Paris Convention historically fixed liability amounts and was initially limited to OECD States, whereas the Vienna Convention allowed national liability limits and had a broader membership. Both regimes originally omitted broader environmental and economic damages from compensation, a gap that has only been partly addressed by later amendments. Practically, victims may face hurdles if damages exceed conventional caps, if they must sue in a foreign court, or if their State is not party to the treaties at all.

Looking ahead, the incomplete global participation is the most pressing concern. About half of nuclear installations lie outside these conventions, and several major nuclear suppliers and users remain non-Parties. Enhancing universal adherence – whether by persuading more States to ratify the existing Conventions (or their modernized Protocols) or by implementing supplementary treaties like the CSC – is essential for a truly effective international liability system. Until then, the regime will continue to operate as a patchwork that robustly serves victims within its sphere but leaves many gaps beyond it. In the words of one nuclear law commentator, the Paris and Vienna Conventions "bring about a uniform liability system which is able to effectively protect victims," but only "if it has been ascertained which courts are competent and which law is applicable". The ongoing challenge for international nuclear law is to extend that protection to all potential victims worldwide.[15]

References:

1. International Atomic Energy Agency. (1963). *Vienna Convention on Civil Liability for Nuclear Damage*. IAEA.
2. OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (1960). *Paris Convention on Third Party Liability in the Field of Nuclear Energy*. OECD
3. International Atomic Energy Agency. (1997). *Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage*. IAEA.
4. International Atomic Energy Agency. (1988). *Joint Protocol Relating to the Application of the Vienna and the Paris Conventions*. IAEA.
5. International Atomic Energy Agency. (2007). *Explanatory Text on the 1997 Vienna Convention and the Convention on Supplementary Compensation for Nuclear Damage* (Legal Series No. 3). Vienna: IAEA.
6. OECD Nuclear Energy Agency. (2004). *Protocol to Amend the Paris Convention*. OECD.

[14] World Nuclear Association. (2022). Nuclear Liability Conventions: Overview and Developments.
[15] International Atomic Energy Agency. (1988). Joint Protocol Relating to the Application of the Vienna and the Paris Conventions. IAEA.

7. IAEA. (2020). *The 1997 Vienna Convention and the 1997 CSC: Overview and Implementation Challenges*. IAEA Legal Series Bulletin No. 106.
8. World Nuclear Association. (2022). *Nuclear Liability Conventions: Overview and Developments*.
9. Tonhauser, W., & Shapiro, S. (2011). *The IAEA's Work on Nuclear Liability: Developments and Current Challenges*. *Nuclear Law Bulletin*, (87), 105–117.