

# Progress and next steps towards addressing nuclear harm through the TPNW

WWW.ARTICLE36.ORG  
INFO@ARTICLE36.ORG  
@ARTICLE36

DECEMBER 2023  
BRIEFING PAPER

WRITTEN BY  
ELIZABETH MINOR

*Since the first Meeting of States Parties, the TPNW's members have shown commitment to undertaking serious work towards addressing nuclear legacies. Nevertheless, there is much to do to develop this. This paper reviews recent developments and, with the second Meeting of States Parties concluded, suggests some initial next steps for states towards making meaningful progress.*

## An opportunity for humanitarian action

The Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons (TPNW)'s obligations in articles 6 and 7, on victim assistance, environmental remediation and international cooperation and assistance, establish the first international legal framework to address ongoing harm from the use and testing of nuclear weapons. These articles create a framework of shared responsibility for collective action amongst states parties, with others supporting their work.

These obligations broaden the international framework for activity to address nuclear weapons' humanitarian and environmental legacies beyond existing bilateral and other routes, through which assistance and redress have been, and continue to be, sought by affected states and communities. (It is worth noting that the TPNW does not limit, and is explicitly compatible with, other agreements and routes.) The TPNW's obligations also widen the terms of the conversation about nuclear legacies and how they should be addressed: they bring a humanitarian and human rights-based lens that promotes a more holistic and inclusive response than many previous national approaches to addressing the ongoing impacts of nuclear weapons.

The TPNW's articles 6 and 7 framework offers new possibilities for those concerned with the humanitarian and environmental impacts of nuclear weapons to act in solidarity, towards addressing urgent, ongoing humanitarian, environmental, and human rights impacts in affected states – whether those that have caused this harm are currently ready to provide full redress for these impacts or not.<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup> For further discussion of the legal structure and basis for articles 6 and 7, see Elizabeth Minor (2021), 'Addressing nuclear harm: Prioritisation for the first Meeting of States Parties of the TPNW', Article 36 <https://article36.org/wp-content/uploads/2021/07/addressing-nuclear-harm-tpnw1msp-elizabeth-minor.pdf>

With the TPNW's recognition of the impact of use, testing and other nuclear weapons activities on people and places,<sup>2</sup> and many states parties' collaborative approach to working with civil society and others, an opportunity has also been created for more effectively centring and including affected communities in international and national responses to nuclear legacies.

The goals of states parties' implementation of articles 6 and 7 must remain to:

- × Practically and measurably improve responses in victim assistance and environmental remediation, through mobilising international attention and resources, and developing and implementing better approaches. These approaches should be developed according to the priorities of affected communities, and article 6's rights-based framework.
- × Improve their understanding of the range of ongoing humanitarian and environmental impacts of nuclear weapons. These facts not only provide the basis for effective responses but are key evidence as to why these weapons must be stigmatised, prohibited, and eliminated.

Since the TPNW's entry into force in 2021, its states parties have concentrated their activity around articles 6 and 7 in two main areas: establishing the structures and foundations for implementation, and spreading the values and emerging norms of this framework across international forums.

### Establishing structures and foundations under the TPNW

At the first Meeting of States Parties (1MSP), held in Vienna in June 2022, states parties put in place the key pillars of the framework to implement articles 6 and 7. In actions 19-32 and 49-50 of the Vienna Action Plan, states parties established core principles for implementation; committed to inclusive ways of working (including to work closely with affected communities at all stages of implementation, and to engage with a wide range of stakeholders including Indigenous Peoples); and adopted specific areas for action to drive forward their work practically.<sup>3</sup>

Developed and then discussed at the 1MSP with input from civil society and people from affected communities, these actions provide a strong, clear, and meaningful foundation for work in the years ahead. They represent a significant achievement by states parties and the wider community involved and lay the groundwork for developing stronger norms and action to address nuclear harm through the TPNW.

Between 1MSP and the second Meeting of States Parties (2MSP) in New York in November 2023, states parties, under the leadership of Kazakhstan and Kiribati as co-chairs of the intersessional working group on articles 6 and 7, held meetings to discuss the themes of: an international trust fund to support affected states;

---

<sup>2</sup> Including the "disproportionate impact of nuclear-weapon activities on indigenous peoples" recognised in the Treaty's preamble

<sup>3</sup> See UN Document TPNW/MSP/2022/6

developing tools for states parties' voluntary reporting on national implementation; and national implementation of victim assistance, environmental remediation and international cooperation and assistance. These themes were chosen to advance actions 27-32 of the Vienna Action Plan, which include time-bound commitments for 2MSP on national implementation and voluntary reporting.

The TPNW's gender focal point, Chile, also held meetings addressing the theme of working towards establishing guidelines for age- and gender-sensitive victim assistance, and the integration of gender perspectives in international cooperation and assistance. States committed to begin working towards these guidelines during the first intersessional period in actions 49 and 50 of the Vienna Action Plan.

The states leading these meetings sought to undertake this work in a spirit of openness to the participation of civil society, including affected communities, whose presentations, contributions and written inputs were invited to various meetings.<sup>4</sup> More than thirty states parties (out of a current membership of sixty-nine states parties) joined these discussions overall, with a smaller number actively contributing their views.

States parties' statements, decisions, and reporting on national work at the 2MSP can be seen as a continuation of this work to develop the structures and foundations for implementation, including through expressions of commitment to this area of the treaty.

As well as many states highlighting the ongoing humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons use and testing and the importance of this area of the Treaty, the need to work inclusively with affected communities, and the welcome engagement of civil society, a reaffirmation of support to "addressing the harms of nuclear weapons use and testing, including through the TPNW's positive obligations" was included in the 2MSP's declaration.<sup>5</sup>

The 2MSP also adopted two decisions<sup>6</sup> towards strengthening the implementation architecture for articles 6 and 7. Firstly, a decision was made to "adopt, on a provisional basis, for voluntary use by States parties" the voluntary reporting guidelines and format that Kazakhstan and Kiribati proposed in their report on intersessional work to the 2MSP.<sup>7</sup> States parties had a deadline of 2MSP to consider developing a reporting format, in action 28 of the Vienna Action Plan. Using these tools could help strengthen states parties' work, through facilitating affected states parties' requests

---

4 For summaries of the discussions, and other resources and recommendations, see ICAN, 'Intersessional progress on the TPNW', [https://www.icanw.org/tpnw\\_intersessional\\_work](https://www.icanw.org/tpnw_intersessional_work). See also the 'Report of the Co-Chairs of the informal working group on victim assistance, environmental remediation, international cooperation and assistance (Kazakhstan and Kiribati)' TPNW/MSP/2023/3 and 'Report of the gender focal point (Chile)' TPNW/MSP/2023/4

5 See 'Revised draft declaration of the second Meeting of States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons: "Our commitment to upholding the prohibition of nuclear weapons and averting their catastrophic consequences" TPNW/MSP/2023/CRP.4/Rev.1

6 See 'Decisions to be taken by the second Meeting of States Parties to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons' TPNW/MSP/2023/CRP.3/Rev.1

7 See 'Report of the Co-Chairs of the informal working group on victim assistance, environmental remediation, international cooperation and assistance (Kazakhstan and Kiribati)' TPNW/MSP/2023/3

for assistance, contributing to tracking implementation progress, and helping develop understandings of the humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons.<sup>8</sup>

Secondly, a decision was made to continue discussions on a voluntary international trust fund for victim assistance and environmental remediation “with the aim of examining the establishment of such a trust fund at the third Meeting of States Parties as a priority.” There was strong interest from civil society and states in the intersessional discussions on a trust fund (which states committed to in action 29 of the Vienna Action Plan). Such a fund could be a useful means for mobilising resources and raising standards for affected states and communities – if it is established with adequate structures and resourcing.<sup>9</sup>

In the Vienna Action Plan, states parties with individuals or areas affected by nuclear weapons use or testing agreed to share initial assessments of the effects of these activities and national capacities to address them at 2MSP. They also committed to share their progress on developing national plans to implement victim assistance and environmental remediation. These steps were included in the action plan because they were considered important activities for developing implementation – including international cooperation and assistance – through facilitating the identification of needs and areas of work.

Of the four TPNW states parties with communities that have identified themselves as affected by nuclear use or testing, Kazakhstan submitted a detailed national report to the 2MSP.<sup>10</sup> This followed a process of information gathering and consultation with different local and national state authorities and research institutions. New Zealand also submitted a national report outlining the impacts and national measures to respond to harm to veterans affected by nuclear use or testing, with input from the government’s Veterans’ Affairs department. It chose to use the (then draft) voluntary reporting format to do so.<sup>11</sup> Fiji, which also has a community of nuclear test veterans, did not submit a report, but stated at 2MSP that they intended “to use the voluntary reporting guidelines as a basis for our ongoing close collaboration with the Civil Society Organisation and Veterans Association on verification assessment and reporting for future Meetings of the State Party.”<sup>12</sup> Fiji’s veterans’ associations submitted their recommendations for national implementation as an NGO working paper to the conference.<sup>13</sup> Kiribati did not submit a national report or share its progress on assessment at 2MSP.

---

8 For further analysis on voluntary reporting, see Harvard Law School International Human Rights Clinic (2023), ‘Reporting guidelines for articles 6 and 7 of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons: Precedent and recommendations,’ <https://humanrightsclinic.law.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/05/TPNW-reporting-report-5-15-23-FINAL.pdf>

9 For research and recommendations regarding a trust fund, see ICAN (2023), ‘Recommendations on an International Trust Fund,’ [https://www.icanw.org/international\\_trust\\_fund\\_recommendations](https://www.icanw.org/international_trust_fund_recommendations) and Harvard Law School International Human Rights Clinic (2023) ‘Designing A Trust Fund for the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons: Precedents and Protocols,’ [https://humanrightsclinic.law.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/011323\\_Trust-Fund-Report-Combined.pdf](https://humanrightsclinic.law.harvard.edu/wp-content/uploads/2023/01/011323_Trust-Fund-Report-Combined.pdf)

10 ‘Assessments of the consequences of nuclear tests on the territory of Kazakhstan,’ TPNW/MSP/2023/10

11 ‘Voluntary report on articles 6 and 7 of the Treaty,’ TPNW/MSP/2023/11

12 ‘TPNW 2MSP Intervention - Government of Fiji,’ [https://reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/nuclear-weapon-ban/2msp/statements/30Nov\\_Fiji.pdf](https://reachingcriticalwill.org/images/documents/Disarmament-fora/nuclear-weapon-ban/2msp/statements/30Nov_Fiji.pdf)

13 ‘Positive Obligation Framework: Forgotten stories of Fiji Veterans exposure to Nuclear Testing on Kiritimati Island. Working paper submitted by the International Campaign to Abolish Nuclear Weapons on behalf of the Fiji Kirisimasi Island Veterans Association and the Returned Soldiers and Ex- servicemen’s association of Fiji,’ TPNW/MSP/2023/NGO/27

Finally, some states party noted at 2MSP that they would examine how they could work with affected communities and states on addressing nuclear legacies – signalling commitment to developing meaningful work on international cooperation and assistance within this new international framework, notwithstanding limited capacities.

Overall, the foundational activities that states parties have undertaken on articles 6 and 7 to date, with collaboration and input from civil society including some engagement with affected communities, show a commitment to serious work in this area, and represent meaningful progress structurally. Work to address nuclear harm, and to develop robust inclusive ways of working to do so, with strong international cooperation and assistance, will be a long-term task. Nevertheless, with the TPNW still a young treaty of limited collective resources, the steps that states parties have undertaken so far to develop the foundations for implementing articles 6 and 7, including first steps on national assessment work, represents a necessary and commendable start.

It is significant that two states parties affected by the testing of nuclear weapons – Kazakhstan and Kiribati – have taken the lead in devoting time to building up the TPNW's work in this area (with the support of other states and civil society). These states led both the facilitation of the development of the Vienna Action Plan's points on articles 6 and 7, and international work during the first intersessional period. Concerns have been expressed that article 6 risks placing further unfair burden or even blame on affected states. However, these states parties have, rather, been looking to use the framework as an opportunity, for example to develop new structures to attract resources. This must be encouraged and built upon.

In continuing their work to develop the structures and foundations for implementing articles 6 and 7, in the period ahead states parties should:

- × Focus on building on their national work so far, and bring meaningful progress to the third Meeting of States Parties. This should include bringing progress on assessments and national plans – which should be developed through inclusive processes – and on international cooperation and assistance.<sup>14</sup>
- × Use the reporting tools provisionally adopted at the 2MSP to share this progress.
- × In their discussions on a voluntary international trust fund, focus on doing the work to establish a fund that effectively mobilises resources and can be a structure for qualitatively improving responses with and for affected communities.

---

<sup>14</sup> For recommendations on national implementation, including principles and areas to consider in assessment, see ICAN (2023) 'Recommendations on national implementation measures and voluntary reporting,' [https://assets.nation-builder.com/ican/pages/3187/attachments/original/1696247901/ICAN\\_nat\\_impl\\_reporting\\_6\\_7\\_paper\\_updated.pdf?1696247901](https://assets.nation-builder.com/ican/pages/3187/attachments/original/1696247901/ICAN_nat_impl_reporting_6_7_paper_updated.pdf?1696247901)

## A growing norm

International attention to the subject of addressing nuclear legacies has been building in international forums, particularly since the 1MSP.<sup>15</sup> This has been driven by the humanitarian initiative on nuclear weapons, the obligations established in the TPNW, and the work of its states parties.

At the Non-Proliferation Treaty (NPT)'s Review Conference in 2022, a range of states recognised the importance of addressing the ongoing impacts of nuclear weapons use and testing. A call on NPT states parties to engage with such efforts (which was not ultimately contested by any state) was included in the unadopted outcome document.<sup>16</sup> At the 2023 NPT Preparatory Committee, the importance of victim assistance and environmental remediation was again raised by some states, with a call for assistance and redress made by Kazakhstan and Kiribati.<sup>17</sup>

Most recently, Kazakhstan and Kiribati tabled a resolution to the UN General Assembly's First Committee on 'Addressing the legacy of nuclear weapons: providing victim assistance and environmental remediation to Member States affected by the use or testing of nuclear weapons.'<sup>18</sup> Among other things, this draws attention to ongoing consequences, encourages cooperation and discussion amongst states, and notes the TPNW's victim assistance and environmental remediation provisions. The resolution passed First Committee in October 2023 with an overwhelming vote in favour – including, significantly, by a majority of countries that are not yet party to the TPNW.

More broadly, attention to the issue of nuclear legacies was seen in the passing of a resolution on support to the Marshall Islands at the Human Rights Council in 2022,<sup>19</sup> and in the UN General Assembly through a regular triennial resolution on assistance to Kazakhstan<sup>20</sup> and in resolutions on French Polynesia<sup>21</sup> (Ma'ohi Nui).

Alongside work in the TPNW itself, these developments are significant for the focus and interest they help to build amongst the international community in addressing nuclear harm. Such interest should be a step that leads to practical action to serve the needs of affected communities.

---

15 For more detail on international discourse during 2022, see NPA (2023), 'Nuclear Weapons Ban Monitor 2022' sections on the TPNW's positive obligations <https://banmonitor.org/news/nuclear-weapons-ban-monitor-2022-is-here>

16 This read: "The Conference welcomes the increased attention in the last review cycle on assistance to the people and communities affected by nuclear weapons use and testing and environmental remediation following nuclear use and testing and calls on States parties to engage with such efforts to address nuclear harm." See Article 36 (2023) 'Growing attention to nuclear weapons' ongoing humanitarian impacts reaches the NPT' <https://article36.org/updates/npt-nuclear-legacies/>

17 See for example Kazakhstan and Kiribati (2023), 'Addressing the Past Use and Testing of Nuclear Weapons,' Working paper to the 2023 NPT Prep Com, NPT/CONF.2026/PC.I/WP.27

18 UN General Assembly (2023), 'Addressing the legacy of nuclear weapons: providing victim assistance and environmental remediation to Member States affected by the use or testing of nuclear weapons,' A/C.1/78/L.52

19 Human Rights Council (2022), 'Technical assistance and capacity-building to address the human rights implications of the nuclear legacy in the Marshall Islands,' A/HRC/RES/51/35

20 UN General Assembly (2023), 'International cooperation and coordination for the human and ecological rehabilitation and economic development of the Semipalatinsk region of Kazakhstan,' A/C.2/78/L.19

21 UN General Assembly (2021), 'Question of French Polynesia,' A/RES/76/95

The embedding of nuclear legacy issues and the need to address them in the broader international discourse on nuclear weapons also contributes to entrenching and spreading the TPNW's values, through attention to the humanitarian and human rights-based norms on victim assistance and environmental remediation that are being developed under the Treaty. The support by states not party to the Treaty for addressing these issues – seen, for example, in their support for the First Committee resolution – should be seen as a step towards universalising the Treaty and its norms. Attention to nuclear legacy issues in a range of international forums also contributes to building and maintaining international focus on the humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons: facts which provide the basis for the TPNW.

To build on momentum so far, in all relevant international forums, states parties to the TPNW and others concerned with the humanitarian impacts of nuclear weapons should continue to:

- × Take steps to understand, and highlight, the ongoing impacts of nuclear weapons. Towards generating greater understanding of the impacts of testing, and assist assessments of ongoing impacts, states should also where relevant commit to declassifying and making public and accessible fallout monitoring records where these are held, so that this information can be used by researchers applying the latest methodologies, and to make this information available to affected communities.
- × Recognise the importance of victim assistance, environmental remediation and international cooperation and assistance.
- × Highlight the TPNW's framework on addressing nuclear legacies, and the need for all states to engage with work on these issues, following the passage in First Committee of the resolution on 'Addressing the legacy of nuclear weapons.'

### Next steps towards meaningful implementation

The framework agreed at the 1MSP on articles 6 and 7, as well as the activity and momentum generated since then including the latest decisions at 2MSP, place requirements and expectations on states parties. Though the implementation of articles 6 and 7 will be a long-term and progressively realised task, there is a need for focused, prioritised action within the TPNW to meet these.

The purpose of the obligations in articles 6 and 7 should be to serve affected communities, raising the profile of their unanswered questions, needs, and rights, and improving how impacts are addressed in the short term. Activity under the TPNW should be seen as one contribution towards the broader nuclear justice that communities demand. Though states parties have focused so far on the impacts of the nuclear weapons activities mentioned explicitly in article 6 (use and testing), in taking implementation forward they should be mindful of the impacts of nuclear weapons activities in general on communities. These are noted in the TPNW's preamble. They must also bear in mind the obligation to implement article 6.1 without discrimination. Ultimately, states parties have the opportunity, through the TPNW, to set standards of practice that can improve responses to affected communities in states parties and beyond through taking a holistic, humanitarian approach.

Going forward, TPNW states parties should consider their national activities to advance victim assistance and environmental remediation as the core of their work. To advance other matters such as discussions on the establishment of a voluntary international trust fund most effectively, states parties need to make progress on developing their implementation approaches and conducting activities such as assessments and putting in place inclusive national plans.

It is worth noting that though articles 6 and 7 are based on legal structures in other humanitarian disarmament treaties, they also represent a new approach when it comes to addressing nuclear harm, in that they respond to a broad range of impacts and rights. As the first and only international legal framework on these issues, the TPNW should remain the centre of discussions on developing progressive norms and practice when it comes to addressing nuclear legacies.

Whilst continuing their work to develop structures for implementation and normative recognition of the value of addressing nuclear legacies, in the next intersessional period states parties should therefore also:

- × Commence the convening of more in-depth discussions that can contribute towards building progressive norms and practice for victim assistance, environmental remediation and international cooperation and assistance. Productive areas of discussion to do so could include looking in detail with all stakeholders at themes such as: the range of harms suffered by affected communities and how they are currently responded to; how the requirement for non-discrimination in victim assistance should be implemented in the context of addressing the impacts of nuclear weapons; and critically examining the limits of current approaches to victim assistance and environmental remediation (given that these are not purely scientific or technical matters, but involve policy decisions that should be made based on the needs, rights and knowledge of affected communities).<sup>22</sup>
- × Push forward work on the theme of age- and gender-sensitivity, reviewing current national practice and lessons from other frameworks.
- × Make space to work in earnest on developing inclusive ways of working in implementation, particularly when it comes to the inclusion of affected communities and Indigenous Peoples.<sup>23</sup>

---

22 Starting points on some of these themes are provided by two recent reports by the Harvard Law School International Human Rights Clinic and the Conflict and Environment Observatory: 'Confronting Conflict Pollution' (2020) [https://ceobs.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Harvard\\_CEOBS\\_Confronting\\_Conflict\\_Pollution\\_2020.pdf](https://ceobs.org/wp-content/uploads/2020/09/Harvard_CEOBS_Confronting_Conflict_Pollution_2020.pdf) and 'Facing Fallout' (2022) [https://ceobs.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Harvard\\_IHRC\\_CEOBS\\_Facing\\_Fallout\\_2022.pdf](https://ceobs.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/06/Harvard_IHRC_CEOBS_Facing_Fallout_2022.pdf) as well as the International Committee of the Red Cross's Briefing Note (2023) on 'The Obligation to Assist Victims and Remediate the Environment Within a Framework of Shared Responsibility Under the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons' [https://www.icrc.org/en/download/file/267925/victim\\_assistance\\_and\\_environmental\\_remediation\\_obligations\\_-\\_briefing\\_note\\_-\\_icrc.pdf](https://www.icrc.org/en/download/file/267925/victim_assistance_and_environmental_remediation_obligations_-_briefing_note_-_icrc.pdf). Further recommendations on national implementation are also available in ICAN (2023) 'Recommendations on national implementation measures and voluntary reporting' [https://assets.nationbuilder.com/ican/pages/3187/attachments/original/1696247901/ICAN\\_nat\\_impl\\_reporting\\_6\\_7\\_paper\\_updated.pdf?1696247901](https://assets.nationbuilder.com/ican/pages/3187/attachments/original/1696247901/ICAN_nat_impl_reporting_6_7_paper_updated.pdf?1696247901)

23 As a starting point, states parties should consider the Protocols for Seeking Nuclear Truth with Integrity developed by the Nuclear Truth Project, available at: <https://nucleartruthproject.org/talking-protocols/> and submitted to the 1MSP as NGO Working Paper 23. See also recommendations from ICAN to the 2MSP on 'Promoting inclusivity in the intersessional work on the Treaty,' TPNW/MSP/2023/WP.5



States parties should not expect to fully address all of these areas by the 3MSP. Nevertheless, they should start approaching them now, through practical work and discussions.

### A route for constructive engagement by states not party

Work to address nuclear legacies – including that taking place under articles 6 and 7 of the TPNW – remains an area in which states concerned by the humanitarian, environmental, human rights, and development impacts of nuclear weapons have an opportunity to build bridges around shared humanitarian goals.<sup>24</sup> Some states not party to the TPNW have already expressed an interest in possibilities to constructively engage with work under the Treaty on victim assistance and environmental remediation, or to engage more broadly with affected states and communities on the contributions they could make. This has been seen in statements at the Treaty's meetings of states parties and in other forums.

Such engagement would be beneficial to the humanitarian objectives of the TPNW through the practical contributions it could bring, as well as to the promotion of the TPNW's normative foundations, and to encouraging the Treaty's universalisation amongst states with humanitarian goals. If states' commitment to addressing nuclear legacies and humanitarian impacts is sincere, ultimately they must join the TPNW, as the international legal framework that addresses these issues. As well as states with general humanitarian goals and concerns, states not party with affected communities should be encouraged to engage with work to implement articles 6 and 7 developing under the TPNW, for the benefit this could bring them, as should states not party that used or tested nuclear weapons on the territories of states parties. (The Vienna Action Plan commits states parties to engagement and information exchange with the latter in action 20).

States party should encourage those that are not yet party to the TPNW, but have expressed their concern at nuclear legacies and supported the resolution at the 2023 UN General Assembly First Committee on 'Addressing the legacy of nuclear weapons', to:

- × Commit to attend future meetings of the TPNW to listen to information on the needs of affected states and communities and follow the activities they are undertaking; share the action they will take on victim assistance and environmental remediation in line with the resolution, to facilitate the effective exchange of information; and, engage with TPNW states parties to work together constructively on this theme.
- × Continue to raise the importance of addressing nuclear legacies in all relevant forums, and engage in dialogue with all relevant stakeholders towards making the most effective contributions on these issues.

---

<sup>24</sup> For further analysis and recommendations, see Matthew Bolton (2022), 'Humanitarian Action on Nuclear Weapons,' FES NY, <https://library.fes.de/pdf-files/iez/19406.pdf> and ICAN (2022), 'Addressing nuclear weapons legacies: opportunities for states to cooperate and engage towards shared humanitarian goals,' [https://www.icanw.org/addressing\\_nuclear\\_weapons\\_legacy](https://www.icanw.org/addressing_nuclear_weapons_legacy)

Overall, since the TPNW's entry into force, states parties have undertaken serious work in relation to the Treaty's humanitarian response to the ongoing impacts of nuclear weapons, contained in articles 6 and 7 on victim assistance, environmental remediation and international cooperation and assistance. In partnership and consultation with civil society, including affected communities, they have put in place strong foundations for implementation, taken initial steps nationally, and made important efforts to embed the values and norms of this part of the TPNW in broader international discussion.

Moving forward, they should build on and strengthen their work so far, and concentrate on developing their practical implementation work. They must work in partnership with the stakeholders they have committed to engage with, to progress towards improving responses with, and for, affected communities.