ST/LEG/SER.E/25

MULTILATERAL TREATIES DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Status as at 31 December 2006

Volume II
Part I, Chapters XII to XXIX, and Part II

UNITED NATIONS

MULTILATERAL TREATIES DEPOSITED WITH THE SECRETARY-GENERAL

Status as at 31 December 2006

Volume II
Part I, Chapters XII to XXIX, and Part II

UNITED NATIONS
New York, 2007

ST/LEG/SER.E/25

UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATION
Sales No. E.07.V.3

ISBN 13 978-92-1-133757-0

ISSN 0082-8319

1. This publication, the twenty-first of the series Multilateral Treaties Deposited with the Secretary-General (ST/LEG/SER/E/ - a supplement to the second volume was issued to cover actions from 1 January to 31 December 1983 under reference ST/LEG/SER.E/22/add.1), consolidates all information on treaty actions (i.e.,signatures, ratifications, accessions, denunciations, miscellaneous notifications, reservations, declarations and objections) undertaken relating to the multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General covered up to 31 December 2006.

A. TREATIES COVERED BY THIS PUBLICATION

2. This publication contains:

- All multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General (presently 534 treaties);
- The Charter of the United Nations, in respect of which certain depositary functions have been conferred upon the Secretary-General (although the Charter itself is deposited with the Government of the United States of America);
- Multilateral treaties formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, to the extent that formalities or decisions affecting them have been taken within the framework of the United Nations;[1] and
- Certain pre-United Nations treaties, other than those formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, which were amended by protocols adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations.

B. DIVISION INTO PARTS AND CHAPTERS

3. The publication is comprised of two volumes, and is divided into two parts. Volume I includes Part I, Chapters I to XI. Volume II includes Part I, Chapters XII to XXIX, and Part II. Part I contains information relating to United Nations treaties,[2] and Part II contains information relating to League of Nations treaties. Part I, in turn, is divided into chapters and each chapter relates to a given theme. The treaties within each chapter are listed in the chronological order of their conclusion. Part II lists the first 26 treaties in the order in which they appear in the last League of Nations publication of signatures, ratifications and accessions.[3] Thereafter, the treaties are listed in the order in which they first gave rise to formalities or decisions within the framework of the United Nations.

C. INFORMATION PROVIDED IN RESPECT OF EACH TREATY

(a) United Nations treaties

4. Chapter headers

The following information is typically provided for each treaty in the header of each chapter:

- The full title, place and date of adoption or conclusion;
- Entry into force;
- Registration date and number, pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter (where appropriate);
- The number of Signatories and Parties. The term "Parties" which appears in the header of each treaty, in this publication, includes both "Contracting States" and "Parties". (For general reference, the term "Contracting States" refers to States and other entities with treaty-making capacity which have expressed their consent to be bound by a treaty where the treaty has not yet entered into force or where it has not entered into force for such States and entities; the term "Parties" refers to States and other entities with treaty-making capacity which have expressed their consent to be bound by a treaty and where the treaty is in force for such States and entities.)
- References to the text of the treaty as published in the United Nations, Treaty Series (UNTS) or, if it has not yet been published in the Treaty Series, the reference to the United Nations documentation where its text may be found; and
- A brief note on the adoption of the treaty.

5. Status tables

Participants are listed in the status tables in alphabetical order. Against each participant's name, the relevant treaty action is entered, i.e., the date of signature, the date of deposit of the instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, accession, or succession.[4] The names of participants that have denounced the treaty appear between brackets, and the date of deposit of the notification of denunciation is indicated in a footnote. Additional information on denunciation of treaties appears in footnotes.

Entries in status tables pertaining to formalities effected by a predecessor State in respect of treaties to which the successor States have notified their succession are replaced by the names of the relevant successor States with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote indicates the date and type of formality effected by the predecessor State, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to the successor States in the table as the case may be. As regards treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by a predecessor State and not listed in the notifications of succession of the successor States, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the predecessor State is included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator appearing next to the heading "Participant".

Treaties which have been terminated are denoted by an asterisk. For those treaties, the participant tables have been removed.

6. Declarations, reservations, objections

The texts of declarations and reservations generally appear in full immediately following the status tables. Objections, territorial applications and communications of a special nature, for example, declarations recognizing the competence of committees such as the Human Rights Committee, also appear in full. Related communications, for example, communications with regard to objections, and other information appear in footnotes.

(b) League of Nations treaties

7. The information provided is essentially based on the official records of the League of Nations. This accounts for the difference in format as compared with treaties deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

8. The list of signatures, ratifications, acceptances, approvals, accessions, and successions in respect of each of the League of Nations multilateral treaties covered by this publication is divided into two sections. The first section reflects the status as at

the time of the transfer of those treaties to the custody of the United Nations, without implying a judgement by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the current legal effect of those actions. The second section provides the status following the assumption of the depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations in relation to these treaties.

D. Information of a general nature

9. On the occasion of undertaking treaty formalities, issues of a general character are sometimes raised (mostly with regard to representation, succession or territorial application). An effort has been made to group all explanatory notes relevant to such issues as they pertain to the States concerned in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this publication as well as in chapters I.1 and I.2. Similarly, Part I, Chapters I.1 and I.2 contain information transmitted by communications from Heads of States or Governments or Ministers for Foreign Affairs informing the Secretary-General of changes in the official denomination of States or territories. In the case of States that are not members of the United Nations or in the case of intergovernmental organizations, the information appears in notes corresponding to the formalities that gave rise to the issue. Cross-references are provided as required. Progressively, all information of a historical and political nature will be moved to the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of the publication.

Suggestions for corrections or modifications should be communicated to:

Office of Legal Affairs
Treaty Section
United Nations
New York, N.Y. 10017
United States of America
e-mail: treaty@un.org
Fax: (212) 963-3693

For the regularly updated electronic version of this publication, please visit the United Nations Treaty Collection on the Internet at:

http://untreaty.un.org

Notes:

[1] Multilateral treaties formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, by virtue of General Assembly resolution 24 (I) of 12 February 1946, and of a League of Nations Assembly resolution of 18 April 1946 (League of Nations, Official Journal, Special Supplement No. 194, p. 57) were transferred, upon dissolution of the League of Nations, to the custody of the United Nations.

[2] For ease of reference, those League of Nations treaties and other pre-United Nations treaties that were amended by protocols adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations are included in Part I, so that the list of States which have become parties to the amending protocol and to the treaty, as amended, are followed immediately by a list showing the status of the treaty at the time of its transfer to the custody of the United Nations.

[3] See League of Nations, *Official Journal*, *Special Supplement* No. 195, Supplement to the Twenty-First List, Geneva, 1946.

[4] The following main symbols are used: a, accession; A, acceptance; AA, approval; c, formal confirmation; d, succession; P, participation; s, definitive signature; and n, notification (of provisional application, of special undertaking, etc.). Unless otherwise indicated the date of effect is determined by the relevant provisions of the treaty concerned.

ARUBA

See note 1 under "Netherlands".

BELARUS

Note 1.

Formerly: "Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic" until 18 September 1991.

BENIN

Note 1.

Formerly: "Dahomey" until 2 December 1975.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA

Note 1.

The Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina deposited with the Secretary-General notifications of succession to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to various treaties with effect from 6 March 1992, the date on which Bosnia and Herzegovina assumed responsibility for its international relations.

See also note 1 under "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

BURKINA FASO

Note 1.

Formerly: "Upper Volta" until 4 August 1984.

BURMA

See note 1 under "Myanmar".

CAMBODIA

Note 1.

As from 3 February 1990, "Cambodia". Formerly, as follows: as from 6 April 1976 to 3 February 1990 "Democratic Kampuchea"; as from 30 April 1975 to 6 April 1976 "Cambodia"; as from 28 December 1970 to 30 April 1975 "Khmer Republic".

CAMEROON

Note 1.

As from 4 February 1984 Cameroon (from 10 March 1975 to 4 February 1984 known as "the United Republic of Cameroon" and prior to 10 March 1975 known as "Cameroon".

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Note 1.

In a communication dated 20 December 1976, the Permanent Mission of the Central African Empire to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that, by a decision of the extraordinary Congress of the Movement for the Social Development of Black Africa (MESAN), held at Bangui from 10 November to 4 December 1976, the Central African Republic had been constituted into the Central African Empire.

In a communication dated 25 September 1979, the Permanent Representative of that country to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that, following a change of regime which took place on 20 September 1979, the former institutions of the Empire had been dissolved and the Central African Republic had been proclaimed.

CHINA

Note 1.

Signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China.

China is an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf, on 26 June and 28 September 1945, respectively, by the Government of the Republic of China, which continued to represent China in the United Nations until 25 October 1971.

On 25 October 1971, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted its resolution 2758 (XXVI), reading as follows:

"The General Assembly.

"*Recalling* the principles of the Charter of the United Nations,

"*Considering* that the restoration of the lawful rights of the People's Republic of China is essential both for the protection of the Charter of the United Nations and for the cause that the United Nations must serve under the Charter,

"*Recognizing* that the representatives of the Government of the People's Republic of China are the only lawful representatives of China to the United Nations and that the People's Republic of China is one of the five permanent members of the Security Council,

"*Decides* to restore all its rights to the People's Republic of China and to recognize the representatives of its Government as the only legitimate representatives of China to the United Nations, and to expel forthwith the representatives of Chiang Kai-shek from the place which they unlawfully occupy at the United Nations and in all the organizations related to it."

The United Nations had been notified on 18 November 1949 of the formation, on 1 October 1949, of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Proposals to effect a change in the representation of China in the United Nations subsequent to that time were not approved until the resolution quoted above was adopted.

On 29 September 1972, a communication was received by the Secretary-General from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China stating:

"1. With regard to the multilateral treaties signed, ratified or acceded to by the defunct Chinese government before the establishment of the Government of the People's Republic of China, my Government will examine their contents before making a decision in the light of the circumstances as to whether or not they should be recognized.

"2. As from October 1, 1949, the day of the founding of the People's Republic of China, the Chiang Kai-shek clique has no right at all to represent China. Its signature and ratification of, or accession to, any multilateral treaties by usurping the name of `China' are all illegal and null and void. My Government will study these multilateral treaties before making a decision in the light of the circumstances as to whether or not they should be acceded to."

All entries recorded throughout this publication in respect of China refer to actions taken by the authorities representing China in the United Nations at the time of those actions.

Note 2.

By a notification on 20 June 1997, the Government of China informed the Secretary-General of the status of Hong Kong in relation to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. The notification, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, signed on 19 December 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. [For the full text of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, 19 December 1984, see United Nation *Treaty Series* volume No. 1399, p. 61, (registration number I-23391)].

It is provided in Section 1 of Annex I to the Joint Declaration, "Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Hong Kong" and in Articles 12, 13 and 14 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 4 April 1990 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as the Basic Law), that the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibility of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, it is provided both in Section XI of Annex I to the Joint Declaration and Article 153 of the Basic Law that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not a party but which are implemented in Hong Kong may continue to be implemented in the Hong Kong Administrative Region.

In this connection, on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, I would like to inform Your Excellency as follows:

I. The treaties listed in Annex I to this Note [herein under], to which the People's Republic of China is a party, will be applied to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997 as they:

(i) are applied to Hong Kong before 1 July 1997; or

(ii) fall within the category of foreign affairs or defence or, owing to their nature and provisions, must apply to the entire territory of a State; or

(iii) are not applied to Hong Kong before 1 July 1997 but with respect to which it has been decided to apply them to Hong Kong with effect from that date (denoted by an asterisk in Annex I).

II. The treaties listed in Annex II to this Note [herein under], to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a party and which apply to Hong Kong before 1 July 1997, will continue to apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997.

The provisions of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights as applied to Hong Kong shall remain in force beginning from 1 July 1997.

III. The Government of the People's Republic of China has already carried out separately the formalities required for the application of the treaties listed in the aforesaid Annexes, including all the related amendments, protocols, reservations and declarations, to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997.

IV. With respect to any other treaty not listed in the Annexes to this Note, to which the People's Republic of China is or will become a party, in the event that it is decided to apply such treaty to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, the Government of the People's Republic of China will carry out separately the formalities for such application. For the avoidance of doubt, no separate formalities will need to be carried out by the Government of the People's Republic of China with respect to treaties which fall within in the category of foreign affairs or defence or which, owing to their nature and provisions, must apply to the entire territory of a State."

The treaties listed in Annexes I and II, referred to in the notification, are reproduced below.

Information regarding reservations and/or declarations made by China with respect to the application of treaties to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Moreover, with regard to treaty actions undertaken by China after 1 July 1997, the Chinese Government confirmed that the territorial scope of each treaty action would be specified. As such, declarations concerning the territorial scope of the relevant treaties with regard to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Annex I

(The treaties are listed in the order that they published in these volumes.)

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice:

- Charter of the United Nations, 26 June 1945;
- Statute of the International Court of Justice, 26 June 1945;
- Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971.

Privileges and Immunities, Diplomatic and Consular Relations:

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946;
- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations, 21 November 1947;
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961;
- Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 24 April 1963.

Human Rights:

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948;
- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966;
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 18 December 1979;
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 10 December 1984;
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, 20 November 1989.

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances:

- Convention on psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971;
- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, as amended by the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 8 August 1975;

- United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 20 December 1988.

Health:

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

International Trade and Development:

- Agreement establishing the Asian Development Bank, 4 December 1965;
- Charter of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre, 1 April 1982

Transport and Communications - Customs matters:

- Customs Convention on Containers, 2 December 1972*.

Navigation:

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948;
- Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, 6 April 1974.

Educational and Cultural Matters:

- Convention for the Protection of Products of Phonograms Against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms, 29 October 1971.

Penal Matters:

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979;
- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

Law of the Sea:

- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 10December 1982.

Commercial Arbitration:

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958.

Outer Space:

- Convention on the Registration of Objects Launched into Outer Space, 12 November 1974.

Telecommunications:

- Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity, 27 March 1976.

Disarmament:

- Convention on Prohibitions or restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (with protocols I, II and III), 10 October 1980;
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, 3 September 1992.

Environment:

- Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, 22 March 1985;
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 16 September 1987;
- Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 29 June 1990;
- Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, 22 March 1989.

Annex II (The treaties are listed in the order that they are published in these volumes.)

Refugees and Stateless Persons:

- Convention relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 28 September 1954.

Traffic in Persons:

- International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, 30 September 1921;
- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949;
- International Agreement for the Suppression of the "White Slave Traffic", 18 May 1904;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, 4 May 1910.

Obscene Publications:

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the suppression of the circulation of, and traffic in, obscene publications, concluded at Geneva on 12 September 1923, 12 November 1947;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the Circulation of, and Traffic in Obscene Publications, 12 September 1923;
- Protocol amending the Agreement for the Suppression of the Circulation of Obscene Publications, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949;
- Agreement for the Repression of Obscene Publications, 4 May 1910.

Transport and Communications - Custom matters:

- International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Materials, 7 November 1952;
- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954;
- Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954;
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954;
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956;
- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation for Private Use of Aircraft and Pleasure Boats, 18 May 1956;
- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets Used in International Transport, 9 December 1960.

Transport and Communications - Road Traffic:

- Convention on Road Traffic, 19 September 1949.

Educational and Cultural Matters

- Agreement of the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural materials, 22 November 1950.

Status of Women

- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953;
- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962.

Penal Matters:

- Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953;
- Slavery Convention, 25 September 1926;
- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956.

Environment:

- Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, Copenhagen, 25 November 1992.

League of Nations:

- Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, 20 April 1921;
- Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, 20 April 1921;
- Declaration Recognizing the Right to a Flag of States Having no Sea-coast, 20 April 1921;
- Convention and Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, 9 December 1923 ;
- International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities, 3 November 1923.

See also note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" .

Note 3.

By a notification dated 13 December 1999, the Government of the People's Republic of China informed the Secretary-General of the status of Macao in relation to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. The notification, in pertinent part, reads as follows:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao signed on 13 April 1987 (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999. Macao will from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. [For the full text of the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macao, 13 April 1987, see United Nation *Treaty Series* volume No. 1498, p. 229 (registration number I-25805)].

It is provided in Section 1 of Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Macao, which is Annex 1 to the Joint Declaration, and in Article 12, 13 and 14 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (hereinafter referred to as the Basic Law), which was adopted by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China on 31 March 1993, that the Macao Special Administrative Region will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China. Furthermore, it is provided both in Section VIII of Annex 1 of the Joint Declaration and Article 138 of the Basic Law that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a party but which are implemented in Macao may continue to be implemented in the Macao Special Administrative Region.

In this connection, on behalf of the Government of the People's Republic of China, I have the honour to inform your Excellency that:

I. The treaties listed in Annex I to this Note [herein below], to which the People's Republic of China is a Party, will be applied to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999 so long as they are one of the following categories:

(i) Treaties that apply to Macao before 20 December 1999;

(ii) Treaties that must apply to the entire territory of a state as they concern foreign affairs or defence or their nature or provision so require.

II. The Treaties listed in Annex II to this Note, to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a Party and which apply to Macao before 20 December 1999, will continue to apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with the effect from 20 December 1999.

III. The Government of the People's Republic of China has notified the treaty depositaries concerned of the application of the treaties including their amendments and protocols listed in the aforesaid Annexes as well as reservations and declarations made thereto by the Chinese Government to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999.

IV.With respect to other treaties that are not listed in the Annexes to this Note, to which the People's Republic of China is or will become a Party, the Government of the People's Republic of China will go through separately the necessary formalities for their application to the Macao Special Administrative Region if it so decided."

The treaties listed in Annexes I and II, referred to in the notification, are reproduced below.

Information regarding reservations and/or declarations made by China with respect to the application of treaties to the Macao Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Moreover, with regard to treaty actions undertaken by China after 13 December 1999, the Chinese Government confirmed that the territorial scope of each treaty action would be specified. As such, declarations concerning the territorial scope of the relevant treaties with regard to the Macao Special Administrative Region can be found in the footnotes to the treaties concerned as published herein. Footnote indicators are placed against China's entry in the status list of those treaties.

Annex I

(The treaties appear in the order as they are provided in these volumes.)

Charter of the United Nations and Statute of the International Court of Justice:

- Charter of the United Nations, 26 June 1945;
- Statute of the International Court of Justice, 26 June 1945;
- Amendment to Article 61 of the Charter of the United Nations, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 2847 (XXVI) of 20 December 1971.

Privileges and Immunities, Diplomatic and Consular Relations:

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946;
- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies of the United Nations, 21 November 1947;
- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961;
- Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, 24 April 1963.

Human Rights:

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966;
- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination against Women, 18 December 1979;
- Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 10 December 1984;
- Convention on the Rights of the Child, 20 November 1989.

Refugees and Stateless Persons:

- Convention relating to the Status of Refugees. 28 July 1951;
- Protocol relating to the Status of Refugees, 31 January 1967;

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances:

- Convention on psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971;
- United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances, 20 December 1988.

Health:

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

International Trade and Development:

- Charter of the Asian and Pacific Development Centre, 1 April 1982.

Navigation:

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948.

Penal Matters:

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979;

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

Law of the Sea:

- United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 10 December 1982.

Law of Treaties:

- Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 23 May 1969.

Telecommunications:

- Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity, 27 March 1976.

Disarmament:

- Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (with Protocols I, II and III), 10 October 1980;
- Additional Protocol to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol IV, entitled Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons), 13 October 1995;
- Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996) annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, 3 May 1996;
- Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, 3 September 1992.

Environment:

- Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, 22 March 1985;
- Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 16 September 1987;
- Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, 29 June 1990;
- Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, 22 March 1989;
- United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, 9 May 1992;
- Convention on biological diversity, 5 June 1992.

Annex II :

(The treaties appear in the order as they are provided in these volumes.)

Human Rights:

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966;
- International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966;

Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances:

- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 30 March 1961
- Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs and Narcotic Substances, 25 March 1972.

Traffic in Persons:

- International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, 30 September 1921;
- International Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, 11 October 1933;
- Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Persons and of the Exploitation of the Prostitution of Others, 21 March 1950;

Transport and Communication - customs matters:

- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954;
- Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954;

Transport and Communication - road traffic:

- Convention on Road Traffic, 19 September 1949.

Penal Matters:

- Slavery Convention, 25 September 1926;
- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956;

League of Nations:

- Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, 7 June1930;
- Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Cheques, 19 March 1931;
- Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, 7 June 1930;
- Convention providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, 19 March 1931;
- Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, 7 June 1930;
- Convention on the Stamps Laws in connection with Cheques, 19 March 1931.

See also note 1 under "Macao" and note 1 under "Portugal".

CONGO

Note 1.

In a communication dated 15 November 1971, the Permanent Mission of the People's Republic of the Congo to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that their country would henceforth be known as the "Congo".

COOK ISLANDS

Note 1.

Formerly administered by New Zealand, the Cook Islands and Niue currently have the status of self-governing States in free association with New Zealand.

The responsibility of the Cook Islands and Niue to conduct their own international relations and particularly to conclude treaties has evolved substantially over the years. For a period of time it was considered that, in view of the fact that the Cook Island and Niue, though self-governing, had entered into special relationships with New Zealand, which discharged the responsibilities for the external relations and defence of the Cook Islands and Niue at their request, it followed that the Cook Islands and Niue did not have their own treaty making capacity.

However, in 1984, an application by the Cook Islands for membership in the World Health Organization was approved by the World Health Assembly in accordance with its article 6, and the Cook Islands, in accordance with article 79, became a member upon deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Secretary-General. In the circumstances, the Secretary-General felt that the question of the status, as a State, of the Cook Islands, had been duly decided in the affirmative by the World Heath Assembly, whose membership was fully respresentative of the international community.

On the basis of the Cook Islands' membership in the World Health Organization, and of its subsequent admittance to other specialized agencies (Food and Agriculture Organization in 1985, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1985 and the International Civil Aviation Organization in 1986) as a full member without any specifications or limitations, the Secretary-General considered that the Cook Islands could participate in a treaty in its own right as a State.

Consequently, the Cook Islands signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992.

The same solution was adopted by the Secretary-General following the approval of Niue's application for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization UNESCO in 1993 and of the World Health Organization in 1994.

As a result of these developments, the Secretary-General, as depositary of multilateral treaties, recognized the full treaty-making capacity of the Cook Islands in 1992 and of Niue in 1994.

COSTA RICA

Note 1.

On 9 January 2002, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Costa Rica a communication transmitting the formal objection to the reservation formulated by the Government of Nicaragua which reads as follows:

I have the honour to write to you in your capacity as depositary of the declarations provided for in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with reference to note MRE/DW1081/10/01, which the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua transmitted to you on 24 October 2001.

On 24 September 1929, the Republic of Nicaragua recognized, unconditionally, the compulsory jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice. That declaration was deemed transferable to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by virtue of Article 36, paragraph 5, of the Statute of the Court. On various occasions, Nicaragua has used this optional declaration to bring proceedings before the International Court of Justice. In the *Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua* case between Nicaragua and the United States of America, the Court found that this declaration was valid.

The above-mentioned note from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Nicaragua, dated 24 October 2001, represents a casuistic attempt by the Nicaraguan Government to modify its voluntary declaration of unconditional acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice as follows:

"Nicaragua will not accept as from 1 November 2001 the jurisdiction or competence of the International Court of Justice in relation to any matter or claim based on interpretations of treaties or arbitral awards that were signed and ratified or made, respectively, prior to 31 December 1901."

The Government of Costa Rica considers that this purported "reservation" is not permissible for the following reasons: (1) Public international law does not recognize the right to formulate reservations a posteriori to unconditional declarations of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; (2) Nicaragua is unable to formulate this "reservation" by virtue of its unilateral declarations before the same Court with respect to the nature of its acceptance of compulsory jurisdiction and the possibility of modifying it; (3) Even if this reservation were permissible, which it is not, the lack of a reasonable time period for its entry into force renders such a "reservation" contrary to the principle of good faith in international relations. In addition, it is worth noting that the foregoing is supported by the provision of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties contained in article 2, paragraph 1 (d), on the meaning of a reservation. Moreover, the provision contained in article 20, paragraph 3, of that Convention should also be borne in mind with respect to the formulation of a reservation to a treaty which is a constituent instrument of an international organization.

I must point out that the note to which my Government objects was not transmitted spontaneously. Rather, it represents a reaction to the fact that my Government has included an item in the national budget to cover the cost of the possible filing of a claim by Costa Rica against Nicaragua before the International Court of Justice for its failure to abide by the provisions agreed upon by both countries in the Cailas-Jerez Treaty of 1858 and the Cleveland Award of 1888. Both instruments were signed and ratified during the period which Nicaragua now seeks to exclude from the Court's jurisdiction by means of the above-mentioned reservation. However, in its haste, it has overlooked the fact that, on 21 February 1949, the Government of Nicaragua signed a Pact of Amity with Costa Rica. Article III of that instrument reflects the commitment to apply the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement. Nicaragua has also failed to consider that, on 9 January 1956, as a corollary to the 1949 Pact of Amity, Nicaragua and Costa Rica signed, at the Pan American Union in Washington, an agreement to facilitate and expedite traffic on the San Juan River within the terms of the Treaty of 15 April 1858 and its interpretation given by arbitration on 22 March 1888. Both instruments were ratified in due course by both countries. The purported reservation also fails to include the judgement pronounced on 20 September 1916 by the Central American Court of Justice. The 1916 judgement of the Central American Court of Justice, the 1949 Pact of Amity and the 1956 agreement reinforce a set of legal rules which must be respected.

1. International law does not give Nicaragua the right to formulate reservations a posteriori to its unconditional declaration of acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

In the judgement on the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice pronounced in the *Military and Paramilitary Activities In and Against Nicaragua* case, the Court indicated that States could not modify their acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction as they pleased, but were bound by the terms of their declarations.

The Court noted, in particular, that the right to terminate declarations with indefinite duration was far from established in international law.

Nicaragua itself has recognized that contemporary international law does not give States the power to modify unilaterally their optional declarations of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice when such declarations are unconditional.

In its written pleadings in the *Border and Transborder Armed Actions* case between Nicaragua and Honduras, Nicaragua stated categorically that a State bound by an optional declaration could not modify or denounce that declaration. Nicaragua claimed that the declaring State was bound by the terms of the optional declaration and that, by virtue of the principle of good faith, it could not seek to disengage unilaterally from the obligations it had acquired in making that declaration.

Nicaragua argued that that rule arose from an analogous application of the customary principles of the law of treaties. Nicaragua indicated that the principles incorporated into the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties were applicable to voluntary declarations of acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction in respect of denunciation and reservation, meaning that such declarations could not be modified unless the declaring State had previously reserved that right. Lastly, Nicaragua maintained that State practice showed that a State could modify an optional declaration only when it reserved the right to do so at the time it made the original declaration.

In its written pleadings in the jurisdictional phase of the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case, Nicaragua argued that the legality of a purported modification depended on the intention of the declaring State at the time of making the original op-

tional declaration. If the declaring State did not expressly reserve the right to make modifications, that State did not have the power to change its declaration or to formulate reservations.

Insofar as the declaration of acceptance of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice made by Nicaragua in 1929 does not include any conditions or time limits, nor does it expressly reserve the right to modify its content, Nicaragua has no right to formulate reservations to its acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction.

2. Nicaragua, by virtue of its public unilateral declarations before the Court with respect to the nature of its optional declaration and the possibility of modifying it, cannot formulate any reservations.

In a number of unilateral declarations, Nicaragua has recognized that its own declaration of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction cannot be modified in any way.

In its written pleadings in the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case, Nicaragua pointed out that its 1924 declaration could not be terminated or modified without prior notice and that any withdrawal or modification of the declaration must be based on the principles of the law of treaties. What is more, Nicaragua indicated categorically that the assumption that its declaration could be modified without prior notice was unfounded in the law relating to consensual legal obligations arising from optional declarations. In the same case, Nicaragua argued against the possibility of unilaterally modifying declarations of acceptance of the Court'scompulsory jurisdiction. Nicaragua based its arguments both on the writings of the most distinguished legal experts and on considerations of principle. Nicaragua noted that the existence of a universal right of unilateral modification of optional declarations would violate the system of optional clauses in the Statute and would essentially eliminate the compulsory nature ofthe Court's jurisdiction.

These arguments demonstrate both Nicaragua's intention that its 1929 declaration of acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction should not be subject to any modification or denunciation and its repeated contention that the unilateral modification of such declarations, in the absence of a previous reservation, is contrary to international law. This acknowledgement of the legal situation is binding on Nicaragua. Under the principles of estoppel and good faith, Nicaragua cannot, at this time, reverse those positions.

Accordingly, Costa Rica considers that Nicaragua cannot now claim to modify unilaterally its unconditional acceptance of the voluntary jurisdiction of the Court by means of a purported "reservation".

Even if Nicaragua had the right to formulate a reservation to its optional declaration, which it does not, the lack of a reasonable time period for its entry into force renders such a "reservation" null and void.

In the *Military and Paramilitary Activities* case, the International Court of Justice indicated that, while the right to denounce declarations without limit of time was far from established in international law, if such a right existed, then any denunciation would, by analogy with the law of treaties, have to provide for a reasonable time period before it entered into force. This principle applies, by analogy, to the introduction of changes to the voluntary acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction. Consequently, even if Nicaragua could modify its optional declaration by means of a reservation, which is not the case, then such a modification would have to be subject to a reasonable time period, by virtue of the principle of good faith.

It should be noted that, in the *Border and Transborder Armed Actions* case, Nicaragua argued that only a period of at least 12 months could be considered reasonable for any modification of a declaration of voluntary acceptance of the Court's jurisdiction.

Nicaragua's purported "reservation", which my Government has analysed in this note, provides for a period of only eight days from the time of its signature by the President of Nicaragua to the time of its purported entry into force. Even if Nicaragua were legally in a position to modify its acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction, which it is not, a period of eight days would not meet the requirement of a reasonable time period for the entry into force of such a modification.

What is more, Nicaragua, by virtue of its declarations in the *Border and Transborder Armed Actions* case, would be obligated, under the principles of good faith and estoppel, to provide for a period of at least 12 months before the purported "reservation" could enter into force. Accordingly, the purported "reservation" formulated on 24 October 2001 cannot be considered to meet the minimum requirements imposed by the principle of good faith.

Jurisdiction of the Court and the Pact of Bogotá:

Moreover, in the case of Nicaragua, as in the case of any other Latin American State party to the Pact of Bogotá, the denunciation of the Statute of the Court would not disengage it from the obligation to recognize the competence of that Court as a respondent, for the following reason:

In April 1948, the American Treaty on Pacific Settlement, better known as the Pact of Bogotá, was adopted. Costa Rica ratified it on 27 April 1949, and Nicaragua, in turn, ratified it on 26 July 1950. Accordingly, the Pact of Bogotá has been in force between Costa Rica and Nicaragua as from the latter date.

The Pact contains a definitive declaration of recognition of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court for all disputes of a juridical nature among the States parties to the Pact. Article XXXI of the Pact says:

"In conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the High Contracting Parties declare that they recognize in relation to any other American State, the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory *ipso facto*, without the necessity of any special agreement so long as the present Treaty is in force, in all disputes of a juridical nature that arise among them ....."

Therefore, since both Costa Rica and Nicaragua are ratifying parties to the Pact of Bogotá, there can be no doubt that both parties have recognized the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice to settle any legal dispute between them.

The above-mentioned article XXXI has the legal effect of transforming the vague juridical relations arising from unilateral declarations made by the parties under the optional clause into contractual relations which have the force and stability characteristic of an obligation arising directly from a treaty.

Dr. Eduardo Jimenez de Aréchega, a distinguished Uruguayan jurist who had the honour to serve as President of the International Court of Justice, maintained that there were substantial differences between the exercise of the optional clause and the fact of being a party to a convention. In an opinion which he provided to Costa Rica in his capacity as adviser to our country in the 1986 *Nicaragua v. Costa Rica* case, he gave the following explanation:

"The fundamental difference between the recognition of the Court's jurisdiction expressed by the parties to the Pact of Bogotá and that expressed by other States under the optional clause is as follows: (a) once the Pact of Bogotá has been ratified by an American State, the recognition of the Court's jurisdiction may be withdrawn only by denunciation of the Pact itself, which must be effected with at least one year's notice; and (b) the States which ratified the Pact could have introduced reservations to their recognition of the Court's jurisdiction if they had done so at the time of signature. As they did not do so with respect to the recognition of the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court, article XXXI became a mechanism for accepting fully

the Court's jurisdiction, and is completely different in this regard from the very conditional acceptance which the majority of States have expressed through the application of the optional clause.

'From these substantial differences, it follows that the American States parties to the Pact of Bogotá have established a legal system among themselves whereby the optional clause has been replaced by the categorical declaration contained in article XXXI of the Pact. The declarations made by American States in exercise of their prerogative under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court only have the legal effect of establishing the tenuous relations under that clause exclusively with States which are not Contracting Parties to the Pact of Bogotá, but not the contractual obligation created by article XXXI to recognize, with the force of a treaty, the obligation to grant the American States parties to the Pact of Bogotá the right to bring claims against other American States before the Court at The Hague".

Consequently, even if Nicaragua's Presidential Decree revoking the unilateral declaration of 1929 in which Nicaragua recognized the jurisdiction of the Court at The Hague to settle legal disputes with any other State having expressed the same recognition were valid, which it is not, that nation would still be bound to recognize the competence of the Court at The Hague to settle legal disputes with any other Latin American State party to the Pact of Bogotá.

In light of the above, so long as the Pact of Bogotá is in force, Nicaragua cannot deny the competence of the International Court of Justice to hear and settle any legal dispute brought before it by Costa Rica.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Government of Costa Rica hereby presents a formal objection to the "reservation" formulated by the Government of Nicaragua, and declares that, for all intents and purposes, it will consider such reservation to be non-existent.

I should be grateful if you would transmit this document to the secretariat of the International Court of Justice and to the States parties to its Statute. Likewise, I should be grateful if you would have it circulated to the General Assembly as a document of the Assembly under the agenda item relating to the consideration of the report of the International Court of Justice to the General Assembly.

Accept, Sir, the renewed assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Roberto Rojas

CÔTE D'IVOIRE

Note 1.

Formerly: "Ivory Coast" until 31 December 1985.

CROATIA

Note 1.

In a letter dated 27 July 1992, received by the Secretary-General on 4 August 1992 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Republic of Croatia notified that:

"[The Government of]...the Republic of Croatia has decided, based on the Constitutional Decision on Sovereignty and Independence of the Republic of Croatia of 25 June, 1991 and the Decision of the Croatian Parliament in respect of the territory of the Republic of Croatia, by virtue of succession of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia of 8 October, 1991, to be considered a party to the conventions that Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia and its predecessor states (the Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia) were parties, according to the enclosed list.

In conformity with the international practice, [the Government of the Republic of Croatia] would like to suggest that this take effect from 8 October, 1991, the date on which the Republic of Croatia became independent."

See also note 1 under "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

CZECH REPUBLIC

Note 1.

In a letter dated 16 February 1993, received by the Secretary-General on 22 February 1993 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Czech Republic notified that :

"In conformity with the valid principles of international law and to the extent defined by it, the Czech Republic, as a successor State to the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of 1 January 1993, i.e., the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, by multilateral international treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party on that date, including reservations and declarations to their provisions made earlier by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic.

The Government of the Czech Republic have examined multilateral treaties the list of which is attached to this letter. [The Government of the Czech Republic] considers to be bound by these treaties as well as by all reservations and declarations to them by virtue of succession as of 1 January 1993.

The Czech Republic, in accordance with the well established principles of international law, recognizes signatures made by the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic in respect of all signed treaties as if they were made by itself."

In view of the information above, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e., signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the former Czechoslovakia prior to dissolution, in respect of treaties to which the Czech Republic and/or Slovakia have succeeded, will be replaced by the name of "Czech Republic" and/or "Slovakia" with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote will indicate the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" as the case may be.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by the former Czechoslovakia and not listed in the notification of succession by either the Czech Republic or Slovakia, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "Participant".

See also note 1 under "Slovakia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

CZECHOSLOVAKIA

See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia".

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

Note 1.

As from 17 May 1997. Formerly: "Zaire" until 16 May 1997 and "Democratic Republic of the Congo" until 27 October 1971.

DENMARK

Note 1.

In a communication received on 22 July 2003, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that "... Denmark's ratifications normally include the entire Kingdom of Denmark including the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

EGYPT

See note 1 under "United Arab Republic".

ESTONIA

Note 1.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 8 October 1991, the Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia informed the Secretary-General that "Estonia does not regard itself as party by virtue of the doctrine of treaty succession to any bilateral or multilateral treaties entered into by the U.S.S.R. The Republic of Estonia has begun careful review of multilateral treaties in order to determine those to which it wishes to become a party. In this regard it will act on a case-by-case basis in exercise of its own sovereign right in the name of the Republic of Estonia.".

FAROE ISLANDS

See note 1 under "Denmark".

FORMER YUGOSLAVIA

Note 1.

The former Yugoslavia was an original Member of the United Nations, the Charter having been signed and ratified on its behalf on 26 June 1945, and 19 October 1945, respectively. The following republics constituting the former Yugoslavia declared their independence on the dates indicated: Slovenia (25 June 1991), The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (17 September 1991), Croatia (8 October 1991), and Bosnia and Herzegovina (6 March 1992). Yugoslavia came into being on 27 April 1992 following the promulgation of the constitution of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on that day. Yugoslavia nevertheless advised the Secretary-General on 27 April 1992 that it claimed to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia. Yugoslavia accordingly claimed to be a member of those international organizations of which the former Yugoslavia had been a member. It also claimed that all those treaty acts that had been performed by the former Yugoslavia were directly attributable to it, as being the same State (See documents S/23877 and A/46/915). Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Slovenia and The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, all of which had applied for and were admitted to membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter (by resolutions 46/237 adopted on 22 May 1992, 46/238 adopted on 22 May 1992, 46/236 adopted on 22 May 1992, and 47/225 adopted on 8 April 1993 respectively), objected to this claim.

In its resolution 47/1 of 22 September 1992, the General Assembly, acting upon the recommendation of the Security Council in its resolution 777 (1992) of 19 September 1992, considered that Yugoslavia could not continue automatically the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations, and decided that it should accordingly apply for membership in the Organization. It also decided that Yugoslavia could not participate in the work of the General Assembly. The Legal Counsel took the view, however, that this resolution of the General Assembly neither terminated nor suspended the membership of the former Yugoslavia in the United Nations. At the same time, the Legal Counsel expressed the view that the admission of a new Yugoslavia to membership in the United Nations, in accordance with Article 4 of the Charter of the United Nations, would terminate the situation that had been created by General Assembly resolution 47/1 (See document A/47/485).

General Assembly resolution 47/1 did not specifically address the question of the status of either the former Yugoslavia or of Yugoslavia with regard to multilateral treaties that were deposited with the Secretary-General. The Legal Counsel took the view in this regard that the Secretary-General was not in a position, as depositary, either to reject or to disregard the claim of Yugoslavia that it continued the legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, absent any decision to the contrary either by a competent organ of the United Nations directing him in the exercise of his depositary functions, or by a competent treaty organ created by a treaty, or by the contracting States to a treaty directing him in the exercise of his depositary functions with regard to that particular treaty, or by a competent organ representative of the international community of States as a whole on the general issue of continuity and discontinuity of statehood to which the claim of Yugoslavia gave rise.

Consistent with the claim of Yugoslavia to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, the Secretary-General, as depositary, continued to list treaty actions that had been performed by the former Yugoslavia in status lists in the present publication, using for that purpose the short-form name "Yugoslavia", which was used at that time to refer to the former Yugoslavia. Between 27 April 1992 and 1 November 2000, Yugoslavia undertook numerous treaty actions with respect to treaties deposited with the Secretary-General. Consistent with the claim of Yugoslavia to continue the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia, these treaty actions were also listed in status lists against the name "Yugoslavia". Accordingly, the Secretary-General, as depositary, did not make any differentiation in the present publication between treaty actions that were performed by the former Yugoslavia and those that were performed by Yugoslavia, both categories of treaty actions being listed against the name "Yugoslavia".

The General Assembly admitted Yugoslavia to membership by its resolution A/RES/55/12 on 1 November 2000. At the same time, Yugoslavia renounced its claim to have continued the international legal personality of the former Yugoslavia.

Treaty actions undertaken by Yugoslavia were subsequently listed in this publication against the designation "Serbia and Montenegro" until 2 June 2006.

Treaty actions undertaken by the former Yugoslavia appear in footnotes, against the designation "former Yugoslavia".

See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "Slovenia", "Serbia and Montenegro", "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

GERMANY

Note 1.

1. Prior to the formation of one sovereign German State through the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany (effective from 3 October 1990), the Secretary-General received numerous communications relating to the application of international instruments to West Berlin.

2. In each case (noted here), the initial communication took the form of a note, letter, or declaration from the Federal Republic of Germany, in, accompanying or in connection with its instrument of accession, acceptance or ratification of an amendment, agreement, convention or protocol, to the effect

that the relevant amendment, agreement, convention or protocol would also apply to *"Land Berlin"* or *"Berlin (West)"* (as noted here) with effect from the date on which it entered into force for the Federal Republic of Germany.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 10 October 1957) to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 10 October 1957) to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947.

Note: Acting in accordance with section 43 of article X of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany undertook to apply the provisions of the Convention to a number of specialized agencies by participation in each Annex to the Convention relevant to that specialized agency (for complete list of the Annexes participated in by the Federal Republic of Germany, see point 15 at the end of this footnote). Thereby, the declaration noted here, and the series of communications provoked by it recorded in the points below, came to apply to each of these Annexes as well. Therefore, any reference to the Convention and these communications below should therefore be understood as applying to each of these Annexes also.

- Statement (re: *"Land Berlin"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 11 November 1964) of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961.

- Statement (re: *"Land Berlin"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 11 November 1964) of the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 24 November 1954) to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 May 1969) of the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 17 December 1973) of the International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 17 December 1973) of the International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 10 July 1985) of the Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 1 October 1990) of the Convention Against Torture: and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, 10 December 1984.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 15 December 1955) referring to the Convention Relating to the Status of Refugees, 28 July 1951.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 October 1976) of the Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 28 September 1954.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying The instrument of accession (deposited 31 August 1977) to the Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness, 30 August 1961.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 5 November 1969) to the Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 13 January 1967.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 22 January 1960) in relation to the Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at the Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and at Geneva on 26 June 1936.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 22 January 1960) in relation to the Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 27 April 1960) in relation to the Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium, 23 June 1953.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 December 1973) of the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 30 March 1961.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 2 December 1977) of the Convention on Psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 20 February 1975) of the Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 25 March 1972.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 6 October 1964) in relation to the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

- Declaration (re: *"Land Berlin"*) with acceptance (deposited 23 December 1971) of the Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 23 May 1967.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 9 July 1975) of the Amendments to articles 34 and 55 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 May 1973.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 16 January 1985) of the Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 17 May 1976.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 15 September 1987) of the Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 12 May 1986.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 14 October 1977) of the Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 13 June 1976.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 13 July 1983) of the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 8 April 1979.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 16 February 1983) of the Agreement establishing the Afri-

can Development Bank done at Khartoum on 4 August 1963, as amended by resolution 05-79 adopted by the Board of Governors on 17 May 1979, 7 May 1982.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 21 December 1989) of the United Nations Convention on Contracts for the International Sale of Goods, 11 April 1980.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (dated 15 December 1955) in relation to the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, 7 November 1952.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 September 1957) of the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954. The note also stated that the Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954 and the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954, also applied to West Berlin.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 September 1957) of the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 30 November 1961) in relation to the Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 30 November 1961) in relation to the Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 29 September 1964) of the European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 20 December 1982) of the Customs Convention on the International Transport of Goods under Cover of TIR Carnets (TIR Convention), 14 November 1975.

Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 12 June 1987) of the International Convention on the Harmonization of Frontier Controls of Goods, 21 October 1982.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 7 July 1961) to the Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic, 18 May 1956.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 7 November 1961) in relation to the Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 1 December 1969) o the European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 4 March 1980) of Protocol amending article 14 (3) of the European Agreement of 30 September 1957 concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 21 August 1975.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 January 1963) of the European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 29 November 1965) of the Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the Convention on Road Traffic, 8 November 1968.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the Convention on Road Signals, 8 November 1968.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 9 July 1975) of the European Agreement concerning the Work of Crews of Vehicles Engaged in International Road Transport (AETR), 1 July 1970.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification, (deposited 3 August 1978) of the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals Opened for Signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, 1 May 1971.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the Protocol on Road Markings, Additional to the European Agreement Supplementing the Convention on Road Signs and Signals Opened for Signature at Vienna on 8 November 1968, 1 March 1973.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) upon ratification (deposited 3 August 1978) of the European Agreement on Main International Arteries, 15 November 1975.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 23 October 1987) of the European Agreement on Main International Railway Lines (AGC), 31 May 1985.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 7 October 1965) of Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964, and instrument of acceptance (deposited 22 July 1966) of Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965, but applying also to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 7 October 1965) of Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 22 July 1966) of Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 1 December 1975) of the Amendments to articles 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28, 31 and 32 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 17 October 1974.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 24 October 1977) of Amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 14 November 1975 and 9 November 1977.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 2 April 1979) of the Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization relating to the institutionalization of the Committee on Technical Co-operation in the Convention, 17 November 1977.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of acceptance (deposited 23 June 1980) of the Amendments to articles 17, 18, 20 and 51 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 November 1979.

- Statement (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) upon ratification (deposited 19 April 1974) of the Convention on the measurement of inland navigation vessels, 15 February 1966.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) in connection with ratification (deposited 6 April 1983) of the Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, 6 April 1974.

- Communication (re: *"Land Berlin"*) (received 25 September 1957) in relation to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, 22 November 1950.

- Declaration (re: *"Land Berlin"*) with ratification (deposited 21 July 1966) of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, 26 October 1961.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 7 February 1974) of the Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms, 29 October 1971.

- Letter (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 17 August 1989) of the Protocol to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials of 22 November 1950, 26 November 1976.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 23 October 1958) to the Protocol for extending the period of validity of the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons, 16 January 1957. Also contains statements regarding specific terms of the convention and their extension to Berlin (West).

- Letter (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 4 November 1970) to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with instrument of accession (deposited 7 February 1974) to the Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of accession (deposited 9 July 1969) to the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with acceptance (deposited 29 May 1973) of the Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 14 January 1959) of the Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 15 December 1980) of the International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979.

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 25 January 1977) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

- Statement (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) in the instrument of ratification (deposited 15 August 1985) of the Agreement establishing the Common Fund for Commodities, 27 June 1980.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 20 July 1959) of the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, 20 June 1956.

- Statement (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with the instrument of ratification (deposited 26 July 1973) of the Convention on the High Seas, 29 April 1958.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 26 July 1973) of the Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, 29 April 1958.

- Declaration (re: *"Land Berlin"*) with ratification (deposited 30 June 1961) of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958.

- Note (re: *"Land Berlin"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 21 July 1987) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, 23 May 1969. Application expressed as being "subject to the rights and responsibilities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America".

- Communication (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 16 October 1979) of the Convention on registration of objects launched into outer space, 12 November 1974).

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 25 May 1979) of the Convention relating to the distribution of programme-carrying signals transmitted by satellite, 21 May 1974.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 24 May 1983) of the Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976.

- Declaration (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) with ratification (deposited 15 July 1982) of the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979.

- Note (re: *"Berlin (West)"*) accompanying the instrument of ratification (deposited 3 March 1987) of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 percent, 8 July 1985.

3. In the case of the following amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols, communications from other States were received by the Secretary-General in response to the application of the relevant amendment, agreement, convention or protocol to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany to the effect that the application to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany had no legal validity on the ground that West Berlin was not a "Land" of, or part of the territory of, the Federal Republic of Germany and could not be governed by it.

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Poland and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of Bulgaria (received 16 September 1969), Czechoslovakia (received 3 November 1969), Mongolia (received 7 January 1970), Poland (received 20 June 1969), the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 10 November 1969) and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 4 August 1969).

- Protocol Relating to the Status of Refugees, 13 January 1967; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria and Mongolia.

- Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and Geneva on 26 June 1936; communications (no dates available)

from the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium, 23 June 1953; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Poland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Amendments to articles 24 and 25 of the Constitution of the World Health Organization, 23 May 1967; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material, 7 November 1952; note accompanying the instrument of accession of the Government of Romania (deposited 15 November 1968).

- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954; Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954; and Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954. Communication (no date available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954. Communication (no date available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, the German Democratic Republic, Hungary, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (reaffirmed in declaration upon accession, deposited 2 September 1983).

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communications from the Governments of Bulgaria (received 13 May 1970) and Mongolia (received 22 June 1970).

- European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of Albania (received 14 June 1966), the Byelorussian SSR (received 6 June 1966 and 10 November 1967), Czechoslovakia (received 1 February 1966 and 13 September 1967), Hungary (received 10 February 1966), Poland (received 4 March 1966), the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 April 1966 and 2 June 1967, and upon accession, deposited 10 December 1986).

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication (no date available) from the Government of Poland.

- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication (no date available) from the Government of Poland.

- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication (no date available) from the Government of Poland.

- Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials, 22 November 1950; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, 26 October 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Mongolia, Poland, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, 20 June 1956; communication (no dates available) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Cuba, Czechoslovakia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

4. Often communications from other States in response to the application to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany of various amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols, noted at point 3 (as listed here), solicited yet further communications from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States

of America rejecting such communications as unfounded. These communications informed the Secretary-General that under the Declaration on Berlin of 5 May 1955, the Federal Republic of Germany had conditional authorisation from the Allied Kommandatura to extend to Berlin the international agreements concluded by the Federal Republic.

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at The Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and Geneva on 26 June 1936; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Protocol for Limiting and Regulating the Cultivation of the Poppy Plant, the Production of, International and Wholesale Trade in, and use of Opium, 23 June 1953; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, 4 June 1954; Additional Protocol to the Convention concerning Customs Facilities for Touring, relating to the Importation of Tourist Publicity Documents and Material, 4 June 1954; and Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Private Road Vehicles, 4 June 1954; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

- Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of France (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the United Kingdom (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the Federal Republic of Germany (25 November 1966 and 21 August 1968) and the United States of America (21 August 1968).

- Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic, 18 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany (25 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), France (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968), the United Kingdom (23 November 1966 and 21 August 1968) and the United States of America (21 August 1968).

- International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations, 26 October 1961; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

- Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery, 7 September 1956; communication (no date available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

- Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, 20 June 1956; communication (no dates available) from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany.

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communications (no dates available) from the Governments of the Federal Republic of Germany, France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America.

5. For a number of amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols (noted here), including some of those noted at points 3 and 4, the initial communication from the Federal Republic of Germany gave rise to communications to the effect that the initial communication was invalid because it was in contradiction to the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 between the Governments of France, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America. The Quadripartite Agreement was said to confirm that West Berlin was not a *"Land"* (where this term had been used) or constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and could not be governed by it, and that treaties affecting matters of security and status could not be extended to West Berlin by the Federal Republic of Germany. The initial communication of the Federal Republic

of Germany was said, in the case of almost every instrument noted here, to contradict or be incompatible with one or a combination of these stipulations (in one case, for the specific reason that it encroached on an area of competence of the German Democratic Republic) (as noted here). In the one exception to this rule (as noted here), the communication was said to encroach on an area of responsibility reserved for the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communication from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 9 November 1981) and the German Democratic Republic (both re: security and status).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 November 1947; declaration upon accession (deposited 4 October 1974) of the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 July 1974, and reaffirming position, 13 February 1975), the German Democratic Republic (received 12 August 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 16 August 1974) (re: security and status).

- International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 July 1974, and reaffirming position, 13 February 1975), the German Democratic Republic (received 12 August 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 16 August 1974) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979; communication from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 15 April 1986) and the German Democratic Republic (received 22 April 1987) (both re: security and status).

- Convention Relating to the Status of Stateless Persons, 28 September 1954; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 13 October 1976) (re: security and status).

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 4 December 1973) and the German Democratic Republic (accompanying the instrument of acceptance, deposited 16 July 1974) (both re: status).

- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 4 December 1973) and the German Democratic Republic (accompanying the instrument of acceptance, deposited 16 July 1974) (both re: status).

- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960; communication upon accession (deposited 15 March 1977) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; declaration upon accession (deposited 27 December 1973) of the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; declarations upon accession from the Governments of the German Democratic Republic (deposited 27 December 1973) and Hungary (deposited 19 July 1979) (re: government).

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be fitted and/or be used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; declaration upon accession (deposited 4 October 1974) of the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government) and communication upon accession (deposited 10 December 1986) of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (re: *"Land"* and government).

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication (no date available) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication (no date available) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication (no date available) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communication from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (received 8 October 1976) (re: area of competence of the German Democratic Republic).

- European Agreement on Main International Arteries, 15 November 1975; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 14 December 1982, and reaffirming position, 2 December 1985) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953; communication (received 27 December 1973) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957; communications from the Governments of Czechoslovakia (received 30 May 1974) and the German Democratic Republic (received 16 July 1974) (both re: security and status).

- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962; communication upon accession (deposited 16 July 1974) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: government).

- Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953; communications from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to the United Nations (received 4 December

1973) and the Government of the German Democratic Republic (upon acceptance, deposited 16 July 1974) (both re: government and security and status).

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 9 November 1981) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 21 July 1977) (re: security and status), the German Democratic Republic (received 22 December 1978) (re: government), Czechoslovakia (received 25 April 1979) (re: security and status) and Hungary (27 November 1979) (re: security and status).

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communication upon accession (deposited 20 February 1975) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic (re: both government and security and status).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 December 1983) and the German Democratic Republic (received 23 January 1984) (both re: area of responsibility reserved for the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States).

6. For a number of other amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols (noted here), the initial communication from the Federal Republic of Germany gave rise to communications to the effect that the application of the relevant instrument to West Berlin would be considered valid only to the extent that it was in conformity with the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement described at point 5.

- Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 30 March 1961; communication from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 3 May 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 6 August 1974), and declaration upon accession of the German Democratic Republic (deposited 2 December 1975).

- Convention on Psychotropic substances, 21 February 1971; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 18 April 1977) and the German Democratic Republic (received 8 July 1977).

- Protocol amending the Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs, 1961, 25 March 1972; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 9 June 1975).

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communication from the Government of Czechoslovakia (received 6 December 1973).

- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communication from the Government of Czechoslovakia (received 6 December 1973).

- Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 13 June 1976; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 January 1978).

- Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 8 April 1979; declaration from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985).

- Amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 14 November 1975 and 9 November 1977; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 10 February 1978).

- Amendments to articles 17, 18, 20 and 51 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 November 1979; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 10 February 1978).

- Convention on the measurement of inland navigation vessels, 15 February 1966; declaration upon accession (deposited 31 August 1976) from the Government of the German Democratic Republic.

- Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 24 May 1974) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 6 August 1974).

- Convention on the High Seas, 29 April 1958; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 November 1973), Czechoslovakia (received 6 December 1973), the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (13 February 1974) and the German Democratic Republic (received 27 December 1973).

- Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes, 29 April 1958. Communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 5 November 1973), Czechoslovakia (6 December 1973) and the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 13 February 1974).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 20 April 1983), the German Democratic Republic (received 28 July 1983) and Poland (received 19 July 1985).

7. For some of the amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols noted in point 6 (as listed here), the communications noted for them at that point, which stated that the application of the relevant instrument to West Berlin would be considered valid only to the extent that it was in conformity with the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement, provoked responding communications. These responding communications made the point that a misleading reference had been made in the preceding communications to the statement in the Agreement that West Berlin continues "not to be [a] constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and not to be governed by it.".

- Agreement establishing the International Fund for Agricultural Development, 13 June 1976; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 11 July 1978) (re: misleading reference).

- Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 8 April 1979; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 29 October 1986) (re: misleading reference).

8. For the amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols noted in point 5 (as listed here), and for a number of such instruments noted in point 3 (as listed here), some of the related communications objecting to the initial declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany on the basis of the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement or otherwise gave rise to further communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (as noted here). At the essence of these communications was, in one case (as noted here), a denial that the material content of the relevant instrument could affect matters of security and status, and in all cases, the claim that the extension of the relevant instrument by the

Federal Republic of Germany was valid and continued to have full effect because it had received proper prior authorization from the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States which had followed established procedures endorsed under the Agreement to ensure matters of security and status were not affected, and integral elements of the Agreement allowed for the limited extension of instruments to West Berlin where matters of security and status were not affected. Communications of this nature were often followed closely by communications from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken (as noted here).

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974), and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 5 November 1974) (including denial re: security and status) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 6 December 1974).

- International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 5 November 1974) (including denial re: security and status) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 6 December 1974).

- Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Discrimination Against Women, 18 December 1979; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 20 March 1987).

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 July 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 27 August 1974).

- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 July 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 27 August 1974).

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974 and 26 July 1984) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974 and 27 August 1984).

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- European Agreement on Main International Arteries, 15 November 1975; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 26 July 1984, and reaffirming position, 29 October 1986) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 23 August 1984).

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (received 10 December 1973) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (also received 10 December 1973).

- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (received 10 December 1973) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (also received 10 December 1973).

- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication from the Permanent Representatives of France, the United Kingdom and the Acting Permanent Representative of the United States of America to the United Nations (received 10 December 1973) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (also received 10 December 1973).

- Convention on the Political Rights of Women, 31 March 1953; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 June 1974) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 July 1974).

- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Protocol amending the Slavery Convention signed at Geneva on 25 September 1926, 7 December 1953; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 17 July 1974 and 8 July 1975) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 27 August 1974 and 19 September 1975).

- International Convention against the taking of hostages, 17 December 1979; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 4 June 1982) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 12 August 1982).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic

Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 7 December 1977) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 13 February 1978).

9. For a number of the instruments noted in points 5 and 8 (as listed here), the relevant communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom, the United States of America, and the Federal Republic of Germany gave rise to further communications from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (noted here), and in some cases also the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (also noted here). These communications expressed solidarity with the position taken by the Government of the German Democratic Republic in the communications noted in point 5, and/or emphasized similar objections to those referred to in point 5 regarding the impropriety and invalidity of the use of the term *"Land"* in extending the relevant instrument to West Berlin (as noted here). In some cases, the communications also reasserted the breach of the "security and status" provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement described in point 5 (as noted here). In exceptional cases, rather than expressing solidarity with the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the communications expressed the same conditional acceptance of the extension of the relevant instrument to West Berlin as described in point 6 (as noted here).

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and *"Land"*).

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and *"Land"*).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and *"Land"*).

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic (received 19 September 1974) (both re: solidarity and *"Land"*).

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985) (re: *"Land"* and security and status).

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communication (received 12 September 1974, and reaffirming position, 8 December 1975) (re: solidarity and *"Land"*) from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

- Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 6 March 1948; communication from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 16 April 1974) (re: conditional acceptance).

- Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 15 September 1964; communication from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 16 April 1974) (re: conditional acceptance).

- Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, 28 September 1965; communication from the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 16 April 1974) (re: conditional acceptance).

10. For some of the instruments noted at point 9 (as listed here), the communications from the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, which had expressed solidarity with the German Democratic Republic and protested the extension of the relevant instrument to *"Land Berlin"*, provoked responding communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (noted here). In essence, the communications responding to those of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics asserted that the extension of the relevant instrument by the Federal Republic of Germany was valid and continued to have full effect for the same reasons of proper authorization detailed in point 6, and also defended the legitimacy under the Quadripartite Agreement of the terminology (*"Land Berlin"*) used by the Federal Republic of Germany in its extension of the relevant instrument to the Western Sectors of Berlin. The communications responding to those of the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic asserted that this Government was not competent to comment authoritatively on the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement because it was not a party to the agreement. The communications were followed closely by communications from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America re: authorization and terminology (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republics respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide, 9 December 1948; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America re: authorization and terminology (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 7 March 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957; communications from the Governments of France, the United

Kingdom and the United States of America (two received 8 July 1975) (responding to the preceding communications of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics and the Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic respectively), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

11. For a number of the amendments, agreements, conventions or protocols noted in points 5, 6, 8 and 9, relevant communications provoked further communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America with different combinations of content to those described above (noted here). These communications made, in one case (as noted here) a denial of the Government of the German Democratic Republic's assertion of competence for the subject matter of the relevant instrument (as noted here), and in all cases: the same assertion regarding the authorization of the extension of the relevant instrument by the Federal Republic of Germany as described in points 6 and 10 (as noted here); and/or the same assertion regarding the use of terminology in that assertion as described in point 10 (as noted here); and/or the same assertion regarding the competence of the makers of the preceding communications as described in point 10; and/or the same allegation regarding the making of a misleading reference to the Quadripartite Agreement as described in point 7 (as noted here). Each variety of communication was followed closely by communications from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken (as noted here).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 June 1982) (re: authorization and competence), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 16 August 1982).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialised Agencies, 21 November 1947; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- International Convention on Civil and Political Rights, 16 December 1966; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Protocol to amend the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women and Children, concluded at Geneva on 30 September 1921, and the Convention for the Suppression of the Traffic in Women of Full Age, concluded at Geneva on 11 October 1933, 12 November 1947; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Protocol amending the International Agreement for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 18 May 1904, and the International Convention for the Suppression of the White Slave Traffic, signed at Paris on 4 May 1910, 4 May 1949; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 6 October 1986) (re: authorization and misleading reference) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 15 January 1987).

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 30 October 1987) (re: authorization and terminology) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 23 December 1987).

- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 13 June 1977) (including denial of the Government of the German Democratic Republic's assertion of competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 July 1977).

- Convention on the Nationality of Married Women, 20 February 1957; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and authorization), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 19 September 1975).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 21 August 1979) (re: competence), and from the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 18 October 1979).

- Convention on the High Seas, 29 April 1958; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 8 July 1975) (re: competence and misleading reference).

- Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 10 June 1958; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 26 January 1976) (reaffirming previous communications regarding other instruments re: competence and terminology, and competence and authorization respectively) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 24 February 1976).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 2 July 1984) (re: authorization and competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 5 June 1985).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communication from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 27 April 1984) (re: misleading reference and competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 13 June 1984).

12. For some of the instruments noted at point 11 (as listed here), the relevant communications asserting the lack of competence of the makers of the preceding communications to comment on the provisions of the Quadripartite Agreement gave rise to further communications from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics or the maker itself (as noted here) rejecting these assertions as unfounded. In one case (as

noted here), the responding communication of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics expressed support for the maker's preceding claim of competence (noted at point 5) in relation to the subject matter of the relevant instrument as a basis for comment on the Agreement. In the other cases, the responding communications reaffirmed the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics' own objections to or conditional acceptance of the extension of the relevant instrument to West Berlin described in points 5 and 6 and/or asserted the indisputable right of other parties to the instrument to express an opinion on the matter (as noted here).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 29 December 1982) (re: previous objections and indisputable right).

- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communications from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 18 October 1977) (re: claim of competence).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communication from the Government of Czechoslovakia (received 25 January 1980) (re: indisputable right).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985) (re: indisputable right).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communication from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (received 2 December 1985) (re: conditional acceptance and indisputable right).

13. For the instruments noted at point 12 (listed again here), the communications in reply from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics gave rise to further communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (noted here). These communications reaffirmed the positions described in point 11, in one case (as noted here) making an assertion of factual error in the communication of the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, and in the others (as noted here), with respect to the competence of non-parties to the Quadripartite Agreement to comment on its provisions, emphasizing that the Agreement was part of conventional, not customary international law. In two cases the communication was followed closely by a communication from the Federal Republic of Germany indicating its solidarity with the position taken (as noted here).

- Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations, 13 February 1946; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 7 July 1983) (re: competence).

- Convention relating to the unification of certain rules concerning collisions in inland navigation, 15 March 1960; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 21 April 1978) (re: factual error) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 30 May 1978).

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 18 February 1982) (re: competence) and the Federal Republic of Germany in support (received 2 April 1982).

- Convention on the prohibition of military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques, 10 December 1976; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 6 October 1986) (re: competence).

- Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, 13 November 1979; communications from the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States of America (received 28 July 1986) (re: competence).

14. Finally, it should be noted that on 3 October 1990 the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of Hungary indicating that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day [3 October 1990], it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, declarations made by it with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to *"Land Berlin"* of the instruments listed here.

- Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, 18 April 1961.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, Concerning Acquisition of Nationality, 18 April 1961.

- Protocol Amending the Agreements, Conventions and Protocols on Narcotic Drugs, concluded at the Hague on 23 January 1912, at Geneva on 11 February 1925, 19 February 1925 and 13 July 1931, at Bangkok on 27 November 1931 and Geneva on 26 June 1936.

- Protocol Bringing under International Control Drugs Outside the Scope of the Convention of 13 July 1931 for Limiting the Manufacture and Regulating the Distribution of Narcotic Drugs, as amended by the Protocol signed at Lake Success, New York, on 11 December 1946, 19 November 1948.

- Constitution of the World Health Organization, 22 July 1946.

- Customs Convention on Containers, 18 May 1956.

- Customs Convention on the Temporary Importation of Commercial Road Vehicles, 18 May 1956.

- European Convention on Customs Treatment of Pallets used in International Transport, 9 December 1960.

- European Agreement on Road Markings, 13 December 1957.

- Convention on the Contract for the International Carriage of Goods by Road (CMR), 19 May 1956.

- European Agreement concerning the International Carriage of Dangerous Goods by Road (ADR), 30 September 1957.

- Agreement concerning the Adoption of Uniform Technical Prescriptions for Wheeled Vehicles, Equipment and Parts which can be Fitted and/or be Used on Wheeled Vehicles and the Conditions for Reciprocal Recognition of Approvals Granted on the Basis of These Prescriptions, 20 March 1958.

- Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, 10 December 1962.

- Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, 14 December 1973.

15. See Note at point 2 above:

- Annex I - International Labour Organisation (ILO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 10 July 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 29 November 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 20 November 1959 (application deposited 23 May 1963).

- Second revised text of Annex II - Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations (FAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 8 December 1965 (application deposited 11 June 1985).

- Annex III - International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 21 June 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex IV - United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 7 February 1949 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex V - International Monetary Fund (IMF) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 11 April 1949 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex VI - International Bank for Reconstruction and Development (IBRD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 19 April 1949 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 17 July 1948 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Second revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 27 May 1957 (application deposited 5 September 1958).

- Third revised text of Annex VII - World Health Organization (WHO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 17 July 1959 (application deposited 11 February 1959).

- Annex VIII - Universal Postal Union (UPU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 25 May 1949 (application deposited 19 May 1958).

- Annex IX - International Telecommunication Union (ITU) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 6 October 1950 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex XI - World Meteorological Organization (WMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 17 April 1951 (application deposited 10 October 1957).

- Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 16 January 1959 (application deposited 12 January 1962).

- Revised text of Annex XII - International Maritime Organization (IMO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 16 May 1968 (application deposited 11 June 1985).

- Annex XIII - International Finance Corporation (IFC) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 2 April 1959 (application deposited 12 April 1962).

- Annex XIV - International Development Association (IDA) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 13 February 1962 (application deposited 11 June 1985).

- Annex XV - World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 4 October 1977 (application deposited 20 August 1979).

- Annex XVI - International Fund for Agricultural Development (IFAD) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 16 December 1977 (application deposited 20 August 1979).

- Annex XVII - United Nations Development Organization (UNIDO) - to the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the Specialized Agencies, 3 July 1987 (application deposited 3 March 1989).

Note 2.

In a communication dated 3 October 1990, the Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Federal Republic of Germany notified the Secretary-General of the following:

". . . Through the accession of the German Democratic Republic to the Federal Republic of Germany with effect from 3 October 1990, the two German States have united to form one sovereign State, which as a single Member of the United Nations remains bound by the provisions of the Charter in accordance with the solemn declaration of 12 June 1973. As from the date of unification, the Federal Republic of Germany will act in the United Nations under the designation 'Germany'."

The former German Democratic Republic was admitted to the Organization on 18 September 1973 by Resolution No. 3050 (XXVIII). For the text of the declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter dated 12 June 1973 made by the German Democratic Republic (registered under No. 12758), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 891, p. 103.

Consequently, and in the light of articles 11 and 12 of the Treaty of 31 August 1990 (Unification Treaty) between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e., signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the Federal Republic of Germany will now appear under "Germany" and indicate the dates of such formalities.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities had been effected by both the Federal Republic of Germany and the former German Democratic Republic prior to unification, the entry will similarly indicate in the corresponding table the type of formality effected by the Federal Republic of Germany and the date on which it took place, while the type of formality effected by the former German Democratic Republic and the date thereof will appear in a footnote.

Finally, as regards the treatment of treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by the former German Democratic Republic alone, article 12, para. 3 of the Unification Treaty contains the following provision: "Should the united Germany intend to accede to international organizations or other multilateral treaties of which the German Democratic Republic but not the Federal Republic of Germany is a member, agreement shall be reached with the respective contracting parties and with the European Communities where the latter's competence is affected". Accordingly, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former German Democratic Republic will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "*Participant*".

GREECE

Note 1.

On 25 January 1995, the Secretary-General received a communication dated 20 January 1995 from the Government of Greece which reads as follows:

The Government of the Hellenic Republic declares that the accession of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Conventions deposited with the Secretary-General to which the Hellenic Republic is also a contracting party does not imply recognition of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia by the Hellenic Republic.

This statement shall apply to all Conventions or other international Agreements deposited with the Secretary-General to

which the Hellenic Republic and the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia are parties.

See also note 1 under "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia".

Hong Kong

See note 2 under "China" and "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland".

Indonesia

Note 1.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 20 January 1965, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that "Indonesia has decided at this stage and under the present circumstances to withdraw from the United Nations". In his reply of 26 February 1965, after noting the contents of the letter from the Government of Indonesia, the Secretary-General expressed "the earnest hope that in due time [Indonesia] will resume full co-operation with the United Nations". For the text of the letter from Indonesia and the Secretary-General's reply, see document A/5857 and Corr.1 and A/5899.

In a telegram of 19 September 1966, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that it "has decided to resume full co-operation with the United Nations and to resume participation in its activities starting with the twenty-first session of the General Assembly". For the text of that telegram, see document A/6419.

At the 1420th plenary meeting of the General Assembly held on 28 September 1966, the President of the General Assembly, referring to the above-mentioned correspondence and to the decision of the Government of Indonesia "to resume full co-operation with the United Nations", stated, inter alia, that "it would appear, therefore, that the Government of Indonesia considers that its recent absence from the Organization was based not upon a withdrawal from the United Nations but upon a cessation of co-operation. The action so far taken by the United Nations on this matter would not appear to preclude this view. If this is also the general view of the membership, the Secretary-General would give instructions for the necessary administrative action to be taken for Indonesia to participate again in the proceedings of the Organization . . . Unless I hear any objection, I would assume that it is the will of the membership that Indonesia should resume full participation in the activities of the United Nations and the Secretary-General may proceed in the manner I have outlined." There having been no objection, the President invited the representatives of Indonesia to take their seats in the General Assembly *(See Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Plenary Meetings, 1420th meeting.)*

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Note 1.

By a communication received on 4 November 1982, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran notified the Secretary-General that the designation "Iran (Islamic Republic of)" should henceforth be used.

Lao People's Democratic Republic

Note 1.

Formerly: "Laos" until 22 December 1975.

Latvia

Note 1.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 26 February 1993, the Minister of Foreign Affairs of Latvia informed the Secretary-General that "Latvia does not regard itself as party by virtue of the doctrine of treaty succession to any bilateral or multilateral treaties entered into by the former USSR."

Libyan Arab Jamahiriya

Note 1.

By two communications dated 1 and 18 April 1977, respectively, the Permanent Mission of the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya informed the Secretary-General that the official designation "Socialist People's Libyan Arab Jamahiriya" (short title: "Libyan Arab Jamahiriya") should be substituted for "Libyan Arab Republic". (Before 6 January 1971: "Libya".)

Lithuania

Note 1.

On 23 June 1995, the Secretary-General received a letter, dated 22 June 1995 and signed by the Permanent Representative of the Government of Lithuania to the United Nations, transmitting a note from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs declaring the following:

".... The Republic of Lithuania was occupied by the USSR on the 15th of June 1940. Many Western countries did not recognize the incorporation of the Republic of Lithuania into the USSR.

Having restored its independence on the 11th of March 1990, the Republic of Lithuania neither is nor can be the successor state of the former USSR. The Republic of Lithuania can not take the responsibility for the treaties concluded by the former USSR, for it neither participated in making those treaties nor influenced them. Therefore the Republic of Lithuania can not take the responsibility for the past treaties concluded by the USSR ."

Macao

Note 1.

At its 3rd plenary meeting, on 4 February 2000, the Economic and Social Council decided to amend paragraphs 2 and 4 of the terms of reference of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific by changing the English-language spelling of "Macau, China" to Macao, China."

See also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal".

Malaysia

Note 1.

On 16 September 1963, the Permanent Representative of Malaysia to the United Nations addressed to the Secretary-General the following communication:

"By the Constitutional process of Amendment provided for in Article 159 of the Constitution of the Federation of Malaya carried out recently in both Houses of Parliament with the requisite two-thirds majorities, the name of the State as set out in Article 1 thereof has been changed from `Federation of Malaya' to `Malaysia'.

"This Mission has therefore from this date assumed the name of `Permanent Mission of Malaysia to the United Nations'.

"I shall be grateful for your having this change noted and also for your bringing it to the notice of all Missions accredited to the United Nations."

Subsequently, the Government of Malaysia confirmed to the Secretary-General that all multilateral treaties, in respect of which he acts as depositary and to which the Federation of Ma-

laysia has become a party either by succession or by ratification or accession, continue to be binding on Malaysia, and that henceforth Malaysia should be listed in the relevant United Nations publications as a party to those treaties.

MALDIVES

Note 1.

In a letter of 14 April 1969, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of Maldives to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that "after the change from a Sultanate to a Republican Administration, the Maldivian Government has decided that the country be known as `Maldives' instead of `Maldive Islands' and that the full title of the State be called `Republic of Maldives'".

MONTENEGRO

Note 1.

The National Assembly of the Republic of Montenegro adopted its Declaration of Independence on 3 June 2006, following the referendum in the Republic of Montenegro on 21 May 2006, which took place pursuant to Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro. Montenegro was admitted to membership in the United Nations by General Assembly resolution A/RES/60/264 on 28 June 2006.

In a letter dated 10 October 2006, received by the Secretary-General on 23 October 2006 and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Republic of Montenegro notified that:

"[The Government of]...the Republic of Montenegro decided to succeed to the treaties to which the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro was a party or signatory.

[The Government of]...the Republic of Montenegro succeeds to the treaties listed in the attached Annex and undertakes faithfully to perform and carry out the stipulations therein contained as from June 3rd 2006, which is the date the Republic of Montenegro assumed responsibility for its international relations and the Parliament of Montenegro adopted the Declaration of Independence.

[The Government of]...the Republic of Montenegro does maintain the reservations, declarations and objections made by Serbia and Montenegro, as indicated in the Annex to this instrument, prior to the date on which the Republic of Montenegro assumed responsibility for its international relations."

See also notes 1 under "Serbia" and "Serbia and Montenegro".

MICRONESIA (FEDERATED STATES OF)

Note 1.

On 11 August 1992, the Secretary-General transmitted the following declaration dated 22 May 1992 emanating from the Secretary of External Affairs of the Federated States of Micronesia to the Secretary-General containing a declaration setting out the position of the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia (FSM) with regard to international agreements entered into by the United States of America and made applicable to the FSM pursuant to the United Nations Trusteeship Agreement for the former Japanese Mandated islands:

"On November 3, 1986, the application of treaties and international agreements to the Federated States of Micronesia by virtue of the application of treaties by the United States of America to the United Nations Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands, ceased. With regard to all bilateral treaties validly concluded by the United States on behalf of the Federated States of Micronesia, or validly applied or extended by the former to the latter before November 3, 1986, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia declares that it will examine each such treaty and communicate its view to the other State Party concerned. In the meantime, the Federated States of Micronesia will continue to observe the terms of each treaty which validly so applies and is not inconsistent with the letter or the spirit of the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia, provisionally and on a basis of reciprocity. The period of examination will extend until November 3, 1995, except in the case of any treaty in respect of which an earlier statement of views is or has been made. At the expiration of that period, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia will consider such of these treaties that could not by the application of the rules of customary international law be regarded as otherwise surviving, as having terminated.

It is the earnest hope of the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia that during the afore-mentioned period of examination, the normal processes of diplomatic negotiations will enable it to reach satisfactory accord with the States Parties concerned upon the possibility of the continuance or modification of such treaties.

With regard to multilateral treaties previously applied, the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia intends to review each of them individually and to communicate to the depositary in each case what steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation or termination, confirmation of succession or accession. During such period of review, any party to a multilateral treaty that has, prior to November 3, 1986, been validly applied or extended to the Federated States of Micronesia and is not inconsistent with the letter or spirit of the Constitution of the Federated States of Micronesia may, on a basis of reciprocity, rely as against the Federated States of Micronesia on the terms of such treaty."

Further, on 15 November 1995, the Secretary-General circulated a communication dated 2 November 1995 from the Government of the Federated States of Micronesia indicating that it had decided to extend the period of examination of the bilateral treaties indicated in its letter of 22 May 1992 for two additional years or until 3 November 1997.

MYANMAR

Note 1.

Formerly: "Burma" until 17 June 1989.

As mentioned in the latest official list of the League of Nations, Burma, which was formerly a part of India, was separated from the latter on 1 April 1937 and had possessed since that time the status of an overseas territory of the United Kingdom. It was as such that Burma continued to be bound by a ratification or accession to various multilateral treaties recorded on behalf of India.

NAMIBIA

Note 1.

Formerly: "Namibia (United Nations Council for Namibia)" until independence (21 March 1990).

The legal status of the United Nations Council for Namibia for the purpose of its participation in treaties was an issue during the period prior to Namibia's assuming responsibility for its international relations and becoming a member State of the United Nations. The Council for Namibia was established as a subsidiary organ of the General Assembly by resolution 2248 (S-V) of 19 May 1967. As a subsidiary organ, it was responsible to, and under the authority of, the General Assembly in the same way as any other subsidiary organ. Unlike other subsidiary organs, however, the Council functioned in a dual capacity: as a policy-making organ of the General Assembly and as the legal Administering Authority of a Trust Territory. This latter characteristic of the Council distinguished it from other United Nations subsidiary organs and it could, therefore, be considered an

organ sui generis for certain purposes. As the legal Administering Authority, the Council was expressly endowed by the General Assembly with certain competences and functions to be exercised on behalf of Namibia in terms comparable to that of a Government, inter alia, to represent Namibia internationally. Even though South Africa continued, at the time, to exercise de facto control over the Territory, the essential element was that the Council had the de jure competence, inter alia, to enact any necessary laws and recognitions. Indeed, the Council became a party to many treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, such as the International Convention on the Elimination of All Forms of Racial Discrimination, 1966; the International Convention on the Suppression and Punishment of the Crime of Apartheid, 1973; the Constitution of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization, 1979; and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1982.

NETHERLANDS

Note 1.

By a communication received on 30 December 1985, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that "the island of Aruba which was a part of the Netherlands Antilles would obtain internal autonomy as a separate country within the Kingdom of the Netherlands as of 1 January 1986". The said change would have no consequence in international law. The treaties concluded by the Kingdom which applied to the Netherlands Antilles, including Aruba, would continue, after 1 January 1986 to apply to the Netherlands Antilles (of which Aruba is no longer a part) and to Aruba.

NETHERLANDS ANTILLES

See note 1 under "Netherlands".

NEW ZEALAND

Note 1.

In a communication dated 10 April 2002, the Government of New Zealand confirmed the following in respect of Tokelau:

"Consistent with international law, New Zealand regards all treaty actions as extending to Tokelau as a non-self-governing territory of New Zealand unless express provision to the contrary is included in the relevant treaty instrument."

See notes 1 under "Cook Islands" and "Niue".

NICARAGUA

See note 1 under "Costa Rica".

NIUE

Note 1.

Formerly administered by New Zealand, the Cook Islands and Niue currently have the status of self-governing States in free association with New Zealand.

The responsibility of the Cook Islands and Niue to conduct their own international relations and particularly to conclude treaties has evolved substantially over the years. For a period of time it was considered that, in view of the fact that the Cook Island and Niue, though self-governing, had entered into special relationships with New Zealand, which discharged the responsibilities for the external relations and defence of the Cook Islands and Niue at their request, it followed that the Cook Islands and Niue did not have their own treaty making capacity.

However, in 1984, an application by the Cook Islands for membership in the World Health Organization was approved by the World Health Assembly in accordance with its article 6, and the Cook Islands, in accordance with article 79, became a member upon deposit of an instrument of acceptance with the Secretary-General. In the circumstances, the Secretary-General felt that the question of the status, as a State, of the Cook Islands, had been duly decided in the affirmative by the World Heath Assembly, whose membership was fully respresentative of the international community.

On the basis of the Cook Islands' membership in the World Health Organization, and of its subsequent admittance to other specialized agencies (Food and Agriculture Organization in 1985, United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1985 and the International Civil Aviation Organization in 1986) as a full member without any specifications or limitations, the Secretary-General considered that the Cook Islands could participate in a treaty in its own right as a State. Consequently, the Cook Islands signed the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Convention on Biological Diversity in 1992.

The same solution was adopted by the Secretary-General following the approval of Niue's application for membership in the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization in 1993 and of the World Health Organization in 1994.

As a result of these developments, the Secretary-General, as depositary of multilateral treaties, recognized the full treaty-making capacity of the Cook Islands in 1992 and of Niue in 1994.

PALAU

Note 1.

In a letter dated 10 November 1994, the President of the Republic of Palau stated, *inter alia*:

"... With regard to multilateral treaties previously applied, the Government of the Republic of Palau intends to review each of them individually and to communicate to the depositary in each case what steps it wishes to take, whether by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession or accession. During such period of review, any party to a multilateral treaty that has, prior to termination of the Trusteeship Agreement with respect to the Republic of Palau may, on a basis of reciprocity, rely as against the Republic of Palau on the terms of such treaty."

PALESTINE

Note 1.

Agreements adopted under the auspices of the Economic and Social Commission for Western Asia (ESCWA) are open for signature by the members of ESCWA. Palestine was admitted to membership in ESCWA pursuant to ECOSOC resolution 2089 (LXIII) dated 22 July 1977, which amended paragraph 2 of the terms of reference of the Commission. Full powers for the signature of the Agreements were issued by the Chairman of the Executive Council of the Palestine Liberation Organization and the President of the Palestinian National Authority.

PORTUGAL

Note 1.

On 18 November 1999, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal, the following communication:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international respsnsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of [Conventions] to Macau."

See also note 3 under "China".

Russian Federation

Note 1.

By a communication dated 24 December 1991, the President of the Russian Federation notified the Secretary-General that membership of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (USSR) in the United Nations is being continued by the Russian Federation.

The Government of the Russian Federation subsequently informed the Secretary-General that as at 24 December 1991, the Russian Federation maintains full responsibility for all the rights and obligations of the USSR under the Charter of the United Nations and multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General and requested that the name "Russian Federation" be used in the United Nations in place of the name "Union of Soviet Socialist Republics".

Saint Kitts and Nevis

Note 1.

Formerly: "Saint Christopher and Nevis" until 28 December 1986.

Serbia

Note 1.

As from 3 June 2006: "Serbia". Formerly: "Serbia and Montenegro" until 2 June 2006.

The Republic of Serbia continued the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations, including all organs and organizations of the United Nations system, on the basis of Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro, activated by the Declaration of Independence adopted by the National Assembly of Montenegro on 3 June 2006. Accordingly, by a letter dated 3 June 2006, the President of the Republic of Serbia notified the Secretary-General that "membership of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro is continued by the Republic of Serbia in the United Nations, including all organs and organizations of the United Nations system...".

Subsequently, in a letter dated 16 June 2006, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia informed the Secretary-General that "the Republic of Serbia continues to exercise its rights and honour its commitments deriving from international treaties concluded by Serbia and Montenegro. Therefore, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs requests that the Republic of Serbia be considered a party to all international agreements in force, instead of Serbia and Montenegro. Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Serbia will perform the functions formerly performed by the Council of ministers of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro as depositary for the corresponding multilateral treaties." Moreover, in a letter dated 30 June 2006, the Minister for Foreign Affaires of the Republic of Serbia confirmed that "all treaty actions undertaken by Serbia and Montenegro will continue in force with respect to the Republic of Serbia with effect from 3 June 2006. Therefore, all declarations, reservations and notifications made by Serbia and Montenegro will be maintained by the Republic of Serbia until the Secretary-General, as depositary, is duly notified otherwise."

See "Montenegro" and "Serbia and Montenegro".

Serbia and Montenegro

Note 1.

As from 4 February 2003 until 2 June 2006. Formerly: "Yugoslavia" until 3 February 2003.

See also "Montenegro", "Serbia" and "Yugoslavia".

Slovakia

Note 1.

In a letter dated 19 May 1993 and also accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, received by the Secretary-General on 28 May 1993, the Government of the Slovak Republic notified that:

"In accordance with the relevant principles and rules of international law and to the extent defined by it, the Slovak Republic, as a successor State, born from the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, considers itself bound, as of January 1, 1993, i.e., the date on which the Slovak Republic assumed responsibility for its international relations, by multilateral treaties to which the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was a party as of 31 December 1992, including reservations and declarations made earlier by Czechoslovakia, as well as objections by Czechoslovakia to reservations formulated by other treaty-parties.

The Slovak Republic wishes further to maintain its status as a contracting State of the treaties to which Czechoslovakia was a contracting State and which were not yet in force at the date of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, as well as the status of a signatory State of the treaties which were previously signed but not ratified by Czechoslovakia as listed in the Annex to this letter."

In view of the information above, entries in status lists pertaining to formalities (i.e., signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the former Czechoslovakia prior to dissolution, in respect of treaties to which the Czech Republic and/or Slovakia have succeeded, will be replaced by the name of "Czech Republic" and/or "Slovakia" with the corresponding date of deposit of the notification of succession. A footnote will indicate the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia, the corresponding indicator being inserted next to "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" as the case may be.

As regards treaties in respect of which formalities were effected by the former Czechoslovakia and not listed in the notification of succession by either the Czech Republic or Slovakia, a footnote indicating the date and type of formality effected by the former Czechoslovakia will be included in the status of the treaties concerned, the corresponding footnote indicator being inserted next to the heading "Participant".

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

Slovenia

Note 1.

In a letter dated 1 July 1992, received by the Secretary-General on the same date and accompanied by a list of multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, the Government of the Republic of Slovenia notified that:

"When declaring independence on 25 June, 1991 the Parliament of the Republic of Slovenia determined that international treaties which had been concluded by the SFRY [Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia] and which related to the Republic of Slovenia remained effective on its territory (Article 3 of the Constitutional Law on the implementation of the Constitutional

Charter on the Independence and Sovereignty of the Republic of Slovenia...). This decision was taken in consideration of customary international law and of the fact that the Republic of Slovenia, as a former constituent part of the Yugoslav Federation, had granted its agreement to the ratification of the international treaties in accordance with the then valid constitutional provisions.

The Republic of Slovenia therefore in principle acknowledges the continuity of treaty rights and obligations under the international treaties concluded by the SFRY before 25 June 1991, but since it is likely that certain treaties may have lapsed by the date of independence of Slovenia or may be outdated, it seems essential that each treaty be subjected to legal examination.

The Government of the Republic of Slovenia has examined 55 multilateral treaties for which [the Secretary-General of the United Nations] ...has assumed the depositary functions. ...[T]he Republic of Slovenia considers to be bound by these treaties by virtue of succession to the SFR Yugoslavia in respect of the territory of the Republic of Slovenia...

Other treaties, for which the Secretary-General of the United Nations is the depositary and which had been ratified by the SFRY, have not yet been examined by the competent authorities of the Republic of Slovenia. [The Government of the Republic of Slovenia] will inform [the Secretary-General] ...on [its] ...position concerning these treaties in due course."

See also "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

South Africa

Note 1.

Formerly: "Union of South Africa" until 31 May 1961.

Sri Lanka

Note 1.

Formerly: "Ceylon" until 29 August 1972.

Suriname

Note 1.

Formerly: "Surinam" until 23 January 1978.

Syria

See note 1 under "United Arab Republic".

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Note 1.

The Government of The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia deposited with the Secretary-General notifications of succession to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to various treaties with effect from 17 September 1991, the date on which it assumed responsibility for its international relations.

See also note 1 under "Greece" and note 1 under "former Yugoslavia".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

Tokelau

See note 1 under "New Zealand".

Uganda

Note 1.

Re: Single Convention on Narcotic Drugs: In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 15 February 1972, the Chargé d'Affaires a.i. of the Republic of Uganda to the United Nations informed him of the following:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of Uganda that in ratifying the said Convention, the Government of Portugal did not purport to act on behalf of Angola, Mozambique and Guinea-Bissau which are distinct and separate political entities for which Portugal lacks any legal, moral or political capacity to represent."

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 25 April 1972, the Permanent Representative of Portugal to the United Nations informed him as follows with respect to the above-mentioned communication:

"The Government of Portugal is surprised that communications containing meaningless statements such as that from the Chargé d'Affaires of Uganda should be circulated, since they show clear ignorance of the fact that Portugal was admitted to the membership of the United Nations with the territorial composition that it has today, and including Angola, Mozambique and Portuguese Guinea."

Ukraine

Note 1.

Formerly: "Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic" until 23 August 1991.

United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria)

Note 1.

By a communication dated 24 February 1958, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the establishment by Egypt and Syria of a single State, the United Arab Republic. Subsequently, in a note dated 1 March 1958, the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the United Arab Republic informed the Secretary-General of the following: "... It is to be noted that the Government of the United Arab Republic declares that the Union henceforth is a single Member of the United Nations, bound by the provisions of the Charter and that all international treaties and agreements concluded by Egypt or Syria with other countries will remain valid within the regional limits prescribed on their conclusion and in accordance with the principles of international law."

In a cable dated 8 October 1961, the Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic informed the President of the General Assembly of the United Nations that Syria had resumed her former status as an independent State and requested that the United Nations take note of the resumed membership in the United Nations of the Syrian Arab Republic. This request was brought to the attention of Member States by the President of the General Assembly at its 1035th plenary meeting on 13 October 1961. At the 1036th plenary meeting which took place on the same date, the President of the General Assembly stated that no objection having been received on the part of any Member State the delegation of the Syrian Arab Republic has taken its seat in the Assembly as a Member of the United Nations with all the obligations and rights that go with that status. In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 19 July 1962, the Permanent Representative of Syria to the United Nations communicated to him the text of decret-loi No. 25 promulgated by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic on 13 June 1962 and stated the following:

"It follows from article 2 of the text in question that obligations contracted by the Syrian Arab Republic under multilateral

agreements and conventions during the period of the Union with Egypt remain in force in Syria. The period of the Union between Syria and Egypt extends from 22 February 1958 to 27 September 1961."

Finally, in a communication dated 2 September 1971, the Permanent Representative of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the United Nations informed the Secretary-General that the United Arab Republic had assumed the name of Arab Republic of Egypt (Egypt), and, in a communication dated 13 September 1971, the Permanent Mission of the Syrian Arab Republic stated that the official name of Syria was "Syrian Arab Republic".

Accordingly, in so far as concerns any action taken by Egypt or subsequently by the United Arab Republic in respect of any instrument concluded under the auspices of the United Nations, the date of such action is shown in the list of States opposite the name of Egypt. The dates of actions taken by Syria prior to the formation of the United Arab Republic are shown opposite the name of the Syrian Arab Republic, as also are the dates of receipt of instrument of accession or notification of application to the Syrian Province deposited on behalf of the United Arab Republic during the time when the Syrian Arab Republic formed part of the United Arab Republic.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Note 1.

The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland was dissolved immediately before 1 January 1964. In reply to the Secretariat's inquiry as to the legal effect of that dissolution, in so far as concerns the application in the territories formerly constituting the Federation, i.e., Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia, of certain multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General which had been extended by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Federation or to any of the territories concerned prior to the formation of the Federation, and of the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material done at Geneva on 7 November 1952 (see chapter XI.A.5), to which the Federation acceded in its capacity of a Contracting Party to the General Agreement on Tariffs and Trade (see chapter X.1), the Government of the United Kingdom in a communication received on 16 April 1964, provided the following clarification:

"Her Majesty's Government consider that in general, multilateral treaties applicable to the Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland continued to apply to the constituent territories of the former Federation on its dissolution. Multilateral treaties under which the Federation enjoyed membership of international organisations fall in a special category; their continued application to the constituent territories of the former Federation depends in each case on the terms of the treaty. Her Majesty's Government regard all the conventions listed in the Secretariat's letter of February 26 as applying to the constituent territories of the former Federation since its dissolution, but the accession by the Federation to the International Convention to Facilitate the Importation of Commercial Samples and Advertising Material has not led to this result as Article XIII of the Convention allows Her Majesty's Government to extend provisions of the Convention to the three constituent territories of the former Federation if considered desirable.

"With regard to the final query by the Secretariat, I am to reply that extensions prior to the inauguration of the Federation do, of course, continue to apply to the constituent territories."

Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland and Southern Rhodesia have since become independent States under the names of Zambia, Malawi, and Zimbabwe, respectively.

Note 2.

On 10 June 1997, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the Government of the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date. Therefore, from that date the Government of the United Kingdom will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of [Conventions] to Hong Kong."

See also note 2 under "China".

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

Note 1.

The People's Republic of Zanzibar was admitted to membership on 16 December 1963 by Resolution No. 1975 (XVIII). For the text of the Declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter dated 10 December 1963 made by Zanzibar (registered under No. 7016), see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 483, p. 237.

In a note addressed to the Secretary General on 6 May 1964, the Ministry of External Affairs of the United Republic of Tanzania informed him that, following the signature and ratification of the Articles of Union between the Republic of Tanganyika and the People's Republic of Zanzibar, the two countries had been united on 26 April 1964, as one sovereign State under the name of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar. The Ministry further asked the Secretary-General "to note that the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar declares that it is now a single Member of the United Nations bound by the provisions of the Charter, and that all international treaties and agreements in force between the Republic of Tanganyika or the People's Republic of Zanzibar and other States or international organizations will, to the extent that their implementation is consistent with the constitutional position established by the Articles of the Union, remain in force within the regional limits prescribed on their conclusion and in accordance with the principles of international law".

In communicating the above-mentioned note, in accordance with the request contained therein, to all States Members of the United Nations, to the principal organs of the United Nations and to the subsidiary organs of the United Nations to which Tanganyika and Zanzibar had been appointed, and to the specialized agencies of the United Nations and the International Atomic Energy Agency, the Secretary-General stated that he "is taking action, within the limits of his administrative responsibilities, to give effect to the declaration in the attached note that the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar is now a single Member of the United Nations bound by the provisions of the Charter. This action is undertaken without prejudice to and pending such action as other organs of the United Nations may take on the basis of the notification of the establishment of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar." No objection was raised in this regard in any of the organs concerned.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 2 November 1964, the Permanent Mission of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar informed him that "the United Republic of Tanganika and Zanzibar shall, with immediate effect, be known as the United Republic of Tanzania".

Subsequently, the Government of the United Republic of Tanzania confirmed to the Secretary-General that the United Republic of Tanzania continues to be bound by multilateral

treaties in respect of which the Secretary-General acts as depositary and which had been signed, ratified or acceded to on behalf of Tanganyika.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Note 1.

As from 17 November 2004. Formerly: "Venezuela".

VIET NAM

Note 1.

The Democratic Republic of Viet-Nam and the Republic of South Viet-Nam (the latter of which replaced the Republic of Viet Nam) united on 2 July 1976 to constitute a new State, the Socialist Republic of Viet-Nam (Viet-Nam).

YEMEN

Note 1.

In a letter dated 19 May 1990, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the Yemen Arab Republic and the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen informed the Secretary-General of the following:

". . . The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic will merge in a single sovereign State called the Republic of Yemen' (short form: Yemen) with Sana'a as its capital, as soon as it is proclaimed on Tuesday, 22 May 1990. The Republic of Yemen will have single membership in the United Nations and be bound by the provisions of the Charter. All treaties and agreements concluded between either the Yemen Arab Republic or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and other States and international organizations in accordance with international law which are in force on 22 May 1990 will remain in effect, and international relations existing on 22 May 1990 between the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and the Yemen Arab Republic and other States will continue."

As concerns the treaties concluded prior to their union by the Yemen Arab Republic or the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, the Republic of Yemen (as now united) is accordingly to be considered as a party to those treaties as from the date when one of these States first became a party to those treaties. Accordingly the tables showing the status of treaties will now indicate under the designation "Yemen" the date of the formalities (signatures, ratifications, accessions, declarations and reservations, etc.) effected by the State which first became a party, those eventually effected by the other being described in a footnote.

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was admitted to the United Nations by Resolution No. 2310 (XXII) of 14 December 1967 registered under No. 8861. For the text of the declaration of acceptance of the obligations contained in the Charter of the United Nations made by the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 614, p. 21. The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen was successively listed in the previous editions as "Southern Yemen", "People's Republic of Southern Yemen", "People's Democratic Republic of Yemen" and "Democratic Republic of Yemen".

YUGOSLAVIA

Note 1.

By a notification dated 8 March 2001, received by the Secretary-General on 12 March 2001, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia lodged an instrument, *inter alia*, advising its intent to succeed to various multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, and confirming certain actions relating to such treaties. The notification stated the following:

"[T]he Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, having considered the treaties listed in the attached annex 1, succeeds to the same and undertakes faithfully to perform and carry out the stipulations therein contained as from April 27, 1992, the date upon which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia assumed responsibility for its international relations [Ed. note: Annex 1 attached to the notification contains a list of treaties to which the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslaiva was a signatory or party],

...[T]he Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia maintains the signatures, reservations, declarations and objections made by the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia to the treaties listed in the attached annex 1, prior to the date on which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia assumed responsibility for its international relations.

...[T]he Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia confirms those treaty actions and declarations made by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which are listed in the attached annex 2. [Ed. note: Annex 2 attached to the notification contains a list of certain treaty actions undertaken by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia between 27 April 1992 and 1 November 2000.]"

Entries in status tables relating to treaty actions undertaken by Yugoslavia between the date of the dissolution of the former Yugoslavia and the date of admission of Yugoslavia to membership in the United Nations, which were not dependent on prior treaty actions by the former Yugoslavia or other conditions, had been maintained against the designation "Yugoslavia".

See also "Serbia and Montenegro" and "former Yugoslavia".

Note 2.

In a communication dated 4 February 2003, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia informed the Secretary-General that :

"...following the adoption and promulgation of the Constitutional Charter of Serbia and Montenegro by the Assembly of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia on 4 February 2003, as previously adopted by the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia on 27 January 2003 and by the Assembly of the Republic of Montenegro on 29 January 2003, the name of the State of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to "Serbia and Montenegro [as of 4 February 2003]". ...

See also "Serbia and Montenegro".

For information on the treatment of treaty actions by predecessor States and successor States in the status tables, see Part C, "Status tables" of the "Introduction" to this publication.

Volume I

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

(See also Index on page 953)

Volume II

GENERAL TABLE OF CONTENTS

(See also Index on page 665)

Volume I

Part I
United Nations multilateral treaties

CHAPTER I. CHARTER OF THE UNITED NATIONS AND STATUTE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

CHAPTER II. PACIFIC SETTLEMENT OF INTERNATIONAL DISPUTES

CHAPTER III. PRIVILEGES AND IMMUNITIES, DIPLOMATIC AND CONSULAR RELATIONS, ETC.

CHAPTER IV. HUMAN RIGHTS

CHAPTER V. REFUGEES AND STATELESS PERSONS

CHAPTER VI. NARCOTIC DRUGS AND PSYCHOTROPIC SUBSTANCES

CHAPTER VII. TRAFFIC IN PERSONS

CHAPTER VIII. OBSCENE PUBLICATIONS

CHAPTER IX. HEALTH

CHAPTER X. INTERNATIONAL TRADE AND DEVELOPMENT

Volume II

Part I
United Nations Multilateral Treaties
Chapters XII to XXIX

CHAPTER XII. NAVIGATION

CHAPTER XVII. FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

CHAPTER XVIII. PENAL MATTERS

CHAPTER XIX. COMMODITIES

CHAPTER XXVI. DISARMAMENT

CHAPTER XXVII. ENVIRONMENT

Part I

UNITED NATIONS MULTILATERAL TREATIES

Chapters XII to XXIX

CHAPTER XII

NAVIGATION

1. CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL MARITIME ORGANIZATION

Geneva, 6 March 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 17 March 1958, in accordance with article 60.
REGISTRATION: 17 March 1958, No. 4214.
STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 167.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 289, p. 3, and vol. 1520, p. 297 (procès-verbal of rectification of Spanish authentic text).

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature and acceptance by the United Nations Maritime Conference convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations pursuant to Economic and Social Council resolution 35 (IV)[1]. The Conference met at Geneva from 19 February to 6 March 1948. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 289, p. 3.

As a result of the entry into force of the amendments adopted by the IMCO Assembly by its resolutions A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 and A.371 (X) of 9 November 1977 [rectification of resolution A.358 (IX) (see chapter XII.1(d))], the name of the Intergovernmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO) has been changed to "International Maritime Organization (IMO)" and the title of the Convention modified accordingly.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Acceptance (A)*
Albania		24 May 1993 A
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 A
Angola		6 Jun 1977 A
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Jan 1986 A
Argentina	6 Mar 1948	18 Jun 1953 A
Australia	6 Mar 1948	13 Feb 1952 A
Austria		2 Apr 1975 A
Azerbaijan		15 May 1995 A
Bahamas		22 Jul 1976 A
Bahrain		22 Sep 1976 A
Bangladesh		27 May 1976 A
Barbados		7 Jan 1970 A
Belgium	6 Mar 1948	9 Aug 1951 A
Belize		13 Sep 1990 A
Benin		19 Mar 1980 A
Bolivia		6 Jul 1987 A
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Jul 1993 A
Brazil		4 Mar 1963 A
Brunei Darussalam		31 Dec 1984 A
Bulgaria		5 Apr 1960 A
Cambodia		3 Jan 1961 A
Cameroon		1 May 1961 A
Canada		15 Oct 1948 A
Cape Verde		24 Aug 1976 A
Chile	6 Mar 1948	17 Feb 1972 A
China[3]		1 Mar 1973 A
Colombia	6 Mar 1948	19 Nov 1974 A
Comoros		3 Aug 2001 A
Congo		5 Sep 1975 A
Costa Rica		4 Mar 1981 A
Côte d'Ivoire		4 Nov 1960 A
Croatia		8 Jul 1992 A
Cuba		6 Mar 1966 A
Cyprus		21 Nov 1973 A
Czech Republic[4]		18 Jun 1993 A
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		16 Apr 1986 A
Democratic Republic of the Congo		16 Aug 1973 A
Denmark[5]		3 Jun 1959 A
Djibouti		20 Feb 1979 A
Dominica		18 Dec 1979 A
Dominican Republic		25 Aug 1953 A
Ecuador		12 Jul 1956 A
Egypt	6 Mar 1948	17 Mar 1958 A
El Salvador		12 Feb 1981 A
Equatorial Guinea		6 Sep 1972 A
Eritrea		31 Aug 1993 A
Estonia		31 Jan 1992 A
Ethiopia		3 Jul 1975 A
Fiji		14 Mar 1983 A
Finland	6 Mar 1948	21 Apr 1959 A
France	6 Mar 1948	9 Apr 1952 A
Gabon		1 Apr 1976 A
Gambia		11 Jan 1979 A
Georgia		22 Jun 1993 A
Germany[6,7]		7 Jan 1959 s
Ghana		6 Jul 1959 A
Greece	6 Mar 1948	31 Dec 1958 A
Grenada		3 Dec 1998 A
Guatemala		16 Mar 1983 A
Guinea		3 Dec 1975 A
Guinea-Bissau		6 Dec 1977 A
Guyana		13 May 1980 A
Haiti		23 Jun 1953 A
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	23 Aug 1954 A
Hungary		10 Jun 1970 A

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Acceptance (A)*
Iceland		8 Nov 1960 A
India	6 Mar 1948	6 Jan 1959 A
Indonesia[8]		18 Jan 1961 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10 Jun 1954	2 Jan 1958 A
Iraq		28 Aug 1973 A
Ireland	6 Mar 1948	26 Feb 1951 A
Israel		24 Apr 1952 A
Italy	6 Mar 1948	28 Jan 1957 A
Jamaica		11 May 1976 A
Japan		17 Mar 1958 A
Jordan		9 Nov 1973 A
Kazakhstan		11 Mar 1994 A
Kenya		22 Aug 1973 A
Kiribati		28 Oct 2003 A
Kuwait[9]		5 Jul 1960 A
Latvia		1 Mar 1993 A
Lebanon	6 Mar 1948	3 May 1966 A
Liberia	9 Mar 1954	6 Jan 1959 A
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 Feb 1970 A
Lithuania		7 Dec 1995 A
Luxembourg		14 Feb 1991 A
Madagascar		8 Mar 1961 A
Malawi		19 Jan 1989 A
Malaysia		17 Jun 1971 A
Maldives		31 May 1967 A
Malta		22 Jun 1966 s
Marshall Islands		26 Mar 1998 A
Mauritania[9]		8 May 1961 A
Mauritius		18 May 1978 A
Mexico		21 Sep 1954 A
Moldova		12 Dec 2001 A
Monaco		22 Dec 1989 A
Mongolia		11 Dec 1996 A
Montenegro[10]		10 Oct 2006 A
Morocco		30 Jul 1962 A
Mozambique		17 Jan 1979 A
Myanmar		6 Jul 1951 A
Namibia		27 Oct 1994 A
Nepal		31 Jan 1979 A
Netherlands	6 Mar 1948	31 Mar 1949 A
New Zealand		9 Nov 1960 A
Nicaragua		17 Mar 1982 A
Nigeria		15 Mar 1962 A
Norway		29 Dec 1958 A
Oman		30 Jan 1974 A
Pakistan		21 Nov 1958 A
Panama		31 Dec 1958 A
Papua New Guinea		6 May 1976 A
Paraguay		15 Mar 1993 A
Peru		15 Apr 1968 A
Philippines		9 Nov 1964 A
Poland	6 Mar 1948	16 Mar 1960 A
Portugal	6 Mar 1948	17 Mar 1976 A
Qatar		19 May 1977 A
Republic of Korea[9]		10 Apr 1962 A
Romania		28 Apr 1965 A
Russian Federation		24 Dec 1958 A
Saint Kitts and Nevis		8 Oct 2001 A
Saint Lucia		10 Apr 1980 A
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 Apr 1981 A
Samoa		25 Oct 1996 A
San Marino		12 Mar 2002 A
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Jul 1990 A
Saudi Arabia		25 Feb 1969 A
Senegal		7 Nov 1960 A
Serbia		11 Dec 2000 A
Seychelles		13 Jun 1978 A
Sierra Leone		14 Mar 1973 A
Singapore		17 Jan 1966 A
Slovakia[4]		24 Mar 1993 A
Slovenia		10 Feb 1993 A
Solomon Islands		27 Jun 1988 A
Somalia		4 Apr 1978 A
South Africa		28 Feb 1995 A
Spain		23 Jan 1962 A
Sri Lanka		6 Apr 1972 A
Sudan		5 Jul 1974 A
Suriname		14 Oct 1976 A
Sweden		27 Apr 1959 A
Switzerland	6 Mar 1948	20 Jul 1955 A
Syrian Arab Republic		28 Jan 1963 A
Thailand		20 Sep 1973 A
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		13 Oct 1993 A
Timor-Leste		10 May 2005 A
Togo		20 Jun 1983 A
Tonga		23 Feb 2000 A
Trinidad and Tobago		27 Apr 1965 A
Tunisia		23 May 1963 A
Turkey	6 Mar 1948	25 Mar 1958 A
Turkmenistan		26 Aug 1993 A
Tuvalu		19 May 2004 A
Ukraine		28 Mar 1994 A
United Arab Emirates		4 Mar 1980 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6 Mar 1948	14 Feb 1949 A
United Republic of Tanzania		8 Jan 1974 A
United States of America	6 Mar 1948	17 Aug 1950 A
Uruguay		10 May 1968 s
Vanuatu	15 Oct 1986	21 Oct 1986 A
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		27 Oct 1975 A
Viet Nam		12 Jun 1984 A
Yemen[11]		14 Mar 1979 A
Zimbabwe		16 Aug 2005 A

BAHRAIN[12]

"The acceptance of the Convention on the Inter-Govern mental Maritime Consultative Organization by the State of Bahrain shall, however, in no way signify recognition of, or entry into any relations with Israel".

CAMBODIA[13]

In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Royal Government of Cambodia declares that the measures it has adopted or may adopt for giving encouragement or assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries (such, for instance, as loan-financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest, or the allocation to Cambodian ships of cargoes owned or controlled by the Royal Government, or the reservation of coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matters as it may adopt with the object of promoting the development of its own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention.

Accordingly, the Royal Government will proceed to a re-examination, before they are put into effect, of any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization.

The Royal Government further declares that its acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law in force in the territory of the Kingdom of Cambodia.

CUBA

In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Revolutionary Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that its current legislation, which is duly adapted to the encouragement and development of its Merchant Marine, is consistent with the General purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be re-examined by the Government of Cuba in the light of the national policy in this regard.

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark supports the work programme adopted during the first Assembly of the Organization in January 1959 and holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise where the Government of Denmark would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

ECUADOR

The Government of Ecuador declares that the protectionist measures adopted in the interests of its National Merchant Marine and the Merchant Fleet of Greater Colombia (Flota Mercante Grancolomibiana), the vessels belonging to which are regarded as ecuadorian by reason of the participation of the Government of Ecuador in the said Fleet, are measures the sole object of which is to promote the development of the National Merchant Marine and of the Merchant Fleet of Greater Colombia and are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Organization, as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be re-examined by the Government of Ecuador.

FINLAND

"The Government of Finland support the work programme proposed by the Preparatory Committee of the Organization in document IMCO/A.I/11. The Government of Finland hold the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise where the Government of Finland would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

GREECE

"Greece, in re-confirming its acceptance, considers that the aforesaid Organization can play a useful and important role in the field of technical and nautical matters, thus contributing to the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world. In case the Organization extends its activities to matters of commercial and economic nature, the Greek Government may find itself bound to reconsider its acceptance of the Convention and avail itself of its provisions concerning withdrawal as laid down in article 59."

ICELAND

"Iceland will reconsider its ratification, if it subsequently were decided to extend IMCO's competence so as also to deal with questions of an entirely financial or commercial nature.

"Great stress is laid by Iceland on the real validity of article 59 of the Convention, regarding withdrawal."

INDIA[14]

"In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of India declare that any measures which it adopts or may have adopted for giving encouragement and assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries (such, for instance, as loan-financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest, or the allocation of Government-owned or Government-controlled cargoes to national ships or the reservation of the coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matters as the Government of India may adopt, the sole object of which is to promote the development of its own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of India. The Government of India further expressly state that its acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law on the subject in force in the territories of the Republic of India."

INDONESIA[15]

"In accepting the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"On matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, the Government holds the view that assistance and encouragement to its national shipping industries for the development of its domestic and foreign trade and for purposes of security, are consistent with the purposes of the Organization as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention.

"Accordingly, the acceptance shall never have the effect of altering or modifying in any recommendation relating to this subject adopted by the Organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia."

IRAQ[16]

The participation of the Republic of Iraq in this Convention shall, however, in no way signify recognition of, or entry into any relations with Israel.

The Republic of Iraq hereby declares that article 1 (b) of the Convention is not in conflict with the measures taken by it to encourage and assist national shipping companies, such as the granting of financial loans, the assignment of cargo vessels flying its flag to carry specific goods and the assignment of commercial vessels, or any other measures aimed at the development and growth of the national fleet or national shipping.

MALAYSIA[17]

"In accepting the Convention of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of Malaysia declares that any measures which she may adopt for giving encouragement or assistance to her national shipping industries (for instance, such as loan financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest or the allocation to Malaysian cargo ships owned or controlled by the Malaysian Government, or the reservation of coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matter as she may adopt with the object of promoting the development of her own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention. Accordingly any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be re-examined by the Government of Malaysia. The Government of Malaysia further expressly states that her acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law on the subject in force in Malaysia."

MEXICO

The Government of the United States of Mexico, in accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, on the understanding that nothing in the said Convention is intended to change national legislation relating to restrictive business practices, expressly states that its acceptance of the above-mentioned international instrument neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the application of the laws against monopolies in the territory of the Republic of Mexico.

MOROCCO

In joining the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco wishes to declare that it is not in agreement with a possible broadening of the scope of the activities of this Organization from the purely technical and nautical activities into the field of matters of an economic and commercial nature as stated in article 1 (b) and (c) of the Convention for the Establishment of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. If such a broadening of the field of activities of the Organization were to take place, the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco reserves the right to reconsider its position concerning the ensuing situation, and might be led to invoke the provisions of article 59 of the Convention, regarding the withdrawal of members from the Organization.

NORWAY

"The Norwegian Government supports the work programme proposed by the Preparatory Committee of the Organization in document IMCO/A.I/11.The Norwegian Government holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise where the Norwegian Government would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

POLAND

"In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, signed at Geneva on 6 March 1948, the Government of the Polish People's Republic declares that it supports the work programme of the Organization, approved by the Assembly at its First Session held in January 1959.

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization shall make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world."

SPAIN

The Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization may not extend its activities to economic or commercial questions but must limit itself to questions of a technical character.

SRI LANKA[18]

In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, as amended, the Government of Ceylon declares that any measures which it adopts or may have adopted for giving encouragement and assistance to its national shipping and shipping industries (such, for instance, as loan-financing of national shipping companies at reasonable or even concessional rates of interest, or the allocation of Government-owned or Government-controlled cargoes to national ships or the reservation of the coastal trade for national shipping) and such other matters as the Government of Ceylon may adopt, the sole object of which is to promote the development of its own national shipping, are consistent with the purposes of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization as defined in article 1 (b) of the Convention. Accordingly, any recommendations relating to this subject that may be adopted by the Organization will be subject to re-examination by the Government of Ceylon. The Government of Ceylon further expressly states that its acceptance of the above-mentioned Convention neither has nor shall have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the law on the subject in force in Ceylon.

SWEDEN

"In accepting the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of Sweden declares that it supports the work programme of the Organization as per document A.I/11 and its corrigendum 1, decided upon by the first meeting of the Assembly of the Organization in January 1959.

"The Government of Sweden holds the view that it is in the field of technical and nautical matters that the Organization can make its contribution towards the development of shipping and seaborne trade throughout the world.

"If the Organization were to extend its activities to matters of a purely commercial or economic nature, a situation might arise in which the Government of Sweden would have to consider resorting to the provisions regarding withdrawal contained in article 59 of the Convention."

SWITZERLAND

In depositing its instrument of ratification of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization (IMCO), Switzerland makes the general reservation that its participation in the work of IMCO, more particularly as regards that organizations relations with the United Nations, cannot exceed the bounds implicit in Switzerland's status as a perpetually neutral State. In conformity with this general reservation, Switzerland wishes to make a particular reservation both in respect of the text of article VI as incorporated in the Agreement, at present in draft form, between IMCO and the United Nations, and in respect of any similar clause which may replace or supplement that provision in the said agreement or in any other arrangement.

TURKEY

"[Participation by Turkey] will in no way have any effect on the provisions of the Turkish laws concerning cabotage and monopoly."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES[12]

"The Government of the United Arab Emirates takes the view that its acceptance of the said Convention and amendments does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor does it oblige to apply the provisions of the Convention and amendments in respect of the said Country.

"The Government of the United Arab Emirates wishes further to indicate that its understanding described above is in conformity with General practice existing in United Arab Emirates regarding signature, ratification, or acceptance to a Convention which a country not recognized by United Arab Emirates is a party."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[19]

"It being understood that nothing in the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization is intended to alter domestic legislation with respect to restrictive business practices, it is hereby declared that ratification of that Convention by the Government of the United States of America does not and will not have the effect of altering or modifying in any way the application of the anti-trust statutes of the United States of America."

VIET NAM

In accepting the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam states to support the purposes of the said Organization as defined in article 1 of the Convention. On the basis of state sovereignty and proceeding from its foreign Policy of peace, friendship, co-operation, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam will take into consideration the recommendations relating to the subject as provided in article 1 (b) of the Convention and relating amendments which may arise.

YUGOSLAVIA (FORMER)[2]

Participation of Territories in the Convention (article 58)

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Denmark[5]	3 Dec 2002	Faroe Islands
Netherlands[20]	3 Oct 1949	Indonesia, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. [*By a further notification received on 12 July 1951, notice was given that the participation Netherlands in this Convention, from 27 December 1949, no longer includes the territories under the jurisdiction of the Republic of Indonesia but includes Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles (formerly the Netherlands West Indies) and Netherlands New Guinea*]
United Kingdom[21,22,23]	19 Jan 1960	Federation of Nigeria
	2 Oct 1961	Sarawak and North Borneo
	7 Jun 1967	Hong Kong

Associate Membership in the Organization (article 8)

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Associate Members:*
Denmark[5]	3 Dec 2002	Faroe Islands
Portugal[24]	2 Feb 1990	Macau
United Kingdom[21,22,23]	19 Jan 1960	Federation of Nigeria
	2 Oct 1961	Joint associate membership of Sarawak and North Borneo
	7 Jun 1967	Hong Kong

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, of 28 March 1947.*

[2] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the Convention on 12 February 1960, with the following declaration:

"In joining the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia wishes to declare that it is not in agreement with a possible broadening of the scope of the activities of this Organization from the purely technical and nautical activities into the field of matters of an economic and commercial nature as stated in Article 1, sections under (b) and (c) of the Convention for the establishment of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. If such a broadening of the field of activities of the Organization were to take place the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia reserves the right to reconsider its position concerning the ensuing situation.

"At the same time, the Government of the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia declares its readiness to fulfil all its obligations toward the Organization, as stated in the instrument of ratification."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The Convention was accepted on behalf of the Republic of China on 1 July 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under China in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.).

With reference to the above-mentioned acceptance, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, on the one hand, and of China on the other hand.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In its instrument of acceptance, the Government of the People's Republic of China declared that the acceptance of and signature of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization and related Conventions and regulations by the Chiang Kai-shek clique usurping the name of China are illegal and null and void.

[4] Czechoslovakia had accepted the Convention on 1 October 1963. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] On 3 December 2002, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of the following:

."....Under the Danish Constitution and the Home Rule Act (Faroe Islands) the Faroe Islands is a part of the Danish Realm with a wide measure of home rule in legislative and administrative affairs. In accordance with these instruments the legal status of the Faroese Home Government has been changed with effect from January 1st 2002 by transferring legislative and administrative powers from the authorities of the Realm to the Faroese Home Government in a number of additional fields including matters related to safety at sea. This transfer does not affect the powers of the authorities of the Realm to act on behalf of the Realm in international affairs.

Article 72 of the IMO Convention provides that: "Members may make a declaration at any time that their participation in the Convention includes all or a group of or a single one of the Territories for whose international relations they are responsible,"

In conformity with this Article the Kingdom of Denmark has the honour to declare that application of the IMO Convention with respect to the Faroe Islands from the date of this notification is based on article 72 of the IMO Convention.

Article 8 of the IMO Convention provides that: "Any Territory or group of Territories to which the Convention has been made applicable under Article 72, by the Member having responsibility for its international relations or by the United Nations, may become an associate Member of the Organization by notification in writing given by such Member or by the United Nations as the case may be, to the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

The Faroe Islands Home Government has expressed its strong desire to become an associate Member of the IMO in the light of the new legislative and administrative powers transferred to the Home Government with respect to matters related to safety at sea and considering the importance to the Faroese economy of the fleet registered in the Faroese registry of ships and flying the Faroese flag. On this background the Kingdom of Denmark considers it appropriate that the Faroe Islands is associated with the IMO in the form of associate membership under article 8 of the IMO Convention.

In conformity with Article 8 of the IMO Convention the Kingdom of Denmark has the honour to notify that the Faroe Islands has become an associate Member of the IMO with effect from the date of this notification."

[6] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Convention on 25 September 1973. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The application of the Federal Republic of Germany for membership in the Organization was approved on 5 January 1959, in accordance with article 8 of the Convention. See also note 5 in this chapter, and notes 1 and 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a communication received on 9 October 1965, the First Deputy Prime Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the Republic of Indonesia from the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. The notification of withdrawal contains the following statement:

"With reference to the provision of Article 59 which stipulates that the withdrawal from IMCO's membership will take effect twelve months from the date on which the notification of withdrawal is received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Indonesia will observe her obligations and responsibilities accordingly. Nevertheless, the Indonesian Government has decided to discontinue its participation in the activities of the IMCO as of this date.

"In conclusion, I wish to add that, notwithstanding the withdrawal from IMCO, Indonesia will continue to work for the attainment of mutually beneficial principles of International maritime cooperation."

In a communication received on 29 September 1966, the Presidium Minister and Minister for Foreign Affairs of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that his government had decided to resume active participation in the Organization and requested that this communication be considered as superseding the above-mentioned notification of with drawal.

[9] The applications of Kuwait, Mauritania and the Republic of Korea for membership in the Organization were approved on 5 July 1960, 13 April 1961 and 21 December 1961, respectively, in accordance with article 8 of the Convention.

[10] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] Democratic Yemen had accepted the Convention on 2 June 1980 with the following declaration:

"The acceptance of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen of the said Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel, or

entering with it into relations governed by the Convention thereto acceded."

See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 November 1976, the Government of Bahrain confirmed that the general reservation "is intended to constitute a general declaration of policy of the Government of the State of Bahrain and should not be interpreted as expanding or diminishing the scope of the Convention or its application to States parties to the Convention."

With regard to the said reservation, the Government of Israel, in communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 December 1976, stated the following:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Bahrain contains a statement of political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Bahrain cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain, under general international law or under particular treaties."

The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Identical communications, *mutatis mutandis*, were received from the Government of Israel on 25 July 1980, in respect of the declarations made by Democratic Yemen (see note 9) and the United Arab Emirates upon acceptance of the Convention.

[13] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General on 14 September 1961, 30 November 1961 and 14 March 1962, respectively, the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Norway and Greece, referring to the declaration made by Cambodia, stated that they assumed that it was a declaration of policy and did not constitute a reservation; and that it had no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention. They further stated that they would welcome assurances from the Government of Cambodia that the declaration was to be understood in this sense.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 31 January 1962, the Government of Cambodia stated that ". . . the Royal Government agrees that the first part of the declaration which it made at the time of the acceptance of the Convention is of a political nature. It therefore has no legal effect regarding the interpretation of the Convention. The statements contained in the third paragraph of the declaration, on the other hand, constitute a reservation to the Convention by the Royal Government of Cambodia."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 3 July 1962, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that ".. Her Majesty's Government do not share the view of the Cambodian Government that the third paragraph of the declaration constitutes a reservation, but they do not wish on that account, to raise formal objection to the terms of Cambodia's acceptance of the Convention."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 23 July 1962, the Government of France stated that ". . . it considers that, for reasons of principle as well as of fact, it cannot accept the terms of the declaration in question, the third paragraph of which is, moreover, described by the Permanent Representative of Cambodia as constituting a reservation."

[14] In resolution 1452 (XIV) adopted on 7 December 1959, the General Assembly of the United Nations, noting the statement made on behalf of India at the 614th meeting of its Sixth Committee (Legal) explaining that the Indian declaration was a declaration of policy and that it did not constitute a reservation, expressed the hope "that, in the light of the above-mentioned statement of India an appropriate solution may be reached in the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization at an early date to regularize the position of India".

By a resolution adopted on 1 March 1960, the Council of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, taking note of the statement made on behalf of India referred to in the foregoing resolution and noting, therefore, that the declaration of India has no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention "considers India to be a member of the Organization".

[15] In communications addressed to the Secretary-General on 14 September 1961, 30 November 1961 and 14 March 1962, respectively, the Governments of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, Norway and Greece, referring to the declaration made by Indonesia, stated that they assumed that it was a declaration of policy and did not constitute a reservation; and that it had no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention. They further stated that they would welcome assurances from the Government of Indonesia that the declaration was to be understood in this sense.

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General on 30 October 1961, 12 January 1962 and 28 March 1962, the Government of Indonesia stated that the declaration in question :

". . . does not constitute a reservation but is an interpretation of article 1 (b) of the said Convention and should be understood as such.

"In view of the above fact, the Government of Indonesia cannot accept the assumption made by [the above-mentioned Governments] that this declaration has no legal effect with regard to the interpretation of the Convention."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 18 April 1962, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland stated that ". . . Her Majesty's Government do not wish to raise formal objection to the terms of Indonesia's acceptance, but they desire to place on record that they do not thereby concede that they will necessarily regard any measures of assistance and encouragement which the Government of Indonesia may give to its national shipping as consistent with the Convention."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 23 July 1962, the Government of France stated that ". . . it considers that, for reasons of principle as well as of fact, it cannot accept the terms of the declaration in question."

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 5 September 1962, the Government of the United States of America stated the following:

"The Government of the United States will not raise objection to the terms of Indonesia's acceptance of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization. However, It does not thereby concede that it will necessarily regard every measure of assistance and encouragement which the Government of Indonesia may give to its national shipping as consistent with the Convention."

[16] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 28 November 1973, the Permanent Representative of Israel to the United Nations stated the following:

"The instrument of acceptance by the Government of Iraq of the above-mentioned Convention contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That statement, therefore, possesses no legal validity whatsoever.

"The Government of Israel utterly rejects that statement and will proceed on the assumption that it has no validity as to the rights and duties of any Member State to the said Organization.

"The declaration of the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect Iraq's obligations under the Constitution of the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization or whatever other obligations are binding upon that State by virtue of general international law.

"The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt toward the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[17] In a letter of 3 June 1971, the Prime Minister and Minister of Foreign Affairs of Malaysia notified the Secretary-General as follows:

"The declaration by the Malaysian Government with regard to the above-mentioned Convention is a declaration of policy of the Government of Malaysia, and does not constitute a reservation by the Government of Malaysia to the Convention as stated in the instrument of acceptance."

[18] Upon deposit of the instrument of acceptance, the Government of Sri Lanka declared that ". . . the declaration set forth in the instrument of acceptance does not constitute a reservation, but is an interpre-

tation of article 1 (b) of the Convention and should be understood as such."

[19] In a note verbale accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Permanent Representative of the United States of America drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact that ... "Article 2 of the Convention provides that the functions of the Organization `shall be consultative and advisory'. Article 3 of the Convention indicates that the functions of the Organization are to make recommendations and to facilitate consultation and exchange of information. The history of the Convention and the records of the conference at which it was formulated indicate no intention to nullify or alter the domestic legislation of any contracting party relating to restrictive business practices or to alter or modify in any way the application of domestic statutes governing the prevention or regulation of business monopolies. It is considered therefore, that the statement as quoted above is merely a clarification of the intended meaning of the Convention and a safeguard against any possible misinterpretation, particularly as to the application of article 4."

[20] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[21] On 15 March 1962, the Federation of Nigeria became a member of the Organization by depositing on that date the instrument of acceptance of the Convention.

[22] In a communication received on 6 August 1964, the Government of the United Kingdom requested the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization, "to take note that, as a result of the Agreement relating to Malaysia signed at London on July 9, 1963, and legislation enacted in accordance with that Agreement, Sarawak and North Borneo, together with the State of Singapore, federated with the existing States of the Federation of Malaya and the Federation is now called Malaysia. Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom are therefore no longer responsible for the international relations of Sarawak and North Borneo.".

In a subsequent communication received on 4 March 1965, the Government of the United Kingdom, in amplification of the information contained in the above-mentioned communication, drew the attention of the Secretary-General to the fact "that the Agreement relating to Malaysia which was signed in London on the 9th of July 1963–the date on which Sarawak and North Borneo, together with the State of Singapore, federated with the States of the Federation of Malaya–Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom ceased to be responsible for the international relations of Sarawak and North Borneo." It also requested the Secretary-General "to take note that Her Majesty's Government accordingly consider that the joint associate membership in the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization of Sarawak and North Borneo under article 9 of the Convention on the Inter-Governmental Maritime Consultative Organization automatically lapsed on the 16th of September 1963."

[23] On 25 August 1987, the Secretary-General received from the Permanent Representative of the People's Republic of China and from the Acting Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Chargé d'Affaires, respectively, the following communications both dated 25 August 1987:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

"I am instructed by her Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to refer to the Declaration made by the United Kingdom on 6 June 1967 concerning the application to Hong Kong of the Convention on the International Maritime Organisation, signed at Geneva on 6 March 1948. By virtue of that Declaration and in accordance with articles 72 (a) and 8 of the Convention, Hong Kong became an associate member of the Organisation with effect from 7 June1967.

I am also instructed to state that having regard to the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the question of Hong Kong, signed in Beijing on 19 December 1984, the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997 and that the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date."

(Signed) John Birch

Acting Permanent Representative

United Kingdom of Great Britain

and Northern Ireland, and Charge d'Affaires

China

I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China, with reference to the communication which the United Kingdom Mission to the United Nations addressed to Your Excellency today, to notify Your Excellency of the declaration of the People's Republic of China as follows:

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Question of Hong Kong signed in Beijing on 19 December 1984, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong, as an inseparable part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, will become a special administrative region with effect from that date. The People's Republic of China will have international responsibility for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

I am also instructed to declare that since China is a contracting State to the Convention on the Maritime Organization, signed in Geneva on 6 March 1948, and the Government of the People's Republic of China accepted the Convention on 1 March 1973, the said Convention will apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997. Accordingly, the Government of the People's Republic of China notifies you that, with effect from 1 July 1997, the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will continue to meet the essential requirements of the Convention for being an associate member of the Organization, and therefore may, using the name of "Hong Kong, China", continue to be an associate member of the Organisation.

I avail myself of this opportunity to renew to Your Excellency the assurances of my highest consideration.

(Signed) Li Luye

Permanent Representative of

the People's Republic of China

to the United Nations

[24] On 2 February 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal a declaration, in accordance with article 72 (a) of the Convention, to the effect that the said Convention is made applicable to Macau with effect from 2 February 1990 and that, in accordance with article 8 of the said Convention, Macau becomes and Associate Member of the International Maritime Organization as from the same date. The declaration also specifies the following:

"The present declaration is made in conformity with the agreement established by the Joint Liaison Group of the Republic of Portugal and the People's Republic of China in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Governments of the Republic of Portugal and the People's Republic of China on the question of Macau, signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, whereby the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from the 20th of December 1999 and that Portugal will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until the 19th of December 1999.".

In this regard to the said declaration, the Secretary-General received on that same date, a communication from the Government of China identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made in respect of Hong Kong (see note 22).

1. a) Amendments to articles 17 and 18 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

London, 15 September 1964

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 October 1967, in accordance with article 52 of the Convention, for all Members of the Organization*.
REGISTRATION: 6 October 1967, No. 4214.
STATUS: Parties*.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 607, p. 276.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.69 (ES.II) of 15 September 1964.

Pursuant to article 54 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force.

In accordance with article 52 of the Convention, the Assembly of the International Maritime Consultative Organization determined that these amendments were of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it did not accept such amendments and within a period of twelve months after they had come into force would, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendments are in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant[1]	*Acceptance (A)*
Argentina	5 Oct 1966 A
Australia	15 Feb 1965 A
Belgium	26 Jul 1965 A
Brazil	30 Dec 1966 A
Bulgaria	3 Oct 1966 A
Cambodia	22 Aug 1966 A
Canada	15 Feb 1965 A
China[2]	
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Oct 1965 A
Denmark	14 Jul 1965 A
Dominican Republic	11 Jul 1966 A
Ecuador	18 Aug 1965 A
Egypt	18 Mar 1966 A
Finland	20 Jan 1967 A
France	21 Apr 1965 A
Germany	7 Oct 1965 A
Ghana	17 May 1965 A
Greece	3 Dec 1965 A
Iceland	14 Sep 1965 A
India	17 Mar 1965 A
Indonesia	21 Oct 1966 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Jun 1966 A
Ireland	14 Jun 1965 A
Israel	9 Feb 1967 A
Kuwait	6 Sep 1966 A
Lebanon	20 Feb 1967 A
Madagascar	25 Feb 1965 A
Malta	8 Sep 1966 A
Mauritania	4 Nov 1966 A
Morocco	7 Oct 1965 A
Myanmar	6 Oct 1966 A
Netherlands	4 Oct 1965 A
New Zealand	26 Nov 1965 A
Norway	13 Sep 1965 A
Pakistan	18 Jun 1965 A
Panama	2 Aug 1966 A
Philippines	2 Nov 1966 A
Poland	9 Jul 1965 A
Republic of Korea	5 May 1965 A
Romania	3 Aug 1966 A
Russian Federation	20 Dec 1965 A
Senegal	6 Oct 1966 A
Singapore	18 Feb 1966 A
Spain	28 Jun 1965 A
Sweden	13 Sep 1965 A
Switzerland	13 Jan 1967 A
Trinidad and Tobago	5 Dec 1966 A
Tunisia	8 Apr 1966 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	15 Feb 1965 A
United States of America	25 Jul 1966 A

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the amendments on 11 March 1966. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The instrument of acceptance by the Government of the Republic of China of the amendments was received by the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization on 27 January 1966 and deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 31 January 1966. See also note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned acceptance, the Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations stated that the only government entitled to represent and to assume obligations on behalf of China is the Central Government of the People's Republic of China and that, consequently, the Government of Romania cannot take note of the said acceptance.

[3] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

1. b) Amendment to article 28 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

London, 28 September 1965

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 November 1968, in accordance with article 52 of the Convention, for all Members of the Organization*.
REGISTRATION: 3 November 1968, No. 4214.
STATUS: Parties*.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 649, p. 335.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1. The amendment was adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.70 (IV) of 28 September 1965.

Pursuant to article 54 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force.

In accordance with article 52 of the Convention, the Assembly of the International Maritime Consultative Organization determined that these amendments were of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it did not accept such amendments and within a period of twelve months after they had come into force would, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendment is in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant[1]	*Acceptance (A)*
Albania	3 Nov 2968 A
Algeria	3 Nov 1967 A
Argentina	5 Oct 1966 A
Australia	23 Jun 1966 A
Belgium	6 Jun 1966 A
Brazil	30 Dec 1966 A
Bulgaria	3 Oct 1966 A
Canada	29 Apr 1966 A
China[2]	
Côte d'Ivoire	20 Mar 1967 A
Denmark	15 Nov 1966 A
Egypt	15 Feb 1967 A
Finland	20 Jan 1967 A
France	14 Mar 1966 A
Germany	22 Jul 1966 A
Iceland	13 Mar 1967 A
India	13 Oct 1966 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	1 Jul 1968 A
Ireland	23 Jun 1966 A
Israel	9 Feb 1967 A
Kuwait	6 Sep 1966 A
Lebanon	20 Feb 1967 A
Madagascar	27 Jan 1966 A
Maldives	22 Apr 1968 A
Malta	8 Sep 1966 A

Participant[1]	*Acceptance (A)*
Mexico	16 Oct 1967 A
Morocco	27 Jan 1966 A
Netherlands	15 May 1967 A
New Zealand	29 Jul 1968 A
Nigeria	11 Dec 1967 A
Norway	23 May 1966 A
Pakistan	5 Jul 1966 A
Panama	2 Aug 1966 A
Philippines	2 Nov 1966 A
Poland	19 Aug 1966 A
Republic of Korea	10 Jan 1967 A
Romania	27 Jul 1967 A
Russian Federation	7 Mar 1966 A
Singapore	18 Feb 1966 A
Spain	9 May 1966 A
Sweden	26 Jul 1966 A
Switzerland	13 Jan 1967 A
Trinidad and Tobago	20 Apr 1967 A
Tunisia	23 Feb 1966 A
Turkey	9 Jun 1967 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	23 May 1966 A
United States of America	1 Feb 1968 A

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the amendments on 28 November 1966. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The instrument of acceptance by the Government of the Republic of China was received by the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization on 22 July 1966 and deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 27 July 1966. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned acceptance, the Permanent Mission of Romania to the United Nations stated that the only government entitled to represent and to assume obligations on behalf of China is the Central Government of the People's Republic of China and that, consequently, the Government of Romania cannot take note of the said acceptance.

[3] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

1. c) Amendments to articles 10, 16, 17, 18, 20, 28, 31 and 32 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

London, 17 October 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 April 1978, in accordance with article 52 of the Convention, for all Members of the Organization*.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1978, No. 4214.
STATUS: Parties*.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1080, p. 375.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974.

Pursuant to article 54 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force

In accordance with article 52 of the Convention, the Assembly of the International Maritime Consultative Organization determined that these amendments were of such a nature that any Member which hereafter declares that it did not accept such amendments and within a period of twelve months after they had come into force would, upon the expiration of this period, cease to be a Party to the Convention.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendments are in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant[1]	*Acceptance (A)*
Algeria	8 Mar 1976 A
Angola	6 Jun 1977 A
Austria	1 Mar 1977 A
Bahamas	31 Jan 1977 A
Bahrain[2]	22 Sep 1976 A
Barbados	30 Jun 1975 A
Belgium	6 Jul 1976 A
Brazil	30 Jul 1976 A
Bulgaria	16 Apr 1975 A
Cameroon	1 Nov 1976 A
Canada	16 Jul 1975 A
Cape Verde	24 Aug 1976 A
Chile	11 Feb 1976 A
China	28 Apr 1975 A
Cuba	24 Nov 1975 A
Cyprus	24 Feb 1976 A
Denmark	20 Jul 1976 A
Dominican Republic	30 Dec 1976 A
Ecuador	3 Jan 1977 A
Egypt	16 Nov 1976 A
Ethiopia	2 Aug 1977 A
Finland	19 Oct 1976 A
France	24 Mar 1975 A
Gabon	15 Nov 1977 A
Germany[3]	1 Dec 1975 A
Ghana	18 Oct 1976 A
Greece	16 May 1977 A
Guinea	1 Apr 1977 A
Guinea-Bissau	6 Dec 1977 A
Hungary	30 Dec 1976 A
Iceland	13 May 1976 A
India	16 Jan 1976 A
Indonesia	23 Nov 1976 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	8 Jul 1975 A
Iraq[4]	11 Mar 1976 A
Israel	8 Sep 1976 A
Italy	13 May 1976 A
Jordan	5 Apr 1977 A
Liberia	8 Sep 1975 A
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	30 Jul 1976 A
Madagascar	29 Dec 1975 A
Maldives	21 Jul 1975 A
Malta	2 Nov 1976 A
Mexico	23 Mar 1976 A
Morocco[5]	17 Sep 1976 A
Netherlands[6]	10 Nov 1975 A
New Zealand	24 Mar 1976 A
Nigeria	30 Jun 1976 A
Norway	28 Apr 1975 A
Oman	17 Nov 1976 A
Pakistan	13 May 1976 A
Panama	23 May 1975 A
Peru	17 Nov 1976 A
Poland	15 Mar 1976 A
Portugal	24 Oct 1977 A
Qatar	19 May 1977 A
Republic of Korea	8 Nov 1976 A
Romania	25 Jul 1977 A
Russian Federation	28 Apr 1975 A
Saudi Arabia	23 Mar 1977 A
Singapore	18 Jan 1977 A
Spain	24 Mar 1975 A
Sri Lanka	17 May 1976 A
Suriname	26 Nov 1976 A
Sweden	5 May 1975 A
Switzerland	16 Jan 1976 A
Syrian Arab Republic	25 Mar 1977 A
Thailand	1 Dec 1975 A
Trinidad and Tobago	16 May 1975 A
Tunisia	13 May 1976 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	26 Jun 1975 A
United Republic of Tanzania	28 Sep 1976 A
United States of America	11 Feb 1976 A
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	27 Oct 1975 A

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the amendments on 30 March 1976. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Upon depositing its instrument of acceptance of the amendments, the Government of Bahrain reiterated the same declaration as the one made upon accceptance of the Convention (see chapter XII.1).

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 November 1976, the Government of Bahrain confirmed that the general reservation is intended to constitute a general declaration of policy of the Government of the State of Bahrain and should not be interpreted as expanding or diminishing the scope of the Convention or its application to States parties to the Convention."

With regard to the said reservation, the Government of Israel, in communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 December 1976, stated the following:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Bahrain contains a statement of political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Bahrain cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain, under general international law or under particular treaties."

The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[3] The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments with the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization on 18 September 1975 and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 30 September 1975. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] With the following declaration:

Acceptance of the above amendments by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations with it.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1977, from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq, under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq and attitude of complete reciprocity."

[6] With the same declaration as the one made in respect of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

1. d) Amendments to the title and substantive provisions of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

London, 14 November 1975 and 9 November 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 May 1982 for all Members of the Organization, in accordance with article 51 of the Convention except for the amendment to article 51which entered into force on 28 July 1982 in accordance with article 62 of the Convention as amended (Article 52, which was renumbered as Article 51 by Resolution 315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974, is renumbered as Article 62 by Resolution A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975)*.

REGISTRATION: 22 May 1982, No. 4214[1].

STATUS: Parties*.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1276, p. 468; and vol. 1285, p. 318.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 and A.371 (X) of 9 November 1977 [rectification of resolution A.358 (IX)].

Note: Pursuant to article 53 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendments are in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant[2]	*Acceptance (A)*
Algeria	6 Jul 1976 A
Angola	6 Jun 1977 A
Argentina	31 Dec 1979 A
Australia	10 Jun 1980 A
Bahamas	1 Mar 1979 A
Bahrain	25 Apr 1980 A
Bangladesh	8 Oct 1979 A
Barbados	30 Aug 1977 A
Belgium	28 Apr 1978 A
Brazil	1 Aug 1977 A
Bulgaria	4 Mar 1980 A
Canada	22 Apr 1977 A
Cape Verde	23 Apr 1980 A
Chile	20 Mar 1978 A
China	14 Mar 1979 A
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Nov 1981 A
Cuba	27 Dec 1979 A
Cyprus	6 Dec 1977 A
Denmark	18 Sep 1976 A
Djibouti	20 Feb 1979 A
Dominica	18 Dec 1979 A
Egypt	16 Nov 1976 A
El Salvador	12 Feb 1981 A
Ethiopia	2 Feb 1979 A
Finland	19 Oct 1976 A
France	1 Feb 1977 A
Gambia	11 Jan 1979 A
Germany[3]	24 Oct 1977 A
Ghana	5 Feb 1980 A
Greece	28 Jul 1981 A
Guinea	1 Apr 1977 A
Guinea-Bissau	6 Dec 1977 A
Guyana	13 May 1980 A
Hungary	31 Mar 1980 A
Iceland	28 Jul 1980 A
India	1 May 1978 A
Iraq	5 Sep 1979 A
Ireland	27 Oct 1981 A
Israel	31 Dec 1979 A
Jamaica	9 Apr 1979 A
Jordan	5 Apr 1977 A
Kuwait	28 Dec 1978 A
Liberia	19 Nov 1979 A
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Sep 1976 A
Malaysia	12 Apr 1982 A
Maldives	25 Feb 1980 A
Malta	23 Apr 1979 A
Mexico	19 Dec 1980 A
Morocco[4]	25 Jul 1980 A
Myanmar	29 Jan 1980 A
Nepal	31 Jan 1979 A
Netherlands[5]	19 Jul 1977 A
New Zealand	15 Aug 1978 A
Nicaragua	17 Mar 1982 A
Norway	8 Aug 1977 A
Oman	22 May 1981 A
Pakistan	23 Jan 1981 A
Panama	22 Jun 1977 A
Peru	21 Jan 1980 A
Philippines	17 Nov 1981 A
Poland	13 Feb 1979 A
Portugal	3 Mar 1980 A
Qatar	19 May 1977 A
Republic of Korea	19 Sep 1978 A
Romania	25 Jul 1977 A
Russian Federation	2 Jul 1979 A
Saint Lucia	10 Apr 1980 A
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	29 Apr 1981 A
Saudi Arabia	1 Aug 1979 A
Seychelles	13 Jun 1978 A
Singapore	15 Jun 1979 A
Spain	14 Apr 1981 A
Sri Lanka	12 Jul 1977 A
Suriname	11 Apr 1979 A
Sweden	23 Mar 1977 A
Switzerland	22 May 1981 A
Thailand	20 Feb 1981 A
Tunisia	1 Aug 1979 A
United Arab Emirates[5]	4 Mar 1980 A

Participant[2]	*Acceptance (A)*	*Participant*[2]	*Acceptance (A)*
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	22 Feb 1980 A	United States of America	28 Aug 1980 A
United Republic of Tanzania	23 Apr 1979 A	Uruguay	17 Dec 1980 A

Notes:

[1] Amendments to article 51 were registered on 28 July 1982 under No. 4214.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the amendments on 4 August 1980. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments on 29 November 1977. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] With the same declaration as the one made in respect of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization.

With regard to the said reservation, the Government of Israel, in communication received by the Secretary-General on 25 July 1980, stated the following:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of the United Arab Emriates contains a statement of political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of the United Arab Emirates cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the United Arab Emriates, under general international law or under particular treaties."

The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government the United Arab Emriates an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands"regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] 22 February 1980: acceptance of the amendments except those relating to article 51 of the Convention.

In a communication accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Government of the United Kingdom stated the following:

"Although this instrument does not include the amendments to article 51 and should not therefore be counted among the acceptances required for the coming into force of those amendments, [the Secretary of State writes] to inform [the Secretary-General], for the sake of clarification, that the Government of the United Kingdom does not wish to make a "declaration" of non-acceptance under the provisions of the present article 51, and will consider itself bound by the amendments to article 51 when these come into force for all Members of IMCO."

28 September 1981: acceptance of amendments to article 51.

1. e) Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization relating to the institutionalization of the Committee on Technical Co-operation in the Convention

London, 17 November 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 November 1984, in accordance with article 62 of the Convention as amended, for all members of the Organization*.
REGISTRATION: 10 November 1984, No. 4214.
STATUS: Parties*.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1380, p. 268.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.400 (X) of 17 November 1977.

Pursuant to article 64 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendments are in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant[1]	*Acceptance (A)*
Argentina	26 May 1981 A
Australia	10 Jun 1980 A
Austria	6 Apr 1983 A
Bahamas	1 Mar 1979 A
Bahrain	25 Apr 1980 A
Bangladesh	8 Oct 1979 A
Barbados	20 Aug 1979 A
Brazil	20 Mar 1979 A
Bulgaria	4 Mar 1980 A
Canada	19 Nov 1979 A
Cape Verde	23 Apr 1980 A
Chile	13 Feb 1979 A
China	30 Oct 1979 A
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Nov 1981 A
Cuba	26 Oct 1982 A
Cyprus	10 Jul 1979 A
Denmark	2 Jan 1979 A
Djibouti	20 Feb 1979 A
Dominica	18 Dec 1979 A
Dominican Republic	10 Nov 1983 A
Egypt	17 Nov 1980 A
El Salvador	12 Feb 1981 A
Ethiopia	11 Apr 1979 A
Finland	19 Nov 1979 A
Gabon	27 Feb 1979 A
Gambia	11 Jan 1979 A
Germany[2,3]	2 Apr 1979 A
Ghana	5 Feb 1980 A
Greece	28 Jul 1981 A
Guyana	13 May 1980 A
Hungary	31 Mar 1980 A
Iceland	28 Jul 1980 A
India	22 Jan 1979 A
Indonesia	29 Jul 1983 A
Iraq	5 Sep 1979 A
Ireland	27 Oct 1981 A
Israel	31 Dec 1979 A
Italy[4]	13 Jun 1983 A
Jamaica	9 Apr 1979 A
Kuwait	27 Nov 1979 A
Liberia	14 Dec 1979 A
Malaysia	28 Sep 1981 A
Maldives	25 Feb 1980 A
Malta	23 Apr 1979 A
Mexico	23 Mar 1983 A
Morocco[5]	25 Jul 1980 A
Mozambique	10 Nov 1983 A
Nepal	31 Jan 1979 A
Netherlands[6]	29 Jun 1981 A
New Zealand	9 Mar 1979 A
Nicaragua	17 Mar 1982 A
Norway	5 Sep 1978 A
Oman	22 May 1981 A
Pakistan	23 Jan 1981 A
Panama	23 Dec 1980 A
Peru	21 Jan 1980 A
Philippines	17 Nov 1981 A
Poland	2 Jan 1980 A
Portugal	22 Dec 1982 A
Republic of Korea	31 May 1979 A
Romania	14 Sep 1982 A
Russian Federation	2 Jul 1979 A
Saint Lucia	10 Apr 1980 A
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	29 Apr 1981 A
Saudi Arabia	1 Aug 1979 A
Seychelles	7 Jul 1982 A
Singapore	15 Jun 1979 A
Spain	14 Apr 1981 A
Sri Lanka	16 Jan 1980 A
Suriname	11 Apr 1979 A
Sweden	5 Jan 1979 A
Switzerland	22 May 1981 A
Thailand	20 Feb 1981 A
Togo	20 Jun 1983 A
Trinidad and Tobago	22 Aug 1984 A
Tunisia	1 Aug 1979 A
United Arab Emirates	2 Nov 1981 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[7]	22 Feb 1980 A
United Republic of Tanzania	23 Apr 1979 A
United States of America	28 Aug 1980 A
Uruguay	17 Dec 1980 A
Yemen[8]	14 Mar 1979 A

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the amendments on 27 June 1979. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments with the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organisation on 29 January 1980 and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 5 February 1980. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Acceptance by the Government of Italy of the 1977 amendments exclude the amendment to what was article 52 at the time of adoption of resolution A.400(X) of 17 November 1977 and became article 62 with the entry into force of the amendments adopted by resolutions A.315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974 and A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 (see chapter XII.1.d).

[5] With the same declaration as the one made in respect of the Convention (see chapter XII.1).

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] 22 February 1980: acceptance of the amendments except those relating to article 51 of the Convention.

In a communication accompanying the instrument of acceptance, the Government of the United Kingdom stated the following:

"Although this instrument does not include the amendments to article 51 and should not therefore be counted among the acceptances required for the coming into force of those amendments, [the Secretary of State writes] to inform [the Secretary-General], for the sake of clarification, that the Government of the United Kingdom does not wish to make a "declaration" of non-acceptance under the provisions of the present article 51, and will consider itself bound by the amendments to article 51 when these come into force for all Members of IMCO."

28 September 1981: acceptance of amendments to article 51.

[8] Democratic Yemen had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments with the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organisation on 13 June 1983 and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 20 June 1983. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

1. f) Amendments to articles 17, 18, 20 and 51 of the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

London, 15 November 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 November 1984, in accordance with article 62 of the Convention as amended, for all Members of the Organization*.
REGISTRATION: 10 November 1984, No. 4214.
STATUS: Parties*.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1380, p. 288.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.450 (XI) of 15 November 1979.

Pursuant to article 64 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendments are in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant[1]	*Acceptance (A)*
Albania	24 May 1993 A
Algeria	28 Oct 1983 A
Antigua and Barbuda	13 Jan 1986 A
Argentina	13 Jun 1983 A
Australia	17 Nov 1980 A
Austria	6 Apr 1983 A
Bahamas	23 May 1980 A
Bahrain	25 Apr 1980 A
Bangladesh	17 Mar 1980 A
Barbados	3 Mar 1980 A
Belgium	23 Dec 1980 A
Bulgaria	21 Oct 1980 A
Cameroon	2 Feb 1984 A
Canada	23 May 1980 A
Cape Verde	30 Aug 1983 A
Chile	16 Mar 1981 A
China	29 Jul 1981 A
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Nov 1981 A
Cuba	3 Nov 1983 A
Cyprus	7 Oct 1982 A
Denmark	12 May 1981 A
Djibouti	1 Jun 1982 A
Egypt	14 Sep 1982 A
Ethiopia	8 Dec 1982 A
Finland	14 Jan 1980 A
France	26 May 1983 A
Gabon	10 Nov 1983 A
Germany[2,3]	23 Jun 1980 A
Ghana	14 Nov 1983 A
Greece	28 Jul 1981 A
Hungary	3 May 1982 A
Iceland	28 Jul 1980 A
India	5 May 1980 A
Indonesia	29 Jul 1983 A
Iraq	6 Apr 1983 A
Ireland	27 Oct 1981 A
Israel	15 Dec 1982 A
Italy[4]	13 Jun 1983 A
Jamaica	30 Apr 1980 A
Jordan	18 Jan 1984 A
Kenya	19 Apr 1983 A
Lebanon	19 Apr 1983 A
Liberia	8 Jan 1981 A
Malaysia	2 Apr 1981 A
Maldives	2 Apr 1980 A
Mexico	23 Mar 1983 A
Morocco[5]	25 Jul 1980 A
Nepal	1 Nov 1982 A
Netherlands[6]	29 Jun 1981 A
New Zealand	15 Dec 1980 A
Nicaragua	17 Mar 1982 A
Norway	28 Jul 1981 A
Oman	24 May 1982 A
Pakistan	10 Dec 1982 A
Peru	28 Jul 1982 A
Philippines	11 Jul 1983 A
Poland	20 Nov 1980 A
Portugal	22 Dec 1982 A
Qatar	29 Jun 1982 A
Republic of Korea	31 Mar 1980 A
Romania	14 Sep 1982 A
Russian Federation	23 Jan 1981 A
Saint Lucia	14 Sep 1983 A
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	29 Apr 1981 A
Senegal	20 Jun 1983 A
Seychelles	7 Jul 1982 A
Singapore	1 Nov 1983 A
Somalia	6 Dec 1983 A
Spain	14 Apr 1981 A
Sri Lanka	17 Mar 1981 A
Suriname	28 May 1980 A
Sweden	25 Nov 1980 A
Switzerland	22 May 1981 A
Thailand	23 Mar 1983 A
Togo	20 Jun 1983 A
Trinidad and Tobago	5 Jul 1983 A
Tunisia	5 Jan 1983 A
United Arab Emirates	2 Nov 1981 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Sep 1983 A
United Republic of Tanzania	26 May 1983 A
United States of America	17 Nov 1981 A
Uruguay	13 Oct 1983 A
Yemen[7]	20 Jun 1983 A

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the amendments on 15 May 1981. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugsoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments with the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization on 2 June 1980 and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 10 June 1983. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Acceptance by the Government of Italy of the 1977 amendments exclude the amendment to what was article 52 at the time of adoption of resolution A.400(X) of 17 November 1977 and became article 62 with the entry into force of the amendments adopted by resolutions A.315 (ES.V) of 17 October 1974 and A.358 (IX) of 14 November 1975 (see chapter XII.1.d).

[5] With the same declaration as the one made in respect of the Convention (see chapter XII.1).

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The Yemen Arab Republic had deposited its instrument of acceptance of the amendments with the Secretary-General of the International Maritime Organization on 8 November 1983 and with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 10 November 1983. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

1. g) Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization, (institutionalization of the Facilitation Committee)

London, 7 November 1991

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 66 of the Convention, as amended which reads as follows: "Texts of proposed amendments to the Convention shall be communicated by the Secretary-General to Members at least six months in advance of their consideration by the Assembly. Amendments shall be adopted by a two-thirds majority vote of the Assembly. Twelve months after its acceptance by two-thirds of the Members of the Organization, other than Associate Members, each amendment shall come into force for all Members." (Article 62 was renumbered as article 66 by Resolution A.400 (X) of 17 November 1977.).

STATUS: Parties: 106.

TEXT: IMO Resolution A.724 (17).

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.724 (17) of 7 November 1991.

Pursuant to article 64 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which have accepted the amendments to the Convention relating to the institutionalization of the facilitation committee in the Convention, either upon acceptance of the Convention or thereafter, showing the dates of deposit of their instruments with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant	*Acceptance (A)*
Albania	1 Jul 2005 A
Algeria	8 Jun 2000 A
Antigua and Barbuda	28 Feb 2002 A
Argentina	17 Oct 2006 A
Australia	1 Jul 1994 A
Bahamas	7 May 1998 A
Barbados	1 Jul 1998 A
Belgium	5 Apr 1994 A
Belize	20 Jan 2006 A
Bolivia	26 May 2006 A
Brazil	16 Nov 1995 A
Brunei Darussalam	23 Dec 1998 A
Bulgaria	29 Jan 1997 A
Cameroon	17 Mar 1994 A
Canada	24 Jun 1993 A
Chile	20 Nov 1995 A
China	27 Oct 1994 A
Colombia	13 Sep 2006 A
Comoros	3 Aug 2001 A
Congo	31 May 2002 A
Côte d'Ivoire	16 Dec 2004 A
Cuba	22 Dec 1993 A
Cyprus	24 Jun 1996 A
Czech Republic	12 Aug 2004 A
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	12 Dec 2002 A
Denmark	6 Jan 1994 A
Djibouti	13 Aug 2002 A
Ecuador	5 Sep 2005 A
Egypt	12 Jul 1994 A
Eritrea	23 Oct 2001 A
Estonia	26 Aug 1992 A
Fiji	3 Mar 2005 A
Finland	26 Jan 1994 A
France	28 May 1996 A
Gabon	10 Jun 2002 A
Gambia	10 Jan 2003 A
Georgia	5 Sep 2006 A
Ghana	21 Nov 2003 A
Greece	2 Dec 1994 A
Guatemala	8 Aug 2001 A
Honduras	30 Aug 2002 A
Hungary	8 Jul 2004 A
Iceland	17 Feb 1998 A
India	31 Oct 1995 A
Indonesia	21 May 1996 A
Ireland	25 Sep 2003 A
Israel	3 May 2006 A
Italy	18 Feb 2000 A
Jamaica	18 Aug 2005 A
Japan	6 Jun 2006 A
Jordan	22 Jun 2005 A
Kenya	13 Nov 2006 A
Kiribati	28 Oct 2003 A
Latvia	16 Jun 2000 A
Liberia	9 Aug 2002 A
Lithuania	16 Nov 2004 A
Luxembourg	22 Sep 2000 A
Malaysia	10 Nov 2004 A
Maldives	23 May 2005 A
Malta	16 Jan 1998 A
Marshall Islands	7 Sep 1998 A
Mauritius	16 Mar 2004 A
Mexico	1 Sep 1998 A
Monaco	13 Nov 2002 A
Montenegro	10 Oct 2006 A
Morocco	16 Jun 1995 A
Namibia	28 Nov 2000 A
Netherlands	6 Dec 1993 A
New Zealand[1]	9 Oct 2000 A
Nicaragua	4 Jul 2006 A
Norway	10 Sep 1992 A
Pakistan	5 Apr 2002 A
Panama	19 Mar 1999 A
Peru	7 May 1996 A
Poland	5 Mar 2002 A
Portugal	12 Jul 2004 A
Republic of Korea	22 Dec 1994 A
Romania	6 Sep 2002 A
Russian Federation	23 Aug 1993 A
Saint Kitts and Nevis	8 Oct 2001 A

Participant	*Acceptance (A)*
Saint Lucia	30 Aug 2005 A
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	9 Aug 2002 A
Samoa	18 Jun 2002 A
San Marino	12 Mar 2002 A
Saudi Arabia	26 Sep 2005 A
Senegal	20 Jun 2005 A
Serbia	11 Dec 2000 A
Seychelles	14 Jul 1992 A
Sierra Leone	27 Jul 2001 A
Singapore	25 May 1994 A
Slovakia	12 Jun 1995 A
Slovenia	10 Mar 1998 A
Spain	6 Oct 1993 A
Sweden	1 Sep 1994 A
Syrian Arab Republic	15 Feb 2001 A
Thailand	19 Apr 1994 A
Togo	11 Jun 2002 A
Tonga	4 Dec 2002 A
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Nov 1995 A
Tunisia	15 Jan 1999 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Sep 1994 A
United Republic of Tanzania	6 Sep 2002 A
United States of America	14 Oct 1998 A
Uruguay	30 Jan 1998 A
Vanuatu	18 Feb 1999 A
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	29 Apr 2004 A

Notes:

[1] With a declaration to the effect that "... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this acceptance shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory.".

1. h) Amendments to the Convention on the International Maritime Organization

London, 4 November 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 November 2002, in accordance with article 66 of the Convention, for all Members of the Organization (Article 62 was renumbered as Article 66 by Resolution A.400 (X) of 17 November 1977)*.
REGISTRATION: 7 November 2002, No. 4214.
TEXT: IMO Resolution A.735. (18).
STATUS: Parties*.

Note: See "*Note:*" at beginning of chapter XII.1.

The amendments were adopted by the Assembly of the Organization by resolution A.735 (18) of 4 November 1993.

Pursuant to article 68 of the Convention, the acceptance of an amendment shall be made by the communication of an instrument to the Secretary-General of the Organization for deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Following is the list of States which had accepted the Amendments to the Convention prior to their entry into force.

*See chapter XII.1 for the complete list of Participants, Members of the International Maritime Organization, for which the above amendments are in force, pursuant to article 66 of the Convention as amended.

Participant	*Acceptance (A)*
Algeria	18 Dec 1996 A
Antigua and Barbuda	10 Oct 2000 A
Argentina	21 Sep 1995 A
Australia	10 Mar 1995 A
Azerbaijan	31 Oct 2001 A
Bahamas	7 May 1998 A
Bahrain	28 Jul 1998 A
Bangladesh	13 Jul 1998 A
Barbados	1 Jul 1998 A
Belgium	15 Sep 1998 A
Belize	6 May 1997 A
Brazil	23 Dec 1996 A
Brunei Darussalam	23 Dec 1998 A
Bulgaria	29 Jan 1997 A
Canada	23 Jun 1995 A
Chile	19 Jun 1998 A
China	27 Oct 1994 A
Comoros	3 Aug 2001 A
Congo	21 Aug 2001 A
Côte d'Ivoire	4 Nov 1998 A
Cuba	28 Feb 1994 A
Cyprus	24 Jun 1996 A
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	5 Apr 1994 A
Denmark	6 Jan 1994 A
Dominica	29 Apr 1997 A
Ecuador	30 Jan 1998 A
Egypt	12 Jul 1994 A
Eritrea	23 Oct 2001 A
Estonia	22 Feb 1994 A
Fiji	20 Aug 2002 A
Finland	28 Aug 1995 A
France	18 Nov 1997 A
Gambia	12 Jul 2001 A
Georgia	7 Jun 2001 A
Germany	17 Mar 1995 A
Ghana	1 Jul 1996 A
Greece	2 Dec 1994 A
Guatemala	8 Aug 2001 A
Guyana	16 Sep 1998 A
Honduras	26 Oct 1999 A
Hungary	12 May 2000 A
Iceland	17 Feb 1998 A
India	28 Nov 1995 A
Indonesia	21 May 1996 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	20 Jun 1996 A
Ireland	16 Nov 1998 A
Italy	18 Feb 2000 A
Jamaica	31 Aug 1999 A
Kenya	4 Nov 1999 A
Kuwait	15 Sep 1995 A
Latvia	16 Jun 2000 A
Lebanon	10 Jul 1995 A
Liberia	16 Jun 1995 A
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	6 Nov 1998 A
Lithuania	16 Nov 1999 A
Luxembourg	22 Sep 2000 A
Madagascar	9 Oct 1996 A
Malawi	26 Oct 2001 A
Malta	4 Feb 1994 A
Marshall Islands	7 Sep 1998 A
Mauritius	16 Jan 1997 A
Mexico	4 May 1995 A
Monaco	27 Jan 1994 A
Morocco	16 Jun 1995 A
Myanmar	7 Jul 1998 A
Namibia	10 Sep 2001 A
Nepal	22 Sep 1998 A
Netherlands[1]	26 Sep 1994 A
New Zealand[2]	9 Oct 2000 A
Nigeria	4 May 1995 A
Oman	20 May 1998 A
Panama	28 Oct 1997 A
Papua New Guinea	7 Nov 2001 A
Peru	7 May 1996 A
Philippines	8 Dec 1997 A
Poland	29 Dec 1995 A
Portugal	16 Oct 2001 A
Qatar	27 Oct 1998 A
Republic of Korea	5 Apr 1994 A
Russian Federation	8 Sep 1994 A
Saint Kitts and Nevis	8 Oct 2001 A
Saint Lucia	10 Sep 1998 A
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	13 Apr 2000 A
Saudi Arabia	27 Feb 1996 A
Serbia	11 Dec 2000 A
Seychelles	30 Jun 1998 A
Sierra Leone	27 Jul 2001 A
Singapore	28 Nov 1995 A

Participant	*Acceptance (A)*
Slovakia	12 Jun 1995 A
Slovenia	10 Mar 1998 A
South Africa	21 Oct 1999 A
Spain	24 Jan 1995 A
Sri Lanka	21 Jan 1998 A
Sudan	21 Aug 2001 A
Sweden	1 Sep 1994 A
Switzerland	21 Dec 1995 A
Syrian Arab Republic	18 Nov 1997 A
Thailand	10 Sep 1996 A
Tonga	3 Nov 2000 A
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Nov 1995 A
Tunisia	16 Jul 1996 A
Turkey	8 May 2001 A
United Arab Emirates	3 Mar 1995 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Sep 1994 A
United Republic of Tanzania	24 Jul 1998 A
United States of America	14 Oct 1998 A
Vanuatu	18 Feb 1999 A
Viet Nam	20 Jul 1998 A

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[2] With a declaration to the effect that "... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this acceptance shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

2. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT AND REGISTRATION OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION

Bangkok, 22 June 1956

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 9 which reads as follows: "The present Convention shall come into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the fourth instrument of ratification. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the fourth instrument of ratification, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 4.

TEXT: United Nations publication, Sales No.: 1957.II.F.9 (E/CN.11/461).

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Inland Waterway Sub-Committee of the Inland Transport Committee of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East at its third session, held at Dacca, East Pakistan, in October 1955.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*	*Participant*[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*
Cambodia	22 Jun 1956		Lao People's Democratic Republic	22 Jun 1956	
China[2]			Thailand	22 Jun 1956	
Indonesia	22 Jun 1956				

Notes:

[1] The Convention was signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 22 June 1956. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 22 June 1956. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

3. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES CONCERNING COLLISIONS IN INLAND NAVIGATION

Geneva, 15 March 1960

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 13 September 1966, in accordance with article 11 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall come into force on the ninetieth day after five of the countries referred to in article 10, paragraph 1, have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession. 2. With respect to any country which ratifies the Convention or accedes to it after five countries have deposited their instruments of ratification or accession, this Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the said country has deposited its instrument of ratification or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 13 September 1966, No. 8310.

STATUS: Signatories: 5. Parties: 13.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 572, p. 133.

Note: The Convention was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its subsidiary bodies (Working Party on River Law and Groups of Rapporteurs). The Inland Transport Committee decided to open it for signature at its nineteenth session, held from 14 to 18 December 1959 (See Report of the Inland Transport Committee on its nineteenth session, document E/ECE/TRANS/514, para. 49).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	14 Jun 1960	27 Sep 1962
Belarus		30 Aug 2006 a
Belgium	15 Jun 1960	
France	15 Jun 1960	12 Mar 1962
Germany[1,2]	14 Jun 1960	29 May 1973
Hungary		24 Jul 1973 a
Kazakhstan		14 Jul 2003 a
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands	14 Jun 1960	15 Jun 1966
Poland		8 May 1972 a
Romania		4 Aug 1969 a
Russian Federation		26 Jan 1962 a
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Switzerland		26 Apr 1972 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

[The Government of Austria] considers the German text as authentic, in accordance with article 19 of the Convention.

BELARUS

Reservations:

Pursuant to article 9, paragraph (a), of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not apply the provisions of the Convention to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;

Pursuant to article 9, paragraph (b), of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not apply the provisions of the Convention on waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping;

Pursuant to article 15, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not apply article 14 of the Convention insofar as it concerns the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

BELGIUM

[The Government of Belgium] considers the French text as authentic, in accordance with article 19 of the Convention.

FRANCE

In accordance with article 19 of the Convention, [the Government of France] considers the French text as authentic.

HUNGARY

(a) Pursuant to article 9 of the Convention, the Hungarian People's Republic reserves the right to provide by law that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply:

- To vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;
- To those waterways in the territory of the Hungarian People's Republic which are reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

(b) Pursuant to article 15 of the Convention, the Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention in so far as it concerns the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

KAZAKHSTAN

Reservation:

The Republic of Kazakhstan having considered the Convention accedes to it subject to the following reservation Republic of Kazakhstan declares pursuant to Article 9 that provisions of

the present Convention shall not apply to the vessels designated for exercising functions of the State authority and hereby reserves the right to provide for nonapplicability of these provisions in its legislation to the waterways where the navigation is permitted only for the vessels of Republic Kazakhstan.

MONTENEGRO[3]

Confirmed upon succession

Reservations:

The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia declares in accordance with article 9 of the afore-mentioned Convention:

(a) that it reserves the right to provide by law or international agreement that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;

(b) that it reserves the right to provide by law that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply on waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

POLAND[5]

[The Polish People's Republic] reserves the right not to apply the present Convention to inland waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

ROMANIA

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 15, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the agreement of all the parties in dispute in each particular case.

The Socialist Republic of Romania reserves the right, in accordance with article 9, paragraphs (a) and (b) of the Convention, to provide by law or international agreement that the provisions of the Convention shall not apply to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities, or to waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

(a) *With respect to the Convention as a whole:* The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of this Convention will not be applied on inland waterways of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that are open to navigation only by ships sailing under the flag of the USSR;

(b) *With respect to article 14:* The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by article 14 of this Convention with regard to the reference of disputes to the International Court.

In acceding to the Convention, the Government of the USSR deems it necessary at the same time to state its view that article 10 of the Convention, which limits the number of States which may become Parties to it, is illegal.

SERBIA[4]

Confirmed upon succession

Reservations:

The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia declares in accordance with article 9 of the afore-mentioned Convention:

(a) that it reserves the right to provide by law or international agreement that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;

(b) that it reserves the right to provide by law that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply on waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Netherlands	15 Jun 1966	Surinam

Notes:

[1] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 8 October 1976 with reservations and a declaration. For the text of the reservations and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1025, p. 378. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Convention on 14 February 1962 with the following declarations:

The Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia declares in accordance with article 9 of the afore-mentioned Convention:

(a) that it reserves the right to provide by law or international agreement that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to vessels exclusively employed by the public authorities;

(b) that it reserves the right to provide by law that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply on waterways reserved exclusively for its own shipping.

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 14 of the Convention made upon accession. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 823, p. 414.

4. CONVENTION ON THE REGISTRATION OF INLAND NAVIGATION VESSELS

Geneva, 25 January 1965

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 June 1982, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 24 June 1982, No. 21114.
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 9.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1281, p. 111.

Note: The Convention was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its subsidiary bodies (Working Party on River Law and Groups of Rapporteurs). The Inland Transport Committee, at its twenty-first session held from 20 to 24 January 1964, decided that the question of the opening of the Convention for signature should be settled by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport at its next session (see Report of the Inland Transport Committee on its twenty-third session, document E/ECE/TRANS/535, paragraph 52). The decision to open the Convention for signature was taken by the said Sub-Committee at its eighth session held from 28 to 30 October 1964 (see document TRANS/291, paragraph 17).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	18 Jun 1965	26 Aug 1977
Belarus		30 Aug 2006 a
Belgium	31 Dec 1965	
Croatia		31 Jul 2002 d
France	31 Dec 1965	13 Jun 1972
Germany[1]	5 Nov 1965	
Luxembourg	14 Dec 1965	26 Mar 1982
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[3]	30 Dec 1965	14 Nov 1974
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Switzerland	28 Dec 1965	14 Jan 1976

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

1. Austria accepts Protocol No. 1 annexed to the Convention concerning the Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels.

2. Austria accepts Protocol No. 2 annexed to the Convention concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels.

BELARUS

Reservations:

Pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1 (a), of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not apply article 20 of the Convention insofar as it concerns the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice;

Pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1 (d), of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not apply the Convention to vessels used exclusively for a non commercial government service;

Pursuant to article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not, in the event of a forced sale in its territory, apply article 14, paragraph 2 (b), of Protocol No. 1 concerning rights in rem in inland navigation vessels;...

Declaration:

In accordance with article 15, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning rights in rem in inland navigation vessels and Protocol No. 2 on attachment and forced sale of inland navigation vessels.

BELGIUM

Belgium enters the reservations provided for in article 21, paragraph 1 (b), (c) and (d).

CROATIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1 annexed to the Convention concerning the Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels and Protocol No. 2 annexed to the Convention concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

France declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1, annexed hereto, concerning Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels, and Protocol No. 2, also annexed hereto, concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels.

Upon ratification:

France, exercising the reservation provided for in article 19 of Protocol No. 1, declares pursuant to article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it will not apply the provisions of article 14, paragraph 2 (b), of this Protocol in the event of a forced sale in its territory.

GERMANY[1]

The Federal Republic of Germany declares that:

1. German registration offices will supply extracts from documents deposited with them and referred to by the entries in the register only to applicants who produce evidence of a legitimate interest in obtaining such extracts.

2. It will not apply the Convention to vessels navigating on lakes and adjacent sections of waterways and belonging to the German Federal Railways.

LUXEMBOURG

Luxembourg declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning Rights in rem in Inland Navigation Vessels, and Protocol No. 2 concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels.

MONTENEGRO[2]

Confirmation upon succession:

Declaration:

Exercising the option provided for in article 15 (1), the Government of Yugoslavia specified in its instrument of ratification that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning rights in rem in Inland Navigation Vessels and Protocol No. 2 concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels, annexed to the Convention.

NETHERLANDS

In accordance with article 21, paragraph 1 (d) of the Convention, the Netherlands will not apply this Convention to vessels used exclusively for a non-commercial government service.

13 June 1985

[The Netherlands], in accordance with the provision of article 15, paragraph 1, accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning Rights *in rem* in inland navigation vessels

SERBIA[4]

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

Exercising the option provided for in article 15 (1), the Government of Yugoslavia specified that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels and Protocol No. 2 concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels, annexed to the Convention.

SWITZERLAND

Reservations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Switzerland enters the following reservations pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1 (b), (c) and (d), of the Convention:

ad (b): Its registration offices will supply extracts as specified in article 2, paragraph 3, of the Convention only to applicants who produce evidence of a legitimate interest in obtaining such extracts;

ad (c): It will not apply the Convention to vessels navigating on lakes and adjacent sections of waterways and belonging to national railways administrations or operating under licence;

ad (d): It will not apply the Convention to vessels used exclusively for a non-commercial government service.

Switzerland declares that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning Rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels and declares that, pursuant to article 19 of the said Protocol and to article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention, it will not apply the provisions of article 14, paragraph 2 (b), of the said Protocol in the event of a forced sale in its territory.

Notes:

[1] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 May 1965 and 11 October 1985, respectively, with the following declaration:

[The Government of Yugoslavia] exercising the option provided for in article 15 (1), the Government of Yugoslavia specified that it accepts Protocol No. 1 concerning rights *in rem* in Inland Navigation Vessels and Protocol No. 2 concerning Attachment and Forced Sale of Inland Navigation Vessels, annexed to the Convention.

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5. Convention on the Measurement of Inland Navigation Vessels

Geneva, 15 February 1966

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 April 1975, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 19 April 1975, No. 13899.
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 16.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 964, p. 177.

Note: The Convention was prepared by the Sub-Committee on Inland Water Transport of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and its subsidiary bodies (Working Party on River Law and Groups of Rapporteurs). The Inland Transport Committee decided to open it for signature at its twenty-fifth session held from 17 to 20 January 1966 (see Report of the Inland Transport Committee on its twenty-fifth session, document E/ECE/TRANS/544, para. 63).

Participant[1,2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Belarus		30 Aug 2006 a
Belgium	2 Nov 1966	9 Mar 1972
Bulgaria	14 Nov 1966	4 Mar 1980
Czech Republic[3]		2 Jun 1993 d
France	17 May 1966	8 Jun 1970
Germany[4,5]	14 Nov 1966	19 Apr 1974
Hungary		5 Jan 1978 a
Luxembourg	29 Jul 1966	26 Mar 1982
Moldova		18 Jan 2000 a
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[7]	14 Nov 1966	14 Aug 1978
Romania		24 May 1976 a
Russian Federation		19 Feb 1981 a
Serbia		31 Jul 2002 d
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Switzerland	14 Nov 1966	7 Feb 1975

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Belarus

Reservation:

Pursuant to article 15, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus will not apply article 14 of the Convention insofar as it concerns the referral of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

Declaration:

In accordance with article 2, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus declares that the guideline document of the Republic of Belarus RD RB 02190.1.37-2003, entitled 'Measurement of vessels: calculation of displacement and tonnage', shall apply in the territory of the Republic of Belarus.

Belgium[8]

Bulgaria[9]

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

It further declares that the validity of measurement certificates issued by its measurement offices for vessels intended for the carriage of goods may be extended only by one of the said offices.

Upon ratification:

The term of validity of measurement certificates issued by its measurement offices for inland navigation vessels is 15 years and cannot be extended.

Czech Republic[3]

France

Upon signature of the Protocol of Signature:

Since the measurement signs affixed by the French services are not intended solely to establish the fact of measurement, the said signs shall not be either removed or effaced at the time of remeasurement; instead, an indelible mark consisting of a small cross with vertical and horizontal arms of equal length shall be applied to the left of such signs.

Hungary

The Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by those provisions of article 14 of the Convention which refer the disputes between Contracting Parties to the International Court of Justice.

Netherlands[10]

Romania

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares, pursuant to article 15, paragraph 1, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention. The position of the Socialist Republic of Romania is that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute, in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation:

In accordance with article 15, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Measurement of Inland Navigation Vessels the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of that Convention, to the effect that any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which the Parties are unable to settle by negotiation or by other settlement procedures may, at the request of any of the Contracting Parties concerned, be referred for settlement to the International Court of Justice, and declares that for the referral of such disputes to the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is necessary in each individual case;

Declaration:

In accordance with article 10, paragraph 6, of the 1966 Convention on the Measurement of Inland Navigation Vessels, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of this Convention shall not apply to inland waterways of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics that are open to navigation only for vessels flying the flag of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

SLOVAKIA[3]

Notification of distinctive letters of measurement offices under article 10 (5) of the Convention

Participant:	*Distincive letters:*
Belarus[11]	RR-BY
Belgium	BR-B
Bulgaria[12]	LB (Lom)
	RB(Rousse)
France	F
Germany[4]	D
Hungary	HU
Luxembourg	L
Luxembourg	L
Moldova	MD 498-85
Netherlands[13]	[RN (Rotterdam)]
	[AN (Amsterdam)]
	[GN (Groningen)]
	HN(Rijswijk)
Romania	RNR
Russian Federation	RSSU
Serbia[14]	JR-JU-XXXX
Switzerland	BS-CH (Basel Stadt)
	BL-CH (Basel-Land)
	AG-CH (Aargau)

Notes:

[1] The Convention and the Protocol of Signature were signed on behalf of each of the States mentioned on the same date, with the exception of Belgium, on behalf of which the Convention was signed on 2 November 1966 and the Protocol on 4 November 1966.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 8 December 1969, selecting the letters JR-YU as distinctive letters of measurement offices under article 10 (5) of the Convention. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 2 January 1974, with a declaration, and choosing "CS" as distinctive letters of measurement offices. Subsequently, on 22 January 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration made upon accession. For the text the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 964, p. 224. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 31 August 1976 choosing "DDR" as distinctive letters of measure- ment offices and with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 1021, p. 474. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[8] On 26 April 2000, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation made upon ratification of the Convention under article 15 (2). For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 964, p. 224.

[9] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification with respect to article 14. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1161, p. 480.

[10] In a communication received on 31 May 1996, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration made upon ratificaction. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1102, p. 342.

[11] In accordance with article 2, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus designates as the agency responsible for the issue of measurement certificates in the territory of the Republic of Belarus the national unitary enterprise Belarusian River Register Inspectorate, which shall be designated by the distinguishing group of letters 'RR-BY'.

[12] Each of these two groups of distinctive letters to be followed by a figure indicating the serial number of the measurement certificate issued by the office concerned.

[13] In a communication received on 19 May 1989, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General of the following changes concerning the declarations made in respect of articles 2 (3) and 10 (5) of the said Convention:

"After an internal reorganisation of the Netherlands Measuring Office for Navigation Vessels on 1 January 1989, the competent office issuing measurement certificates for the application of art. 2 paragraph 3 and art. 10 paragraph 5 of the Convention, is the Measurement Office in Rijswijk, designated by the letters HN."

[14] "... The "XXXX" represents the measurement number issued by the Federal Public Institution, Yugoslav Register of Inland Vessels Navigation. In accordance with Article 8(1) of the Convention, the competent Yugoslav central measuring service is the Federal Public Institution, Yugoslav Register of Inland Vessels Navigation, Narodnih heroja 30/II, 11000 Belgrade."

6. Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences

Geneva, 6 April 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 October 1983, in accordance with article 49 (1).
REGISTRATION: 6 October 1983, No. 22380.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 81.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1334, p. 15 and vol. 1365, p. 360 (procès-verbal of rectification of the English and French authentic texts).

Note: Adopted by a Conference of plenipotentiaries which met at Geneva from 12 November to 15 December 1973 and from 11 March to 6 April 1974 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in accordance with resolution 3035 (XXVII)[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated on 19 December 1972. Open for signature from 1 July 1974 to 30 June 1975.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Succession (d)*
Algeria	27 Jun 1975	12 Dec 1986
Bangladesh		24 Jul 1975 a
Barbados		29 Oct 1980 a
Belgium	30 Jun 1975	30 Sep 1987
Benin		27 Oct 1975 a
Brazil	23 Jun 1975	
Bulgaria		12 Jul 1979 a
Burkina Faso		30 Mar 1989 a
Burundi		2 Nov 2005 a
Cameroon		15 Jun 1976 a
Cape Verde		13 Jan 1978 a
Central African Republic		13 May 1977 a
Chile		25 Jun 1975 s
China[2]		23 Sep 1980 a
Congo		26 Jul 1982 a
Costa Rica	15 May 1975	27 Oct 1978
Côte d'Ivoire	1 May 1975	17 Feb 1977
Cuba		23 Jul 1976 a
Czech Republic[3]		2 Jun 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		25 Jul 1977 a
Denmark[4]		28 Jun 1985 a
Ecuador	22 Oct 1974	
Egypt		25 Jan 1979 a
Ethiopia	19 Jun 1975	1 Sep 1978
Finland		31 Dec 1985 a
France	30 Jun 1975	4 Oct 1985 AA
Gabon	10 Oct 1974	5 Jun 1978
Gambia		30 Jun 1975 s
Germany[5,6]	30 Jun 1975	6 Apr 1983
Ghana	14 May 1975	24 Jun 1975
Guatemala	15 Nov 1974	3 Mar 1976
Guinea		19 Aug 1980 a
Guyana		7 Jan 1980 a
Honduras		12 Jun 1979 a
India	27 Jun 1975	14 Feb 1978
Indonesia	5 Feb 1975	11 Jan 1977
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	7 Aug 1974	
Iraq		25 Oct 1978 a
Italy		30 May 1989 a
Jamaica		20 Jul 1982 a
Jordan		17 Mar 1980 a
Kenya		27 Feb 1978 a
Kuwait		31 Mar 1986 a
Lebanon		30 Apr 1982 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Madagascar		23 Dec 1977 a
Malaysia		27 Aug 1982 a
Mali		15 Mar 1978 a
Malta	15 May 1975	
Mauritania		21 Mar 1988 a
Mauritius		16 Sep 1980 a
Mexico		6 May 1976 a
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		11 Feb 1980 a
Mozambique		21 Sep 1990 a
Netherlands[8]		6 Apr 1983 a
Niger	24 Jun 1975	13 Jan 1976
Nigeria		10 Sep 1975 a
Norway		28 Jun 1985 a
Pakistan		27 Jun 1975 s
Peru		21 Nov 1978 a
Philippines	2 Aug 1974	2 Mar 1976
Portugal		13 Jun 1990 a
Qatar		31 Oct 1994 a
Republic of Korea		11 May 1979 a
Romania		7 Jan 1982 a
Russian Federation	27 Jun 1975	28 Jun 1979 A
Saudi Arabia		24 May 1985 a
Senegal	30 Jun 1975	20 May 1977
Serbia[10]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		9 Jul 1979 a
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Somalia		14 Nov 1988 a
Spain		3 Feb 1994 a
Sri Lanka		30 Jun 1975 s
Sudan		16 Mar 1978 a
Sweden		28 Jun 1985 a
Togo	25 Jun 1975	12 Jan 1978
Trinidad and Tobago		3 Aug 1983 a
Tunisia		15 Mar 1979 a
Turkey	30 Jun 1975	

Participant	Signature	Definitive signature (s), Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Succession (d)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2,9]		28 Jun 1985 a
United Republic of Tanzania		3 Nov 1975 a
Uruguay		9 Jul 1979 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		30 Jun 1975 s
Zambia		8 Apr 1988 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or succession.)

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Under Belgian law, the Convention must be approved by the legislative chambers before it can be ratified.

In due course, the Belgian Government will submit this Convention to the legislative chambers for ratification, with the express reservation that its implementation should not be contrary to the commitments undertaken by Belgium under the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the OECD Code of Liberalisation of invisible trade, and taking into account any reservations it may deem fit to make to the provisions of this Convention.

Upon ratification:

I. *Reservations:*

1. For the purposes of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a State member of the European Economic Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established on the territory of that member State, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community.

2. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, Article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code:

(b) Point (a) shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles reflected in Article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) Already members of a conference serving these trades, or

(ii) Admitted to such a conference under Article 1 (3) of the Code.

3. Articles 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

4. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

(b) This sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

II. *Declarations:*

1. In accordance with the Resolution on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries, as reproduced in annex II-2 to this convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium shall not prevent non-conference shipping lines from operating, provided that they compete with the conferences on a commercial basis, respecting the principle of fair competition. This government confirms its intention to abide by the said Resolution.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium declares that it will implement the Convention and its annexes in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing, is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another contracting party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trades.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

"In accordance with SUNAMAM's resolutions Nos. 3393, of 12/30/1972, and 4173, of 12/21/1972, which set up and structured the "Bureau de Estudos de Fretes Internacionais da SUNAMAM", and by which the "Superintendência Nacional de Marinha Mercante (SUNAMAM)" has the authority to reject any proposal on freight rates put forward by Liner Conferences, the contents of article 14, paragraph 6, of that Convention do not conform to Brazilian Law."

BULGARIA

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the definition of liner conference does not include joint bilateral lines operating on the basis of inter-governmental agreements.

With regard to the text of point 2 of the annex to resolution I, adopted on 6 April 1974, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the provisions of the Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences do not cover the activities of non-conference shipping lines.

CHINA

The joint shipping services established between the People's Republic of China and any other country through consultations and on a basis that the parties concerned may deem appropriate, are totally different from liner conferences in nature, and the provisions of the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences shall not be applicable thereto.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Republic of Cuba enters a reservation concerning the provisions of article 2, paragraph 17, of the Convention, to the effect that Cuba will not apply said paragraph to goods carried by joint liner services for the carriage of any cargo, established in accordance with inter-governmental agreements, regardless of their origin, their destination or the use for which they are intended.

Declaration:

With regard to the definitions in the first paragraph of part one, chapter I, the Republic of Cuba does not accept the inclusion in the concept of "Liner conference or conference" of joint liner services for the carriage of any type of cargo, established in accordance with inter-governmental agreements.

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

DENMARK

Reservations:

"1. For the purposes of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a State member of the European Economic Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established on the territory of that member State, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community.

2. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, Article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code;

(b) Point (a) shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles reflected in Article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) Already members of a conference serving these trades; or

(ii) Admitted to such a conference under Article 1 (3) of the Code.

3. Article 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the States members of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

4. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

(b) This sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement."

Declarations:

The Government of Denmark considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences affords the shipping lines of developing countries extended opportunities to participate in the conference system and is drafted so as to regulate conferences and their activities in open trades (i.e., when opportunities to compete exist). This Government also considers that it is essential for the functioning of the Code and conferences subject thereto that opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis by non-conference shipping lines continue to exist and that shippers are not denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in a number of provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and they are expressly set out in Resolution No. 2 on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

This Government considers furthermore that any regulations or other measures adopted by a contracting party to the United Nations Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition by non-conference shipping lines would be inconsistent with the above-mentioned basic concepts and would bring about a radical change in the circumstances in which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operating. Nothing in the Convention obliges other contracting parties to accept either the validity of such regulations or measures, or situations where conferences, by virtue of such regulations or measures, acquire effective monopoly in trades subject to the Code.

The Government of Denmark declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing, is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another contracting party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trades.

FINLAND

Reservations:

"1. Articles 2, 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall, on a reciprocal basis, not be applied in conference trades between Finland and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

2. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

a) The two groups of national shipping lines will coordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

b) This sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

Declarations:

A. The Government of Finland considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences affords the shipping lines of developing countries extended opportunities to participate in the conference system and is drafted so as to regulate conferences and their activities in open trades (i.e., when opportunities to compete exist). This Government also considers that it is essential for the functioning of the Code and conferences subject thereto that opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis by non-conference shipping lines continue to exist and that shippers are not denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in a number of provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and they are expressly set out in Resolution No. 2 on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

B. This Government considers furthermore that any regulations or other measures adopted by a contracting party to the UN Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition by non-conference shipping lines would be inconsistent with the above-mentioned basic concepts and would bring about a radical change in the circumstances in which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operating. Nothing in the Convention obliges other contracting parties to accept either the validity of such regulations or measures or situations where conferences, by virtue of such regulations or measures, acquire effective monopoly in trades subject to the Code.

C. The Government of Finland declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another contracting party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trades."

FRANCE

Declaration made upon signature:

Under the French Constitution, approval of the Convention is subject to authorization by Parliament.

It is understood that this approval is conditional upon compliance with the commitments undertaken by France under the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the Code of Liberalisation of invisible trade of the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development, taking into account any reservations which the French Government may deem fit to make to the provisions of this Convention.

Reservations made upon approval:

[Same reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

GERMANY[5]

Upon signature:

"The Convention under the law of the Federal Republic of Germany, requires the approval of the legislative bodies for ratification. At the appropriate time, the Federal Republic of Germany will implement the Convention in conformity with its obligations under the Treaty of Rome establishing the European Economic Community as well as under the OECD Code of Liberalisation of Current Invisible Operations."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

1. For the purposes of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a Member State of the European Economic Community, include any vessel operating shipping line established on the territory of such Member State in accordance with the EEC Treaty.

2. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) [hereinafter], article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the European Economic Community or, on the basis of reciprocity, between such States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code. .

(b) Paragraph (a) [above] shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third-country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles laid down in such trades, in accordance with the principles laid down in article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are: (i)Already members of a conference serving these trades; or (ii)Admitted to such a conference under article 1 (3) of the Code

3. Articles 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the Community or, on a reciprocal basis, between such States and the other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

4. In trades to which article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that article is interpreted as meaning that:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines will coordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

(b) this sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

5. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany will not prevent non-conference shipping lines from operating as long as they compete with conferences on a commercial basis while adhering to the principle of fair competition, in accordance with the resolution on non-conference lines adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries. It confirms its intention to act in accordance with the said resolution.

INDIA

"In confirmation of paragraph (2) of the statement filed by the Representative of India on behalf of the Group of 77 on 8 April 1974 at the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences, it is the understanding of the Government of India that the inter-governmental shipping services established in accordance with intergovernmental agreements fall outside the purview of the Convention on the Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences regardless of the origin of the cargo, their destination or the use for which they are intended."

IRAQ

The accession shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relation therewith.

ITALY

Reservation:

1. In application of the Code of Conduct, the concept of a "national shipping line" may, in the case of a member State of the European Community, include all shipping companies established on the territory of that member State in accordance with the treaty setting up the European Economic Community.

2. (a) Without prejudice to the text of paragraph (b) of this reservation, article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in trade carried by a conference between the member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between those States and the other OECD countries parties to the Code,

(b) The text of paragraph (a) shall not affect the opportunities for shipping lines of developing countries, as third-country shipping lines, to take part in such trade in accordance with the principles set out in article 2 of the Code, provided they have been recognized as national shipping lines under the terms of the Code and:

(i) Are already members of a conference carrying such trade, or

(ii) Have been accepted for membership of such a conference under the provisions of article 1(3) of the Code.

3. Article 3 and article 14(9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in trade carried out by a conference between the member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between those countries and the other OECD countries parties to the Code.

4. In any trade to which article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of the article is taken to mean that:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines shall co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters relating to trade between their two countries;

(b) The sentence shall be applied solely to matters defined in a conference agreement as requiring the consent of the two groups of national shipping lines concerned and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Italy

-Will not prevent non-conference lines from operating as long as they compete with conferences on a commercial basis while adhering to the principle of fair competition, in accordance with the Resolution on non-conference lines adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries;

-Confirms its intention of acting in accordance with the said Resolution."

KUWAIT

Understanding:

The accession to the Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of Kuwait.

NETHERLANDS

[Same declarations, identical in essence, as those made by the Federal Republic of Germany upon ratification]

NORWAY

[Same declarations and reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

PERU

The Government of Peru does not regard itself as being bound by the provisions of chapter II, article 2, paragraph 4, of the Convention.

PORTUGAL

A. *Reservations*:

1. In application of the Code of Conduct, the term "national shipping line" may, in the case of a Member State of the European Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established on the territory of such Member State in accordance with the EEC Treaty.

2 (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between such States and the other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

(b) The text of paragraph (a) shall not affect the opportunities for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades, in accordance with the principles reflected in article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) Already members of a conference serving these trade; or

(ii) Admitted to such a conference under article 1 (3) of the Code.

3. Articles 3 and 14 (9) of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades between the Member States of the Community and, on a reciprocal basis, between such States and the other OECD countries which are parties to the Code. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code of Conduct applies, the last sentence of that Article is interpreted as meaning that:

- The two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their positions before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries;

- This sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

B. *Declarations:*

1. The Government of Portugal considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences affords the shipping lines of developing countries extended opportunities to participate in the conference system and is drafted so as to regulate conferences and their activities in open trades. The Government also considers that it is essential for the functioning of the Code and conferences subject thereto that opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis by non-conference shipping lines continue to exist and that shippers are not denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in a number of provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and they are expressly set out in Resolution No. 2 on non-conference shipping lines adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

2. The Government considers furthermore that any regulations or other measures adopted by a Contracting Party to the Convention with the aim or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition by non-conference shipping lines would be inconsistent with the above-mentioned basic concepts and would bring about a radical change in the circumstances in which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operating. Nothing in the Convention obliges other Contracting Parties to accept either the validity of such regulations or measures or situations where conferences, by virtue of such regulations or measures, acquire effective monopoly in trades subject to the Code.

3. The Government of Portugal declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and considerations herein stated and, in so doing, is not precluded by the Convention from taking appropriate steps in the event that another Contracting Party adopts measures or practices that prevent fair competition on a commercial basis in its liner trade.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the provisions of the Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences do not apply to joint shipping lines established on the basis of intergovernmental agreements to serve bilateral trade between the countries concerned.

SLOVAKIA[3]

SPAIN

Reservation 1:

For the purposes of implementing the Code of Conduct, the concept of a "national shipping line" may, in the case of a State member of the European Economic Community, include any vessel-operating shipping line established in the territory of that State, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community.

Reservation 2:

(a) Without prejudice to the text of (b) below, article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not apply in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on the basis of reciprocity, between these States and other Organization for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD) countries which are parties to the Code.

(b) The text of (a) above shall not affect the opportunities for participation in such trades, as third-country shipping lines, in accordance with the principles set out in article 2 of the Code, by the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(I) Members of a conference which ensures such trades, or

(II) Admitted to membership of that conference under article 1, paragraph 3, of the Code.

Reservation 3:

Article 3 and article 14, paragraph 9, of the Code shall not apply in conference trades between States members of the Community and, on the basis of reciprocity, between these States and other OECD countries which are parties to the Code.

Reservation 4:

In trades to which article 3 of the Code applies, the final sentence of that article shall be interpreted as follows:

(a) The two groups of national shipping lines shall coordinate their positions prior to voting on issues relating to trade between their two countries.

(b) This sentence shall apply solely to issues which, under the conference agreement, require the consent of the two groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all issues dealt with in the conference agreement.

Declaration:

A. The Government of Spain considers that the United Nations Convention on a Code of Conduct for Liner Conferences provides the shipping lines of developing countries with ample opportunities to participate in the liner conference system, and that it has been drafted in such a manner as to regulate conferences and their activities within a system of free trade (where there are opportunities for non-conference shipping lines).

This Government also deems it essential to the functioning of the Code and of the conferences whose regulation is referred to that there should continue to be opportunities for fair competition on a commercial basis for non-conference shipping lines, and that shippers should not be denied an option in the choice between conference shipping lines and non-conference shipping lines, subject to any loyalty arrangements where they exist. These basic concepts are reflected in several provisions of the Code itself, including its objectives and principles, and are expressly set out in resolution No. 2, concerning non-conference shipping lines, adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries.

B. This Government further believes that any regulation or other measures adopted by a Contracting Party to the United Nations Convention and having the purpose or effect of eliminating such opportunities for competition for non-conference shipping lines would be incompatible with the basic concepts mentioned above, and would effect a radical change in the circumstances under which conferences subject to the Code are envisaged as operative. Nothing in the Convention requires other Contracting Parties to accept either the validity of such regulations, or measures or situations whereby conferences, through such regulations or measures, would, in practice, acquire a monopoly on trades subject to the Code.

C. The Government of Spain declares that it will implement the Convention in accordance with the basic concepts and conclusions stipulated herein and that, accordingly, the Convention shall not prevent it from taking appropriate steps in the event that another Contracting Party adopts measures or practices which impede fair competition on a commercial basis in liner shipping service.

SWEDEN

Reservations and declarations:

[*Same declarations and reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.*]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

I. *In relation to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and to Gibraltar*:

[Same reservations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.]

II. *In relation to Hong Kong*:

1. (a) Without prejudice to paragraph (b) of this reservation, Article 2 of the Code of Conduct shall not be applied in conference trades, on a reciprocal basis, between Hong Kong and any State which has made a reservation disapplying Article 2 in respect of its trades with the United Kingdom

(b) Point (a) above shall not affect the opportunity for participation as a third country shipping lines in such trades in accordance with the principles reflected in Article 2 of the Code, of the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognized as national shipping lines under the Code and which are:

(i) Already members of a conference serving these traces; or

(ii) Admitted to such a conference under Article 1 (3) of the Code.

2. In trades where Article 2 of the Code applies, Hong Kong shipping lines will, subject to reciprocity, allow participation in redistribution by lines from any country which has agreed to allow participation by United Kingdom lines in redistribution in respect of any of its trades.

3. Article 3 and Article 14 (9) of the Code shall not be applied in conference trades, on a reciprocal basis, between Hong Kong and any State which has made a reservation disapplying Article 3 and Article 14 (9) in respect of its trades with the United Kingdom.

4. In trades to which Article 3 of the Code applies, the last sentence of that article is interpreted as meaning that:

(i) The two groups of national shipping lines will co-ordinate their position before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries; and

(ii) This sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement."

[*Same declarations, identical in essence, as those made by Denmark.*]

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 30* (A/8730), p. 51.

[2] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

1. (A) Without prejudice to paragraph 1 (B) of this reservation, article 2 of the Convention shall not be applied in conference trades, on a reciprocal basis, between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and any State which has made a reservation disapplying article 2 in respect of its trade with the People's Republic of China.

(B) Paragraph 1 (A) above shall not affect the opportunity of shipping lines of a developing country for participation as third country shipping lines in such trades in accordance with the principles reflected in article 2 of the Convention, or the shipping lines of a developing country which are recognised as national shipping lines under the Convention and which are:

(a) Already members of a conference serving these trades: or

(b) Admitted to such a conference under article 1(3) of the Convention.

2. In trades where article 2 of the Convention applies, shipping lines incorporated in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region will, subject to reciprocity, allow participation in redistribution by lines from any country which has agreed to allow participation by lines of the People's Republic of China in redistribution in respect of its trades.

3. Article 3 and article 14 (9) of the Convention shall not be applied in conference trades, on a reciprocal basis, between the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and any State which has made a reservation disapplying article 3 and article 14 (9) in respect of its trade with the People's Republic of China.

4. In trade to which article 3 of the Convention applies, the last sentence of that article is interpreted as meaning that:

(A) The two groups of national shipping lines will coordinate their position before voting on matters concerning the trade between their two countries; and

(B) This sentence applies solely to matters which the conference agreement identifies as requiring the assent of both groups of national shipping lines concerned, and not to all matters covered by the conference agreement.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Convention on 30 June 1975 and 4 June 1979, respectively, with a declaration made upon signature. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1334, p. 202. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The instrument also specifies that the accession shall not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 27 June 1975 and 9 July 1979, respectively, with a reservation. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1334, p. 206. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe and, as from 1 January 1986, for Aruba. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/ Netherladns Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] On behalf of the United Kingdom, Gibraltar and Hong Kong. See also note 2.

[10] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 December 1974 and 7 July 1980, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. United Nations Convention on Conditions for Registration of Ships

Geneva, 7 February 1986

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 19 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force 12 months after the date on which not less than 40 States, the combined tonnage of which amounts to at least 25 per cent of the world tonnage, have become Contracting Parties to it in accordance with article 18. For the purpose of this article the tonnage shall be deemed to be that contained in annex III to this Convention. 2. For each State which becomes a Contracting Party to this Convention after the conditions for entry into force under paragraph 1 of this article have been met, the Convention shall enter into force for that State 12 months after that State has become a Contracting Party.".

STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 14.

TEXT: Doc. TD/RS/CONF/19/Add.1; depositary notifications C.N.131.1986.TREATIES-3 of 30 July 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of original Russian text) and C.N.246.1987.TREATIES-6 of 12 November 1987 (procès-verbal of rectification of original French text).

Note: The Convention was adopted by a Conference of plenipotentiaries which met at Geneva from 20 January to 7 February 1986 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development, in accordance with resolution 37/209[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 20 December 1982. The Conference on Conditions for Registration of Ships had held its first part from 16 July to 3 August 1984, and had resumed its work, first at its second part from 28 January to 15 February 1985 and then, at its third part from 8 to 19 July 1985, before adopting the Convention at its fourth and last part. Open for signature from 1 May 1986 to 30 April 1987 in New York.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*
Albania		4 Oct 2004 a
Algeria	24 Feb 1987	
Bolivia	18 Aug 1986	
Bulgaria		27 Dec 1996 a
Cameroon	29 Dec 1986	
Côte d'Ivoire	2 Apr 1987	28 Oct 1987
Czech Republic[2]	2 Jun 1993 d	
Egypt	3 Mar 1987	9 Jan 1992
Georgia		7 Aug 1995 a
Ghana		29 Aug 1990 a
Haiti		17 May 1989 a
Hungary		23 Jan 1989 a
Indonesia	26 Jan 1987	
Iraq		1 Feb 1989 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	21 Apr 1987	28 Feb 1989
Mexico	7 Aug 1986	21 Jan 1988
Morocco	31 Jul 1986	
Oman		18 Oct 1990 a
Poland	1 Apr 1987	
Russian Federation	12 Feb 1987	
Senegal	16 Jul 1986	
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 d	
Syrian Arab Republic		29 Sep 2004 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

Russian Federation

Upon signature :

The USSR regards the reference to "Democratic Kampuchea" in the list of countries compiled for the purposes of the present Convention as unlawful, inasmuch as all matters relating to Kampuchean participation in international treaties and agreements lie exclusively within the competence of the Government of the People's Republic of Kampuchea.

Syrian Arab Republic

Declaration:

[The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic] wishes to affirm that the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention does not in any way imply its recognition of Israel, nor will it lead to any dealings with Israel under the articles of this Convention.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-seventh session, Supplement No. 51* (A/37/51), p. 139.

[2] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 9 April 1987. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8. International Convention on Arrest of Ships, 1999

Geneva, 12 March 1999

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 14 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force six months following the date on which 10 States have expressed their consent to be bound by it. 2. For a State which expresses its consent to be bound by this Convention after the conditions for entry ito force thereof have been met, such consent shall take effect three months after the date of expression of such consent.".

STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 7.

TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.188.6.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 12 March 1999 at the United Nations/International Maritime Organization Diplomatic Conference on Arrest of Ships held in Geneva from 1 to 12 March 1999. In accordance with its article 12 (1), the Convention will be open for signature by any State at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 1 September 1999 to 31 August 2000.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Algeria		7 May 2004 a
Bulgaria	27 Jul 2000	21 Feb 2001
Denmark	10 Aug 2000	
Ecuador	13 Jul 2000	
Estonia		11 May 2001 a
Finland	31 Aug 2000	
Latvia		7 Dec 2001 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Norway	25 Aug 2000	
Pakistan	11 Jul 2000	
Spain		7 Jun 2002 a
Syrian Arab Republic		16 Oct 2002 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

Spain

Reservation:

At the time of its accession, the Kingdom of Spain, in accordance with article 10, paragraph 1 (b), reserves the right to exclude the application of this Convention in the case of ships not flying the flag of a State party.

Syrian Arab Republic

Reservation:

The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall not in any way be construed to mean recognition of Israel and shall not lead to entry with it into any of the transactions regulated by the provisions of the Convention.

CHAPTER XIII

ECONOMIC STATISTICS

1. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION RELATING TO ECONOMIC STATISTICS, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 14 DECEMBER 1928

Paris, 9 December 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 December 1948, in accordance with article V[1].
REGISTRATION: 9 December 1948, No. 318.
STATUS: Signatories: 8. Parties: 19.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 20, p. 229.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 255 (III)[2] of 18 November 1948.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Acceptance (A)*
Australia		9 Dec 1948 s
Austria		10 Nov 1949 A
Canada		9 Dec 1948 s
Denmark	9 Dec 1948	27 Sep 1949 A
Egypt		9 Dec 1948 s
Finland		17 Aug 1949 A
France	9 Dec 1948	11 Jan 1949 A
Greece	9 Dec 1948	9 Oct 1950 A
India	9 Dec 1948	14 Mar 1949 A
Ireland		28 Feb 1952 A
Italy		20 May 1949 s
Japan		2 Dec 1952 A
Myanmar	9 Dec 1948	
Netherlands	9 Dec 1948	13 Apr 1950 A
Norway	9 Dec 1948	22 Mar 1949 A
Pakistan		3 Mar 1952 s
South Africa		10 Dec 1948 s
Sweden		9 Dec 1948 s
Switzerland	9 Dec 1948	23 Jan 1970 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		9 Dec 1948 s

Notes:

[1] The amendments set forth in the annex to the Protocol entered into force on 9 October 1950, in accordance with article V of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Third Session, Part I*, A/810, p. 160.

2. International Convention relating to economic statistics, signed at Geneva on 14 December 1928, amended by the Protocol signed at Paris on 9 December 1948

Paris, 9 December 1948

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 October 1950 , the date on which the amendments to the Convention, as set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 9 December 1948, entered into force in accordance with article V of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 9 October 1950, No. 942.
STATUS: Parties: 26.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 73, p. 39.

Participant	*Definitive signature or acceptance of the Protocol*	*Ratification of the Convention as amended by the Protocol, Accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol (a), Succession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol (d)*
Australia	9 Dec 1948	
Austria	10 Nov 1949	
Belgium[1]		2 May 1952
Canada	9 Dec 1948	
Denmark	27 Sep 1949	
Egypt	9 Dec 1948	
Finland	17 Aug 1949	
France	11 Jan 1949	
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
Greece	9 Oct 1950	
India	14 Mar 1949	
Ireland	28 Feb 1952	
Israel		28 Dec 1950 a
Italy	20 May 1949	
Japan	2 Dec 1952	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Luxembourg		23 Jul 1953
Netherlands	13 Apr 1950	
Nigeria		23 Jul 1965 a
Norway	22 Mar 1949	
Pakistan	3 Mar 1952	
South Africa	10 Dec 1948	
Sweden	9 Dec 1948	
Switzerland	23 Jan 1970	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2]	9 Dec 1948	
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] A declaration accompanying the instrument of ratification by the Government of Belgium stipulates that the ratification applies only to the metropolitan territories, the territories of Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi being expressly excluded.

[2] Notice of application of the Convention to Southern Rhodesia was received from the Government of the United Kingdom on 2 December 1949.

3. a) International Convention relating to Economic Statistics

Geneva, 14 December 1928

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 December 1930, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 14 December 1930, No. 2560[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (March 27th, 1931)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (May 9th, 1930)

and all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations

Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (October 14th, 1931 a)

Returns provided for in Article 2, III (B), will not contain information with regard to areas under crops on native farms, and in native reserves, locations and mission stations[2].

Canada (August 23rd, 1930 a)

Australia[2] (April 13th, 1932 a)

Does not apply to the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island, New Guinea and Nauru.

(1) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I (b), for separate returns for direct transit trade shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

(2) The provision under Article 3, Annex I, Part I, Paragraph IV, that when the quantity of goods of any kind is expressed in any unit or units of measure other than weight, an estimate of the average weight of each unit, or multiple of units, shall be shown in the annual returns, shall not apply to the Commonwealth of Australia.

Union of South Africa (including the mandated territory of *South West Africa*) (May 1st, 1930)

Ireland (September 15th, 1930)

India (May 15th, 1931 a)

A. Under the terms of Article 11, the obligations of the Convention shall not extend to the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty the King Emperor.

B[2] (1) Article 2. I (a).–The provisions for returns of "transit trade" made in Annex I, Part I, 1 (b) shall not apply to India nor shall returns of the "land frontier trade" of India be required.

(2) Article 2. II (a).–The question whether a general census of agriculture can be held in India and, if so, on what lines and at what intervals still remains to be settled. For the present, India can assume no obligations under this article.

(3) Article 2. III (b). (1).–For farms in the "permanently settled" tracts in India, estimates of the cultivated areas may be used in compiling the returns.

(4) Article 2. III (b). (2).–The returns of quantities of crops harvested may be based on estimates of yield each year per unit area in each locality.

(5) Article 2. III (d).–Complete returns cannot be guaranteed from Burma, and in respect of the rest of India the returns shall refer to Government forests only.

The Government of India further declared that, with regard to the second paragraph of Article 3 of the Convention, they cannot, with the means of investigation at their disposal, usefully undertake to prepare experimentally the specified tables, and that for similar reasons they are not in a position to accept the proposal contained in Recommendation II of the Convention.

Bulgaria (November 29th, 1929)

Chile (November 20th, 1934 a)

Cuba (August 17th, 1932 a)

Czechoslovakia[3] (February 19th, 1931)

Denmark (September 9th, 1929)

In pursuance of Article 11, Greenland is excepted from the provisions of this Convention. Furthermore, the Danish Government, in accepting the Convention, does not assume any obligation in respect of statistics concerning the Faroe Islands.

Egypt (June 27th, 1930)

Finland (September 23rd, 1938)

France (February 1st, 1933)

By its acceptance, France does not intend to assume any obligation in regard to any of its Colonies, Protectorates and Territories under its suzerainty or mandate.

Greece (September 18th, 1930)

Italy (June 11th, 1931)

In accepting the present Convention, Italy does not assume any obligation in respect of her Colonies, Protectorates and other Territories referred to in the first paragraph of Article 11.

Latvia (July 5th, 1937)

Lithuania (April 2nd, 1938 a)

Netherlands (September 13th, 1932)

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies (May 5th, 1933 a)

1. The following shall not be applicable:

(a) The provisions of Article 2, III (E) and V;

(b) The provisions concerning the system of valuations known as "declared values" mentioned in Annex I, Part I, para. II (see Article 3);

(c) Article 3, paragraph 2.

2. The returns mentioned in Article 2. IV, shall apply only to coal, petroleum, natural gas, tin, manganese, gold and silver.

3. The statistics of foreign trade mentioned in Article 3 shall not comprise tables concerning transit.[2]

Norway (March 20th, 1929)

In accordance with Article 11, the Bouvet Island is excepted from the provisions of the present Convention. Furthermore, in ratifying the Convention, Norway does not assume any obligation as regards statistics relating to the Svalbard.

Poland (July 23rd, 1931)

Portugal (October 23rd, 1931)

In accordance with Article 11, the Portuguesc Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that the present Convention docs not apply to the Portuguese Colonies.

Romania	(June 22nd, 1931)
Sweden	(February 17th, 1930)
Switzerland	(July 10th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil	Hungary
Estonia	Yugoslavia (former)[4]
Germany	

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, Succession (d)*
Belgium[5]	5 May 1950
Czech Republic[3]	30 Dec 1993 d
Japan	3 Sep 1952

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 110, p.171.

[2] These reservations were accepted by the States parties to the Convention, which were consulted in accordance with article 17.

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Declaration made on signature: In pursuance of article 11 of the Convention, the Belgian Delegation declares on behalf of its Government that it cannot accept, in regard to the Colony of the Belgian Congo, the obligations arising out of the clauses of the present Convention.

3. b) Protocol

Geneva, 14 December 1928

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 December 1930.
REGISTRATION: 14 December 1930, No. 2560[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(March 27th, 1931)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations*	(May 9th, 1930)
Southern Rhodesia	(October 14th, 1931 a)
Canada	(August 23rd, 1930)
Australia	(April 13th, 1932 a)
Union of South Africa (including the mandated territory of *South West Africa*	(May 1st, 1930)
Ireland	(September 15th, 1930)
India	(May 15th, 1931 a)
Bulgaria	(November 29th, 1929)
Chile	(November 20th, 1934 a)
Cuba	(August 17th, 1932 a)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(February 19th, 1931)
Denmark	(September 9th, 1929)
Egypt	(June 27th, 1930)
Finland	(September 23rd, 1938)
France	(February 1st, 1933)
Greece	(September 18th, 1930)
Italy	(June 11th, 1931)
Latvia	(July 5th, 1937)
Lithuania	(April 2nd, 1938 a)
Netherlands	(September 13th, 1932)

This ratification applies only to the territory of the Netherlands in Europe; the Netherlands do not intend to assume, at present, any obligation as regards the whole of the Netherlands overseas territories.

Netherlands Indies	(May 5th, 1933 a)
Norway	(March 20th, 1929)
Poland	(July 23rd, 1931)
Portugal	(October 23rd, 1931)
Romania	(June 22nd, 1931)
Sweden	(February 17th, 1930)
Switzerland	(July 10th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil
Estonia
Germany
Hungary
Yugoslavia (former)[3]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, Succession (d)*
Belgium	5 May 1950
Czech Republic	30 Dec 1993 d
Japan	3 Sep 1952

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 110, p.171.

[2] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XIV

EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL MATTERS

1. AGREEMENT FOR FACILITATING THE INTERNATIONAL CIRCULATION OF VISUAL AND AUDITORY MATERIALS OF AN EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL CHARACTER

Lake Success, New York, 15 July 1949

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 August 1954, in accordance with article XII.
REGISTRATION: 12 August 1954, No. 2631.
STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 38.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 197, p. 3.

Note: The Agreement was approved by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its third session, held at Beirut from 17 November to 11 December 1948, in a resolution[1] adopted at the seventeenth plenary meeting on 10 December 1948.

Participant	*Signature*	*Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	29 Dec 1949	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		12 Jan 1994 d
Brazil	15 Sep 1949	15 Aug 1962 A
Cambodia		20 Feb 1952 a
Canada	17 Dec 1949	4 Oct 1950 A
Congo		26 Aug 1968 a
Costa Rica		9 Jun 1971 a
Croatia[2]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		7 Feb 1977 a
Cyprus		10 Aug 1972 a
Czech Republic		22 Aug 1997 a
Denmark	29 Dec 1949	10 Aug 1955 A
Dominican Republic	5 Aug 1949	
Ecuador	29 Dec 1949	
El Salvador	29 Dec 1949	24 Jun 1953 A
Ghana		22 Mar 1960 a
Greece	31 Dec 1949	9 Jul 1954 A
Haiti	2 Dec 1949	14 May 1954 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	31 Dec 1949	30 Dec 1959 A
Iraq		29 Aug 1952 a
Jordan		7 Jul 1972 a
Lebanon	30 Dec 1949	12 May 1971 A
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Jan 1973 a
Madagascar		23 May 1962 a
Malawi		5 Jul 1967 a
Malta		29 Jul 1968 a
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		25 Jul 1968 a
Netherlands	30 Dec 1949	
Niger		22 Apr 1968 a
Norway	20 Dec 1949	12 Jan 1950 A
Pakistan		16 Feb 1950 A
Philippines	31 Dec 1949	13 Nov 1952 A
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia		9 Jun 1997 a
Slovenia[2]		3 Nov 1992 d
Syrian Arab Republic		16 Sep 1951 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		2 Sep 1997 d
Trinidad and Tobago		31 Aug 1965 a
United States of America	13 Sep 1949	14 Oct 1966 A
Uruguay	31 Dec 1949	20 Apr 1999 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon acceptance, accession or succession.)

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article IX, inasmuch as it believes that any disputes which may arise between States concerning the interpretation or application of the Agreement must be settled by direct negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba hereby declares that the provisions of paragraphs 1 to 4 of article XIV of the

Agreement for Facilitating the International Circulation of Visual and Auditory Materials of an Educational, Scientific and Cultural Character are contrary to the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples (resolution 1514 (XV)), adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1960, which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

The accession of the Libyan Arab Republic to this Agreement does not imply recognition of Israel or the assumption towards Israel of any commitments arising out of this Agreement.

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

"As regards article III, paragraph 1, the words and quantitative restrictions and from the necessity of applying for an import licence' will be deleted, and excluded from the application of the Agreement."

Notes:

[1] *Records of the General Conference of UNESCO, Third Session, Beirut 1948, vol. II, Resolutions* (3/3C/110, vol. II), p. 113.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Agreement on 30 June 1950. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. AGREEMENT ON THE IMPORTATION OF EDUCATIONAL, SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL MATERIALS

Lake Success, New York, 22 November 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 May 1952, in accordance with article XI.
REGISTRATION: 21 May 1952, No. 1734.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 97.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 131, p. 25.

Note: The Agreement was approved by the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization at its fifth session, held at Florence from 22 May to 17 June 1950, in a resolution[2] adopted at the fourteenth plenary meeting on 17 June 1950.

Participant[1,3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	8 Oct 1951	19 Mar 1958
Australia		5 Mar 1992 A
Austria		12 Jun 1958 A
Barbados		13 Apr 1973 d
Belgium	22 Nov 1950	31 Oct 1957
Bolivia	22 Nov 1950	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina[4]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria		14 Mar 1997 A
Burkina Faso		14 Sep 1965 A
Cambodia		5 Nov 1951 A
Cameroon		15 May 1964 A
China[5,6]		
Colombia	22 Nov 1950	
Congo		26 Aug 1968 A
Côte d'Ivoire		19 Jul 1963 A
Croatia[4]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		27 Aug 1952 A
Cyprus		16 May 1963 d
Czech Republic		22 Aug 1997 A
Democratic Republic of the Congo		3 May 1962 d
Denmark		4 Apr 1960 A
Dominican Republic	22 Nov 1950	
Ecuador	22 Nov 1950	
Egypt	22 Nov 1950	8 Feb 1952
El Salvador	4 Dec 1950	24 Jun 1953
Estonia		1 Aug 2001 A
Fiji		31 Oct 1972 d
Finland		30 Apr 1956 A
France	14 May 1951	14 Oct 1957
Gabon		4 Sep 1962 A
Germany[7,8]		9 Aug 1957 A
Ghana		7 Apr 1958 d
Greece	22 Nov 1950	12 Dec 1955
Guatemala	22 Nov 1950	8 Jul 1960
Haiti	22 Nov 1950	14 May 1954
Holy See		22 Aug 1979 A
Honduras	13 Apr 1954	
Hungary		15 Mar 1979 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	9 Feb 1951	7 Jan 1966
Iraq		11 Aug 1972 A
Ireland		19 Sep 1978 A
Israel	22 Nov 1950	27 Mar 1952
Italy		26 Nov 1962 A
Japan		17 Jun 1970 A
Jordan		31 Dec 1958 A
Kazakhstan		21 Dec 1998 A
Kenya		15 Mar 1967 A
Kyrgyzstan		19 Jul 2005 A
Lao People's Democratic Republic		28 Feb 1952 A
Latvia		20 Nov 2001 A
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 A
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Jan 1973 A
Lithuania		21 Aug 1998 A
Luxembourg	22 Nov 1950	31 Oct 1957
Madagascar		23 May 1962 A
Malawi		17 Aug 1965 A
Malaysia		29 Jun 1959 d
Malta		19 Jan 1968 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Moldova		3 Sep 1998 A
Monaco		18 Mar 1952 A
Montenegro[9]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		25 Jul 1968 A
Netherlands	22 Nov 1950	31 Oct 1957
New Zealand	16 Mar 1951	29 Jun 1962
Nicaragua		17 Dec 1963 A
Niger		22 Apr 1968 A
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Norway		2 Apr 1959 A
Oman		19 Dec 1977 A
Pakistan	9 May 1951	17 Jan 1952
Peru	8 Jul 1964	
Philippines	22 Nov 1950	30 Aug 1952
Poland		24 Sep 1971 A
Portugal		11 Jun 1984 A
Romania		24 Nov 1970 A
Russian Federation		7 Oct 1994 A
Rwanda		1 Dec 1964 d
San Marino		30 Jul 1985 A
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore		11 Jul 1969 A
Slovakia		9 Jun 1997 A
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
Spain		7 Jul 1955 A
Sri Lanka		8 Jan 1952 A
Sweden	20 Nov 1951	21 May 1952
Switzerland[1]	22 Nov 1950	7 Apr 1953
Syrian Arab Republic	7 Aug 1979	16 Sep 1980
Thailand	22 Nov 1950	18 Jun 1951

Participant[1,3]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Succession (d)*
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4]		2 Sep 1997 d
Tonga		11 Nov 1977 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia		14 May 1971 A
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 Nov 1950	11 Mar 1954
United Republic of Tanzania		26 Mar 1963 A
United States of America	24 Jun 1959	2 Nov 1966
Uruguay	27 Apr 1964	20 Apr 1999
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		1 May 1992 A
Zambia		1 Nov 1974 d
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

GERMANY[7]

(1) "Until the expiration of the interim period as defined in article 3 of the Treaty between France and the Federal Republic of Germany of 27 October 1956 on the Settlement of the Saar Questions, the above-mentioned Agreement does not apply to the Saar Territory;

(2) "In accordance with the aims of the Agreement, as out lined in its preamble, the Federal Republic's interpretation of the provisions contained in article 1 of the Agreement is that the granting of customs exemption is intended to serve the promotion of a free exchange of ideas and knowledge between the States Parties; that, however, this provision does not aim at furthering the shifting of production to a foreign country if such shifts are made chiefly for commercial reasons."

HUNGARY

The Hungarian People's Republic calls attention to the fact that articles XIII and XIV of the Agreement are at variance with resolution 1514 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations at its XVth session on 14 December 1960.

IRAQ[10]

Accession by the Republic of Iraq to the Agreement shall [. . .] in no way imply recognition of Israel or lead to entry into any relations with it.

KENYA

"1. Annex B (vi) of the Agreement requires free admission for `Antiques, being articles in excess of 100 years of age'. Under the relevant laws in force in Kenya, such items are admitted free of duty only if–

"(a) They can be classified as `Works of Art'; and

"(b) They are not intended for resale and are admitted as such by the Commissioner of Customs and Excise; and

"(c) They are proved to the satisfaction of the Commissioner of Customs and Excise to be `over 100 years old'.

"If the above conditions are not fulfilled, such articles attract appropriate duty under the Tariff.

"2. With respect to Annex C (i) of the Agreement, films, filmstrips, microfilms and slides of an *educational or scientific character* are granted duty-free entry into Kenya under conditions which accord with those specified in the Agreement. This is not necessarily so in the case of similar materials of *a cultural nature* which are dutiable under the appropriate items in the Tariff. This position may be attributed to the impossibility of defining the word `cultural' with any degree of precision.

"3. With respect to Annex C (iii), sound recordings of an educational or scientific character for use under conditions specified in the Agreement are admitted into Kenya free of duty. However, no special provision exists for the admission of sound recordings of a cultural character and these attract duty under the relevant items of the Tariff."

LIBYAN ARAB JAMAHIRIYA

The acceptance of the Libyan Arab Republic of this Agreement does not imply recognition of Israel or the assumption towards Israel of any commitments arising out of this Agreement.

ROMANIA

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the maintenance of the state of dependence of certain territories to which the provisions of articles XIII and XIV of the Agreement refer is inconsistent with the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, which was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1960, by resolution 1514 (XV), which proclaims the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations.

The State Council of the Socialist Republic of Romania considers that the provisions of paragraph 1 of article IX are inconsistent with the principle that all multilateral treaties whose aim and purpose concern the international community as a whole should be open to universal participation.

SWITZERLAND

The Government of Switzerland reserves the right to resume its freedom of action with regard to contracting States which unilaterally apply quantitative restrictions and exchange control measures of a nature to render the Agreement inoperative.

Furthermore, [the signature by the Government of Switzerland] is appended without prejudice to the attitudes of the Government of Switzerland in regard to the Havana Charter for an International Trade Organization signed at Havana on 24 March 1948.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

The ratification is subject to the reservation contained in the Protocol annexed to the Agreement.

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Belgium	31 Oct 1957	Belgian Congo and the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi
France	10 Dec 1951	Tunisia
Netherlands[11]	31 Oct 1957	Surinam and Netherlands New Guinea
	1 Jan 1986	Aruba
New Zealand[12]	29 Jun 1962	Tokelau Islands
	28 Feb 1964	Cook Islands (including Niue)
United Kingdom[6],[13]	11 Mar 1954	Aden (Colony and Protectorate), Barbados, British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei (Protected State), Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gold Coast: (a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories (d) Togoland (under United Kingdom Trusteeship), Hong Kong, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla), Virgin Islands, Federation of Malaya (The British Settlements of Penang and Malacca and the Protected States of Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Perlis, Selangor and Trengganu), Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria: (a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons (under United Kingdom Trusteeship), St. Helena (including Ascension Island and Tristan da Cunha), Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Singapore (including Christmas and Cocos (Keeling) Islands), Somaliland Protectorate, Tanganyika (under United Kingdom Trusteeship), Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda (Protectorate), Western Pacific High Commission Territories: British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Central and Southern Line Islands, Zanzibar Protecorate
	16 Sep 1954	Cyprus, Falkland Islands (Colony and Dependencies), North Borneo (including Labuan), Tonga (Protected State), Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent)
	18 May 1955	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man
	22 Mar 1956	The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland
	14 Mar 1960	Bahamas

Notes:

[1] Including Liechtenstein. On 16 June 1975, the Government of Switzerland declared that the provisions of the Agreement apply to the Principality of Liechtenstein so long as it is linked to Switzerland by a customs union treaty.

[2] Records of the General Conference of UNESCO, Fifth Session, Florence, 1950, *Resolutions (5C/Resolutions)*, p. 64.

[3] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Agreement on 1 June 1952. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Agreement on 26 April 1951. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 22 November 1950. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume.).

On depositing the instrument of acceptance of the Agreement, the Government of Romania stated that it considered the above-mentioned signature as null and void, inasmuch as the only Government competent to assume obligations on behalf of China and to represent China at the international level is the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned declaration, the Permanent Representative of the Republic of China to the United Nations stated:

"The Republic of China, a sovereign State and member of the United Nations, attended the Fifth Session of the General Conference of the United Nations Educational, Cultural and Scientific Organization, contributed to the formulation of the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials and duly signed the said Agreement on 22 November 1950 at the Interim Headquarters of the United Nations at Lake Success. Any statement relating to the said Agreement that is incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said Agreement."

[6] On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, the Governments of China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

China:

[*Same notification as the one made under note 6 in chapter V.3.*]

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

[*Same notification as the one made under note 5 in chapter IV.1.*]

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

The signature by the Taiwan authorities on 22 November 1950 by usurping the name of "China" of the said Agreement is illegal and therefore null and void.

[7] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 20 October 1972, the Government of Israel made the following declaration:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of a reservation made by the Government of Iraq on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Agreement is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, that declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[11] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3. International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations

Rome, 26 October 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 May 1964, in accordance with article 25.
REGISTRATION: 18 May 1964, No. 7247.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 85.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 43.

Note: The Convention was drawn up by the Diplomatic Conference on the International Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations convened jointly by the International Labour Organisation, the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works. The Conference was held at Rome at the invitation of the Government of Italy from 10 to 26 October 1961.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania		1 Jun 2000 a
Andorra		25 Feb 2004 a
Argentina	26 Oct 1961	2 Dec 1991
Armenia		31 Oct 2002 a
Australia		30 Jun 1992 a
Austria	26 Oct 1961	9 Mar 1973
Azerbaijan		8 Jul 2005 a
Bahrain		18 Oct 2005 a
Barbados		18 Jun 1983 a
Belarus		27 Feb 2003 a
Belgium	26 Oct 1961	2 Jul 1999
Bolivia		24 Aug 1993 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Jan 1994 d	
Brazil	26 Oct 1961	29 Jun 1965
Bulgaria		31 May 1995 a
Burkina Faso		14 Oct 1987 a
Cambodia	26 Oct 1961	
Canada		4 Mar 1998 a
Cape Verde		3 Apr 1997 a
Chile	26 Oct 1961	5 Jun 1974
Colombia		17 Jun 1976 a
Congo		29 Jun 1962 a
Costa Rica		9 Jun 1971 a
Croatia		20 Jan 2000 a
Czech Republic		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark	26 Oct 1961	23 Jun 1965
Dominica		9 Aug 1999 a
Dominican Republic		27 Oct 1986 a
Ecuador	26 Jun 1962	19 Dec 1963
El Salvador		29 Mar 1979 a
Estonia		[28 Jan 2000 a]
Fiji		11 Jan 1972 a
Finland	21 Jun 1962	21 Jul 1983
France	26 Oct 1961	3 Apr 1987
Georgia		14 May 2004 a
Germany	26 Oct 1961	21 Jul 1966
Greece		6 Oct 1992 a
Guatemala		14 Oct 1976 a
Holy See	26 Oct 1961	
Honduras		16 Nov 1989 a
Hungary		10 Nov 1994 a
Iceland	26 Oct 1961	15 Mar 1994 a
India	26 Oct 1961	
Ireland	30 Jun 1962	19 Jun 1979
Israel	7 Feb 1962	30 Sep 2002 a
Italy	26 Oct 1961	8 Jan 1975
Jamaica		27 Oct 1993 a
Japan		26 Jul 1989 a
Kyrgyzstan		13 May 2003 a
Latvia		20 May 1999 a
Lebanon	26 Jun 1962	12 May 1997
Lesotho		26 Oct 1989 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein		12 Jul 1999 a
Lithuania		22 Apr 1999 a
Luxembourg		25 Nov 1975 a
Mexico	26 Oct 1961	17 Feb 1964
Moldova		5 Sep 1995 a
Monaco	22 Jun 1962	6 Sep 1985
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands		7 Jul 1993 a
Nicaragua		10 May 2000 a
Niger		5 Apr 1963 a
Nigeria		29 Jul 1993 a
Norway		10 Apr 1978 a
Panama		2 Jun 1983 a
Paraguay	30 Jun 1962	26 Nov 1969
Peru		7 May 1985 a
Philippines		25 Jun 1984 a
Poland		13 Mar 1997 a
Portugal		17 Apr 2002 a
Romania		22 Jul 1998 a
Russian Federation		26 Feb 2003 a
Saint Lucia		17 May 1996 a
Serbia	12 Mar 2001 d	10 Mar 2003
Slovakia		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		9 Jul 1996 a
Spain	26 Oct 1961	14 Aug 1991
Sweden	26 Oct 1961	13 Jul 1962
Switzerland		24 Jun 1993 a
Syrian Arab Republic		13 Feb 2006 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		2 Dec 1997 a
Togo		10 Mar 2003 a
Turkey		8 Jan 2004 a
Ukraine		12 Mar 2002 a
United Arab Emirates		14 Oct 2004 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	26 Oct 1961	30 Oct 1963
Uruguay		4 Apr 1977 a

Participant	Signature, Succession to signature (d)	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		30 Oct 1995 a
Viet Nam		1 Dec 2006 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

Declarations:

"Australia, pursuant to article 5 (3), will not apply the criterion of publication;

Australia, pursuant to article 6 (2), will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

Australia, pursuant to article 16 (1) (a), will not, as regards article 12, apply the provision of that article; and

Australia, pursuant to article 16 (1) (b), will not, as regards article 13, apply item (d) of that article."

AUSTRIA

1. In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii), of the Convention, Austria will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State;

2. In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), of the Convention, [. . .], as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, Austria will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by an Austrian national;

3. In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, Austria will not apply article 13 (d).

BELARUS

Reservations:

The Republic of Belarus in accordance with:

Article 5(3) of the Convention will not apply the criterion of fixation provided for by Article 5(1)(b) of the convention;

Article 6(2) of the Convention will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

Article 16(1)(a)(iii) of the Convention as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State will not apply Article 12 of the Convention;

Article 16(1)(a)(iv) of the Convention as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State will limit the protection provided for by Article 12 of the Convention to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Republic of Belarus.

BELGIUM

Declarations:

1. Pursuant to article 5, paragraph 3, of the Rome Convention, Belgium will not apply the criterion of publication;

2. Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 2, of the Rome Convention, Belgium will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

3. Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii), of the Rome Convention, Belgium will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State;

4. Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), of the Rome Convention, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, Belgium will limit the protection provided for by that article to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the State making the declaration; however, the fact that the Contracting State of which the producer is a national does not grant the protection to the same beneficiary or beneficiaries as the State making the declaration shall not be considered as a difference in the extent of the protection.

BULGARIA

Declarations:

1. The Republic of Bulgaria declares in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1(a)(iii), that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

2. The Republic of Bulgaria declares in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1(a)(iv), that as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Republic of Bulgaria.

CANADA

Declarations:

"1. In respect of article 5 (1) (b) and pursuant to article 5 (3) of the Convention, as regards the Right of Reproduction for Phonogram Producers (art. 10), Canada will not apply *criterion of fixation.*

2. In respect of article 5 (1) (c) and pursuant to article 5 (3) of the Convention, as regards the Secondary Users of Phonograms (art. 12), Canada will not apply *criterion of publication.*

3. In respect of article 6 (1) and pursuant to article 6 (2) of the Convention, Canada will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

4. In respect of article 12 and pursuant to article 16 (1) (a) (iv) of the Convention, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, Canada will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of Canada."

CONGO

In a communication received on 16 May 1964, the Government of the Congo has notified the Secretary-General that it has decided to make its accession subject to the following declarations:

(1) Article 5, paragraph 3: the "criterion of publication" is excluded;

(2) Article 16: the application of article 12 is completely excluded.

CROATIA

Declarations:

"1) that [the Republic of Croatia] shall not apply, pursuant to para 3, Article 5 of the Convention, the criterion of the first fixation, but the criterion of publication of phonograms,

2) that [the Republic of Croatia] shall not apply, pursuant to subpara a) iii), para 1, Article 16 of the Convention, provisions of Article 12 as to phonograms whose producer is not a national of another Contracting State,

3) that [the Republic of Croatia] shall limit the protection provided for in Article 12 of the Convention, pursuant to subpara a) iv), para 1, Article 16, as to phonograms whose producer is a national of another Contracting State, to the extent to which and to the term for which the Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national from the Republic of Croatia."

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

DENMARK

"1) With regard to article 6, paragraph 2: Protection will be granted to broadcasting organisations only if their headquarters is situated in another Contracting State and if their broadcasts are transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

"2) With regard to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii): The provisions of article 12 will be applied solely with respect to broadcasting as well as any other communication to the public which is carried out for profit-making purposes.

"3) With regard to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv): As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, the protection provided for in article 12 will be limited to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a Danish national.

"4) With regard to article 17: Denmark will grant the protection provided for in article 5 only if the first fixation of the sound was made in another Contracting State (the criterion of fixation) and will apply for the purposes of paragraph 1 (a) (iii) and (iv) of article 16 the said criterion instead of the criterion of nationality."

Declarations made in accordance with articles 5(3) and 17 of the Convention:

"With regard to Article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Denmark will not apply the criterion of publication in Article 5, paragraph 1 (c).

With regard to Article 17 of the Convention, the government of Denmark hereby withdraws its notification concerning the sole application of the criterion of fixation in relation to the protection of phonogram producers. This withdrawal of the notification shall take effect as of the same date as the notification pursuant to Article 5, paragraph 3, becomes effective."

ESTONIA[7]

Declarations :

"1. Pursuant to Article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia declares that it will not apply the criterion of publication;

2. Pursuant to Article 6, paragraph 2 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia declares that it will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

... "

9 April 2003

Declaration :

"....that Republic of Estonia applies instead Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention pursuant to which, as regards Article 12 of the Convention in connection with phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, the Republic of Estonia will limit the protection provided for by Article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Republic of Estonia; however, the fact that the Contracting State of which the producer is a national does not grant the protection to the same beneficiary or beneficiaries as the Republic of Estonia shall not be considered as a difference in the extent of the protection".

FIJI

"(1) In respect of Article 5 (1) (b) and in accordance with Article 5 (3) of the Convention, Fiji will not apply, in respect of phonograms, the criterion of fixation;

"(2) In respect of Article 6 (1) and in accordance with Article 6 (2) of the Convention, Fiji will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

"(3) In respect of article 12 and in accordance with article 16 (1) of the Convention,

"(a) Fiji will not apply the provisions of Article 12 in respect of the following uses:

"(i)The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public at premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein except where a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard;

"(ii)The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of, a club, society or other organisation which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, except where a charge is made for admission to the place where the phonogram is to be heard, and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purpose of the organisation;

"(b) As regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State or as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of a Contracting State which has made a declaration under Article 16 (1) (a) (i) stating that it will not apply the provisions of Article 12, Fiji will not grant the protection provided for by Article 12, unless, in either event, the phonogram has been first published in a Contracting State which has made no such declaration."

Communication received on 12 June 1972:

"The Government of Fiji, having reconsidered the said Convention hereby withdraws its declaration in respect of certain provisions of article 12 and in substitution thereof declares in

accordance with article 16 (1) of the said Convention that Fiji will not apply the provisions of article 12".

FINLAND[8]

Reservations:

"1....

2.Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i)

The provisions of article 12 will not be applied with respect to phonograms acquired by a broadcasting organisation be fore 1 September 1961.

3.Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii)

The provisions of article 12 will be applied solely with respect to broadcasting as well as to any other communication to the public which is carried out for profit-making purposes.

4.Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv)

As regards phonograms first fixed in another Contracting State, the protection provided for in article 12 will be limited to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed in Finland.

5...

6. Article 17

Finland will apply, for the purposes of article 5, the criterion of fixation alone and, for the purposes of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), the criterion of fixation instead of the criterion of nationality."

FRANCE

Article 5

The Government of the French Republic declares, in conformity with article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, concerning the protection of phonograms, that it rejects the criterion of first publication in favour of the criterion of first fixation.

Article 12

The Government of the French Republic declares, first, that it will not apply the provisions of this article to all phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State, in conformity with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii) of this Convention.

Secondly, the Government of the French Republic declares that, with regard to phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the extent and duration of the protection provided in this article (article 12), to those which the latter Contracting State grants to phonograms first fixed by French nationals.

29 June 1987

The Government of France specifies that it understands the expression "International Court of Justice", in article 30 of the Convention, as covering not only the Court itself but also a chamber of the Court.

GERMANY[4]

"1. The Federal Republic of Germany makes use of the following reservations provided for in article 5, paragraph 3, and article 16, paragraph 1 a (iv) of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations:

"1) As regards the protection of producers of phonograms it will not apply the criterion of fixation referred to in article 5, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention;

"2) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 of the Convention to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a German national."

ICELAND

Declarations:

Iceland, pursuant to article 5, paragraph 3, will not apply the criterion of fixation.

Iceland, pursuant to article 6, paragraph 2, will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and if the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i), will not apply article 12 with respect to the use of phonograms published before 1 September 1961.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii), will apply article 12 solely with respect to use for broadcasting or for any other communication to the public for commercial purposes.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii), will not apply article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

Iceland, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv), will, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, limit the protection provided for in article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed in Iceland.

IRELAND

"(1) With regard to article 5, paragraph 1, and in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention: Ireland will not apply the criterion of fixation;

"(2) With regard to article 6, paragraph 1, and in accordance with article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention: Ireland will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

"(3)With regard to article 12, and in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii): Ireland will not protect broadcasts heard in public (a) at any premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein unless a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the recording is to be heard or (b) as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of a club, society or other organisation which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, unless a charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the recording is to be heard and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purposes of the organisation."

ISRAEL

Declarations:

"1. Pursuant to Article 5(3) of the Convention, Israel shall not apply the criterion of fixation, as set forth in Article 5(l) (b).

2. In respect of Article 6(1) and pursuant to Article 6(2) of the convention, Israel will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

3. Pursuant to Article 16(1)(a)(iii) of the Convention, as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State, Israel will not apply Article 12 of the Convention.

4. Pursuant to Article 16(1)(a)(iv) of the Convention, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another

Contracting State, Israel will limit the protection provided by Article 12 of the Convention to the extent to which, and to the term for which, that other Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of Israel.

5. Pursuant to Article 16(1)(b) of the Convention, Israel will not apply Article 13(d) of the Convention."

ITALY

(1) With regard to article 6, paragraph 1, and in accordance with article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention: Italy will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

(2) With regard to article 12 and in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a), of the Convention:

(a) Italy will apply the provisions of article 12 to use for broadcasting or for any other communication to the public for commercial purposes, with the exception of cinematography;

(b) It will apply the provisions of article 12 only to phonograms fixed in another Contracting State;

(c) With regard to phonograms fixed in another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed in Italy; however, if that State does not grant the protection to the same beneficiary or beneficiaries as Italy, that fact will not be considered as a difference in the extent of the protection.

(3) With regard to article 13 and in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention: Italy will not apply the provisions of article 13 (d);

(4) With regard to article 5 and in accordance with article 17 of the Convention, Italy will apply only the criterion of fixation for the purposes of article 5; the same criterion, instead of the criterion of nationality, will be applied for the purposes of the declarations provided for in article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii) and (iv), of the Convention.

JAPAN

Declaration:

"(1) Pursuant to article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Government of Japan will not apply the criterion of publication concerning the protection of producers of phonograms,

"(2) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii) of the Convention, the Government of Japan will apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention in respect of uses for broadcasting or for wire diffusion,

"(3) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention,

(i) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of a Contracting State which has made a declaration under article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i) of the Convention stating that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention, the Government of Japan will not grant the protection provided for by the provisions of article 12 of the Convention.

(ii) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State which applies the provisions of article 12 of the Convention, the Government of Japan will limit the term of the protection provided for by the provisions of article 12 of the Convention to the term for which that State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a Japanese national."

LESOTHO

Reservations:

"Pursuant to article 12 of the said Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that the provisions of this article will not apply in respect of broadcasts made for non-profit making purposes or where communication to the public in public places is not the result of a purely commercial activity;

With regard to article 13:

". . . [The Kingdom of Lesotho] does not consider itself bound by the provisions of item (d)."

LATVIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with paragraph 1 of article 16 of the [Convention], the Republic of Latvia declares that it will not apply article 12 of the Convention on phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Reservation to Article 5:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, that it rejects the criterion of first fixation. It will therefore apply the criterion of first publication.

Reservations to Article 12:

In accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the Principality of Liechtenstein declares that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

The Principality of Liechtenstein also declares, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, that it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection of phonograms first fixed by a Liechtenstein national, in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention."

LITHUANIA

Reservation:

"In accordance with sub-paragraph (a)(iii) of paragraph 1 of article 16 of the [...] Convention, the Republic of Lithuania declares that as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national or a legal person of another Contracting State, it will not apply the provisions of article 12 of the above-mentioned Convention."

LUXEMBOURG

1. With regard to the protection of producers of phonograms, Luxembourg will not apply the criterion of publication but only the criteria of nationality and fixation, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention.

2. With regard to the protection of phonograms, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i), of the Convention, Luxembourg will not apply any of the provisions of article 12.

3. With regard to broadcasting organizations, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, Luxembourg will not apply the protection envisaged in article 13 (d) against communication to the public of their television broad casts.

MOLDOVA

Reservations:

1. In accordance with article 5, paragraph 3, the Republic of Moldova declares that it will not apply the criteria of fixation under article 5, paragraph 1 (b).

2. In accordance with article 6, paragraph 2, the Republic of Moldova declares that it will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

3. With reference to article 16, paragraph 1 (a), the Republic of Moldova declares that:

a) It will not apply the provisions of article 12 in the case of communications to the public of phonograms as part of the activities or for the benefit of a club, society or other organization which has been established or is being administered on a non-commercial basis, the purpose of which, generally speaking, is charitable or concerned with the advancement of education, the promotion of the public good and the dissemination of religion, unless a charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard and any of profit thus obtained is used for purposes which differ from those of the organization;

b) It will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State;

c) It will limit the protection stipulated in article 12 for phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State to the extent to which and as long as that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms which were originally fixed by a national of the Republic of Moldova.

MONACO

Reservations:

1. With regard to the protection of producers of phonograms, Monaco will not apply the criterion of publication but only the criteria of nationality and fixation, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3.

2. With regard to broadcasting organizations, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i), Monaco will not apply any of the provisions of article 12.

3. With regard to broadcasting organizations, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (b), Monaco will not apply the provisions of article 13 (d) concerning protection against communication to the public of television broadcasts.

NETHERLANDS

Reservation:

"The said Convention shall be observed subject to the following reservations, provided for in article 16, paragraph [1], (a) (iii) and (iv), of the Convention:

- The Kingdom of the Netherlands will not apply article 12 to phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State;
- As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Kingdom of the Netherlands."

NIGER

Declarations:

(1) Article 5, paragraph 3: the "criterion of publication" is excluded;

(2) Article 16: the application of article 12 is completely excluded.

NIGERIA

Declarations:

1. With regard to article 5, paragraph 3, the Federal Republic of Nigeria will not apply the criteria of publication under article 5, paragraph 1 (c).

2. With regard to article 6, paragraph 2, the Federal Republic of Nigeria will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and if the broadcast is transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

3. With regard to article 16, paragraph 1 (a):

i) The provisions of article 12 will not be applied in case of communication to the public of phonograms (a) at any premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein unless a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard or (b) as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of a club, society or other organization which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, unless a charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purpose of the organization;

ii) The provisions of article 12 will not apply as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State; and

iii) As regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, the Federal Republic of Nigeria will limit the protection provided for in article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by nationals of the Federal Republic of Nigeria.

NORWAY[9]

Reservations:

"b) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, item a (iii), reservation is made to the effect that article 12 shall not be applicable if the producer is not a national of another Contracting State.

"c) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, item a (iv), reservation is made to the effect that the extent and duration of the protection provided for under article 12 for phonograms which are produced by a national in another Contracting State shall not be more comprehensive than protection granted by that State to phonograms first produced by a Norwegian national.

"d) Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 2, reservation is made to the effect that broadcasts are only protected if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State, and the broadcast is transmitted from a transmitter in the same Contracting State."

Declaration:

"The Norwegian Act of 14 December 1956 concerning a Levy on the Public Presentation of Recordings of Artists' Performances, etc., establishes rules for the disbursement of that levy to producers and performers of phonograms.

"A portion of the annual revenue from the levy devolves, as of rights, to producers of phonograms as a group, without distinction as to nationality, in remuneration for the public use of phonograms.

"Under the terms of the Act, contributions from the levy may be made to Norwegian performing artists and their survivors on the basis of individual needs. This benevolent arrangement falls entirely outside the scope of the Convention.

"The régime established by the said Act, being fully consistent with the requirements of the Convention, will be maintained."

POLAND

Declarations:

1. As regards article 5, paragraph 3:

The Republic of Poland will not apply the criterion of publication.

2. As regards article 6, paragraph 2:

The Republic of Poland will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

3. As regards article 16, paragraph 1 item (a)(i), (iii) and (iv); the Republic of Poland:

(i) With regard to broadcasters - will not apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention in respect of the uses of a published phonogram referred to therein,

(iii) With regard to schools - will not apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State,

(iv) With regard to schools - will not apply the provisions of article 12 of the Convention as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State; the extent and term of protection provided for by this article shall be limited to the extent and period of protection granted by this Contracting State to phonograms first fixed by a national of the Republic of Poland.

4. As regards article 16 paragraph 1 item (b), the Republic of Poland will not apply the provisions of item (d) of article 13 of the Convention so as to exclude the rights of broadcasting organisations in respect of the communication of their broadcasts made in places accessible to the public against payment of an entrance fee.

ROMANIA

Reservation:

1. With regard to article 5, paragraph 3, Romania declares that it will not apply the criterion of fixation.

2. With regard to article 6, paragraph 2, Romania declares that it will protect radio and television broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in that same Contracting State.

3. With reference to article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iii) and (iv):

(iii) Romania will not apply any of the provisions of article 12, as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

(iv) For the producers of phonograms who are nationals of another Contracting State, the scope and length of the protection provided for in article 12 shall be limited to the extent to which and as long as that Contracting State grants protection to phonograms which were originally fixed by a national of Romania.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Russian Federation:

1. Pursuant to article 5, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organisations of 26 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention), will not apply the criterion of fixation provided for article 5, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention;

2. Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention, will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same contracting State;

3. Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention:

Will not apply article 12 of the Convention as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national or a body corporate of another contracting State;

Will limit the protection provided for by article 12 of the Convention as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another contracting State to the extent to which, and under the terms on which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a national or a body corporate of the Russian Federation.

SAINT LUCIA

Declarations:

"The Government of Saint Lucia declares that as regards article 5 it will not apply the criterion of publication contained in article 5 (1) (c).

The Government of Saint Lucia declares that as regards article 12 it will not apply that article in relation to phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State."

SLOVAKIA[3]

SLOVENIA

Reservations:

1."In respect of article 5, paragraph 1 (c) and in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia will not apply the criterion of publication;

2.In accordance with article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (I) of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia will not apply the provisions of article 12 until 1 January 1998."

SPAIN

Declarations:

Article 5

[The Government of Spain] will not apply the criterion of first publication and will apply instead the criterion of first fixation.

Article 6

[The Government of Spain] will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organization is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State.

Article 16

Firstly [the Government of Spain] will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of a Contracting State.

Secondly, the Spanish Government, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, will limit the scope and duration of the protection provided in article 12 to the extent to which that latter Contracting State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by nationals of Spain, in conformity with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention.

SWITZERLAND

Reservations:

Ad article 5

The Swiss Government declares, in accordance with article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention, that it rejects the criterion of first fixation. It will therefore apply the criterion of first publication.

Ad article 12

In accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention, the Swiss Government declares that it will not apply the provisions of article 12 as regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State.

The Swiss Government also declares, as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of another Contracting State, that it will limit the protection provided for by article 12 to the extent to which, and to the term for which, the latter State grants protection to phonograms first fixed by a Swiss national, in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (iv) of the Convention.

SWEDEN[10]

(a) . . .
(b) . . .
(c) With regard to article 16, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) (iv);
(d) . . .
(e) . . .

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way imply its recognition of Israel or entail its entry into any dealings with Israel under the provisions thereof.

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Reservations:

"1. According to the article 5, paragraph 3 of this Convention, the Republic of Macedonia shall not apply the criterion of publication provided under article 5, paragraph 1 (c).

2. According to the article 16, paragraph 1 (a)(1) of this Convention, the Republic of Macedonia shall not apply the provisions of the article 12."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"(1) In respect of article 5 (1) (b) and in accordance with article 5 (3) of the Convention, the United Kingdom will not apply, in respect of phonograms, the criterion of fixation;

"(2) In respect of article 6 (1) and in accordance with article 6 (2) of the Convention, the United Kingdom will protect broadcasts only if the headquarters of the broadcasting organisation is situated in another Contracting State and the broadcast was transmitted from a transmitter situated in the same Contracting State;

"(3) In respect of article 12 and in accordance with article 16 (1) of the Convention,

"(a) The United Kingdom will not apply the provisions of article 12 in respect of the following uses:

"(i) The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public at any premises where persons reside or sleep, as part of the amenities provided exclusively or mainly for residents or inmates therein except where a special charge is made for admission to the part of the premises where the phonogram is to be heard.

"(ii) The causing of a phonogram to be heard in public as part of the activities of, or for the benefit of, a club, society or other organisation which is not established or conducted for profit and whose main objects are charitable or are otherwise concerned with the advancement of religion, education or social welfare, except where a charge is made for admission to the place where the phonogram is to be heard, and any of the proceeds of the charge are applied otherwise than for the purposes of the organisation.

"(b) As regards phonograms the producer of which is not a national of another Contracting State or as regards phonograms the producer of which is a national of a Contracting State which has made a declaration under article 16 (1) (a) (i) stating that it will not apply the provisions of article 12, the United Kingdom will not grant the protection provided for by article 12, unless, in either event, the phonogram has been first published in a Contracting State which has made no such declaration."

VIET NAM

Declaration:

"The Socialist Republic of Vietnam, pursuant to Article 16 (1) of that Convention, declares that the Socialist Republic of Vietnam does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 12 and item (d) of Article 13 of that Convention."

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
United Kingdom[11]	20 Dec 1966	Gibraltar
	10 Mar 1970	Bermuda
	28 Apr 1999	Ile of Man

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 26 October 1961. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 13 May 1964, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 96. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[7] On 9 April 2003, the Government of Estonia notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration made upon accession pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1 (a)(i). The text of the declaration reads as follows:

"3. Pursuant to Article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (i) the Republic of Estonia declares that it will not apply the provisions of Article 12."

[8] On 10 February 1994, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations to article 6 (2) and 16 (1)(b), and to amend, reducing in scope, the reservation with regard to article 16 (1)(a)(ii) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservations made upon ratification, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1324, p. 380.

[9] In a communication received on 30 June 1989, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General of its decision to substitute a new reservation for the one made to the said Convention upon accession. The text of the reservation so withdrawn reads as follows:

"(a) Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 1, item a (ii), reservation is made to the effect that article 12 shall not apply in respect of use other than for the purpose of economic gain."

Further, on 15 July 2002, the Government of Norway informed the Secretary-General of the following:

...the Government of Norway hereby withdraws the following reservation:

"Pursuant to article 16, section 1, item a (ii), reservation is made to the effect that article 12 shall not apply in respect of use other than use of phonograms in broadcast transmissions."

[10] With regard to the said declarations, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden on 27 June 1986, the following notification:

"With application of article 18 of the Convention, a notification notifying its withdrawal or amendment of the notifications deposited with the instrument of ratification on July 13, 1962, as follows:

1. The notification relating to article 6, paragraph 2, is with drawn.

2. The notification under article 16, paragraph 1 (a) (ii) according to which Sweden will apply article 12 only in relation to broadcasting is reduced in scope to the effect that Sweden will apply article 12 to broadcasting and to such communication to the public which is carried out for commercial purposes.

3. The notification relating to article 17 is withdrawn in so far as reproduction of phonograms is concerned. Sweden will from July 1, 1986, grant protection according to article 10 of the Convention to all phonograms.

The withdrawals and amendments take effect on July 1, 1986."

Subsequently, on 1 December 1995, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Sweden, the following notification:

"With application of article 18 of the Convention Sweden withdraws or amends the notifications deposited with the instrument of ratification on 13 July 1962, as follows:

1. The notification under article 16 (1) (a) (ii), amended by the notification of 26 June 1986, to the effect that Sweden will apply article 12 only to broadcasting and such communication to the public which is carried out for commercial purposes is withdrawn with immediate effect.

2. The notification under article 16(1)(b) to the effect that Sweden will apply article 13 (d) only to communication to the public of television broadcasts in a cinema or similar place is withdrawn with immediate effect."

For the text of the declarations so withdrawn and the unamended declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 94.

[11] The territorial applications were effected subject to the same declarations as those made on behalf of the United Kingdom upon ratification of the Convention.

4. Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms

Geneva, 29 October 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 April 1973, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 18 April 1973, No. 12430.
STATUS: Signatories: 32. Parties: 76.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 866, p. 67.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the International Conference of States on the Protection of Phonograms convened jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization. The Conference was held at the Palais des Nations, in Geneva, from 18 to 29 October 1971.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Succession (d)*
Albania		26 Mar 2001 a
Argentina		19 Mar 1973 a
Armenia		31 Oct 2002 a
Australia		12 Mar 1974 a
Austria	28 Apr 1972	6 May 1982
Azerbaijan		1 Jun 2001 a
Barbados		23 Mar 1983 a
Belarus		17 Jan 2003 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]	12 Jan 1994 d	
Brazil	29 Oct 1971	6 Aug 1975
Bulgaria		31 May 1995 a
Burkina Faso		14 Oct 1987 a
Canada	29 Oct 1971	
Chile		15 Dec 1976 a
China[2]		5 Jan 1993 a
Colombia	29 Oct 1971	14 Feb 1994
Costa Rica		1 Mar 1982 a
Croatia		20 Jan 2000 a
Cyprus		25 Jun 1993 a
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sep 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		25 Jul 1977 a
Denmark	29 Oct 1971	7 Dec 1976
Ecuador	29 Oct 1971	4 Jun 1974
Egypt		15 Dec 1977 a
El Salvador		25 Oct 1978 a
Estonia		28 Feb 2000 a
Fiji		15 Jun 1972 a
Finland	21 Apr 1971	18 Dec 1972
France	29 Oct 1971	12 Sep 1972
Germany[4,5]	29 Oct 1971	7 Feb 1974
Greece		2 Nov 1993 a
Guatemala		14 Oct 1976 a
Holy See	29 Oct 1971	4 Apr 1977
Honduras		16 Nov 1989 a
Hungary		24 Feb 1975 a
India	29 Oct 1971	1 Nov 1974
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Oct 1971	
Israel	29 Oct 1971	10 Jan 1978
Italy	29 Oct 1971	20 Dec 1976
Jamaica		7 Oct 1993 a
Japan	21 Apr 1972	19 Jun 1978 A
Kazakhstan		3 May 2001 a
Kenya	4 Apr 1972	6 Jan 1976
Kyrgyzstan		12 Jul 2002 a
Latvia		29 Apr 1997 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein	28 Apr 1972	12 Jul 1999
Lithuania		27 Oct 1999 a
Luxembourg	29 Oct 1971	25 Nov 1975
Mexico	29 Oct 1971	11 Sep 1973
Moldova		17 Apr 2000 a
Monaco	29 Oct 1971	21 Aug 1974
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[7]		7 Jul 1993 a
New Zealand		3 May 1976 a
Nicaragua	29 Oct 1971	10 May 2000
Norway	28 Apr 1972	10 Apr 1978
Panama	28 Apr 1972	20 Mar 1974
Paraguay		30 Oct 1978 a
Peru		7 May 1985 a
Philippines	29 Apr 1972	
Republic of Korea		1 Jul 1987 a
Romania		1 Jul 1998 a
Russian Federation		9 Dec 1994 a
Saint Lucia		2 Jan 2001 a
Serbia[1]	12 Mar 2001 d	10 Mar 2003
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		9 Jul 1996 a
Spain	29 Oct 1971	16 May 1974
Sweden	29 Oct 1971	18 Jan 1973
Switzerland	29 Oct 1971	24 Jun 1993
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		2 Dec 1997 a
Togo		10 Mar 2003 a
Trinidad and Tobago		27 Jun 1988 a
Ukraine		18 Nov 1999 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	29 Oct 1971	5 Dec 1972
United States of America	29 Oct 1971	26 Nov 1973
Uruguay	29 Oct 1971	6 Oct 1982
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		30 Jul 1982 a
Viet Nam		6 Apr 2005 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

EGYPT[8]

HUNGARY

"A. *Ad* article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2:

In the opinion of the Hungarian People's Republic, article 9, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention have a discriminatory character. The Convention is a general, multilateral one and therefore every State has the right to be a party to it, in accordance with the basic principles of international law.

"B. *Ad* article 11, paragraph 3:

The Hungarian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 11, paragraph 3 of the Convention are inconsistent with the principles of the independence of colonial countries and peoples, formulated, *inter alia*, also in resolution No. 1514 (XV) of the United Nations General Assembly."

SLOVAKIA[3]

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
United Kingdom	4 Dec 1974	Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Isle of Man, Montserrat, St. Lucia, Seychelles, British Virgin Islands

---

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 29 October 1971. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On 17 June 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of China, the following communication:

"In accordance with the Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibility of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

The [said Convention], which the Government of the People's Republic of China acceded on 5 January 1993, will apply to the Hong Kong Sspecial Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997.

The Government of the Prcople's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 5 October 1984. Subsequently, on 1 February 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Czechoslovakia, the following reservation:

"The provision of article 11, paragraph 3 of the Convention for the Protection of Producers of Phonograms against Unauthorized Duplication of their Phonograms is in contradiction to the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which was adopted at the XVth session of the United Nations General Assembly (resolution C 1514/XV of 14 December 1960)."

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[8] In a notification received on 18 January 1980, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration relating to Israel. The notification indicates 25 January 1980 as the effective date of the withdrawal. For the text of said declar- ation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1067, p. 327.

5. Protocol to the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials of 22 November 1950

Nairobi, 26 November 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 January 1982, in accordance with article VIII (17a).
REGISTRATION: 2 January 1982, No. 20669.
STATUS: Signatories: 13. Parties: 42.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1259, p. 3.

Note: The Protocol, approved on 30 March 1976 by a Special Committee of Governmental Experts convened in pursuance of resolution 4.112 of the eighteenth session of the General Conference of UNESCO, was adopted on the Report of Programme Commission II at the thirty-fourth plenary meeting of the nineteenth session of the General Conference of UNESCO at Nairobi, Kenya, on 26 November 1976, and opened for signature on 1 March 1977.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Succession (d)*
Australia		5 Mar 1992 a
Austria	4 Feb 1993	28 Jun 1994
Barbados		10 Apr 1979 a
Belgium	18 Jun 1980	25 Sep 1986
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria		14 Mar 1997 a
Croatia[1]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		15 May 1992 a
Cyprus		3 Aug 2004 a
Czech Republic		22 Aug 1997 a
Denmark	18 Jun 1980	17 Feb 1983
Egypt		18 Sep 1981 a
Estonia		1 Aug 2001 a
Finland		17 Feb 1987 a
France	18 Jun 1980	3 Jan 1986
Germany[2,3]	18 Jun 1980	17 Aug 1989
Greece		4 Mar 1983 a
Holy See		22 Feb 1980 a
Iraq		13 Apr 1978 a
Ireland	18 Jun 1980	18 Jun 1980
Italy	18 Jun 1980	2 Jul 1981 A
Kazakhstan		21 Dec 1998 a
Latvia		20 Nov 2001 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania		21 Aug 1998 a
Luxembourg	18 Jun 1980	22 Jun 1982
Moldova		3 Sep 1998 a
Montenegro		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[4]	18 Jun 1980	15 Jul 1981 A
New Zealand[5]	9 Nov 1981	
Oman	19 Dec 1977	
Portugal		11 Jun 1984 a
Russian Federation		7 Oct 1994 a
San Marino		30 Jul 1985 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia		9 Jun 1997 a
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		2 Oct 1992 a
Sweden		30 Jul 1997 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1]		2 Sep 1997 d
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	18 Jun 1980	9 Jun 1982
United States of America	1 Sep 1981	15 May 1989
Uruguay		20 Apr 1999 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		1 May 1992 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or succession.)

Australia

Declaration:

"Pursuant to paragraph 16 (a), Australia declares that it will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the Protocol."

Austria

Declaration:

"Austria shall not be bound by Part II, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H."

Barbados

Declaration:

"The Government of Barbados hereby declares that it will not be bound by annex H."

Belgium

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Belgium made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II,

Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

CYPRUS

5 June 2006

Declaration:

"The Republic of Cyprus declares in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol that it shall not to be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of France made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

... The Government of France shall not be bound by parts II and IV and anenxes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol.

GERMANY[2,3]

DENMARK

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Denmark made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

Pursuant to paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Denmark declares that shall not be bound by part II, part IV, annex C.I, annex F, annex G and annex H of the Protocol.

FINLAND

Declaration:

[Finland] shall not be bound by parts II and IV and annexes C.1, F and G of the Protocol.

GREECE

Declaration:

The Government of Greece shall not be bound by part II, part IV, and annexes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol.

IRAQ[7]

Declaration:

Entry into the above Protocol by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or be conducive to entry into any relations with it.

IRELAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Ireland made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"Ireland will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.I, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H, or by any of those Parts or Annexes."

ITALY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Italy made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex."

Upon ratification :

Declaration:

"(a) Italy shall not be bound by part II, part IV, annex C.1, annex F, annex G and annex H;

"(b) Italy, within the framework of the European Economic Community, will examine the possibility of accepting annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that annex."

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

"As provided in paragraph 16 (a) of part VIII of the Protocol the Republic of Lithuania declares that it will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H."

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Government of Luxembourg made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

The Government of Luxembourg will not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of

the Protocol and will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex.

NETHERLANDS[4]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Netherlands made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex."

Upon acceptance:

Declaration:

"In conformity with paragraph 16 (a) of the said Protocol, the Kingdom shall not be bound by part II, part IV, annex C.1, annex F, annex G and annex H thereof."

NEW ZEALAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of New Zealand shall not be bound by annex C.1, annex F and annex H of the Protocol."

PORTUGAL

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 16 (a) of the Protocol, [Portugal] shall not be bound by parts II and IV (a) and annexes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol.

SPAIN

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 16 of the Protocol, Spain shall not be bound by parts II and IV and annexes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol.

SWEDEN

Declaration:

"Sweden shall not be bound by Parts II, IV, and Annexes C.1, F, G and H of the Protocol."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made a declaration according to the terms of which it shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H of the said Protocol, and within the framework of the European Economic Community, it will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex."

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

"The United Kingdom shall not be bound by Part II, Part IV, Annex C.1, Annex F, Annex G and Annex H;

"The United Kingdom, within the framework of the European Economic Community, will examine the possibility of accepting Annex C.1 in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that Annex."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reserves the right to extend the Protocol at a later date, to any territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible and to which the Agreement on the Importation of Educational, Scientific and Cultural Materials has been extended in accordance with the provisions of article XIII thereof."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article VII, Section 16 (a), of the Protocol, the United States hereby declares that it will not be bound by Annexes C.1, F, G, and H. The United States will examine the possibility of withdrawing this declaration with regard to annex C.1, and of accepting that annex, in the light of the position adopted by other Contracting Parties with regard to that annex."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Protocol on 13 November 1981. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe and as from 1 January 1986 for Aruba. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The signature of the Protocol extends to Tokelau Islands.

[6] In a communication received on 20 April 1989, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declared that subject to the same declarations made by the United Kingdom, the Protocol shall extend, with effect from the date of receipt of the said communication, to the following territories for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible:

Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Anguilla, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat, St. Helena, St. Helena Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus.

In this connection, on 7 August 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina an objection, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the one made in this regard in note 21 in chapter IV.3, however also referring to General Assembly resolutions 41/40/, 42/19 and 43/25.

[7] With reference to the declaration made by the Government of Iraq, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel on 1 May 1979, the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are moreover, in flagrant

contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon it under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

6. International Agreement for the Establishment of the University for Peace

New York, 5 December 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 April 1981, in accordance with article 7.
REGISTRATION: 7 April 1981, No. 19735.
STATUS: Parties: 38.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1223, p. 87; and C.N.1127.2001.TREATIES-3 of 1 November 2001[1].

Note: The Agreement was adopted by resolution 35/55[2] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 5 December 1980. It was open for definitive signature by all States at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 5 December 1980 to 31 December 1981.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Argentina		29 Dec 1997 a
Bangladesh		8 Apr 1981 s
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Cambodia		10 Apr 1981 s
Cameroon		16 Aug 1982 a
Chile		2 Mar 1981 s
Colombia		18 Mar 1981 s
Costa Rica		5 Dec 1980 s
Cuba		9 Aug 1985 a
Cyprus		15 Mar 1983 a
Dominican Republic		21 Nov 1983 a
Ecuador		18 Mar 1981 s
El Salvador		7 Apr 1981 s
Guatemala		14 Sep 1981 s
Guyana		9 Aug 2001 a
Honduras		10 Apr 1981 s
India		3 Dec 1981 s
Italy		27 Nov 1981 s
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Mexico		15 May 1981 s
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nicaragua		3 Apr 1981 s
Pakistan		30 Mar 1981 s
Panama		20 Mar 1981 s
Peru		9 Apr 1981 s
Philippines		20 Mar 1984 a
Russian Federation		23 Dec 1987 a
Saint Lucia		2 Sep 1986 a
Senegal		1 Apr 1981 s
Serbia		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		21 Apr 1981 s
Sri Lanka		10 Aug 1981 s
Suriname		3 Jun 1981 s
Togo		3 Jun 1981 s
Turkey		27 Nov 1995 a
Uruguay		19 Nov 1985 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		5 Dec 1980 s

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession .)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

The Argentine Republic does not consider itself bound to make any financial contribution towards such expenses as may derive from the application of this Agreement.

Notes:

[1] At its twelfth session held in San José, Costa Rica, from 7 to 8 November 2000, the Council of the University for Peace received from the Rector of the University, in accordance with article 5 (2) of the Agreement and article 19 (1)(b) of the Charter, a proposal of amendments to the Charter. Pursuant to article 5 (2) of the Agreement and article 19 (2) of the Charter, the Council of the University for Peace formally adopted on 20 April 2001, by written procedure, the amendments to the Charter, which forms an annex to the Agreement for the Establishment of the University for Peace.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fifth Session, Supplement No. 31* (A/35/49) p. 103.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Agreement on 19 January 1983. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. STATUTES OF THE INTERNATIONAL CENTRE FOR GENETIC ENGINEERING AND BIOTECHNOLOGY

Madrid, 13 September 1983

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1994, in accordance with article 21 (1).
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1994, No. 30673.
STATUS: Signatories: 45. Parties: 54.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1763, p. 91; see also hereinafter the Protocol of the reconvened plenipotentiary meeting (XIV.7a).

Note: The Statutes were adopted at the Ministerial Level Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology held at Madrid, Spain, from 7 to 13 September 1983 under the auspices of the United Nations Industrial Development Organization. They were open for signature at Madrid on 12 and 13 September 1983 and remain open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, until their entry into force.

Pursuant to article 21 (1), the Statutes are to enter into force when at least twenty-four States, including the Host State[1] of the Centre, have deposited instruments of ratification or acceptance and having further ascertained among themselves that sufficient financial resources are ensured, have then deposited with the Secretary-General notifications indicating their agreement to the entry into force of the Statutes.

Participant[2]	*Signature, Signature ad referendum (s)*	*Confirmation of signature ad referendum (C)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*	*Notification under article 21 (1)*
Afghanistan	13 Sep 1983 s	28 Mar 1984 C	6 Jul 1988	
Algeria	13 Sep 1983		11 Sep 1987	22 Dec 1992
Argentina	13 Sep 1983		8 May 1990	22 Dec 1992
Bangladesh			18 Jul 1996 a	
Bhutan	31 May 1984		7 May 1985	22 Dec 1992
Bolivia	13 Sep 1983			
Bosnia and Herzegovina			1 Feb 2005 a	
Brazil[3]	5 May 1986 s		9 Mar 1990	4 Feb 1993
Bulgaria	13 Sep 1983 s		23 Jun 1986 A	
Cameroon			27 Apr 2006 a	
Chile	13 Sep 1983		27 Apr 1994	
China	13 Sep 1983		13 Apr 1992 A	22 Dec 1992
Colombia	21 Nov 1986		3 Mar 1997	
Congo	13 Sep 1983			
Costa Rica	14 Aug 1990 s		11 Oct 1996	
Côte d'Ivoire			22 Jan 1999 a	
Croatia	20 Oct 1992		26 Aug 1993 A	20 Sep 1993
Cuba	13 Sep 1983		30 Jun 1986	22 Dec 1992
Democratic Republic of the Congo	13 Sep 1983			
Ecuador	13 Sep 1983		26 Oct 1994	
Egypt	13 Sep 1983		13 Jan 1987	22 Dec 1992
Greece	13 Sep 1983			
Hungary	13 Jan 1987		13 Jan 1987 A	31 Aug 1993
India	13 Sep 1983		9 Jul 1985	22 Dec 1992
Indonesia	13 Sep 1983			
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Apr 1988 s		18 Dec 2001	
Iraq	28 Feb 1984		19 Feb 1985	22 Dec 1992
Italy	13 Sep 1983		20 Sep 1990	22 Dec 1992
Jordan			8 Nov 2002 a	
Kuwait[4]	13 Sep 1983		21 Oct 1986	
Kyrgyzstan			7 Oct 1994 a	
Liberia			22 Nov 2005 a	
Mauritania	13 Sep 1983			
Mauritius	19 Sep 1984		5 Jan 1989	11 May 1993
Mexico	13 Sep 1983 s	21 May 1984 C	21 Jan 1988	
Morocco	19 Oct 1984		28 Jun 1990	22 Dec 1992
Nigeria	13 Sep 1983		13 Mar 1991	27 Apr 1994
Pakistan	4 Nov 1983		5 Apr 1994	
Panama	11 Dec 1984		12 Aug 1986	22 Dec 1992
Peru	22 Mar 1984		6 Jan 1995	
Poland	1 Aug 1990		9 Sep 1996	

Participant[2]	*Signature, Signature ad referendum (s)*	*Confirmation of signature ad referendum (C)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*	*Notification under article 21 (1)*
Romania			5 Dec 1995 a	
Russian Federation			30 Nov 1992 A	22 Dec 1992
Saudi Arabia			2 Jan 2006 a	
Senegal	29 Jun 1984		4 May 1985	23 Dec 1993
Slovakia			13 Jan 1998 a	
Slovenia			28 Dec 1994 a	
South Africa			6 Feb 2004 a	
Spain	13 Sep 1983			
Sri Lanka	12 Nov 1991		1 Oct 1993	3 Feb 1994
Sudan	13 Sep 1983		21 Oct 1991	22 Dec 1992
Syrian Arab Republic	17 Oct 1991		18 Apr 2001	
Thailand	13 Sep 1983			
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia			27 Apr 1994 a	
Trinidad and Tobago	13 Sep 1983		13 Oct 2003	
Tunisia	27 Oct 1983		20 Sep 1990	22 Dec 1992
Turkey	22 Sep 1987		10 Jan 1989	22 Dec 1992
United Arab Emirates			22 Mar 2004 a	
United Republic of Tanzania			1 May 2001 a	
Uruguay			5 Dec 1995 a	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	13 Sep 1983		15 Oct 1985	22 Dec 1992
Viet Nam	17 Sep 1984		15 Apr 1993 A	15 Apr 1993

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

CHILE[5]

Reservations:

(a) The Government of Chile hereby enters a reservation to article 13, paragraph 3, of the Statutes inasmuch as, under the provisions of its Constitution and internal law, the property and assets of the Centre may be expropriated by virtue of a general or special law authorizing such expropriation on the ground of public benefit or national interest as may be determined by legislation.

(b) The Government of Chile hereby enters a reservation to article 13, paragraphs 5, 6 and 7, of the Statutes inasmuch as the privileges and immunities of representatives of the Members and of officials and experts of the Centre shall be granted in accordance with the terms of the said paragraphs save where any such person holds Chilean nationality.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba formulates an express reservation to paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of article 14 of the Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, because it considers that the provisions thereof contravene the regulations of article 4 of the Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property of 20 March 1883, to which Cuba is a party, and the Cuban legislation guaranteeing the implementation of that Convention.

COLOMBIA

Declarations:

1. Pilot plant activities in Colombian territory

With respect to the scope of article 3 (a) of the Statutes, which refers to pilot plant activities in the field of genetic engineering and biotechnology, when pilot plants are established in Colombian territory they may not contravene the regulations in force in Colombia regarding management of genetic resources, biosafety, protection of life, health, food production and the cultural integrity of indigenous, black and peasant communities.

2. Functions of the Board of Governors

With regard to the scope of article 6, paragraph 2 (a), which specifies that the Board of Governors shall determine the general policies and principles governing the activities of the Centre, it is to be understood that when this provision is applied in Colombia it shall not contravene the domestic, supranational or international legal provisions regarding biosafety, management of genetic resources, and protection of biological, ethnic and cultural diversity and of life, health and food production.

3. Attributions of the Council of Scientific Advisers

Likewise, the Government of the Republic of Colombia makes the following statement with regard to the function of the Council of Scientific Advisers provided for in article 7, paragraph 4 (e), of the Statutes, giving it the power to approve safety regulations for the Centre, in other words the safety regulations governing the research work approved by the Council of Scientific Advisers. These provisions, when applied in Colombia, may not contravene the regulations in force in Colombia regarding management of genetic resources, biosafety, and protection of biological, ethnic and cultural diversity and of life, health and food production.

4. Intellectual property rights and patents

With respect to article 6, paragraph 2 (e), which specifies that one of the functions of the Board of Governors is to "Establish ... rules which regulate patents, licensing, copyrights and other rights to intellectual property, including the transfer of results emanating from the research work of the Centre", the Government of the Republic of Colombia considers that these

powers of the Board of Governors must be exercised in conformity with and subject to the national, supranational and international provisions in force in relation to industrial and intellectual property, especially with regard to the rights of ethnic and cultural minorities in respect of products derived from their knowledge.

The foregoing declaration also extends to article 14, paragraph 2, of the Statutes, which establishes the Centre's ownership of copyright and patent rights relating to any work produced or developed by the Centre; in other words, these rights must be exercised in conformity with and subject to the national, supranational and international provisions in force in relation to industrial and intellectual property, especially with regard to the rights of ethnic and cultural minorities in respect of products derived from their knowledge.

As a consequence of the foregoing declarations, the Government of the Republic of Colombia states that article 14, paragraph 3, referring to the policy pursued by the Centre to obtain patents or interests in patents on results of genetic engineering and biotechnology developed through projects of the Centre, shall apply in Colombia on the understanding that the rules in force under domestic, supranational and international regulations with regard to industrial and intellectual property will be complied with; specifically, the Government of the Republic of Colombia states that the scope of the paragraphs cited in article 14 of the present instrument is to be understood as being subject to the following conditions:

"The Centre may not acquire any right to any work developed or produced on the basis of Colombian biological or genetic material if the development or product is among those provided for in articles 6 and 7 of Decision 344 of 1993 of the Commission of the Cartagena Agreement or, in general, contravenes the regimes provided for in Decisions 344 and 345 of 1993 of the Cartagena Agreement" and

"The Centre shall not be able to patent or exercise any right over inventions deriving from traditional knowledge, utilization or exploitation of biological or genetic resources developed by Colombian black, indigenous and peasant communities, except in cases where the national communities, by common agreement and subject to payment of such fees as may be payable under the legislation in force, cede the rights in question."

Likewise, the Government of the Republic of Colombia wishes to indicate with respect to article 14, paragraph 4, dealing with access to intellectual property rights concerning the results emanating from the research work of the Centre by Members and by developing countries that are not Members of the Centre, that this provision must be interpreted in conformity with the principles of equity and reciprocity governing Colombia's international relations. In particular, the Republic of Colombia considers that where such rights are the outcome of research conducted on the basis of Colombian biological or genetic material, Colombia should enjoy particularly favourable access to them.

5. Legal status, privileges and immunities

With respect to article 13, paragraph 2, of the Statutes, which provides that the property of the Centre "shall enjoy immunity from every form of legal process except insofar as in any particular case it has expressly waived its immunity", the Government of the Republic of Colombia accepts that provision on condition that, in the event of a legal dispute arising between an inhabitant of the national territory and the Centre in which the latter is acting as a private individual or subject to the rules of domestic or supranational law, recourse may be had to the judicial mechanisms prescribed by the national and international legal order in order that the conflict may be resolved in accordance with the legislation in force in Colombian territory.

With regard to the provisions of paragraph 3 of the same article, which refers to the inviolability of the premises of the Centre and states that wherever located, they shall be immune from search, requisition, confiscation, expropriation and any other form of interference, whether by executive, administrative, judicial or legislative actions, the Republic of Colombia wishes to point out that this provision does not prevent the Colombian authorities from establishing effective control and inspection mechanisms that will enable the State to discharge its inescapable duty of monitoring compliance with the national, supranational and international legislation on biosecurity and protection of natural resources, cultural diversity, life, health and the production of food in Colombian territory.

ITALY

Declaration:

Pending adoption of the Headquarters Agreement, article 13, paragraphs 2 and 9, of the Statutes, will be implemented within the limits established by applicable norms of the Italian legal system.

MEXICO

In accordance with article 19 of the 1967 Paris Convention for the Protection of Industrial Property, the United Mexican States declares that it will apply the general policy regarding copyright established by the governing body of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, insofar as it reflects the principles relating to that subject embodied in the above-mentioned Paris Convention.

SPAIN

Upon signature:

Reservation:

In respect of article 13 (4).

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"The reservation of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago to articles 10 and 11 of these statutes relates specifically to the non-acceptance by the Government of Trinidad and Tobago of any obligation with respect to the financing of the International Centre by assessed contributions or by voluntary contributions on the part of the Government of Trinidad and Tobago, in the absence of any decision on the selection of a host country for the International Centre, and consequently in the absence of any reliable indication of the cost of the International Centre, and the proportion of that cost to be borne by the host country, on the one hand, or by other member States, on the other hand."

Notes:

[1] In accordance with the Protocol of the Reconvened Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnolgy of 4 April 1984 [see chapter XIV.7 (a)], the Governments of Italy and India are to host the Centre. For the date of deposit of their instruments of ratification and notifications under article 21 (1), see the table in this chapter.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Statutes on 13 September 1983 and 18 March 1987, respectively. Subsequently, on 22 December 1992, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia deposited a notification under article 21 (1) of the Statutes. Some States indicated that, without prejudice to further decisions, they did not consider valid the notification by the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia. The Federal

Republic of Yugoslavia in turn indicated that in its opinion there were no legal grounds whatsoever to question the legality of its notification. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 15 May 2001, the Government of Brazil notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw from the Statutes, the date of effect being 14 May 2002. Subsequently, in a communication received on 9 May 2002, the Government of Brazil notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its notification of withdrawal of 15 May 2001.

[4] The instrument was accompanied by an understanding to the effect that the ratification by Kuwait of the said Convention does not mean a recognition of Israel nor that treaty relations will arise with Israel.

[5] The International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology informed the Secretary-General on 12 May 1994, that these reservations had been accepted by the Board of Governors on 27 April 1994.

7. a) Protocol of the Reconvened Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology

Vienna, 4 April 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 February 1994 , in accordance with article 21 of the Statutes[1].
REGISTRATION: 3 February 1994, No. 30673.
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 33.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.96.1984.TREATIES-3 of 12 June 1984.

Note: The Reconvened Plenipotentiary Meeting on the Establishment of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology held at Vienna, Austria, from 3 to 4 April 1984, adopted the said Protocol, in the English language only, in order to complete article 1(2) of the Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, concluded at Madrid on 13 September 1983. The Protocol was opened for signature to all Contracting Parties to the Statutes at Vienna, from 4 to 12 April 1984, and shall remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, until the entry into force of the Statutes.

The Protocol, for all legal and practical purposes, completes the Statutes and is therefore considered as an integral part thereto and shall become effective upon the entry into force of the Statutes in accordance with article 21 thereof.

Participant[2]	*Signature ad referendum*	*Definitive signature (s), Confirmation of signature*
Afghanistan		15 Aug 1984 s
Algeria		4 Nov 1985 s
Argentina		4 Apr 1984 s
Bhutan		31 May 1984 s
Brazil	5 May 1986	9 Mar 1990
Bulgaria		4 Apr 1984 s
Chile		4 Apr 1984 s
Colombia		14 Sep 1987 s
Costa Rica	14 Aug 1990	11 Oct 1996
Croatia		26 Aug 1993 s
Cuba		4 Apr 1984 s
Ecuador	17 Jul 1990	
Egypt	2 Jan 1986	13 Jan 1987
Greece		4 Apr 1984 s
Hungary		14 Sep 1987 s
India		4 Apr 1984 s
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Apr 1988	18 Dec 2001
Iraq		23 Oct 1984 s
Italy		4 Apr 1984 s
Mauritius		19 Sep 1984 s
Mexico	25 Oct 1984	21 Jan 1988
Morocco		19 Oct 1984 s
Nigeria		2 May 1985 s
Panama		11 Dec 1984 s
Peru		4 Apr 1984 s
Poland	1 Aug 1990	
Russian Federation		18 Sep 1992 s
Senegal		29 Jun 1984 s
Sri Lanka		1 Oct 1993 s
Sudan		29 Jan 1993 s
Trinidad and Tobago		8 Feb 1985 s
Tunisia		5 Aug 1992 s
Turkey		22 Sep 1987 s
Venezuela		4 Apr 1984 s
Viet Nam		17 Sep 1984 s

Notes:

[1] The Protocol shall become effective upon the entry into force of the Statutes in accordance with article 21 thereof.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Protocol definitively on 4 April 1984. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. b) Amendments to Articles 6 (6) and 7 (1) of the Statutes of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology

Trieste, Italy, 3 December 1996

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 16 of the Statutes which reads as follows: "1. Any Member may propose amendments to the Statutes. Texts of proposed amendments shall be promptly communicated by the Director to all Members and shall not be considered by the Board until ninety days after the dispatch of such communication. 2. Amendments shall be approved by a two-thirds majority of all Members and shall enter into force for those Members who have deposited instruments of ratification.".

STATUS: Parties: 4.

TEXT: Doc. (ICGEB/BG.3/21); (and depositary notifications C.N.155.1997.TREATIES-1 of 5 May 1997 and C.N.233.1997.TREATIES-2 of 12 September 1997 (authentic Spanish text).

Note: At its third Session, held in Trieste (Italy) from 2 to 3 December 1996, the Board of Governors of the International Centre for Genetic Engineering and Biotechnology, having ascertained that the two-thirds of Members were present, adopted amendments to articles 6 (6) and 7 (1) of the above Statutes.

Participant	*Ratification*	*Participant*	*Ratification*
Cameroon	27 Apr 2006	Liberia	22 Nov 2005
Croatia	28 Oct 1998	Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	4 Dec 1998

CHAPTER XV

DECLARATION OF DEATH OF MISSING PERSONS

1. CONVENTION ON THE DECLARATION OF DEATH OF MISSING PERSONS

Lake Success, New York, 6 April 1950

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 January 1952 by the exchange of the said letters, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 24 January 1952, No. 1610.
STATUS: Parties: 6.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119, p. 99.
TERMINATION : 24 January 1972, in accordance with article 1 of the Protocol of 15 January 1967 (United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 808, p. 296.)

Note: The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 369 (IV)[1] of 3 December 1949 and met at Lake Success, New York, from 15 March to 6 April 1950. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 119, p. 99.

In accordance with article 17 (1), the Convention was to cease to have effect on 23 January 1957. However, the Convention remained in force until 24 January 1972 as a result of the adoption of the protocols of 16 January 1957 and 15 January 1967 extending it (see chapters XV.2 and XV.3).

Participant	*Accession (a)*
Belgium[2]	22 Jul 1953 a
China[3]	
Germany[4]	30 Jan 1956 a
Guatemala	25 Dec 1951 a
Israel	7 May 1952 a
Italy	25 Mar 1958 a
Pakistan	6 Dec 1955 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon accession.)

GERMANY[4]

"The Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons also applies to *Land Berlin*.

"Moreover, the Permanent Observer on instructions from his government has the honour to communicate to the Secretary-General that in accordance with article 2, sub-paragraph 3, of the Convention the Amtsgericht Schöneberg in Berlin-Schöneberg has been designated as the tribunal which shall be exclusively competent to receive applications and to issue declarations of death which otherwise would have come within the competence of the tribunals specified in article 2, sub-paragraph 2. This transfer of competence to the Amtsgericht Schöneberg also applies to *Land Berlin*.

"Furthermore, the Permanent Observer on instructions from his government has the honour to notify the Secretary-General that in accordance with article 1, sub-paragraph 2, the Federal Government has extended the application of the Convention to persons who subsequent to 1945 disappeared under circumstances similar to those specified in its article 1, sub-paragraph 1. This extension of the application of the Convention likewise applies to *Land Berlin*."

ISRAEL

"Having regard to the provisions of the domestic law of Israel according to which matters of marriage are within the exclusive jurisdiction of the established Religious Courts, the effect to be given to declarations of death, whether issued pursuant to the Convention on the Declaration of Death of Missing Persons or satisfying the conditions and requirements contained in articles 1, 2 and 3 of the said Convention, and valid by virtue of article 6 thereof, as regards the dissolution of marriages, will depend upon the extent to which the appropriate Religious Court exercising jurisdiction in a given case will be able to recognize the same in accordance with its own religious law."

PAKISTAN

11 April 1956

The Government of Pakistan extends the application of the Convention to persons having disappeared subsequent to 1945.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Fourth Session* (A/1251 & Corr.1 and 2), p. 65.

[2] With a declaration to the effect that the Government of Belgium does not assume any obligations as regards the Belgian Congo and the Trust Territories of Ruanda-Urundi.

[3] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 20 December 1950. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

[4] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. PROTOCOL FOR EXTENDING THE PERIOD OF VALIDITY OF THE CONVENTION ON THE DECLARATION OF DEATH OF MISSING PERSONS

New York, 16 January 1957

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 January 1957, in accordance with article III (a).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1998, No. 1610.
STATUS: Parties: 6.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 258, p. 392.
TERMINATION: of the Convention of 6 April 1950 (see chapter XV.1).

Participant	*Accession (a)*
Cambodia	30 Jul 1957 a
China[1]	
Germany[2,3]	23 Oct 1958 a
Guatemala	8 Aug 1961 a
Israel	22 Jan 1957 a
Italy	25 Mar 1958 a
Pakistan	21 Jan 1957 a

Notes:

[1] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 9 September 1957. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations stated that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legal Government which represented China and the Chinese people in international relations and that, therefore, the allegations made in the above-mentioned communica tions as to the lack of validity of the signature or ratification in question had no legal foundation whatsoever.

[2] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3. PROTOCOL FOR THE FURTHER EXTENSION OF THE PERIOD OF VALIDITY OF THE CONVENTION ON THE DECLARATION OF DEATH OF MISSING PERSONS

New York, 15 January 1967

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 January 1967 by exchange of letters, in accordance with article 3.
REGISTRATION: 24 January 1967, No. 1610.
STATUS: Parties: 5.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 588, p. 290.
TERMINATION: of the Convention of 6 April 1950 (see chapter XV.1).

Note: The draft protocol was drawn up by the Secretary-General in accordance with a desire expressed by several States Parties to the Convention of 6 April 1950.

Participant	*Accession (a)*
Cambodia	11 Aug 1967 a
China[1]	
Guatemala	24 Jan 1967 a
Israel	15 Sep 1967 a
Italy	24 Jan 1967 a
Pakistan	24 Jan 1967 a

Notes:

[1] Accession on behalf of the Republic of China on 23 January 1967. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

CHAPTER XVI

STATUS OF WOMEN

1. CONVENTION ON THE POLITICAL RIGHTS OF WOMEN

New York, 31 March 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 July 1954, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 7 July 1954, No. 2613.
STATUS: Signatories: 47. Parties: 120.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 193, p. 135.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature pursuant to resolution 640 (VII),[1] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 20 December 1952.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		16 Nov 1966 a
Albania		12 May 1955 a
Algeria		5 Aug 2004 a
Angola		17 Sep 1986 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina	31 Mar 1953	27 Feb 1961
Australia		10 Dec 1974 a
Austria	19 Oct 1959	18 Apr 1969
Bahamas		16 Aug 1977 d
Bangladesh		5 Oct 1998 a
Barbados		12 Jan 1973 a
Belarus	31 Mar 1953	11 Aug 1954
Belgium		20 May 1964 a
Bolivia	9 Apr 1953	22 Sep 1970
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil	20 May 1953	13 Aug 1963
Bulgaria		17 Mar 1954 a
Burkina Faso		9 Dec 1998 a
Burundi		18 Feb 1993 a
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	
Canada		30 Jan 1957 a
Central African Republic		4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	31 Mar 1953	18 Oct 1967
China[3,4]		
Colombia		5 Aug 1986 a
Congo		15 Oct 1962 d
Costa Rica	31 Mar 1953	25 Jul 1967
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 a
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	31 Mar 1953	8 Apr 1954
Cyprus	10 Sep 1968	12 Nov 1968
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		12 Oct 1977 a
Denmark	29 Oct 1953	7 Jul 1954
Dominican Republic	31 Mar 1953	11 Dec 1953
Ecuador	31 Mar 1953	23 Apr 1954
Egypt		8 Sep 1981 a
El Salvador	24 Jun 1953	
Ethiopia	31 Mar 1953	21 Jan 1969
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		6 Oct 1958 a
France	31 Mar 1953	22 Apr 1957
Gabon	19 Apr 1967	19 Apr 1967
Georgia		6 Jul 2005 a
Germany[6,7]		4 Nov 1970 a
Ghana		28 Dec 1965 a
Greece	1 Apr 1953	29 Dec 1953
Guatemala	31 Mar 1953	7 Oct 1959
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	24 Jan 1978
Haiti	23 Jul 1957	12 Feb 1958
Hungary	2 Sep 1954	20 Jan 1955
Iceland	25 Nov 1953	30 Jun 1954
India	29 Apr 1953	1 Nov 1961
Indonesia	31 Mar 1953	16 Dec 1958
Ireland		14 Nov 1968 a
Israel	14 Apr 1953	6 Jul 1954
Italy		6 Mar 1968 a
Jamaica		14 Aug 1966 a
Japan	1 Apr 1955	13 Jul 1955
Jordan		1 Jul 1992 a
Kazakhstan		28 Mar 2000 a
Kyrgyzstan		10 Feb 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		28 Jan 1969 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon	24 Feb 1954	5 Jun 1956
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 a
Liberia	9 Dec 1953	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Luxembourg	4 Jun 1969	1 Nov 1976
Madagascar		12 Feb 1964 a
Malawi		29 Jun 1966 a
Mali		16 Jul 1974 a
Malta		9 Jul 1968 a
Mauritania		4 May 1976 a
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico	31 Mar 1953	23 Mar 1981
Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Mongolia		18 Aug 1965 a
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		22 Nov 1976 a
Myanmar	14 Sep 1954	
Nepal		26 Apr 1966 a
Netherlands	8 Aug 1968	30 Jul 1971
New Zealand		22 May 1968 a
Nicaragua		17 Jan 1957 a
Niger		7 Dec 1964 d
Nigeria	11 Jul 1980	17 Nov 1980
Norway	18 Sep 1953	24 Aug 1956
Pakistan	18 May 1954	7 Dec 1954
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 a
Paraguay	16 Nov 1953	22 Feb 1990
Peru		1 Jul 1975 a
Philippines	23 Sep 1953	12 Sep 1957
Poland	31 Mar 1953	11 Aug 1954
Republic of Korea		23 Jun 1959 a
Romania	27 Apr 1954	6 Aug 1954
Russian Federation	31 Mar 1953	3 May 1954
Rwanda		26 Sep 2003 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Senegal		2 May 1963 d
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		25 Jul 1962 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands[9]		3 Sep 1981 a
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	
Spain		14 Jan 1974 a
Swaziland		20 Jul 1970 a
Sweden	6 Oct 1953	31 Mar 1954
Tajikistan		7 Jun 1999 a
Thailand	5 Mar 1954	30 Nov 1954
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		18 Jan 1994 d
Trinidad and Tobago		24 Jun 1966 a
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 a
Turkey	12 Jan 1954	26 Jan 1960
Turkmenistan		11 Oct 1999 a
Uganda		21 Jun 1995 a
Ukraine	31 Mar 1953	15 Nov 1954
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		24 Feb 1967 a
United Republic of Tanzania		19 Jun 1975 a
United States of America		8 Apr 1976 a
Uruguay	26 May 1953	
Uzbekistan		29 Sep 1997 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		31 May 1983 a
Yemen[10]		9 Feb 1987 a
Zambia		4 Feb 1972 a
Zimbabwe		5 Jun 1995 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification,accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA

1. *As regards Article VII*: The People's Republic of Albania declares its disagreement with the last sentence of article VII and considers that the juridical effect of a reservation is to make the Convention operative as between the State making the reservation and all other States parties to the Convention, with the exception only of that part thereof to which the reservation relates.

2. *As regards Article IX:* The People's Republic of Albania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article IX which provides that disputes between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, and declares that for any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in each individual case.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

"The Government of Antigua and Barbuda reserves from the application of this Convention all matters relating to the recruitment to, and conditions of service in, the armed forces of Antigua and Barbuda."

ARGENTINA

The Argentine Government reserves the right not to submit to the procedure set out in this article [article IX] any dispute which is directly connected with territories which fall within Argentine sovereignty.

AUSTRALIA

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that the accession by Australia shall be subject to the reservation that article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards recruitment to and conditions of service in the Defence Forces.

"The Government of Australia furthermore declares that the Convention shall not extend to Papua New Guinea."

AUSTRIA[11]

BANGLADESH[12]

Declarations:

Article III:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh will apply article III of the Convention in consonance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution of Bangladesh and in particular, article 28 (4) allowing special provision in favour of

women; article 29.3 (c) allowing reservation of any class of employment or office for one sex on the ground that it is considered by its nature to be unsuited to members of the opposite sex; and article 65 (3) providing for reservation of 30 seats in the National Assembly for women in addition to the provision allowing women to be elected to any and all of the 300 seats.

Article IX:

For the submission of any dispute in terms of this article to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the consent of all the parties to the dispute will be required in each case."

BELARUS[13]

As regards article VII:
[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".]

BELGIUM[14]

BULGARIA[15]

As regards article VII:
[Same declaration and reservation as the ones reproduced under "Albania".]

CANADA

"Inasmuch as under the Canadian constitutional system legislative jurisdiction in respect of political rights is divided between the provinces and the Federal Government, the Government of Canada is obliged, in acceding to this Convention, to make a reservation in respect of rights within the legislative jurisdiction of the provinces."

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK

Subject to a reservation with respect to article III of the Convention, in so far as it relates to the right of women to hold military appointments or to act as heads of recruitment services or to serve on recruitment boards.

ECUADOR

"The Government of Ecuador signs this Convention subject to a reservation with respect to the last phrase in article I, `without any discrimination', since article 22 of the Political Constitution of the Republic specifies that "a vote in popular elections is obligatory for a man and optional for a woman".

FIJI

"The reservations of the United Kingdom 1 (a), (b), (d) and (f) are affirmed and are redrafted as more suitable to the situation of Fiji in the following terms:

"Article III is accepted subject to reservations, pending notification of withdrawal of any case, insofar as it relates to:

"(a) succession to the Crown;

"(b) certain offices primarily of a ceremonial nature;

"(d) recruitment to and conditions of service in the armed forces;

"(f) the employment of married women in the civil service

"All other reservations made by the United Kingdom are withdrawn."

FINLAND

As regards Article III: "A decree may be issued to the effect that only men or women can be appointed to certain functions, which because of their nature, can be properly discharged either only by men or by women."

FRANCE[16]

GERMANY[6]

"The Federal Republic of Germany accedes to the Convention with the reservation that article III of the Convention does not apply to service in the armed forces."

GUATEMALA

1. Articles I, II and III shall apply only to female citizens of Guatemala in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 2 of the Constitution of the Republic.

2. In order to satisfy constitutional requirements, article IX shall be interpreted subject to the provisions of article 149, paragraph 3 (b) of the Constitution of the Republic.

HUNGARY[17]

As regards article VII:
[Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".]

INDIA

"Article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards recruitment to, and conditions of service in any of the Armed Forces of India or the Forces charged with the maintenance of public order in India."

INDONESIA

"The last sentence of article VII and the whole article IX do not apply to Indonesia."

IRELAND

"Article III is accepted subject to reservation in so far as it relates to

"(a) the employment of married women in the public service;

"(b) the unequal remuneration of women in certain positions in the public service,

"and subject to the following declarations:

"(1) that the exclusion of women from positions of employment for which by objective standards or for physical reasons they are not suitable is not regarded as discriminatory;

"(2) that the fact that jury service is not at present obligatory for women is not regarded as discriminatory."

ITALY

"In acceding to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women, done at New York on 31 March 1953, the Italian Government declares that it reserves its rights to apply the provisions of Art. III as far as service in the armed forces and in special armed corps is concerned within the limits established by national legislation."

LESOTHO

"Article III is accepted subject to reservation, pending notification of withdrawal in any case, so far as it relates to: Matters regulated by Basotho Law and Custom."

MALTA

"In acceding to this Convention, the Government of Malta hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by article III in so far as that article applies to conditions of service in the Public Service and to Jury Service."

MAURITIUS

"The Government of Mauritius hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by article III of the Convention in so far as that Article applies to recruitment to and conditions of service in the armed forces or to jury service."

MEXICO

Declaration:

"It is expressly understood that the Government of Mexico will not deposit its instrument of ratification pending the entry into force of the amendment to the Political Constitution of the United Mexican States which is now under consideration, providing that citizenship rights shall be granted to Mexican women."

MONGOLIA[18]

"To articles IV and V:

"The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic declares its disagreement with paragraph 1 of article IV and paragraph 1 of article V and considers that the present Convention should be open to all States for signature or accession.

MOROCCO

The consent of all the parties concerned is required for the referral of any dispute to the International Court of Justice.

NEPAL

As regards article IX of the Convention: "A dispute shall be referred for decision to the International Court of Justice only at the request of all the parties to the dispute."

NETHERLANDS[19]

NEW ZEALAND

"Subject to a reservation with respect to Article III of the Convention, in so far as it relates to recruitment and conditions of service in the armed forces of New Zealand."

PAKISTAN

"Article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards recruitment to and conditions of services charged with the maintenance of public order or unsuited to women because of the hazards involved."

POLAND[20]

As regards article VII:

[*Same declaration and reservation as the ones*reproduced under "Albania".]

ROMANIA[21]

As regards article VII:

[*Same declaration and reservation as the ones*reproduced under "Albania".]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[13]

As regards article VII:

[*Same declaration as the one reproduced under "Albania".*]

SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

Reservation:

"The Government of St. Vincent and the Grenadines reserves from the application of article III of this Convention all matters relating to the recruitment to, and conditions of service in, the armed forces of St. Vincent and the Grenadines."

SIERRA LEONE

"In acceding to this Convention, the Government of Sierra Leone hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by article III in so far as that article applies to recruitment to and conditions of service in the Armed Forces or to jury service."

SLOVAKIA[5]

SOLOMON ISLANDS

10 May 1982

In relation to the succession:

The Government of Solomon Islands declared that Solomon Islands maintains the reservations entered by the United Kingdom save in so far as the same cannot apply to Solomon Islands.

SPAIN

Articles I and III of the Convention shall be interpreted without prejudice to the provisions which in current Spanish legislation define the status of head of family.

Articles II and III shall be interpreted without prejudice to the norms relating to the office of Head of State contained in the Spanish Fundamental Laws.

Article III shall be interpreted without prejudice to the fact that certain functions, which by their nature can be exercised satisfactorily only by men or only by women, shall be exercised exclusively by men or by women, as appropriate, in accordance with Spanish legislation.

SWAZILAND

"(a) Article III of the Convention shall have no application as regards remuneration for women in certain posts in the Civil Service of the Kingdom of Swaziland;

"(b) The Convention shall have no application to matters which are regulated by Swaziland Law and Custom in accordance with Section 62 (2) of the Constitution of the Kingdom of Swaziland. [(a) The office of Nggwenyama; (b) the office of Ndlovukazi (the Queen Mother); (c) the authorization of a person to perform the functions of Regent for the purposes of section 30 of this Constitution; (d) the appointment, revocation of appointment and suspension of Chiefs; (e) the composition of the Swazi National Council, the appointment and revocation of appointment of members of the Council, and the procedure of the Council; (f) the Ncwala Ceremony; (g) the Libutfo (regimental) system.]

TUNISIA

[Article IX] For any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in every case.

UKRAINE[13]

As regards article VII:

[*Same declaration as the one reproduced* under "Albania".]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[22]

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accedes to the Convention with the following reservations submitted in accordance with article VII:

"(1) Article III is accepted subject to reservations, pending notification of withdrawal in any case, in so far as it relates to:

"(a) succession to the Crown;

"(b) certain offices primarily of a ceremonial nature;

"(c) the function of sitting and voting in the House of Lords pertaining to holders of hereditary peerages and holders of certain offices in the Church of England;

"(d) recruitment to and conditions of service in the armed forces;

"(e) jury service in Grenada, [...] as well as in the Kingdom of Tonga;

"(f). . .

"(g) remuneration for women in the Civil Service of [...] Hong Kong, as well as of the Protectorate of Swaziland;

"(h). . .

"(i) in the State of Brunei, the exercise of the royal powers, jury service or its equivalent and the holding of certain offices governed by Islamic Law.

"(2) The United Kingdom reserves the right to postpone the application of this Convention in respect of women living in the Colony of Aden, having regard to the local customs and traditions. Further, the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply this Convention to Rhodesia unless and until the United Kingdom informs the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it is in a position to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation with regard to article IX:

[Venezuela] does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention.

YEMEN[10]

(a) The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that it does not accept the last sentence of article VII and considers that the juridical effect of a reservation is to make the Convention operative as between the State making the reservation and all other States parties to the Convention with the exception only of that part thereof to which the reservation relates.

(b) The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by the text of article IX, which provides that disputes between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may, at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

(Note: In accordance with article VII of the Convention, a State which objects to a reservation, may ".. within a period of ninety days from the date of the [notification of the reservation by the Secretary-General], notify the Secretary-General that it does not accept it. In such case, the Convention shall not enter into force as between such State and the State making the reservation.")

CANADA

Objection to the reservations made in respect of articles VII and IX by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

CHINA[23]

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:

[*Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".*]

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics in respect of articles VII and IX.

ETHIOPIA

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:

[*Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".*]

ISRAEL

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:

[*Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".*]

MONTENEGRO[8]

Confirmed upon succession:

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala, in respect of articles I, II and III, as these reservations "are not in accordance with the principles contained in Article I of the Charter of the United Nations and with the aims of the Convention".

NORWAY

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Argentina in respect of article VII.

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala in respect of articles I, II and III.

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:

[*Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".*]

15 March 1999

With regard to the reservation with reagard to article III made by the Government of Bangladesh upon accession:

"A reservation by which a State Party limits its responsibilities under the Convention by invoking general principles of internal law may create doubts about the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. Under well-established international treaty law, a state is not permitted to invoke internal law as justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations. For this reason, the Government of Norway objects to the said reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh.

The Government of Norway does not consider this objection to preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the People's Republic of Bangladesh, the Convention thus becomes operative between the Kingdom of Norway and the People's Republic of Bangladesh without the Republic of Bangladesh benefiting from these reservations."

PAKISTAN

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Argentina in respect of article VII.

Objection to the reservation made by France and recorded in the procès-verbal of signature of the Convention.

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala in respect of articles I, II and III.

Objection to the reservations in respect of articles VII and IX:

[*Same States as the ones listed under "Canada".*]

PHILIPPINES

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Albania in respect of articles VII and IX.

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Romania in respect of articles VII and IX.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Mongolia in respect of articles IV, paragraph 1, and V, paragraph 1.

SERBIA[2]

Confirmed upon succession:

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala, in respect of articles I, II and III, as these reservations "are not in accordance with the principles contained in Article I of the Charter of the United Nations and with the aims of the Convention".

SLOVAKIA[5]

SWEDEN

Objection to reservations:

[*Same objections as the ones listed under "Norway".*]

14 December 1999

With regard to the declarations made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"In this context the Government of Sweden would like to recall, that under well-established international treaty law, the name assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. Thus, the Government of Sweden considers that the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh, in the absence of further clarification, in substance constitute reservations to the Convention.

The Government of Sweden notes that the declaration relating to article III is of a general kind, stating that Bangladesh will apply the said article in consonance with the relevant provisions of its Constitution. The Government of Sweden is of the view that this declaration raises doubts as to the commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to well-established international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under those treaties.

For the reasons set out above the Government of Sweden objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of Bangladesh to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefitting from the declaration".

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Netherlands[24]	30 Jul 1971	Suriname
United Kingdom [4,25]	24 Feb 1967	Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, State of Brunei, Protectorate of Swaziland, Kingdom of Tonga

---

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 20* (A/2361), p. 27.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 March 1953 and 23 June 1954, respectively. The former Yugoslavia had also made the following objection:

Objection to the reservations made by the Government of Guatemala, in respect of articles I, II and III, as these reservations "are not in accordance with the principles contained in Article I of the Charter of the United Nations and with the aims of the Convention".

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of

Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 9 June 1953 and 21 December 1953, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations stated that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legal Government which represented China and the Chinese people in international relations and that, therefore, the allegations made in the above-mentioned communica tions as to the lack of validity of the signature or ratification in question had no legal foundation whatever.

[4] On 10 June 1997, the Governments of China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

China:

[*Same notification as the one made under note 6 in chapter V.3.*]

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

[*Same notification as the one made under note 5 in chapter IV.1.*]

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

The signature and ratification by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China respectively on 9 June 1953 and 21 December 1953 of the [said Convention] are all illegal and therefore null and void.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 March 1953 and 6 April 1995, respectively, with reservations, one of which regarding article IX of the Convention, had been withdrawn on 26 April 1991. For the text of the said reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 157. Subsequently, on 10 June 1974, the Government of Czechoslovakia formulated an objection to the reservation made by Spain. For the text of the objection, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 940, p. 340. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with reservations and a declaration on 27 March 1973. For the text of the reservations and declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 861, p. 203. See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] In a communication received on 10 May 1982, the Government of Solomon Islands declared that Solomon Islands maintains the reservations entered by the United Kingdom save in so far as the same cannot apply to Solomon Islands.

[10] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] On 11 September 2000, the Government of Austria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to article III made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 669, p. 312.

[12] In this regard, the Secretary-General received the following communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (17 December 1999):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that the declaration with regard to article III of the Convention, application of that article "in consonance with the relevant provisions of the Constitution of Bangladesh", constitutes a reservation of a general nature in respect of a provision of the Convention which may be contrary to the Constitution of Bangladesh.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts as to the full commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the Convention on the Political Rights of Women. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the People's Republic of Bangladesh".

Netherlands (20 December 1999):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declarations made by the Government of Bangladesh at the time of its accession to the Convention on the political rights of women and considers the declaration concerning Article III as a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bangladesh".

[13] In communications received on 8 March 1989, 19 and 20 April 1989, respectively, the Governments of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw the reservation relating to article IX. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, pp. 170, 154 and 169, respectively.

[14] By notifications received by the Secretary-General on 19 June 1978 and on 14 September 1998, respectively, the Government of Belgium withdrew reservations No. 2 and No. 1 relating to article III of the Convention. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 496, p. 353.

[15] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General its decision to withdraw the reservation to article IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 136.

[16] In a communication received on 26 November 1960, the Government of France gave notice of the withdrawal of the reservation made in the procès-verbal of signature of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 159.

[17] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article IX made upon ratifica-

tion. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 202, p. 382.

[18] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservations to articles VI and IX made upon accession. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 543, p. 362.

[19] On 17 December 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands a notification of withdrawal of its reservation (the reservation concerned the succession to the Crown) relating to article III of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the said reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 790, p. 130.

[20] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 9 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 196, p. 365.

[21] On 2 April 1997, the Government of Romania informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article IX. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 196, p. 363.

[22] The Secretary-General received the following communications from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the dates indicated hereinafter:

(*12 February 1968*):

Withdrawal of the reservation contained in sub-paragraph (e), in respect of the Bahamas, as formulated upon accession.

(*15 October 1974*):

Withdrawal of the reservation contained in sub-paragraph (f) (employment of married women in Her Majesty's Diplomatic Service and in the Civil Service) in respect of the territories where the reservation was still applicable, that is to say: Northern Ireland, Antigua, Hong Kong and St. Lucia. The same reservation had been withdrawn in respect of St. Vincent by a notification received on 24 November 1967.

On that same date, withdrawal of the reservation contained in sub-paragraph (e) in respect of the Seychelles, to which the said reservation applied originally.

(*4 January 1995*):

Withdrawal of the reservations contained in sub-paragraph (e) in respect of the Isle of Man and Montserrat; in sub-paragraph (g) in respect of Gibraltar; and sub-paragraph (h) in respect of Bailiff in Guernsey.

[23] Various communications were received by the Secretary-General on behalf of the Republic of China, objecting to the reservations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics. In this connection, see note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc. (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.).

[24] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[25] For the reservations to article III of the Convention in its application to certain territories, and for the reservations regarding the application of the Convention to the Colony of Aden and to Rhodesia, see "United Kingdom" under "Declarations and Reservations".

2. Convention on the Nationality of Married Women

New York, 20 February 1957

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 August 1958 by the exchange of the said letters, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 11 August 1958, No. 4468.
STATUS: Signatories: 29. Parties: 74.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 309, p. 65.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature pursuant to resolution 1040 (XI)[1] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 29 January 1957.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania		27 Jul 1960 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina		10 Oct 1963 a
Armenia		18 May 1994 a
Australia		14 Mar 1961 a
Austria		19 Jan 1968 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 d
Barbados		26 Oct 1979 a
Belarus	7 Oct 1957	23 Dec 1958
Belgium	15 May 1972	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil	26 Jul 1966	4 Dec 1968
Bulgaria		22 Jun 1960 a
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	
Canada	20 Feb 1957	21 Oct 1959
Chile	18 Mar 1957	
China[3]		
Colombia	20 Feb 1957	
Côte d'Ivoire		2 Nov 1999 a
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	20 Feb 1957	5 Dec 1957
Cyprus		26 Apr 1971 d
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	20 Feb 1957	22 Jun 1959
Dominican Republic	20 Feb 1957	10 Oct 1957
Ecuador	16 Jan 1958	29 Mar 1960
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		15 May 1968 a
Germany[5,6]		7 Feb 1974 a
Ghana		15 Aug 1966 a
Guatemala	20 Feb 1957	13 Jul 1960
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	
Hungary	5 Dec 1957	3 Dec 1959
Iceland		18 Oct 1977 a
India	15 May 1957	
Ireland	24 Sep 1957	25 Nov 1957
Israel	12 Mar 1957	7 Jun 1957
Jamaica	12 Mar 1957	30 Jul 1964 d
Jordan		1 Jul 1992 a
Kazakhstan		28 Mar 2000 a
Kyrgyzstan		10 Feb 1997 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Luxembourg	11 Sep 1975	22 Jul 1977
Madagascar	12 Sep 2002	
Malawi		8 Sep 1966 a
Malaysia		24 Feb 1959 a
Mali		2 Feb 1973 a
Malta		7 Jun 1967 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico		4 Apr 1979 a
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[8,9]		[8 Aug 1966 a]
New Zealand[9]	7 Jul 1958	17 Dec 1958
Nicaragua		9 Jan 1986 a
Norway	9 Sep 1957	20 May 1958
Pakistan	10 Apr 1958	
Poland		3 Jul 1959 a
Portugal	21 Feb 1957	
Romania		2 Dec 1960 a
Russian Federation	6 Sep 1957	17 Sep 1958
Rwanda		26 Sep 2003 a
Saint Lucia		14 Oct 1991 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore		18 Mar 1966 d
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa	29 Jan 1993	17 Dec 2002
Sri Lanka		30 May 1958 a
Swaziland		18 Sep 1970 a
Sweden	6 May 1957	13 May 1958
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		20 Apr 1994 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 a
Uganda		15 Apr 1965 a
Ukraine	15 Oct 1957	3 Dec 1958
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[10]	[20 Feb 1957	28 Aug 1957]
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 a
Uruguay	20 Feb 1957	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		31 May 1983 a
Zambia		22 Jan 1975 d
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Declaration and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Article 7:

The Argentine Government expressly reserves the rights of the Republic with respect to the Islas Malvinas (Falkland Islands), the South Sandwich Islands and the lands included within the Argentine Antarctic Sector, declaring that they do not constitute a colony or possession of any nation but are part of Argentine territory and lie within its dominion and sovereignty.

Article 10:

The Argentine Government reserves the right not to submit disputes directly or indirectly linked with the territories under Argentine sovereignty to the procedure indicated in this article.

BRAZIL

"Reservation is made concerning application of article 10."

CHILE

The Government of Chile makes a reservation with regard to article 10, in the sense that it does not accept the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the purpose of the settlement of disputes which may arise between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention.

GUATEMALA

Article 10 of the said Convention shall, by reason of constitutional requirements, be applied without prejudice to article 149, paragraph 3 (b) of the Constitution of the Republic.

INDIA

Reservation as to Article 10:

"Any dispute which may arise between any two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by negotiations shall with the consent of the parties to the dispute be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision unless the parties agree to another mode of settlement."

TUNISIA

[Article 10]

For any dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all the parties to the dispute shall be necessary in every case.

URUGUAY

On behalf of Uruguay we hereby make a reservation to the provisions of article 3 which has a bearing on the application of the Convention. The Constitution of Uruguay does not authorize the granting of nationality to an alien unless he is the child of a Uruguayan father or mother, in which case he may become a natural citizen. This case apart, an alien who fulfils the constitutionality and legal conditions may be granted only legal citizenship, and not nationality.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

[*See chapter XVI.1.*]

Territorial application
Declarations made under paragraph 1 of article 7 of the Convention.

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Australia	14 Mar 1961	All the non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible
Netherlands[8]	8 Aug 1966	Netherlands Antilles, Surinam
New Zealand[9]	17 Dec 1958	The Cook Islands (including Niue), the Tokelau Islands, and the Trust Territory of Western Samoa
United Kingdom[10]	28 Aug 1957	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man

Notifications under paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
United Kingdom[10]	18 Mar 1958	Aden, the Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, British Somaliland, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya, the Leeward Islands (Antigua, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis), the British Virgin Islands, Malta, Mauritius, North Borneo, St. Helena, Sarawak, the Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda, the Windward Islands (Dominica, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar
	19 May 1958	The Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
	3 Nov 1960	Tonga
	1 Oct 1962	Brunei

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/3572), p. 18.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 27 March 1957 and 13 March 1959, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 20 February 1957 and 22 September 1958, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations stated that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legal Government which represented China and the Chinese people in international relations and that, therefore, the allegations made in the above-mentioned communica tions as to the lack of validity of the signature or ratification in question had no legal foundation whatever.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 3 September 1957 and 5 April 1962, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with a reservation and a declaration on 27 December 1973. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 76. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Nertherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

On 16 January 1992, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Netherlands a notification of denunciation (for the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba). In accordance with article 9 (1), the denunciation will take effect one year after the date of receipt of the said notification, i.e., on 16 January 1993.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] On 24 December 1981, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a notification of denunciation of the said Convention:

The notification specifies that the denunciation is effected on behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and of the following territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible and to which the Convention was extended in accordance with the provisions of article 7: Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Saint Christopher-Nevis, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, State of Brunei, United Kingdom Sovereign Bases Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the Island of Cyprus.

In accordance with the provisions of article 9 (2) of the Convention, the denunciation will take effect one year after the date of receipt of the said notification, that is to say, on 24 December 1982.

3. Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages

New York, 10 December 1962

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 December 1964 by the exchange of the said letters, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 23 December 1964, No. 7525.
STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 54.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 521, p. 231.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature pursuant to resolution 1763 (XVII),[1] adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 7 November 1962.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina		26 Feb 1970 a
Austria		1 Oct 1969 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bangladesh		5 Oct 1998 a
Barbados		1 Oct 1979 a
Benin		19 Oct 1965 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil		11 Feb 1970 a
Burkina Faso		8 Dec 1964 a
Chile	10 Dec 1962	
China[3,4]		
Côte d'Ivoire		18 Dec 1995 a
Croatia[2]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	17 Oct 1963	20 Aug 1965
Cyprus		30 Jul 2002 a
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	31 Oct 1963	8 Sep 1964
Dominican Republic		8 Oct 1964 a
Fiji		19 Jul 1971 d
Finland		18 Aug 1964 a
France	10 Dec 1962	
Germany[6,7]		9 Jul 1969 a
Greece	3 Jan 1963	
Guatemala		18 Jan 1983 a
Guinea	10 Dec 1962	24 Jan 1978
Hungary		5 Nov 1975 a
Iceland		18 Oct 1977 a
Israel	10 Dec 1962	
Italy	20 Dec 1963	
Jordan		1 Jul 1992 a
Kyrgyzstan		10 Feb 1997 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		6 Sep 2005 a
Mali		19 Aug 1964 a
Mexico		22 Feb 1983 a
Mongolia		6 Jun 1991 a
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands	10 Dec 1962	2 Jul 1965
New Zealand	23 Dec 1963	12 Jun 1964
Niger		1 Dec 1964 a
Norway		10 Sep 1964 a
Philippines	5 Feb 1963	21 Jan 1965
Poland	17 Dec 1962	8 Jan 1965
Romania	27 Dec 1963	21 Jan 1993
Rwanda		26 Sep 2003 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Samoa		24 Aug 1964 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
South Africa		29 Jan 1993 a
Spain		15 Apr 1969 a
Sri Lanka	12 Dec 1962	
Sweden	10 Dec 1962	16 Jun 1964
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		18 Jan 1994 d
Trinidad and Tobago		2 Oct 1969 a
Tunisia		24 Jan 1968 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		9 Jul 1970 a
United States of America	10 Dec 1962	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		31 May 1983 a
Yemen[9]		9 Feb 1987 a
Zimbabwe		23 Nov 1994 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Bangladesh[10]

Reservations:

Articles 1 and 2:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh reserves the right to apply the provisions of articles 1 and 2 in so far as they relate to the question of legal validity of child marriage, in accordance with the Personal Laws of different religious communities of the country.

Article 2:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh, in acceding to the Convention will not be bound by the exception clause of article 2 *viz.* except where a competent authority has granted a dispensation as to age, for serious reasons, in the interest of the intending spouses".

DENMARK

"With the reservation that article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Kingdom of Denmark."

DOMINICAN REPUBLIC

The Dominican Republic wishes the laws of the Dominican Republic to continue to have precedence in respect of the possibility, provided for in article 1, paragraph 2, of entering into a civil marriage by means of a proxy or procuration. Consequently, it can accept the said provisions only with reservations.

FIJI

"The Government of Fiji withdraws the reservation, and declarations in respect of the law of Scotland and in respect of Southern Rhodesia, made on 9th July, 1970 by Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom, and affirms that the Government of Fiji declares it to be their understanding that:

"(a) paragraph 1 of Article 1, and the second sentence of Article 2, of the Convention are concerned with the entry into marriage under the laws of a State Party and not with the recognition under the laws of one State or territory of the validity of marriages contracted under the laws of another State or territory; and

(b) paragraph 2 of Article 1 does not require legislative provision to be made where no such legislation already exists, for marriages to be contracted in the absence of one of the parties."

FINLAND

"With the reservation that article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Republic of Finland."

GREECE

With reservation to article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

With regard to article 1, paragraph 1, of the Convention, Guatemala declares that since its legislation, in respect of its nationals, does not call for the requirements relating to publicity of the marriage and the presence of witnesses for it to be solemnized, it does not consider itself obliged to comply with those requirements where the parties are Guatemalans.

HUNGARY

In acceding to the Convention, the Presidential Council of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that it does not consider paragraph 2 of article 1 of the Convention as binding the Hungarian People's Republic to grant, under the terms thereof, permit of marriage when one of the intending spouses is not present.

ICELAND

"Article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Republic of Iceland."

NETHERLANDS

In signing the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages, [the Government of the Netherlands] hereby declare that, in view of the equality which exists, from the standpoint of public law, between the Netherlands, Surinam and the Netherlands Antilles, the Government of the Kingdom reserves the right to ratify the Convention in respect of only one or two parts of the Kingdom and to declare at a later date, by written notification to the Secretary-General, that the Convention is to apply also to the other part or parts of the Kingdom.

NORWAY

"With the reservation that article 1, paragraph 2, shall not apply to the Kingdom of Norway."

PHILIPPINES

"The Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages was adopted for the purpose, among other things, of insuring to all persons complete freedom in the choice of a spouse. The first paragraph of Article 1 of the Convention requires that the full and free consent of both parties shall be expressed in the presence of the competent authority and of witnesses.

"Considering the provisions of its Civil Code, the Philippines, in ratifying this Convention interprets the second paragraph of Article 1 (which authorizes, in exceptional cases, the solemnization of marriage by proxy) as not imposing upon the Philippines the obligation to allow within its territory the celebration of proxy marriages or marriages of the kind contemplated in that paragraph, where such manner of marriage is not authorized by the laws of the Philippines. Rather, the solemnization within Philippine territory of a marriage in the absence of one of the parties under the conditions stated in said paragraph will be permitted only if so allowed by Philippine law."

ROMANIA

Reservation:

Romania will not apply the provisions of article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention, regarding the celebration of marriage in the absence of one of the future spouses.

SWEDEN

With reservation to article 1, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[11]

"(a). . .

"(b) It is the understanding of the Government of the United Kingdom that paragraph (1) of article 1 and the second sentence of article 2, of the Convention are concerned with entry into marriage under the laws of a State Party and not with the recognition under the laws of one State or territory of the validity of marriages contracted under the laws of another State or territory; nor is paragraph (1) of article 1 applicable to marriages by cohabitation with habit and repute under the law of Scotland;

"(c) Paragraph (2) of article 1 does not require legislative provision to be made, where no such legislation already exists, for marriages to be contracted in the absence of one of the parties;

"(d) The provisions of the Convention shall not apply to Southern Rhodesia unless and until the Government of the United Kingdom inform the Secretary-General that they are in a po-

sition to ensure that the obligations imposed by the Convention in respect of that territory can be fully implemented."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"With the understanding that legislation in force in the various States of the United States of America is in conformity with this Convention and that action by the United States of America with respect to this Convention does not constitute acceptance of the provisions of article 8 as a precedent for any subsequent instruments."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

[*See chapter XVI.1.*]

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

FINLAND

13 December 1999

With regard to the reservations made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of Finland notes that the reservation of Bangladesh, being of such a general nature, raises doubts as to the full commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

Furthermore, reservations are subject to the general principle of treaty interpretation according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its domestic law as justification for a failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Therefore the Government of Finland objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Bangladesh. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefitting from this reservation".

SWEDEN

14 December 1999

With regard to the reservations made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden notes that the reservations include a reservation of a general kind, in respect of articles 1 and 2, which reads as follows:

*[See reservation to Articles 1 and 2 made by Bangladesh under **"Reservations and Declarations"**.]*

The Government of Sweden is of the view that this general reservation, referring to the Personal Laws of different religious communities of the country, raises doubts as to the commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to well-established international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh to the Convention on Consent to Marriage, Minimum Age for Marriage and Registration of Marriages.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Bangladesh and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Bangladesh benefitting from the reservation".

Territorial Application

Participant:	***Date of receipt of the notification:***	***Territories:***
Netherlands[12]	2 Jul 1965	Netherlands Antilles, Surinam
United Kingdom[4,11]	9 Jul 1970	Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, Grenada, Saint Kitts-Nevis-Anguilla, Saint Lucia and Saint Vincent), State of Brunei, Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom
	15 Oct 1974	Montserrat

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventeenth Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/5217), p. 28.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 10 December 1962 and 19 June 1964, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 4 April 1963. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[4] On 10 June 1997, the Governments of China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

China:

[*Same notification as the one made under note 6 in chapter V.3.*]

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland:

[*Same notification as the one made under note 5 in chapter IV.1.*]

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

1. It is the understanding of the Government of the People's Republic of China that article 1 (2) of the [said Convention] does not require legislative provision to be made, where no such legislation already exists in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, for marriage to be contracted in the absence of one of the parties.

2. The signature by the Taiwan authorities of China on 4 April 1963 of the [said Convention] is illegal and null and void.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 8 October 1963 and 5 March 1965, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 16 July 1974. See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] In this regard, the Secretary-General received the following communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (17 December 1999):

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany notes that this constitutes a reservation of a general nature in respect of provisions of the Convention which may be contrary to the domestic law of Bangladesh. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts as to the full commitment of Bangladesh to the object and purpose of the Convention. In view of the fact that the Convention contains only ten short articles the reservation to one of its core principles seems particularly problematic. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to this reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the People's Republic of Bangladesh".

Netherlands (20 December 1999):

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that such a reservation, which seeks to limit the responsibilities of the reserving State under the Convention by invoking national law, may raise doubts as to the commitment of this State to the object and purpose of the Convention and, moreover, contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to object and purpose, by all parties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Bangladesh.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Bangladesh."

[11] In a notification received on 15 October 1974, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the reservation corresponding to sub-paragraph a, according to which it reserved the right to postpone the application of article 2 of the Convention to Montserrat pending notification to the Secretary-General that the said article would be applied there.

[12] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XVII

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION

1. CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL RIGHT OF CORRECTION

New York, 31 March 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 August 1962, in accordance with article VIII.
REGISTRATION: 24 August 1962, No. 6280.
STATUS: Signatories: 12. Parties: 17.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 435, p. 191.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 630 (VII)[1] of 16 December 1952, and it was opened for signature at the closing of the seventh session of the General Assembly.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Argentina	11 Jun 1953	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		12 Jan 1994 d
Burkina Faso		23 Mar 1987 a
Chile	22 Apr 1953	
Cuba		17 Nov 1954 a
Cyprus	20 Jun 1972	13 Nov 1972
Ecuador	31 Mar 1953	
Egypt	27 Jan 1955	4 Aug 1955
El Salvador	11 Mar 1958	28 Oct 1958
Ethiopia	31 Mar 1953	21 Jan 1969
France	2 Apr 1954	16 Nov 1962
Guatemala[3]	1 Apr 1953	9 May 1957
Guinea	19 Mar 1975	
Jamaica		15 Jun 1967 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Paraguay	16 Nov 1953	
Peru	12 Nov 1959	
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		25 Jul 1962 a
Syrian Arab Republic		4 Aug 1955
Uruguay		21 Nov 1980 a

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Seventh Session, Supplement No. 20* (A/2361), p. 22.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 31 January 1956. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", "Slovenia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The Convention was signed on behalf of Guatemala with reservation to article V of the Convention. Upon ratification, the Government of Guatemala did not maintain the said reservation.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XVIII

PENAL MATTERS

1. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE SLAVERY CONVENTION SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 25 SEPTEMBER 1926

New York, 7 December 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 December 1953, in accordance with article III[1].
REGISTRATION: 7 December 1953, No. 2422.
STATUS: Signatories: 11. Parties: 59.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 182, p. 51.

Note: The Protocol was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in resolution 794 (VIII)[2] of 23 October 1953.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Acceptance (A), Succession (d), Accession (a)*
Afghanistan		16 Aug 1954 s
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Australia		9 Dec 1953 s
Austria	7 Dec 1953	16 Jul 1954 A
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 d
Bangladesh		7 Jan 1985 A
Barbados		22 Jul 1976 d
Belgium	24 Feb 1954	13 Dec 1962 A
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 A
Canada		17 Dec 1953 s
Chile		20 Jun 1995 a
China[4,5]		
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		28 Jun 1954 s
Denmark		3 Mar 1954 s
Dominica		17 Aug 1994 d
Ecuador	7 Sep 1954	17 Aug 1955 A
Egypt	15 Jun 1954	29 Sep 1954 A
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		19 Mar 1954 A
France	14 Jan 1954	14 Feb 1963 A
Germany[6,7]		29 May 1973 A
Greece	7 Dec 1953	12 Dec 1955 A
Guatemala		11 Nov 1983 A
Guinea		12 Jul 1962 A
Hungary		26 Feb 1958 A
India		12 Mar 1954 s
Iraq		23 May 1955 A
Ireland		31 Aug 1961 A
Israel		12 Sep 1955 A
Italy		4 Feb 1954 s
Liberia		7 Dec 1953 s
Mali		2 Feb 1973 A
Mauritania		6 Jun 1986 A
Mexico		3 Feb 1954 s
Monaco	28 Jan 1954	12 Nov 1954 A
Morocco		11 May 1959 A
Myanmar	14 Mar 1956	29 Apr 1957 A
Netherlands[8]	15 Dec 1953	7 Jul 1955 A
New Zealand[9]		16 Dec 1953 s
Nicaragua		14 Jan 1986 A
Niger		7 Dec 1964 A
Norway	24 Feb 1954	11 Apr 1957 A
Romania		13 Nov 1957 s
Saint Lucia		14 Feb 1990 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 A
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa		29 Dec 1953 s
Spain		10 Nov 1976 s
Sweden		17 Aug 1954 s
Switzerland		7 Dec 1953 s
Syrian Arab Republic		4 Aug 1954 A
Turkey		14 Jan 1955 s
Turkmenistan		1 May 1997 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		7 Dec 1953 s
United States of America	16 Dec 1953	7 Mar 1956 A

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Netherlands[8]	7 Jul 1955	Netherlands Antilles, Netherlands New Guinea, Surinam

Notes:

[1] The amendments set forth in the Annex to the Protocol entered into force on 7 July 1955, in accordance with article III of the Protocol.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eighth Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/2630), p. 50.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and accepted the Protocol on 11 February 1954 and 21 March 1955, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 7 December 1953 and 14 December 1955, respectively (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[5] The Secretary-General received, on 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the communication by China contained the following declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that the signature and ratification by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China on 7 December 1953 and 14 December 1955 respectively of the [said Protocol] are all illegal and therefore null and void.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had accepted the Protocol on 16 July 1974. See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. SLAVERY CONVENTION, SIGNED AT GENEVA ON 25 SEPTEMBER 1926 AND AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOL

New York, 7 December 1953

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 July 1955, in accordance with article III (2) the date on which the amendments, set forth in the annex to the Protocol of 7 December 1953, entered into force in accordance with article III of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 7 July 1955, No. 2861.
STATUS: Parties: 95.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 212, p. 17.

Participant	*Definitive signature or participation in the Convention and the Protocol*	*Ratification of the Convention as amended, Accession to the Convention as amended (a), Succession to the Convention as amended (d)*
Afghanistan	16 Aug 1954	
Albania		2 Jul 1957 a
Algeria		20 Nov 1963 a
Australia	9 Dec 1953	
Austria	16 Jul 1954	
Azerbaijan	16 Aug 1996	
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976	
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 a
Bangladesh	7 Jan 1985	
Barbados	22 Jul 1976	
Belarus		13 Sep 1956 a
Belgium	13 Dec 1962	
Bolivia	6 Oct 1983	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil		6 Jan 1966 a
Cameroon	27 Jun 1984	
Canada	17 Dec 1953	
Chile	20 Jun 1995	
China[2]		
Croatia[1]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	28 Jun 1954	
Cyprus		21 Apr 1986 d
Denmark	3 Mar 1954	
Dominica	17 Aug 1994	
Ecuador	17 Aug 1955	
Egypt	29 Sep 1954	
Ethiopia		21 Jan 1969
Fiji	12 Jun 1972	
Finland	19 Mar 1954	
France	14 Feb 1963	
Germany[3]	29 May 1973	
Greece	12 Dec 1955	
Guatemala	11 Nov 1983	
Guinea	12 Jul 1963	
Hungary	26 Feb 1958	
India	12 Mar 1954	
Iraq	23 May 1955	
Ireland	31 Aug 1961	
Israel	12 Sep 1955	
Italy	4 Feb 1954	
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 d
Jordan		5 May 1959 a
Kuwait		28 May 1963 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liberia	7 Dec 1953	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		14 Feb 1957 a
Madagascar		12 Feb 1964 a
Malawi		2 Aug 1965 a
Mali	2 Feb 1973	
Malta		3 Jan 1966 d
Mauritania	6 Jun 1986	
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico	3 Feb 1954	
Monaco	12 Nov 1954	
Mongolia		20 Dec 1968 a
Morocco	11 May 1959	
Myanmar	29 Apr 1957	
Nepal		7 Jan 1963 a
Netherlands[4]	7 Jul 1955	
New Zealand[5]	16 Dec 1953	
Nicaragua	14 Jan 1986	
Niger	7 Dec 1964	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	11 Apr 1957	
Pakistan		30 Sep 1955 a
Papua New Guinea		27 Jan 1982 a
Philippines		12 Jul 1955 a
Romania	13 Nov 1957	
Russian Federation[6]		8 Aug 1956 a
Saint Lucia	14 Feb 1990	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981
Saudi Arabia		5 Jul 1973 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981	
South Africa	29 Dec 1953	
Spain	10 Nov 1976	
Sri Lanka		21 Mar 1958 a
Sudan		9 Sep 1957 d
Sweden	17 Aug 1954	
Switzerland	7 Dec 1953	
Syrian Arab Republic	4 Aug 1954	

Participant	Definitive signature or participation in the Convention and the Protocol	Ratification of the Convention as amended, Accession to the Convention as amended (a), Succession to the Convention as amended (d)
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia		15 Jul 1966 a
Turkey	14 Jan 1955	
Turkmenistan	1 May 1997	
Uganda		12 Aug 1964 a
Ukraine		27 Jan 1959 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Dec 1953	
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 a
United States of America	7 Mar 1956	
Uruguay		7 Jun 2001 a
Viet Nam[7]		14 Aug 1956 a
Yemen[8]		9 Feb 1987 a
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 d

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN[9]

Reservation:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had accepted the Protocol on 21 March 1955 and, as such, participated in the Convention, as amended by the Protocol. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 14 December 1955 (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[3] A notification of reapplication of the Convention of 25 September 1926 was received on 16 July 1974 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic. As an instrument of acceptance of the amending Protocol of 7 December 1953 was deposited with the Secretary-General on the same date on behalf of the Government of the German Democratic Republic, the latter has been applying the Convention as amended since 16 July 1974. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] By a communication received on 25 March 1959, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics notified the Secretary-General that it confirms the accession of the Soviet Union to the Convention as amended, of which the Permanent Mission of the USSR to the United Nations advised the Secretary-General of the United Nations in its note of 8 August 1956 is thus the date on which the aforesaid Convention became formally applicable by the Soviet Union in its relations with other States.

[7] The Republic of Viet Nam had acceded to the Convention on 14 August 1956. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[9] On 25 June 1990, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following objection concerning the reservation:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instruments of accession of Bahrain [to the Slavery Convention signed on 25 September 1926 and amended by the Protocol of 7 December 1953 and to the Supplementary Convention on the abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery of 7 September 1956] contain a declaration in respect of Israel.

"In the view of the Government of the State of Israel such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of these Conventions and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain under general International Law or under particular Conventions.

"The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity."

3. SLAVERY CONVENTION

Geneva, 25 September 1926

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 March 1927, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 9 March 1927, No. 1414[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Afghanistan (November 9th, 1935 a)
Austria (August 19th, 1927)
United States of America[2] (March 21st, 1929 a)

Subject to the reservation that the Government of the United States, adhering to its policy of opposition to forced or compulsory labour except as punishment for crime of which the person concerned has been duly convicted, adheres to the Convention except as to the first subdivi sion of the second paragraph of Article 5, which reads as follows:

"(I) Subject to the transitional provisions laid down in paragraph (2) below, compulsory or forced labour may only be exacted for public purposes."

Belgium (September 23rd, 1927)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland [3] (June 18th, 1927)
Canada (August 6th, 1928)
Australia (June 18th, 1927)
New Zealand (June 18th, 1927)
Union of South Africa(including *South West Africa*)(June 18th, 1927)
Ireland (June 18th, 1930 a)
India (June 18th, 1927)

The signature of the Convention is not binding in respect of Article 3 in so far as that article may require India to enter into any convention whereby vessels, by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Indians, or of the fact that one half of the crew is Indian, are classified as native vessels, or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of such other States are not subject.

Bulgaria (March 9th, 1927)
China[3,4,9] (April 22nd, 1937)
Cuba (July 6th, 1931)
Czechoslovakia[5] (October 10th, 1930)
Denmark (May 17th, 1927)
Ecuador (March 26th, 1928 a)
Egypt (January 25th, 1928 a)
Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Finland (September 29th, 1927)
France (March 28th, 1931)
Syria (June 25th, 1931 a)
Lebanon (June 25th, 1931 a)
Germany (March 12th, 1929)
Greece (July 4th, 1930)
Haiti (September 3rd, 1927 a)
Hungary[6] (February 17th, 1933 a)
Iraq (January 18th, 1929 a)
Italy (August 25th, 1928)
Latvia (July 9th, 1927)
Liberia (May 17th, 1930)
Mexico (September 8th, 1934 a)
Monaco (January 17th, 1928 a)

Burma[7] The Convention is not binding upon Burma in respect of Article 3 in so far as that Article may require her to enter into any convention whereby vessels by reason of the fact that they are owned, fitted out or commanded by Burmans, or of the fact that one-half of the crew is Burman, are classified as native vessels or are denied any privilege, right or immunity enjoyed by similar vessels of other States signatories of the Covenant or are made subject to any liability or disability to which similar ships of these other States are not subject.

Netherlands[8] (January 7th, 1928)
(including *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*)
Nicaragua (October 3rd, 1927 a)
Norway (September 10th, 1927)
Poland (September 17th, 1930)
Portugal[9] (October 4th, 1927)
Romania (June 22nd, 1931)
Spain (September 12th, 1927)

For Spain and the *Spanish Colonies*, with the exception of the Spanish Protectorate of Morocco.

Sudan (September 15th, 1927 a)

Sweden (December 17th, 1927)
Switzerland (November 1st, 1930 a)
Turkey (July 24th, 1933 a)
Yugoslavia (former)[10] (September 28th, 1929)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania[11]
Colombia
Dominican Republic a
Iran

Ad referendum and interpreting Article 3 as without power to compel Iran to bind herself by any arrangement or convention which would place her ships of whatever tonnage in the category of native vessels provided for by the Convention on the Trade in arms.

Lithuania
Panama
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[12]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 d
Azerbaijan	16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas	10 Jun 1976 d
Bangladesh	7 Jan 1985 a
Barbados	22 Jul 1976 d
Benin	4 Apr 1962 d
Bolivia	6 Oct 1983 a
Cameroon	7 Mar 1962 d
Central African Republic	4 Sep 1962 d
Chile	20 Jun 1995 a
Congo	15 Oct 1962 d
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Dec 1961 d
Croatia[10]	12 Oct 1992 d
Czech Republic[5]	22 Feb 1993 d
Dominica	17 Aug 1994 d
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Ghana	3 May 1963 d
Guatemala	11 Nov 1983 a
Guinea	30 Mar 1962 d
Israel	6 Jan 1955 a
Mali	2 Feb 1973 d
Mauritania	6 Jun 1986 a
Morocco[13]	11 May 1959 d
Niger	25 Aug 1961 d
Saint Lucia	14 Feb 1990 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	9 Nov 1981 a
Senegal	2 May 1963 d
Seychelles	5 May 1992 a
Slovakia[5]	28 May 1993 d
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 d
Suriname	12 Oct 1979 d
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[10]	18 Jan 1994 d
Togo	27 Feb 1962 d
Turkmenistan	1 May 1997 a

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 60, p. 253.

[2] This accession, given subject to reservation, has been communicated to the signatory States for acceptance.

[3] The Secretary-General received, on 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 130. p. 444.

[7] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonand "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] The Government of Albania deposited on 2 July 1957 the instrument of accession to the Convention as amended by the Protocol of 7 December 1953 (see chapter XVIII.2).

[12] In a notification received on 16 July 1974 the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 22 December 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 17 June 1974, concerning the application, as from 22 December 1958, of the Slavery Convention of 25 September 1926, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Slavery Convention, September 25th, 1926 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] By virtue of its acceptance of the Protocol of amendment on 7 December 1953.

4. Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery

Geneva, 7 September 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 April 1957, in accordance with article 13.
REGISTRATION: 30 April 1957, No. 3822.
STATUS: Signatories: 35. Parties: 121.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 266, p. 3.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the United Nations Conference of Plenipotentiaries on a Supplementary Convention on the Abolition of Slavery, the Slave Trade, and Institutions and Practices Similar to Slavery. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 608 (XXI)[1] of 30 April 1956 of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, and met at the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva from 13 August to 4 September 1956. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and two resolutions for the texts of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 226, p. 3.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		16 Nov 1966 a
Albania		6 Nov 1958 a
Algeria		31 Oct 1963 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina		13 Aug 1964 a
Australia	7 Sep 1956	6 Jan 1958
Austria		7 Oct 1963 a
Azerbaijan		16 Aug 1996 a
Bahamas		10 Jun 1976 d
Bahrain		27 Mar 1990 a
Bangladesh		5 Feb 1985 a
Barbados		9 Aug 1972 d
Belarus	7 Sep 1956	5 Jun 1957
Belgium	7 Sep 1956	13 Dec 1962
Bolivia		6 Oct 1983 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil		6 Jan 1966 a
Bulgaria	26 Jun 1957	21 Aug 1958
Cambodia		12 Jun 1957 a
Cameroon		27 Jun 1984 a
Canada	7 Sep 1956	10 Jan 1963
Central African Republic		30 Dec 1970 a
Chile		20 Jun 1995 a
China[4,5,6]		
Congo		25 Aug 1977 a
Côte d'Ivoire		10 Dec 1970 a
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba	10 Jan 1957	21 Aug 1963
Cyprus		11 May 1962 d
Czech Republic[7]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		28 Feb 1975 a
Denmark	27 Jun 1957	24 Apr 1958
Djibouti		21 Mar 1979 a
Dominica		17 Aug 1994 d
Dominican Republic		31 Oct 1962 a
Ecuador		29 Mar 1960 a
Egypt		17 Apr 1958 a
El Salvador	7 Sep 1956	
Ethiopia		21 Jan 1969 a
Fiji		12 Jun 1972 d
Finland		1 Apr 1959 a
France	7 Sep 1956	26 May 1964
Germany[8,9]	7 Sep 1956	14 Jan 1959
Ghana		3 May 1963 a
Greece	7 Sep 1956	13 Dec 1972
Guatemala	7 Sep 1956	11 Nov 1983
Guinea		14 Mar 1977 a
Haiti	7 Sep 1956	12 Feb 1958
Hungary	7 Sep 1956	26 Feb 1958
Iceland		17 Nov 1965 a
India	7 Sep 1956	23 Jun 1960
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		30 Dec 1959 a
Iraq	7 Sep 1956	30 Sep 1963
Ireland		18 Sep 1961 a
Israel	7 Sep 1956	23 Oct 1957
Italy	7 Sep 1956	12 Feb 1958
Jamaica		30 Jul 1964 d
Jordan		27 Sep 1957 a
Kuwait		18 Jan 1963 a
Kyrgyzstan		5 Sep 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		9 Sep 1957 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lesotho		4 Nov 1974 d
Liberia	7 Sep 1956	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 May 1989 a
Luxembourg	7 Sep 1956	1 May 1967
Madagascar		29 Feb 1972 a
Malawi		2 Aug 1965 a
Malaysia		18 Nov 1957 a
Mali		2 Feb 1973 a
Malta		3 Jan 1966 d
Mauritania		6 Jun 1986 a
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Mexico	7 Sep 1956	30 Jun 1959
Mongolia		20 Dec 1968 a
Montenegro[10]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		11 May 1959 a
Nepal		7 Jan 1963 a
Netherlands[11]	7 Sep 1956	3 Dec 1957
New Zealand[12]		26 Apr 1962 a
Nicaragua		14 Jan 1986 a
Niger		22 Jul 1963 a
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Norway	7 Sep 1956	3 May 1960
Pakistan	7 Sep 1956	20 Mar 1958
Peru	7 Sep 1956	

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Philippines		17 Nov 1964 a
Poland	7 Sep 1956	10 Jan 1963
Portugal[6]	7 Sep 1956	10 Aug 1959
Romania	7 Sep 1956	13 Nov 1957
Russian Federation	7 Sep 1956	12 Apr 1957
Rwanda		4 Oct 2006 a
Saint Lucia		14 Feb 1990 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		9 Nov 1981 a
San Marino	7 Sep 1956	29 Aug 1967
Saudi Arabia		5 Jul 1973 a
Senegal		19 Jul 1979 a
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		5 May 1992 a
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Singapore		28 Mar 1972 d
Slovakia[7]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
Spain		21 Nov 1967 a
Sri Lanka	5 Jun 1957	21 Mar 1958
Sudan	7 Sep 1956	9 Sep 1957
Suriname		12 Oct 1979 d
Sweden		28 Oct 1959 a
Switzerland		28 Jul 1964 a
Syrian Arab Republic[13]		17 Apr 1958 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[3]		18 Jan 1994 d
Togo		8 Jul 1980 a
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia		15 Jul 1966 a
Turkey	28 Jun 1957	17 Jul 1964
Turkmenistan		1 May 1997 a
Uganda		12 Aug 1964 a
Ukraine	7 Sep 1956	3 Dec 1958
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	7 Sep 1956	30 Apr 1957
United Republic of Tanzania		28 Nov 1962 a
United States of America		6 Dec 1967 a
Uruguay		7 Jun 2001 a
Zambia		26 Mar 1973 d
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN

[See in chapter XVIII.2.]

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Australia	6 Jan 1958	All the non-self governing, trust and other non-metropolitan territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible
France	26 May 1964	All the territories of the Republic (Metropolitan France, overseas departments and territories)
Italy	12 Feb 1958	Somaliland under Italian Administration
Netherlands[11]	3 Dec 1957	Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles and Netherlands New Guinea
New Zealand[12]	26 Apr 1962	The Cook Islands (including Niue) and the Tokelau Islands
United Kingdom	30 Apr 1957	The Channel Islands and the Isle of Man
United States of America	6 Dec 1967	All territories for the international relations of which the United States of America is responsible

Territorial applications under paragraph 2 of article 12 of the Convention

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
United Kingdom[5,14,15]	6 Sep 1957	Aden, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei, Cyprus, Falkland Islands, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Jamaica, Kenya, Antigua, Montserrat, St. Kitts-Nevis, Virgin Islands, Malta, Mauritius, North Borneo, St. Helena, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Somaliland Protectorate, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Solomon Islands Protectorate, Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Zanzibar, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Bahrain, Qatar, The Trucial States (Abu Dhabi, Ajman, Dubai, Fujairah, Ras al Khaimah, Sharjah and Ummal Qaiwain)
	18 Oct 1957	Dominica and Tonga
	21 Oct 1957	Kuwait
	30 Oct 1957	Uganda
	14 Nov 1957	Trinidad and Tobago
	1 Jul 1957	The Federation of Nigeria

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2889), p. 7.

[2] The Convention had been signed on behalf of the Republic of Viet-Nam on 7 September 1956. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 September 1956 and 20 May 1958, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 23 May 1957 and 28 May 1959, respectively (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature and/or ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Czechoslovakia, Denmark, India, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Yugoslavia stated that, since their Governments did not recognize the Nationalist Chinese authorities as the Government of China, they could not regard the said signature or ratification as valid. The Permanent Missions of Czechoslovakia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics further stated that the sole authorities entitled to act for China and the Chinese people in the United Nations and in international relations, and to sign, ratify, accede or denounce treaties, conventions and agreements on behalf of China, were the Government of the People's Republic of China and its duly appointed representatives.

In a note addressed to the Secretary-General, the Permanent Mission of China to the United Nations stated that the Government of the Republic of China was the only legal Government which represented China and the Chinese people in international relations and that, therefore, the allegations made in the above-mentioned communications as to the lack of validity of the signature or ratification in question had no legal foundation whatever.

[5] The Secretary-General received, on 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the communication by the Government of China also contained the following declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that the signature and ratification by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China on 23 May 1957 and 28 May 1959 respectively of the [said Convention] are all illegal and therefore null and void.

[6] On 27 April 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Macao. On that same date and subsquently on 3 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and the China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[7] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 7 September 1956 and 13 June 1958, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 16 July 1974. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See note 1 under "United Arab Republic (Egypt/Syria)" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands (and dependencies), which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

[15] See note 1 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5. International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages

New York, 17 December 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 June 1983, in accordance with article 18 (2) which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratificaiton or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 3 June 1983, No. 21931.

STATUS: Signatories: 39. Parties: 158.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1316, p. 205; and depositary notifications C.N.209.1987.TREATIES-6 of 8 October 1987 and C.N.324.1987.TREATIES-9 of 1 February 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Russian text).

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 34/146[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 17 December 1979. It was opened for signature from 18 December 1979 to 31 December 1980.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria		18 Dec 1996 a
Andorra		23 Sep 2004 a
Antigua and Barbuda		6 Aug 1986 a
Argentina		18 Sep 1991 a
Armenia		16 Mar 2004 a
Australia		21 May 1990 a
Austria	3 Oct 1980	22 Aug 1986
Azerbaijan		29 Feb 2000 a
Bahamas		4 Jun 1981 a
Bahrain		16 Sep 2005 a
Bangladesh		20 May 2005 a
Barbados		9 Mar 1981 a
Belarus		1 Jul 1987 a
Belgium	3 Jan 1980	16 Apr 1999
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Benin		31 Jul 2003 a
Bhutan		31 Aug 1981 a
Bolivia	25 Mar 1980	7 Jan 2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		8 Sep 2000 a
Brazil		8 Mar 2000 a
Brunei Darussalam		18 Oct 1988 a
Bulgaria		10 Mar 1988 a
Burkina Faso		1 Oct 2003 a
Cambodia		27 Jul 2006 a
Cameroon		9 Mar 1988 a
Canada	18 Feb 1980	4 Dec 1985
Cape Verde		10 Sep 2002 a
Chad		1 Nov 2006 a
Chile	3 Jan 1980	12 Nov 1981
China[3,4]		26 Jan 1993 a
Colombia		14 Apr 2005 a
Comoros		25 Sep 2003 a
Costa Rica		24 Jan 2003 a
Côte d'Ivoire		22 Aug 1989 a
Croatia		23 Sep 2003 d
Cuba		15 Nov 2001 a
Cyprus		13 Sep 1991 a
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		12 Nov 2001 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 Jul 1980	
Denmark		11 Aug 1987 a
Djibouti		1 Jun 2004 a
Dominica		9 Sep 1986 a
Dominican Republic	12 Aug 1980	
Ecuador		2 May 1988 a
Egypt	18 Dec 1980	2 Oct 1981
El Salvador	10 Jun 1980	12 Feb 1981
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Estonia		8 Mar 2002 a
Ethiopia		16 Apr 2003 a
Finland	29 Oct 1980	14 Apr 1983
France		9 Jun 2000 a
Gabon	29 Feb 1980	19 Apr 2005
Georgia		18 Feb 2004 a
Germany[6,7]	18 Dec 1979	15 Dec 1980
Ghana		10 Nov 1987 a
Greece	18 Mar 1980	18 Jun 1987
Grenada		10 Dec 1990 a
Guatemala	30 Apr 1980	11 Mar 1983
Guinea		22 Dec 2004 a
Haiti	21 Apr 1980	17 May 1989
Honduras	11 Jun 1980	1 Jun 1981
Hungary		2 Sep 1987 a
Iceland		6 Jul 1981 a
India		7 Sep 1994 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		20 Nov 2006 a
Iraq	14 Oct 1980	
Ireland		30 Jun 2005 a
Israel	19 Nov 1980	
Italy	18 Apr 1980	20 Mar 1986
Jamaica	27 Feb 1980	9 Aug 2005
Japan	22 Dec 1980	8 Jun 1987
Jordan		19 Feb 1986 a
Kazakhstan		21 Feb 1996 a
Kenya		8 Dec 1981 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		6 Feb 1989 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Kyrgyzstan		2 Oct 2003 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Aug 2002 a
Latvia		14 Nov 2002 a
Lebanon		4 Dec 1997 a
Lesotho	17 Apr 1980	5 Nov 1980
Liberia	30 Jan 1980	5 Mar 2003
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		25 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein		28 Nov 1994 a
Lithuania		2 Feb 2001 a
Luxembourg	18 Dec 1979	29 Apr 1991
Madagascar		24 Sep 2003 a
Malawi		17 Mar 1986 a
Mali		8 Feb 1990 a
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		13 Mar 1998 a
Mauritius	18 Jun 1980	17 Oct 1980
Mexico		28 Apr 1987 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Jul 2004 a
Moldova		10 Oct 2002 a
Monaco		16 Oct 2001 a
Mongolia		9 Jun 1992 a
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique		14 Jan 2003 a
Myanmar		4 Jun 2004 a
Nauru		2 Aug 2005 a
Nepal		9 Mar 1990 a
Netherlands[9]	18 Dec 1980	6 Dec 1988
New Zealand[10]	24 Dec 1980	12 Nov 1985
Nicaragua		24 Sep 2003 a
Niger		26 Oct 2004 a
Norway	18 Dec 1980	2 Jul 1981
Oman		22 Jul 1988 a
Pakistan		8 Sep 2000 a
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	24 Jan 1980	19 Aug 1982
Papua New Guinea		30 Sep 2003 a
Paraguay		22 Sep 2004 a
Peru		6 Jul 2001 a
Philippines	2 May 1980	14 Oct 1980
Poland		25 May 2000 a
Portugal[4]	16 Jun 1980	6 Jul 1984
Republic of Korea		4 May 1983 a
Romania		17 May 1990 a
Russian Federation		11 Jun 1987 a
Rwanda		13 May 2002 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		17 Jan 1991 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		12 Sep 2000 a
Sao Tome and Principe		23 Aug 2006 a
Saudi Arabia		8 Jan 1991 a
Senegal	2 Jun 1980	10 Mar 1987
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		12 Nov 2003 a
Sierra Leone		26 Sep 2003 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa		23 Sep 2003 a
Spain		26 Mar 1984 a
Sri Lanka		8 Sep 2000 a
Sudan		19 Jun 1990 a
Suriname	30 Jul 1980	5 Nov 1981
Swaziland		4 Apr 2003 a
Sweden	25 Feb 1980	15 Jan 1981
Switzerland	18 Jul 1980	5 Mar 1985
Tajikistan		6 May 2002 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		12 Mar 1998 d
Togo	8 Jul 1980	25 Jul 1986
Tonga		9 Dec 2002 a
Trinidad and Tobago		1 Apr 1981 a
Tunisia		18 Jun 1997 a
Turkey		15 Aug 1989 a
Turkmenistan		25 Jun 1999 a
Uganda	10 Nov 1980	5 Nov 2003
Ukraine		19 Jun 1987 a
United Arab Emirates		24 Sep 2003 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3,11]	18 Dec 1979	22 Dec 1982
United Republic of Tanzania		22 Jan 2003 a
United States of America	21 Dec 1979	7 Dec 1984
Uruguay		4 Mar 2003 a
Uzbekistan		19 Jan 1998 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		13 Dec 1988 a
Yemen		14 Jul 2000 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the [said Convention].

These provisions are not in accordance with the view of the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria that the submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice requires the prior agreement of all the parties concerned in each case.

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1, of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that, in order for any dispute between parties to the Convention con-

cerning the interpretation or application thereof to be referred to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute must be secured in each individual case.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic condemns international terrorism, which takes the lives of innocent people, constitutes a threat to their freedom and personal inviolability and destabilizes the international situation, whatever the motives used to explain terrorist actions. Accordingly, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention should be applied in a manner consistent with the stated aims of the Convention, which include the development of international co-operation in adopting effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking as manifestations of international terrorism through, inter alia, the extradition of alleged offenders.

BRAZIL

Reservation:

With the reservation provided under article 16 (2).

BULGARIA[12]

Declaration on article 9, paragraph 1:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria condemns all acts of international terrorism, whose victims are not only governmental and public officials but also many innocent people, including mothers, children, old-aged, and which exerts an increasingly destabilizing impact on international relations, complicates considerably the political solution of crisis situations, irrespective of the reasons invoked to explain terrorist acts. The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention should be applied in a manner consistent with the stated aims of the Convention, which include the development of international co-operation in adopting effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking as manifestations of international terrorism, including extradition of alleged offenders.

CHILE

The Government of the Republic [of Chile], having approved this Convention, states that such approval is given on the understanding that the aforesaid Convention prohibits the taking of hostages in any circumstances, even those referred to in article 12.

CHINA

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China makes its reservation to article 16, paragraph 1, and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

In accordance with article 16 (2) of the Convention, Colombia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 (1).

CUBA

Reservation:

The Republic of Cuba declares, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article, concerning the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, inasmuch as it considers that such disputes must be settled through amicable negotiation. In consequence, it reiterates that it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservations:

... with the following reservations:

1. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

2. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention.

DOMINICA

Understanding:

"The aforesaid Convention prohibits the taking of hostages in any circumstances, even those referred to in article 12."

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

With the reservation permitted under article 16 (2) of the said Convention.

Upon ratification:

Reservation with respect to the application of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

ETHIOPIA

Reservation pursuant to article 16 (2):

"The Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by the aforementioned provision of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention would be submitted to arbitration or to the Court only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned."

FRANCE

Declarations:

1. France considers that the act of hostage-taking is prohibited in all circumstances.

2. With regard to the application of article 6, France, in accordance with the principles of its penal procedure, does not intend to take an alleged offender into custody or to take any other coercive measures prior to the institution of criminal proceedings, except in cases where pre-trial detention has been requested.

3. With regard to the application of article 9, extradition will not be granted if the person whose extradition is requested was a French national at the time of the events or, in the case of a foreign national, if the offence is punishable by the death penalty under the laws of the requesting State, unless that State gives what are deemed to be adequate assurances that the death penalty will not be imposed or, if a death sentence is passed, that it will not be carried out.

HUNGARY[13]

INDIA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of India declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the

International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention at the request of one of them."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

"Pursuant to Article 16, paragraph 2 of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention regarding the reference of any dispute concerning the interpretation, or application of this Convention, which is not settled by negotiation to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

Interpretative declaration:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran declares its categorical condemnation of each and every act of terrorism, including taking innocent civilians as hostages, which violates human rights and fundamental freedom of human kind, undermines the stability and security of human communities, and hinders countries from development and progress. The Islamic Republic of Iran believes that elimination of terrorism requires a comprehensive campaign by the international community to identify and eradicate political, economic, social and international root causes of the scourge.

The Islamic Republic of Iran further believes that fighting terrorism should not affect the legitimate struggle of peoples under colonial domination and foreign occupation in the exercise of their right of self-determination, as enshrined in a variety of international documents, including the Charter of the United Nations, the Declaration on Principles of International Law concerning Friendly Relations and Cooperation among States in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, and Article 1 paragraph 4 of the Protocol I Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts."

ISRAEL

Upon signature:

"1. It is the understanding of Israel that the Convention implements the principle that hostage taking is prohibited in all circumstances and that any person committing such an act shall be either prosecuted or extradited pursuant to article 8 of this Convention or the relevant provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or their additional Protocols, without any exception whatsoever.

"2) The Government of Israel declares that it reserves the right, when depositing the instrument of ratification, to make reservations and additional declarations and understandings."

ITALY

Upon signature:

The Italian Government declares that, because of the differing interpretations to which certain formulations in the text lend themselves, Italy reserves the right, when depositing the instrument of ratification, to invoke article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969 in conformity with the general principles of international law.

JORDAN

"The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan declares that their accession to the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages can in no way be construed as constituting recognition of, or entering into treaty relations with the 'state of Israel'.

KENYA

"The Government of the Republic of Kenya does not consider herself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the article 16 of the Convention."

KUWAIT[14]

Declaration:

It is understood that the accession to this Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait.

Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 2, Article 16 of the International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1, article 16 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

LEBANON

Declaration:

1. The accession of the Lebanese Republic to the Convention shall not constitute recognition of Israel, just as the application of the Convention shall not give rise to relations or cooperation of any kind with it.

2. The provisions of the Convention, and in particular those of its article 13, shall not affect the Lebanese Republic's stance of supporting the right of States and peoples to oppose and resist foreign occupation of their territories.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Interpretative declaration:

The Principality of Liechtenstein construes article 4 of the Convention to mean that the Principality of Liechtenstein undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein under the conditions laid down in its domestic legislation.

MALAWI

"While the Government of the Republic of Malawi accepts the principles in article 16, this acceptance would nonetheless be read in conjunction with [the] declaration [made by the President and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Malawi] of 12 December, 1966 upon recognition as compulsory, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under article 36, paragraph 2, of the State of the Court."

MEXICO

In relation to article 16, the United Mexican States adhere to the scope and limitations established by the Government of Mexico on 7 November 1945, at the time when it ratified the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

6 August 1987

The Government of Mexico subsequently specified that the said declaration should be understood to mean that, in so far as article 16 is concerned, the United Mexican States accede subject to the limits and restrictions laid down by the Mexican Government when recognizing, on 23 October 1947, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in

accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the State of the Court.

MOLDOVA

Reservation:

Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 2 of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, the Republic of Moldova declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

MONTENEGRO[8]

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

"The [Government of Yugoslavia] herewith states that the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention should be interpreted and applied in practice in the way which would not bring into question the goals of the Convention, i.e. undertaking of efficient measures for the prevention of all acts of the taking of hostages as a phenomenon of international terrorism, as well as the prosecution, punishment and extradition of persons considered to have perpetrated this criminal offence."

MOZAMBIQUE

Declaration:

"... with the following declaration in accordance with its article 16, paragraph 2:

"The Republic of Mozambique does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

In this connection, the Republic of Mozambique states that, in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to [the] International Court of Justice."

Furthermore, the Republic of Mozambique declares that:

"The Republic of Mozambique, in accordance with its Constitution and domestic laws, can not extradite Mozambique citizens.

Therefore, Mozambique citizens will be tried and sentenced in national courts."

MYANMAR

Reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar does not consider itself bound by the article 16 (1) of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages adopted on 17 December 1979."

NETHERLANDS

Reservation:

"In cases where the judicial authorities of either the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles or Aruba cannot exercise jurisdiction pursuant to one of the principles mentioned in article 5, paragraph 1, the Kingdom accepts the aforesaid obligation [laid down in article 8] subject to the condition that it has received and rejected a request for extradition from another State party to the Convention."

Declaration:

"In the view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands article 15 of the Convention, and in particular the second sentence of that article, in no way affects the applicability of article 33 of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

[*Same reservation and declaration identical in substance,* mutatis mutandis, *as those made by Belarus.*]

SAUDI ARABIA[14]

Reservation:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself obligated with the provision of paragraph 1, of article 16, of the Convention concerning arbitration.

Declaration:

2. The accession of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to this Convention does not constitute a recognition of Israel and does not lead to entering into any transactions or the establishment of any relations based on this Convention.

SERBIA[2]

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

"The [Government of Yugoslavia] herewith states that the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention should be interpreted and applied in practice in the way which would not bring into question the goals of the Convention, i.e. undertaking of efficient measures for the prevention of all acts of the taking of hostages as a phenomenon of international terrorism, as well as the prosecution, punishment and extradition of persons considered to have perpetrated this criminal offence."

SLOVAKIA[3]

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

TUNISIA

Reservation:

[The Government of the Republic of Tunisia] declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 16 and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention can only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the prior consent of all the Parties concerned.

TURKEY

Reservation:

In acceding to the Convention the Government of the Republic of Turkey, under article 16 (2) of the Convention declares that it doesn't consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the said article.

UKRAINE

[*Same reservation and declaration identical in substance,* mutatis mutandis, *as those made by Belarus.*]

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Declaration:

The Republic of Venezuela declares that it is not bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession.)

ISRAEL

9 Septemer 1998

With regard to declarations made by Lebanon upon accession:

"... The Government of Israel refers in particular to the political declaration "[*see declaration "1" made under "Lebanon"*] made by the Lebanese Republic on acceding to the [said] Convention.

"In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making declarations of a political character. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter adopt towards the Lebanese Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity.

"Moreover, in view of the Government of Israel, the Lebanese understanding of certain of the Convention's provisions [*see declaration "2" made under "Lebanon"*] is incompatible with and contradictory to the object and purpose of the Convention and in effect defeats that object and purpose."

Communications made under article 7 of the Convention

SAUDI ARABIA

11 December 2001

[For the text of the communication see depositary notification C.N.1500.2001.TREATIES- of 8 January 2002]

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46* (A/34/46), p. 245.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 December 1980 and 19 April 1985, respectively, with the following reservation (made upon signature) and declaration (made upon ratification):

"With the reservation with regard to article 9, subject to subsequent approval pursuant to the constitutional provisions in force in Solicalist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia".

Declaration:

"The Government of the Yugoslavia herewith states that the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention should be interpreted and applied in practice in the way which would not bring into question the goals of the Convention, i.e. undertaking of efficient measures for the prevention of all acts of the taking of hostages as a phenomenon of international terrorism, as well as the prosecution, punishment and extradition of persons considered to have perpetrated this criminal offence."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with reservation will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] On 28 June 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would also apply to Macao. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 27 October and 3 December 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portgual and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 27 January 1988, with the following reservation to article 16 (1):

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of its article 16, paragraph 1, and states that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to a conciliation procedure or to the International Court of Justice the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the said reservation.

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 May 1988 with the following reservation and declaration:

Reservation regarding article 16, paragraph 1:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that in every single case the consent of all parties in the dispute is necessary to submit to arbitration or refer to the International Court of Justice any dispute between the States Parties to the Convention concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Declaration regarding article 9, paragraph 1:

The German Democratic Republic decisively condemns any act of international terrorism. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic holds the opinion that article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention shall be applied in such a way as to be in correspondence with the declared aims of the Convention which embrace the taking of effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of international terrorism, including the taking of hostages.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[10] For New Zealand (except Tokelau), Cook Islands and Niue.

[11] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom. See also note 3.

[12] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 16 (1) of the Convention, made upon accession which reads as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that submission of any dispute concerning interpretation and application of the Convention between parties to the Convention to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice requires the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

[13] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 16 made upon accession which reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in article 16, paragraph ,1 of the Convention, since in its opinion, the jurisdiction of any arbitral tribunal or of the International Court of Justice can be founded only on the voluntary prior acceptance of such jurisdiction by all the Parties concerned.

[14] On 17 May 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession by the Government of Kuwait to the above-mentioned Convention contains a declaration in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of Kuwait under general international law or under particular Conventions.

"The Government of the State of Israel, will insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

On 22 May 1991, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel a communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, with regard to the declaration made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

6. International Convention Against the Recruitment, Use, Financing and Training of Mercenaries

New York, 4 December 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 October 2001, in accordance with article 19 (1).
REGISTRATION: 20 October 2001, No. 37789.
STATUS: Signatories: 17. Parties: 28.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2163, p. 75; depositary notification C.N.888.2004.TREATIES-1 of 3 September 2004 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (authentic Russian text)] and C.N.1070.2004.TREATIES-4 of 4 October 2004 [Rectification of the original of the Convention (Russian authentic text)].

Note: The Convention was adopted by Resolution 44/34[1] on 4 December 1989. It is open for signature by all States until 31 December 1990 at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Angola	28 Dec 1990	
Azerbaijan		4 Dec 1997 a
Barbados		10 Jul 1992 a
Belarus	13 Dec 1990	28 May 1997
Belgium		31 May 2002 a
Cameroon	21 Dec 1990	26 Jan 1996
Congo	20 Jun 1990	
Costa Rica		20 Sep 2001 a
Croatia[2]		27 Mar 2000 a
Cyprus		8 Jul 1993 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	20 Mar 1990	
Georgia		8 Jun 1995 a
Germany	20 Dec 1990	
Guinea		18 Jul 2003 a
Italy	5 Feb 1990	21 Aug 1995
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Sep 2000 a
Maldives	17 Jul 1990	11 Sep 1991
Mali		12 Apr 2002 a
Mauritania		9 Feb 1998 a
Moldova		28 Feb 2006 a
Montenegro[3]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Morocco	5 Oct 1990	
New Zealand[4]		22 Sep 2004 a
Nigeria	4 Apr 1990	
Poland	28 Dec 1990	
Qatar		26 Mar 1999 a
Romania	17 Dec 1990	
Saudi Arabia		14 Apr 1997 a
Senegal		9 Jun 1999 a
Serbia[2]	12 Mar 2001 d	
Seychelles		12 Mar 1990 a
Suriname	27 Feb 1990	10 Aug 1990
Togo		25 Feb 1991 a
Turkmenistan		18 Sep 1996 a
Ukraine	21 Sep 1990	13 Sep 1993
Uruguay	20 Nov 1990	14 Jul 1999
Uzbekistan		19 Jan 1998 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or acession.)

Belgium

Reservations:

No provision of the present Convention should be interpreted as implying an obligation of mutual judicial assistance if the requested State party has reason to believe that the request for judicial assistance concerning certain offences has been submitted for the purposes of prosecuting or punishing a certain person on the grounds of ethnic origin, religion, nationality or political views, or if acceding to the request would prejudice the situation of that person on any of those grounds.

No provision of the present Convention should be interpreted as implying an obligation of extradition if the requested State party has reason to believe that the request for extradition based on the offences set forth in the Convention has been submitted for the purposes of prosecuting or punishing a certain person on the grounds of ethnic origin, religion, nationality or political views , or if acceding to the request would prejudice the situation of that person on any of those grounds.

No provision of the Convention should be interpreted as implying, for Belgium, an obligation to extradite Belgian nationals.

Moldova

Declarations and Reservation:

Until the full re-establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Convention shall be applied only on the territory controlled effectively by the authorities of the Republic of the Moldova.

No provision of the Convention should be interpreted as implying, for the Republic of Moldova, an obligation to extradite its own citizens or persons granted with political asylum.

According to article 17 paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova docs not consider itself bound by article 17, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservation:

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself bound by article 17, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/44/49), p. 306.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 12 December 1990. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] With the following territorial exclusion:

"... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

7. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents

New York, 14 December 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 February 1977, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 20 February 1977, No. 15410.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 164.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 167.

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 14 December 1973 until 31 December 1974.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria		7 Nov 2000 a
Andorra		23 Sep 2004 a
Antigua and Barbuda		19 Jul 1993 a
Argentina		18 Mar 1982 a
Armenia		18 May 1994 a
Australia	30 Dec 1974	20 Jun 1977
Austria		3 Aug 1977 a
Azerbaijan		2 Apr 2001 a
Bahamas		22 Jul 1986 a
Bahrain		16 Sep 2005 a
Bangladesh		20 May 2005 a
Barbados		26 Oct 1979 a
Belarus	11 Jun 1974	5 Feb 1976
Belgium		19 May 2004 a
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Benin		31 Jul 2003 a
Bhutan		16 Jan 1989 a
Bolivia		22 Jan 2002 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		25 Oct 2000 a
Brazil		7 Jun 1999 a
Brunei Darussalam		13 Nov 1997 a
Bulgaria	27 Jun 1974	18 Jul 1974
Burkina Faso		1 Oct 2003 a
Burundi		17 Dec 1980 a
Cambodia		27 Jul 2006 a
Cameroon		8 Jun 1992 a
Canada	26 Jun 1974	4 Aug 1976
Cape Verde		10 Sep 2002 a
Chile		21 Jan 1977 a
China		5 Aug 1987 a
Colombia		16 Jan 1996 a
Comoros		25 Sep 2003 a
Costa Rica		2 Nov 1977 a
Côte d'Ivoire		13 Mar 2002 a
Croatia		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		10 Jun 1998 a
Cyprus		24 Dec 1975 a
Czech Republic		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		1 Dec 1982 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		25 Jul 1977 a
Denmark	10 May 1974	1 Jul 1975
Djibouti		1 Jun 2004 a
Dominica		24 Sep 2004 a
Dominican Republic		8 Jul 1977 a
Ecuador	27 Aug 1974	12 Mar 1975
Egypt		25 Jun 1986 a
El Salvador		8 Aug 1980 a
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia		16 Apr 2003 a
Finland	10 May 1974	31 Oct 1978
France		26 Aug 2003 a
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 a
Georgia		18 Feb 2004 a
Germany	15 Aug 1974	25 Jan 1977
Ghana		25 Apr 1975 a
Greece		3 Jul 1984 a
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala	12 Dec 1974	18 Jan 1983
Guinea		22 Dec 2004 a
Haiti		25 Aug 1980 a
Honduras		29 Jan 2003 a
Hungary	6 Nov 1974	26 Mar 1975
Iceland	10 May 1974	2 Aug 1977
India		11 Apr 1978 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		12 Jul 1978 a
Iraq		28 Feb 1978 a
Ireland		30 Jun 2005 a
Israel		31 Jul 1980 a
Italy	30 Dec 1974	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica		21 Sep 1978 a
Japan		8 Jun 1987 a
Jordan		18 Dec 1984 a
Kazakhstan		21 Feb 1996 a
Kenya		16 Nov 2001 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		1 Mar 1989 a
Kyrgyzstan		2 Oct 2003 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Aug 2002 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		3 Jun 1997 a
Liberia		30 Sep 1975 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		25 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein		28 Nov 1994 a
Lithuania		23 Oct 2002 a
Luxembourg		10 May 2006 a
Madagascar		24 Sep 2003 a
Malawi		14 Mar 1977 a
Malaysia		24 Sep 2003 a
Maldives		21 Aug 1990 a
Mali		12 Apr 2002 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		9 Feb 1998 a
Mauritius		24 Sep 2003 a
Mexico		22 Apr 1980 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Jul 2004 a
Moldova		8 Sep 1997 a
Monaco		27 Nov 2002 a
Mongolia	23 Aug 1974	8 Aug 1975
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		9 Jan 2002 a
Mozambique		14 Jan 2003 a
Myanmar		4 Jun 2004 a
Nauru		2 Aug 2005 a
Nepal		9 Mar 1990 a
Netherlands		6 Dec 1988 a
New Zealand		12 Nov 1985 a
Nicaragua	29 Oct 1974	10 Mar 1975
Niger		17 Jun 1985 a
Norway	10 May 1974	28 Apr 1980
Oman		22 Mar 1988 a
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 a
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama		17 Jun 1980 a
Papua New Guinea		30 Sep 2003 a
Paraguay	25 Oct 1974	24 Nov 1975
Peru		25 Apr 1978 a
Philippines		26 Nov 1976 a
Poland	7 Jun 1974	14 Dec 1982
Portugal		11 Sep 1995 a
Qatar		3 Mar 1997 a
Republic of Korea		25 May 1983 a
Romania	27 Dec 1974	15 Aug 1978
Russian Federation	7 Jun 1974	15 Jan 1976
Rwanda	15 Oct 1974	29 Nov 1977
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		12 Sep 2000 a
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Saudi Arabia		1 Mar 2004 a
Senegal		7 Apr 2006 a
Serbia		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		29 May 1980 a
Sierra Leone		26 Sep 2003 a
Slovakia		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa		23 Sep 2003 a
Spain		8 Aug 1985 a
Sri Lanka		27 Feb 1991 a
Sudan		10 Oct 1994 a
Swaziland		4 Apr 2003 a
Sweden	10 May 1974	1 Jul 1975
Switzerland		5 Mar 1985 a
Syrian Arab Republic		25 Apr 1988 a
Tajikistan		19 Oct 2001 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		12 Mar 1998 d
Togo		30 Dec 1980 a
Tonga		9 Dec 2002 a
Trinidad and Tobago		15 Jun 1979 a
Tunisia	15 May 1974	21 Jan 1977
Turkey		11 Jun 1981 a
Turkmenistan		25 Jun 1999 a
Uganda		5 Nov 2003 a
Ukraine	18 Jun 1974	20 Jan 1976
United Arab Emirates		25 Feb 2003 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	13 Dec 1974	2 May 1979
United States of America	28 Dec 1973	26 Oct 1976
Uruguay		13 Jun 1978 a
Uzbekistan		19 Jan 1998 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		19 Apr 2005 a
Viet Nam		2 May 2002 a
Yemen		9 Feb 1987 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria states that in each individual case, a dispute may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

ANDORRA

Declaration:

In view of article 1, paragraph 1 (a) of this Convention, the Principality of Andorra declares that, in accordance with article 43 of the Constitution of Andorra, and the tradition dating from the Pareatges of 1278, the Heads of State of Andorra are jointly and indivisbly the Coprinceps. These Coprinceps, in their personal and exclusive right, are the Bishop of Urgell and the President of the French Republic.

ARGENTINA

In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

BELARUS

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states

that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

BRAZIL

Reservation:

With the reservation provided for in paragraph 2 of article 13.

BULGARIA[12]

BURUNDI[13]

In respect of cases where the alleged offenders belong to a national liberation movement recognized by Burundi or by an international organization of which Burundi is a member, and their actions are part of their struggle for liberation, the Government of the Republic of Burundi reserves the right not to apply to them the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1.

CHINA

[The People's Republic of China] declares that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Convention, the People's Republic of China has reservations on paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the said paragraph.

COLOMBIA[14]

Reservations:

...

3. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the Convention, which are contrary to the guiding principles of the Colombian Penal Code and to article 29 of the Political Constitution of Colombia, the fourth paragraph of which states that:

Everyone shall be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law. Anyone who is charged with an offence shall be entitled to defence and the assistance of counsel of his own choosing, or one appointed by the court, during the investigation and trial; to be tried properly, in public without undue delay; to present evidence and to refute evidence brought against him; to contest the sentence; and not to be tried twice for the same act.

Consequently, the expression "Alleged offender" shall be taken to mean "the accused".

CUBA

Declaration:

In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, recognizing that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention should not, without consent of both parties, be submitted to international arbitration and to the International Court of Justice.

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

The Republic of Zaire does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice. In the light of its policy based on respect for the sovereignty of States, the Republic of Zaire is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration and hopes that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice not at the request of one of the parties but with the consent of all the interested parties.

ECUADOR

Upon signature:

Ecuador wishes to avail itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, declaring that it does not consider itself bound to refer disputes concerning the application of the Convention to the International Court of Justice.

EL SALVADOR

The State of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention.

ETHIOPIA

Reservation pursuant to article 13 (2) :

"The Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by the aforementioned provision of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention would be submitted to arbitration or to the Court only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned."

FINLAND

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Finland reserves the right to apply the provision of article 8, paragraph 3, in such a way that extradition shall be restricted to offences which, under Finnish Law, are punishable by a penalty more severe than imprisonment for one year and, provided also that other conditions in the Finnish Legislation for extradition are fulfilled."

Declaration made upon signature:

"Finland also reserves the right to make such other reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when ratifying this Convention."

FRANCE

Déclarations:

France understands that only acts which may be defined as acts of terrorism constitute crimes within the meaning of article 2 of the Convention.

The application of the Convention shall be without prejudice to the Convention adopted at New York on 9 December 1994 on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

GERMANY[7]

Upon signature:

"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying this Convention, to state its views on the explanations of vote and declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

GHANA[15]

"(i) Paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention provides that disputes may be submitted to arbitration, failing which any of the parties to the dispute may refer it to the International Court of Justice by request. Since Ghana is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration, she wishes to exercise her option under article 13 (2) to make a reservation on article 13 (1). It is noted that such a reservation can be withdrawn later under article 13 (3)."

HUNGARY[16]

INDIA

"The Government of the Republic of India does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention."

IRAQ[17,13]

(1) The resolution of the United Nations General Assembly with which the above-mentioned Convention is enclosed shall be considered to be an integral part of the above-mentioned Convention.

(2) Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention shall cover the representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by the League of Arab States or the Organization of African Unity.

(3) The Republic of Iraq shall not bind itself by paragraph (1) of article 13 of the Convention.

(4) The accession of the Government of the Republic of Iraq to the Convention shall in no way constitute a recognition of Israel or a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

ISRAEL[18]

Declarations:

"The Government of the State of Israel declares that its accession to the Convention does not constitute acceptance by it as binding of the provisions of any other international instrument, or acceptance by it of any other international instrument as being an instrument related to the Convention.

The Government of Israel reaffirms the contents of its communication of 11 May 1979 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

Reservation:

"The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

JAMAICA

"Jamaica avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

JORDAN[17]

Reservation:

The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan declares that its accession [. . .] cannot give rise to relations with "Israel".

KUWAIT[17]

Declaration:

[The Government of Kuwait] wishes to reiterate Kuwait's complete reservation on paragraph 1 of article 13 in the Convention, for its accession to it does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and does not engage them into any treaty relations as a result.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 2, Article 13 of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1, article 13 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer to a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Interpretative declaration:

The Principality of Liechtenstein construes articles 4 and 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention, to mean that the Principality of Liechtenstein undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein under the conditions laid down in its domestic legislation.

LITHUANIA

Reservation:

"... Whereas it is provided in paragraph 2 of Article 13 of the said Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 13 of the said Convention, providing that any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

Luxembourg courts are competent to apply the Convention, and Luxembourg criminal law applies to the crimes referred to in article 2 of the Convention when the alleged offender is in Luxembourg territory and has not been extradited to another State, regardless of the nationality of the alleged offender and the place where the crime was perpetrated.

MALAWI

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi [declares], in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 13, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

MALAYSIA

Declarations:

"1. The Government of Malaysia understands the phrase "alleged offender" in Article 1(2) of the Convention to mean the accused.

2. The Government of Malaysia understands the phrase "or other attack" in Article 2(1)(a) of the Convention to mean acts that are recognized as offences under its domestic laws.

3. The Government of Malaysia understands Article 7 of the Convention to include the right of the competent authorities to decide not to submit any particular case for prosecution before the judicial authorities if the alleged offender is dealt with under national security and preventive detention laws.

4. (a) Pursuant to Article 13(2) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 13(l) of the Convention; and

(b) the Government of Malaysia reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the arbitration procedure set forth in Article 13(l) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

MAURITIUS

Reservation:

"In accordance with Article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, the Republic of Mauritius hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, and states that it considers that a dispute may be submitted or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute."

Declaration:

"The Republic of Mauritius rejects the extension of the Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland to the Chagos Archipelago (so-called British Indian Ocean Territory) and reaffirms its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago which forms part of its national territory."

MONGOLIA

Declaration made upon signature and renewed upon ratification:

"The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

MOZAMBIQUE

Declaration:

"... with the following declaration in accordance with its article 13, paragraph 2:

"The Republic of Mozambique does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

In this connection, the Republic of Mozambique states that, in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to [the] International Court of Justice."

Furthermore, the Republic of Mozambique declares that:

The Republic of Mozambique, in accordance with its Constitution and domestic laws, can not extradite Mozambique citizens.

Therefore, Mozambique citizens will be tried and sentenced in national courts."

MYANMAR

Reservation:

"The Government of Myanmar does not consider itself bound by the article 13 (1) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents adopted on 14 December 1973."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"In view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands article 12 of the Convention, and in particular the second sentence of that Article, in no way affects the applicability of article 33 of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees".

Reservation:

"In cases where the judicial authorities of either the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles or Aruba cannot exercise jurisdiction pursuant to one of the principles mentioned in article 3, para. 1, the Kingdom accepts the aforesaid obligation [laid down in article 7] subject to the condition that it has received and rejected a request for extradition from another State party to the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND[9]

Reservation:

The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply the provisions of the Convention to Tokelau pending the enactment of the necessary implementing legislation in Tokelau law.

PAKISTAN

"Pakistan shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention".

PERU

With reservation as to article 13 (1).

POLAND[19]

PORTUGAL

Reservation:

Portugal does not extradite anyone for crimes which carry the death penalty or life imprisonment under the law of the requesting State nor does it extradite anyone for violations which carry security measure for life.

ROMANIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratifica tion:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

Declaration:

"Saint Vincent and the Grenadines avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2 of the aforesaid Convention and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservation:

.....the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself obligated to observe paragraph 1 of Article 13 which deals with resolving any dispute arising from interpretation or implementation of the Convention .

SLOVAKIA[4]

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 and article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[17]

Declaration:

1. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, concerning arbitration and the results thereof.

2. Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention in no way implies recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with Israel concerning any question regulated by this Convention.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

TUNISIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

No dispute may be brought before the International Court of Justice unless by agreement between all parties to the dispute.

UKRAINE

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider it self bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in accordance with the provision of article 13 (2) of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents formulates a reservation with respect to the provision established under paragraph 1 of the said article. Consequently, it does not consider itself obligated to refer to arbitration as a means of settlement of disputes, nor does it recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

VIET NAM

Reservation:

"Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam makes its reservation to paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

YEMEN[11,17]

Reservation:

In acceding to this Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which states that disputes between States parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may, at the request of anyone of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Declaration

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that its accession to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or serve as grounds for the establishment of relations of any sort with Israel.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

GERMANY[7]

30 November 1979

The statement by the Republic of Iraq on sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention does not have any legal effects for the Federal Republic of Germany.

25 March 1981

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the reservation made by the Government of Burundi concerning article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

3 November 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the declaration relating to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against internationally protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 7 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia introduces a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to clearly identify in which way the Government of Malaysia intends to change the obligations arising from the Convention. Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby objects to this declaration which is considered to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Malaysia."

ISRAEL

"The Government of the State of Israel does not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

28 June 1982

"The Government of the State of Israel regards the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn.

"In the view of the Government of Israel, the purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven."

ITALY

(a) The Italian Government does not consider as valid the reservation made by Iraq on 28 February 1978 with regard to article 1, paragraph 1(b), of the said Convention;

(b) With regard to the reservation expressed by Burundi on 17 December 1980, [the Italian Government considers that] the purpose of the Convention is to ensure the punishment, worldwide, of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny a safe haven to the perpetrators of such crimes. Considering therefore that the reservation expressed by the Government of Burundi is incompatible with the aim and purpose of the Convention, the Italian Government can not consider Burundi's accession to the Convention as valid as long as it does not withdraw that reservation.

NETHERLANDS

2 November 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 7 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia is formulating a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to identify the changes to the obligations arising from the Convention that it is intended to introduce. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers that a reservation formulated in this way is likely to contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

For these reasons, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby objects to this declaration which it considers to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

15 January 1982

"The purpose of this Convention was to secure the worldwide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven. Accordingly the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regard the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and are unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn."

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
United Kingdom[3,20,21,22]	2 May 1979	Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Belize, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, the Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the Island of Cyprus.
	16 Nov 1989	Anguilla

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 December 1974 and 29 December 1976, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with reservation will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] On 11 August 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Macao. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 18 November 1999 and 13 December 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portgual and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with reservation will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 11 October 1974 and 30 June 1975, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1035, p. 234. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] In a notification received on 12 March 1980, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification of the Convention, which specified that until further decision, the Convention would not apply to the Faeroe Islands or to Greenland. The notification indicates 1 April 1980 as the effective date of withdrawal.

[7] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention, with reservation, on 23 May 1974 and 30 November 1976, respectively. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 230. See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[10] The instrument of accession specifies that the Convention will also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue. See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[11] The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, made upon signature and renewed upon ratification. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 228.

[13] Upon depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of France made the following declaration with regard to declarations made by the following States:

Burundi upon accession:

France objects to the declaration made by Burundi on 17 December 1980 limiting the application of the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2 and article 6, paragraph 1.

Iraq upon accession:

France contests the interpretation made by Iraq on 28 February 1978 that the resolution of the United Nations General Assembly with which the above-mentioned Convention is enclosed should be considered to be an integral part of the Convention, and objects to Iraq's reservation relating to article 1, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention.

[14] On 1 March 2002, the Government of Colombia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession:

1. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the Convention, and particularly to article 8 (1), (2), (3) and (4) thereof, which are inconsistent with article 35 of the Basic Law in force which states that: Native-born Colombians may not be extradited. Aliens will not be extradited for political crimes or for their opinions. Any Colombian who has committed, abroad, crimes that are considered as such under national legislation, shall be tried and sentenced in Colombia.

2. Colombia enters a reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, inasmuch as it is contrary to the provisions of article 35 of its Political Constitution.

[15] In a notification received on 18 November 1976, the Government of Ghana informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation contained in its instrument of accession, concerning article 3 (1)(c) of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 235.

[16] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 13 (1) of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 235.

[17] The Secretary-General received on 11 May 1979 from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The instrument deposited by the Government of Iraq contains a statement of a political character in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of Israel, this is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements, which are, moreover, in flagrant contradiction to the principles, objects and purposes of the Organization. That pronouncement by the Government of Iraq cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon it under general international law or under particular treaties.

"The Government of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis* have been received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 11 March 1985 in respect of the reservation made by Jordan; on 21 August 1987 in respect of the declaration by Democratic Yemen; on 26 July 1988 in respect of the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic; and on 17 May 1989 in respect of the declaration made by Kuwait.

[18] The communication of 11 May 1979 referred to in the second paragraph of the declaration made by Israel upon accession to the Convention, refers to the communication made with respect to the reservation made by Iraq upon its accession to the Convention. See note 14 in this chapter.

[19] On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 13, paragraph 1 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1295, p. 394.

[20] The Secretary-General received, on 25 May 1979 from the Government of Guatemala,the following communication:

The Government of Guatemala [docs] not accept [the extension by the United Kingdom of the Convention to the Territory of Belize] in view of the fact the said Territory is a territory concerning which a dispute exists and to which [Guatemala] maintains a claim that is the subject, by mutual agreement, of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes between the two Governments concerned.

In this respect, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 November 1979, stated the following:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their sovereignty over Belize and do not accept the reservation submitted by the Government of Guatemala."

[21] On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands [and dependencies], which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their right, by notification to the Depositary under the relevant provisions of the above-mentioned Convention, to extend the application of the Convention in question to the Falkland Islands or to the Falkland Islands Dependencies, as the case may be.

For this reason alone, the Government of the United Kingdom are unable to regard the Argentine [communication] under reference as having any legal effect."

[22] The Government of the United Kingdom specified that the application of the Convention had been extended to Anguilla as from 26 March 1987.

8. Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel

New York, 9 December 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 January 1999, in accordance with article 27 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force thirty days after twenty-two instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession have been deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 15 January 1999, No. 35457.

STATUS: Signatories: 43. Parties: 81.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2051, p. 363

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 49/59 of the General Assembly dated 9 December 1994. The Convention was open for signature on 15 December 1994 and will remain open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 31 December 1995.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Approval (AA), Succession (d)*
Albania		30 Mar 2001 a
Argentina	15 Dec 1994	6 Jan 1997
Australia	22 Dec 1995	4 Dec 2000
Austria		6 Sep 2000 a
Azerbaijan		3 Aug 2000 a
Bangladesh	21 Dec 1994	22 Sep 1999
Belarus	23 Oct 1995	29 Nov 2000
Belgium	21 Dec 1995	19 Feb 2002
Bolivia	17 Aug 1995	22 Dec 2004
Bosnia and Herzegovina		11 Aug 2003 a
Botswana		1 Mar 2000 a
Brazil	3 Feb 1995	6 Sep 2000
Brunei Darussalam		20 Mar 2002 a
Bulgaria		4 Jun 1998 a
Canada	15 Dec 1994	3 Apr 2002
Chile		27 Aug 1997 a
China[1]		22 Sep 2004 a
Costa Rica		17 Oct 2000 a
Côte d'Ivoire		13 Mar 2002 a
Croatia		27 Mar 2000 a
Cyprus		1 Jul 2003 a
Czech Republic	27 Dec 1995	13 Jun 1997
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Oct 2003 a
Denmark	15 Dec 1994	11 Apr 1995
Ecuador		28 Dec 2000 a
Estonia		8 Mar 2006 a
Fiji	25 Oct 1995	1 Apr 1999
Finland	15 Dec 1994	5 Jan 2001
France	12 Jan 1995	9 Jun 2000
Germany	1 Feb 1995	22 Apr 1997
Greece		3 Aug 2000 a
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Guyana		21 May 2004 a
Haiti	19 Dec 1994	
Honduras	17 May 1995	
Hungary		13 Jul 1999 a
Iceland		10 May 2001 a
Ireland		28 Mar 2002 a
Italy	16 Dec 1994	5 Apr 1999
Jamaica		8 Sep 2000 a
Japan	6 Jun 1995	6 Jun 1995 A
Kenya		19 Oct 2004 a
Kuwait		19 Jul 2004 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Aug 2002 a
Lebanon		25 Sep 2003 a
Lesotho		6 Sep 2000 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein	16 Oct 1995	11 Dec 2000
Lithuania		8 Sep 2000 a
Luxembourg	31 May 1995	30 Jul 2001
Malta	16 Mar 1995	
Monaco		5 Mar 1999 a
Mongolia		25 Feb 2004 a
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nauru		12 Nov 2001 a
Nepal		8 Sep 2000 a
Netherlands[3]	22 Dec 1995	7 Feb 2002 A
New Zealand[4]	15 Dec 1994	16 Dec 1998
Norway	15 Dec 1994	3 Jul 1995
Pakistan	8 Mar 1995	
Panama	15 Dec 1994	4 Apr 1996
Philippines	27 Feb 1995	17 Jun 1997
Poland	17 Mar 1995	22 May 2000
Portugal	15 Dec 1994	14 Oct 1998
Republic of Korea		8 Dec 1997 a
Romania	27 Sep 1995	29 Dec 1997
Russian Federation	26 Sep 1995	25 Jun 2001
Samoa	16 Jan 1995	19 Aug 2005
Senegal	21 Feb 1995	9 Jun 1999
Serbia		31 Jul 2003 a
Sierra Leone	13 Feb 1995	
Singapore		26 Mar 1996 a
Slovakia	28 Dec 1995	26 Jun 1996
Slovenia		21 Jan 2004 a
Spain	19 Dec 1994	13 Jan 1998
Sri Lanka		23 Sep 2003 a
Sweden	15 Dec 1994	25 Jun 1996

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Approval (AA), Succession (d)
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		6 Mar 2002 a
Togo	22 Dec 1995	
Tunisia	22 Feb 1995	12 Sep 2000
Turkey		9 Aug 2004 a
Turkmenistan		29 Sep 1998 a
Ukraine	15 Dec 1994	17 Aug 1995
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	19 Dec 1995	6 May 1998
United States of America	19 Dec 1994	
Uruguay	17 Nov 1995	3 Sep 1999
Uzbekistan		3 Jul 1996 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance or accession.)

BELGIUM

Interpretative declaration:

The Belgian Government declares the following: article 9, paragraph 1 (c), only covers cases where the threat is credible.

CHINA

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China makes a reservation with regard to Article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel and is not bound by the provisions of Article 22, paragraph 1.

COSTA RICA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic enters a reservation to article 2, paragraph 2, of the Convention, to the effect that limiting the scope of application of the Convention is contrary to the pacifist thinking of our country and, accordingly, that, in the event of conflicts with the application of the Convention, Costa Rica will, where necessary, give precedence to humanitarian law.

ESTONIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 10 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia establishes her jurisdiction over any such crime when it is committed with respect to a national of Estonia."

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by all of paragraph 1 of Article 22 of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel."

GERMANY

Declaration:

In accordance with German law, the authorities of the Federal Republic of Germany will communicate information on alleged offenders, victims and circumstances of the crime (personal data) directly to the states concerned and, in parallel with this, will inform the Secretary-General of the United Nations that such information has been communicated.

KUWAIT

Reservation:

... with a reservation in respect of article 22 (1), in accordance with article 22 (2) of the Convention.

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 2, Article 22 of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1, article 22 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

NEPAL

Declaration:

"[The Government of Nepal] avails itself of the provisions of article 22, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of the said article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, prior consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 14 of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel states that the competent national authorities must decide on a case submitted to them in accordance with national law and in the same manner as they would decide on ordinary offences of a grave nature. Consequently, the Kingdom of the Netherlands understands this provision to include the right of its

competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed a crime as referred to in Article 9, paragraph 1, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities, grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution would be possible."

TUNISIA

Reservation:

The Tunisian Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 22, paragraph 1, of the Convention and that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned.

TURKEY[5]

Declarations:

"I. The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Convention only to the State Parties with which it has diplomatic relations.

II. The Republic of Turkey declares that this Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

III. The Republic of Turkey declares that, in accordance with article 22, paragraph 2 of the Convention, Turkey does not consider itself bound by article 22, paragraph 1 of this Convention. The explicit consent of the Republic of Turkey is necessary in each individual case before any dispute to which the Republic of Turkey is party concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may be referred to the International Court of Justice."

Reservations:

"In connection with Article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention, concerning the applicability of international humanitarian law, the Republic of Turkey is not a party to the Protocols I and II, dated 8 June 1977, Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and therefore will not be bound by the provisions of the said Protocols."

SLOVAKIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"If a dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention is not settled by negotiation, the Slovak Republic prefers its submission to the International Court of Justice in accordance with article 22, paragraph 1 of the Convention. Therefore a dispute, to which the Slovak Republic might be a Party can be submitted to arbitration only with the explicit consent of the Slovak Republic."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance or accession.)

CYPRUS

7 December 2004

With regard to the declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Cyprus has examined the declarations made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratification of the Convention on the Safety of the United Nations and Associated Personnel.

The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of the Convention only to the States with which it has diplomatic relations.

In view of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. The reservation makes it unclear to what extent the Republic of Turkey considers itself bound by the obligations arising from the Convention. In the absence of further clarification, this reservation creates uncertainty as to the States Parties in respect of which Turkey is undertaking the obligations in the Convention, and raises doubt as to the commitment of the Republic of Turkey to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Republic of Turkey furthermore declares that the Convention is ratified exclusively with regard to the national territory where the Constitution and the legal and administrative order of the Republic of Turkey are applied.

In the view of the Republic of Cyprus, this declaration in fact amounts to a reservation. This reservation is contrary to the letter and the spirit of Article 10 of the Convention. It should be recalled that the duty to establish jurisdiction over the crimes set out in the Convention is mandatory upon States Parties when the crime is committed in the territory of that State or on board a ship or aircraft registered in that State and when the alleged offender is a national of that State. A limitation to the national territory is contrary to the obligations of States Parties in this regard and therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Republic of Turkey also makes a reservation that in connection with Article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention, concerning the applicability of international humanitarian law, the Republic of Turkey is not a party to the Protocols I and II, dated 8 June 1977, Additional to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, and therefore will not be bound by the provisions of the said Protocols.

The Republic of Cyprus considers this reservation to be contrary to the letter and spirit of Article 20 (1) of the Convention, which states that nothing shall affect the applicability of international humanitarian law as contained in international instruments in relation to the protection of United Nations operations and United Nations and Associated Personnel. Accordingly, this reservation is prohibited by the Convention.

For these reasons, the Government of the Republic of Cyprus objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the Convention on the Safety of the United Nations and Associated Personnel.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Cyprus and the Republic of Turkey. The Convention, therefore, enters into force between the two States without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from these reservations".

GREECE

21 July 2005

With regard to the declarations made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic has examined the declarations made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratification of the 1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

In the view of the Government of the Hellenic Republic, paragraph 1 of these declarations amounts to a reservation which raises concerns as to the commitment of Turkey to implement core provisions of the Convention and in particular those pertaining to the prevention and suppression of crimes against United Nations and Associated Personnel. The reservation may also lead to a discriminatory application of the Convention.

In connection with paragraph II of the declarations, the Government of the Hellenic Republic is of the view that it also amounts to a reservation as it raises the same concerns as above. Furthermore, it raises doubts as to whether Turkey fully undertakes the obligations incumbent upon it by virtue of Article 10 of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic, therefore, considers that the above reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Regarding the reservation made by the Republic of Turkey in connection with Article 20 par. 1 of the Convention, the Government of the Hellenic Republic considers that, in so far as the instruments referred to in the reservation are reflective of customary international law, they are universally binding and cannot be exempted from by a reservation.

For these reasons, the Government of the Hellenic Republic objects to the above reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Hellenic Republic and the Republic of Turkey. The Convention, therefore, enters into force between the two States without taking into account the abovementioned reservations."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

16 August 2005

With regard to the declarations and reservation made by Turkey upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has examined the declaration made by the Republic of Turkey upon ratification of the 1994 Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is concerned that paragraph 1 of the declaration may amount to a reservation of indeterminate scope. Diplomatic relations between Turkey and other States are capable of being established and terminated at will, and without the other State Parties to the Convention knowing of their status. It would offend the legal certainty of treaty relations to attempt to make these contingent upon the existence of diplomatic relations.

As regards paragraph II of the declaration, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland is of the view that it raises doubts as to whether Turkey fully undertakes the obligations incumbent upon it by virtue of Article 10 of the Convention. As well as providing that a State Party shall establish its jurisdiction over crimes committed within its national territory, or on board a ship or aircraft registered in that State, Article 10 also provides that a State shall take measures to assume jurisdiction where the alleged offender is a national of that State. Paragraph II, in attempting to ratify the Convention solely with regard to the national territory of Turkey, appears to be contrary to Article 10 (1) (b).

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, therefore, considers that the above paragraphs of the declaration constitute reservations which are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Regarding the reservation made by the Republic of Turkey in connection with Article 20 (1) of the Convention, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers that, in so far as the instruments referred to in the reservation are reflective of customary international law, they are universally binding and cannot be derogated from.

For these reasons, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland objects to the above reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Republic of Turkey. The Convention, therefore, enters into force between the two States without taking into account the above-mentioned reservations."

Notes:

[1] With the following:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[4] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] In regard to the declarations made by the Government of Turkey upon accession, the Secretary-General received a communication from the following State on the date indicated hereinafter:

Portugal (15 December 2005):

The Government of the Portuguese Republic has carefully examined the declarations and reservations made by the Republic of Turkey upon the ratification of the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel.

The Government of Portugal considers that paragraph 1 of the declarations amounts to a reservation which raises concerns as to the commitment of Turkey to implement core provisions of the Convention and in particular those concerning the prevention and suppression of crimes against United Nations and Associated personnel. This reservation may also lead to a discriminatory application of the Convention.

Portugal considers that paragraph II of the declaration also amounts to a reservation which is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely to its Article 10 which requires that each State party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the crimes against Untied Nations and Associate personnel in the case of crimes committed in the territory of that State.

With regard to the reservation made by Turkey in connection with article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention, Portugal considers that in so far as the instruments referred to in a reservation are reflective of customary international law, they are universally binding and cannot be exempted from by a reservation.

The Government of the Portugese Republic, therefore objects to the above reservations made by the Republic of Turkey to the Convention on the Safety of Untied Nations and Associate Personnel.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force o the Convention between Portugal and Turkey.

8. a) Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Safety of United Nations and Associated Personnel

New York, 8 December 2005

NOT YET IN FORCE: in accordance with article 6 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force thirty days after twenty-two instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession have been deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Protocol after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 2.

TEXT: Doc. A/60/518.

Note: The above Optional Protocol was adopted on 8 December 2005 during the 61st plenary meeting of the General Assembly by resolution A/60/42. In accordance with its article IV, the Optional Protocol shall be open for signature by all States from 16 January 2006 to 16 January 2007 at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Australia	19 Sep 2006	
Austria	14 Mar 2006	
Azerbaijan	26 Sep 2006	
Belgium	15 Sep 2006	
Bolivia	3 Aug 2006	
Bulgaria	20 Sep 2006	
Central African Republic	27 Feb 2006	
Chile	15 Sep 2006	
Cyprus	13 Sep 2006	
Czech Republic	20 Sep 2006	
Germany	13 Sep 2006	
Lebanon	14 Mar 2006	
Liberia	21 Sep 2006	
Liechtenstein	16 Jan 2006	
Luxembourg	16 Jan 2006	
Netherlands	19 Sep 2006	
New Zealand	20 Sep 2006	
Norway	20 Jan 2006	24 Feb 2006 AA
Poland	15 Sep 2006	
Republic of Korea	20 Sep 2006	
Romania	20 Sep 2006	
Senegal	17 Jan 2006	
Sierra Leone	21 Sep 2006	
Slovakia	22 Sep 2006	
Slovenia	13 Oct 2006	
Spain	19 Sep 2006	
Sweden	7 Jul 2006	30 Aug 2006
Switzerland	19 Sep 2006	
Tunisia	19 Sep 2006	
Ukraine	19 Sep 2006	
Uruguay	15 Sep 2006	

9. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings

New York, 15 December 1997

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 May 2001, in accordance with article 22 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 23 May 2001, No. 37517.

STATUS: Signatories: 58. Parties: 149.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2149, p. 256; depositary notification C.N.801.2001.TREATIES-9 of 12 October 2001 [proposal for corrections to the original of the Convention (authentic Chinese text)] and C.N.16.2002.TREATIES-1 of 10 January 2002 [rectification of the original text of the Convention (Chinese authentic text)]; C.N.310.2002.TREATIES-14 of 4 April 2002 [proposal of a correction to the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)] and C.N.416.2002.TREATIES-16 of 3 May 2002 [rectification of the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)]; C.N.1161.2005.TREATIES-15 of 15 Novemberl 2005 [proposal of a correction to the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)].

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution A/RES/52/164 of the General Assembly on 15 December 1997. In accordance with its article 21(1), the Convention will be open for signature by all States on 12 January 1998 until 31 December 1999 at United Nations Headquarters.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria	17 Dec 1998	8 Nov 2001
Andorra		23 Sep 2004 a
Argentina	2 Sep 1998	25 Sep 2003
Armenia		16 Mar 2004 a
Australia		9 Aug 2002 a
Austria	9 Feb 1998	6 Sep 2000
Azerbaijan		2 Apr 2001 a
Bahrain		21 Sep 2004 a
Bangladesh		20 May 2005 a
Barbados		18 Sep 2002 a
Belarus	20 Sep 1999	1 Oct 2001
Belgium	12 Jan 1998	20 May 2005
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Benin		31 Jul 2003 a
Bolivia		22 Jan 2002 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina		11 Aug 2003 a
Botswana		8 Sep 2000 a
Brazil	12 Mar 1999	23 Aug 2002
Brunei Darussalam		14 Mar 2002 a
Bulgaria		12 Feb 2002 a
Burkina Faso		1 Oct 2003 a
Burundi	4 Mar 1998	
Cambodia		31 Jul 2006 a
Cameroon		21 Mar 2005 a
Canada	12 Jan 1998	3 Apr 2002
Cape Verde		10 May 2002 a
Chile		10 Nov 2001 a
China[1]		13 Nov 2001 a
Colombia		14 Sep 2004 a
Comoros	1 Oct 1998	25 Sep 2003
Costa Rica	16 Jan 1998	20 Sep 2001
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 1998	13 Mar 2002
Croatia		2 Jun 2005 a
Cuba		15 Nov 2001 a
Cyprus	26 Mar 1998	24 Jan 2001
Czech Republic	29 Jul 1998	6 Sep 2000
Denmark[2]	23 Dec 1999	31 Aug 2001
Djibouti		1 Jun 2004 a
Dominica		24 Sep 2004 a
Egypt	14 Dec 1999	9 Aug 2005
El Salvador		15 May 2003 a
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Estonia	27 Dec 1999	10 Apr 2002
Ethiopia		16 Apr 2003 a
Finland	23 Jan 1998	28 May 2002 A
France	12 Jan 1998	19 Aug 1999
Gabon		10 Mar 2005 a
Georgia		18 Feb 2004 a
Germany	26 Jan 1998	23 Apr 2003
Ghana		6 Sep 2002 a
Greece	2 Feb 1998	27 May 2003
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala		12 Feb 2002 a
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Honduras		25 Mar 2003 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Hungary	21 Dec 1999	13 Nov 2001
Iceland	28 Sep 1998	15 Apr 2002
India	17 Sep 1999	22 Sep 1999
Indonesia		29 Jun 2006 a
Ireland	29 May 1998	30 Jun 2005
Israel	29 Jan 1999	10 Feb 2003
Italy	4 Mar 1998	16 Apr 2003
Jamaica		9 Aug 2005 a
Japan	17 Apr 1998	16 Nov 2001 A
Kazakhstan		6 Nov 2002 a
Kenya		16 Nov 2001 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		19 Apr 2004 a
Kyrgyzstan		1 May 2001 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Aug 2002 a
Latvia		25 Nov 2002 a
Lesotho		12 Nov 2001 a
Liberia		5 Mar 2003 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein		26 Nov 2002 a
Lithuania	8 Jun 1998	17 Mar 2004
Luxembourg	6 Feb 1998	6 Feb 2004
Madagascar	1 Oct 1999	24 Sep 2003
Malawi		11 Aug 2003 a
Malaysia		24 Sep 2003 a
Maldives		7 Sep 2000 a
Mali		28 Mar 2002 a
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		30 Apr 2003 a
Mauritius		24 Jan 2003 a
Mexico		20 Jan 2003 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		23 Sep 2002 a
Moldova		10 Oct 2002 a
Monaco	25 Nov 1998	6 Sep 2001
Mongolia		7 Sep 2000 a
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique		14 Jan 2003 a
Myanmar		12 Nov 2001 a
Nauru		2 Aug 2005 a
Nepal	24 Sep 1999	
Netherlands[4]	12 Mar 1998	7 Feb 2002 A
New Zealand[5]		4 Nov 2002 a
Nicaragua		17 Jan 2003 a
Niger		26 Oct 2004 a
Norway	31 Jul 1998	20 Sep 1999
Pakistan		13 Aug 2002 a
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	3 Sep 1998	5 Mar 1999
Papua New Guinea		30 Sep 2003 a
Paraguay		22 Sep 2004 a
Peru		10 Nov 2001 a
Philippines	23 Sep 1998	7 Jan 2004
Poland	14 Jun 1999	3 Feb 2004
Portugal	30 Dec 1999	10 Nov 2001
Republic of Korea	3 Dec 1999	17 Feb 2004
Romania	30 Apr 1998	29 Jul 2004
Russian Federation	12 Jan 1998	8 May 2001
Rwanda		13 May 2002 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		16 Nov 2001 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		15 Sep 2005 a
San Marino		12 Mar 2002 a
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Senegal		27 Oct 2003 a
Serbia		31 Jul 2003 a
Seychelles		22 Aug 2003 a
Sierra Leone		26 Sep 2003 a
Slovakia	28 Jul 1998	8 Dec 2000
Slovenia	30 Oct 1998	25 Sep 2003
South Africa	21 Dec 1999	1 May 2003
Spain	1 May 1998	30 Apr 1999
Sri Lanka	12 Jan 1998	23 Mar 1999
Sudan	7 Oct 1999	8 Sep 2000
Swaziland		4 Apr 2003 a
Sweden	12 Feb 1998	6 Sep 2001
Switzerland		23 Sep 2003 a
Tajikistan		29 Jul 2002 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	16 Dec 1998	30 Aug 2004
Togo	21 Aug 1998	10 Mar 2003
Tonga		9 Dec 2002 a
Trinidad and Tobago		2 Apr 2001 a
Tunisia		22 Apr 2005 a
Turkey	20 May 1999	30 May 2002
Turkmenistan	18 Feb 1999	25 Jun 1999
Uganda	11 Jun 1999	5 Nov 2003
Ukraine		26 Mar 2002 a
United Arab Emirates		23 Sep 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	12 Jan 1998	7 Mar 2001
United Republic of Tanzania		22 Jan 2003 a
United States of America	12 Jan 1998	26 Jun 2002
Uruguay	23 Nov 1998	10 Nov 2001
Uzbekistan	23 Feb 1998	30 Nov 1998
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	23 Sep 1998	23 Sep 2003
Yemen		23 Apr 2001 a

ALGERIA

Reservation:

Reservation of Algeria

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that in order for a dispute to be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties to the dispute shall be required in each case.

BELGIUM

Declaration regarding article 11:

1. In exceptional circumstances, the Government of Belgium reserves the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance in respect of any offence set forth in article 2 which it considers to be a political offence or as an offence connected with a political offence or as an offence inspired by political motives.

2. In cases where the preceding paragraph is applicable, Belgium recalls that it is bound by the general legal principle aut dedere aut judicare, pursuant to the rules governing the competence of its courts.

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

The Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by Paragraph 1 of Article 20 of the Convention.

BRAZIL

Reservation:

".....the Federative Republic of Brazil declares, pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted in New York on the 15th December 1997, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1, of the said Convention.

CANADA

Declaration:

"Canada declares that it considers the application of article 2 (3) (c) of the Terrorist Bombing Convention to be limited to acts committed in furthering a conspiracy of two or more persons to commit a specific criminal offence contemplated in paragraph 1 or 2 of article 2 of that Convention."

CHINA

Reservation:

"... China accedes to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombing, done at New York on 15 December 1997, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 20 of the Convention."

COLOMBIA

Declaration:

By virtue of article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Colombia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article.

Furthermore, by virtue of article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Colombia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in relation to paragraph 2 of the same article.

CUBA

Reservation and declaration:

Reservation

The Republic of Cuba declares, pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article, concerning the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, inasmuch as it considers that such disputes must be settled through amicable negotiation. In consequence, it declares that it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Declaration

The Republic of Cuba declares that none of the provisions contained in article 19, paragraph 2, shall constitute an encouragement or condonation of the threat or use of force in international relations, which must under all circumstances be governed strictly by the principles of international law and the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba also considers that relations between States must be based strictly on the provisions contained in resolution 2625 (XXV) of the United Nations General Assembly.

In addition, the exercise of State terrorism has historically been a fundamental concern for Cuba, which considers that the complete eradication thereof through mutual respect, friendship and cooperation between States, full respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, self-determination and non-interference in internal affairs must constitute a priority of the international community.

Cuba is therefore firmly of the opinion that the undue use of the armed forces of one State for the purpose of aggression against another cannot be condoned under the present Convention, whose purpose is precisely to combat, in accordance with the principles of the international law, one of the most noxious forms of crime faced by the modern world.

To condone acts of aggression would amount, in fact, to condoning violations of international law and of the Charter and provoking conflicts with unforeseeable consequences that would undermine the necessary cohesion of the international community in the fight against the scourges that truly afflict it.

The Republic of Cuba also interprets the provisions of the present Convention as applying with full rigour to activities carried out by armed forces of one State against another State in cases in which no armed conflict exists between the two.

EGYPT[6]

Upon signature :

Reservations:

"1. Article 6, paragraph 5:

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it is bound by Article 6, paragraph 5, of the Convention insofar as the domestic laws of States Parties do not contradict the relevant rules and principles of international law.

2. Article 19, paragraph 2:

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it is bound by Article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention in-

sofar as the military forces of the State, in the exercise of their duties do not violate the rules and principles of international law."

Upon ratification :

1. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 6, paragraph 5, of the Convention to the extent that the national legislation of States Parties is not incompatible with the relevant norms and principles of international law.

2. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention to the extent that the armed forces of a State, in the exercise of their duties, do not violate the norms and principles of international law.

El Salvador

Declaration:

... with regard to article 20, paragraph 2, the Republic of El Salvador declares that it does not consider itsel f bound by paragraph 1 of the said article because it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Ethiopia

Reservation pursuant to article 20 (2):

"The Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by the aforementioned provision of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention would be submitted to arbitration or to the Court only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned."

Germany

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Declaration:

The Federal Republic of Germany understands article 1 para. 4 of [the said Convention] in the sense that the term "military forces of a state" includes their national contingents operating as part of the United Nations forces. Furthermore, the Federal Republic of Germany also understands that, for the purposes of this Convention, the term "military forces of a state" also covers police forces.

India

Reservation:

"In accordance with Article 20 (2), the Government of the Republic of India hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 20 (1) of the Convention.".

Indonesia

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that the provisions of Article 6 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings will have to be implemented in strict compliance with the principles of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States."

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 20 and takes the position that dispute relating to the interpretation and application on the Convention which cannot be settled through the channel provided for in Paragraph (1) of the said Article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the Parties to the dispute."

Kuwait

Reservation and declaration:

".....the reservation to its paragraph (a) of article (20) and the declaration of non-compliance to its provisions."

Israel

" ... with the following declarations:

The Government of the State of Israel understands Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, in the sense that the term "military forces of a State" includes police and security forces operating pursuant to the internal law of the State of Israel.

...

The Government of the State of Israel understands that the term "international humanitarian law"referred to in Article 19, of the Convention has the same substantive meaning as the term "the laws of war"("jus in bello"). This body of laws does not include the provisions of the protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1977 to which the State of Israel is not a Party.

The Government of the State of Israel understands that under Article 1 paragraph 4 and Article 19 the Convention does not apply to civilians who direct or organize the official activities of military forces of a state.

Pursuant to Article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the State of Israel does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

Lao People's Democratic Republic

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 2, Article 20 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1, article 20 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

Malaysia

Declarations:

"1. The Government of Malaysia understands the phrase "Military forces of a State" in Article 1 (4) of the Convention to include the national contingents of Malaysia operating as part of United Nations forces.

2. .....

3. The Government of Malaysia understands Article 8 (1) of the Convention to include the right of the competent authorities to decide not to submit any particular case for prosecution before the judicial authorities if the alleged offender is dealt with under national security and preventive detention laws.

4. (a) Pursuant to Article 20 (2) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 20 (1) of the Convention; and

(b) the Government of Malaysia reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the arbitration procedure set forth in Article 20 (1) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

Moldova

Declarations:

... with the following declarations and reservation

1. .....

2. The Republic of Moldova declares its understanding that the provisions of article 12 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings should be implemented in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offenses falling within the scope of the Convention, without prejudice to the effectiveness of the international cooperation on the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

3. Pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Moldova declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

Mozambique

Declaration:

"... with the following declaration in accordance with its article 20, paragraph 2:

"The Republic of Mozambique does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

In this connection, the Republic of Mozambique states that, in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice".

Furthermore, the Republic of Mozambique declare that:

"The Republic of Mozambique, in accordance with its Constitution and domestic laws, may not and will not extradite Mozambique citizens.

Therefore, Mozambique citizens will be tried and sentenced in national courts".

Myanmar

Reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar, having considered the Convention aforesaid, hereby declares that it accedes to the same with reservation on Article 20 (1) and does not consider itself bound by the provision set forth in the said Article."

Netherlands

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

Pakistan[7]

Declaration:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination, in accordance with the rules of international law. This interpretation is consistent with Article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969 which provides that an agreement or treaty concluded in conflict with an existing jus cogen or preemptory norm of international law is void and, the right of self-determination is universally recognized as *a jus cogen*."

Portugal

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"For the purposes of article 8, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Portugal declares that the extradiction of Portuguese nationals from its territory will be authorized only if the following conditions, as stated in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, are met:

a) In case of terrorism and organised criminality; and

b) For purposes of criminal proceedings and, being so, subject to a guarantee given by the state seeking the extradition that the concerned person will be surrended to Portugal to serve the sentence or mesure imposed on him or her, unless such person does not consent thereto by means of expressed declaration.

For purposes of enforcement of a sentence in Portugal, the procedures referred to in the declaration made by Portugal to the European Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons shall be complied with."

Russian Federation

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The position of the Russian Federation is that the provisions of article 12 of the Convention should be implemented in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offences falling within the scope of the Convention, without detriment to the effectiveness of international cooperation on the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

.....

2) "The position of the Russian Federation is that the provisions of article 12 of the Convention should be implemented in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offenses falling within the scope of the Convention, without detriment to the effectiveness of international cooperation on the questions of extradition and legal assistance".

Spain

29 February 2000

Declaration:

According to article 23 of the Organization of Justice Act 6/1985 of 1 July, terrorism is a crime that is universally prosecutable and over which the Spanish courts have international jurisdiction under any circumstances; accordingly, article 6, paragraph 2 of the Convention is deemed to have been satisfied and there is no need to establish a special jurisdiction upon ratification of the Convention.

Sudan

Declaration concerning article 19, paragraph 2:

This paragraph shall not create any additional obligation to the Government of the Republic of the Sudan. It does not affect and does not diminish the responsibility of the Government of the Republic of the Sudan to maintain by all legitimate means order and law or re-establish it in the country or to defend its national unity or territorial integrity.

This paragraph does not affect the principle of non-interference in internal affairs of states, directly or indirectly, as it is set out in the United Nations Charter and relative provisions of international law.

Reservation to article 20, paragraph 1:

The Republic of the Sudan does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 20, in pursuance to paragraph 2 of the same article.

TUNISIA

Reservation:

By agreeing to accede to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997, [the Republic of Tunisia] declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20 (1) and affirms that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the said Convention may only be submitted to the International Court of Justice with its prior consent."

TURKEY

Upon signature:

Declarations:

"The Republic of Turkey declares that articles 9 and 12 should not be interpreted in such a way that offenders of these crimes are neither tried nor prosecuted. Furthermore mutual legal assistance and extradition are two different concepts and the conditions for rejecting a request for extradition should not be valid for mutual legal assistance.

The Republic of Turkey declares its understanding that the term international humanitarian law referred to in article 19 of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings shall be interpreted as comprising the relevant international rules excluding the provisions of additional Protocols to Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, to which Turkey is not a Party. The first part of the second paragraph of the said article should not be interpreted as giving a different status to the armed forces and groups other than the armed forces of a state as currently understood and applied in international law and thereby as creating new obligations for Turkey.

Reservation:

Pursuant to paragraph 2 of article (20) of the [Convention] the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article (20) of the said Convention."

Upon ratification:

"[W]ith the stated reservations...[:]

1) The Republic of Turkey declares that Articles (9) and (12) should not be interpreted in such a way that offenders of these crimes are neither tried nor prosecuted.

2) The Republic of Turkey declares its understanding that the term international humanitarian law referred to in Article (19) of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings shall be interpreted as comprising the relevant international rules excluding the provisions of Additional Protocols to Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, to which Turkey is not a Party. The first part of the second paragraph of the said article should not be interpreted as giving a different status to the armed forces and groups other than the armed forces of a state as currently understood and applied in international law and thereby as creating new obligations for Turkey.

3) Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Article (20) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Paragraph 1 of Article (20) of the said Convention."

UKRAINE

Reservation:

The provisions of article 19, paragraph 2, do not preclude Ukraine from exercising its jurisdiction over the members of military forces of a state and their prosecution, should their actions be illegal. The Convention will be applied to the extent that such activities are not governed by other rules of international law.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Reservation and declaration:

....subject to a reservation with respect to paragraph 1 of article 20 thereof, which relates to the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, in consequence of which the United Arab Emirates does not consider itself bound by that paragraph concerning arbitration.

Moreover, the Government of the United Arab Emirates will determine its jurisdiction over the offences in the cases provided for in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention and will notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations to that effect in accordance with paragraph 3 of that article.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservation:

"(a) pursuant to article 20 (2) of the Convention, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 20 (1) of the Convention; and

(b) the United States of America reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the procedure in Article 20 (1) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

Understandings:

"(1) EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF TERM "ARMED CONFLICT". The United States of America understands that the term "armed conflict"in Article 19 (2) of the Convention does not include internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence, and other acts of a similar nature.

(2) MEANING OF TERM "INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW". The United States of America understands that the term "international humanitarian law"in Article 19 of the Convention has the same substantive meaning as the law of war.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF ACTIVITIES BY MILITARY FORCES. The United States understands that, under Article 19 and Article 1 (4), the Convention does not apply to:

(A) the military fores of a state in the exercise of their official duties;

(B) civilians who direct or organize the official activities of military forces of a state; or

(C) civilians acting in support of the official activities of the military forces of a state, if the civilians are under the formal command, control, and responsibility of those forces."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, pursuant to the provisions of article 20, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, formulates an express reservation regarding the stipulation in paragraph 1 of that article. Accordingly, it does not consider itself bound to resort to arbitration as a means of dispute settlement, and does not recognize the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

14 April 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

The Government of Austria considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstance justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Austria recalls that according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Austria ans the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

AUSTRALIA

25 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Australia has examined the Declaration made by the Government of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997. The Government of Australia considers the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Government of Australia further considers the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention ... are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of Australia recalls that, according to Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Australia objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Australia and Pakistan."

CANADA

18 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Canada has examined the Declaration made by Pakistan at the time of its accession to the Convention and considers that the Declaration is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of Canada considers the Declaration to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of Canada considers that the above Declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of Canada recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and Pakistan".

26 April 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Belgium upon accession:

"The Government of Canada considers the Reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to ".....adopt such

measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the Reservation relating to Article 2 made by the Government of Belgium upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings which it considers as contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and Belgium.

The Government of Canada notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted."

DENMARK

18 March 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark recalls that, according to Article 19 C of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become party, as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Denmark and Pakistan."

FINLAND

17 June 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of Finland is of the view that the declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Finland further considers the declaration to be in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings wherever and by whomever carried out.

The declaration is, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the abovementioned interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its declaration."

FRANCE

3 February 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the French Republic has considered the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, in ratifying the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings of 15 December 1997, that 'nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination, in accordance with international law'. The aim of the Convention is to suppress all terrorist bombings, and article 5 states that 'each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary (...) to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature'. The Government of the French Republic considers that the above declaration constitutes a reservation, to which it objects".

15 August 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon ratification:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings of 15 December 1997. Pursuant to that reservation, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it is bound by article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention only insofar as the military forces of the State, in the exercise of their duties, do not violate the rules and principles of international law. However, the relevant portion of article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention states that: "the activities undertaken by military forces of a State in the exercise of their official duties, inasmuch as they are governed by other rules of international law, are not governed by this Convention".

The Government of the French Republic considers that the effect of the reservation made by the Government of the Arab

Republic of Egypt is to bring within the scope of the Convention activities undertaken by a State's armed forces which do not belong there because they are covered by other provisions of international law. As a result, the reservation substantially alters the meaning and scope of article 19, paragraph 2 of the Convention. The Government of the French Republic objects to the reservation, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and Egypt.

GERMANY

23 April 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the "declaration" to the International Convention of the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature."

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Pakistan."

3 November 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the declaration relating to the Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 8 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia introduces a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to clearly identify in which way the Government of Malaysia intends to change the obligations arising from the Convention.

Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby objects to this declaration which is considered to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Malaysia."

18 May 2006

With regard to the declaration made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings with respect to its Article 11. With this reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium expresses that it reserves the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance in respect of any offence which it considers to be politically motivated. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, this reservation seeks to limit the Convention's scope of application in a way that is incompatible with the objective and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Belgium."

11 August 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

In this declaration the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt expresses the opinion that the activities of the armed forces of a State in the exercise of their duties, inasmuch as they are not consistent with the rules and principles of international humanitarian law, are governed by the Convention. However, according to article 19, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under international humanitarian law, which are governed by that law, as well as the activities undertaken by military forces of a State in the exercise of their official duties, inasmuch as they are governed by other rules of international law, are not governed by this Convention, so that the declaration by the Arab Republic of Egypt aims to broaden the scope of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is only entitled to make such a declaration unilaterally for its own armed forces, and it interprets the declaration as having binding effect only on armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt. In the view of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, such a unilateral declaration cannot apply to the armed forces of other States Parties without their express consent. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore declares that it does not consent to the Egyptian declaration as so interpreted with regard to any armed forces other than those of the Arab Republic of Egypt, and in particular does not recognize any applicability of the Convention to the armed forces of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany also emphasizes that the declaration by the Arab Republic of Egypt has no effect whatsoever on the Federal Republic of Germany's obligations as State Party to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, or on the Convention's applicability to armed forces of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the International Convention for the Suppression of Ter-

rorist Bombings as entering into force between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Arab Republic of Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, which relates exclusively to the obligations of the Arab Republic of Egypt and to the armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt."

INDIA

3 April 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of India have examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997.

The Government of the Republic of India consider that the Declaration made by Pakistan is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and it is, therefore, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of India consider the Declaration to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention ... are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of their political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of India consider that the above Declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of India recall that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of India therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between India and Pakistan."

IRELAND

23 June 2006

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Ireland have examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings according to which the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggles, for the realisation of the right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland are also of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing terrorist bombings, wherever and by whomever carried out.

The Government of Ireland further consider the declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

ISRAEL

28 May 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Permanent Mission of the State of Israel to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the declaration of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 1997.

"The Government of the State of Israel considers that declaration to be, in fact, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as expressed in Article 5 thereof.

The Government of the State of Israel recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan."

ITALY

3 June 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Italy has examined the "declaration" to the International Convention of the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of Italy considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the term of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considera-

tions of political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and Pakistan."

18 May 2006

With regard to the declaration made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of Belgium upon the accession to that Convention. The Government of Italy considers the reservation by Belgium as intended to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis, which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where it takes place and of who carries it out. The Government of Italy recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and Italy. The Convention enters into force between Belgium and Italy without the Government of Belgium benefiting from its reservation."

14 August 2006

With regard to the reservations made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism Bombings, according to which 1) The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 6, paragraph 5, of the Convention to the extent that national legislation of States Parties is not incompatible with relevant norms and principles of international law. 2) The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention to the extent that the armed forces of a State, in article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention to the extent that the armed forces of a State, in the exercise of their duties, do not violate the norms and principles of international law.

The Government of Italy considers the reservations to be contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which the States Parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Italy wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the reservations made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Italy. The Convention enters into force between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Italy without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservations."

JAPAN

4 August 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

".....[The Permanent Mission of Japan] has the honour to make the following declaration on behalf of the Government of Japan.

When depositing its Instrument of Accession, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan made a declaration which reads as follows:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination, in accordance with the rules of international law. This interpretation is consistent with Article53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969 which provides that an agreement or treaty concluded in conflict with an existing jus cogen or preemptory norm of international law is void and, the right of self-determination is universally recognized as a jus cogen."

In this connection, the Government of Japan draws attention to the provisions of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Japan considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan seeks to exclude struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination from the application of the Convention and that such declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Japan therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

NETHERLANDS

20 February 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary,

including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Pakistan."

2 November 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Malaysia upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 8 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia is formulating a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to identify the changes to the obligations arising from the Convention that it is intended to introduce. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers that a reservation formulated in this way is likely to contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

For these reasons, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby objects to this declaration which it considers to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

14 August 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to article 19, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

In the view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands this declaration made by the Government of Egypt seeks to extend the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis to include the armed forces of a State to the extent that they fail to meet the test that they 'do not violate the rules and principles of international law'. Otherwise such activities would be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the Government of Egypt is entitled to make such a declaration, only to the extent that Egypt will apply the terms of the Convention in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention to their own armed forces.

The declaration of the Government of Egypt will have no effect in respect of the obligations of the Kingdom of the Netherlands under the Convention or in respect to the application of the Convention to the armed forces of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

This statement shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

NEW ZEALAND

12 August 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government f New Zealand has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997.

The Government of New Zealand considers the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of New Zealand further considers the declaration to be contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention...are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of New Zealand recalls that, according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of New Zealand therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between New Zealand and Pakistan."

NORWAY

5 September 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Norway has examined the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of Norway considers the declaration to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent wit their grave nature.

The Government of Norway recalls that, according to customary international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of Pakistan to the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and Pakistan."

SPAIN

23 January 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has considered the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in respect of the International Convention for the Prevention of Terrorist Bombings (New York, 15 December 1997) at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers this declaration to constitute a de facto reservation the aim of which is to limit unilaterally the scope of the Convention. This is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, which is the repression of terrorist bombings, by whomever and wherever they may be carried out.

In particular, the declaration by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is incompatible with the spirit of article 5 of the Convention, which establishes the obligation for all States Parties to adopt "such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention [...] are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature."

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain wishes to point out that, under customary international law, as codified in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of treaties are not permitted.

Consequently, the Government of Spain objects to the aforementioned declaration by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Prevention of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the aforementioned Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

19 May 2006

With regard to the declaration made by Belgium upon ratification:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to article 11 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings upon ratifying that Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers, in particular, that the reservation by Belgium is incompatible with article 5 of the Convention, whereby States parties undertake to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or others of similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under the customary-law provision enshrined in article 19 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty concerned are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to article 11 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Kingdom of Belgium.

11 August 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon ratification:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation to article 19, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings presented by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that Egypt's reservation relates to an essential component of the Convention, having an impact not only on article 19, paragraph 2, but also on the clause establishing the scope of the Convention's implementation, because its effect is to alter the law applicable to actions of a State's armed forces which violate international law. As a result, this is a reservation which runs counter to the interests safeguarded by the Convention, and to the Convention's object and purpose.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain wishes to recall that, according to the provision of international law codified in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are prohibited.

Consequently, the Kingdom of Spain objects to Egypt's reservation to article 19, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Arab Republic of Egypt.

SWEDEN

3 June 2003

With regard to the reservation made by Turkey upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Turkey to article 19 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, whereby Turkey intends to exclude the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions from the term international humanitarian law. It is the view of the Government of Sweden that the majority of the provisions of those Additional Protocols constitute customary international law, by which Turkey is bound.

In the absence of further clarification, Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by Turkey to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Turkey and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Turkey benefiting from its reservation."

4 June 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon acceding to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (the Convention).

The Government of Sweden recalls that the name assigned to a statement, whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified,, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by Pakistan to the Convention in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation. This reservation does

not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the Convention and it raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Pakistan and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation".

30 January 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Israel upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by Israel regarding article 19 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, whereby Israel intends to exclude the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions from the term international humanitarian law.

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by Israel in substance constitutes a reservation.

It is the view of the Government of Sweden that the majority of the provisions of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions constitute customary international law, by which Israel is bound. In the absence of further clarification, Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by Israel to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Israel and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Israel benefiting from this reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

28 March 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the Declaration made by the Government of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom consider the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Government of the United Kingdom further consider the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention...are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, hnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the United Kingdom recall that, according to Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom and Pakistan."

15 May 2006

With regard to the declaration made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the reservation relating to Article 11 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of Belgium at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that the effect of the said reservation is to disapply the provisions of Article 11 in "exceptional circumstances". In light of the grave nature of the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention, the Government of the United Kingdom consider that the provisions of Article 11 should apply in all circumstances.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom and Belgium."

3 August 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The declaration appears to purport to extend the scope of application of the Convention to include the armed forces of a State to the extent that they fail to meet the test that they 'do not violate the rules and principles of international law'. Such activities would otherwise be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2. It is the opinion of the United Kingdom that the Government of Egypt is entitled to make such a declaration only insofar as the declaration constitutes a unilateral declaration by the Government of Egypt that Egypt will apply the terms of the Convention in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention to their own armed forces on a unilateral basis. The United Kingdom consider this to be the effect of the declaration made by Egypt.

However, in the view of the United Kingdom, Egypt cannot by a unilateral declaration extend the obligations of the United Kingdom under the Convention beyond those set out in the Convention without the express consent of the United King-

dom. For the avoidance of any doubt, the United Kingdom wish to make clear that it does not so consent. Moreover, the United Kingdom do not consider the declaration made by the Government of Egypt to have any effect in respect of the obligations of the United Kingdom under the Convention or in respect of the application of the Convention to the armed forces of the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom thus regard the Convention as entering into force between the United Kingdom and Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of Egypt, which applies only to the obligations of Egypt under the Convention and only in respect of the armed forces of Egypt."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

5 June 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Pakistan upon accession:

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The declaration is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of the United States also considers the declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, which provides: "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention ... are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature."

The Government of the United States notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United States therefore objects to the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Pakistan."

22 May 2006

With regard to the declaration made by Belgium upon ratification :

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the Declaration made by Belgium to Article 11 of the Convention, to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United States understands that the intent of the Government of Belgium may have been narrower than apparent from its Declaration in that the Government of Belgium would expect its Declaration to apply only in exceptional circumstances where it believes that, because of the political nature of the offense, an alleged offender may not receive a fair trial. The United States believes the Declaration is unnecessary because of the safeguards already provided for under Articles 12, 14, and 19 (2) of the Convention. However, given the broad wording of the Declaration and because the Government of the United States considers Article 11 to be a critical provision in the Convention, the United States is constrained to file this objection. This objection does not preclude entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Belgium."

16 August 2006

With regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the United States of America has examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The declaration appears to purport to extend the scope of application of the Convention to include the armed forces of a State, to the extent that those forces fail to meet the test that they 'do not violate the rules and principles of international law'. Such activities would otherwise be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2. It is the opinion of the United States that the Government of Egypt is entitled to make such a declaration only insofar as the declaration constitutes a unilateral declaration by the Government of Egypt that Egypt will apply the terms of the Convention in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention to its own armed forces on a unilateral basis. The United States considers this to be the effect of the declaration made by Egypt. However, in the view of the United States, Egypt cannot by a unilateral declaration extend the obligations of the United States or any country other than Egypt under the Convention beyond those obligations set out in the Convention without the express consent of the United States or other countries. To avoid any doubt, the United States wishes to make clear that it does not consent to Egypt's declaration. Moreover, the United States does not consider the declaration made by the Government of Egypt to have any effect in respect of the obligations of the United States under the Convention or in respect of the application of the Convention to the armed forces of the United States. The United States thus regards the Convention as entering into force between the United States and Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of Egypt, which applies only to the obligations of Egypt under the Convention and only in respect of the armed forces of Egypt."

Notifications under article 6 (3)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ANDORRA

In accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Andorra establishes its competence regarding the offences described in article 2, for all the cases covered by article 6, paragraph 2, b), c) and d).

AUSTRALIA

18 October 2002

"... in accordance with article 6 (3) of the Convention, Australia has chosen to establish jurisdiction in all the circumstances provided for by Article 6 (2), and has provided for such jurisdiction in domestic legislation which took effect on 8 September 2002."

BOLIVIA

... by virtue of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Bolivia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in respect of offences committed in the situations and conditions provided for under article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

BRAZIL

... the Federative Republic of Brazil declares that, in accordance with the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the said Convention, it will exercise jurisdiction over the offences within the meaning of article 2, in the cases set forth in article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraphs (a), (b) and (e) of the Convention."

CHILE

In accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Government of Chile declares that, in accordance with article 6, paragraph 8, of the Courts Organization Code of the Republic of Chile, crimes and ordinary offences committed outside the territory of the Republic which are covered in treaties concluded with other Powers remain under Chilean jurisdiction.

CYPRUS

"In accordance with article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Cyprus establishes its jurisdiction over the offences specified in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4.

DENMARK

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Denmark provides the following information on Danish criminal jurisdiction:

Rules on Danish criminal jurisdiction are laid down in Section 6 to 12 in the Danish Criminal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Section 6

Acts committed

1) within the territory of the Danish state; or

2) on board a Danish ship or aircraft, being outside the territory recognized by international law as belonging to any state; or

3) on board a Danish ship or aircraft, being within the territory recognized by international law as belonging to a foreign state, if committed by persons employed on the ship or aircraft or by passengers travelling on board the ship or aircraft, shall be subject to Danish criminal jurisdiction.

Section 7

(1) Acts committed outside the territory of the Danish state by a Danish national or by a person resident in the Danish state shall also be subject to Danish criminal jurisdiction in the following circumstances, namely;

1) where the act was committed outside the territory recognized by international law as belonging to any state, provided acts of the kind in question are punishable with a sentence more severe than imprisonment for four months; or

2) where the act was committed within the territory of a foreign state, provided that it is also punishable under the law in force in that territory.

(2) The provisions in Subsection (1) above shall similarly apply to acts committed by a person who is a national of, or who is resident in Finland, Iceland, Norway or Sweden, and who is present in Denmark.

Section 8

The following acts committed outside the territory of the Danish state, shall also come within Danish criminal jurisdiction, irrespective of the nationality of the perpetrator.

1) where the act violates the independence, security, Constitution of public authorities of the Danish state, official duties toward the state or such interests, the legal protection of which depends on a personal connection with the Danish state; or

2) where the act violates an obligation which the perpetrator is required by law to observe abroad or prejudices the performance of an official duty incumbent on him with regard to a Danish ship or aircraft; or

3) where an act committed outside the territory recognized by international law as belonging to any state violates a Danish national or a person resident in the Danish state, provided acts of the kind in question are punishable with a sentence more severe than imprisonment for four months; or

4) where the act comes within the provisions of Section 183 a of this Act. The prosecution may also include breaches of Sections 237 and 244-248 of this Act, when committed in conjunction with the breach of Section 183 a; or

5) where the act is covered by an international convention in pursuance of which Denmark is under an obligation to start legal proceedings; or

6) where transfer of the accused for legal proceedings in another country is rejected, and the act, provided it is committed within the territory recognized by international law as belonging to a foreign state, is punishable according to the law of this state, and provided that according to Danish law the act is punishable with a sentence more severe than one year of imprisonment.

Section 9

Where the punishable nature of an act depends on or is influenced by an actual or intended consequence, the act shall also be deemed to have been committed where the consequence has taken effect or has been intended to take effect.

Section 10

(1) Where prosecution takes place in this country under the foregoing provisions, the decision concerning the punishment or other legal consequences of the act shall be made under Danish law.

(2) In the circumstances referred to in Section 7 of this Act, if the act was committed within the territory recognized by international law as belonging to a foreign state, the punishment may not be more severe than that provided for by the law of that state.

Section 10 a

(1) A person who has been convicted by a criminal court in the state where the act was committed or who has received a sentence which is covered by the European Convention on the International Validity of Criminal Judgments, or by the Act governing the Transfer of Legal Proceedings to another country, shall not be prosecuted in this country for the same act, if,

1) he is finally acquitted; or

2) the penalty imposed has been served, is being served or has been remitted according to the law of the state in which the court is situated; or

3) he is convicted, but no penalty is imposed.

(2)The provisions contained in Subsection (1) above shall not apply to

a) acts which fall within Section 6 (1) of this Act; or

b) the acts referred to in Section 8 (1) 1) above, unless the prosecution in the state in which the court was situated was at the request of the Danish Prosecuting Authority.

Section 10 b

Where any person is prosecuted and punishment has already been imposed on him for the same act in another country, the

penalty imposed in this country shall be reduced according to the extent to which the foreign punishment has been served.

Section 11

If a Danish national or a person resident in the Danish state has been punished in a foreign country for an act which under Danish law may entail loss or forfeiture of an office or profession or of any other right, such a deprivation may be sought in a public action in this country.

Section 12

The application of the provisions of Section 6-8 of this Act shall be subject to the applicable rules of international law."

El Salvador

With regard to article 6, paragraph 3, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador, gives notification that it has established its jurisdiction under its domestic law in respect of the offences committed in the situations and under the conditions mentioned in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention;...

Estonia

".....pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Estonia declares that in its domestic law it shall apply the jurisdiction set forth in article 6 paragraph 2 over offences set forth in article 2."

Finland

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Finland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4."

Hungary

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary declares that, in relation to Article 6, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Hungary, pursuant to its Criminal Code, has jurisdiction over the crimes set out in Article 2 of the Convention in the cases provided for in Article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention."

Iceland

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Iceland declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

Israel

Pursuant to Article 6 paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Government of the State of Israel hereby notifies the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it has established jurisdiction over the offences referred to in Article 2 in all the cases detailed in Article 6 paragraph 2.

Jamaica

".....Jamaica has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2, with respect to the jurisdiction stated in Article 6 (2) (d) which states:

'A State Party may establish jurisdiction over any such offence when:

...(d) The offence is committed in an attempt to compel that State to do or abstain from doing any act;'..."

Latvia

"In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, opened for signature at New York on the 12th day of January 1998, the Republic of Latvia declares that it has established jurisdiction in all cases listed in Article 6, paragraph 2."

Lithuania

".....the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania establishes the jurisdiction for the offences provided in Article 2 of the Convention in all cases described in paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the said Convention."

Malaysia

"In accordance with Article 6 (3) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it has established jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic laws over the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in Article 6 (1) and 6 (2)."

Mexico

24 February 2003

.....in accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Mexico exercises jurisdiction over the offences defined in the Convention where:

(a) They are committed against Mexicans in the territory of another State party, provided that the accused is in Mexico and has not been tried in the country in which the offence was committed. Where it is a question of offences defined in the Convention but committed in the territory of a non-party State, the offence shall also be defined as such in the place where it was committed (art. 6, para. 2 (a));

(b) They are committed in Mexican embassies and on diplomatic or consular premises (art. 6, para. 2 (b));

(c) They are committed abroad but produce effects or are claimed to produce effects in the national territory (art. 6, para. (d)).

Moldova

Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Moldova establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in cases provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2.

Monaco

The Principality declares that, in accordance with the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, it establishes its jurisdiction over the acts recognized as offences within the meaning of article 2 of the Convention, in the cases set forth in article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention.

Paraguay

..., by virtue of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the aforementioned Convention, the Republic of Paraguay has established its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic legislation, under article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Portugal

16 January 2002

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Portugal declares that

in accordance with article 5 (1) (a) of the Penal Code, Portuguese courts will have jurisdiction against the crimes of terrorism and of terrorist organisations, set forth respectively in article 300 and 301 of the same Code, wherever the place they have been committed, thus covering, in connection with the said crimes, the cases set forth in article 6 (2) of the Convention."

Republic of Korea

7 July 2004

Pursuant to Article 6, Paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings,

The Republic of Korea provides the following information on its criminal jurisdiction. Principles on the criminal jurisdiction are set out in the Chapter I of Part I of the Korean Penal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Article 2 (Domestic Crimes)

This Code shall apply to anyone, whether Korean or alien, who commits a crime within the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 3 (Crimes by Koreans outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to a Korean national who commits a crime outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 4 (Crimes by Aliens on board Korean Vessel, etc., outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits a crime on board a Korean vessel or a Korean aircraft outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 5 (Crimes by Aliens outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits any of the following crimes outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea:

1. Crimes concerning insurrection;
2. Crimes concerning treason;
3. Crimes concerning the national flag;
4. Crimes concerning currency;
5. Crimes concerning securities, postage and revenue stamps;
6. Crimes specified in Articles 225 through 230 among crimes concerning documents; and
7. Crimes specified in Article 238 among crimes concerning seal.

Article 6 (Foreign Crimes against the Republic of Korea and Koreans outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits a crime, other than those specified in the preceding Article, against the Republic of Korea or its national outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea, unless such act does not constitute a crime, or it is exempt from prosecution or execution of punishment under the *lex loci delictus*.

Article 8 (Application of General Provisions)

The provisions of the preceding Articles shall also apply to such crimes as are provided by other statutes unless provided otherwise by such statutes.

Romania

"In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, Romania declares that it has established its jurisdiction for the offenses set forth in Article 2, in all cases stipulated by Article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, in conformity with relevant provisions of its domestic law."

Russian Federation

"The Russian Federation declares that in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 6 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (hereinafter - the Convention) it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases envisaged in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 6 of the Convention."

Sudan

The Republic of the Sudan declares hereby that it has established its jurisdiction over crimes set out in article 2 of the Convention in accordance with situations and conditions as stipulated in article 6, paragraph 2.

Sweden

5 November 2002

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Sweden provides the following information on Swedish criminal jurisdiction. Rules on Swedish criminal jurisdiction are laid down in Chapter 2 Section 1-5 in the Swedish Penal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Section 1

Crimes committed in this Realm shall be adjudged in accordance with Swedish law and by a Swedish court. The same applies when it is uncertain where the crime was committed but grounds exist for assuming that it was committed within the Realm.

Section 2

Crimes committed outside the Realm shall be adjudged according to Swedish law and by a Swedish court when the crime has been committed:

1. By a Swedish citizen or an alien domiciled in Sweden,
2. By an alien not domiciled in Sweden who, after having committed the crime, has become a Swedish citizen or has acquired domicile in the Realm or who is a Danish, Finnish, Icelandic or Norwegian citizen and is present in the Realm, or
3. By any other alien, who is present in the Realm, and the crime under Swedish law can result in imprisonment for more than six months.

The first paragraph shall not apply if the act is not subject to criminal responsibility under the law of the place where it was committed or if it was committed within an area not belonging to any state and, under Swedish law, the punishment for the act cannot be more severe than a fine.

In cases mentioned in this Section, a sanction may not be imposed which is more severe than the most severe punishment provided for the crime under the law in the place where it was committed.

Section 3

Even in cases other than those listed in Section 2, crimes committed outside the Realm shall be adjudged according to Swedish law and by a Swedish court:

1. if the crime was committed on board a Swedish vessel or aircraft, or was committed in the course of duty by the officer in charge or by a member of its crew,
2. if the crime was committed by a member of the armed force in an area in which a detachment of the armed forces was present, or if it was committed by some other person in such an area and the detachment was present for a purpose other than exercise,
3. if the crime was committed in the course of duty outside the Realm by a person employed in a foreign contingent of the Swedish armed forces,

3a. if the crime was committed in the course of duty outside the Realm by a policeman, custom officer or official employed at the coast guard, who performs boundless assignments according to an international agreement that Sweden has ratified,

4. if the crime committed was a crime against the Swedish nation, a Swedish municipal uthority or other assembly, or against a Swedish public institution,

5. If the crime was committed in an area not belonging to any state and was directed against a Swedish citizen, a Swedish association or private institution, or against an alien domiciled in Sweden,

6. if the crime is hijacking, maritime or aircraft sabotage, airport sabotage, counterfeiting currency, an attempt to commit such crimes, a crime against international law, unlawful dealings with chemical weapons, unlawful dealings with mines or false or careless statement before an international court, or

7. if the least severe punishment prescribed for the crime in Swedish law is imprisonment for four years or more.

Section 3 a

Besides the cases described in Sections 1-3, crimes shall be adjudged according to Swedish law by a Swedish court in accordance with the provisions of the Act on International Collaboration concerning Proceedings in Criminal matters.

Section 4

A crime is deemed to have been committed where the criminal act was perpetrated and also where the crime was completed or in the case of an attempt, where the intended crime would have been completed.

Section 5

Prosecution for a crime committed within the Realm on a foreign vessel or aircraft by an alien, who was the officer in charge or member of its crew or otherwise travelled in it, against another alien or a foreign interest shall not be instituted without the authority of the Government or a person designated by the Government.

1. on a Swedish vessel or aircraft or by the officer in charge or some member of its crew in the course of duty,

2. by a member of the armed forces in an area in which a detachment of the armed forces was present,

3. in the course of duty outside the Realm by a person employed by a foreign contingent of the Swedish armed forces,

4. In the course of duty outside the Realm by a policeman, custom officer or official employed at the coast guard, who performs boundless assignments according to an international agreement that Sweden has ratified,

5. In Denmark, Finland, Iceland or Norway or on a vessel or aircraft in regular commerce between places situated in Sweden or one of the said states, or

6. By a Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Icelandic or Norwegian citizen against a Swedish interest."

SWITZERLAND

Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Switzerland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraph 2.

UKRAINE

21 May 2002

"Ukraine exercises its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases provided for in paragraph 2 article 6 of the Convention."

URUGUAY

Notifies, by virtue of article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, that the authorities of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay exercise jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2, to which reference is made in article 6, paragraph 2. With regard to article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraphs (a) and (b), that jurisdiction is established in article 10 of the Penal Code (Act 9.155 of 4 December 1933) and, with regard to article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraph (c), in article 4 of the Aeronautical Code (Decree-Law 14.305 of 29 November 1974).

UZBEKISTAN

15 May 2000

The Republic of Uzbekistan has established its jurisdiction over the crimes set out in article 2 under all the conditions stipulated in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Moreover, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, having regard for article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, declares that it has established jurisdiction under its domestic law over the offences committed in the situations and under the conditions envisaged in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Notes:

[1] On 13 November 2001, the Government of China notified the Secretary-General of the following:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[2] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

Subsequently, on 8 February 2005, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Aruba with the following declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

[5] With a territorial exclusion with resepct to Tokelau to the effect that:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this accession shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultations with that territory."

[6] The Secretary-General received a communciation with regard to the declaration made by the Government of Egypt upon ratification from the following Government on the date indicated hereinafter:

Canada (14 September 2006) :

"The Government of Canada has examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The declaration appears to extend the scope of the application of the Convention to include the armed forces of a State, in the exercise of their duties, to the extent that those armed forces violate the rules and principles of international law. Such activities would otherwise be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2.

The Government of Canada considers the effect of the declaration to be a unilateral extension of the terms of the Convention by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to apply only to the armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention. The Arab Republic of Egypt cannot by unilateral declaration extend the obligations of Canada under the Convention beyond those set out in the Convention. Canada does not consider the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to have any effect in respect of the obligations of Canada under the Convention or in respect of the application of the Convention to the armed forces of Canada.

The Government of Canada thus regards the Convention as entering into force between Canada and the Arab Republic of Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, which applies only to the obligations of the Arab Republic of Egypt under the Convention and only in respect of the armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt."

Russian Federation (14 November 2006):

The Russian Side has considered the reservation to Article 19 (2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the Convention.

The objective of this reservation is to extend the scope of application of the Convention and to cover armed forces of the States Parties, if they violate "norms and principles of international law"in the exercise of their official duties.

The Russian side regards this reservation of Egypt as unilateral obligation of Egypt to apply the Convention to its own armed forces if they in the exercise of their official duties go beyond the scope of the norms and principles of international law.

The Russian side proceeds from the understanding that Egypt does not have right to unilaterally impose additional obligations on other Parties to the Convention without their explicit consent through formulating its reservation.

The Russian side does not recognize the extension of the Convention to include activities of armed forces of the States Parties except for Egypt, which according to Article 19 (2) are explicitly excluded from the scope of application of the Convention. Thus the Convention applies in relations between the Russian Federation and the Arab Republic of Egypt with the reservation of Egypt, which stipulates only obligations of Egypt and is applicable to its armed forces.

[7] The Secretary-General received communciations with regard to the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan upon accession, from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Republic of Moldova (6 october 2003):

"The Government of the Republic of Moldova has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova considers that the declaration is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention...are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the Republic of Moldova recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Moldova and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

Russian Federation (22 September 2003):

The Russian Federation has considered the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, of 1997.

The Russian Federation takes the position that every State which has agreed to the binding nature of the provisions of the Convention must adopt such measures as may be necessary, pursuant to article 5, to ensure that criminal acts which, in accordance with article 2, are within the scope of the Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Russian Federation notes that the realization of the right of peoples to self- determination must not conflict with other fundamental principles of international law, such as the principle of the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, the principle of the territorial integrity of States, and the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Russian Federation believes that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

In the view of the Russian Federation, the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan may jeopardize the fulfilment of the provisions of the Convention in relations between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and other States Parties and thereby impede cooperation in combating acts of terrorist bombing. It is in the common interest of States to develop and strengthen cooperation in formulating and adopting effective practical measures to prevent terrorist acts and punish the perpetrators.

The Russian Federation, once again declaring its unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustified, regardless of their motives and in all their forms and manifestations, wherever and by whomever they are perpetrated, calls upon the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to reconsider its position and withdraw the declaration.

Poland (3 February 2004):

"The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings of 15 December 1997 is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Government of the Republic of Poland further considers the declaration to be contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which each State Party commits itself to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic,

religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature'.

The Government of the Republic of Poland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

Ireland (23 June 2006):

"The Government of Ireland have examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings according to which the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggles, for the realisation of the right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland are also of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing terrorist bombings, wherever and by whomever carried out.

The Government of Ireland further consider the declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

10. Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court

Rome, 17 July 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 2002, in accordance with article 126.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 2002, No. 38544.
STATUS: Signatories: 139. Parties: 104.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2187, p. 3; depositary notifications C.N.577.1998.TREATIES-8 of 10 November 1998[1] and CN.604.1999.TREATIES-18 of 12 July 1999 [procès-verbaux of rectification of the original of the Statute (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)]; C.N.1075.1999.TREATIES-28 of 30 November 1999 [procès-verbal of rectification of the original text of the Statute (French and Spanish authentic texts)]; C.N.266.2000.TREATIES-8 of 8 May 2000 [procès-verbal of rectification of the original text of the Statute (French and Spanish authentic texts)]; C.N.17.2001.TREATIES-1 of 17 January 2001 [procès-verbal of rectification of the Statute (authentic French, Russian and Spanish texts)]; C.N.765.2001.TREATIES-18 of 20 September 2001 (Proposals for corrections to the original text of the Statute (Spanish authentic text)] and C.N.1439.2001.TREATIES-28 of 16 January 2002 (Procès-verbal).

Note: The Statute was adopted on 17 July 1998 by the United Nations Diplomatic Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Establishment of an International Criminal Court. In accordance with its article 125, the Statute was opened for signature by all States in Rome at the Headquarters of the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations on 17 July 1998. Thereafter, it was opened for signature in Rome at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Italy until 17 October 1998. After that date, the Statute was opened for signature in New York, at United Nations Headquarters, where it will be until 31 December 2000.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		10 Feb 2003 a
Albania	18 Jul 1998	31 Jan 2003
Algeria	28 Dec 2000	
Andorra	18 Jul 1998	30 Apr 2001
Angola	7 Oct 1998	
Antigua and Barbuda	23 Oct 1998	18 Jun 2001
Argentina	8 Jan 1999	8 Feb 2001
Armenia	1 Oct 1999	
Australia	9 Dec 1998	1 Jul 2002
Austria	7 Oct 1998	28 Dec 2000
Bahamas	29 Dec 2000	
Bahrain	11 Dec 2000	
Bangladesh	16 Sep 1999	
Barbados	8 Sep 2000	10 Dec 2002
Belgium	10 Sep 1998	28 Jun 2000
Belize	5 Apr 2000	5 Apr 2000
Benin	24 Sep 1999	22 Jan 2002
Bolivia	17 Jul 1998	27 Jun 2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina	17 Jul 2000	11 Apr 2002
Botswana	8 Sep 2000	8 Sep 2000
Brazil	7 Feb 2000	20 Jun 2002
Bulgaria	11 Feb 1999	11 Apr 2002
Burkina Faso	30 Nov 1998	16 Apr 2004
Burundi	13 Jan 1999	21 Sep 2004
Cambodia	23 Oct 2000	11 Apr 2002
Cameroon	17 Jul 1998	
Canada	18 Dec 1998	7 Jul 2000
Cape Verde	28 Dec 2000	
Central African Republic	7 Dec 1999	3 Oct 2001
Chad	20 Oct 1999	1 Nov 2006
Chile	11 Sep 1998	
Colombia	10 Dec 1998	5 Aug 2002
Comoros	22 Sep 2000	18 Aug 2006
Congo	17 Jul 1998	3 May 2004
Costa Rica	7 Oct 1998	7 Jun 2001
Côte d'Ivoire	30 Nov 1998	
Croatia	12 Oct 1998	21 May 2001
Cyprus	15 Oct 1998	7 Mar 2002
Czech Republic	13 Apr 1999	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	8 Sep 2000	11 Apr 2002
Denmark[2]	25 Sep 1998	21 Jun 2001
Djibouti	7 Oct 1998	5 Nov 2002
Dominica		12 Feb 2001 a
Dominican Republic	8 Sep 2000	12 May 2005
Ecuador	7 Oct 1998	5 Feb 2002
Egypt	26 Dec 2000	
Eritrea	7 Oct 1998	
Estonia	27 Dec 1999	30 Jan 2002
Fiji	29 Nov 1999	29 Nov 1999
Finland	7 Oct 1998	29 Dec 2000
France	18 Jul 1998	9 Jun 2000
Gabon	22 Dec 1998	20 Sep 2000
Gambia	4 Dec 1998	28 Jun 2002
Georgia	18 Jul 1998	5 Sep 2003
Germany	10 Dec 1998	11 Dec 2000
Ghana	18 Jul 1998	20 Dec 1999
Greece	18 Jul 1998	15 May 2002
Guinea	7 Sep 2000	14 Jul 2003
Guinea-Bissau	12 Sep 2000	
Guyana	28 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2004
Haiti	26 Feb 1999	
Honduras	7 Oct 1998	1 Jul 2002
Hungary	15 Jan 1999	30 Nov 2001
Iceland	26 Aug 1998	25 May 2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	31 Dec 2000	
Ireland	7 Oct 1998	11 Apr 2002

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Israel[3]	31 Dec 2000	
Italy	18 Jul 1998	26 Jul 1999
Jamaica	8 Sep 2000	
Jordan	7 Oct 1998	11 Apr 2002
Kenya	11 Aug 1999	15 Mar 2005
Kuwait	8 Sep 2000	
Kyrgyzstan	8 Dec 1998	
Latvia	22 Apr 1999	28 Jun 2002
Lesotho	30 Nov 1998	6 Sep 2000
Liberia	17 Jul 1998	22 Sep 2004
Liechtenstein	18 Jul 1998	2 Oct 2001
Lithuania	10 Dec 1998	12 May 2003
Luxembourg	13 Oct 1998	8 Sep 2000
Madagascar	18 Jul 1998	
Malawi	2 Mar 1999	19 Sep 2002
Mali	17 Jul 1998	16 Aug 2000
Malta	17 Jul 1998	29 Nov 2002
Marshall Islands	6 Sep 2000	7 Dec 2000
Mauritius	11 Nov 1998	5 Mar 2002
Mexico	7 Sep 2000	28 Oct 2005
Moldova	8 Sep 2000	
Monaco	18 Jul 1998	
Mongolia	29 Dec 2000	11 Apr 2002
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	8 Sep 2000	
Mozambique	28 Dec 2000	
Namibia	27 Oct 1998	25 Jun 2002
Nauru	13 Dec 2000	12 Nov 2001
Netherlands[5]	18 Jul 1998	17 Jul 2001 A
New Zealand[6]	7 Oct 1998	7 Sep 2000
Niger	17 Jul 1998	11 Apr 2002
Nigeria	1 Jun 2000	27 Sep 2001
Norway	28 Aug 1998	16 Feb 2000
Oman	20 Dec 2000	
Panama	18 Jul 1998	21 Mar 2002
Paraguay	7 Oct 1998	14 May 2001
Peru	7 Dec 2000	10 Nov 2001
Philippines	28 Dec 2000	
Poland	9 Apr 1999	12 Nov 2001
Portugal	7 Oct 1998	5 Feb 2002
Republic of Korea	8 Mar 2000	13 Nov 2002
Romania	7 Jul 1999	11 Apr 2002
Russian Federation	13 Sep 2000	
Saint Kitts and Nevis		22 Aug 2006 a
Saint Lucia	27 Aug 1999	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		3 Dec 2002 a
Samoa	17 Jul 1998	16 Sep 2002
San Marino	18 Jul 1998	13 May 1999
Sao Tome and Principe	28 Dec 2000	
Senegal	18 Jul 1998	2 Feb 1999
Serbia	19 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2001
Seychelles	28 Dec 2000	
Sierra Leone	17 Oct 1998	15 Sep 2000
Slovakia	23 Dec 1998	11 Apr 2002
Slovenia	7 Oct 1998	31 Dec 2001
Solomon Islands	3 Dec 1998	
South Africa	17 Jul 1998	27 Nov 2000
Spain	18 Jul 1998	24 Oct 2000
Sudan	8 Sep 2000	
Sweden	7 Oct 1998	28 Jun 2001
Switzerland	18 Jul 1998	12 Oct 2001
Syrian Arab Republic	29 Nov 2000	
Tajikistan	30 Nov 1998	5 May 2000
Thailand	2 Oct 2000	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	7 Oct 1998	6 Mar 2002
Timor-Leste		6 Sep 2002 a
Trinidad and Tobago	23 Mar 1999	6 Apr 1999
Uganda	17 Mar 1999	14 Jun 2002
Ukraine	20 Jan 2000	
United Arab Emirates	27 Nov 2000	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	30 Nov 1998	4 Oct 2001
United Republic of Tanzania	29 Dec 2000	20 Aug 2002
United States of America[7]	31 Dec 2000	
Uruguay	19 Dec 2000	28 Jun 2002
Uzbekistan	29 Dec 2000	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	14 Oct 1998	7 Jun 2000
Yemen	28 Dec 2000	
Zambia	17 Jul 1998	13 Nov 2002
Zimbabwe	17 Jul 1998	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ANDORRA

Declaration:

With regard to article 103, paragraph 1 (a) and (b) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Principality of Andorra declares that it would, if necessary, be willing to accept persons of Andorran nationality sentenced by the Court, provided that the sentence imposed by the Court was enforced in accordance with Andorran legislation on the maximum duration of sentences.

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"The Government of Australia, having considered the Statute, now hereby ratifies the same, for and on behalf of Australia, with the following declaration, the terms of which have full effect in Australian law, and which is not a reservation:

Australia notes that a case will be inadmissible before the International Criminal Court (the Court) where it is being investigated or prosecuted by a State. Australia reaffirms the primacy of its criminal jurisdiction in relation to crimes within the jurisdiction of the Court. To enable Australia to exercise its ju-

risdiction effectively, and fully adhering to its obligations under the Statute of the Court, no person will be surrendered to the Court by Australia until it has had the full opportunity to investigate or prosecute any alleged crimes. For this purpose, the procedure under Australian law implementing the Statute of the Court provides that no person can be surrendered to the Court unless the Australian Attorney-General issues a certificate allowing surrender. Australian law also provides that no person can be arrested pursuant to an arrest warrant issued by the Court without a certificate from the Attorney-General.

Australia further declares its understanding that the offences in Article 6, 7 and 8 will be interpreted and applied in a way that accords with the way they are implemented in Australian domestic law."

BELGIUM

Declaration concerning article 31, paragraph 1 (c):

Pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1 (b) of the Statute and having regard to the rules of international humanitarian law which may not be derogated from, the Belgian Government considers that article 31, paragraph 1 (c), of the Statute can be applied and interpreted only in conformity with those rules.

COLOMBIA

Declarations:

1. None of the provisions of the Rome Statute concerning the exercise of jurisdiction by the International Criminal Court prevent the Colombian State from granting amnesties, reprieves or judicial pardons for political crimes, provided that they are granted in conformity with the Constitution and with the principles and norms of international law accepted by Colombia.

Colombia declares that the provisions of the Statute must be applied and interpreted in a manner consistent with the provisions of international humanitarian law and, consequently, that nothing in the Statute affects the rights and obligations embodied in the norms of international humanitarian law, especially those set forth in article 3 common to the four Geneva Conventions and in Protocols I and II Additional thereto.

Likewise, in the event that a Colombian national has to be investigated and prosecuted by the International Criminal Court, the Rome Statute must be interpreted and applied, where appropriate, in accordance with the principles and norms of international humanitarian law and international human rights law.

2. With respect to articles 61(2)(b) and 67(1)(d), Colombia declares that it will always be in the interests of justice that Colombian nationals be fully guaranteed the right of defence, especially the right to be assisted by counsel during the phases of investigation and prosecution by the International Criminal Court.

3. Concerning article 17(3), Colombia declares that the use of the word "otherwise" with respect to the determination of the State's ability to investigate or prosecute a case refers to the obvious absence of objective conditions necessary to conduct the trial.

4. Bearing in mind that the scope of the Rome Statute is limited exclusively to the exercise of complementary jurisdiction by the International Criminal Court and to the cooperation of national authorities with it, Colombia declares that none of the provisions of the Rome Statute alters the domestic law applied by the Colombian judicial authorities in exercise of their domestic jurisdiction within the territory of the Republic of Colombia.

5. Availing itself of the option provided in article 124 of the Statute and subject to the conditions established therein, the Government of Colombia declares that it does not accept the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the category of crimes referred to in article 8 when a crime is alleged to have been committed by Colombian nationals or on Colombian territory.

6. In accordance with article 87(1)(a) and the first paragraph of article 87(2), the Government of Colombia declares that requests for cooperation or assistance shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel and shall either be in or be accompanied by a translation into the Spanish language.

EGYPT

Upon signature:
Declarations:

...

2. The Arab Republic of Egypt affirms the importance of the Statute being interpreted and applied in conformity with the general principles and fundamental rights which are universally recognized and accepted by the whole international community and with the principles, purposes and provisions of the Charter of the United Nations and the general principles and rules of international law and international humanitarian law. It further declares that it shall interpret and apply the references that appear in the Statute of the Court to the two terms fundamental rights and international standards on the understanding that such references are to the fundamental rights and internationally recognized norms and standards which are accepted by the international community as a whole.

3. The Arab Republic of Egypt declares that its understanding of the conditions, measures and rules which appear in the introductory paragraph of article 7 of the Statute of the Court is that they shall apply to all the acts specified in that article.

4. The Arab Republic of Egypt declares that its understanding of article 8 of the Statute of the Court shall be as follows:

(a) The provisions of the Statute with regard to the war crimes referred to in article 8 in general and article 8, paragraph 2 (b) in particular shall apply irrespective of the means by which they were perpetrated or the type of weapon used, including nuclear weapons, which are indiscriminate in nature and cause unnecessary damage, in contravention of international humanitarian law.

(b) The military objectives referred to in article 8, paragraph 2 (b) of the Statute must be defined in the light of the principles, rules and provisions of international humanitarian law. Civilian objects must be defined and dealt with in accordance with the provisions of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 (Protocol I) and, in particular, article 52 thereof. In case of doubt, the object shall be considered to be civilian.

(c) The Arab Republic of Egypt affirms that the term "the concrete and direct overall military advantage anticipated" used in article 8, paragraph 2 (b) (iv), must be interpreted in the light of the relevant provisions of the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 (Protocol I). The term must also be interpreted as referring to the advantage anticipated by the perpetrator at the time when the crime was committed. No justification may be adduced for the nature of any crime which may cause incidental damage in violation of the law applicable in armed conflicts. The overall military advantage must not be used as a basis on which to justify the ultimate goal of the war or any other strategic goals. The advantage anticipated must be proportionate to the damage inflicted.

(d) Article 8, paragraph 2 (b) (xvii) and (xviii) of the Statute shall be applicable to all types of emissions which are indiscriminate in their effects and the weapons used to deliver them, including emissions resulting from the use of nuclear weapons.

5. The Arab Republic of Egypt declares that the principle of the non-retroactivity of the jurisdiction of the Court, pursuant to articles 11 and 24 of the Statute, shall not invalidate the well established principle that no war crime shall be barred from prosecution due to the statute of limitations and no war criminal

shall escape justice or escape prosecution in other legal jurisdictions.

FRANCE

I. Interpretative declarations:

1. The provisions of the Statute of the International Criminal Court do not preclude France from exercising its inherent right of self-defence in conformity with Article 51 of the Charter.

2. The provisions of article 8 of the Statute, in particular paragraph 2 (b) thereof, relate solely to conventional weapons and can neither regulate nor prohibit the possible use of nuclear weapons nor impair the other rules of international law applicable to other weapons necessary to the exercise by France of its inherent right of self-defence, unless nuclear weapons or the other weapons referred to herein become subject in the future to a comprehensive ban and are specified in an annex to the Statute by means of an amendment adopted in accordance with the provisions of articles 121 and 123.

3. The Government of the French Republic considers that the term 'armed conflict' in article 8, paragraphs 2 (b) and (c), in and of itself and in its context, refers to a situation of a kind which does not include the commission of ordinary crimes, including acts of terrorism, whether collective or isolated.

4. The situation referred to in article 8, paragraph 2 (b) (xx-iii), of the Statute does not preclude France from directing attacks against objectives considered as military objectives under international humanitarian law.

5. The Government of the French Republic declares that the term "military advantage" in article 8, paragraph 2 (b) (iv), refers to the advantage anticipated from the attack as a whole and not from isolated or specific elements thereof.

6. The Government of the French Republic declares that a specific area may be considered a "military objective" as referred to in article 8, paragraph 2 (b) as a whole if, by reason of its situation, nature, use, location, total or partial destruction, capture or neutralization, taking into account the circumstances of the moment, it offers a decisive military advantage.

The Government of the French Republic considers that the provisions of article 8, paragraph 2 (b) (ii) and (v), do not refer to possible collateral damage resulting from attacks directed against military objectives.

7. The Government of the French Republic declares that the risk of damage to the natural environment as a result of the use of methods and means of warfare, as envisaged in article 8, paragraph 2 (b) (iv), must be weighed objectively on the basis of the information available at the time of its assessment.

...

III. Declaration under article 124:

Pursuant to article 124 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court, the French Republic declares that it does not accept the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the category of crimes referred to in article 8 when a crime is alleged to have been committed by its nationals or on its territory.

ISRAEL

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Being an active consistent supporter of the concept of an International Criminal Court, and its realization in the form of the Rome Statute, the Government of the State of Israel is proud to thus express its acknowledgment of the importance, and indeed indispensability, of an effective court for the enforcement of the rule of law and the prevention of impunity.

As one of the originators of the concept of an International Criminal Court, Israel, through its prominent lawyers and statesmen, has, since the early 1950's, actively participated in all stages of the formation of such a court. Its representatives, carrying in both heart and mind collective, and sometimes personal, memories of the holocaust - the greatest and most heinous crime to have been committed in the history of mankind - enthusiastically, with a sense of acute sincerity and seriousness, contributed to all stages of the preparation of the Statute. Responsibly, possessing the same sense of mission, they currently support the work of the ICC Preparatory Commission.

At the 1998 Rome Conference, Israel expressed its deep disappointment and regret at the insertion into the Statute of formulations tailored to meet the political agenda of certain states. Israel warned that such an unfortunate practice might reflect on the intent to abuse the Statute as a political tool. Today, in the same spirit, the Government of the State of Israel signs the Statute while rejecting any attempt to interpret provisions thereof in a politically motivated manner against Israel and its citizens. The Government of Israel hopes that Israel's expressions of concern of any such attempt would be recorded in history as a warning against the risk of politicization, that might undermine the objectives of what is intended to become a central impartial body, benefiting mankind as a whole.

Nevertheless, as a democratic society, Israel has been conducting ongoing political, public and academic debates concerning the ICC and its significance in the context of international law and the international community. The Court's essentiality - as a vital means of ensuring that criminals who commit genuinely heinous crimes will be duly brought to justice, while other potential offenders of the fundamental principles of humanity and the dictates of public conscience will be properly deterred - has never seized to guide us. Israel's signature of the Rome Statute will, therefore, enable it to morally identify with this basic idea, underlying the establishment of the Court.

Today, [the Government of Israel is] honoured to express [its] sincere hopes that the Court, guided by the cardinal judicial principles of objectivity and universality, will indeed serve its noble and meritorious objectives."

JORDAN

Interpretative declaration:

"The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan hereby declares that nothing under its national law including the Constitution, is inconsistent with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. As such, it interprets such national law as giving effect to the full application of the Rome Statute and the exercise of relevant jurisdiction thereunder."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration pursuant to article 103, paragraph 1 of the Statute:

"Pursuant to article 103, paragraph 1 of the Statute, the Principality of Liechtenstein declares its willingness to accept persons sentenced to imprisonment by the Court, for purposes of execution of the sentence, if the persons are Liechtenstein citizens or if the persons' usual residence is in the Principality of Liechtenstein".

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

"... AND WHEREAS, it is provided in paragraph1(b) of Article 103, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania is willing to accept persons, sentenced by the International Criminal Court to serve the sentence of imprisonment, if such persons are nationals of the Republic of Lithuania."

MALTA

Declarations:

"Article 20, paragraphs 3 (a) and (b).

With regard to article 20 paragraphs 3 (a) and (b) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court Malta declares that according to its constitution no person who shows that he has been tried by any competent court for a criminal offence and either convicted or acquitted shall again be tried for that offence or for any other criminal offence of which he could have been convicted at the trial for that offence save upon the order of a superior court made in the course of appeal or review proceedings relating to the conviction or acquittal; and no person shall be tried for a criminal offence if he shows that he has been pardoned for that offence.

It is presumed that under the general principles of law a trial as described in paragraphs 3 (a) and (b) of Article 20 of the Statute would be considered a nullity and would not be taken into account in the application of the above constitutional rule. However, the matter has never been the subject of any judgment before the Maltese courts.

The prerogative of mercy will only be exercised in Malta in conformity with its obligations under International law including those arising from the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

"1. The Government of New Zealand notes that the majority of the war crimes specified in article 8 of the Rome Statute, in particular those in article 8 (2) (b) (i)-(v) and 8 (2) (e) (i)-(iv) (which relate to various kinds of attacks on civilian targets), make no reference to the type of the weapons employed to commit the particular crime. The Government of New Zealand recalls that the fundamental principle that underpins international humanitarian law is to mitigate and circumscribe the cruelty of war for humanitarian reasons and that, rather than being limited to weaponry of an earlier time, this branch of law has evolved, and continues to evolve, to meet contemporary circumstances. Accordingly, it is the view of the Government of New Zealand that it would be inconsistent with principles of international humanitarian law to purpot to limit the scope of article 8, in particular article 8 (2) (b), to events that involve conventional weapons only.

2. The Government of New Zealand finds support for its view in the Advisory Opinion of the International Court of Justice on the *Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons* (1996) and draws attention to paragraph 86, in particular, where the Court stated that the conclusion that humanitarian law did not apply to such weapons "would be incompatible with the intrinsically humanitarian character of the legal principles in question which permeates the entire law of armed conflict and applies to all forms of warfare and to all kinds of weapons, those of the past, those of the present and those of the future."

3. The Government of New Zealand further notes that international humanitarian law applies equally to aggressor and defender states and its application in a particular context is not dependent on a determination of whether or not a state is acting in self-defence. In this respect it refers to paragraphs 40-42 of the Advisory Opinion in the *Nuclear Weapons Case*."

PORTUGAL

Declaration:

"... with the following declaration:

The Portuguese Republic declares the intention to exercise its jurisdictional powers over every person found in the Portuguese territory, that is being prosecuted for the crimes set forth in article 5, paragraph 1 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, within the respect for the Portuguese criminal legislation. ..."

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 103, paragraph 1 (b) of the Statute the Slovak Republic declares that it would accept, if necessary, persons sentenced by the Court, if the persons are citizens of the Slovak Republic or have a permanent residence in its territory, for purposes of execution of the sentence of imprisonment and at the same time it will apply the principle of conversion of sentence imposed by the Court."

SPAIN

Declaration under article 103, paragraph 1(b):

Spain declares its willingness to accept at the appropriate time, persons sentenced by the International Criminal Court, provided that the duration of the sentence does not exceed the maximum stipulated for any crime under Spanish law.

SWEDEN

Statement:

"In connection with the deposit of its instrument of ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and, with regard to the war crimes specified in Article 8 of the Statute which relate to the methods of warfare, the Government of the Kingdom of Sweden would like to recall the Advisory Opinion given by the International Court of Justice on 8 July 1996 on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, and in particular paragraphs 85 to 87 thereof, in which the Court finds that there can be no doubt as to the applicability of humanitarian law to nuclear weapons."

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

In accordance with article 103, paragraph 1, of the Statute, Switzerland declares that it is prepared to be responsible for enforcement of sentences of imprisonment handed down by the Court against Swiss nationals or persons habitually resident in Switzerland.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration:

"The United Kingdom understands the term "the established framework of international law", used in article 8 (2) (b) and (e), to include customary international law as established by State practice and opinio iuris. In that context the United Kingdom confirms and draws to the attention of the Court its views as expressed, inter alia, in its statements made on ratification of relevant instruments of international law, including the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12th August 1949, and relating to the Protection of Victims of International Armed Conflicts (Protocol I) of 8th June 1977."

URUGUAY[8]

Interpretative declaration:

As a State party to the Rome Statute, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay shall ensure its application to the full extent of the powers of the State insofar as it is competent in that respect and in strict accordance with the Constitutional provisions of the Republic.

Pursuant to the provisions of part 9 of the Statute entitled "International cooperation and judicial assistance", the Executive shall within six months refer to the Legislature a bill establishing the procedures for ensuring the application of the Statute.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

FINLAND

8 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Uruguay upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of these interpretative declarations, in particular the statement that "as a State party to the Rome Statute, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay shall ensure its application to the full extent of the powers of the State insofar as it is competent in that respect and in strict accordance with the Constitutional provisions of the Republic." Such a statement, without further specification, has to be considered in substance as a reservation which raises doubts as to the commitment of Uruguay to the object and purpose of the Statute.

The Government of Finland would like to recall Article 120 of the Rome Statute and the general principle relating to internal law and observance of treaties, according to which a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Statute between Finland and Uruguay. The Statute will thus become operative between the two states without Uruguay benefiting from its reservation."

GERMANY

7 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Uruguay upon ratification:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the Interpretative Declaration to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court made by the Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay at the time of its ratification of the Statute.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that the Interpretative Declaration with regard to the compatibility of the rules of the Statute with the provisions of the Constitution of Uruguay is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Statute on a unilateral basis. As it is provided in article 120 of the Statute that no reservation may be made to the Statute, this reservation should not be made.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforementioned "declaration" made by the Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Statute between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Eastern Republic of Uruguay."

NETHERLANDS

8 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Uruguay upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the interpretative declaration made by the Government of Uruguay and regards the declaration made by the Government of Uruguay to effectively be a reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the application of the Statute by the Government of Uruguay will be limited by the bounds of national legislation. The reservation made by Uruguay therefore raises doubts as to the commitment of Uruguay to the object and purpose of the Statute.

Article 120 of the Statute precludes reservations.

On these two grounds the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by Uruguay to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Statute between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Uruguay. The Statute will be effective between the two States, without Uruguay benefiting from its reservation."

SWEDEN

7 July 2003

With regard to the declaration made by Uruguay upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the interpretative declaration made by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay upon ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court (the Statute).

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by Uruguay to the Statute in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Sweden notes that the application of the Statute is being made subject to a general reference to possible limits of the competence of the State and the constitutional provisions of Uruguay. Such a general reservation referring to national legislation without specifying its contents makes it unclear to what extent the reserving State considers itself bound by the obligations of the Statute. The reservation made by Uruguay therefore raises doubts as to the commitment of Uruguay to the object and purpose of the Statute.

According to article 120 of the Statute no reservations shall be permitted. The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Uruguay to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Statute between Sweden and Uruguay. The Statute enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Uruguay benefiting from its reservation."

Notifications made under article 87, paragraphs 1 and 2
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ALBANIA

30 August 2004

"In accordance with article 87, paragraph 1, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Republic of Albania declares that the requests of the Court shall be sent through diplomatic channels to the Ministry of Justice, Department of International Judicial Cooperation, Boulevard A. Zog, Tirana, Albania.

In accordance with article 87, paragraph 2, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the requests for cooperation and all the supporting documents of the requests, shall be in Albanian Language and in one of the working languages of the Court, English or French."

ANDORRA

With regard to article 87, paragraph 1, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Principality of Andorra declares that all requests for cooperation made by the Court under part IX of the Statute must be transmitted through the diplomatic channel.

With regard to article 87, paragraph 2, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Principality of Andorra declares that all requests for cooperation and any supporting documents that it receives from the Court must, in accordance with article 50 of the Statute establishing Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish as the official languages of the Court, be drafted in French or Spanish or accompanied, where necessary, by a translation into one of these languages.

ARGENTINA

With regard to article 87, paragraph 2, of the Statute, the Argentine Republic hereby declares that requests for cooperation coming from the Court, and any accompanying documentation, shall be in Spanish or shall be accompanied by a translation into Spanish.

26 January 2005

Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Rome Statute, the Argentine Government wishes to inform the Secretary-General, in his capacity as depositary of the Rome Statute, that it has chosen the diplomatic channel as the channel of communication. To that end, communications from the International Criminal Court should be addressed to the Embassy of the Argentine Republic at The Hague, which shall transmit them to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, International Trade and Worship and, through that Ministry, to the relevant local authorities, where necessary.

This communication has also been transmitted, by the Embassy of the Argentine Republic to the Netherlands, to the Registry of the International Criminal Court.

AUSTRALIA

10 March 2004

".....[P]ursuant to paragraph 1 (a) of Article 87 of the Rome Statute,.....the Australian Government has designated the Australian Embassy to The Netherlands as the diplomatic channel for transmission of requests for cooperation in accordance with that Article.

".....[P]ursuant to paragraph 2 of Article 87 of the Rome Statute, ...any such request for cooperation in accordance with that Article should be either be in, or accompanied by a translation into, English."

AUSTRIA

"Pursuant to aritcle 87, paragraph 2 of the Rome Statute the Republic of Austria declares that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall either be in or be accompanied by a translation into the German language."

BELGIUM

With reference to article 87, paragraph 1, of the Statute, the Kingdom of Belgium declares that the Ministry of Justice is the authority competent to receive requests for cooperation.

With reference to article 87, paragraph 2, the Kingdom of Belgium declares that requests by the Court for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall be in an official language of the Kingdom.

BELIZE

"Pursuant to Article 87 (1) (a) of the Statute of the International Criminal Court, Belize declares that all requests made to it in accordance with Chapter 9 be sent through diplomatic channels."

BRAZIL

".....with regard to article 87, paragraph 2 of the said Statute, the official language of the Federative Republic of Brazil is Portuguese and that all requests for cooperation and any supporting documents that it receives from the Court must be drafted in Portuguese or accompanied by a translation into Portuguese."

COLOMBIA

18 March 2004

[Pursuant] ... to the notification that Colombia must make as a State party to the Rome Statute concerning the communication channel and official language to be used when requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request are transmitted, in accordance with article 87, paragraphs 1(a) and 2 of the above-mentioned instrument ... , [the Government of Colombia wishes to inform] that any communications sent or received in this area should be drafted in Spanish and that the channel for transmission should be the Embassy of Colombia to the Kingdom of the Netherlands, at The Hague, which can be contacted as follows:

Embassy of Colombia to the Kingdom of the Netherlands
Address: Groot Hertoginnelaan 14
2517 EG Den Haag
Netherlands
Telephone:+31-(0)70-3614545
Fax: +31-(0)70-3614636

CROATIA

19 July 2004

"Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1, of the Statute, the Republic of Croatia declares that requests from the Court shall be transmitted through diplomatic channel to the Ministry of Justice - Department for Cooperation with the International Criminal Courts.

Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 2, of the Statute, the Republic of Croatia declares that requests for cooperation and documents supporting the request from the Court shall be in Croatian which is the official language of the Republic of Croatia and shall be accompanied by a translation in English

which is one of the working languages of the International Criminal Court."

CYPRUS

"1. Pursuant to article 87 (1) of the Rome Statute of the International [Criminal] Court, theRepublic of Cyprus declares that requests from the Court may also be transmitted directly to the Ministry of Justice and Public Order.

2. Pursuant to article 87 (2) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Republic of Cyprus declares that requests from the Court for cooperation and any documents supporting them shall be transmitted also in English, which is one of the working languages of the Court."

DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC OF THE CONGO

"Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, requests for cooperation issued by the Court shall be transmitted to the Government Procurator's Office of the Democratic Republic of the Congo;

For any request for cooperation within the meaning of article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, French shall be the official language."

DENMARK

"Pursuant to article 87 (1) of the Statute, Denmark declares that requests from the Court shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel or directly to the Ministry of Justice, which is the authority competent to receive such requests.

Pursuant to article 87 (2) of the Statute, Denmark declares that requests from the Court for cooperation and any documents supporting such requests shall be submitted either in Danish which is the official language of Denmark or in English, which is one of the working languages of the Court."

EGYPT

Pursuant to article 87, paragraphs 1 and 2, the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that the Ministry of Justice shall be the party responsible for dealing with requests for cooperation with the Court. Such requests shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel. Requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall be in the Arabic language, being the official language of the State, and shall be accompanied by a translation into English being one of the working languages of the Court.

ESTONIA

"Pursuant to Article 87, paragraph 1 of the Statute the Republic of Estonia declares that the requests from the International Criminal Court shall be transmitted either through the diplomatic channels or directly to the Public Prosecutor's Office, which is the authority to receive such requests.

Pursuant to 87, paragraph 2 of the Statute the Republic of Estonia declares that requests from the International Criminal Court and any documents supporting such requests shall be submitted either in Estonian which is the official language of the Republic of Estonia or in English which is one of the working languages of the International Criminal Court."

FINLAND

"Pursuant to article 87 (1) (a) of the Statute, the Republic of Finland declares that requests for cooperation shall be transmitted either through the diplomatic channel or directly to the Ministry of Justice, which is the authority competent to receive such requests. The Court may also, if need be, enter into direct contact with other competent authorities of Finland. In matters relating to requests for surrender the Ministry of Justice is the only competent authority.

Pursuant to article 87 (2) of the Statute, the Republic of Finland declares that requests from the Court and any documents supporting such requests shall be submitted either in Finnish or Swedish, which are the official languages of Finland, or in English which is one of the working languages of the Court."

FRANCE

Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 2, of the Statute, the French Republic declares that requests for cooperation, and any documents supporting the request, addressed to it by the Court must be in the French language.

10 May 2004

... The Permanent Mission of France confirms that the channel to be used for transmitting any communication between France and the International Criminal Court shall be the diplomatic channel through the embassy of France at The Hague.

Requests for cooperation from the International Criminal Court should be transmitted in the original or in the form of a certified true copy, accompanied by all supporting documentation. In cases of urgency, such documents may be transmitted by any means to the Procureur de la République (Government Procurator) for Paris. They shall then be transmitted through the diplomatic channel.

GAMBIA

"Pursuant to article 87 (1) of the Statute, the Republic of the Gambia declares that requests from the Court shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel or directly to the Attorney General's Chambers and the Department of State for Justice, which is the authority competent to receive such request.

Pursuant to article 87 (2) of the Statute, the Republic of the Gambia declares that requests from the Court and any document supporting such requests shall be in English which is one of the working languages of the Court and the official language of the Republic of the Gambia."

GEORGIA

".....according to the Chapter 8, Section 2 of the Rome Statute any request for cooperation or additional documentation shall be provided in Georgian language or in adequate translation." *

*[*1. Should read "Article 87, paragraph 2".]*

GERMANY

"The Federal Republic of Germany declares, pursuant to article 87 (1) of the Rome Statute, that requests from the Court can also be transmitted directly to the Federal Ministry of Justice or an agency designated by the Federal Ministry of Justice in an individual case. Requests to the Court can be transmitted directly from the Federal Ministry of Justice or, with the Ministry's agreement, from another competent agency to the Court.

The Federal Republic of Germany further declares, pursuant to article 87 (2) of the Rome Statute, that requests for cooperation to Germany and any documents supporting the request must be accompanied by a translation into German."

GREECE

".....pursuant to article 87 paragraph 1 (a) of the Rome Statute, the Hellenic Republic declares that, until further notice, requests by the Court for cooperation shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel.

Furthermore, pursuant to article 87 paragraph 2 of the Rome Statute, the Hellenic Republic declares that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall be accompanied by a translation into the Greek language."

HONDURAS

13 July 2004

With respect to article 87, paragraph 1 (a), of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Republic of Honduras has designated the Ministry of the Interior and Justice as the competent authority to receive and transmit requests for cooperation. With respect to article 87, paragraph 2, the Republic of Honduras declares that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request should be submitted in the Spanish language, or accompanied by a translation into Spanish. Lastly, with regard to article 103, the Republic of Honduras declares its willingness to accept persons sentenced by the Court, provided that such persons are of Honduran nationality, the Court has decided their cases pursuant to article 21, paragraph 1 (c), and the terms of their sentences are equal to or less than the maximum terms permitted by Honduran law for committing the crimes of which they have been convicted.

II. This Agreement shall be submitted to the Sovereign National Congress for its consideration, for the purposes of article 205, paragraph 30, of the Constitution of the Republic.

For communications: (F) Ricardo Maduro: President; Secretary of State to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs: (F) Guillermo Pérez-Cadalso.

HUNGARY

"... the Government of the Republic of Hungary makes the following declaration in relation to Article 87 of the Statute of the International Criminal Court (Rome, 17 July 1998):

Requests of the Court for cooperation shall be transmitted to the Government of the Republic of Hungary through diplomatic channel. These requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall be made in English."

ICELAND

9 June 2004

1. With reference to article 87, paragraph 1(a), of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Iceland declares that the Ministry of Justice is designated as the channel for the transmission of requests for cooperation from the Court.

2. With reference to article 87, paragraph 2, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, Iceland declares that requests for cooperation from the Court and any documents supporting the requests shall be submitted in English, which is one of the working languages of the Court.

ITALY

28 April 2004

"Italy hereby specifies that it would like to receive the requests for cooperation provided for by Article 87 of the Rome Statute through diplomatic channels. The language in which those requests and the relevant documents should be received is Italian, together with a French translation."

LATVIA

"Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 2 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court the Republic of Latvia declares that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall either be in or be accompanied by a translation into the Latvian language."

LESOTHO

17 March 2004

"Pursuant to Article 87 paragraph 1 (a) and 2 of the Rome Statute establishing the International Criminal Court, with regard to the Kingdom of Lesotho, requests for cooperation and any documents supporting such requests shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel, that is, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Lesotho, and such communication be in the English language."

LIECHTENSTEIN

"Declaration pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, concerning the central authority:

Requests of the Court made pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, shall be transmitted to the central authority for cooperation with the International Criminal Court, namely the Ministry of Justice of the Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein.

"Declaration pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, concerning direct service of documents:

Pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, the Court may serve in decisions and other records or documents upon recipients in the Principality of Liechtenstein directly by mail. A summons to appear before the Court as a witness or expert shall be accompanied by the Rule of Procedure and Evidence of the Court on self-incrimination; this Rule shall be given to the person concerned in a language that the person understands.

"Declaration pursuant to article 87, paragraph 2 of the Statute, concerning the official language:

The official language in the sense of article 87, paragraph 2 of the Statute is German. Requests and supporting documentation shall be submitted in the official language of the Principality of Liechtenstein, German, or translated into German.

LITHUANIA

"AND WHEREAS, it is provided in paragraph 1 of Article 87, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that requests of the International Criminal Court for cooperation may be transmitted directly to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania or to the Prosecutor's General Office of the Republic of Lithuania;

AND WHEREAS, it is provided in paragraph 2 of Article 87, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that requests of the International Criminal Court for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall be presented either in Lithuanian language, which is State Language of the Republic of Lithuania, or in English language, which is one of the working languages of the International Criminal Court, or be accompanied by a translation either into Lithuanian language or in English language;..."

LUXEMBOURG

3 March 2004

.....French is the language chosen by the Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and that the Embassy of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg at The Hague is the most appropriate channel for the transmission of all communications with the International Criminal Court.

MALI

21 May 2004

Pursuant to article 87, paragraphs 1 (a) and 2 of the Rome Statute, relating to the designation of channels of communication between States parties and the Court and to the language to

be used in requests for cooperation, the Permanent Mission of Mali to the United Nations has the honour to inform the Secretariat that the Government of Mali wishes such requests to be addressed to it in French, the official language, through the diplomatic channel.

Malta

"Malta declares, pursuant to article 87, paragraph 2 of the Statute, that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request, must be in English or accompanied, where necessary, by a translation into English."

Marshall Islands

18 February 2004

".....the Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Marshall Islands to the United Nations is the designated channel of communication between the States Parties and the Court and English is the designated language.

.....Please find below the Mission's contact information:

Permanent Mission of the Republic of the Marshall Islands
to the United Nations
800 Second Avenue, 18th Floor
New York, New York 10017
Tel No: (212) 983-3040
Fax No: (212) 983-3202
Email: marshallislands@un.int"

Mexico

The Government of the United Mexican States requests, in accordance with article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, that the requests for cooperation from the International Criminal Court shall be transmitted through diplomatic channels to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Similarly, the Government of the United Mexican States decides that the request for cooperation from the International Criminal Court, and any documents supporting such requests to which article 87, paragraph 2 refers, shall be written in or submitted together with a translation into Spanish.

Montenegro[4]

Confirmed upon succession :

"...in accordance with article 87, paragraphs 1 (a) and 2 of the Rome Statute, Serbia and Montenegro has designated Diplomatic Channel of communication as its channel of communication with the International Criminal Court and Serbian and English language as the languages of communication."

Namibia

".....with reference to Article 87 paragraph 2 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, [the Republic of Namibia] declares that all requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request, must either be in, or be accompanied by a translation into the English language."

21 July 2004

".....in terms of the provisions of Article 87 (1) (a) of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Republic of Namibia designates the Namibian diplomatic channel or the Permanent Secretary, Ministry of Justice of the Government of the Republic of Namibia as the appropriate channel of communication."

Netherlands

10 March 2004

"[Pursuant] to article 87, paragraphs 1(a) and 2 of the Rome Statute concerning designation of channels and languages of communication between States Parties and the Court, ... the Kingdom of the Netherlands indicates English as language of communication and designates as national authority charged with receiving communications:

Ministry of Justice
Office of International Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters
Postbus 20301
2500 EH Den Haag
Fax. (+31) (0) 70 370 7945"

New Zealand

9 March 2004

[Pursuant to] article 87 paragraphs 1 (a) and 2 of the Rome Statute concerning designation of channels and language of communication between the States Parties to the Rome Statute and the International Criminal Court, [the Government of New Zealand has the] honour to advise that [it] designates the diplomatic channel through the New Zealand Embassy in The Hague as its preferred channel of communication with the International Criminal Court, and English as its preferred language of communication."

Norway

"1. With reference to Article 87, paragraph 1 (a), the Kingdom of Norway hereby declares that the Royal Ministry of Justice is designated as the channel for the transmission of requests from the Court.

2. With reference to Article 87, paragraph 2, the Kingdom of Norway hereby declares that requests from the Court and any documents supporting the request shall be submitted in English, which is one of the working languages of the Court."

Panama

25 May 2004

..... requests for cooperation pursuant to article 87, paragraph 1 (a), of the Rome Statute shall be transmitted by the Court to the Republic of Panama through the diplomatic channel.

In addition, requests for cooperation pursuant to paragraph 2 of the aforementioned article, and any documents supporting such requests, shall be written in or translated into Spanish, the official language of the Republic of Panama.

Peru

The Permanent Mission of Peru wishes to state that the channel of communication with the International Criminal Court shall be the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Peru through the Embassy of Peru in the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and furthermore that requests for cooperation by the International Criminal Court to Peru should be made in the Spanish language or be accompanied by a translation into Spanish.

Poland

In accordance with Article 87 paragraph 2 of the Statute the Republic of Poland declares that applications on cooperation submitted by Court and documents added to them shall be made in Polish language.

PORTUGAL

"With regard to article 87, paragraph 2 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Portuguese Republic declares that all requests for cooperation and any supporting documents that it receives from the Court must be drafted in Portuguese or accompanied by a translation into Portuguese."

ROMANIA

"1. With reference to article 87 paragraph 1 (a) of the Statute, the Ministry of Justice is the Romanian authority competent to receive the requests of the International Criminal Court, to send them immediately for resolution to the Romanian judicial competent bodies, and to communicate to the International Criminal Court the relevant documents:

2. With reference to article 87 paragraph 2 of the Statute, the requests of the International Criminal Court and the relevant documents shall be transmitted in the English language, or accompanied by official translations in this language."

SAMOA

"[The Government of Samoa] has the honour to advise that in pursuance of article 87 paragraphs 1 (a) and 2 of the Rome Statute concerning the designation of channels and languages of communication between the States Parties and the International Criminal Court, such channel and language of communication is as follows:

Channel: Permanent Mission of Samoa to the United Nations
800 Second Avenue, Suite 400 J
New York, New York 10017
Tel: (212) 599-6196 Fax: (212) 599-0797

Language: English."

SERBIA

26 May 2006

Confirmed upon succession :

"...in accordance with article 87, paragraphs 1 (a) and 2 of the Rome Statute, Serbia and Montenegro has designated Diplomatic Channel of communication as its channel of communication with the International Criminal Court and Serbian and English language as the languages of communication."

SIERRA LEONE

30 April 2004

".....the Permanent Mission of Sierra Leone to the United Nations remains the main channel of communication between Sierra Leone as a State Party and the Court, the language of communication is English."

SLOVAKIA

"Pursuant to Article 87, paragraph 2 of the Statute the Slovak Republic declares that requests from the Court for cooperation and any documents supporting such requests shall be submitted in English which is one of the working languages of the Court along with the translation into Slovak which is the official language of the Slovak Republic."

SLOVENIA

27 June 2006

"Pursuant to Article 87, paragraph 1 (a) of the Rome Statute the Republic of Slovenia declares that requests for cooperation made by the Court, shall be addressed to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Slovenia.

Pursuant to Article 87, paragraph 2 of the Rome Statute the Republic of Slovenia declares that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting the request shall either be in or be accompanied by translation into Slovene language."

SPAIN

In relation to article 87, paragraph 1, of the Statute, the Kingdom of Spain declares that, without prejudice to the fields of competence of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Justice shall be the competent authority to transmit requests for cooperation made by the Court or addressed to the Court.

In relation to article 87, paragraph 2, of the Statute, the Kingdom of Spain declares that requests for cooperation addressed to it by the Court and any supporting documents must be in Spanish or accompanied by a translation into Spanish.

SWEDEN

"With regard to Article 87, paragraph 1, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Kingdom of Sweden declares that all requests for cooperation made by the Court under part IX of the Statute must be transmitted through the Swedish Ministry of Justice.

With regard to Article 87, paragraph 2, of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Kingdom of Sweden declares that all requests for cooperation and any supporting documents that it receives from the Court must be drafted in English or Swedish, or accompanied, where necessary, by a translation into one of these languages."

SWITZERLAND

Requests for cooperation made by the Court under article 87, paragraph 1 (a), of the Statute shall be transmitted to the Central Office for Cooperation with the International Criminal Court of the Federal Bureau of Justice.

The official languages within the meaning of article 87, paragraph 2, of the Statute, shall be French, German and Italian.

The Court may serve notice of its decisions and other procedural steps or documents on the persons to whom such decisions or documents are addressed in Switzerland directly through the mail. Any summons to appear in Court as a witness or expert shall be accompanied by the provision of the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Court concerning self-incrimination; that provision shall be provided to the person concerned in a language which he or she is able to understand.

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

27 May 2004

".....pursuant to Article 87 (1) of the Statute, that requests from the Court shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel or directly to the Ministry of Justice, which is the authority competent to receive such requests.

.....pursuant to Article 87 (2) of the Statute, that requests from the Court for cooperation and any documents supporting such requests shall be submitted either in Macedonian which is the official language of the Republic of Macedonia or in English, which is one of the working languages of the Court."

TIMOR-LESTE

"... that the official language of communication between the Court and the Government of the Democratic Republic of Timor-Leste shall be English."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The United Kingdom declares. pursuant to article 87 (2) of the Statute, that requests for co-operation, and any documents supporting the request, must be in the English language."

URUGUAY

19 July 2002

.....in accordance with article 87, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Criminal Court, the Government of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay wishes to inform the Secretary-General that requests for cooperation and any documents supporting such requests should be drawn up in Spanish or be accompanied by a translation into Spanish.

5 March 2004

".....according to article 87 paragraph 1 (a) of the Rome Statute, ...the Government of Uruguay has designated the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as its channel of communication with the International Criminal Court."

Notes:

[1] On 6 November 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United States of America the following communication dated 5 November 1998, relating to the proposed corrections to the Statute circulated on 25 September 1998:

"[...] The United States wishes to note a number of concerns and objections regarding the procedure proposed for the correction of the six authentic texts and certified true copies:

"First, the United States wishes to draw attention to the fact that, in addition to the corrections which the Secretary-General now proposes, other changes had already been made to the text which was actually adopted by the Conference, without any notice or procedure. The text before the Conference was contained in A/CONF.183/C.1/L.76 and Adds. 1-13. The text which was issued as a final document, A/CONF.183/9, is not the same text. Apparently, it was this latter text which was presented for signature on July 18. even though it differed in a number of respects from the text that was adopted only hours before. At least three of these changes are arguably substantive, including the changes made to Article 12, paragraph 2(b), the change made to Article 93, paragraph 5, and the change made to Article 124. Of these three changes, the Secretary-General now proposes to "re-correct" only Article 124, so that it returns to the original text, but the other changes remain. The United States remains concerned, therefore, that the corrections process should have been based on the text that was actually adopted by the Conference.

"Second, the United States notes that the Secretary-General's communication suggests that it is "established depositary practice" that only signatory States or contracting States may object to a proposed correction. The United States does not seek to object to any of the proposed corrections, or to the additional corrections that were made earlier and without formal notice, although this should not be taken as an endorsement of the merits of any of the corrections proposed. The United States does note, however, that insofar as arguably substantive changes have been made to the original text without any notice or procedure, as noted above in relation to Articles 12 and 93, if any question of interpretation should subsequently arise it should be resolved consistent with A/CONF.183/C.1/L.76, the text that was actually adopted.

"More fundamentally, however, as a matter of general principle and for future reference, the United States objects to any correction procedure, immediately following a diplomatic conference, whereby the views of the vast majority of the Conference participants on the text which they have only just adopted would not be taken into account. The United States does not agree that the course followed by the Secretary-General in July represents "established depositary practice" for the type of circumstances presented here. To the extent that such a procedure has previously been established, it must necessarily rest on the assumption that the Conference itself had an adequate opportunity, in the first instance, to ensure the adoption of a technically correct text. Under the circumstances which have prevailed in some recent conferences, and which will likely recur, in which critical portions of the text are resolved at very late stages and there is no opportunity for the usual technical review by the Drafting Committee, the kind of corrections process which is contemplated here must be open to all.

"In accordance with Article 77, paragraph 1 (e) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the United States requests that this note be communicated to all States which are entitled to become parties to the Convention."

[2] With a territorial exclusion to the effect that "Until further notice, the Statute shall not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland".

Subsequently, on 17 November 2004 and 20 November 2006, respectively, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark the following territorial applications:

"With reference to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, done at Rome on 17 July 1998, [the Government of Denmark informs the Secretary-General] that by Royal [Decrees of 20 August 2004 entering into force on 1 October 2004, and 1 September 2006 entering into force on 1 October 2006, respectively] the above Convention will also be applicable in [Greenland and the Faroe Islands].

Denmark therefore withdraws its declaration made upon ratification of the said Convention to the effect that the Convention should not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

[3] On 28 August 2002, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel, the following communication:

".....in connection with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court adopted on 17 July 1998, [...] Israel does not intend to become a party to the treaty. Accordingly, Israel has no legal obligations arising from its signature on 31 December 2000. Israel requests that its intention not to become a party, as expressed in this letter, be reflected in the depositary's status lists relating to this treaty."

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[6] With a declaration to the effect that "consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account its commitment to the development of self-government through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory.".

[7] In a communication received on 6 May 2002, the Government of the United States of America informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"This is to inform you, in connection with the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court adopted on July 17, 1998, that the United States does not intend to become a party to the treaty. Accordingly, the United States has no legal obligations arising from its signature on December 31, 2000. The United States requests that its intention not to become a party, as expressed in this letter, be reflected in the depositary's status lists relating to this treaty."

[8] The Secretary-General received communications with regard to the interpretative declaration made by Uruguay upon ratification from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Ireland (28 July 2003):

"Ireland has examined the text of the interpretative declaration made by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay upon ratifying the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

Ireland notes that the said interpretative declaration provides that the application of the Rome Statute by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay shall be subject to the provisions of the Constitution of Uruguay.

Ireland considers this interpretative declaration to be in substance a reservation.

Article 120 of the Rome Statute expressly precludes the making of reservations. In addition, it is a rule of international law that a state may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as a justification for its failure to perform its treaty obligations.

Ireland therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Statute between Ireland and the Eastern Republic of Uruguay. The Statute will therefore be effective between the two states, without Uruguay benefiting from its reservation."

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (31 July 2003):

"At the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay made two statements which are called "interpretative declarations", at the first of which states that "as a State party to the Rome Statute, the Eastern Republic of Uruguay shall ensure its application to the full extent of the powers of the State insofar as it is competent in that respect and in strict accordance with the Constitutional provisions of the Republic".

The Government of the United Kingdom has given careful consideration to the so-called interpretative declaration quoted above. The Government of the United Kingdom is obliged to conclude that this so-called interpretative declaration purports to exclude or modify the legal effects of the Rome Statute in its application to the Eastern Republic of Uruguay and is accordingly a reservation. However, according to Article 120 of the Rome Statute, no reservations may be made thereto.

Accordingly, the Government objects to the above-quoted reservation by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay. However, this objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Rome Statute between the United Kingdom and Uruguay."

Uruguay (21 July 2003):

The Eastern Republic of Uruguay, by Act No. 17.510 of 27 June 2002 ratified by the legislative branch, gave its approval to the Rome Statute in terms fully compatible with Uruguay's constitutional order. While the Constitution is a law of higher rank to which all other laws are subject, this does not in any way constitute a reservation to any of the provisions of that international instrument.

It is noted for all necessary effects that the Rome Statute has unequivocally preserved the normal functioning of national jurisdictions and that the jurisdiction of the International Criminal Court is exercised only in the absence of the exercise of national jurisdiction.

Accordingly, it is very clear that the above-mentioned Act imposes no limits or conditions on the application of the Statute, fully authorizing the functioning of the national legal system without detriment to the Statute.

The interpretative declaration made by Uruguay upon ratifying the Statute does not, therefore, constitute a reservation of any kind.

Lastly, mention should be made of the significance that Uruguay attaches to the Rome Statute as a notable expression of the progressive development of international law on a highly sensitive issue.

Demark (21 August 2003):

Denmark has carefully examined the interpretative declaration made by Eastern Republic of Uruguay upon ratifying the Statute of the IInternational Criminal Court.

Denmark has noted that Uruguay effectively condition its application of provisions of the Statute on their accordance with the Constitution of Uruguay. The Government of Denmark believes that an interpretative declaration to this effect in substance must be understood as a reservation to the Statute, which if accepted would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Statute. In addition, Article 120 of the Statute expressly precludes the making of reservations to the Statute.

For these reasons Denmark objects to the reservation made by the Eastern Republic of Uruguay to the Statute of the International Criminal Court.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Statute between Denmark and the Eastern Republic of Uruguay. The Statute will be effective between the two states, without the Eastern Republic of Uruguay benefiting from its reservations.

Norway (29 August 2003):

"The Government of the Kingdom of Norway has examined the interpretative declaration made by the Government of Uruguay upon ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.

The Government of Norway notes that the interpretative declaration purports to limit the application of the Statute within national legislation, and therefore constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Norway recalls that according to Article 120 of the Statute, no reservations may be made to the Statute.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Uruguay upon ratification of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Statute in its entirety between the Kingdom of Norway and Uruguay. The Statute thus becomes operative between the Kingdom of Norway and Uruguay without Uruguay benefiting from the reservation."

11. International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism

New York, 9 December 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 April 2002, in accordance with article 26 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 10 April 2002, No. 38349.

STATUS: Signatories: 132. Parties: 156.

TEXT: Resolution A/RES/54/109; depositary notifications C.N.327.2000.TREATIES-12 of 30 May 2000 (rectification of the original text of the Convention); and C.N.3.2002.TREATIES-1 of 2 January 2002 [proposal for corrections to the original text of the Convention (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)] and C.N.86.2002.TREATIES-4 of 1 February 2002 [Rectification of the original of the Convention (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)]; C.N.312.2002.TREATIES-14 of 4 April 2002 [proposal of a correction to the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)] and C.N.420.2002.TREATIES-20 of 3 May 2002 [rectification of the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)].

Note: The Convention was adopted by Resolution 54/109 of 9 December 1999 at the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 25 (1), the Convention will be open for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters from 10 January 2000 to 31 December 2001.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania	18 Dec 2001	10 Apr 2002
Algeria	18 Jan 2000	8 Nov 2001
Andorra	11 Nov 2001	
Antigua and Barbuda		11 Mar 2002 a
Argentina	28 Mar 2001	22 Aug 2005
Armenia	15 Nov 2001	16 Mar 2004
Australia	15 Oct 2001	26 Sep 2002
Austria	24 Sep 2001	15 Apr 2002
Azerbaijan	4 Oct 2001	26 Oct 2001
Bahamas	2 Oct 2001	1 Nov 2005
Bahrain	14 Nov 2001	21 Sep 2004
Bangladesh		26 Aug 2005 a
Barbados	13 Nov 2001	18 Sep 2002
Belarus	12 Nov 2001	6 Oct 2004
Belgium	27 Sep 2001	17 May 2004
Belize	14 Nov 2001	1 Dec 2003
Benin	16 Nov 2001	30 Aug 2004
Bhutan	14 Nov 2001	22 Mar 2004
Bolivia	10 Nov 2001	7 Jan 2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11 Nov 2001	10 Jun 2003
Botswana	8 Sep 2000	8 Sep 2000
Brazil	10 Nov 2001	16 Sep 2005
Brunei Darussalam		4 Dec 2002 a
Bulgaria	19 Mar 2001	15 Apr 2002
Burkina Faso		1 Oct 2003 a
Burundi	13 Nov 2001	
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	12 Dec 2005
Cameroon		6 Feb 2006 a
Canada	10 Feb 2000	19 Feb 2002
Cape Verde	13 Nov 2001	10 May 2002
Central African Republic	19 Dec 2001	
Chile	2 May 2001	10 Nov 2001
China[1]	13 Nov 2001	19 Apr 2006
Colombia	30 Oct 2001	14 Sep 2004
Comoros	14 Jan 2000	25 Sep 2003
Congo	14 Nov 2001	
Cook Islands	24 Dec 2001	4 Mar 2004
Costa Rica	14 Jun 2000	24 Jan 2003
Côte d'Ivoire		13 Mar 2002 a
Croatia	11 Nov 2001	1 Dec 2003
Cuba	19 Oct 2001	15 Nov 2001
Cyprus	1 Mar 2001	30 Nov 2001
Czech Republic	6 Sep 2000	27 Dec 2005
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	12 Nov 2001	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Nov 2001	28 Oct 2005
Denmark[2]	25 Sep 2001	27 Aug 2002
Djibouti	15 Nov 2001	13 Mar 2006
Dominica		24 Sep 2004 a
Dominican Republic	15 Nov 2001	
Ecuador	6 Sep 2000	9 Dec 2003
Egypt	6 Sep 2000	1 Mar 2005
El Salvador		15 May 2003 a
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Estonia	6 Sep 2000	22 May 2002
Finland	10 Jan 2000	28 Jun 2002 A
France	10 Jan 2000	7 Jan 2002
Gabon	8 Sep 2000	10 Mar 2005
Georgia	23 Jun 2000	27 Sep 2002
Germany	20 Jul 2000	17 Jun 2004

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Ghana	12 Nov 2001	6 Sep 2002
Greece	8 Mar 2000	16 Apr 2004
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala	23 Oct 2001	12 Feb 2002
Guinea	16 Nov 2001	14 Jul 2003
Guinea-Bissau	14 Nov 2001	
Honduras	11 Nov 2001	25 Mar 2003
Hungary	30 Nov 2001	14 Oct 2002
Iceland	1 Oct 2001	15 Apr 2002
India	8 Sep 2000	22 Apr 2003
Indonesia	24 Sep 2001	29 Jun 2006
Ireland	15 Oct 2001	30 Jun 2005
Israel	11 Jul 2000	10 Feb 2003
Italy	13 Jan 2000	27 Mar 2003
Jamaica	10 Nov 2001	16 Sep 2005
Japan	30 Oct 2001	11 Jun 2002 A
Jordan	24 Sep 2001	28 Aug 2003
Kazakhstan		24 Feb 2003 a
Kenya	4 Dec 2001	27 Jun 2003
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kyrgyzstan		2 Oct 2003 a
Latvia	18 Dec 2001	14 Nov 2002
Lesotho	6 Sep 2000	12 Nov 2001
Liberia		5 Mar 2003 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	9 Jul 2002
Liechtenstein	2 Oct 2001	9 Jul 2003
Lithuania		20 Feb 2003 a
Luxembourg	20 Sep 2001	5 Nov 2003
Madagascar	1 Oct 2001	24 Sep 2003
Malawi		11 Aug 2003 a
Maldives		20 Apr 2004 a
Mali	11 Nov 2001	28 Mar 2002
Malta	10 Jan 2000	11 Nov 2001
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		30 Apr 2003 a
Mauritius	11 Nov 2001	14 Dec 2004
Mexico	7 Sep 2000	20 Jan 2003
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Nov 2001	23 Sep 2002
Moldova	16 Nov 2001	10 Oct 2002
Monaco	10 Nov 2001	10 Nov 2001
Mongolia	12 Nov 2001	25 Feb 2004
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	12 Oct 2001	19 Sep 2002
Mozambique	11 Nov 2001	14 Jan 2003
Myanmar	12 Nov 2001	16 Aug 2006
Namibia	10 Nov 2001	
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	24 May 2005
Netherlands[4]	10 Jan 2000	7 Feb 2002 A
New Zealand[5]	7 Sep 2000	4 Nov 2002
Nicaragua	17 Oct 2001	14 Nov 2002
Niger		30 Sep 2004 a
Nigeria	1 Jun 2000	16 Jun 2003
Norway	1 Oct 2001	15 Jul 2002
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	12 Nov 2001	3 Jul 2002
Papua New Guinea		30 Sep 2003 a
Paraguay	12 Oct 2001	30 Nov 2004
Peru	14 Sep 2000	10 Nov 2001
Philippines	16 Nov 2001	7 Jan 2004
Poland	4 Oct 2001	26 Sep 2003
Portugal	16 Feb 2000	18 Oct 2002
Republic of Korea	9 Oct 2001	17 Feb 2004
Romania	26 Sep 2000	9 Jan 2003
Russian Federation	3 Apr 2000	27 Nov 2002
Rwanda	4 Dec 2001	13 May 2002
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12 Nov 2001	16 Nov 2001
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	3 Dec 2001	28 Mar 2002
Samoa	13 Nov 2001	27 Sep 2002
San Marino	26 Sep 2000	12 Mar 2002
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Saudi Arabia	29 Nov 2001	
Senegal		24 Sep 2004 a
Serbia	12 Nov 2001	10 Oct 2002
Seychelles	15 Nov 2001	30 Mar 2004
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001	26 Sep 2003
Singapore	18 Dec 2001	30 Dec 2002
Slovakia	26 Jan 2001	13 Sep 2002
Slovenia	10 Nov 2001	23 Sep 2004
Somalia	19 Dec 2001	
South Africa	10 Nov 2001	1 May 2003
Spain	8 Jan 2001	9 Apr 2002
Sri Lanka	10 Jan 2000	8 Sep 2000
Sudan	29 Feb 2000	5 May 2003
Swaziland		4 Apr 2003 a
Sweden	15 Oct 2001	6 Jun 2002
Switzerland	13 Jun 2001	23 Sep 2003
Syrian Arab Republic		24 Apr 2005 a
Tajikistan	6 Nov 2001	16 Jul 2004
Thailand	18 Dec 2001	29 Sep 2004
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	31 Jan 2000	30 Aug 2004
Togo	15 Nov 2001	10 Mar 2003
Tonga		9 Dec 2002 a
Tunisia	2 Nov 2001	10 Jun 2003
Turkey	27 Sep 2001	28 Jun 2002
Turkmenistan		7 Jan 2005 a
Uganda	13 Nov 2001	5 Nov 2003
Ukraine	8 Jun 2000	6 Dec 2002
United Arab Emirates		23 Sep 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	10 Jan 2000	7 Mar 2001
United Republic of Tanzania		22 Jan 2003 a
United States of America	10 Jan 2000	26 Jun 2002
Uruguay	25 Oct 2001	8 Jan 2004
Uzbekistan	13 Dec 2000	9 Jul 2001
Vanuatu		31 Oct 2005 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	16 Nov 2001	23 Sep 2003
Viet Nam		25 Sep 2002 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that in order for a dispute to be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties to the dispute shall be required in each case.

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of article 24, paragraph 2, the Argentine Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 24, paragraph 1, and consequently does not accept mandatory recourse to arbitration or to the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

BAHAMAS

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 2.2 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of the Commonwealth of The Bahamas declares that it is not a party to the Agreements listed as items 5 to 9 in the annex referred to in paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of the Convention and that those Agreements shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in paragraph 1, subparagraph (a). Those Agreements are:

Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3rd March, 1980.

Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 24th February, 1988.

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10th March, 1988.

Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome, on 10th March, 1988.

International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15th December, 1997."

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

The Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention.

Declaration:

The following Conventions shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), since Bahrain is not a party thereto:

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973.

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979.

with a political offence or as an offence inspired by political

3. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, signed at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

4. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

6. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

BANGLADESH

Reservation:

"Pursuant to Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention [the] Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

Understanding:

"[The] Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh understands that its accession to this Convention shall not be deemed to be inconsistent with its international obligations under the Constitution of the country."

BELGIUM[6]

Declaration :

I. Concerning article 2, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, the Government of Belgium declares the following:

The following treaties are to be deemed not to be included in the annex:

Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973;

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (Rome, 10 March 1988);

Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf (Rome, 10 March 1988);

International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

II. The Government of Belgium interprets paragraphs 1 and 3 of article 2 as follows: an offence in the sense of the Convention is committed by any person who provides or collects funds if by doing so he contributes, fully or partly, to the planning, preparation or commission of an offence as defined in article 2, paragraph 1 (a) and (b) of the Convention. There is no requirement to prove that the funds provided or collected have been used precisely for a particular terrorist act, provided that they have contributed to the criminal activities of persons whose goal was to commit the acts set forth in article 2, paragraph 1 (a) and (b).

Reservation:

As for article 14 of the Convention, the Government of Belgium makes the following reservation:

1. In exceptional circumstances, the Government of Belgium reserves the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance in respect of any offence set forth in article 2 which it considers to be a political offence or as an offence connected motives.

2. In cases where the preceding paragraph is applicable, Belgium recalls that it is bound by the general legal principle *aut dedere aut judicare*, pursuant to the rules governing the competence of its courts.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

Interpretative declarations:

"Interpretative Declarations to be made by the Federal Republic of Brazil on the occasion of signing of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism:

1. As concerns Article 2 of the said Convention, three of the legal instruments listed in the Annex to the Convention have not come into force in Brazil. These are the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation; Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf; and the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

2. As concerns Article 24, paragraph 2 of the said Convention, Brazil does not consider itself obligated by paragraph 1 of the said Article, given that it has not recognized the mandatory jurisdiction clause of the International Court of Justice."

CHINA

Reservation and declaration:

1. The People's Republic of China shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 24 of the Convention.

[...]

3. As to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the following three Conventions shall not be included in the annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of the Convention:

(1) Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

(2) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

(3) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

COLOMBIA

Declaration:

By virtue of article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Colombia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article.

Furthermore, by virtue of article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Colombia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in accordance with paragraph 2 of the same article.

COOK ISLANDS

Declaration:

"In accordance with the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of the Cook Islands declares:

That in the application of this Convention, the treaties listed in the annex, referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) shall be deemed not to be included, given that the Cook Islands is not yet a party to the following Conventions:

(i) Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980;

(ii) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 24 February 1988;

(iii) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988;

(iv) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988;

(v) International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

CROATIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia, pursuant to Article 2 paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, declares that in the application of the Convention to the Republic of Croatia the following treaties shall be deemed not to be included in the Annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of the Convention:

1. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979,

2. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988,

3. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988,

4. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

CUBA

Reservation:

The Republic of Cuba declares, pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article, concerning the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, inasmuch as it considers that such disputes must be settled through amicable negotiation. In consequence, it declares that it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

DEMOCRATIC PEOPLE'S REPUBLIC OF KOREA[7]

Upon signature:

Reservations:

1.The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) of the Convention.

2. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

3. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

EGYPT[8]

Reservations and declaration:

1. Under article 2, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt considers that, in the application of the Convention, conventions to which it is not a party are deemed not included in the annex.

2. Under article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article.

Explanatory declaration:

Without prejudice to the principles and norms of general international law and the relevant United Nations resolutions, the Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider acts of national resistance in all its forms, including armed resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view to liberation and self-determination, as terrorist acts within the meaning of article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (b), of the Convention.

EL SALVADOR

Declarations:

(1) Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a), the Republic of El Salvador declares that in the application of this Convention, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted in Vienna on 3 March 1980, shall not be considered as having been included in the annex referred to in article 2, paragraph 1 (a), since El Salvador is not currently a State party thereto;

...

(3) pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2, the Republic of El Salvador declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of that article, because it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; and

(4) El Salvador accedes to this Convention on the understanding that such accession is without prejudice to any provisions thereof which may conflict with the principles expressed in its Constitution and domestic legal system.

ESTONIA[9]

FRANCE

Declarations:

Declaration pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a)

In accordance with article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of this Convention, France declares that in the application of the Convention to France, the Convention of 14 December 1973 on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), since France is not a party thereto.

GEORGIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 2.2, Georgia declares, that while applying this Convention, treaties to which Georgia is not contracting party shall not be considered as included in the annex to this Convention."

GUATEMALA

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention referred to in the preceding article, the State of Guatemala, in ratifying the Convention, makes the following declaration: "In the application of this Convention, Guatemala deems the following treaties not to be included in the annex: the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, signed at Rome on 10 March 1988; the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 and the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997. The declaration shall cease to have effect, for each of the treaties indicated, as soon as the treaty enters into force for the State of Guatemala, which shall notify the depositary of this fact.

6 June 2002

Declaration under article 2 (2) (a):

[The Government of Guatemala notifies,]...pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, that on 14 March 2002 *[should read: 10 April 2002]*, the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings entered into force for the Republic of Guatemala. Accordingly, the declaration made by the Republic of Guatemala at the time of depositing its instrument of ratification that the latter Convention was deemed not to be included in the annex to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism has ceased to have effect.

INDONESIA

Declaration:

"A. In accordance with Article 2 paragraph 2 subparagraph (a) of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that the following treaties are to be deemed not to be included in the Annex referred to in Article 2 paragraph 1 subparagraph (a) of the Convention:

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973.

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979.

3. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal on 24 February 1988.

4. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

B. The Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism will have to be implemented in strict compliance with the principles of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States."

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Indonesia, while signatory to the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 24 and takes the position that dispute relating to the interpretation and application on the Convention which cannot be settled through the channel provided for in paragraph (1) of the said Article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the Parties to the dispute."

ISRAEL[10]

"... with the following declarations:

Pursuant to Article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of the State of Israel declares that in the application of the Convention the treaties to which the state of Israel

is not a party shall be deemed not to be included in the Annex of the Convention.

...

Pursuant to Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the State of Israel does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

The Government of the State of Israel understands that the term "international humanitarian law" referred to in Article 21 of the Convention has the same substantial meaning as the term "the law of war". This body of laws does not include the provisions of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Convention of 1977 to which the State of Israel is not a party."

JORDAN[11]

Declarations:

"1. The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan does not consider acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determation as terrorist acts within the context of paragraph 1(b) of article 2 of the Convention.

2. Jordan is not a party to the following treaties:

A. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted in Vienna on 3 March 1980.

B. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

C. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Contiental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

D. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted in New York on 15 December 1997.

Accordingly Jordan is not bound to include, in the application of the International Covention for the Supresssion of the Financing of Terrorism, the offences within the scope and as defined in such Treaties."

LATVIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted at New York on the 9th day of December 1999, the Republic of Latvia declares that in the application of the Convention to the Republic of Latvia the following treaties shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in Article 2 paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of the Convention:

1 . International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979.

2. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

4. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

5. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

20 March 2003

"In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted at New York on the 9th day of December 1999, the Republic of Latvia notifies that the following treaties have entered into force for the Republic of Latvia:

1. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979,

2. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980,

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988,

4. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988; and

5. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

LITHUANIA

Reservation and declaration:

".....it is provided in paragrah 2 of Article 24 of the said Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention stipulating that any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice.

.....it is provided in subparagraph a) of paragraph 2 of the said Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that in the application of this Convention to the Republic of Lithuania, the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted on 15 December 1997, shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in subparagraph a) of paragraph 1 of Article 2 of the Convention."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a), of the Convention, Luxembourg declares that when the Convention is applied to it, the treaties listed in the annex which have not yet been ratified by Luxembourg shall be deemed not to appear in the annex.

As at the date of ratification of the Convention, the following treaties listed in the annex had been ratified by Luxembourg:

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, done at The Hague, on 16 December 1970;

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal, on 23 September 1971;

International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations, on 17 December 1979;

Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted in Vienna on 3 March 1980.

MAURITIUS

Declarations:

"(1) in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a) of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius declares that in the application of this Convention to the Republic of Mauritius, the following treaty shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in Article 2 [paragraph 1 subparagraph (a)] of the said Convention, since the Republic of Mauritius is not yet a party thereto -

(1) The International Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials:

(ii) In accordance with Article 24(2) of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius does not consider itself bound by Article 24 (1). The Government of the Republic of Mauritius considers that any dispute may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the Parties to the dispute."

MOLDOVA

Declaration and reservation:

1. Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Moldova declares that in the application of the Convention the treaties the Republic of Moldova is not a party to shall be deemed not to be included in the Annex of the Convention.

2. Pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Moldova declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

MOZAMBIQUE

Declaration:

"... with the following declaration in accordance with its article 24, paragraph 2:

"The Republic of Mozambique does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

In this connection the Republic of Mozambique states that, in the each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

Furthermore, the Republic of Mozambique declare that:

"The Republic of Mozambique, in accordance with its Constitution and domestic laws, may not and will not extradite Mozambique citizens.

Therefore, Mozambique citizens will be tried and sentenced in national courts".

MYANMAR

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar declares in pursuance of Article 24, paragraph (2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 24, Paragraph (1)."

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

"Regarding articles 13, 14 and 15 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Union of Myanmar reserves its right to extradite its own citizen or citizens.

Regarding article 24 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Union of Myanmar declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the article 24 of the said Convention.

Regarding the 9 Conventions mentioned in the Annex of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Union of Myanmar declares that it is yet to be a party to the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 10, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

"... AND DECLARES, in accordance with Article 2, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, that, in the application of the Convention to New Zealand, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials adopted at Vienna on [3 March 1980] shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1 (a), as New Zealand is not yet a party to it; ..."

NICARAGUA

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of Nicaragua declares:

That, in the application of this Convention, the treaties listed in the annex referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), shall be deemed not to be included, given that Nicaragua is not yet a party to the following conventions:

1. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 17 December 1979.

2. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

4. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

PHILIPPINES

Declaration:

"... , in ratifying the Convention, the Philippines has to declare, as it hereby declares, that in the application of the Convention the following treaties to which it is not yet a party shall be deemed not included in the annex:

(a) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation;

(b) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation;

(c) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf;

(d) International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

... , this declaration shall cease to have effect upon entry into force of the said treaties with respect to the Philippines."

25 June 2004

".....pursuant to Article 2 (a) of the International Convention on the Financing of Terrorism, the Philippine Government has become State Party to the following international instruments:

1. Protocol on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, entered into force for [the Republic of the Philippines] on 16 January 2004 ([Republic of Philippines] ratification deposited with the ICAO on 17 December 2003);

2. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, entered into force for [the Republic of the Philippines] on 06 February 2004 ([Republic of the Philippines] ratification deposited with the UN Secretary-General on 07 January 2004);

3. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, entered into force for [the Republic of the Philippines] on 05 April 2004 ([Republic of the Philippines] ratification deposited with the IMO on 06 January 2004); and

4. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, entered into force for [the Republic of the Philippines] on 05 April 2004 ([Republic of the Philippines] ratification deposited with the IMO on 06 January 2004).

ROMANIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a) of the Convention, Romania declares that, on the date of the application of this Convention to Romania, the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism Bombings of 15 December 1997, shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a)."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Upon signature:

Declaration:

It is the position of the Russian Federation that the provisions of article 15 of the Convention must be applied in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for perpetrating the crimes falling within the purview of the Convention, without prejudice to the effectiveness of international cooperation with regard to the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

1. ....

2. It is the position of the Russian Federation that the provisions of article 15 of the Convention must be applied in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for perpetrating crimes falling within the purview of the Convention, without prejudice to the effectiveness of international cooperation with regard to the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

SAINT VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

Declaration and Reservation:

"In accordance with Article 2 paragraph 2 a) of the said Convention, however, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declares that in the application of this Convention to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines the following treaties shall be deemed not to be included in the Annex referred to in its Article 2 paragraph 1(a):

1. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

2. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

Further, in accordance with Article 24 paragraph 2 of the said Convention, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 24. The Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines considers that any dispute may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute."

SINGAPORE

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"... the Government of the Republic of Singapore makes the following reservations in relation to Article 2 and Article 24 of the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism:

i) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of Article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention that in the application of this Convention, the treaty shall be deemed not to include the treaties listed in the annex of this Convention which the Republic of Singapore is not a party to.

ii) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it will not be bound by the provisions of Article 24 paragraph 1 of the Convention."

Upon ratification:

"... [S]ubject to the following declarations and reservations:

Declarations and reservations:

Declarations

(1) The Republic of Singapore understands that Article 21 of the Convention clarifies that nothing in the Convention precludes the application of the law of armed conflict with regard to legitimate military objectives.

Reservations

(1) With respect to Article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention, the Republic of Singapore declares that the treaty shall be deemed not to include the treaties listed in the annex of this Convention which the Republic of Singapore is not a party to.

(2) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it will not be bound by the provisions of Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[12]

Reservations and declarations:

A reservation concerning the provisions of its article 2, paragraph 1 (b), inasmuch as the Syrian Arab Republic considers that acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism;

Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention, the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention shall not apply to the following treaties listed in the annex to the Convention until they have been adopted by the Syrian Arab Republic:

1. The International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly on 17 December 1979;

2. The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980;

3. The International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly on 15 December 1997.

Pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Syrian Arab Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article;

The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way imply its recognition of Israel or entail its entry into any dealings with Israel in the matters governed by the provisions thereof.

THAILAND

Declarations:

"I. The Kingdom of Thailand declares in pursuance to Article 2 paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention that in the application of this Convention, the following treaties, which the Kingdom of Thailand is not a party to, shall not be included in the annex of this Convention.

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973.

2. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979.

3. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

4. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

6. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

II. The Kingdom of Thailand declares, in pursuance to Article 24 paragraph 2 of the Convention, that it does not consider itself bound by Article 24 paragraph 1 of the Convention.".

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Declaration:

"The following treaties are to be deemed not to be included in the annex:

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done on 10 March 1988;

Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988."

TUNISIA

Reservation:

The Republic of Tunisia,

In ratifying the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted on 9 December 1999 by the General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session and signed by the Republic of Tunisia on 2 November 2001, declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1, of the Convention and affirms that, in the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or implementation of the Convention, there shall be no recourse to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice without its prior consent.

TURKEY

Declaration:

"1. The Republic of Turkey declares that the application of Paragraph 1(b) of Article (2) of the Convention does not necessarily indicate the existence of an armed conflict and the term "armed conflict", whether it is organized or not, describes a situation different from the commitment of acts that constitute the crime of terrorism within the scope of criminal law.

2. The Republic of Turkey declares its understanding that Paragraph 1(b) of Article (2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, as stated in Article (21) of the said Convention, shall not prejudice the obligations of states under international law including the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the obligation of not providing financial support to terrorist and armed groups acting in the territory of other states.

3. Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Article 24 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Paragraph 1 of Article (24) of the said Convention."

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

Reservation:

.....subject to a reservation with respect to article 24, paragraph 1, thereof, in consequence of which the United Arab Emirates does not consider itself bound by that paragraph, which relates to arbitration.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservation:

"(a) pursuant to Article 24 (2) of the Convention, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 24 (1) of the Convention; and

(b) the United States of America reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the arbitration procedure set forth in Article 24 (1) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

Understandings:

"(1) EXCLUSION OF LEGITIMATE ACTIVITIES AGAINST LAWFUL TARGETS. The United States of America understands that nothing in the Convention precludes any State Party to the Convention from conducting any legitimate activity against any lawful target in accordance with the law of armed conflict.

(2) MEANING OF THE TERM "ARMED CONFLICT". The United States of America understands that the term "armed conflict"in Article 2 (1) (b) of the Convention does not include internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence, and other acts of a similar nature."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservations:

Pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela hereby formulates an express reservation to the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1, of that Convention. Accordingly, it does not consider itself bound to resort to arbitration as a means of dispute settlement, and does not recognize the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Furthermore, pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, it declares that in the application of that Convention to Venezuela, the following treaties shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), of that Convention until they enter into force for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela:

1. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973;

2. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, signed at Vienna on 3 March 1980;

3. Protocol on the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation, signed at Montreal on 24 February 1988;

4. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988;

5. Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988;

6. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

VIET NAM

Reservation and declaration:

"Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam makes its reservation to paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam also declares that the provisions of the Convention shall not be applied with regard to the offences set forth in the following treaties to which the Socialist Republic of Vietnam is not a party:

- International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979;
- Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980;
- International Convention for [the] Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

15 July 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of Austria has examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of Austria considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of Austria recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Austria and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan."

25 August 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of Austria considers that this declaration is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of Austria recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Austria and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

12 September 2005

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of Austria considers that this declaration is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a polit-

ical, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of Austria recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Austria and the Syrian Arab Republic."

BELGIUM

25 July 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has examined the reservation formulated by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, in particular the part of the reservation in which the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it "does not consider acts of national resistance in all its forms, including armed resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view to liberation and self-determination, as terrorist acts within the meaning of article 2, [paragraph 1], subparagraph (b), of the Convention". The Government of Belgium considers that this reservation is a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and that is contrary to its object and purpose, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, wherever and by whomever committed.

Moreover, this declaration is contrary to article 6 of the Convention, according to which "each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Belgium recalls that, according to article 19, paragraph (c), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Belgium therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and Egypt.

24 October 2005

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

The Government of Belgium has examined the reservation formulated by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, in particular the part of the reservations and declarations relating to the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, in which the Syrian Arab Republic declares that it considers "that acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism". The Government of Belgium considers that this reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis, which is contrary to the object and purpose thereof, namely, the suppression of the financing of acts of terrorism, wherever and by whomever committed.

Moreover, this reservation contravenes article 6 of the Convention, according to which "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Belgium recalls that, under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, no reservation may be formulated that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Belgium therefore objects to the abovementioned reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and the Syrian Arab Republic.

CANADA

25 August 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of Canada has examined the Declaration made by [the] Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and considers that the Declaration is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of the financing of terrorism, irrespective of who carries it out.

The Government of Canada considers the Declaration to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Canada considers that the above Declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of Canada recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Canada therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan."

18 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of Canada considers the Reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to ".....adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate,

domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of Canada notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the Reservation relating to Article 2 made by the Government of Belgium upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism because it is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and Belgium."

26 April 2006

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Canada has examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and considers that the Declaration is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of the financing of terrorism, irrespective of who carries it out.

The Government of Canada considers the declaration to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Canada recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt."

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession

"The Government of Canada has examined the Reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and considers that the Reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of the financing of terrorism, irrespective of who carries it out.

The Government of Canada considers the Reservation to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Canada recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and the Syrian Arab Republic."

31 August 2006

With regard to the understanding made by Bangladesh upon accession

"The Government of Canada has examined the "understanding"made by the People's Republic of Bangladesh at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and considers that the "understanding" is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis.

The Government of Canada recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and the People's Republic of Bangladesh."

DENMARK

30 April 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

".....the Kingdom of Denmark has examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of Denmark considers the declaration made by Jordan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The Government of Denmark further considers the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Denmark recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of

Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Denmark and Jordan."

15 September 2005

With regard to a reservation made the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark has examined the reservation made by Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession to the Convention relating to Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof.

The Government of Denmark considers that the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and that the reservation is contrary to the Convention's object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The Government of Denmark further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature'.

The Government of Denmark recalls that, according to Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Kingdom of Denmark and the Syrian Arab Republic". "

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark has examined the Declaration Relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of Denmark considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The Government of Denmark further considers the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature'.

The Government of Denmark recalls that, according to Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Kingdom of Denmark and the Arab Republic of Egypt".

ESTONIA

23 September 2005

With regard to a reservation made the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the reservation relating to Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of Estonia considers the Syrian reservation to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (b). The Government of Estonia finds that such acts can never be justified with reference to resistance to foreign occupation.

Furthermore, the Government of Estonia is in the position that the reservation is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Estonia recalls that according to Article 19, sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law f Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of states that all parties respect the treaties to which they have chosen to become parties as to their object and purpose, and that states are prepared to take all necessary measures to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Estonia and the Syrian Arab Republic."

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the explanatory declaration relating to Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of Estonia considers the declaration made by Egypt to be in fact a reservation that seeks to limit unilaterally the scope of the Convention and is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (b). The Government of Estonia finds that such acts can never be justified with reference to resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view to liberation and self-determination.

Furthermore, the Government of Estonia is in the position that the explanatory declaration is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, accding to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political,

philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Estonia recalls that according to Article 19, sub-paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that all parties respect the treaties to which they have chosen to become parties as to their object and purpose, and that states are prepared to take all necessary measures to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the aforementioned declaration made by the Government of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Estonia and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

FINLAND

29 April 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the interpretative declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Jordan.

The Government of Finland is of the view that the declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Finland further considers the declaration to be in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever carried out.

The declaration is, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the abovementioned interpretative declaration made by the Government of Jordan to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Jordan and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Jordan benefiting from its declaration."

20 July 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the interpretative declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The Government of Finland is of the view that the declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Finland further considers the declaration to be in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be carried out.

The declaration is, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the abovementioned interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its declaration."

20 July 2005

With regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservation relating to paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic.

The Government of Finland considers the reservation to be in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be carried out.

The reservation is, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the abovementioned reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservation."

FRANCE

4 December 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 12 November 2001, when it signed the International Convention on the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, which was opened for signature on 10 January 2000. By indicating that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea excludes from the definition of offences within the meaning of the Convention the financing of any act which constitutes an offence within the scope of and as defined in the treaties listed in the annex.

Under article 2, paragraph 2 (a), a State Party is entitled to exclude from the definition of offences within the meaning of the Convention the financing of acts which constitute offences within the scope of and as defined in any treaty listed in the annex to which it is not party; however, it is not entitled to exclude from the definition of offences within the meaning of the Convention the financing of acts which constitute offences within the scope of and as defined in any treaty listed in the annex to which it is party. It just so happens that the Democratic People's Republic of Korea is party to some of those treaties.

The Government of the French Republic lodges an objection to the reservation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph 1 (a) of the Convention.

11 June 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, of 9 December 1999. In that declaration, the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan states that it 'does not consider acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determination as terrorist acts within the context of paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the Convention.' However, the Convention applies to the suppression of the financing of all acts of terrorism, and its article 6 specifies that States parties shall 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.' The Government of the French Republic considers that the aforementioned declaration constitutes a reservation, and objects to that reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the convention between France and Jordan.

15 August 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999, whereby Egypt "... does not consider acts of national resistance in all its forms, including armed resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view to liberation and self-determination, as terrorist acts within the meaning of article 2,[paragraph 1], subparagraph (b), of the Convention ...". However, the Convention applies to the suppression of the financing of all acts of terrorism and states particularly in its article 6 that "each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature". The Government of the French Republic considers that the said declaration constitutes a reservation, contrary to the object and the purpose of the Convention and objects to that reservation. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and France.

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999, inasmuch as Syria considers, with regard to the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention that "... Acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism ...". However, the Convention applies to the suppression of the financing of all acts of terrorism and states particularly in its article 6 that "each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature". The Government of the French Republic considers that the said reservation is contrary to the object and the purpose of the Convention and objects to the reservation. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Syria and France.

GERMANY

With regard to the declarations made by the Jordan upon ratification:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the substance of the declarations made by the Government of the Kingdom of Jordan upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, especially that part of the declarations in which the Government of the Kingdom of Jordan states that it "does not consider acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determination as terrorist acts within the context of paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the Convention". The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that this declaration in fact constitutes a reservation aimed at unilaterally limiting the scope of application of the Convention, and is thus contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorism, regardless of by whom and to what end it is perpetrated.

In this respect, the declaration is furthermore in contravention of Article 6 of the Convention, under which the State Parties commit themselves to adopting "such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above reservation by the Government of the Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection does not

preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Jordan.

18 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism with respect to its Article 14. With this reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium expresses that it reserves the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance in respect of any offence which it considers to be politically motivated. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, this reservation seeks to limit the Convention's scope of application in a way that is incompatible with the objective and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Belgium."

16 August 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession to the Convention relating to Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof. It is of the opinion that this reservation unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and is thus in contradiction to the object and purpose of the Convention, in particular the object of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The reservation is further contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Syrian Arab Republic.

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon ratification of the Convention relating to Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof. It is of the opinion that this declaration amounts to a reservation, since its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is furthermore of the opinion that the declaration is in contradiction to the object and purpose of the Convention, in particular the object of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The declaration is further contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Arab Republic of Egypt.

11 August 2006

With regard to the understanding made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The People's Republic of Bangladesh has declared that its accession to the Convention shall not be deemed to be inconsistent with its obligations under the Constitution of the country. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that this declaration raises questions as to which obligations the People's Republic of Bangladesh intends to give precedence to in the event of any inconsistency between the Convention and its Constitution.

Declarations that leave it uncertain to what extent that State consents to be bound by its contractual obligations are in the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany to be treated, in effect, as vague and general reservations, which are not compatible with the object and purpose of a Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the People's Republic of Bangladesh."

HUNGARY

26 August 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"... The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Hungary considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of the Republic of Hungary recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan."

28 February 2006

With regard to the reservatiaon made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Hungary considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of article 6 of the Convention according to which States Parties commit themselves to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature'.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Syrian Arab Republic."

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the explanatory declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Hungary considers that the explanatory declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The explanatory declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of article 6 of the Convention according to which States Parties commit themselves to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature'.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Hungary and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

IRELAND

23 June 2006

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Ireland have examined the explanatory declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, done at New York on 9 December 1999, according to which the Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider acts of national resistance in all its forms, including armed resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view to liberation and self-determination, as terrorist acts within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this explanatory declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland are also of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention, wherever and by whomever committed.

This reservation is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Arab Republic of Egypt. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Arab Re-

public of Egypt, without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation."

ITALY

20 May 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of Italy has examined the "declaration" relating to paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Jordan at the time of its ratification to the Convention. The Government of Italy considers the declaration made by Jordan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Italy recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and Jordan."

20 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Belgium at the time of its ratification to the Convention. The Government of Italy considers the reservation by Belgium to be a unilateral limitation on the scope of the Convention, which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorism, irrespective of where it takes place and of who carries it out.

The Government of Italy recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and Belgium."

12 January 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Italy has examined the explanatory declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider acts of national resistance in all its forms, including armed resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view of liberation and self-determination, as terrorist acts within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The Government of Italy recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Italy considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt in substance constitutes a reservation.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention. Such acts can never be justified with reference to the exercise of people's right to self-determination.

The Government of Italy further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which the States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Italy wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Italy. The Convention enters into force between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Italy without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation."

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Syrian Arab Republic considers that acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 9B0 of Article 2 of the Convention. Such acts can never be justified with reference to the exercise of people's right to self-determination.

The Government of Italy further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which the States Parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Italy wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative

changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Italy objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Italy. The Convention enters into force between the Syrian Arab Republic and Italy, without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservation."

JAPAN

1 May 2006

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"When depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of Syrian Arab Republic made a reservation which reads as follows: 'A reservation concerning the provisions of its article 2, paragraph 1 (b), inasmuch as the Syrian Arab Republic considers that acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism'.

In this connection, the Government of Japan draws attention of the provisions of article 6 of the Convention, according to which each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Japan considers that the aforementioned reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic seeks to exclude acts of resistance to foreign occupation from application of the Convention and that such reservation constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Japan therefore objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic."

LATVIA

30 September 2003

With regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has examined the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention of the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession to the Convention regarding Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that this reservation unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and is thus in contradiction to the objectives and purposes of the Convention to suppress the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomsoever they may be carried out.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the reservation conflicts with the terms of Article 6 of the Convention setting out the obligation for State Parties to adopt such measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the Syrian Arab Republic. Thus, the Convention will become operative without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservation."

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has examined the explanatory reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention of the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession to the Convention regarding Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that this explanatory declaration is in fact unilateral act that is deemed to limit the scope of the Convention and therefore should be regarded as reservation. Thus, this reservation contradicts to the objectives and purposes of the Convention to suppress the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomsoever they may be carried out.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the reservation conflicts with the terms of Article 6 of the Convention setting out the obligation for States Parties to adopt such measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the Arab Republic of Egypt. Thus, the Convention will become operative without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation."

23 August 2006

With regard to the understanding made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the 'understanding' made by the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession.

Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that the understanding is in fact a unilateral act deemed to limit the scope of application of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and therefore, it shall be regarded as a reservation.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia has noted that the understanding does not make it clear to what extent the People's Republic of Bangladesh considers itself bound by the provisions of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and whether the way of implementation of the provisions of the aforementioned Convention is in line with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism between the Republic of Latvia and the People's Republic of Bangladesh. Thus, the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism will become operative without People's Republic of Bangladesh benefiting from its reservation."

NETHERLANDS

1 May 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph 1 (a), and article 14 of the International Convention for the suppression of the financing of terrorism made at the time of its signature of the said Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph 1 (a), and article 14 of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the International Convention for the suppression of the financing of terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

21 April 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

".....the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Jordan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands further considers the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of the States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Jordan."

20 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Belgium regarding Article 14 of the International Convention for the suppression of the financing of terrorism made at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the reservation made by the Government of Belgium is expressed to apply only "in exceptional circumstances"and that, notwithstanding the application of the reservation, Belgium continues to be bound by the general legal principle of aut dedere aut judicare. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands further notes that the exceptional circumstances that are envisaged in paragraph 1 of the reservation made by the Government of Belgium are not specified in the reservation.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention to be of such grave nature, that the provisions of Article 14 should apply in all circumstances.

Furthermore the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls the principle that claims of political motivation must not be recognised as grounds for refusing requests for the extradition of alleged terrorists.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the suppression of the financing of terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and the Kingdom of the Netherlands, without Belgium benefiting from its reservation."

30 August 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the declaration made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon ratification of the Convention relating to Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof. It is of the opinion that this declaration amounts to a reservation, since its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is furthermore of the opinion that the declaration is in contradiction to the object and purpose of the Convention, in particular the object of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The declaration is further contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession to the Convention relating to Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) thereof. It is of the opinion that this reservation unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and is in contradiction to the object and purpose of the Convention, in particular the object of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The reservation is further contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic."

25 August 2006

With regard to the understanding made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The People's Republic of Bangladesh has declared that its accession to the Convention shall not be deemed to be inconsistent with its international obligations under the Constitution of the country. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that this declaration raises questions as to which obligations the People's Republic of Bangladesh intends to give precedence to in the event of any inconsistency between the Convention and its Constitution. Declarations that leave it uncertain to what extent a State consents to be bound by its contractual obligations are in the opinion of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands to be treated, in effect, as general reservations, which are not compatible with the object and purpose of a Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the above-mentioned declaration made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the People's Republic of Bangladesh."

NORWAY

3 December 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

"The Government of Norway has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

It is the position of the Government of Norway that the reservations with regard to paragraph 1 (a) of Article 2 and Article 14 are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as they purport to exclude the application of core provisions of the Convention. The Government of Norway recalls that, in accordance with well-established treaty law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. This objection does not preclude the entry into force, in its entirety, of the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Convention thus becomes operative between the Kingdom of Norway and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea without the Democratic People's Republic of Korea benefiting from these reservations."

15 July 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of Norway has examined the declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Jordan.

The Government of Norway considers the declaration to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of financing of terrorism, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of Norway recalls that, according to customary international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Jordan to the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Norway and Jordan."

4 October 2005

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Norway has examined the contents of the reservation relating to paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 to the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Syrian Arab Republic.

The Government of Norway considers the reservation to be in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention,

namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be carried out.

The reservation is, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of Norway wishes to recall that according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties a reservation incompatible with the object and purposes of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with the obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the abovementioned reservations made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Norway. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its declaration."

POLAND

28 April 2006

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism relating to article 2, paragraph 1 (b) thereof.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and it is, therefore, contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservation to be contrary to the terms of article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of their political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature'.

The Government of the Republic of Poland wishes to recall that according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and the Syrian Arab Republic."

2 August 2006

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the explanatory declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism relating to article 2, paragraph 1 (b) thereof.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and it is, therefore, contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the declaration to be contrary to the terms of article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of their political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of the Republic of Poland wishes to recall that according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Financing of Terrorism. However this objection shall not precluded the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

PORTUGAL

27 August 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

".....the Government of Portugal has examined the declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of the Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of Portugal considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of the Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Portugal recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan."

31 August 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist

acts, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of the Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Portugal recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

With regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Portugal considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of the Article 6 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Portugal recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Portugal therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Portugal and the Syrian Arab Republic."

SPAIN

3 December 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

The Government of Spain has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea on 12 November 2001 to articles 2, paragraph 1 (a), and 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999).

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that those reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of that Convention, since their aim is to release the People's Democratic Republic of Korea from any commitment with regard to two essential aspects of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain observes that according to the rule of customary law embodied in article 19 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of treaties are prohibited.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Korea to the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the aforementioned Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the People's Democratic Republic of Korea.

20 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by the Belgium upon ratification:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to article 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism at the time of ratifying the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers, in particular, that Belgium's reservation is incompatible with article 6 of the Convention, whereby States Parties undertake to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under the norm of customary law laid down in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the law of treaties (article 19 c)), reservations which are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are prohibited.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to article 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not impede the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Kingdom of Belgium.

4 April 2006

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation entered by the Syrian Arab Republic to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon ratifying that instrument.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers, in particular, that the reservation entered by the Syrian Arab Republic is incompatible with article 6 of the Convention, whereby States parties undertake to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under the customary-law provision enshrined in article 19 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty concerned are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservation entered by the Syrian Arab Republic to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Syrian Arab Republic.

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers, in particular, that the reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt is contrary to article 6 of the Convention, according to which the States Parties pledge to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (article 19 (c)), a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Arab Republic of Egypt.

SWEDEN

27 November 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea at the time of its signature of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, regarding article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) and article 14 of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden considers those reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Democratic People's Republic of Korea and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Democratic People's Republic of Korea benefiting from its reservation."

27 January 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Israel upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by Israel regarding article 21 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, whereby Israel intends to exclude the Protocols Additionals to the Geneva Conventions from the term international humanitarian law.

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by Israel in substance constitutes a reservation.

It is the view of the Government of Sweden that the majority of the provisions of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions constitute customary international law, by which Israel is bound. In the absence of further clarification, Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by Israel to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Israel and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Israel benefiting from this reservation."

28 May 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by the Government of Jordan upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Government of Jordan does not consider acts of national struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determination as terrorist acts within the context of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by the Government of Jordan in substance constitutes a reservation.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention. Such acts can never be justified with reference to the exercise of people's right to self-determination.

The Government of Sweden further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Jordan to the International

Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Jordan and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between the two parties without Jordan benefiting from its reservation."

5 October 2005

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the explanatory declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider acts of national resistance in all its forms, including armed resistance against foreign occupation and aggression with a view of liberation and self-determination, as terrorist acts within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt in substance constitutes a reservation.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention. Such acts can never be justified with reference to the exercise of people's right to self-determination.

The Government of Sweden further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which the States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Sweden without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation."

With regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Syrian Arab Republic considers that acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The object and purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention. Such acts can never be justified with reference to the exercise of people's right to self-determination.

The Government of Sweden further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which the States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Sweden wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between the Syrian Arab Republic and Sweden, without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

22 November 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

"The signature of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea was expressed to be subject to reservations in respect of Article 2 (1) (a), Article 14 and Article 24 (1) of the Convention. The United Kingdom objects to the reservations entered by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea in respect of Article 2 (1) (a) and Article 14 of the Convention, which it considers to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention."

25 February 2004

With regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom consider the declaration made by Jordan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The Government of the United Kingdom further consider the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of the United Kingdom recall that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Jordan to

the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom and Jordan."

20 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by the Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the reservation relating to Article 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of Belgium at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that the effect of the said reservation is to disapply the provisions of Article 14 in "exceptional circumstances". Article 14 provides that:

"None of the offences set forth in Article 2 shall be regarded for the purposes of extradition or mutual legal assistance as a political offence or as an offence connected with a political offence or as an offence inspired by political motives. Accordingly, a request for extradition or for mutual legal assistance based on such an offence may not be refused on the sole ground that it concerns a political offence or an offence inspired by political motives."

The Government of the United Kingdom note that the provisions of Article 14 reflect in part the principle that claims of political motivation must not be recognised as grounds for refusing requests for the extradition of alleged terrorists. The Government of the United Kingdom consider this principle to be an important measure in the fight against terrorism and the provisions of Article 14 of the Convention in particular to be an essential measure in States' efforts to suppress the financing of terrorist acts.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that paragraph 1 of the reservation made by the Government of Belgium is expressed to apply only "in exceptional circumstances" and that, notwithstanding the application of the reservation, Belgium continues to be bound by the principle of aut dedere aut judicare as set out in Article 10 of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom note further, however, that the exceptional circumstances that are envisaged are not specified in the reservation.

In light of the grave nature of the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention, the Government of the United Kingdom consider that the provisions of Article 14 should apply in all circumstances. A reservation that seeks to disapply Article 14, even while reaffirming the application of the principle of aut dedere aut judicare, undermines the effectiveness of the provisions of Article 14 of the Convention as a measure in States' efforts to suppress the financing of terrorist acts.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom and Belgium."

1 May 2006

With regard to the reservaton made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

The Government of Belgium has examined the reservation formulated by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, in particular the part of the reservations and declarations relating to the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention, in which the Syrian Arab Republic declares that it considers "that acts of resistance to foreign occupation are not included under acts of terrorism". The Government of Belgium considers that this reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis, which is contrary to the object and purpose thereof, namely, the suppression of the financing of acts of terrorism, wherever and by whomever committed.

Moreover, this reservation contravenes article 6 of the Convention, according to which "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Government of Belgium recalls that, under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, no reservation may be formulated that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Belgium therefore objects to the abovementioned reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and the Syrian Arab Republic.

3 August 2006

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the explanatory declaration relating to article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom consider the declaration made by Egypt to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis.

The Government of the United Kingdom objects to the aforesaid reservation."

With regard to the understanding made by Bangladesh upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the 'understanding' of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom consider the understanding made by Bangladesh to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis.

The Government of the United Kingdom objects to the aforesaid reservation."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

6 August 2004

With regard to the declaration made by the Jordan upon ratification:

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the statement made by Jordan relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention (the Declaration) to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the offense set forth in the Convention on a unilateral basis. The Declaration is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

The Government of the United States also considers the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, which provides: "Each state party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this convention are under no circumstances justifiable

by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of the United States notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United States therefore objects to the Declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 made by the Government of Jordan upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Jordan."

20 May 2005

With regard to the reservation made by the Belgium upon ratification:

"The Government of the United States of America has examined the reservation made by Belgium on 17 May 2004 at the time of ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The Government of the United States objects to the reservation relating to Article 14, which provides that a request for extradition or mutual legal assistance may not be refused on the sole ground that it concerns a political offense or an offense connected with a political offense or an offense inspired by political motives. The Government of the United States understands that the intent of the Government of Belgium may have been narrower than apparent from its reservation in that the Government of Belgium would expect its reservation to apply only in exceptional circumstances where it believes that, because of the political nature of the offense, an alleged offender may not receive a fair trial. The United States believes the reservation is unnecessary because of the safeguards already provided for under Articles 15, 17 and 21 of the Convention. However, given the broad wording of the reservation and because the Government of the United States considers Article 14 to be a critical provision in the Convention, the United States is constrained to file this objection. This objection does not preclude entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Belgium."

9 March 2006

With regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification:

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the explanatory declaration made by Egypt to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The explanatory declaration is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and who perpetrates them.

The Government of the United States also considers the explanatory declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, which provides: "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other similar nature."

The Government of the United States notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United States of America therefore objects to the explanatory declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 made by Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Egypt."

With regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession:

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and who perpetrates them.

The Government of the United States also considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, which provides: "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other similar nature."

The Government of the United States notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United States therefore objects to the explanatory declaration relating to paragraph 1(b) of Article 2 made by the Government of Syria upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and the Syrian Arab Republic."

Notifications made under article 7 (3)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ARGENTINA

Article 7, paragraph 3:

In relation to article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that the territorial scope of application of its criminal law is set forth in article 1 of the Argentine Penal Code (Act No. 11,729), which states:

"This Code shall apply:

1. To offences that are committed or that produce effects in the territory of the Argentine nation, or in places under its jurisdiction;

2. To offences that are committed abroad by agents or employees of the Argentine authorities during the performance of their duties".

The Argentine Republic shall therefore exercise jurisdiction over the offences defined in article 7, paragraph 2 (c), and over the offences defined in article 7, paragraph 2 (a), (b) and (d), when they produce effects in the territory of the Argentine Republic or in places under its jurisdiction, or when they were committed abroad by agents or employees of the Argentine authorities during the performance of their duties.

With regard to the offences referred to in article 7, paragraph 2 (e), jurisdiction over such offences shall be exercised in accordance with the legal provisions in force in the Argentine Republic. In this regard, reference should be made to article 199 of the Argentine Aeronautical Code, which states:

"Acts occurring, actions carried out, and offences committed in a private Argentine aircraft over Argentine territory or its jurisdictional waters, or where no State exercises sovereignty, shall be governed by the laws of the Argentine nation and tried by its courts.

Acts occurring, actions carried out, and offences committed on board a private Argentine aircraft over foreign territory shall also fall under the jurisdiction of the Argentine courts and the application of the laws of the nation if a legitimate interest of the Argentine State or of persons domiciled therein are thereby injured or if the first landing, following the act, action or offence, occurs in the Republic".

AUSTRALIA

24 October 2002

".... pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, ... Australia has established jurisdiction in relation to all the circumstances referred to in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

AZERBAIJAN

16 June 2004

".....in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 3, of the abovementioned International Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it establishes its jurisdiction in all the cases provided for in Article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

BELARUS

The Republic of Belarus establishes its jurisdiction over all offenses set forth in article 2 of the Convention in the cases described in article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2.

BELGIUM

Belgium also wishes to make the following declaration of jurisdiction: In accordance with the provisions of article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Belgium declares that, pursuant to its national legislation, it establishes its jurisdiction over offences committed in the situations referred to in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

BOLIVIA

13 February 2002

... by virtue of the provisions of article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Bolivia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in respect of offences committed in the situations and conditions provided for under article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

BRAZIL

26 September 2005

"The Government of Brazil would like to inform that according to the provisions of Article 7, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism, by ratifying that instrument the Federative Republic of Brazil will exercise jurisdiction over all hypotheses foreseen in items "a" to "e" of paragraph 2 of the same article."

CHILE

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of Chile declares that, in accordance with article 6, paragraph 8, of the Courts Organization Code of the Republic of Chile, crimes and ordinary offenses committed outside the territory of the Republic which are covered in treaties concluded with other Powers remain under Chilean jurisdiction.

CHINA

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 7 of the Convention, the People's Republic of China has established the jurisdiction over five offences stipulated in paragraph 2 of Article 7 of the Convention, but this jurisdiction shall not apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

COOK ISLANDS

".....the Government of the Cook Islands makes the following notification that pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Cook Islands establishes its jurisdiction in relation to all cases referred to in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

CROATIA

"Pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism the Republic of Croatia notifies the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it has established jurisdiction over the offence set forth in Article 2 in all the cases described in Article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

CYPRUS

27 December 2001

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 7, the Republic of Cyprus declares that by section 7.1 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (Ratification and other Provisions) Law No. 29 (III) of 2001, it has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2 in all circumstances described in paragraph 2 of Article 7."

CZECH REPUBLIC

"In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Czech Republic notifies that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all cases referred to in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

DENMARK

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism Denmark declares that section 6-12 of the Danish Criminal Code provide for Danish jurisdiction in respect of offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all the circumstances laid down in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

EL SALVADOR

... (2) pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, the Republic of El Salvador notifies that it has established its jurisdiction in accordance with its national laws in respect of offences committed in the situations and under the conditions provided for in article 7, paragraph 2;

ESTONIA

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Estonia declares that in its domestic law it shall apply the jurisdiction set forth in article 7 paragraph 2 over offences set forth in article 2."

FINLAND

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Finland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2."

FRANCE

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, France states that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all cases referred to in article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2.

GERMANY

.....pursuant to article 7 paragraph 3 thereof, that the Federal Republic of Germany has established jurisdiction over all offences described in article 7 paragraph 2 of the Convention.

HUNGARY

"The Republic of Hungary declares that it establishes its jurisdiction in all the cases provided for in Article 7, Paragraph 2 of the Convention."

ICELAND

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, Iceland declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

ISRAEL

Pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Government of the state of Israel hereby notifies the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it has established jurisdiction over the offences referred to in Article 2 in all the cases detailed in Article 7 paragraph 2.

JAMAICA

"Jamaica has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2, with respect to the jurisdiction stated in Article 7(2) (c) which states:

"A State Party may also establish its jurisdiction over any such offence when:

... (c) The offence was directed towards or resulted in an offence referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) or (b), committed in an attempt to compel that State to do or abstain from doing any act".

JORDAN

"Jordan decides to establish its jurisdition over all offences described in paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention."

LATVIA

"In accordance with Article 7, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted at New York on 9th day of December 1999, the Republic of Latvia declares that it has established jurisdiction in all cases listed in Article 7, paragraph 2."

LIECHTENSTEIN

"In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Principality of Liechtenstein declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

LITHUANIA

".....it is provided in paragrah 3 of Article 7 of the said Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania shall have jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention in all cases specified in paragraph 2 of Article 7 of the Convention."

MAURITIUS

"Pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 3 of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius declares that it has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in paragraph 2 of Article 7."

MEXICO

24 February 2003

.....in accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Mexico exercises jurisdiction over the offences defined in the Convention where:

(a) They are committed against Mexicans in the territory of another State party, provided that the accused is in Mexico and has not been tried in the country in which the offence was committed. Where it is a question of offences defined in the Convention but committed in the territory of a non-party State, the offence shall also be defined as such in the place where it was committed (art. 7, para. 2 (a));

(b) They are committed in Mexican embassies and on diplomatic or consular premises (art. 7, para. 2 (b));

(c) They are committed abroad but produce effects or are claimed to produce effects in the national territory (art. 7, para. 2 (c)).

MOLDOVA

".....pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted on December 9, 1999, in New York, the Republic of Moldova has established its jurisdiction over the offenses set forth in article 2 in all cases referred to in article 7, paragraph 2."

MONACO

The Principality of Monaco reports, pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted in New York on 9 December 1999, that it exercises very broad jurisdiction over the offences referred to in that Convention.

The jurisdiction of the Principality is thus established pursuant to article 7, paragraph 1, over:

(a) Offences committed in its territory: this is the case in Monaco in application of the general principle of territoriality of the law;

(b) Offences committed on board a vessel flying the Monegasque flag: this is the case in Monaco in application of article L.633-1 et seq. of the Maritime Code;

Offences committed on board an aircraft registered under Monegasque law: the Tokyo Convention of 14 September 1963, rendered enforceable in Monaco by Sovereign Order No. 7.963 of 24 April 1984, specifies that the courts and tribunals of the State of registration of the aircraft are competent to exercise jurisdiction over offences and acts committed on board it;

(c) Offences committed by a Monegasque national: the Code of Criminal Procedure states in articles 5 and 6 that any

Monegasque committing abroad an act qualified as a crime or offence by the law in force in the Principality may be charged and brought to trial there.

The jurisdiction of the Principality is also established pursuant to article 7, paragraph 2 when:

(a) The offence was directed towards or resulted in the carrying out of a terrorist offence in its territory or against one of its nationals: articles 42 to 43 of the Criminal Code permit the Monegasque courts, in general terms, to punish accomplices of a perpetrator charged in Monaco with offences referred to in article 2 of the Convention;

(b) The offence was directed towards or resulted in the carrying out of a terrorist offence against a State or government facility, including diplomatic or consular premises: attacks aimed at bringing about devastation, massacres and pillage in Monegasque territory are punishable under article 65 of the Criminal Code; in addition, article 7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for the charging and trial in Monaco of foreigners who, outside the territory of the Principality, have committed a crime prejudicial to the security of the State or a crime or offence against Monegasque diplomatic or consular agents or premises;

(c) The offence was directed towards or resulted in a terrorist offence committed in an attempt to compel the State to do or abstain from doing any act: the crimes and offences in question normally correspond to one of those referred to above, directly or through complicity;

(d) The offence was committed by a stateless person who had his or her habitual residence in Monegasque territory: application of the general principle of territoriality of the law permits the charging of stateless persons having their habitual residence in Monaco;

(e) The offence was committed on board an aircraft operated by the Monegasque Government: if the Monegasque Government directly operated an aircraft or an airline, its aircraft would have to be registered in Monaco, and the Tokyo Convention of 14 September 1963 referred to above would then apply

Norway

"Declaration: In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, Norway hereby declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2, of the Convention in all cases provided for in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

Republic of Korea

7 July 2004

Pursuant to Article 7, Paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism,

The Republic of Korea provides the following information on its criminal jurisdiction. Principles on the criminal jurisdiction are set out in the Chapter I of Part I of the Korean Penal Code. The provisions have the following wording;

Article 2 (Domestic Crimes)

This Code shall apply to anyone, whether Korean or alien, who commits a crime within the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 3 (Crimes by Koreans outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to a Korean national who commits a crime outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 4 (Crimes by Aliens on board Korean Vessel, etc., outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits a crime on board a Korean vessel or a Korean aircraft outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 5 (Crimes by Aliens outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits any of the following crimes outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea:

1. Crimes concerning insurrection;
2. Crimes concerning treason;
3. Crimes concerning the national flag;
4. Crimes concerning currency;
5. Crimes concerning securities, postage and revenue stamps;
6. Crimes specified in Articles 225 through 230 among crimes concerning documents; and
7. Crimes specified in Article 238 among crimes concerning seal.

Article 6 (Foreign Crimes against the Republic of Korea and Koreans outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits a crime, other than those specified in the preceding Article, against the Republic of Korea or its national outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea, unless such act does not constitute a crime, or it is exempt from prosecution or execution of punishment under the *lex loci delictus*.

Article 8 (Application of General Provisions)

The provisions of the preceding Articles shall also apply to such crimes as are provided by other statutes unless provided otherwise by such statutes.

Romania

"In accordance with Article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, Romania declares that establishes its jurisdiction for the offences referred to in Article 2, in all cases referred to in Article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2, according with the relevant provisions of the internal law."

Russian Federation

The Russian Federation, pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, declares that it establishes its jurisdiction over the acts recognized as offences under article 2 of the Convention in the cases provided for in article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention.

Singapore

In accordance with the provision of Article 7, paragraph 3, the Republic of Singapore gives notification that it has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in Article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

Slovakia

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Slovak Republic declares that it shall exercise its jurisdiction as provided for under article 7, paragraph 2, subparagraphs a) to e) of the Convention."

Slovenia

"Pursuant to Article 7, Paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Slovenia declares that it has established jurisdiction over the offences in accordance with Paragraph 2."

Spain

"In accordance with the provisions of article 7, paragraph 3, the Kingdom of Spain gives notification that its courts have in-

ternational jurisdiction over the offences referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2, pursuant to article 23 of the Organization of Justice Act No. 6/1985 of 1 July 1985."

SWEDEN

5 November 2002

"Pursuant to article 7 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, Sweden provides the following information on Swedish criminal jurisdiction. Rules on Swedish criminal jurisdiction are laid down in Chapter 2 Section 1-5 in the Swedish Penal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Section 1

Crimes committed in this Realm shall be adjudged in accordance with Swedish law and by a Swedish court. The same applies when it is uncertain where the crime was committed but grounds exist for assuming that it was committed within the Realm.

Section 2

Crimes committed outside the Realm shall be adjudged according to Swedish law and by a Swedish court when the crime has been committed:

1. by a Swedish citizen or an alien domiciled in Sweden,

2. by an alien not domiciled in Sweden who, after having committed the crime, has become a Swedish citizen or has acquired domicile in the Realm or who is a Danish, Finnish, Icelandic or Norwegian citizen and is present in the Realm, or

3. By any other alien who is present in the Realm, and the crime under Swedish Law can result in imprisonment for more than six months.

The first paragraph shall not apply if the act is not subject to criminal responsibility under the law of the place where it was committed or if it was committed within an area not belonging to any state and, under Swedish law, the punishment for the act cannot be more severe than a fine.

In cases mentioned in this Section, a sanction may not be imposed which is more severe than the most severe punishment provided for the crime under the law in the place where it was committed.

Section 3

Even in cases other than those listed in Section 2, crimes committed outside the Realm shall be adjudged according to Swedish law and by a Swedish court:

1. if the crime was committed on board a Swedish vessel or aircraft, or was committed in the course of duty by the officer in charge or by a member of its crew,

2. if the crime was committed by a member of the armed forces in an area in which a detachment of the armed forces was present, or if it was committed by some other person in such an area and the detachment was present for a purpose other than exercise,

3. if the crime was committed in the course of duty outside the Realm by a person employed in a foreign contingent of the Swedish armed forces,

3a. if the crime was committed in the course of duty outside the Realm by a policeman, custom officer or official employed at the coast guard, who performs boundless assignments according to an international agreement that Sweden has ratified,

4. if the crime committed was a crime against the Swedish nation, a Swedish municipal authority or other assembly, or against a Swedish public institution,

5. if the crime was committed in an area not belonging to any state and was directed against a Swedish citizen, a Swedish association or private institution, or against an alien domiciled in Sweden,

6. if the crime is hijacking, maritime or aircraft sabotage, airport sabotage, counterfeiting currency, an attempt to commit such crimes, a crime against international law, unlawful dealings with chemical weapons, unlawful dealings with mines or false or careless statement before an international court, or

7. if the least severe punishment prescribed for the crime in Swedish law is imprisonment for four years or more.

Section 3 a

Besides the cases described in Sections 1-3, crimes shall be adjudged according to Swedish law by a Swedish court in accordance with the provisions of the Act on International Collaboration concerning Proceedings in Criminal matters.

Section 4

A crime is deemed to have been committed where the criminal act was perpetrated and also where the crime was completed or in the case of an attempt, where the intended crime would have been completed.

Section 5

Prosecution for a crime committed within the Realm on a foreign vessel or aircraft by an alien, who was the officer in charge or member of its crew or otherwise travelled in it, against another alien or a foreign interest shall not be instituted without the authority of the Government or a person designated by the Government.

Prosecution for a crime committed outside the Realm may be instituted only following the authorisation referred to in the first paragraph. However, prosecution may be instituted without such an order if the crime consists of a false or careless statement before an international court or if the crime was committed:

1. on a Swedish vessel or aircraft or by the officer in charge or some member of its crew in the course of duty,

2. by a member of the armed forces in an area in which a detachment of the armed forces was present,

3. in the course of duty outside the Realm by a person employed by a foreign contingent of the Swedish armed forces,

4. in the course of duty outside the Realm by a policeman, custom officer or official employed at the coast guard, who performs boundless assignments according to an international agreement that Sweden has ratified,

5. in Denmark, Finland, Iceland or Norway or on a vessel or aircraft in regular commerce between places situated in Sweden or one of the said states, or

6. By a Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Icelandic or Norwegian citizen against a Swedish interest."

SWITZERLAND

Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, Switzerland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 7, paragraph 2.

TUNISIA

The Republic of Tunisia,

In ratifying the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted on 9 December 1999 by the General Assembly at its fifty-fourth session and signed by the Republic of Tunisia on 2 November 2001, declares that it considers itself bound by the provisions of article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention and decides to establish its jurisdiction when:

- The offence was directed towards or resulted in the carrying out of an offence referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) or (b), in the territory of Tunisia or against one of its nationals;

- The offence was directed towards or resulted in the carrying out of an offence referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) or (b), against a Tunisian State or government facility abroad, including Tunisian diplomatic or consular facilities;
- The offence was directed towards or resulted in an offence referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) or (b), committed in an attempt to compel Tunisia to do or abstain from doing any act;
- The offence is committed by a stateless person who has his or her habitual residence in Tunisian territory;
- The offence is committed on board an aircraft operated by the Government of Tunisia.

TURKEY

".....pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, Turkey has established its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in respect of offences set forth in Article 2 in all cases referred to in Article 7, paragraph 2."

UKRAINE

"Ukraine exercises its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases provided for in paragraph 2 article 7 of the Convention."

UZBEKISTAN

5 February 2002

"Republic of Uzbekistan establishes its jurisdiction over offences referred to in article 2 of the Convention in all cases stipulated in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention.".

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

By virtue of the provisions of article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares that it has established jurisdiction under its domestic law over offences committed in the situations and under the conditions envisaged in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Notes:

[1] With a communication with respect to Hong Kong and Macao:

1. In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

2. The reservation made by the People's Republic of China on paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

3. The jurisdiction over five offences established by the People's Republic of China in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 7 of the Convention shall not apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

4. As to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the following three Conventions shall not be included in the annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a) of the Convention :

(1) Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.

(2) Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

(3) Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988.

[2] With a territorial exclusion with respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] See *note 1 under "Montenegro"* in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

Subsequently, on 23 March 2005, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Aruba with the following declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 10, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing Terrorism to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

[5] With a territorial exclusion with respect to Tokelau to the effect that:

".... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

[6] The Secretary-General received communications with regard to the reservation made by Belgium upon ratification from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Russian Federation (7 June 2005):

"Russia considers the Convention as an instrument designed to establish a solid and effective mechanism for cooperation between States in preventing and fighting the financing of terrorism regardless of its forms and motives. One of the basic rationales for the establishing of this mechanism is achievement of a common and impartial approach by States to the notion of an offence that consists in financing terrorists and terrorist organizations, as well as to the principles of prosecution and punishment of its perpetrators.

Russia notes that for the purposes of consistent prosecution and prevention of offences related to the financing of terrorism there is, inter alia, a clearly stipulated obligation of its States Parties under the Convention, when considering the issues of extradition based on this offence or mutual legal assistance, not to invoke any presumed connection of the committed offence with political motives.

In Russia's view, conceding to a State Party to the Convention the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance on the ground that the committed offence is of political nature or connected with a political offence or inspired by political motives, impairs the rights and obligations of other States Parties to the Convention to establish their jurisdiction over the offences set forth in the Convention and prosecute perpetrators of such offences.

Moreover, defining an offence as political or connected with a political offence is not an objective criterion and introduces considerable uncertainty to the relations between the States Parties to the Convention.

Thus Russia is of the view that the reservation made by the Kingdom of Belgium can jeopardize the consistent implementation of the Convention and achievement of its key objectives, including creation of favourable conditions for concerted efforts by the international community to counter terrorism and crimes contributing to commitment of acts of terrorism.

Russia reiterates its unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism in all its forms and manifestations as well as any kind of assistance (including financial) in commitment of such acts, and calls upon the Kingdom of Belgium to review its position expressed in the reservation."

Argentina (22 August 2005):

The Government of the Argentine Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium, whereby, in exceptional circumstances, that Government reserves the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance in respect of any offence set forth in article 2 which it considers to be a political offence or an offence connected with a political offence or an offence inspired by political motives.

As its provisions make clear, the intent of article 14 is to establish the inoperability of the nature or political motives of the offence. Article 14 is thus categorical and does not allow for exceptions of any kind. The Government of the Argentine Republic therefore believes that a reservation of this nature is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and cannot accept it.

The effect of the reservation would not be offset by the affirmation of the principle aut dedere aut judicare in paragraph 2 of the reservation, since the application of this principle derives from the provisions of the Convention and does not require confirmation by States Parties. Moreover, the application of this principle, in the event that extradition does not take place, entails the exercise of local criminal jurisdiction, but the exclusion made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium rules out mutual legal assistance from the outset.

The Government of the Argentine Republic therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium concerning article 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not impede the entry into force of the Convention between the Argentine Republic and the Kingdom of Belgium.

[7] The Secretary-General received communciations with regard to the declaration made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Republic of Moldova (6 october 2003):

"The Government of the Republic of Moldova has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature of the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova considers that the reservations with regard to article 2, paragraph 1 (a), and article 14 are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as they purport to exclude the application of core provisions of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism.This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Moldova and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without the Democratic People's Republic of Korea benefiting from its reservations."

Germany (17 June 2004):

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany the reservations with respect to article 2 paragraph 1 (a) and article 14 of the Convention are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, since they are intended to exclude the application of fundamental provisions of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

Argentina (22 August 2005):

The Government of the Argentine Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whereby it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1 (a), of the Convention.

The effect of the reservation to article 2, paragraph 1 (a), would be to exclude from consent the financing of the acts of terrorism listed in the annex to the article. This means that the obligation to criminalize the financing of terrorism, provided for in article 2, paragraph 1, would be void, since that obligation necessarily refers to the acts mentioned in the annex to paragraph 1 (a). This reservation is therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, since its legal consequence would be to exclude from consent the main obligation deriving from it.

The Government of the Argentine Republic has also examined the reservation made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea, whereby it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

As its provisions make clear, the intent of article 14 is to establish the inoperability of the nature or political motives of the offence. Article 14 is thus categorical, and does not allow for exceptions of any kind. The Government of the Argentine Republic therefore believes that a reservation of this nature is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and cannot accept it.

The Government of the Argentine Republic therefore objects to the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea concerning article 2, paragraph 1 (a), and article 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not impede the entry into force of the Convention between the Argentine Republic and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea.

[8] The Secretary-General received a communication with regard to the explanatory declaration made by Egypt upon ratification by the following Government on the date indicated hereinafter :

Argentina (22 August 2005):

With respect to the [declaration] made by the Arab Republic of Egypt [.....] concerning article 2, paragraph 1 (b), and any similar declaration that other States may make in the future, the Government of the Argentine Republic considers that all acts of terrorism are criminal, regardless of their motives, and that all States must strengthen their cooperation in their efforts to combat such acts and bring to justice those responsible for them.

Czech Republic (23 August 2006)

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the explanatory declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Czech Republic considers that the declaration amounts to a reservation, as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of the Czech Republic further considers the declaration to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

In addition, the Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that the declaration is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention,

according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Czech Republic wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Czech Republic. The Convention enters into force between the Arab Republic of Egypt and the Czech Republic without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation."

[9] On 30 March 2006, the Government of Estonia notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration mde upon ratification. The text of the declaration reads as follows:

"... pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Estonia declares, that she does not consider itself bound by the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome, on 10 March 1988, annexed to the Convention;"....

[10] The Secretary-General received the following communication with regard to the declaration made by Israel upon ratification, by the following Government on the date indicated hereinafter:

Argentina (22 August 2005):

With respect to the declaration concerning article 21 of the Convention made by the State of Israel upon depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Argentine Republic considers that the term 'international humanitarian law' covers the body of norms constituting customary and conventional law, including the provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols of 1977.

[11] The Secretary-General received the communciations with regard to the declaration made by Jordan upon ratification from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Belgium (23 September 2004):

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, in particular the part of the declaration in which the Kingdom of Jordan states that it "does not consider acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determination as terrorist acts within the context of paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the Convention". The Belgian Government considers this declaration to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place or who carries them out.

Moreover, the declaration contravenes article 6 of the Convention, according to which "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature".

The Belgian Government recalls that, under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Belgian Government therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Jordanian Government to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and Jordan.

Russian Federation (1 March 2005):

"Russia has examined the declaration made by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (1999).

Russia assumes that every state, which has expressed its consent to be bound by the provisions of the Convention, has to adopt, in accordance with article 6, such measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts, set forth in article 2, in particular acts intended to cause death or serious bodily injury to a civilian, or to any other person not taking an active part in the hostilities in a situation of armed conflict, when the purpose of such act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population or compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

Sharing the purposes and principles of the Charter of the United Nations, Russia wishes to draw attention that the right of people to self-determination may not go against other fundamental principles of international law, such as the principle of settlement of disputes by peaceful means, the principle of the territorial integrity of states, the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

In Russia's view, the declaration by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan may endanger the implementation of the provisions of the Convention between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and other States Parties and thus impede their interaction in the suppression of the financing of terrorism. It is of common interest to promote and enhance cooperation in devising and adopting effective practical measures to prevent terrorism financing, as well as to fight against terrorism through prosecution of and bringing to justice those involved in terrorist activity, keeping in mind that the number and seriousness of acts of international terrorism to a great extent depend on the financing that may be available to terrorists.

Russia reiterates its unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustifiable in all its forms and manifestations, wherever and by whomsoever committed, and calls upon the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to review its position."

Japan (14 July 2005):

"When depositing its instrument of ratification, the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan made a declaration which reads as follows: "The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan does not consider acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determination as terrorist acts within the context of paragraph 1 (b) of article 2 of the Convention".

In this connection, the Government of Japan draws attention to the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Japan considers that the declaration made by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan seeks to exclude acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation in the exercise of people's right to self-determination from the application of the Convention and that such declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Japan therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan.

Argentina (22 August 2005):

With respect to the declarations made by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Arab Republic of Egypt concerning article 2, paragraph 1 (b), and any similar declaration that other States may make in the future, the Government of the Argentine Republic considers that all acts of terrorism are criminal, regardless of their motives, and that all States must strengthen their cooperation in their efforts to combat such acts and bring to justice those responsible for them.

Ireland (23 June 2006):

"The Government of Ireland have examined the explanatory declaration made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, done at New York on 9 December 1999, according to which the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan does not consider acts of national armed struggle and fighting foreign occupation foreign occupation in the exercise of people' right to self-determination as terrorist acts within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland are also of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention, wherever and by whomever committed.

This reservation is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservation made by the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan, without the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan benefiting from its reservation

Czech Republic (23 August 2006):

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the declaration relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Czech Republic considers that the declaration amounts to a reservation, as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of the Czech Republic further considers the declaration to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

In addition, the Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that the declaration is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Czech Republic wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Czech Republic. The Convention enters into force between the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan and the Czech Republic without the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan benefiting from its reservation."

[12] The Secretary-General received a communciation with regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession from the following Government on the date indicated hereinafter :

Ireland (23 June 2006) :

"The Government of Ireland have examined the reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, done at New York on 9 December 1999, according to which the Syrian Arab Republic does not consider acts of resistance to foreign occupation as terrorist acts within the meaning of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.Ireland (23 June 2003):The Government of Ireland are of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention, wherever and by whomever committed.

This reservation is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Syrian Arab Republic. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Syrian Arab Republic, without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservation."

Czech Republic (23 August 2006):

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the reservation relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Czech Republic considers the reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

In addition, the Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that the reservation is contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Czech Republic wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Czech Republic. The Convention enters into force between the Syrian Arab Republic and the Czech Republic without the Syrian Arab Republic benefiting from its reservation."

12. United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

New York, 15 November 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 September 2003, in accordance with article 38.
REGISTRATION: 29 September 2003, No. 39574.
STATUS: Signatories: 147. Parties: 131.
TEXT: Doc. A/55/383; depositary notifications C.N.488.2004.TREATIES-10 of 18 May 2004 [Russian Federation: proposed correction to the original of the Convention (authentic Russian text)] and C.N.619.2004.TREATIES-23 of 21 June 2004 [Russian Federation: Rectification of the original of the Convention (Russian authentic text) and transmission of the relevant procès-verbal].

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution A/RES/55/25 of 15 November 2000 at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 36, the Convention will be open for signature by all States and by regional economic integration organizations, provided that at least one Member State of such organization has signed the Convention, from 12 to 15 December 2000 at the Palazzi di Giustizia in Palermo, Italy, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 12 December 2002.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2003
Albania	12 Dec 2000	21 Aug 2002
Algeria	12 Dec 2000	7 Oct 2002
Andorra	11 Nov 2001	
Angola	13 Dec 2000	
Antigua and Barbuda	26 Sep 2001	24 Jul 2002
Argentina	12 Dec 2000	19 Nov 2002
Armenia	15 Nov 2001	1 Jul 2003
Australia	13 Dec 2000	27 May 2004
Austria	12 Dec 2000	23 Sep 2004
Azerbaijan	12 Dec 2000	30 Oct 2003
Bahamas	9 Apr 2001	
Bahrain		7 Jun 2004 a
Barbados	26 Sep 2001	
Belarus	14 Dec 2000	25 Jun 2003
Belgium	12 Dec 2000	11 Aug 2004
Belize		26 Sep 2003 a
Benin	13 Dec 2000	30 Aug 2004
Bolivia	12 Dec 2000	10 Oct 2005
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Dec 2000	24 Apr 2002
Botswana	10 Apr 2002	29 Aug 2002
Brazil	12 Dec 2000	29 Jan 2004
Bulgaria	13 Dec 2000	5 Dec 2001
Burkina Faso	15 Dec 2000	15 May 2002
Burundi	14 Dec 2000	
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	12 Dec 2005
Cameroon	13 Dec 2000	6 Feb 2006
Canada	14 Dec 2000	13 May 2002
Cape Verde	13 Dec 2000	15 Jul 2004
Central African Republic		14 Sep 2004 a
Chile	13 Dec 2000	29 Nov 2004
China[1]	12 Dec 2000	23 Sep 2003
Colombia	12 Dec 2000	4 Aug 2004
Comoros		25 Sep 2003 a
Congo	14 Dec 2000	
Cook Islands		4 Mar 2004 a
Costa Rica	16 Mar 2001	24 Jul 2003
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Dec 2000	
Croatia	12 Dec 2000	24 Jan 2003
Cuba	13 Dec 2000	
Cyprus	12 Dec 2000	22 Apr 2003
Czech Republic	12 Dec 2000	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		28 Oct 2005 a
Denmark[2]	12 Dec 2000	30 Sep 2003
Djibouti		20 Apr 2005 a
Dominican Republic	13 Dec 2000	26 Oct 2006
Ecuador	13 Dec 2000	17 Sep 2002
Egypt	13 Dec 2000	5 Mar 2004
El Salvador	14 Dec 2000	18 Mar 2004
Equatorial Guinea	14 Dec 2000	7 Feb 2003
Estonia	14 Dec 2000	10 Feb 2003
Ethiopia	14 Dec 2000	
European Community	12 Dec 2000	21 May 2004 AA
Finland	12 Dec 2000	10 Feb 2004
France	12 Dec 2000	29 Oct 2002
Gabon		15 Dec 2004 a
Gambia	14 Dec 2000	5 May 2003
Georgia	13 Dec 2000	5 Sep 2006
Germany	12 Dec 2000	14 Jun 2006
Greece	13 Dec 2000	
Grenada		21 May 2004 a
Guatemala	12 Dec 2000	25 Sep 2003
Guinea		9 Nov 2004 a
Guinea-Bissau	14 Dec 2000	
Guyana		14 Sep 2004 a
Haiti	13 Dec 2000	
Honduras	14 Dec 2000	2 Dec 2003
Hungary	14 Dec 2000	22 Dec 2006
Iceland	13 Dec 2000	
India	12 Dec 2002	
Indonesia	12 Dec 2000	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	12 Dec 2000	
Ireland	13 Dec 2000	
Israel	13 Dec 2000	27 Dec 2006
Italy	12 Dec 2000	2 Aug 2006
Jamaica	26 Sep 2001	29 Sep 2003
Japan	12 Dec 2000	
Jordan	26 Nov 2002	

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Kazakhstan	13 Dec 2000	
Kenya		16 Jun 2004 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait	12 Dec 2000	12 May 2006
Kyrgyzstan	13 Dec 2000	2 Oct 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic		26 Sep 2003 a
Latvia	13 Dec 2000	7 Dec 2001
Lebanon	18 Dec 2001	5 Oct 2005
Lesotho	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2003
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	18 Jun 2004
Liechtenstein	12 Dec 2000	
Lithuania	13 Dec 2000	9 May 2002
Luxembourg	13 Dec 2000	
Madagascar	14 Dec 2000	15 Sep 2005
Malawi	13 Dec 2000	17 Mar 2005
Malaysia	26 Sep 2002	24 Sep 2004
Mali	15 Dec 2000	12 Apr 2002
Malta	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2003
Mauritania		22 Jul 2005 a
Mauritius	12 Dec 2000	21 Apr 2003
Mexico	13 Dec 2000	4 Mar 2003
Micronesia (Federated States of)		24 May 2004 a
Moldova	14 Dec 2000	16 Sep 2005
Monaco	13 Dec 2000	5 Jun 2001
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	13 Dec 2000	19 Sep 2002
Mozambique	15 Dec 2000	20 Sep 2006
Myanmar		30 Mar 2004 a
Namibia	13 Dec 2000	16 Aug 2002
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Nepal	12 Dec 2002	
Netherlands[4]	12 Dec 2000	26 May 2004
New Zealand[5]	14 Dec 2000	19 Jul 2002
Nicaragua	14 Dec 2000	9 Sep 2002
Niger	21 Aug 2001	30 Sep 2004
Nigeria	13 Dec 2000	28 Jun 2001
Norway	13 Dec 2000	23 Sep 2003
Oman		13 May 2005 a
Pakistan	14 Dec 2000	
Panama	13 Dec 2000	18 Aug 2004
Paraguay	12 Dec 2000	22 Sep 2004
Peru	14 Dec 2000	23 Jan 2002
Philippines	14 Dec 2000	28 May 2002
Poland	12 Dec 2000	12 Nov 2001
Portugal	12 Dec 2000	10 May 2004
Republic of Korea	13 Dec 2000	
Romania	14 Dec 2000	4 Dec 2002
Russian Federation	12 Dec 2000	26 May 2004
Rwanda	14 Dec 2000	26 Sep 2003
Saint Kitts and Nevis	20 Nov 2001	21 May 2004
Saint Lucia	26 Sep 2001	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	24 Jul 2002	
San Marino	14 Dec 2000	
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Saudi Arabia	12 Dec 2000	18 Jan 2005
Senegal	13 Dec 2000	27 Oct 2003
Serbia	12 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2001
Seychelles	12 Dec 2000	22 Apr 2003
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001	
Singapore	13 Dec 2000	
Slovakia	14 Dec 2000	3 Dec 2003
Slovenia	12 Dec 2000	21 May 2004
South Africa	14 Dec 2000	20 Feb 2004
Spain	13 Dec 2000	1 Mar 2002
Sri Lanka	13 Dec 2000	22 Sep 2006
Sudan	15 Dec 2000	10 Dec 2004
Swaziland	14 Dec 2000	
Sweden	12 Dec 2000	30 Apr 2004
Switzerland	12 Dec 2000	27 Oct 2006
Syrian Arab Republic	13 Dec 2000	
Tajikistan	12 Dec 2000	8 Jul 2002
Thailand	13 Dec 2000	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 Dec 2000	12 Jan 2005
Togo	12 Dec 2000	2 Jul 2004
Trinidad and Tobago	26 Sep 2001	
Tunisia	13 Dec 2000	19 Jun 2003
Turkey	13 Dec 2000	25 Mar 2003
Turkmenistan		28 Mar 2005 a
Uganda	12 Dec 2000	9 Mar 2005
Ukraine	12 Dec 2000	21 May 2004
United Arab Emirates	9 Dec 2002	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Dec 2000	9 Feb 2006
United Republic of Tanzania	13 Dec 2000	24 May 2006
United States of America	13 Dec 2000	3 Nov 2005
Uruguay	13 Dec 2000	4 Mar 2005
Uzbekistan	13 Dec 2000	9 Dec 2003
Vanuatu		4 Jan 2006 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	14 Dec 2000	13 May 2002
Viet Nam	13 Dec 2000	
Yemen	15 Dec 2000	
Zambia		24 Apr 2005 a
Zimbabwe	12 Dec 2000	

ALGERIA

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 35, paragraph 2, of this Convention, which provide that any dispute between two or more States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention that has not been settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties thereto.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that no dispute of such nature must be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice without the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

Declaration:

The ratification of this Convention by the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not in any way signify recognition of Israel.

The present ratification does not entail the establishment of relations of any kind with Israel.

AZERBAIJAN

Declaration:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee the application of the provisions of the Convention in the territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from that occupation."

Réservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 35 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provision of paragraph 2 of Article 35."

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

"... the Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 35 of the Convention."

BELARUS

Statement:

"The Republic of Belarus understands the implementation of the provisions of Article 10 of the Convention to the degree that will not contradict its national legislation."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The French, Flemish and German-speaking Communities and the Regions of Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels-Capital are also bound by this signature.

BELIZE

Reservation:

"The Government of Belize does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 35, paragraph 2, of this Convention, which provide that any dispute between two or more States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention that has not been settled by negotiation shall be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties thereto."

BOLIVIA

18 May 2006

Declarations:

With respect to the definitions and characterizations set out in Articles 5, 6, 8 and 23 of the Convention, the Republic of Bolivia declares that it will first apply its national legislation in force and, secondly, the provisions of the present Convention.

The Republic of Bolivia declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 35, which deals with the settlement of disputes concerning this Convention.

CHINA

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China makes a reservation with regard to Article 35, paragraph 2 of the Convention and is not bound by the provisions of Article 35, paragraph 2.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

In accordance with article 35, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Colombia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of that article.

ECUADOR

Reservation:

...

With regard to article 10 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Government of Ecuador points out that the concept of criminal liability of legal persons is not at the moment embodied in Ecuadorian legislation. When legislation progresses in this area, this reservation will be withdrawn.

Exercising the powers referred to in article 35, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the Government of Ecuador makes a reservation with regard to article 35, paragraph 2, relating to the settlement of disputes.

EGYPT

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 35, paragraph 2, thereof.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"Article 36 (3) of the United Nations Convention against transnational organised crime provides that the instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval of a regional economic integration organisation shall contain a declaration on the extent of its competence.

The Community points out that it has competence with regard to progressively establishing the internal market, comprising an area without internal frontiers in which the free movement of goods and services is ensured in accordance with

the provisions of the Treaty establishing the European Community. For this purpose, the Community has adopted measures to combat money laundering. They do, however, at present not include measures concerning cooperation between Financial Intelligence Units, detection and monitoring the movement of cash across the borders between the Member States or cooperation among judicial and law enforcement authorities. The Community also has adopted measures to ensure transparency and the equal access of all candidates for the public contracts and services markets which contributes to preventing corruption. Where the Community has adopted measures, it is for the Community alone to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent international organisations which affect those measures or alter their scope. This competence relates to Articles 7, 9 and 31 (2)(c) of the Convention. Moreover, Community policy in the sphere of development cooperation complements policies pursued by Member States and includes provisions to combat corruption. This competency relates to Article 30 of the Convention. Moreover, the Community considers itself bound by other provisions of the Convention to the extent that they are related to the application of Articles 7, 9. 30 and 31 (2)(c). in particular the articles concerning its purpose and definitions and its final provisions.

The scope and the exercise of Community competence are, by their nature, subject to continuous development and the Community will complete or amend this declaration, if necessary, in accordance with Article 36 of the Convention.

2) The United Nations Convention against transnational organised crime shall apply, with regard to the competence of the Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty, in particular Article 299 thereof.

Pursuant to Article 299, this declaration is not applicable to the territories of the Member States in which the said Treaty does not apply and is without prejudice to such acts or positions as may be adopted under the Convention by the Member States concerned on behalf of and in the interests of those territories."

Statement:

"With respect to Article 35, paragraph 2, the Community points out that, according to Article 34, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, only States may be parties before that Court. Therefore, under Article 35, paragraph 2, of the Convention, in disputes involving the community only dispute settlement by way of arbitration will be available."

El Salvador

Reservation:

With regard to article 35, paragraph 3, of the said Convention, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of the said article because it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Israel

Declaration Regarding Article 35(2)

"In accordance with Article 35 paragraph 3 of the Convention the State of Israel declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 35 paragraph 2, which stipulates that all disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice."

Jordan

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"The Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan declares its intention not to be bound by the provisions of article 35, Paragraph (2) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime."

Lao People's Democratic Republic

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3, Article 35 of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2, Article 35 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

Lithuania

Declarations:

".....according to paragraph 6 of Article 13 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania shall consider the Convention the necessary and sufficient treaty basis for the taking of the measures referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2 of Article 13 of this Convention;

...

.....pursuant to paragraph 3 of Article 35 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania shall not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 35, stipulating that any disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice."

Micronesia (Federated States of)

Reservation:

"... with a reservation that the FSM Government shall not consider itself bound by article 35, paragraph 2, of the Convention; ..."

Malaysia

Declarations:

"(a) Pursuant to Article 35, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 35, paragraph 2 of the Convention, and

(b) the Government of Malaysia reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the arbitration procedure set forth in Article 35, paragraph 2 of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

Moldova

Declarations:

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 35 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 35 of the Convention.

Until the full establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Convention will be applied only on the territory controlled by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova.

In accordance with paragraph 5 (a) of Article 16 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova consider the Convention as legal basis for cooperation with other States Parties on extradition. The Republic of Moldova does not consider the Conven-

tion as legal basis for extradition of its own citizens and persons who have been granted political asylum in the country, according to national legislation.

MYANMAR

Reservations:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar wishes to express reservations on Article 16 relating to extradition and does not consider itself bound by the same.

The Government further wishes to make a reservation on Article 35 and does not consider itself bound by obligations to refer disputes relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention to the International Court of Justice."

NICARAGUA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The State of the Republic of Nicaragua declares that such measures as may be necessary to harmonize the Convention with its domestic law, will be the outcome of the processes of revision of criminal legislation which the State of the Republic of Nicaragua is currently pursuing or which it may pursue in the future. Moreover, the State of the Republic of Nicaragua reserves the right, at the moment of depositing its instrument of ratification of the present Convention, to invoke, in accordance with the general principles of international law, article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969.

PANAMA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Panama hereby declares that, in connection with articles 16 and 18 of the Convention, it shall not be obliged to carry out extraditions or to render mutual legal assistance in cases where the events giving rise to a request for extradition or mutual legal assistance are not offences under the criminal legislation of the Republic of Panama.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declarations:

The Russian Federation, in accordance with article 13, paragraph 6 of the Convention declares that, on the basis of reciprocity, it will consider the Convention the necessary and sufficient treaty basis for the taking of the measures referred to in article 13, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention;

The Russian Federation shall have jurisdiction over the offences established in accordance with articles 5, 6, 8 and 23 of the Convention in the cases envisaged in article 15, paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Convention;

The Russian Federation considers that the provisions of article 16, paragraph 14 of the Convention must be applied in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offences falling within the purview of the Convention, without detriment to the effectiveness of international cooperation in the areas of extradition and legal assistance;

The Russian Federation, on the basis of article 18, paragraph 7 of the Convention, declares that, on the basis of reciprocity, it will apply article 18, paragraphs 9 to 29 instead of the relevant provisions of any treaty of the mutual legal assistance concluded by the Russian Federation with another State Party to the Convention, if, in the view of the central authority of the Russian Federation, that will facilitate cooperation;

The Russian Federation declares that, in accordance with article 27, paragraph 2 of the Convention, it will consider the Convention as the basis for mutual law enforcement cooperation in respect of the offences covered by the Convention, on condition that such cooperation does not include the conduct of investigatory or other procedural actions in the territory of the Russian Federation.

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservations:

"The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself obligated by paragraph 2 of article 35 of the Convention."

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 6, paragraph 2 (d) and Article 13, paragraph 5 the appropriate authority which will furnish copies of the laws and regulations of the Slovak Republic that give effect to these paragraphs and of any subsequent changes to such laws and regulations or a description thereof to the Secretary General of the United Nations is the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic."

SOUTH AFRICA

Reservation :

"AND WHEREAS pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article 35 (2) of the Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case."

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

Reservation:

"In accordance with Article 35, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the Republic of Macedonia states that it does not consider itself bound by Article 35, paragraph 2, which stipulates that all disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be referred to the International Court of Justice."

TUNISIA

Reservation:

In ratifying the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 15 November 2000, the Tunisian Government declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 35, paragraph 2, of the Convention and emphasizes that disputes over the interpretation or application of this Convention may not be submitted to the International Court of Justice unless there is agreement in principle among all the parties concerned.

UKRAINE

Reservations and declarations:

The Verkhovna Rada of Ukraine declares that it ratified the following acts:

1. United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (referred hereinafter as this Convention) signed by Ukraine in Palermo on 12 December 2000 with the following reservations and declarations:

to the paragraph 6 of Article 13:

The Convention shall be applied only subject to the observation of the constitutional principles and fundamental basis of the legal system of Ukraine;

to the paragraph b of Article 2:

The term "serious crime" corresponds to the terms "grave crime"and "especially grave crime"in the Ukrainian criminal law. Grave crime means the crime for which the law provides such type of punishment as imprisonment for at least five years and not exceeding ten years (paragraph 4 of Article 12 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine), and especially grave crime means crime for which the law provides such type of punishment as imprisonment for more than ten years or life imprisonment (paragraph 5 of Article 12 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine);

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservation:

(1) The United States of America reserves the right to assume obligations under the Convention in a manner consistent with its fundamental principles of federalism, pursuant to which both federal and state criminal laws must be considered in relation to the conduct addressed in the Convention. U.S. federal criminal law, which regulates conduct based on its effect on interstate or foreign commerce, or another federal interest, serves as the principal legal regime within the United States for combating organized crime, and is broadly effective for this purpose. Federal criminal law does not apply in the rare case where such criminal conduct does not so involve interstate or foreign commerce, or another federal interest. There are a small number of conceivable situations involving such rare offenses of a purely local character where U.S. federal and state criminal law may not be entirely adequate to satisfy an obligation under the Convention. The United States of America therefore reserves to the obligations set forth in the Convention to the extent they address conduct which would fall within this narrow category of highly localized activity. This reservation does not affect in any respect the ability of the United States to provide international cooperation to other Parties as contemplated in the Convention.

(2) The United States of America reserves the right not to apply in part the obligation set forth in Article 15, paragraph 1 (b) with respect to the offenses established in the Convention. The United States does not provide for plenary jurisdiction over offenses that are committed on board ships flying its flag or aircraft registered under its laws. However, in a number of circumstances, U.S. law provides for jurisdiction over such offenses committed on board U.S. -flagged ships or aircraft registered under U.S. law. Accordingly, the United States will implement paragraph 1 (b) to the extent provided for under its federal law.

(3) In accordance with Article 35, paragraph 3, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by the obligation set forth in Article 35, paragraph 2."

UZBEKISTAN

Reservation:

The Republic of Uzbekistan does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 35 of this Convention.

Declaration:

Communication concerning article 2, paragraph (a), of the Convention

Under article 29, section 4, of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, approved by the Act of 22 September 1994, a group of two or more persons constituted in advance for the purpose of joint criminal activity is considered an organized group.

Communication concerning article 2, paragraph (b), of the Convention

Under article 15 of the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, offences are subdivided, according to their nature and the degree of danger they pose to society, into: offences that do not pose a great danger to society, less grave, grave and especially grave offences.

Offences that do not pose a great danger to society are premeditated offences punishable by deprivation of liberty for not more than three years and offences committed through negligence and punishable by deprivation of liberty for not more than five years.

Less grave offences are premeditated offences punishable by deprivation of liberty for more than three years but not exceeding five years and offences committed through negligence and punishable by deprivation of liberty for more than five years.

Grave offences are premeditated offences punishable by deprivation of liberty for more than 5 years but not exceeding 10 years.

Especially grave offences are premeditated offences punishable by deprivation of liberty for more than 10 years or the death penalty.

Communication concerning article 2, paragraph (g), of the Convention

Pursuant to the Act of the Republic of Uzbekistan of 29 August 2001, confiscation of property as a form of punishment has been removed from the Criminal Code.

Article 284 of the Code of Criminal Procedure of the Republic of Uzbekistan provides that property that is the object of a crime shall, on the judgement of a court, become State property, unless it is subject to return to the former owner.

Communication concerning article 7 of the Convention

Under article 38 of the Act of the Republic of Uzbekistan of 25 April 1996 on banks and bank activities, information on transactions by and accounts belonging to natural and legal persons may be transmitted to the clients and organizations themselves, to the procurator, and to courts and bodies conducting initial inquiries and investigations:

(a) Information on transactions by and accounts belonging to legal persons and other organizations may be transmitted to the organizations themselves, to the procurator, and to courts and bodies conducting initial inquiries and investigations when criminal proceedings have been initiated;

(b) Information on accounts and deposits belonging to natural persons may be transmitted to the clients themselves and their legal representatives and, provided that such information pertains to cases they are handling, to courts and bodies conducting initial inquiries and investigations when financial resources and other assets of the client in the account or deposit may be subject to seizure, when a penalty is enforced or when property is confiscated.

Communication concerning article 10 of the Convention

The legislation of the Republic of Uzbekistan does not provide for criminal or administrative liability in respect of legal persons.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)[6]

14 January 2005

Reservation:

Pursuant to article 35, paragraph 3, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares that it enters an express reservation concerning the provisions of paragraph 2 of this article. Consequently, it does not consider itself bound to submit to arbitration as a means of settling disputes, nor does it recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Notifications under articles 5 (3), 16 (5), 18 (13) and (14), and 31 (6) of the Convention.
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ARMENIA

"Article 5

Pursuant to paragraph 3 of Article 5 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted in New York on the 15th day of November 2000 (hereinafter referred as to Convention) the Republic of Armenia declares that its Criminal Code (chapter 7, in particular Article 41 of the Code) covers all serious crimes involving organized criminal groups provided in paragraph 1 (a) (i) of Article 5 of the Convention.

Article 16

Pursuant to paragraph 5 of Article 16 of the Convention the Republic of Armenia declares that it will take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

However, at the same time the Republic of Armenia declares that it shall apply the Convention in relations with the States Parties of the European Convention on Extradition, done at Paris, on 13th day of December 1957, provided that the Convention supplements and facilitates the application of the provisions of the European Convention on Extradition.

Article 18

Pursuant to paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the Convention the Republic of Armenia designates the following central authorities to receive the requests for mutual legal assistance:

a/ in respect of the cases of pretrial investigation phase

- the General Prosecutor's Office of the Republic of Armenia

b/ in respect of the cases of court proceedings phase or connected with the implementation of the judgment

- the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Armenia.

Pursuant to paragraph 14 Article 18 of the Convention the Republic of Armenia declares that the acceptable languages are Armenian, English or Russian."

AUSTRALIA

2 July 2004

Australia has the additional honour to note that, under article 5 (3) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime, Australia is required to inform the Secretary General of the United Nations if its law operates in a way that is covered by the paragraph. In accordance with that obligation, the Permanent Mission of Australia is pleased to advise that Australia's law does require an act of furtherance of the Agreement for the conspiracy offence to be made out.

The Permanent Mission of Australia is also pleased to advise that the appropriate Australian authority to contact for the purposes of articles 18 and 31 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime is:

The Attorney-General's Department
(Assistant Secretary, International Crime Branch)
Robert Garran Offices
National Circuit
BARTON ACT 2602
AUSTRALIA

Australia further notes that Australia is not required to make a notification under article 16 (5) of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organised Crime as Australian extradition law does not operate in the manner covered by this article."

2409114. Fax: (591) (2) 2408642. E-mail: mreu-

AZERBAIJAN

"In accordance with paragraph 5 of Article 16 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it will use the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States- Parties to the Convention.

In accordance with paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Azerbaijan is designated as the central authority that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution.

In accordance with paragraph 14 of Article 18 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that the requests and supporting documents should be submitted in Russian or English as the UN official languages, and should be accompanied by a translation in Azeri.

In accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 31 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that the following authority can assist other States Parties in developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime:

Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan
H. Hajiev st. 7,
Baky, Azerbaijan."

BELARUS

"The Republic of Belarus in accordance with Article 16 of the Convention will use the Convention as a basis for cooperation on the issues of extradition with other states - members of the Convention."

BELGIUM

In accordance with article 18, paragraph 13 of the Convention, the Federal Department of Justice, head office for legislation, fundamental rights and freedoms, 115 Boulevard de Waterloo, 1000 Brussels, has been designated as the central authority.

BELIZE

"[The Government of Belize] declares that it shall take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention;

[The Government of Belize] further declares that the central authority designated for the purpose of article 18, paragraph 13 of the aforesaid Convention is the Attorney-General's Office and the language acceptable to Belize for the purposes of article 18, paragraph 14 is English."

BOLIVIA

18 May 2006

1.Pursuant to Article 16, paragraph 5, on the subject of extradition, the Republic of Bolivia declares that it will be governed by its domestic laws, by the international treaties signed bilaterally with various States, and, supplementarily, by the Convention.

2. Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 13, of the Convention, it declares further that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Worship is the central authority for the receipt of requests for mutual legal assistance. The address of the Ministry is Plaza Murillo, c. Ingavi esq. c. Junín, La Paz, Bolivia. Tel: (591) (2) 2408900 - no@rree.gov.bo.

3. In addition, pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 14, of the Convention, it wishes to advise that all requests should be submitted to the central authority in writing and in the Spanish language.

BOTSWANA

"The Government of the Republic of Botswana hereby notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations that pursuant to:

a) paragraph 5 (a) of Article 16, the Government of the Republic of Botswana will not take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention;

b) paragraph 13 of Article 18, the Government of the Republic of Botswana designates the Attorney General of the Republic of Botswana as the central authority that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution;

c) paragraph 14 of Article 18, English is the acceptable language to the Government of the Republic of Botswana;

d) paragraph 6 of Article 31, the following authorities can assist other State Parties in developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime:

i) The Commissioner of Police
Botswana Police Headquarter
Government Enclave
Private Bag 0012
Gaborone, Botswana

ii) The Attorney General of the Republic of Botswana
Attorney General's Chambers
Government Enclave
Private Bag 009
Gaborone, Botswana."

BRAZIL

15 August 2005

".....the Brazilian government has designated its Ministry of Justice as the central authority for matters related to mutual legal assistance, in accordance with article 18, paragraph 13 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime (Palermo Convention).

Any requests for international legal assistance under the Palermo Convention shall be directed, in Portuguese or in English, to the following focal points:

* International legal assistance

Department of Asset Recovery and International Legal Cooperation (DRCI)
SCN-Block 1–Building A - Office 101
Zip Code: 70711-900
Phone: 00. 55. 61. 429 8900
Fax: 00. 55. 61. 328 1347
E-mail: drci-cgci@mj.gov.br

* Extradition and transference of convicted criminals

Department of Foreigners (DEEST)
Esplanade of Ministries - Ministry of Justice - Building T - Annex II
3rd Floor - Office 305
Zip Code: 70064-900
Phone: 00. 55. 61. 429 3325
Fax: 00. 55. 61. 429 9383
E-mail: deesti@mj.gov.br."

- The convention A/P.1/7/92 of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) on mutual legal assistance in criminal matters, adopted at Dakar on 29 July 1992;

BURKINA FASO

... the information below relates to the criminalization of an organized criminal group and of certain offences provided for in the Convention, the extradition regime, the central authority competent to receive and execute requests for mutual legal assistance, and the acceptable language for submitting such requests to Burkina Faso.

I. Criminalization of an organized criminal group, and certain offences covered by the Convention

In the positive law of Burkina Faso, the applicable Penal Code (Act 43/96/ADP of 13 November 1996) criminalizes an organized criminal group.

Article 222 of the Penal Code, which defines the crime of association of offenders, stipulates that "any association or agreement of whatever duration or number of members, formed or established for the purpose of committing crimes against persons or property, shall constitute the crime of association of offenders, which exists by the sole fact of the resolution to act decided by mutual consent".

Articles 223 and 224, which punish that offence, set the following penalties for offenders:

- Five to 10 years of imprisonment for any person belonging to the association or agreement defined in article 222;
- Ten to 20 years of imprisonment for the leaders of such an association or agreement.

The Penal Code of Burkina Faso accordingly criminalizes the existence of an organized criminal group as a separate offence, before the commission of any act that is the subject of the agreement.

It should also be pointed out that the Penal Code allows for the extension of the prosecution of members of an organized group to persons outside the group who have participated in the commission of an offence by the group, as associates or accomplices (arts. 64 and 65 of the Penal Code). Receiving, which is defined as the knowing possession or enjoyment of proceeds of crime or of money laundered from drug trafficking by an individual, is also a crime under articles 508 to 510 and article 446 of the Penal Code.

With regard to corruption, whose criminalization has been recommended by the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, it should be noted that the Penal Code of Burkina Faso, in articles 156 and 160, defines and imposes penalties for the commission of such an offence.

Regarding the criminal liability of legal persons, the Penal Code allows for the establishment of such liability, since article 64, paragraph 2, thereof provides that "any legal person having a civil, commercial, industrial or financial purpose on whose behalf or in whose interest the act of commission or omission that constitutes an offence has been wilfully perpetrated by its organs shall also be considered an accomplice".

II. Extradition regime

Burkina Faso has signed agreements on mutual legal assistance, including extradition, with France (an agreement on judicial cooperation, signed at Paris on 24 April 1961) and Mali (a general convention on cooperation in judicial matters, signed at Ouagadougou on 23 November 1963).

At the multilateral level, Burkina Faso has also signed several conventions on judicial cooperation, including:

- The general convention on judicial cooperation, signed at Antananarivo on 12 September 1961 under the auspices of the former African and Malagasy Common Organization (OCAM);
- The convention on judicial cooperation among the States parties to the Accord on Non-Aggression and Mutual Assistance in Defence (ANAD), adopted at Nouakchott on 21 April 1987;

- The extradition convention A/P.1/8/94 of ECOWAS, signed at Abuja on 6 August.

For countries bound to Burkina Faso by a cooperation agreement or convention, these texts are applicable in their relations.

For countries not bound to Burkina Faso by an agreement or convention on judicial cooperation, the text which applies in the case of a request for extradition is the legislative act of 10 March 1927 on the extradition of foreigners. That law was promulgated in former French West Africa (AOF) and made applicable to the former colonies by an order dated 2 April 1927 (Official Journal of French West Africa, 1927, p. 297). It remained in force in Burkina Faso after independence. Article 1 of the act provides that, "in the absence of a treaty, the conditions, procedure and modalities of extradition shall be determined by the provisions of the present law. The law shall also apply to those issues not regulated by treaties".

What is clear from the reading of this article on the extradition law of Burkina Faso is that the extradition of foreigners is not subordinated to the prior existence of a treaty, since the law in question is designed to regulate cases where no treaty exists or points on which existing treaties are silent.

In the case of a request for extradition, the same law subordinates the handing over of the foreigner who is the subject of the request to the existence of legal proceedings or a conviction for an offence under the law (art. 2).

With regard to offences for which extradition may be requested by foreign Governments, the law makes a distinction between the case of persons being prosecuted and those sentenced (art. 4). For persons being prosecuted, the law allows extradition for all offences constituting crimes under the laws of the requesting State. Regarding offences punishable by custodial sentences under the laws of the requesting State, the laws of Burkina Faso require that the maximum sentence must be at least two years of imprisonment.

For sentenced offenders, the act dated 10 March 1927 requires that the sentence handed down by the court in the requesting State must equal or exceed two months of imprisonment.

From these various clarifications, it may be said that the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime alone cannot serve as the legal basis for the offences it considers extraditable. It can certainly be affirmed, however, that the domestic laws of Burkina Faso, and the agreements to which the country is signatory, easily allow for extradition and are not at variance with the Convention.

III. Central authority competent to receive and execute requests for mutual legal assistance

In Burkina Faso, the central authority competent to receive and execute requests for mutual legal assistance is the Garde des sceaux, Minister of Justice. This principle is enshrined in articles 9 and 10 of the act dated 10 March 1927 on extradition and is applicable to any form of mutual legal assistance.

- Under article 9 of that act, requests for extradition should be addressed to the Government of Burkina Faso through the diplomatic channel;
- Article 10 of the act stipulates that, "after documentary verification, the request for extradition shall be transmitted, with the supporting documents, by the Minister for Foreign Affairs to the Minister of Justice, who shall ensure that the request is in order and shall take such action as is required under law";
- Thus, the principle is that the Minister for Foreign Affairs serves as the intermediary for transmission of the request for mutual legal assistance sent through the diplomatic channel, while the Minister of Justice is the authority empowered to receive and execute the request.

It should be mentioned that agreements on judicial cooperation intended to simplify procedures between the States parties, often provide for a waiver of this principle by allowing for direct transmittal of the request for mutual legal assistance from the competent judicial authority of the requesting State to that of the requested State.

IV. Language acceptable for requesting mutual legal assistance

In accordance with the provisions of article 35, paragraph 1, of the Constitution, the official language of Burkina Faso is French. For that reason, the language acceptable for official documents addressed to the Government, including requests for mutual legal assistance, is French.

CHILE

The Republic of Chile, in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 5 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, hereby gives notification that under the Chilean legal system involvement of an organized criminal group is required for purposes of the offences established in accordance with paragraph 1(a)(i) of article 5.

Moreover, in accordance with paragraph 6 of article 31 of the Convention, it hereby designates the Ministry of the Interior, with address at the Palacio de la Moneda, Santiago, Chile, as the national authority that can assist other States parties in developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime.

Furthermore, in accordance with paragraph 13 of article 18, it hereby designates the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as the central authority for purposes of receiving requests for mutual legal assistance, further specifying in accordance with paragraph 14 of that article that for purposes of such requests the language acceptable to Chile is Spanish.

CHINA

29 March 2006

"In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Public Security of the People's Republic of China are designated as the central authorities that have the responsibility and power to receive requests for legal assistance. The address of the Ministry of Justice is: 10 Chaoyangmen Nandajie, Chaoyang District, Beijing, China, 100020; and the address of the Ministry of Public Security is: 14 Dong Chang'anjie, Dongcheng District, Beijing, China, 100741.

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 14 of Article 18 of the Convention, Chinese is the only language acceptable to the People's Republic of China for the written requests for legal assistance."

COLOMBIA

Furthermore, in accordance with article 18, paragraph 13, Colombia gives notice that the central authorities designated to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution, and to formulate requests for legal assistance, shall be as follows:

(a) The Office of the Prosecutor-General, to receive and execute or transmit requests for mutual legal assistance made by other States Parties, and to formulate requests for legal assistance to other States Parties in the case of investigations being handled by that Office.

Address: Diagonal 22B No. 52-01 Ciudad Salitre
Switchboard: 5702000-41449000
Electronic mail: contacto@fiscalia.gov.co
Bogotá D.C., Colombia

(b) The Ministry of the Interior and Justice, to formulate requests to other States Parties for legal assistance in cases other

than investigations being handled by the Office of the Prosecutor-General.

Address: Avenida Jiménez No. 8-89
Switchboard: 5960500
Electronic mail: admin_web@mininteriorjusticia.gov.co
Bogotá D.C., Colombia

Finally, in accordance with article 18, paragraph 14, of the Convention, notice is given that Spanish is the language acceptable to Colombia for requests for legal assistance.

Cook Islands

"In accordance with the provisions of article 18, paragraph 13, of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Government of the Cook Islands declares that the Attorney General of the Cook Islands is designated by the Government of the Cook Islands as the Central Authority that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance.

AND pursuant to article 18, paragraph 14, of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, that the English language is designated by the Government of the Cook Islands as the acceptable language in which to make requests for mutual legal assistance."

Denmark

"In accordance with Article 18 (13) of the Convention Denmark declares that the central authority in Denmark competent to receive requests for mutual legal assistance is the Ministry of Justice. The address is: Justitsministeriet, Det Internationale Kontor, Slotsholmsgade 10, DK-1216 Copenhagen K, tel. +45 33 92 33 40, fax +45 33 93 35 10, email: *jm@jm.dk*.

In accordance with Article 18 (14) of the Convention Denmark declares that it will accept requests in the following languages: Danish, Swedish Norwegian, English, French and German."

Ecuador

For the purposes of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Government of Ecuador designates the Office of the Public Prosecutor as the central Ecuadorian authority [in acordance with article 18, paragraph 13].

El Salvador

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador recognizes the extradition of nationals on the basis of article 28, second and third subparagraphs, of the Constitution of the Republic, which states as follows: `Extradition shall be governed by international treaties and, where Salvadorans are involved, shall be in order only where a treaty expressly so stipulates and has been approved by the legislative bodies of the signatory countries. In any event, its stipulations shall embody the principle of reciprocity and shall grant to all Salvadorans all of the penal and procedural guarantees that are set forth in this Constitution.' 'Extradition shall be in order only where the offence has been committed within the territorial jurisdiction of the requesting country, except where offences of international reach are involved. Under no circumstances may extradition be stipulated for political offences, even where common crimes are the result of such offences,' advising further that the said Convention shall not be considered to be the legal basis of cooperation on extradition in its relations with other States parties thereto, and that it shall nonetheless endeavour, where necessary, to conclude extradition treaties with other States parties to the Convention.

With regard to article 18, paragraphs 13 and 14, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador states that the designated central authority is the Ministry of the Interior. Communications shall be transmitted through the diplomatic channel, and the acceptable language is Spanish.

Estonia

"... the Riigikogu of the Republic of Estonia, while ratifying the Convention, made the following declarations:

1) pursuant to Article 5 paragraph 3 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia declares that under its legislation it considers the act provided in paragraph l(a)(i) of Article 5 as a crime;

2) pursuant to Article 16 paragraph 5 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia declares that it will take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention;

3) pursuant to Article 18 paragraph 13 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia designates the Ministry of Justice as a central authority to receive the requests for mutual legal assistance;

4) pursuant to Article 18 paragraph 14 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia declares that the acceptable languages are Estonian and English."

Germany

With reference to Article 5, paragraph 3:

"German domestic law requires the involvement of an organized criminal group for the purposes of the offences established in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 1 (a) (i)."

...

Pursuant to the obligation under Article 18, paragraph 13:

"Germany designates the

Bundesministerium der Justiz
[Federal Ministry of Justice]
Adenauerallee 99-103
D-53113 Bonn
Tel.: +49 (0) 228 580
Fax: +49 (0) 228 58 83 25

as the central authority authorized to receive requests for mutual legal assistance."

Pursuant to the obligation under Article 18, paragraph 14:

"Requests for mutual legal assistance submitted to Germany must be written in the German language or be accompanied by a translation into German."

Pursuant to the obligation under Article 31, paragraph 6:

"Germany designates the

Bundeskriminalamt
[Federal Criminal Police Office]
65173 Wiesbaden
Tel.: +49 (0) 611-55-0
Fax: +49 (0) 611-55-12141
E-Mail: info@bka.de

as the authority responsible under Article 31, paragraph 6 of the Convention."

Israel

"Declaration Regarding Article 18 (13)

The Minister of Justice is the competent authority under Israeli law to receive requests for legal assistance, an authority which is permitted to delegate. Pursuant to such designation, requests for mutual assistance in criminal cases should be addressed to the Israel Directorate of Courts in the Ministry of Justice, 22 Kanfei Nesharim St. Jerusalem, 95464, copied to the Diplomatic and Civil Law Department in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, 9 Rabin Ave., Jerusalem.

Declaration Regarding Article 18(14)

Requests for legal assistance must be submitted either in Hebrew or in English.

Declaration Regarding Article 31 (6)

The authority qualified to assist other countries Parties to the Convention in developing means for the prevention of Transnational Organized Crime is the Special Operations Division of the Israeli Police."

KIRIBATI

"... pursuant to article 18 (13) of the Convention that the Attorney-General of Kiribati is designated by the Republic of Kiribati as the Central Authority who shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance; and

... pursuant to Article 18 (14) of the Convention that English is designated by the Republic of Kiribati as the acceptable language in which to make requests for mutual legal assistance."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

"1. In accordance with paragraph 5(a), Article 16 of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not take this Convention as the legal basic for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention.

2. In accordance with paragraph 13, Article 18, the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic designates the Ministry of Public Security as central authority and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs as alternate central authority that have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution.

3. In accordance with paragraph 14, Article 18, in addition to the Lao language, English is acceptable to the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic."

LATVIA

"Declaration

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 5 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted at New York on the 15th day of November 2000, the Republic of Latvia declares that its domestic law requires an act in furtherance of the agreement for purposes of the offences established in accordance with paragraph 1 (a) (i) of Article 5."

"Declaration

In accordance with paragraph 5 of Article 16 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted at New York on the 15th day of November 2000, the Republic of Latvia declares that it takes the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention."

"Declaration

In accordance with paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted at New York on the 15th day of November 2000, the Republic of Latvia declares that the designated authorities are:

1) Prosecutor General's Office - during a pre-trial investigation

O. Kalpaka blvd. 6, Riga, LV-1801, Latvia
Phone: +371 704 4400
Fax: +371 704 4449
E-mail: gen@lrp.gov.lv

2) Ministry of Justice - during a trial.

Brivibas blvd. 36, Riga, LV- 1536, Latvia
Phone: +371 703 6801, 703 6716
Fax: +371 721 0823, 728 5575
E-mail: tm.kancelcja@tm.gov.lv"

"Declaration

In accordance with paragraph 14 of Article 18 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted at New York on the 15th day of November 2000, the Republic of Latvia declares that the acceptable language is English or Latvian."

LESOTHO

"1. The legal system pertaining in the Kingdom of Lesotho requires involvement of an organized criminal groups for purposes of the offences established in accordance with article 5 (1) (a) (i), and further requires an act in furtherance of an agreement for purposes of the offences established in accordance with article 5 (1) (a) (i) of the Convention.

2. In response to article 16 (5) of the Convention, in Lesotho, extradition is conditional on the existence of a treaty.

3. In response to article 18 (13) of the Convention, in Lesotho the office of the Attorney-General shall be the designated central authority with the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance.

4. In response to article 18 (14) of the Convention, the English language is acceptable for purposes of requests for mutual legal assistance."

LITHUANIA

...

.... pursuant to paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania and the Prosecutor General's Office under the Supreme Court of the Republic of Lithuania shall be designated as central authorities to receive requests for mutual legal assistance;

.... pursuant to paragraph 14 of Article 18 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that requests for legal assistance and documents pertaining thereto, which shall be submitted to the Republic of Lithuania, should be accompanied by respective translations into English, Russian or Lithuanian, in case the aforementioned documents are not in one of these languages;

.... pursuant to paragraph 5 (a) of Article 16 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania shall consider this Convention a legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention; however, the Republic of Lithuania in no case shall consider the Convention a legal basis for the extradition of Lithuanian nationals, as it is stipulated in the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania.

MALAWI

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi is currently in the process of reviewing its domestic legislation with the aim of incorporating obligations assumed on, ratification of this convention, specifically, offences stipulated in consonant with Article 5 (1) and (2).

The Government also undertakes to notify, the Secretary-General of the United Nations once the enabling legislation has been prepared and passed perforce Article 5 (3).

Further, the Government regards this convention as the legal basis for matters relating to extradition, on the basis of reciprocity with those States Parties which likewise have accepted the same.

Further informs consistent with Article 18 (13) that the Competent Authority for the administration of this convention is the Ministry responsible for Home Affairs and Internal Security whose address is given below;

The Principal Secretary
Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security
P/Bag 331
Capital Hill,

Lilongwe 3. Malawi.

The Preferred language for Official Communications perforce Article 18 (14) is English language."

MALAYSIA

"1. Pursuant to Article 16, paragraph 5 (a) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it does not take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention. The Government of Malaysia declares that it will render cooperation on extradition on the legal basis provided under the Extradition Act 1992 of Malaysia.

2. Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 13 of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia designates the Attorney General of Malaysia as the central authority.

3. In accordance with Article 18, paragraph 14 of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that requests and attachments thereto addressed to the central authority of Malaysia should be in the English language or a translation into the English language should be attached thereto.

4. Pursuant to Article 31, paragraph 6 of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia notifies that the authorities that can assist other States Parties in developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime are -

a) Ministry of Internal Security;
b Ministry of Home Affairs;
c) Attorney General's Chambers;
d) Royal Malaysian Police;
e) Anti-Corruption Agency;
f) Central Bank of Malaysia;
g) Immigration Department;
h) National Drugs Agency."

MALTA

11 December 2003

"... the Government of Malta wishes to enter the following declarations:

Article 16, paragraph 5 (a)

Pursuant to Article 16, paragraph 5 of the Convention, Malta declares that it will take the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

Article 18, paragraph 13

Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 13 of the Convention Malta designates the Attorney General of Malta as the central authority to receive requests for mutual assistance.

Article 18, paragraph 14

Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 14 of the Convention, Malta declares that the acceptable languages are Maltese and English."

MAURITIUS

"DECLARES that it shall take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention;

AND FURTHER declares that the central authority designated for the purpose of article [18], paragraph 13 of the aforesaid Convention is the Attorney-General's Office and the languages acceptable to the Republic of Mauritius for the purposes of article [18], paragraph 14 are English and French."

MEXICO

Article 5 (3) - The United Mexican States wishes to state that in criminalizing the offences defined in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1 (a) (i), the domestic law of the Mexican State covers all serious crimes involving the participation of an organized criminal group. The criminalization of an agreement with one or more other persons to commit a serious crime for a purpose relating directly or indirectly to the obtaining of a financial or other material benefit involves the participation of an organized criminal group in the offence of organized crime provided for in article 2 of the Federal Act to Combat Organized Crime, insofar as it is relevant to the crimes to which the said article refers. The offence of criminal association, provided for in article 164 of the Federal Criminal Code, is applicable insofar as it is relevant to the other serious crimes to which the Convention refers.

Article 16, paragraph 5 (a) - The Mexican State shall consider the Convention as the legal basis of cooperation in extradition matters in respect of those States parties with which it has not concluded treaties in the matter.

Article 18, paragraph 13 - The Office of the Attorney-General of the Republic is designated as the central authority in matters of mutual legal assistance.

Article 18, paragraph 14 - Requests for judicial assistance shall be submitted in the Spanish language. Requests may also be submitted in the language of the requesting State, provided that they are accompanied by a translation into Spanish.

MOLDOVA

In accordance with paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova designate the following central authorities responsible for receiving requests of legal assistance:

a) General Prosecutor's Office - during pre-trial investigation;

b) Ministry of Justice - during the trial or execution of punishment.

In accordance with paragraph 14 of Article 18 of the Convention, the acceptable languages for the requests of legal assistance and for appended documents are: Moldovan, English or Russian.

MONACO

18 October 2006

In accordance with article 16, paragraph 5 of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that, in the absence of a bilateral convention on extradition, it considers the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime to be the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

In accordance with article 18, paragraph 13, the Principality of Monaco declares that it designates the Director of Judicial Services as the authority with the responsibility and power for executing or transmitting requests for mutual legal assistance to the competent authorities.

In accordance with article 18, paragraph 14, the Principality of Monaco declares that the acceptable language is French.

In accordance with article 31, paragraph 6, the Principality of Monaco declares that the Director of Judicial Services is the authority that can assist other States Parties.

MOZAMBIQUE

"Pursuant to :

(a) paragraph 13 of Article 18, the Government of the Republic of Mozambique designates the Minister of Justice as the central authority that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution.

(b) paragraph 14 of Article 18, Portuguese or English are the acceptable languages to the Government of the Republic of Mozambique."

NETHERLANDS

"With reference to Article 16, paragraph 5, under a), of the Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, done at New York on 15 November 2000, the Kingdom of the Netherlands declares that it will take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

".....DECLARES pursuant to Article 18 (13) of the Convention that the Attorney General of New Zealand is designated by the Government of New Zealand as the Central Authority that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance;

AND DECLARES pursuant to Article 18 (14) of the Convention that English is designated by the Government of New Zealand as the acceptable language in which to make requests for mutual legal assistance."

NICARAGUA

10 February 2005

... in accordance with article 18, paragraph 13, of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua has designated the Office of the Attorney-General of the Republic as the central authority with the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution.

NORWAY

"Article 5 of the Palermo Convention has been implemented in Norwegian law through Section 162 c of the Penal Code, which reads as follows:

"Any person who enters into an agreement with another person to commit an act that is punishable by imprisonment for a term of not less than three years, and that is to be committed as a step in the activity of an organized criminal group, shall be liable to imprisonment for a term not exceeding three years unless the offence comes under a more severe penal provision. An increase of the maximum penalty in the case of a repeated offence or a concurrence of felonies is not to be taken into account.

An organized criminal group is here defined as an organized group of three or more persons whose main purpose is to commit an act that is punishable by imprisonment for a term of not less than three years, or whose activity largely consists of committing such acts."

Under Article 5 (3) of the Palermo Convention, States Parties are to inform the Secretary-General when the national legislation implementing Article 5 requires 1) "involvement of an organized criminal group"or 2) that "an act in furtherance of the agreement" has taken place.

1. Section 162 c of the Norwegian Penal Code requires that the "agreement" has some link with the criminal activity of an organized criminal group. The provision only applies to an agreement concerning acts that are committed as "a step in the activity of an organized criminal group". At least one of the Parties to the agreement must be a member of such a group, and the agreement must have been entered into by the group or by an individual representing the group. This is specified in the "travaux préparatoires"of this legislation, cf. Proposition No. 62 (2002-2003) to the Odelsting, pp. 31-32 and 95-96. This condition means that Section 162 c requires the "involovement of an organized criminal group".

2. On the other hand, if "an act in furtherance of the agreement" has taken place, this is not a necessary condition for punishment, cf. Proposition No. 62 (2002-2003) t the Odelsting, p.95.

Communications concerning mutual assistance in criminal matters are to be addressed to the Department of Civil Affairs, Ministry of Justice, as the competent authority in Norway.

Communications concerning legal aid may be made in the Norwegian, Swedish, Danish and English languages.

The Norwegian agency responsible for receiving requests from other States Parties for assistance in developing measures to prevent transnational crime is the Police Department, Ministry of Justice."

PANAMA

In that connection, I have the honour to inform you that requests to the Republic of Panama for legal assistance pursuant to article 18, paragraph 13, of the Convention must be made through the diplomatic channel.

13 December 2004

1.In accordance with article 5 (3) of the aforementioned Convention, the domestic law of the Republic of Panama does not require the involvement of an organized criminal group for purposes of the offences established in accordance with paragraph 1 (a) (i) of the aforementioned article. Similarly, the domestic law of the Republic of Panama requires an act in furtherance of the agreement for purposes of the offences established in accordance with paragraph 1 (a) (i) of the aforementioned article.

2. In accordance with article 16 (5) (a), the Republic of Panama will take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

3. In accordance with article 18 (14), the acceptable languages for requests for judicial assistance addressed to the Republic of Panama are Spanish and English.

4. In accordance with article 31 (6), the authority or authorities that can assist other States Parties in developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime are:

National Police
Address: Corregimiento de Ancón
Telephone: (507) 227-1801, (507) 232-5756,
(507) 232-5898
Fax: (507) 5757
Criminal Investigation Department
Address: Edificio Ancón, Avenida Frangipani, frente
al Mercado de Abasto
Telephone: (507) 212-2223
Fax: (507) 212-2400
Public Security and National Defence Council
Address: San Felipe, frente a la Presidencia de la República
Telephone: (507) 227-9871
Fax: (507) 225-1355

PARAGUAY

Article 16, paragraph 5 (a):

..., in accordance with article 16, paragraph 5 (a) of the Convention, I hereby inform you that the Republic of Paraguay will take the aforementioned Convention as the legal basis for coop-

eration on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

Article 18, paragraph 13:..., in accordance with article 18, paragraph 13, of the Convention, I hereby notify you that the Republic of Paraguay has designated the following institution as its central authority:

Central authority: Office of the Public Prosecutor

Department responsible: Department of International Affairs and External Legal Assistance

Director: Juan Emilio Oviedo Cabañas, lawyer

Address: Nuestra Señora de la Asunción 737 entre Víctor Haedo y Humaitá

Telephone: 595-21-4155000 extensions 162 and 157; 595-21-4155100; 595-21-454603

e-mail: jcoviedo@ministeriopublico.gov.py

Poland

Pursuant to article 18, paragraph 13 the Republic of Poland declares that the Ministry of Justice is designated as the central authority competent to receive requests for mutual legal assistance.

The Republic of Poland declares that Polish and English shall be the languages acceptable pursuant to article 18, paragraph 14.

Romania

"1. In accordance with Article 16 paragraph 5 (a) of the Convention, Romania considers this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention;

2. In accordance with Article 18 paragraph 13 of the Convention, the Romanian central authorities designated to receive the requests for mutual legal assistance are:

a) The Prosecutor's Office attached to the Supreme Court of Justice, for the requests for mutual legal assistance formulated in pre-trial investigation (Blvd. Libertatii nr.14, sector 5 Bucuresti, tel. 410 54 35/fax.337 47 54);

b) The Ministry of Justice, for the requests for mutual legal assistance formulated during the trial or execution of punishment, as well as for the requests of extradition (Str. Apollodor nr.17, sector 5 Bucaresti, tel. 3141514/fax. 310 16 62);

3. In accordance with Article 18 paragraph 14 of the Convention, the requests for mutual legal assistance and the enclosed documents submitted to the Romanian authorities shall be accompanied by translations in the Romanian language or in the French or English languages."

Russian Federation

The Russian Federation, in accordance with article 16, paragraph 5 (a) of the Convention, declares that, on the basis of reciprocity, it will take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention;

The Russian Federation, on the basis of the last sentence of article 18, paragraph 13 of the Convention declares that, on the basis of reciprocity, and in urgent circumstances, it will receive requests for mutual legal assistance and communications through the International Criminal Police Organization, on condition that documents containing such requests or communications are transmitted without delay under the established procedure;

The Russian Federation, in accordance with article 18, paragraph 14 of the Convention, declares that requests for legal assistance and related materials transmitted to the Russian Federation must be accompanied by a translation into Russian, unless otherwise provided by international treaty of the Russian Federation, or unless agreement has otherwise been reached between the central authority of the Russian Federation and the central authority of the other State Party to the Convention.

7 December 2004

".....the central authorities of the Russian Federation with responsibility for ensuring the implementation of the provisions of the Convention relating to mutual legal assistance are: the Ministry of Justice of the Russian Federation (in civil law matters, including civil-law aspects of criminal cases) and the Office of the Public Prosecutor of the Russian Federation (in criminal law matters)."

Saudi Arabia

"The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is one of the countries whose domestic laws stipulate that an act is to be undertaken in furtherance of the agreement, in order for the act to be criminalized as stated in paragraph 1/a/i of article 5 of the Convention."

Slovakia

"Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 13 the Slovak Republic designates the following central authorities to receive requests for mutual legal assistance:

(a) The General Prosecutor's Office of the Slovak Republic - in respect of cases of pretrial investigation phase.

(b) The Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic - in respect of cases of court proceedings phase.

Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 14 the acceptable languages for the Slovak Republic for receiving and producing a written records in respect of requests for mutual legal assistance are Slovak, Czech, English and French.

Pursuant to Article 31, paragraph 6 the authority that can assist other States Parties in developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime is the Ministry of Interior of the Slovak Republic."

9 August 2006

"The Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic is the competent authority under article 18, paragraph 13. In urgent cases, the request may be transmitted through the International Criminal Police Organization (Interpol)."

Slovenia

"Pursuant to Article 16, Paragraph 5 (a) of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia declares that it will take this Convention as the legal basis for co-operation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention. In the absence of an international agreement or any other arrangement regulating extradition between the Republic of Slovenia and another State Party to this Convention, the Republic of Slovenia will require documents relating to extradition in compliance with its domestic law.

Pursuant to Article 18, Paragraph 13 of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia declares that the central authority for the implementation of the Convention shall be the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Slovenia.

In compliance with Article 18, Paragraph 14 of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia declares that requests and attachments thereto addressed to the central authority of the Republic of Slovenia should be in the Slovenian language or a translation into Slovenian should be attached thereto. Should it be impossible to provide translation into the Slovenian language, requests and attachments should be in the English language or a translation into English should be enclosed."

South Africa

"AND WHEREAS the Secretary-General is hereby notified, in accordance with Article 18 (13) of the Convention that the

Director-General of the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development has been designated as the central authority to receive requests for mutual legal assistance.

AND WHEREAS the Secretary-General is hereby notified, as provided for in Article 18 (14) of the Convention, that English is the acceptable language for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance."

SWEDEN

"Pursuant to Article 18 (13) of the Convention, the central authority in Sweden competent to receive requests for mutual assistance is the Ministry of Justice.

Pursuant to Article 18 (14) of the Convention, a request together with the appendices shall be translated into Swedish, Danish or Norwegian, unless the authority dealing with the application otherwise allows in the individual case."

SWITZERLAND

21 November 2006

- The central authority designated by Switzerland to receive requests for mutual legal assistance, in accordance with article 18 (13) of the Convention is:

The Federal Office of Justice

CH-3003 Berne

- In accordance with article 18 (14) of the Convention, requests for mutual legal assistance and documents pertaining thereto must be submitted to Switzerland along with an official certified translation into French, German or Italian, should they not have been established in either of these languages.

THE FORMER YUGOSLAV REPUBLIC OF MACEDONIA

"1. The acts determined in Article 5, paragraph 1 (a) (i), of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, represent, according to the Criminal Code of the Republic of Macedonia, a criminal offense in Article 393 conspiracy to commit a crime. According to Article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the Criminal Code of the Republic of Macedonia does not require an act of furtherance of the agreement for the purposes of the offenses established in accordance with Article 5, paragraph 1 (a) (i).

2. In accordance with Article 18, paragraph 13, of the Convention, the Republic of Macedonia states that the central authority for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance shall be the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Macedonia.

3. In accordance with Article 18, paragraph 14, of the Convention, the Republic of Macedonia states that requests for mutual legal assistance and the documents enclosed that shall be made to the Republic of Macedonia, should be accompanied by translation in Macedonian and English.

4. In accordance with Article 16, paragraph 5, of the Convention, the Republic of Macedonia states that it takes this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention."

UKRAINE

to the paragraph 5 (a) of Article 16:

Ukraine declares that the Convention constitutes the legal ground for cooperation in the matters of extradition if a request for extradition is received from the State Party to the Convention with which there is no treaty on extradition;

to the paragraph 13 of Article 18:

Central authorities in Ukraine, designated in accordance with the paragraph 13 of Article 18, are the Ministry of Justice of Ukraine (with respect to judicial decisions) and the Office of the Prosecutor-General of Ukraine (with respect to legal proceedings during the investigation of criminal cases);

to the paragraph 14 of Article 18:

Requests for legal assistance and documents attached therein will be sent to Ukraine together with their authenticated translation in Ukrainian, Russian, English or French, if they have not been drawn up in one of these languages.

to the paragraph 3 of Article 26:

Provisions of paragraph 3 shall not be applied to the organizer or leader of criminal group in respect of granting immunity from criminal prosecution. In accordance with the legislation of Ukraine (paragraph two of Article 255 of the Criminal Code of Ukraine) the above persons bear criminal responsibility notwithstanding the grounds provided for in the Article 26 of the Convention.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Pursuant to Article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention, I have the honour to inform you that, in order to establish criminal liability under the United States law with respect to the offense described in Article 5, paragraph 1 (a) (i), the commission of an overt act in furtherance of the agreement is generally required.

Pursuant to Article 16, paragraph 5, of the Convention, I have the honour to inform you that the United States of America will not apply Article 16, paragraph 4.

Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 13, of the Convention, I have the honour to inform you that the Office of International Affairs, United States Department of Justice, Criminal Division, is designated as the central authority of the United States of America for mutual legal assistance under the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 18, paragraph 14, of the Convention, I have the honour to inform you that requests for mutual legal assistance under the Convention should be made in, or accompanied by, a translation into the English language.

Pursuant to Article 31, paragraph 6, of the Convention, I have the honour to inform you that requests for assistance on developing measures to prevent transnational organized crime should be directed to the United States Department of Justice, Office of Justice Programs, National Institute of Justice."

UZBEKISTAN

Communication concerning article 5, paragraph 3, of the Convention

The Republic of Uzbekistan communicates hereby that, under the Criminal Code of the Republic of Uzbekistan, offences committed by organized groups or for their benefit are categorized as grave or especially grave offences, depending on their defining elements and on the form of punishment for the separate types of offence.

Communication concerning article 16, paragraph 5, of the Convention

The Republic of Uzbekistan regards this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention. However, this provision shall not preclude the Republic of Uzbekistan from concluding bilateral treaties on extradition with individual States Parties to this Convention.

Notification concerning article 18, paragraphs 13 and 14, of the Convention

Concerning paragraph 13

The Republic of Uzbekistan has designated the Office of the Procurator General of the Republic of Uzbekistan as the central authority with responsibility for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance and either executing them or transmitting them to the competent authorities for execution.

Concerning paragraph 14

The Republic of Uzbekistan designates the Russian language as the language acceptable to it.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

19 December 2003

Pursuant to the provisions of article 5, paragraph 3 of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares the following:

With respect to national laws governing the offences described in article 5, paragraph 1 (a)(i), Venezuelan law typifies and penalizes such offences under articles 287 to 293 of the current Penal Code referring to the offence of forming an organized criminal group.

Pursuant to article 16, paragraph 5, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares:

The United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime shall be taken as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition in relations between the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela and other States Parties to the Convention.

Pursuant to article 18, paragraph 13, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares:

The central authority that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution shall be the Public Prosecutor's Office, in accordance with the powers conferred upon the said institution by the Act for partial reform of the Code of Criminal Procedure.

Pursuant to article 18, paragraph 14, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares:

Requests for mutual legal assistance in criminal matters made to the Government of the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela shall be written in Spanish, in accordance with Venezuelan constitutional and legal provisions.

Notes:

[1] With the following declaration in respect of Hong Kong and Macao:

1. In accordance with the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and after consultation with the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region (hereinafter as HKSAR), the application of the Convention to the HKSAR requires prior enactment of domestic legislation by the HKSAR. To this end, the Convention shall not apply to the HKSAR until the Government of the People's Republic of China notifies otherwise.

2. In accordance with the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and after consultation with the Government of the Macao Special Administrative Region (hereinafter as MSAR), the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the MSAR and states for the MSAR as follows:

(a) The identification of the offences established under paragraph 1 (a) (i) of Article 5 of the Convention requires involvement of an organized crime group in accordance with the domestic law of the MSAR;

(b) In accordance with the provisions of Article 18, paragraph 13 of the Convention, the MSAR designates the Secretary for Administration and Justice of the MSAR as the Central Authority in the MSAR to receive the requests for legal assistance and to transmit them to the competent authorities of the MSAR for execution;

(c) In accordance with the provisions of Article 18, paragraph 14 of the Convention, requests for legal assistance will only be accepted by the MSAR in the Chinese or Portuguese language.

Further, in a communication received on 27 September 2006, the Government of China declared the following:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China (hereafter referred to as HKSAR).

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 13 of Article 18 of the Convention and for the application of the Convention to the HKSAR, the HKSAR designates the Secretary for Justice of the Department of Justice of the HKSAR as the Central Authority. (Address: 47/F High Block, Queensway Government Offices, 66 Queensway, Hong Kong). In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 14 of Article 18 of the Convention, Chinese or English is the only language acceptable to the HKSAR for the written requests for legal assistance.

[2] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] With the following territorial exclusion:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory....." .

[6] By 14 January 2005, i.e., within a period of one year from the date of depositary notification C.N.1593.2003.TREATIES-41 of 14 January 2004, no objection had been notified to the Secretary-General. Consequently, in keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposes to receive the reservation in question for deposit.

12. a) Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

New York, 15 November 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 December 2003, in accordance with article 17 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the fortieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, except that it shall not enter into force before the entry into force of the Convention. For the purpose of this paragraph, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of such organization. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Protocol after the deposit of the fortieth instrument of such action, this Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of the relevant instrument or on the date this Protocol enters into force pursuant to paragraph 1 of this article, whichever is the later.".

REGISTRATION: 25 December 2003, No. 39574.

STATUS: Signatories: 117. Parties: 111.

TEXT: Doc. A/55/383.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by resolution A/RES/55/25 of 15 November 2000 at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 16, the Protocol will be open for signature by all States and by regional economic integration organizations, provided that at least one Member State of such organization has signed the Protocol, from 12 to 15 December 2000 at the Palazzi di Giustizia in Palermo, Italy, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 12 December 2002.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania	12 Dec 2000	21 Aug 2002
Algeria	6 Jun 2001	9 Mar 2004
Argentina	12 Dec 2000	19 Nov 2002
Armenia	15 Nov 2001	1 Jul 2003
Australia	11 Dec 2002	14 Sep 2005
Austria	12 Dec 2000	15 Sep 2005
Azerbaijan	12 Dec 2000	30 Oct 2003
Bahamas	9 Apr 2001	
Bahrain		7 Jun 2004 a
Barbados	26 Sep 2001	
Belarus	14 Dec 2000	25 Jun 2003
Belgium	12 Dec 2000	11 Aug 2004
Belize		26 Sep 2003 a
Benin	13 Dec 2000	30 Aug 2004
Bolivia	12 Dec 2000	18 May 2006
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Dec 2000	24 Apr 2002
Botswana	10 Apr 2002	29 Aug 2002
Brazil	12 Dec 2000	29 Jan 2004
Bulgaria	13 Dec 2000	5 Dec 2001
Burkina Faso	15 Dec 2000	15 May 2002
Burundi	14 Dec 2000	
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	
Cameroon	13 Dec 2000	6 Feb 2006
Canada	14 Dec 2000	13 May 2002
Cape Verde	13 Dec 2000	15 Jul 2004
Central African Republic		6 Oct 2006 a
Chile	8 Aug 2002	29 Nov 2004
Colombia	12 Dec 2000	4 Aug 2004
Congo	14 Dec 2000	
Costa Rica	16 Mar 2001	9 Sep 2003
Croatia	12 Dec 2000	24 Jan 2003
Cyprus	12 Dec 2000	6 Aug 2003
Czech Republic	10 Dec 2002	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		28 Oct 2005 a
Denmark[1]	12 Dec 2000	30 Sep 2003
Djibouti		20 Apr 2005 a
Dominican Republic	15 Dec 2000	
Ecuador	13 Dec 2000	17 Sep 2002
Egypt	1 May 2002	5 Mar 2004
El Salvador	15 Aug 2002	18 Mar 2004
Equatorial Guinea	14 Dec 2000	7 Feb 2003
Estonia	20 Sep 2002	12 May 2004
European Community	12 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2006 AA
Finland	12 Dec 2000	7 Sep 2006 A
France	12 Dec 2000	29 Oct 2002
Gambia	14 Dec 2000	5 May 2003
Georgia	13 Dec 2000	5 Sep 2006
Germany	12 Dec 2000	14 Jun 2006
Greece	13 Dec 2000	
Grenada		21 May 2004 a
Guatemala		1 Apr 2004 a
Guinea		9 Nov 2004 a
Guinea-Bissau	14 Dec 2000	
Guyana		14 Sep 2004 a
Haiti	13 Dec 2000	
Hungary	14 Dec 2000	22 Dec 2006
Iceland	13 Dec 2000	
India	12 Dec 2002	
Indonesia	12 Dec 2000	
Ireland	13 Dec 2000	
Israel	14 Nov 2001	
Italy	12 Dec 2000	2 Aug 2006

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Jamaica	13 Feb 2002	29 Sep 2003
Japan	9 Dec 2002	
Kenya		5 Jan 2005 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		12 May 2006 a
Kyrgyzstan	13 Dec 2000	2 Oct 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic		26 Sep 2003 a
Latvia	10 Dec 2002	25 May 2004
Lebanon	9 Dec 2002	5 Oct 2005
Lesotho	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2003
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	24 Sep 2004
Liechtenstein	14 Mar 2001	
Lithuania	25 Apr 2002	23 Jun 2003
Luxembourg	13 Dec 2000	
Madagascar	14 Dec 2000	15 Sep 2005
Malawi		17 Mar 2005 a
Mali	15 Dec 2000	12 Apr 2002
Malta	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2003
Mauritania		22 Jul 2005 a
Mauritius		24 Sep 2003 a
Mexico	13 Dec 2000	4 Mar 2003
Moldova	14 Dec 2000	16 Sep 2005
Monaco	13 Dec 2000	5 Jun 2001
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique	15 Dec 2000	20 Sep 2006
Myanmar		30 Mar 2004 a
Namibia	13 Dec 2000	16 Aug 2002
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Netherlands[3]	12 Dec 2000	27 Jul 2005 A
New Zealand[4]	14 Dec 2000	19 Jul 2002
Nicaragua		12 Oct 2004 a
Niger	21 Aug 2001	30 Sep 2004
Nigeria	13 Dec 2000	28 Jun 2001
Norway	13 Dec 2000	23 Sep 2003
Oman		13 May 2005 a
Panama	13 Dec 2000	18 Aug 2004
Paraguay	12 Dec 2000	22 Sep 2004
Peru	14 Dec 2000	23 Jan 2002
Philippines	14 Dec 2000	28 May 2002
Poland	4 Oct 2001	26 Sep 2003
Portugal	12 Dec 2000	10 May 2004
Republic of Korea	13 Dec 2000	
Romania	14 Dec 2000	4 Dec 2002
Russian Federation	12 Dec 2000	26 May 2004
Rwanda	14 Dec 2000	26 Sep 2003
Saint Kitts and Nevis		21 May 2004 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	20 Nov 2002	
San Marino	14 Dec 2000	
Sao Tome and Principe		23 Aug 2006 a
Saudi Arabia	10 Dec 2002	
Senegal	13 Dec 2000	27 Oct 2003
Serbia	12 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2001
Seychelles	22 Jul 2002	22 Jun 2004
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001	
Slovakia	15 Nov 2001	21 Sep 2004
Slovenia	15 Nov 2001	21 May 2004
South Africa	14 Dec 2000	20 Feb 2004
Spain	13 Dec 2000	1 Mar 2002
Sri Lanka	13 Dec 2000	
Swaziland	8 Jan 2001	
Sweden	12 Dec 2000	1 Jul 2004
Switzerland	2 Apr 2002	27 Oct 2006
Syrian Arab Republic	13 Dec 2000	
Tajikistan		8 Jul 2002 a
Thailand	18 Dec 2001	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 Dec 2000	12 Jan 2005
Togo	12 Dec 2000	
Trinidad and Tobago	26 Sep 2001	
Tunisia	13 Dec 2000	14 Jul 2003
Turkey	13 Dec 2000	25 Mar 2003
Turkmenistan		28 Mar 2005 a
Uganda	12 Dec 2000	
Ukraine	15 Nov 2001	21 May 2004
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Dec 2000	9 Feb 2006
United Republic of Tanzania	13 Dec 2000	24 May 2006
United States of America	13 Dec 2000	3 Nov 2005
Uruguay	13 Dec 2000	4 Mar 2005
Uzbekistan	28 Jun 2001	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	14 Dec 2000	13 May 2002
Zambia		24 Apr 2005 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ALGERIA

Reservations:

The Government of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 15, paragraph 2, of this Protocol, which provides that any dispute between two or more States concerning the interpretation or application of the said Protocol that cannot be settled through negotiation shall, at the request of one of those States, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic believes that any dispute of this kind can only be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

Declarations:

Ratification of this Protocol by the Algerian People's Democratic Republic in no way signifies recognition of Israel.

Such ratification cannot be construed as leading to the establishment of any kind of relations with Israel.

AUSTRALIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of Australia hereby declares that nothing in the Protocol shall be seen to be imposing obligations on Australia to admit or retain within its borders persons in respect of whom Australia would not otherwise have an obligation to admit or retain within its borders."

AZERBAIJAN

Declaration:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee the application of the provisions of the Protocol in the territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from that occupation."

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 15 of the Protocol, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 15."

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

"... the Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 15 of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The French, Flemish and German-speaking Communities and the Regions of Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels-Capital are also bound by this signature.

BOLIVIA

Declaration:

The Republic of Bolivia declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 15, which deals with the settlement of disputes concerning this Protocol.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

In accordance with article 15, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, Colombia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of that article.

ECUADOR

Reservation:

Exercising the powers referred to in article 15, paragraph 3, of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children, the Government of Ecuador makes a reservation with regard to article 15, paragraph 2, relating to the settlement of disputes.

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 15, inasmuch as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

With respect to the provisions of article 15, paragraph 3, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 15, paragraph 2, inasmuch as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"Article 16 (3) of the Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children, provides that the instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval of a regional economic integration organisation shall contain a declaration specifying the matters governed by the Protocol in respect of which competence has been transferred to the organisation by its Member States which are Parties to the Protocol.

The Protocol to prevent, suppress and punish trafficking in persons, especially women and children, shall apply, with regard to the competences transferred to the European Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty, in particular Article 299 thereof and the Protocols annexed to it.

This declaration is without prejudice to the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland under the Protocol integrating the Schengen acquis into the framework of the European Union and under the Protocol on the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland, annexed to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community.

This declaration is equally without prejudice to the position of Denmark under the Protocol on the position of Denmark annexed to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community.

Pursuant to Article 299, this declaration is also not applicable to the territories of the Member States in which the said Treaty does not apply and is without prejudice to such acts or positions as may be adopted under the Protocol by the Member States concerned on behalf of and in the interests of those territories. In accordance with the provision referred to above, this declaration indicates the competence that the Member States have transferred to the Community under the Treaties in matters governed by the Protocol. The scope and the exercise of such Community competence are, by their nature, subject to continuous development as the Community further adopts relevant rules and regulations, and the Community will complete or amend this declaration, if necessary, in accordance with Article 16 (3) of the Protocol.

The Community points out that it has competence with regard to the crossing of external borders of the Member States, regulating standards and procedures when carrying out checks on persons at such borders and rules on visas for intended stays of no more than three months.

The Community is also competent for measures on immigration policy regarding conditions of entry and residence and measures to counter illegal immigration and illegal residence, including repatriation of illegal residents. Moreover, it can take measures to ensure cooperation between the relevant departments of the administrations of the Member States, as well as

between those departments and the Commission, in the aforementioned areas. In these fields the Community has adopted rules and regulations and, where it has done so, it is hence solely for the Community to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent international organisations.

In addition, Community policy in the sphere of development cooperation complements policies pursued by Member States and includes provisions to prevent and combat trafficking in persons."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3, Article 15 of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, Supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2, Article 15 of the present Protocol. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Protocol to arbitration or [the] International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

LITHUANIA

Reservation:

"AND WHEREAS, it is provided in paragraph 3 of Article 15 of the Protocol, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania would like to declare that the Republic of Lithuania does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 15, which provides that any State Party may refer any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the said Protocol to the International Court of Justice."

MALAWI

Declarations:

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi in its efforts to curb and stamp out offences related to trafficking in persons especially women and children has embarked upon various social and legal reforms to incorporate obligations emanating from this Protocol (Article 16 (4)).

Further, declares expressly its acceptance of Article 15 (2) on settlement of disputes concerning interpretation and application of this Protocol.

The Competent Authority charged with the responsibility of coordinating and rendering of mutual legal assistance is:

The Principal Secretary

Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security

Private Bag 331, Lilongwe 3. MALAWI

Fax: 265 1 789509 Tel: 265 1 789 177

The Official Language of communication is English."

MOLDOVA

Reservation and declaration:

In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 15 of the Protocol, the Republic of Moldova does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 15 of the Protocol.

Until the full establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Protocol will be applied only on the territory controlled by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova.

MYANMAR

Reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar wishes to express reservation on Article 20 and does not consider itself bound by obligations to refer disputes relating to the interpretation or application of this Protocol to the International Court of Justice."

SAUDI ARABIA

Upon signature:

Declaration and reservation:

The public order of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia prohibits trafficking in persons for the purpose referred to in paragraph (a) of Article 3 of the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress, and Punish Trafficking in Persons, Especially Women and Children.

The Kingdom does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 15 of the said Protocol. It makes reservations regarding the contents of paragraph 3d of Article Six and paragraph 1 of Article 7 of the said protocol.

SOUTH AFRICA

Reservation:

"AND WHEREAS pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article 15 (2) of the Protocol which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Protocol. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case."

TUNISIA

Reservation:

In ratifying the Protocol to Prevent, Suppress and Punish Trafficking in Persons, especially Women and Children, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 November 2000, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 15, paragraph 2, of the Protocol and affirms that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Protocol may be referred to the International Court of Justice only after it has given its prior consent.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservations:

" (1) The United States of America reserves the right not to apply in part the obligation set forth in Article 15, paragraph 1 (b), of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime with respect to the offenses established in the Trafficking Protocol. The United States does not provide for plenary jurisdiction over offenses that are committed on board ships flying its flag or aircraft registered under its laws. However, in a number of circumstances, U.S. law provides for jurisdiction over such offenses committed on board U.S. - flagged ships or aircraft registered under U.S. law. Accordingly, the United States will implement paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention to the extent provided for under its federal law.

(2) The United States of America reserves the right to assume obligations under this Protocol in a manner consistent with its fundamental principles of federalism, pursuant to which both federal and state criminal laws must be considered in relation to conduct addressed in the Protocol. U.S. federal criminal

law, which regulates conduct based on its effect on interstate or foreign commerce, or another federal interest, such as the Thirteen Amendment's prohibition of "slavery" and "involuntary servitude," serves as the principal legal regime within the United States for combating the conduct addressed in this Protocol, and is broadly effective for this purpose. Federal criminal law does not apply in the rare case where such criminal conduct does not so involve interstate or foreign commerce, or otherwise implicate another federal interest, such as the Thirteenth Amendment. There are a small number of conceivable situations involving such rare offenses of a purely local character where U.S. federal and state criminal law may not be entirely adequate to satisfy an obligation under the Protocol. The United States of America therefore reserves to the obligations set forth in the Protocol to the extent they address conduct which would fall within this narrow category of highly localized activity. This reservation does not affect in any respect the ability of the United States to provide international cooperation to other Parties as contemplated in the Protocol.

(3) In accordance with Article 15, paragraph 3, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by the obligation set forth in Article 15, paragraph 2."

Understanding:

"The United States of America understands the obligation to establish the offenses in the Protocol as money laundering predicate offenses, in light of Article 6, paragraph 2 (b) of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, as requiring States Parties whose money laundering legislation sets forth a list of specific predicate offenses to include in such list a comprehensive range of offenses associated with trafficking in persons."

Notes:

[1] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] With the following territorial exclusion:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory....."

12. b) Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

New York, 15 November 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 January 2004, in accordance with article 22 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol will enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the fortieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, except that it shall not enter into force before the entry into force of the Convention. For the purpose of this paragraph, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member states of such organization. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Protocol after the deposit of the fortieth instrument of such action, this Protocol shall enter inot force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of the relevant instrument or on the date this Protocol enters into force pursuant to paragraph 1 of this article, whichever is the later.".

REGISTRATION: 28 January 2004, No. 39574.

STATUS: Signatories: 112. Parties: 105.

TEXT: Doc. A/55/383.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by resolution A/RES/55/25 of 15 November 2000 at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 21, the Protocol will be open for signature by all States and by regional economic integration organizations, provided that at least one Member State of such organization has signed the Protocol, from 12 to 15 December 2000 at the Palazzi di Giustizia in Palermo, Italy, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 12 December 2002.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania	12 Dec 2000	21 Aug 2002
Algeria	6 Jun 2001	9 Mar 2004
Argentina	12 Dec 2000	19 Nov 2002
Armenia	15 Nov 2001	1 Jul 2003
Australia	21 Dec 2001	27 May 2004
Austria	12 Dec 2000	
Azerbaijan	12 Dec 2000	30 Oct 2003
Bahamas	9 Apr 2001	
Bahrain		7 Jun 2004 a
Barbados	26 Sep 2001	
Belarus	14 Dec 2000	25 Jun 2003
Belgium	12 Dec 2000	11 Aug 2004
Belize		14 Sep 2006 a
Benin	17 May 2002	30 Aug 2004
Bolivia	12 Dec 2000	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	12 Dec 2000	24 Apr 2002
Botswana	10 Apr 2002	29 Aug 2002
Brazil	12 Dec 2000	29 Jan 2004
Bulgaria	13 Dec 2000	5 Dec 2001
Burkina Faso	15 Dec 2000	15 May 2002
Burundi	14 Dec 2000	
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	12 Dec 2005
Cameroon	13 Dec 2000	6 Feb 2006
Canada	14 Dec 2000	13 May 2002
Cape Verde	13 Dec 2000	15 Jul 2004
Central African Republic		6 Oct 2006 a
Chile	8 Aug 2002	29 Nov 2004
Congo	14 Dec 2000	
Costa Rica	16 Mar 2001	7 Aug 2003
Croatia	12 Dec 2000	24 Jan 2003
Cyprus	12 Dec 2000	6 Aug 2003
Czech Republic	10 Dec 2002	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		28 Oct 2005 a
Denmark[1]	12 Dec 2000	8 Dec 2006
Djibouti		20 Apr 2005 a
Dominican Republic	15 Dec 2000	
Ecuador	13 Dec 2000	17 Sep 2002
Egypt		1 Mar 2005 a
El Salvador	15 Aug 2002	18 Mar 2004
Equatorial Guinea	14 Dec 2000	
Estonia	20 Sep 2002	12 May 2004
European Community	12 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2006 AA
Finland	12 Dec 2000	7 Sep 2006 A
France	12 Dec 2000	29 Oct 2002
Gambia	14 Dec 2000	5 May 2003
Georgia	13 Dec 2000	5 Sep 2006
Germany	12 Dec 2000	14 Jun 2006
Greece	13 Dec 2000	
Grenada		21 May 2004 a
Guatemala		1 Apr 2004 a
Guinea		8 Jun 2005 a
Guinea-Bissau	14 Dec 2000	
Haiti	13 Dec 2000	
Hungary	14 Dec 2000	22 Dec 2006
Iceland	13 Dec 2000	
India	12 Dec 2002	
Indonesia	12 Dec 2000	
Ireland	13 Dec 2000	
Italy	12 Dec 2000	2 Aug 2006
Jamaica	13 Feb 2002	29 Sep 2003
Japan	9 Dec 2002	
Kenya		5 Jan 2005 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		12 May 2006 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Kyrgyzstan	13 Dec 2000	2 Oct 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic		26 Sep 2003 a
Latvia	10 Dec 2002	23 Apr 2003
Lebanon	26 Sep 2002	5 Oct 2005
Lesotho	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2004
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	24 Sep 2004
Liechtenstein	14 Mar 2001	
Lithuania	25 Apr 2002	12 May 2003
Luxembourg	12 Dec 2000	
Madagascar	14 Dec 2000	15 Sep 2005
Malawi		17 Mar 2005 a
Mali	15 Dec 2000	12 Apr 2002
Malta	14 Dec 2000	24 Sep 2003
Mauritania		22 Jul 2005 a
Mauritius		24 Sep 2003 a
Mexico	13 Dec 2000	4 Mar 2003
Moldova	14 Dec 2000	16 Sep 2005
Monaco	13 Dec 2000	5 Jun 2001
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique	15 Dec 2000	20 Sep 2006
Myanmar		30 Mar 2004 a
Namibia	13 Dec 2000	16 Aug 2002
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Netherlands[3]	12 Dec 2000	27 Jul 2005 A
New Zealand[4]	14 Dec 2000	19 Jul 2002
Nicaragua		15 Feb 2006 a
Nigeria	13 Dec 2000	27 Sep 2001
Norway	13 Dec 2000	23 Sep 2003
Oman		13 May 2005 a
Panama	13 Dec 2000	18 Aug 2004
Peru	14 Dec 2000	23 Jan 2002
Philippines	14 Dec 2000	28 May 2002
Poland	4 Oct 2001	26 Sep 2003
Portugal	12 Dec 2000	10 May 2004
Republic of Korea	13 Dec 2000	
Romania	14 Dec 2000	4 Dec 2002
Russian Federation	12 Dec 2000	26 May 2004
Rwanda	14 Dec 2000	4 Oct 2006
Saint Kitts and Nevis		21 May 2004 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	20 Nov 2002	
San Marino	14 Dec 2000	
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Saudi Arabia	10 Dec 2002	
Senegal	13 Dec 2000	27 Oct 2003
Serbia	12 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2001
Seychelles	22 Jul 2002	22 Jun 2004
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001	
Slovakia	15 Nov 2001	21 Sep 2004
Slovenia	15 Nov 2001	21 May 2004
South Africa	14 Dec 2000	20 Feb 2004
Spain	13 Dec 2000	1 Mar 2002
Sri Lanka	13 Dec 2000	
Swaziland	8 Jan 2001	
Sweden	12 Dec 2000	6 Sep 2006
Switzerland	2 Apr 2002	27 Oct 2006
Syrian Arab Republic	13 Dec 2000	
Tajikistan		8 Jul 2002 a
Thailand	18 Dec 2001	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	12 Dec 2000	12 Jan 2005
Togo	12 Dec 2000	
Trinidad and Tobago	26 Sep 2001	
Tunisia	13 Dec 2000	14 Jul 2003
Turkey	13 Dec 2000	25 Mar 2003
Turkmenistan		28 Mar 2005 a
Uganda	12 Dec 2000	
Ukraine	15 Nov 2001	21 May 2004
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Dec 2000	9 Feb 2006
United Republic of Tanzania	13 Dec 2000	24 May 2006
United States of America	13 Dec 2000	3 Nov 2005
Uruguay	13 Dec 2000	4 Mar 2005
Uzbekistan	28 Jun 2001	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	14 Dec 2000	19 Apr 2005
Zambia		24 Apr 2005 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ALGERIA

Reservations:

The Government of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 2, of this Protocol, which provides that any dispute between two or more States concerning the interpretation or application of the said Protocol that cannot be settled through negotiation shall, at the request of one of those States, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the Algerian People's Democratic Republic believes that any dispute of this kind can only be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

Declarations:

Ratification of this Protocol by the Algerian People's Democratic Republic in no way signifies recognition of Israel.

Such ratification cannot be construed as leading to the establishment of any kind of relations with Israel.

AZERBAIJAN

Declaration:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it is unable to guarantee the application of the provisions of the Protocol in the territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from that occupation."

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 20 of the Protocol, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 20."

BAHRAIN

Reservation:

"... the Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 20 of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The French, Flemish and German-speaking Communities and the Regions of Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels-Capital are also bound by this signature.

ECUADOR

Declaration and reservation:

With regard to the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, the Government of Ecuador declares that migrants are the victims of illicit trafficking in persons on the part of criminal organizations whose only goal is unjust and undue enrichment at the expense of persons wishing to perform honest work abroad.

The provisions of the Protocol must be understood in conjunction with the International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of Their Families, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1990, and with current international instruments on human rights.

Exercising the powers referred to in article 20, paragraph 3, of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, the Government of Ecuador makes a reservation with regard to article 20, paragraph 2, relating to the settlement of disputes.

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 20, inasmuch as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. With regard to article 9, paragraph 2, it hereby declares that only in the event of the revision of criminal judgements shall the State, in keeping with its domestic legislation, by law compensate the victims of judicial errors that have been duly proved. With regard to article 18, it states that the return of smuggled migrants shall take place to the extent possible and within the means of the State.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

With regard to article 20, paragraph 3, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of this article, inasmuch as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Declarations:

With regard to article 9, paragraph 2, it hereby declares that only in the event of the revision of criminal judgements shall the State, in keeping with its domestic legislation, by law compensate the victims of judicial errors that have been duly proved.

With regard to article 18, it states that the return of smuggled migrants shall take place to the extent possible and within the means of the State.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"Article 21 (3) of the Protocol provides that the instrument of accession of a regional economic integration organisation shall contain a declaration specifying the matters governed by the Protocol in respect of which competence has been transferred to the organisation by its Member States which are Parties to the Protocol.

The Protocol against the smuggling of migrants by land, air and sea shall apply, with regard to the competences transferred to the European Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty, in particular Article 299 thereof and the Protocols annexed to it.

This declaration is without prejudice to the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland under the Protocol integrating the Schengen acquis into the framework of the European Union and under the Protocol on the position of the United Kingdom and Ireland, annexed to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community.

This declaration is equally without prejudice to the position of Denmark under the Protocol on the position of Denmark annexed to the Treaty on European Union and the Treaty establishing the European Community.

Pursuant to Article 299, this declaration is also not applicable to the territories of the Member States in which the said Treaty does not apply and is without prejudice to such acts or positions as may be adopted under the Protocol by the Member States concerned on behalf of and in the interests of those territories. In accordance with the provision referred to above, this declaration indicates the competence that the Member States have transferred to the Community under the Treaties in matters governed by the Protocol. The scope and the exercise of such Community competence are, by their nature, subject to continuous development as the Community further adopts relevant rules and regulations, and the Community will complete or amend this declaration, if necessary, in accordance with Article 21 (3) of the Protocol.

The Community points out that it has competence with regard to the crossing of external borders of the Member States, regulating standards and procedures when carrying out checks on persons at such borders and rules on visas for intended stays of no more than three months. The Community is also competent for measures on immigration policy regarding conditions of entry and residence and measures to counter illegal immigration and illegal residence, including repatriation of illegal residents. Moreover, it can take measures to ensure cooperation between the relevant departments of the administrations of the Member States, as well as between those departments and the Commission, in the aforementioned areas. In these fields the Community has adopted rules and regulations and, where it has done so, it is hence solely for the Community to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent international organisations.

In addition, Community policy in the sphere of development cooperation complements policies pursued by Member States and includes provisions to prevent and combat smuggling of migrants."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3, Article 20 of the Protocol Against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, Supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2, Article 20 of the present Protocol. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Protocol to arbitration or the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

LITHUANIA

Reservation:

"AND WHEREAS, it is provided in paragraph 3 of Article 20 of the Protocol, the Republic of Lithuania would like to declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 20, which provides that any State Party may refer any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the said Protocol to the International Court of Justice."

MALAWI

Declarations:

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi in its efforts to curb and stamp out offences related to trafficking in persons especially women and children has embarked upon various social and legal reforms to incorporate obligations emanating from this Protocol;

Further, expressly declares its acceptance of Article 20 (2) on settlement of disputes concerning interpretation and application of this Protocol in consonant with Article 20 (3)."

MOLDOVA

Reservation and declaration :

In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 20 of the Protocol, the Republic of Moldova does not consider itself bound by provisions of the paragraph 2 of article 20 of the Protocol.

Until the full establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Protocol will be applied only on the territory controlled by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova.

MYANMAR

Reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar wishes to express reservation on Article 20 and does not consider itself bound by obligations to refer disputes relating to the interpretation or application of this Protocol to the International Court of Justice."

SAUDI ARABIA

Upon signature:

Declaration and reservation:

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is not a party to the 1951 U.N. Convention or to the 1967 Protocol, dealing with the status of refugees.

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 20 of the Protocol Against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air.

SOUTH AFRICA

Reservation:

"AND WHEREAS pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article 20 (2) of the Protocol which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Protocol. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case."

TUNISIA

Reservation:

In ratifying the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 November 2000, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 20, paragraph 2, of the Protocol and affirms that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Protocol may be referred to the International Court of Justice only after it has given its prior consent.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Reservation:

"(1)The United States of America criminalizes most but not all forms of attempts to commit the offenses established in accordance with Article 6, paragraph 1 of this Protocol. With respect to the obligation under Article 6, Paragraph 2 (a), the United States of America reserves the right to criminalize attempts to commit the conduct described in Article 6, paragraph 1 (b), to the extent that under its laws such conduct relates to false or fraudulent passports and other specified identity documents, constitutes fraud or the making of a false statement, or constitutes attempted use of a false or fraudulent visa.

(2) In accordance with Article 20, paragraph 3, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by the obligation set forth in Article 20, paragraph 2.".

Understanding:

"The United States of America understands the obligation to establish the offenses in the Protocol as money laundering predicate offenses, in light of Article 6, paragraph 2 (b) of the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, as requiring States Parties whose money laundering legislation sets forth a list of specific predicate offenses to include in such list a comprehensive range of offenses associated with smuggling of migrants."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation:

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, in accordance with the provision of article 20 (3) of the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, formulates a reservation with respect to the provision established under paragraph 2 of the said article. Consequently, it does not consider itself obligated to refer to arbitration as a means of settlement of disputes, nor does it recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Notifications under article 8 paragraph 6
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AZERBAIJAN

"In accordance with paragraph 6 of Article 8 of the Protocol, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that the Ministry of Transport is designated as an authority to receive and respond to requests for assistance, for conformation of registry or of the right of a vessel to fly its flag and for authorization to take appropriate measures."

BELGIUM

In accordance with article 8, paragraph 6 of the supplementary Protocol, the Federal Department of the Interior, rue de Louvain 3, 1000 Brussels (for the coastline, the Maritime coordination and rescue centre) has been designated as the authority.

DENMARK

"Authorization granted by a Danish authority pursuant to Article 8 denotes only that Denmark will abstain from pleading infringement of Danish sovereignty in connection with the requesting State's boarding of a vessel. Danish authorities cannot authorize another state to take legal action on behalf of the Kingdom of Denmark."

FINLAND

"In Finland the authorities responsible for suppressing the use of vessels for smuggling of migrants by sea are the Border Guard and the National Bureau of Investigation. The authority responsible for responding to a request concerning confirmation of registry or the right of a vessel to fly the flag is the Finnish Maritime Administration."

GERMANY

Germany designates the

Bundesamt für Seeschiffahrt und Hydrographie

[Federal Maritime and Hydrographic Agency]

Bernhard-Nocht-Str. 78

D-20359 Hamburg

Tel. :+49 (0) 40-31900

Fax: +49 (0) 40-31905000

as the responsible authority under Article 8, paragraph 6 of the Protocol.

LATVIA

"In accordance with article 8, paragraph 6 of the Protocol against Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, Supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Republic of Latvia designates the following national authorities to receive and respond to requests for assistance, for confirmation of registry or of the right of a vessel to fly its flag and for authorization to take appropriate measures:

Ministry of Interior
Raina blvd. 6,
Riga, LV-1050
Latvia
Phone: +371 7219263
Fax: +371 7271005
E-mail: *kanceleja@iem.gov.lv*
Homepage: *http://www.iem.gov.lv*
Ministry of Transport
Gogola iela 3,
Riga, LV-1743
Latvia
Phone: +371 7226922
Fax: +371 7217180
E-mail: *satmin@sam.gov.lv*
Homepage: *http://www.sam.gov.lv*

MALAWI

"The Competent Authority charged with the responsibility of coordinating and the rendering of mutual legal assistance is:
The Principal Secretary
Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security
Private Bag 331, Lilongwe 3. MALAWI
Fax: 265 1 789509 Tel: 265 1 789 177
The Official Language of communication is English."

PANAMA

13 December 2004

..... in accordance with article 8 (6), the Republic of Panama has designated the Maritime Authority of Panama as the authority to receive and respond to requests for assistance and for confirmation of registry or of the right of a vessel to fly its flag.

MOLDOVA

In accordance with paragraph 6 of article 8 of the Protocol, the Ministry of Transportation and Communication is designated as a central authority responsible for receiving the requests of legal assistance referred to in this article.

ROMANIA

"In accordance with Article 8 paragraph 6 of the supplementing Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, the Romanian central authority designated to receive the requests for assistance is the Ministry of Public Works, Transports and Housing (Blvd. Dinicu Golescu nr. 38, sector 1 Bucuresti, tel. 223 29 81/fax,223 0272)."

SOUTH AFRICA

"AND WHEREAS the Secretary-General is hereby notified, in accordance with Article 8 (6) of the Protocol, that the Director-General of the Department of Transport has been designated as the authority to receive and respond to requests for assistance in terms of the Protocol."

SWEDEN

"Pursuant to Article 8 (6) of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, Sweden designates the Ministry of Justice, as central au-

thority to receive and respond to requests for assistance referred to in this article.

Furthermore, the Swedish Coast Guard is a designated authority to respond to requests of the right of a vessel to fly a Swedish flag. Such requests should be addressed to:

NCC (National Contact Centre) Sweden at Coast Guard HQ
P.O.Box 536
S-371 23 KARLSKRONA
Sweden
Phone: + 46 455 35 35 35 (24 hours)
Fax: + 46 455 812 75 (24 hours)
E-mail:ncc.sweden@coastguard.se (24 hours)."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

10 April 2006

"The United Kingdom has the honour to designate the Director of Detection at Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs as the authority for the purposes of paragraph 6 of article 8 of the above-mentioned Protocol. Communications should be addressed as follows:

Director of Detection
Her Majesty's Revenue and Customs
Customs House
20 Lower Thames Street
London EC3R 6EE
Tel No: +44 (0) 870 785 3841 (office hours)
+44 (0) 870 785 3600 (24 hours)
Fax No: +44 (0) 870 240 3738 (24 hours)
(Office house 08:00 - 18:00 GMT:0:language English)

* Please note that requests in languages other than English must be accompanied by a translation in English. Please provide a name; telephone number; fax number; status and requesting authority. Please also provide details of the name of port; registry type; description of vessel; vessel port; last port of call; intended destination; persons on board; nationality (ies); details of reasons for suspicion and intended action."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

23 June 2006

".....the notification of the designation of the necessary authority or authorities to receive and respond to request for assistance, for confirmation of registry or of the right of a vessel to fly its flag and for authorization to take appropriate measures under article 8 (6) of the Protocol:

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
P.O. Box 9000
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Pursuant to Article 8, paragraph 6 of the Protocol against the Smuggling of Migrants by Land, Sea and Air, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, I request that you notify the other States concerned with the Protocol that the Operations Center, U.S. Department of State, is designated as the United States authority to receive and respond to requests made under the above-referenced provision of the Protocol."

Notes:

[1] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] With the following territorial exclusion:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory....."

12. c) Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime

New York, 31 May 2001

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 July 2005, in accordance with article 18 (1) which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the fortieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, except that is shall not enter into force before the entry into force of the Convention. For the purpose of this paragraph, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of such organization. 2. For each State or gerional economi integration organization ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Protocol after the deposit of thefortieth instrument of such action, this Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of the relevant instrument or on the date this Protocole enters into force pursuant to paragraph 1 of this article, whichever is the later.".

REGISTRATION: 3 July 2005, No. 39574.

STATUS: Signatories: 52. Parties: 60.

TEXT: Doc. A/55/383/Add.2; depositary notification C.N.959.2002.TREATIES-24 of 6 September 2002 (Correction to the English text of the original of the Protocol); C.N.1321.2003.TREATIES-10 of 21 November 2003 (Algeria: Proposed correction to the authentic Arabic text of the Protocol and C.N.105.2004.TREATIES-2 of 12 February 2004 (Correction to the Arabic text of the original of the Protocol).

Note: The Protocol was adopted by resolution 55/255 of 31 May 2001 at the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations.

In accordance with its article 17, paragraphs 1 and 2, the Protocol will be open for signature by all States and by regional economic integration organizations, provided that at least one member State of such organization has signed the Protocol, from 2 July 2001 to 12 December 2002, at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Algeria		25 Aug 2004 a
Argentina	7 Oct 2002	18 Dec 2006
Australia	21 Dec 2001	
Austria	12 Nov 2001	
Azerbaijan		3 Dec 2004 a
Barbados	26 Sep 2001	
Belarus		6 Oct 2004 a
Belgium	11 Jun 2002	24 Sep 2004
Benin	17 May 2002	30 Aug 2004
Brazil	11 Jul 2001	31 Mar 2006
Bulgaria	15 Feb 2002	6 Aug 2002
Burkina Faso	17 Oct 2001	15 May 2002
Cambodia		12 Dec 2005 a
Canada	20 Mar 2002	
Cape Verde		15 Jul 2004 a
Central African Republic		6 Oct 2006 a
China	9 Dec 2002	
Costa Rica	12 Nov 2001	9 Sep 2003
Croatia		7 Feb 2005 a
Cyprus	14 Aug 2002	6 Aug 2003
Democratic Republic of the Congo		28 Oct 2005 a
Denmark	27 Aug 2002	
Dominican Republic	15 Nov 2001	
Ecuador	12 Oct 2001	
El Salvador	15 Aug 2002	18 Mar 2004
Estonia	20 Sep 2002	12 May 2004
European Community	16 Jan 2002	
Finland	23 Jan 2002	
Germany	3 Sep 2002	
Greece	10 Oct 2002	
Grenada		21 May 2004 a
Guatemala		1 Apr 2004 a
Iceland	15 Nov 2001	
India	12 Dec 2002	
Italy	14 Nov 2001	2 Aug 2006
Jamaica	13 Nov 2001	29 Sep 2003
Japan	9 Dec 2002	
Kenya		5 Jan 2005 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		26 Sep 2003 a
Latvia		28 Jul 2004 a
Lebanon	26 Sep 2002	13 Nov 2006
Lesotho		24 Sep 2003 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	18 Jun 2004
Lithuania	12 Dec 2002	24 Feb 2005
Luxembourg	11 Dec 2002	
Madagascar	13 Nov 2001	15 Sep 2005
Malawi		17 Mar 2005 a
Mali	11 Jul 2001	3 May 2002
Mauritania		22 Jul 2005 a
Mauritius		24 Sep 2003 a
Mexico	31 Dec 2001	10 Apr 2003
Moldova		28 Feb 2006 a
Monaco	24 Jun 2002	

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique		20 Sep 2006 a
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Netherlands		8 Feb 2005 a
Nigeria	13 Nov 2001	3 Mar 2006
Norway	10 May 2002	23 Sep 2003
Oman		13 May 2005 a
Panama	5 Oct 2001	18 Aug 2004
Peru		23 Sep 2003 a
Poland	12 Dec 2002	4 Apr 2005
Portugal	3 Sep 2002	
Republic of Korea	4 Oct 2001	
Romania		16 Apr 2004 a
Rwanda		4 Oct 2006 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		21 May 2004 a
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Senegal	17 Jan 2002	7 Apr 2006
Serbia		20 Dec 2005 a
Seychelles	22 Jul 2002	
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001	
Slovakia	26 Aug 2002	21 Sep 2004
Slovenia	15 Nov 2001	21 May 2004
South Africa	14 Oct 2002	20 Feb 2004
Sweden	10 Jan 2002	
Tunisia	10 Jul 2002	
Turkey	28 Jun 2002	4 May 2004
Turkmenistan		28 Mar 2005 a
Uganda		9 Mar 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6 May 2002	
United Republic of Tanzania		24 May 2006 a
Zambia		24 Apr 2005 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ALGERIA

Reservation and declaration :

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 2 of this Protocol, which provides that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Protocol that cannot be settled through negotiation shall, at the request of one of those States Parties, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that no dispute of such nature may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice without the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

Declaration:

The ratification of this Protocol by the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not in any way signify recognition of Israel.

The present ratification may not be interpreted as leading to the establishment of relations of any kind with Israel.

ARGENTINA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Argentine Republic declares that, in relation to article 2, the provisions of the Protocol shall be without prejudice to the right of the Argentine Republic to adopt, at the domestic level, stricter provisions designed to fulfil the objectives of the Protocol of preventing, combating and eradicating the illicit manufacturing of and trafficking in firearms, their parts and components and ammunition.

AZERBAIJAN

Declaration and reservation:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it will be unable to guarantee compliance with the provisions of this Protocol in its territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from that occupation..."

"With regard to Article 16, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the Republic of Azerbaijan does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 16."

BELGIUM

Reservation:

The Government of Belgium makes the following reservation concerning article 4, paragraph 2 of the Additional Protocol: the activities of armed forces during a period of armed conflict, in the sense given these terms under international humanitarian law, which are governed by this law, are not governed by the present Protocol.

EL SALVADOR

Upon signature:

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 16, inasmuch as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

With regard to article 16, paragraph 3, of the Protocol, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of this article, inasmuch as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Interpretative declaration:

Article 3 a)

The Republic of El Salvador, in accordance with its domestic law (Act on Control and Monitoring of Firearms, Ammunition, Explosives and Similar Articles and their Regulation) interprets the following as collector's weapons: weapons of war which have been deactivated; and antique and obsolete weapons and those of historical value which shall not be utilized, subject to technical review by the Ministry of National Defence which shall so certify them; weapons of war: pistols, rifles and carbines with automatic firing action as well as those classified as light and heavy, mines, grenades and military explosives; antique weapons are those which are no longer manufactured and may be registered only for purposes of collection, in accordance with technical certification and prior authorization of the Ministry of National Defence; deactivated weapons: any weapon of war that, for purposes of collection, has been deactivated for its original use, with prior authorization by the Ministry of National Defence; firearm: weapons that, by the use of rimfire or centerfire percussion cartridges, expel projectiles through a smooth or rifled barrel, by means of the expansion of gases produced by the combustion of explosive solids or powder or other flammable material contained in the cartridge; furthermore, for identification purposes, pistols and revolvers shall be marked on the weapon and for rifles, carbines and shotguns, the serial number shall appear on the case of the mechanism; explosives are the combination of various substances and mixtures that produce an exothermic reaction when ignited. Any substance or material which, when struck, subjected to friction, heated or subjected to the effect of a small detonation or a chemical reaction, reacts violently, producing gases at high temperature and pressure that impact anything found in their vicinity; articles similar to firearms or ammunition: any articles or objects made by hand that have similar characteristics or can be used for the same purposes.

GUATEMALA

Declaration:

The Republic of Guatemala shall provide the information referred to in article 12 of the Protocol in the case of information disclosed by individuals on a confidential basis only in the context of a request for judicial assistance.

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

".....in accordance with Article 16 (3) of the Protocol, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2, Article 16 of the Protocol providing the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation and application of this Protocol at the International Court of Justice."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

Reservation:

"In accordance with paragraph 3, Article 16 of the Protocol Against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, Supplementing the United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2, Article 16 of the present Protocol. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Protocol to arbitration or the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

MALAWI

Declarations:

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi in its efforts to curb and stamp out offences related to trafficking in persons especially women and children has embarked upon various social and legal reforms to incorporate obligations emanating from this Protocol (Article 17 (4));

Further, expressly declares its acceptance of Article 16 (2) on settlement of disputes concerning interpretation and application of this Protocol in consonant with Article 16 (3)."

MOLDOVA

Declaration:

Until the full re-establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Protocol shall be applied only on the territory controlled effectively by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova.

SOUTH AFRICA

Reservation:

"AND WHEREAS pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article 16 (2) of the Protocol which provided for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Protocol. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case."

TUNISIA

Upon signature:

Reservation:

.... With a reservation to article 16 (2).

Notifications under article 13
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AZERBAIJAN

27 January 2005

"... designated the Ministry of Internal Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan as the national body."

BELARUS

.....in accordance with article 13, paragraph 2 of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Ministry of Interior of the Republic of Belarus has been designated as the national authority to maintain con- on matters relating to the Protocol.

tacts between the Republic of Belarus and other States Parties

BELGIUM

Pursuant to article 13 (2) of the Additional Protocol, the Federal Ministry of Justice, Department of Legislation, Fundamental Rights and Liberties, 115 Boulevard de Waterloo, 1000 Brussels, is designated as the sole contact point.

CAMBODIA

3 February 2006

"Police Brigadier Gen. NHEAN VIBOL (Chairman)
Address: House No. 275 Preah Norodom Boulevard
Cell phone: (855)-12810-428
Fax: (855) 23-726 052
E-mail: vibolnhean@yahoo.com"

CROATIA

"In accordance with Article 13, paragraph 2 of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the body of contact, to act as liaison with other States Parties on matters relating to the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, shall be the Ministry of the Interior."

EL SALVADOR

With regard to article 13, paragraph 2, of this Protocol and without prejudice to the designation made in accordance with article 18, paragraph 13, of the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador designates the Ministry of National Defence of the Republic of El Salvador as the central point of contact to provide liaison with other States Parties on matters relating to the Protocol.

LATVIA

"In accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 13 of the Protocol against the Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition, supplementing the United Nations Convention against Transnational Organized Crime the Republic of Latvia declares that the competent national authority to provide liaison with other state parties on matters relating to said protocol is:
Ministry of Interior
Raina Boulevard 6
Riga, LV-1505
Latvia
Phone: +371 7219263,
Fax: +371 7271005,
E-mail: kancleja@iem.gov.lv"

LITHUANIA

".....in accordance with Article 13 (2) of the Protocol, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Police Department under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania is designated as the point of contact to act as liaison between it and other States Parties on matters relating to this Protocol."

MALAWI

"The Competent Authority charged with the responsibility of coordinating and the rendering of mutual legal assistance is:
The Principal Secretary
Ministry of Home Affairs and Internal Security
Private Bag 331, Lilongwe 3. MALAWI
Fax: 265 1 789509 Tel: 265 1 789 177.
The Official Language of communication is English."

NORWAY

"The agency that may act pursuant to Article 13 of the Firearms Protocol as liaison for Norway with regard to the exchange of information between States Parties in connection with the efforts to combat violations of the Firearms Protocol is the National Criminal Investigation Service."

PANAMA

13 December 2004

.....in accordance with article 13 (2) of the aforementioned Protocol, the Republic of Panama has designated the Ministry of Government and Justice as the national body or single point of contact to act as liaison between it and other States Parties on matters relating to the Protocol.

POLAND

"With regard to article 13, paragraph 2 of this Protocol, without prejudice to article 18, paragraph 13 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Poland designates the Chief Commander of the Police as the national body to act as a liaison between the Republic of Poland and other States Parties on matters relating to this Protocol."

ROMANIA

"In accordance with Article 13 paragraph 2 of the Protocol, Romania declares that the National Agency for Export Control is the national point of contact designated to liaise with other States Parties in matters relating to the said Protocol."

SOUTH AFRICA

"AND WHEREAS the Secretary-General is hereby notified, in accordance with Article 13 (2) of the Protocol, that the National Commissioner of the South African Police Service has been designated as the single point of contact to liaise with other States Parties on matters relating to the Protocol as required by Article 13 (2) of said Protocol."

TURKEY

3 June 2005

"National Body: General Command of Gendarmarie
Department of Combatting Smuggling and
Organized Crime
Point of Contact: Senior Colonel Cengiz Yildirim
Head of Department
Department of Cobatting Smuggling and
Organized Crime General Command of Gendarmaric."

UGANDA

"...The National Focal Point for the Protocol Against Illicit Manufacturing of and Trafficking in Firearms, Their Parts and Components and Ammunition is as follows:
The Coordinator
Uganda National Focal Point on Small Arms and Light Weapons
P.O.Box 7191
KAMPALA
Telephone No: 256-41-252091
Cell No: 256-71-667720
Fax No: 256-41-252093."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

9 June 2006

"Point of Contact:

Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation
P.O. Box 9000
Dar es Salaam, Tanzania."

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

13. Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court

New York, 9 September 2002

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 July 2004, in accordance with article 35 (1) which reads as follows: "1.The present Agreement shall enter into force thirty days after the date of deposit with the Secretary-General of the tenth instrument of ratification acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the present Agreement after the deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification, aceptance approval or accession, the Agreement shall enter into force on the thirthieth day following the deposit with the Secretary-General of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 22 July 2004, No. 40446.

STATUS: Signatories: 62. Parties: 46.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2271, p. 3.

Note: The above Agreement was adopted during the meeting of the Assembly of the States Parties, held from 3 to 10 September 2002, at United Nations Headquarters in New York. The Agreement is open for signature by all States as from 10 September 2002 at United Nations Headquarters in New York and will remain open for signature until 30 June 2004.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania		2 Aug 2006 a
Andorra	21 Jun 2004	11 Feb 2005
Argentina	7 Oct 2002	
Austria	10 Sep 2002	17 Dec 2003
Bahamas	30 Jun 2004	
Belgium	11 Sep 2002	28 Mar 2005
Belize	26 Sep 2003	14 Sep 2005
Benin	10 Sep 2002	24 Jan 2006
Bolivia	23 Mar 2004	20 Jan 2006
Brazil	17 May 2004	
Bulgaria	2 May 2003	28 Jul 2006
Burkina Faso	7 May 2004	10 Oct 2005
Canada	30 Apr 2004	22 Jun 2004
Central African Republic		6 Oct 2006 a
Colombia	18 Dec 2003	
Costa Rica	16 Sep 2002	
Croatia	23 Sep 2003	17 Dec 2004
Cyprus	10 Jun 2003	18 Aug 2005
Denmark[1]	13 Sep 2002	3 Jun 2005
Ecuador	26 Sep 2002	19 Apr 2006
Estonia	27 Jun 2003	13 Sep 2004
Finland	10 Sep 2002	8 Dec 2004 A
France	10 Sep 2002	17 Feb 2004 AA
Germany	14 Jul 2003	2 Sep 2004
Ghana	12 Sep 2003	
Greece	25 Sep 2003	
Guinea	1 Apr 2004	
Guyana		16 Nov 2005 a
Hungary	10 Sep 2002	22 Mar 2006
Iceland	10 Sep 2002	1 Dec 2003
Ireland	9 Sep 2003	20 Nov 2006
Italy	10 Sep 2002	20 Nov 2006
Jamaica	30 Jun 2004	
Jordan	28 Jun 2004	
Latvia	29 Jun 2004	23 Dec 2004
Lesotho		16 Sep 2005 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein		21 Sep 2004 a
Lithuania	25 May 2004	30 Dec 2004
Luxembourg	10 Sep 2002	20 Jan 2006
Madagascar	12 Sep 2002	
Mali	20 Sep 2002	8 Jul 2004
Mongolia	4 Feb 2003	
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Namibia	10 Sep 2002	29 Jan 2004
Netherlands	11 Sep 2003	
New Zealand[3]	22 Oct 2002	14 Apr 2004
Norway	10 Sep 2002	10 Sep 2002
Panama	14 Apr 2003	16 Aug 2004
Paraguay	11 Feb 2004	19 Jul 2005
Peru	10 Sep 2002	
Poland	30 Jun 2004	
Portugal	10 Dec 2002	
Republic of Korea	28 Jun 2004	18 Oct 2006
Romania	30 Jun 2004	17 Nov 2005
Senegal	19 Sep 2002	
Serbia	18 Jul 2003	7 May 2004
Sierra Leone	26 Sep 2003	
Slovakia	19 Dec 2003	26 May 2004
Slovenia	25 Sep 2003	23 Sep 2004
Spain	21 Apr 2003	
Sweden	19 Feb 2004	13 Jan 2005
Switzerland	10 Sep 2002	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		19 Oct 2005 a
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Sep 2002	6 Feb 2003
Uganda	7 Apr 2004	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	10 Sep 2002	
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Jan 2004	
Uruguay	30 Jun 2004	3 Nov 2006
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	16 Jul 2003	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement, the Republic of Austria declares that persons referred to in this article who are Austrian nationals or permanent residents of Austria shall, in the territory of the Republic of Austria, enjoy only the privileges and immunities referred to in this article."

BOLIVIA

Declaration:

The Republic of Bolivia declares that persons referred to in articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 of this Agreement who are nationals or permanent residents of the Republic of Bolivia, and while staying in Bolivia territory, shall enjoy only the privileges and immunities referred to in paragraph (a) of article 23.

The persons referred to in articles 20 and 22 who are either nationals or permanent residents shall be subject to the application of paragraph (b) of article 23 of this Agreement.

CANADA

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, Canada declares that persons referred to in articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 of the Agreement who are nationals or permanent residents of Canada enjoy, while in Canada, only the privileges and immunities as required for the independent performance of his or her functions, or his or her appearance or testimony before the International Criminal Court, as laid down in Article 23."

CROATIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia, pursuant to Article 23 of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, delcares that the persons referred to in that Article, who are nationals of the Republic of Croatia, or who are permanent residents of the Republic of Croatia, in the territory of the Republic of Croatia enjoy only the privileges and immunities referred to in that Article."

GERMANY

Declaration:

"Germany declares according to Art. 23 of the Agreement that persons referred to in articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 who are either nationals or permanent residents of the Federal Republic of Germany enjoy, while staying in German territory, only the privileges and immunities to the extent necessary for the independent performance of his or her functions or his or her appearance or testimony before the Court as laid down in the respective Article."

ITALY

Declarations:

"Pursuant to article 15, paragraph 6 of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, Italy declares that tax exemption for salaries, emoluments and allowances only applies to sum paid by the International Criminal Court to eligible persons under article 15, paragraph 6; and

In accordance with article 23 of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, Italy declares that persons referred to in articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 of the Agreement who are nationals or residents of Italy enjoy, while in Italy, only the privileges and immunities as required for the independent performance of his or her functions, or his or her appearance or testimony before the International Criminal Court, as laid down in article 23."

LATVIA[4]

14 November 2005

Reservation to article 23 of the Agreement:

"In accordance with article 23 of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, adopted at Geneva on the 9th day of September, 2002, the Republic of Latvia declares that the persons mentioned in the article 23, that are citizens or permanent residents of the Republic of Latvia, in the territory of the Republic of Latvia enjoy only the privileges and immunities mentioned in the article 23."

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

".....in accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement, the Republic of Lithuania declares that persons referred to in this article who are nationals or permanent residents of the Republic of Lithuania shall, in the territory of the Republic of Lithuania, enjoy only the privileges and immunities referred to in this article."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

".....in accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement, that persons referred to in Articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 of the Agreement who are nationals or permanent residents of New Zealand enjoy, in the territory of New Zealand, only the privileges and immunities to the extent necessary for the independent performance of his or her functions or his or her appearance or testimony before the Court as laid down in Article 23."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Korea, in accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement, declares that persons referred to in Article 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 who are Korean nationals or permanent residents of Korea shall, in the Korean territory, enjoy only the privileges and immunities to the extent necessary for the independent performance of his/her functions, or his/her appearance or testimony before the Court as laid down in Article 23 paragraph (a), and persons referred to in Article 20 and 22 who are Korean nationals or permanent residents of Korea shall, in the Korean territory, enjoy only the privileges and immunities to the extent necessary for his/her appearance before the Court as laid down in Article 23 paragraph (b)."

ROMANIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Criminal Court, Romania declares that the persons referred to in Articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21, who are Romanian nationals or permanent residents of Romania shall, on the territory of Romania, enjoy only the privileges and immunities necessary for the independent performance of their functions or appearance or testimony before the Court stipulated in Article 23 paragraph a). The persons referred to in Articles 20 and 22, who are Romanian nationals or permanent residents of Romania shall, on the territory of Romania, enjoy only the privileges and immunities necessary for their appearance before the Court stipulated in Article 23 paragraph b)".

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"The Slovak Republic declares that persons referred to in Article 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 of this Agreement who are either nationals or permanent residents of the Slovak Republic shall, in the territory of the Slovak Republic, enjoy only the privileges and immunities referred to in Article 23 paragraph a) of this Agreement. Persons referred to in Articles 20 and 22 of this Agreement, who are either nationals or permanent residents of the Slovak Republic shall, in the territory of the Slovak Republic, enjoy only the privileges and immunities referred to in Article 23 paragraph b) of this Agreement."

Notes:

[1] With the following territorial exclusion:

.....until further notice the agreement shall not apply to the Faroe Islands.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

Further, upon ratification, the Government of New Zealand made the following territorial declaration:

".....in accordance with Article 23 of the Agreement, that persons referred to in Articles 15, 16, 18, 19 and 21 of the Agreement who are nationals or permanent residents of New Zealand enjoy, in the territory of New Zealand, only the privileges and immunities to the extent necessary for the independent performance of his or her functions or his or her appearance or testimony before the Court as laid down in Article 23."

[4] In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposes to receive the reservation in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 12 months from the date of the present depositary notification. In the absence of any such objection, the above reservation will be accepted in deposit upon the expiration of the above-stipulated 12-month period, that is on 28 November 2006.

14. United Nations Convention against Corruption

New York, 31 October 2003

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 December 2005, in accordance with article 68 (1) which reads as follows: "1.This Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the thirtieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. For the purpose of this paragraph, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of such organization. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Convention after the deposit of the thirtieth instrument of such action, this Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of the relevant instrument or on the date this Convention enters into force pursuant to paragraph 1 of this article, whichever is later.".

REGISTRATION: 14 December 2005, No. 42146.

STATUS: Signatories: 140. Parties: 82.

TEXT: Doc. A/58/422.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 31 October 2003 at United Nations Headquarters in New York. It shall be open to all States for signature from 9 to 11 December 2003 in Merida, Mexico, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 9 December 2005, in accordance with article 67 (1) of the Convention. The Convention shall also be open for signature by regional economic integration organizations provided that at least one member State of such organization has signed this Convention in accordance with its article 67 (2).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	20 Feb 2004	
Albania	18 Dec 2003	25 May 2006
Algeria	9 Dec 2003	25 Aug 2004
Angola	10 Dec 2003	29 Aug 2006
Antigua and Barbuda		21 Jun 2006 a
Argentina	10 Dec 2003	28 Aug 2006
Armenia	19 May 2005	
Australia	9 Dec 2003	7 Dec 2005
Austria	10 Dec 2003	11 Jan 2006
Azerbaijan	27 Feb 2004	1 Nov 2005
Bahrain	8 Feb 2005	
Barbados	10 Dec 2003	
Belarus	28 Apr 2004	17 Feb 2005
Belgium	10 Dec 2003	
Benin	10 Dec 2003	14 Oct 2004
Bhutan	15 Sep 2005	
Bolivia	9 Dec 2003	5 Dec 2005
Bosnia and Herzegovina	16 Sep 2005	26 Oct 2006
Brazil	9 Dec 2003	15 Jun 2005
Brunei Darussalam	11 Dec 2003	
Bulgaria	10 Dec 2003	20 Sep 2006
Burkina Faso	10 Dec 2003	10 Oct 2006
Burundi		10 Mar 2006 a
Cameroon	10 Dec 2003	6 Feb 2006
Canada	21 May 2004	
Cape Verde	9 Dec 2003	
Central African Republic	11 Feb 2004	6 Oct 2006
Chile	11 Dec 2003	13 Sep 2006
China[1]	10 Dec 2003	13 Jan 2006
Colombia	10 Dec 2003	27 Oct 2006
Comoros	10 Dec 2003	
Congo		13 Jul 2006 a
Costa Rica	10 Dec 2003	
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Dec 2003	
Croatia	10 Dec 2003	24 Apr 2005
Cuba	9 Dec 2005	
Cyprus	9 Dec 2003	
Czech Republic	22 Apr 2005	
Denmark[2]	10 Dec 2003	26 Dec 2006
Djibouti	17 Jun 2004	20 Apr 2005
Dominican Republic	10 Dec 2003	26 Oct 2006
Ecuador	10 Dec 2003	15 Sep 2005
Egypt	9 Dec 2003	25 Feb 2005
El Salvador	10 Dec 2003	1 Jul 2004
Ethiopia	10 Dec 2003	
European Community	15 Sep 2005	
Finland	9 Dec 2003	20 Jun 2006 A
France	9 Dec 2003	11 Jul 2005
Gabon	10 Dec 2003	
Germany	9 Dec 2003	
Ghana	9 Dec 2004	
Greece	10 Dec 2003	
Guatemala	9 Dec 2003	3 Nov 2006
Guinea	15 Jul 2005	
Haiti	10 Dec 2003	
Honduras	17 May 2004	23 May 2005
Hungary	10 Dec 2003	19 Apr 2005
India	9 Dec 2005	
Indonesia	18 Dec 2003	19 Sep 2006
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	9 Dec 2003	
Ireland	9 Dec 2003	
Israel	29 Nov 2005	
Italy	9 Dec 2003	
Jamaica	16 Sep 2005	
Japan	9 Dec 2003	
Jordan	9 Dec 2003	24 Feb 2005
Kenya	9 Dec 2003	9 Dec 2003
Kuwait	9 Dec 2003	
Kyrgyzstan	10 Dec 2003	16 Sep 2005

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10 Dec 2003	
Latvia	19 May 2005	4 Jan 2006
Lesotho	16 Sep 2005	16 Sep 2005
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	23 Dec 2003	7 Jun 2005
Liechtenstein	10 Dec 2003	
Lithuania	10 Dec 2003	21 Dec 2006
Luxembourg	10 Dec 2003	
Madagascar	10 Dec 2003	22 Sep 2004
Malawi	21 Sep 2004	
Malaysia	9 Dec 2003	
Mali	9 Dec 2003	
Malta	12 May 2005	
Mauritania		25 Oct 2006 a
Mauritius	9 Dec 2003	15 Dec 2004
Mexico	9 Dec 2003	20 Jul 2004
Moldova	28 Sep 2004	
Mongolia	29 Apr 2005	11 Jan 2006
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	9 Dec 2003	
Mozambique	25 May 2004	
Myanmar	2 Dec 2005	
Namibia	9 Dec 2003	3 Aug 2004
Nepal	10 Dec 2003	
Netherlands[4]	10 Dec 2003	31 Oct 2006 A
New Zealand	10 Dec 2003	
Nicaragua	10 Dec 2003	15 Feb 2006
Nigeria	9 Dec 2003	14 Dec 2004
Norway	9 Dec 2003	29 Jun 2006
Pakistan	9 Dec 2003	
Panama	10 Dec 2003	23 Sep 2005
Papua New Guinea	22 Dec 2004	
Paraguay	9 Dec 2003	1 Jun 2005
Peru	10 Dec 2003	16 Nov 2004
Philippines	9 Dec 2003	8 Nov 2006
Poland	10 Dec 2003	15 Sep 2006
Portugal	11 Dec 2003	
Qatar	1 Dec 2005	
Republic of Korea	10 Dec 2003	
Romania	9 Dec 2003	2 Nov 2004
Russian Federation	9 Dec 2003	9 May 2006
Rwanda	30 Nov 2004	4 Oct 2006
Sao Tome and Principe	8 Dec 2005	12 Apr 2006
Saudi Arabia	9 Jan 2004	
Senegal	9 Dec 2003	16 Nov 2005
Serbia	11 Dec 2003	20 Dec 2005
Seychelles	27 Feb 2004	16 Mar 2006
Sierra Leone	9 Dec 2003	30 Sep 2004
Singapore	11 Nov 2005	
Slovakia	9 Dec 2003	1 Jun 2006
South Africa	9 Dec 2003	22 Nov 2004
Spain	16 Sep 2005	19 Jun 2006
Sri Lanka	15 Mar 2004	31 Mar 2004
Sudan	14 Jan 2005	
Swaziland	15 Sep 2005	
Sweden	9 Dec 2003	
Switzerland	10 Dec 2003	
Syrian Arab Republic	9 Dec 2003	
Tajikistan		25 Sep 2006 a
Thailand	9 Dec 2003	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 Aug 2005	
Timor-Leste	10 Dec 2003	
Togo	10 Dec 2003	6 Jul 2005
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Dec 2003	31 May 2006
Tunisia	30 Mar 2004	
Turkey	10 Dec 2003	9 Nov 2006
Turkmenistan		28 Mar 2005 a
Uganda	9 Dec 2003	9 Sep 2004
Ukraine	11 Dec 2003	
United Arab Emirates	10 Aug 2005	22 Feb 2006
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	9 Dec 2003	9 Feb 2006
United Republic of Tanzania	9 Dec 2003	25 May 2005
United States of America	9 Dec 2003	30 Oct 2006
Uruguay	9 Dec 2003	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	10 Dec 2003	
Viet Nam	10 Dec 2003	
Yemen	11 Dec 2003	7 Nov 2005
Zambia	11 Dec 2003	
Zimbabwe	20 Feb 2004	

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification,acceptance, approval or accession.)

(Notifications under article 6 (3), 44 (6)(a) and 46 (13)(14) of the Convention follow the declarations and reservations.)

ALGERIA[6]

Reservation and declaration:

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2 of this Convention, which provides that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention that cannot be settled through negotiation shall, at the request of one of those States Parties, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that no dispute of such nature may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice without the consent of all the parties to the dispute.

Declaration:

The ratification of this Convention by the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not in any way signify recognition of Israel.

The present ratification may not be interpreted as leading to the establishment of relations of any kind with Israel.

AZERBAIJAN

Declarations:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it will be unable to guarantee compliance with the provisions of this Convention in its territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from that occupation.

The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that none of the rights, obligations and provisions set out in the Convention shall be applied by the Republic of Azerbaijan in respect of the Republic of Armenia.

Reservation:

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 66 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of Article 66."

BELARUS

Declaration:

"... Pursuant to the Article 44, paragraph 6 of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus regards the Convention as a legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention".

CHINA

Reservation:

.....the People's Republic of China shall not be bound by paragraph 2 of Article 66 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

In accordance with article 66, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Colombia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of that article.

EL SALVADOR

Declaration and notifications:

(a) With respect to the provisions of article 44, the Republic of El Salvador does not regard the above-mentioned Convention as the legal basis for cooperation in connection with extradition;

(b) With respect to article 46, paragraphs 13 and 14, the Republic of El Salvador states that the central authority as regards El Salvador is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and that the acceptable language is Spanish; and

(c) With respect to article 66, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador states that, by virtue of the provisions of paragraph 3 of that article, it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 as it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice. The foregoing applies exclusively to the context of the process for the settlement of disputes set forth in the said article.

INDONESIA

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2 and takes the position that disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention which can not be settled through the channel provided for in paragraph 2 of the said article may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with consent of the parties to the disputes."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"Pursuant to article 66, paragraph 3 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2 of the Convention. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran affirms that the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary, in each individual case, for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice. The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran can, if it deems appropriate, for the settlement of such a dispute, agree with the submission of the dispute to arbitration in accordance with its Constitution and related domestic law.

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran reserves its right to declare further reservation(s), at it deems appropriate, at the time of the deposit of the instrument of ratification of the Convention."

ISRAEL

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"Pursuant to article 66, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Israel declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

MYANMAR

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"With regard to any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Union of Myanmar does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of article 66 of the Convention."

PANAMA

Declaration :

...the Republic of Panama does not consider itself bound by paragraph 2 of [article 66] which reads as follows:

"2. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention that cannot be settled through negotiation within a reasonable time shall, at the request of one of those States Parties, be submitted to arbitration. If, six months after the date of the request for arbitration, those States Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those States Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in accordance with the Statute of the Court."

PARAGUAY

Reservation;

The Republic of Paraguay makes the following reservation in relation to the term "offence" as defined in the United Nations Convention against Corruption:

For the application of the Convention, the meaning of the term "offence" shall be understood to be "punishable act", in accordance with current domestic legislation.

Qatar

Upon signature:

Declaration:

... with reservation on the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 66 of the Convention, concerning arbitration and referring the dispute to the International Court of Justice, under the name of the State of Qatar.

Romania

Declaration:

"In accordance with Article 46, paragraph 13, of the Convention, Romania declares that the central authorities responsible for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance are:

a) the Prosecutor's Office to the High Court of Cassation and Justice for the requests formulated in criminal investigation and prosecution;

b) the Ministry of Justice for the requests formulated during the trial and execution of punishment, and for receiving requests for extradition and transfer of sentenced persons."

Russian Federation

Declarations:

1) The Russian Federation possesses jurisdiction over the acts recognized as criminal pursuant to article 15; article 16, paragraph 1; articles 17 to 19, 21 and 22; article 23, paragraph 1; and articles 24, 25 and 27 of the Convention in the cases covered by article 42, paragraphs 1 and 3 of the Convention;

...

3) The Russian Federation believes that article 44, paragraph 15 of the Convention must be interpreted in such a way as to make accountability for offences falling within the purview of this Convention inescapable, without prejudice to the effectiveness of international cooperation on extradition and legal assistance;

...

4) The Russian Federation declares, on the basis of article 46, paragraph 7, of the Convention, that it will apply article 46, paragraphs 9 to 29, of the Convention in lieu of the corresponding provisions of treaties of mutual legal assistance concluded between the Russian Federation and other States Parties to the Convention, on a foundation of reciprocity, if, in the view of the central authority of the Russian Federation, to do so would facilitate cooperation;

...

7) The Russian Federation declares, in accordance with article 48, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it will consider the Convention to be the basis for mutual cooperation between law enforcement agencies in respect of the offences covered by the Convention, provided that such cooperation does not involve investigations or other procedural activities in the territory of the Russian Federation;

8) The Russian Federation declares, in accordance with article 55, paragraph 6, of the Convention, that it will consider the Convention to be a necessary and sufficient treaty basis for taking the measures referred to in article 55, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention, on a foundation of reciprocity.

South Africa

Reservation:

"... pending a decision by the Government of the Republic of South Africa on the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the Republic does not consider itself bound by the terms of Article 66 (2) of the Convention which provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in differences arising out of the interpretation or application of the Convention. The Republic will adhere to the position that, for the submission of a particular dispute for settlement by the International Court, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in every individual case."

Spain

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Kingdom of Spain declares that the expression "special territory" used in article 46, paragraph 13, refers to entities included within the territorial organization of States Parties, but not to dependent territories for whose international relations those States are responsible.

Upon ratification :

Declaration:

The Kingdom of Spain declares that the expression "special territory"used in article 46, paragraph 13, refers to entities included within the territorial organization of States Parties, but not to territories for whose international relations those States are responsible.

Tunisia

Upon signature:

Reservation:

The Republic of Tunisia declares that, in signing the United Nations Convention against Corruption, adopted in New York on 31 October 2003, it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2, of the Convention and affirms that differences as to the interpretation or application of the said Convention may be submitted to the International Court of Justice only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned.

United Arab Emirates

Reservation:

... subject to a reservation to article 66, paragraph 2, of the Convention regarding arbitration, which it does not consider itself bound by.

United States of America

Reservations and declarations:

"Reservations

(1) The United States of America reserves the right to assume obligations under the Convention in a manner consistent with its fundamental principles of federalism, pursuant to which both federal and state criminal laws must be considered in relation to the conduct addressed in the Convention. U.S. federal criminal law, which regulates conduct based on its effect on interstate or foreign commerce, or another federal interest, serves as an important component of the legal regime within the United States for combating corruption and is broadly effective for this purpose. Federal criminal law does not apply where such criminal conduct does not so involve interstate or foreign commerce, or another federal interest. There are conceivable situations involving offenses of a purely local character where U.S. federal and state criminal law may not be entirely adequate to satisfy an obligation under the Convention. Similarly, in the U.S. system, the states are responsible for preventive measures governing their own officials. While the states generally regulate their own affairs in a manner consistent with the obligations set forth in the chapter on preventive measures in the Convention, in some cases they may do so in a different manner. Accordingly, there may be situations where state and federal law

will not be entirely adequate to satisfy an obligation in Chapters II and III of the Convention. The United States of America therefore reserves to the obligations set forth in the Convention to the extent they (1) address conduct that would fall within this narrow category of highly localized activity or (2) involve preventive measures not covered by federal law governing state and local officials. This reservation does not affect in any respect the ability of the United States to provide international cooperation to other States Parties in accordance with the provisions of the Convention.

(2) The United States of America reserves the right not to apply in part the obligation set forth in Article 42, paragraph 1 (b) with respect to the offenses established in accordance with the Convention. The United States does not provide for plenary jurisdiction over offenses that are committed on board ships flying its flag or aircraft registered under its laws. However, in many circumstances, U.S. law provides for jurisdiction over such offenses committed on board U.S. - flagged ships or aircraft registered under U.S. law. Accordingly, the United States shall implement paragraph 1 (b) to the extent provided for under its federal law.

Declarations

(1) In accordance with Article 66, paragraph 3, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by the obligations set forth in Article 66, paragraph 2.

(2) The United States declares that the provisions of the Convention (with the exception of Articles 44 and 46) are non-self-executing. None of the provisions of the Convention creates a private right of action.

VIET NAM

Reservation:

"The Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 66, paragraph 2, of this Convention."

YEMEN

Reservation:

.....subject to our reservation concerning article 44 and article 66, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Notifications under article 6 (3), 44 (6)(a) and 46 (13)(14) of the Convention
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ALBANIA

"Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3, of the above mentioned Convention, the Department of the Internal Audit and Anti-Corruption is the competent authority of the Government of the Republic of Albania.

Address: Department of the Internal Audit
and Anti-Corruption
Council of Ministers
Blv. "Deshmoret e Kombit"
Tirana, Albania

Pursuant to Article 44, paragraph 6, subparagraph a, the Republic of Albania regards this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other state parties to this Convention.

Pursuant to Article 46, paragraph 13, of the Convention, the central authorities that shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution, are:

1. The General Prosecutor Office, which shall have the responsibility for criminal investigations and proceedings,

Address: Office of the General Attorney
Rr. Qemal Stafa, Nr. 1
Tirana, Albania

2. The Ministry of Justice, which shall have the responsibility for the requests during the trial process and the execution of verdicts, as well as the requests for extradition and transfer of the convicted persons.

Address: Ministry of Justice
Blv: "Zogu I"
Tirana, Albania

Pursuant to article 46, paragraph 14 of the Convention, the Albanian language is the acceptable language for the Republic of Albania, and if it is not possible, a certified translation in the Albanian language will be the acceptable one."

AZERBAIJAN

In accordance with sub paragraph "a" of paragraph 6 of Article 44 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it will use the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

In accordance with paragraph 13 of Article 46 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it designates the Prosecutors' Office of the Republic of Azerbaijan as the central authority responsible for receiving requests or for implementation of mutual legal assistance.

Address: Nigar Rafibeyli st, 7, AZ1001, Baky, Azerbaijan.

In accordance with paragraph 14 of Article 46 of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that the requests and supporting documents on legal assistance should be submitted in Russian or English as the UN official languages and should be accompanied by a translation in Azerbaijani language.

BENIN

3 April 2006

The Permanent Mission of the Republic of Benin to the United Nations in New York presents its compliments to the United Nations Secretariat (Office of Legal Affairs, Treaty Section) and has the honour to transmit to it the contact information of the central authority designated by Benin in accordance with the provisions of article 46, paragraph 13, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

This function shall be carried out by the Directorate of Civil and Criminal Affairs of the Ministry of Justice, Legislation and Human Rights, whose contact information is as follows:

B.P. 967 Cotonou
Tel.:(229) 21 31 31 46
(229) 21 31 31 47
(229) 21 31 51 45
(229) 21 31 56 57
(229) 21 31 56 51
Fax:(229) 21 31 34 48
E-mail: mildh@intnet.bj

Office hours: 8 a.m. to 6.30 p.m. (Lunch break 12.30 to 3.00) (Local time is one hour ahead of Greenwich Mean Time.)

Pursuant to the provisions of article 46, paragraph 14, of the same Convention, the working language of Benin is French.

BOLIVIA

The Republic of Bolivia, in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 6, hereby gives notification that its Central Authority is the Delegaci6n Presidencial para la Transparencia y la Integndad Publica, whose address is the following:

Calle Batallon Colorados Nro. 24
Edificio El Cóndor, piso 11
Tel/fax (+)591-2-2153085
Website: http://www.transparencia-integndad.gov.bo/
Email: dptip@transparencia-integridad.gov.bo
La Paz, Bolivia

Moreover, accordingly with paragraph 6.(a) of Article 44, notice is given that the legal basis for extradition is that of existing extradition treaties with other countries.

With respect to article 46, paragraphs 13 and 14, also states that the central authority that has the responsibility and power to receive written requests for mutual legal assistance is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Worship; and that the acceptable language is Spanish.

BULGARIA

Declaration under article 46, paragraph 13

"In accordance with Article 46, paragraph 13, of the Convention, the Republic of Bulgaria declares that the requests for mutual legal assistance must be addressed to the Minister of Justice."

Declaration under article 46, paragraph 14

"In accordance with Article 46, paragraph 14, of the Convention, the Republic of Bulgaria declares that the requests for mutual legal assistance must be accompanied by a translation into Bulgarian or English language."

CHILE

The Government of the Republic of Chile, in accordance with the provisions of article 44, paragraph 6 (a), of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, hereby states that it takes the said Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States parties to the Convention.

In addition, in accordance with the provisions of article 46, paragraph 13, it designates the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, with main address at 180 Calle Teatinos, Santiago, Chile, as the central authority for the purpose of receiving requests for mutual legal assistance. It further states that the language acceptable for such requests shall be Spanish.

CHINA

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Convention, the Ministry of Supervision of the People's Republic of China is designated as the authority to assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption (Address: Jia 2 Guanganmen Nanjie, Xuanwu District, Beijing, China, 100053), while for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, such authority is the Independent Commission against Corruption of Hong Kong (SAR) (Address: c/o ICAC Report Center, 10/F Murray Road CAR Park Building, 2 Murray Road, Central, Hong Kong), and for the Macao Special Administrative Region, such authority is the Commission against Corruption of Macao SAR (Address: Alameda Dr. Carlos d'Assumpçao, Edf. "Dynasty Plaza", 14o Andar-NAPE-Macau).

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 13 of Article 46 of the Convention, the Supreme People's Procuratorate of the People's Republic of China is designated as the central authority which is responsible for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance and other related issues (Address: 147 Beiheyan Dajie, Dongcheng District, Beijing, China, 100726), while for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, such central authority is the Secretary for Justice of the Department of Justice of Hong Kong SAR (47/F High Block, Queensway Government Offices, 66 Queensway, Hong Kong), and for the Macao Special Administrative Region, such central authority is the Office of the Secretary for Administration and Justice of Macao SAR (Address: Sede do Governo da RAEM, Avenida da Praia Grande, Macau).

In accordance with the provisions of paragraph 14 of Article 46 of the Convention, Chinese is the only language acceptable to the People's Republic of China for the written requests for mutual legal assistance, while for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region, such language is English or Chinese, and for the Macao Special Administrative Region, such language is Chinese or Portuguese.

COLOMBIA

... in accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, Colombia hereby reports that the authority that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption is the Presidential Programme for Modernization, Efficiency, Transparency and Combating Corruption:

Address: Carrera 8 No. 7-27 Edificio Galán
Bogotá, D.C., Colombia
Switchboard: 5601095-3341507
E-mail: buzon1@presidencia.gov.co.

Moreover, in accordance with article 46, paragraph 13, Colombia hereby reports that the central authorities designated to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution, and also to formulate requests for legal assistance, are as follows:

(a) The Office of the Attorney-General of the Republic, which is designated to receive and execute or transmit requests for legal assistance formulated by other States Parties, and to formulate requests for legal assistance to other States Parties in the case of investigations being handled by that Office:

Address: Diagonal 22B No. 52-01 Ciudad Salitre
Bogotá, D.C., Colombia
Switchboard: 5702000-4144900
E-mail: contacto@fiscalia.gov.co;

(b) The Department of Consular Affairs and Colombian Communities Abroad in the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which is designated to formulate requests for legal assistance to other States Parties in cases other than investigations being handled by the Office of the Attorney-General of the Republic:

Address: Palacio San Carlos - Calle 10 No. 5-51
Bogotá, D.C., Colombia
Switchboard: 5662008.

Lastly, in accordance with article 46, paragraph 14, of the Convention, Colombia hereby reports that Spanish is the language acceptable to it for requests for legal assistance.

CROATIA

"The authorities that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption, pursuant to Article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, shall be the Office for the Suppression of Corruption and Organised Crime, the Ministry of the Interior and the Ministry of Justice,

Pursuant to Article 44, paragraph 6, subparagraph (a) of the Convention, the Republic of Croatia will take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention.

The central authority responsible and authorised to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them

or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution, pursuant to Article 46, paragraph 13 of the Convention, shall be the Ministry of Justice.

Pursuant to Article 46, paragraph 14 of the Convention, the languages acceptable to the Republic of Croatia are Croatian and English."

DENMARK

Declaration concerning Article 6, paragraph 3, and Article 46, paragraph 13 of the Convention:

"In accordance with Article 6 (3) of the Convention, the Government of Denmark has designated the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Asiatisk Plads 2, DK-1448 Copenhagen K, Denmark, the Ministry of Justice, Slotholmsgade 10, DK-1216 Copenhagen K, Denmark, and the Ministry of Economic and Business Affairs, Slotholmsgade 10, KD-1216 Copenhagen K, Denmark, as competent authorities."

"In accordance with Article 46 (13) of the Convention, the Government of Denmark has designated to the Ministry of Justice, Slotholmsgade 10, DK-1216 Copenhagen K, Denmark, as competent authority."

ECUADOR

23 October 2006

... the Comisión de Control Cívico de la Corrupción (Commission for Civic Control of Corruption) is the Ecuadorian authority empowered to implement the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Convention against Corruption.

The head of the Commission is Dr. Ramiro Borja y Borja and the Commission headquarters is located in Quito at the following address:

Av. Amazonas 4430 y Villalengua, Edificio Amazonas 100, Piso 3

Telephone: (593-2) 298 36 00

E-mail: comision@control-corrupcion.gov.ec

Website: www.comisionanticorrupcion.com

FINLAND

28 July 2006

"In Finland the authorities that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption are:

The National Council for Crime Prevention

Address: PO Box 25, FIN 00023 Government, Finland

The Criminal Policy Department of the Ministry of Justice

Address: PO Box 25, FIN 00023 Government, Finland

The National Bureau of Investigation

Address: PO Box 285, 01301 Vantaa, Finland."

GUATEMALA

(a) Pursuant to article 44, paragraph 6 (a), the Republic of Guatemala regards this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition;

(b) Pursuant to article 46, paragraph 13, the Republic of Guatemala notifies that the Public Minister is designated as central authority to receive requests for mutual legal assistance;

(c) Pursuant to article 46, paragraph 14, the Republic of Guatemala notifies that Spanish is the language acceptable for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance.

LATVIA

Notification under article 6 (3)

"...the Republic of Latvia declares that the authority that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures is:

Corruption Prevention and Combating Bureau
Alberta Str. 13,
Riga, LV-1010
Latvia
Phone: +371 7356161
Fax: +371 7331150
E-mail: knab@knab.gov.lv

Notification under article 44 (6)

"...the Republic of Latvia will take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to this Convention."

Notification under article 46 (13)

"...the Republic of Latvia declares that the authority which shall have the responsibility and power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or to transmit them to the competent authorities for execution under Article 46 is:

Ministry of Justice
Brivibas blvd. 36,
Riga, LV-1536
Latvia
Phone: +371 7036801
Fax: +371 7285575
E-mail: tm.kanceleja@tm.gov.lv

Notification under article 46 (14)

"...the Republic of Latvia declares that requests and supplementary documents addressed to the Republic of Latvia shall be sent together with their translation in Latvian."

LITHUANIA

"The Republic of Lithuania has designated the Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania as a national competent authority that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption, in accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, adopted by the General Assembly Resolution of 31 October 2003.

Address: *Special Investigation Service of the Republic of Lithuania*

A.Jakšto st. 6,
Vilnius, LT--01105,
Republic of Lithuania
Phone : (+370 5) 266 3335
Fax : (+370 5) 266 3307,
E-mail: sst@stt.lt

[...] it is provided in subparagrah a) of paragraph 6 of Article 44 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania shall consider this Convention a legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention; however, the Republic of Lithuania in no case shall consider the Convention a legal basis for the extradition of Lithuanian nationals, as it is stipulated in the Constitution of the Republic of Lithuania;

[...] it is provided in paragraph 13 of Article 46 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Lithuania and the Prosecutor General's Offfice of the Republic of Lithuania shall be designated as central authorities to receive requests for mutual legal assistance;

[...] it is provided in paragraph 14 of Article 46 of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that requests for legal assistance and documents pertaining thereto,

which shall be submitted to the Republic of Lithuania, should be accompanied by respective translations into English, Russian or Lithuanian, in case the aforementioned documents are not in one of these languages."

MAURITIUS

"The Government of the Republic of Mauritius wishes to inform the Secretary-General of the following notifications pursuant to Articles 6 (3), 44 (6), 46 (13) and 46 (14), of the Convention.

Article 6 (3)

The contact details of the authority in Mauritius that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption are as follows:

The Commissioner
The Independent Commission Against Corruption (ICAC)
Marine Road,
Quay D Round About,
Port Louis
Republic of Mauritius
Tel: (230) 217-1640/45/48 or 217-1655/56
Fax: (230) 217 1643
Hotline 800 4222
Email: contact@icac.mu
Web: http://www.icac.mu

Article 44 (6)

Mauritius makes extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty. The Extradition Act does not at present allow Mauritius to take the Convention as the legal basis for co-operation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

Article 46 (13)

The central authority designated to receive requests for mutual legal assistance is the Attorney General.

Address:
Attorney General's Office
4th Floor, Renaganaden Seeneevassen Building
Jules Koenig Street
Port Louis
Mauritius
Tel: (230) 208-7234, (230) 212-2132
Fax: (230) 211 8084
E-mail: sgo@mail.gov.mu

Article 46 (14)

The acceptable languages are English (preferably) and French.

NICARAGUA

25 October 2006

In accordance with the provisions of article 46 (13) of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Government of the Republic of Nicaragua declares that the Attorney General of the Republic is designated as the central authority competent to receive requests for mutual legal assistance.

NORWAY

21 September 2006

"*Article 6 (3)*

In Norway the authorities that may assist other States Parties in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption are:

The Royal Ministry of Justice and the Police, P.O. Box 8005 Dep, N-0030 Oslo

The Royal Ministry of Finance, P.O. Box Dep, N-0030 Oslo

Article 46 (13)

The Norwegian authority responsible for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance in accordance with article 46 (13) is:

The Royal Ministry of Justice and the Police, P.O. Box 8005 Dep, N-0030 Oslo

Article 46 (14)

Norway will accept requests in English, Danish and Swedish in addition to Norwegian."

PANAMA

...the Republic of Panama will take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States parties to the Convention.

...the Office of the Attorney-General is the central authority responsible for receiving and implementing requests for mutual legal assistance.

... the Republic of Panama considers that, for requests for legal assistance, the acceptable language is Spanish.

PARAGUAY

Pursuant to article 44 (6) (a) of the Convention, I have the honour to inform you that the Republic of Paraguay will take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States parties to the Convention.

Pursuant to the provisions of article 46 (13) of the aforementioned Convention, I hereby notify you that the Republic of Paraguay has designated the following institution as its central authority:

Central authority:Government Procurator's Department - Office of the Attorney-General

Department responsible: Department of International Affairs and External Legal Assistance

Director: Juan Emilio Oviedo Cabañas

Address: 737 Nuestra Señora de la Asunción, between Víctor Haedo and Humaitá

Telephone: 595-21-415 5000, extensions 162 and 157;
595-21-415 5100; 595-21 454603

e-mail: jeoviedo@ministeriopublico.gov.py

Pursuant to the terms of article 46 (14) of the Convention, the Republic of Paraguay considers that, for requests for mutual legal assistance and any other relevant communication, the Spanish language is acceptable or, failing that, officially certified translations into Spanish.

PHILIPPINES

14 December 2006

"In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3, the Republic of the Philippines declares that the authorities for assisting other States in developing and implementing specific measures for the prevention of corruption are:

Office of the Ombudsman
Agham Road, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines
Commission on Audit
Commonwealth Avenue, Quezon City, Philippines

In accordance with Article 44, paragraph 6, the Republic of the Philippines declares that dual criminality is required under its extradition law and the Philippines therefore cannot consider the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States.

In accordance with Article 46, paragraphs 13 and 14, the Republic of the Philippines declares that if the request involves a State Party which has a bilateral treaty on mutual legal assistance with the Philippines, the Central Authority which shall have the power to receive requests for mutual legal assistance and either to execute them or transmit them to the competent authorities for execution is:

The Department of Justice
Padre Faura Street, Manila, Philippines

In the absence of a bilateral treaty, the Central Authority shall be:

Office of the Ombudsman
Agham Road, Diliman, Quezon City, Philippines

The acceptable language for requests for mutual assistance is English."

POLAND

13 October 2006

"Pursuant to article 46, paragraph 13, the Republic of Poland declares that the Ministry of Justice is designed as the central authority competent to receive requests for mutual legal assistance.

Pursuant to article 44, paragraph 6, the Republic of Poland regards the aforementioned Convention as a legal basis for co-operation on extradition with other States Parties of the Convention.

The Republic of Poland declares that Polish and English shall be the languages acceptable pursuant to article 46, paragraph 14 of the Convention."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

...

2) The Russian Federation declares, in accordance with article 44, paragraph 6, subparagraph (a) of the Convention, that it will take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention, on a foundation of reciprocity;

...

5) The Russian Federation declares, on the basis of the last sentence of article 46, paragraph 13, of the Convention, that it will, on a foundation of reciprocity and in urgent circumstances, accept requests for mutual legal assistance and communications through the International Criminal Police Organization, provided that the documents containing such requests and communications are dispatched without delay in the prescribed manner;

6) The Russian Federation declares, in accordance with article 46, paragraph 14, of the Convention, that requests for mutual legal assistance and communications related thereto addressed to the Russian Federation must be accompanied by translations into Russian, unless otherwise established by an international agreement of the Russian Federation or unless otherwise arranged between the central authority of the Russian Federation and the central authority of the other State Party to the Convention;

...

SEYCHELLES

"That, under Article 44.6 (a) of the Convention, the Republic of Seychelles will not take the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition, and

That in accordance with Article 46.13 of the Convention, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs has been designated the competent authority to receive requests for mutual assistance and transmit them to the central authority for execution."

SLOVAKIA

"Pursuant to article 46, paragraphs 13 and 14 of the United Nations Convention against Corruption, the Slovak Republic notifies that the central authority of the Slovak Republic responsible for receiving requests for mutual legal assistance is the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic and the acceptable languages are Slovak and English."

SOUTH AFRICA

"... in terms of Article 44 (6) of the Convention it is approved that South Africa uses the Convention as the legal basis for co-operation on extradition with other States Parties to the Convention.

... it is approved that the Director-General of the Department of Justice and Constitutional Development is the designated Central Authority to receive requests for mutual legal assistance in terms of article 46 (13) of the Convention."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, [the United States notifies] that the authorities are:

The Department of Justice
Office of Justice Programs
National Institute of Justice
810 7th Street, NW
Washington, D.C. 20531
and
The Department of State
Bureau of International Narcotics
and Law Enforcement Affairs
Anticorruption Unit
2201 C Street NW
Washington, D.C. 20520.

Pursuant to Article 44, paragraph 6, of the Convention, ... the United States will not apply Article 44, paragraph 5.

Pursuant to Article 46, paragraph 13, of the Convention, ... the Department of Justice, Criminal Division, Office of International Affairs, is designated as the central authority for mutual legal assistance under the Convention.

Pursuant to Article 46, paragraph 14, of the Convention, ... requests for mutual legal assistance under the Convention should be made in, or accompanied by a translation into, the English language."

Notes:

[1] In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[2] With the following territorial exclusion: ... until further decision, the Convention shall not apply to the Faeroe Islands or to Greenland.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] On 12 October 2006, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... the said Convention shall extend to the British Virgin Islands being a territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the United Nations Convention against Corruption to the British Virgin Islands to take effect from the date of deposit of this notification...".

[6] Upon signing the Convention, the Government of Israel communciated the following with regard to the declaration made by the Government of Algeria upon ratification:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of ratification of Algeria of the abovementioned Convention contains a declaration with respect to the State of Israel.

The Government of the State of Israel considers that such declaration, which is explicitly of a political nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Convention.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration."

15. International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism

New York, 13 April 2005

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 25 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, acceptance or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 115. Parties: 11.

TEXT: A/RES/59/290.

Note: The above Convention was adopted on 13 April 2005 during the 91st plenary meeting of the General Assembly by resolution A/RES/59/290. In accordance with its article 24, the Convention shall be open for signature by all States from 14 September 2005 until 31 December 2006 at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Afghanistan	29 Dec 2005	
Albania	23 Nov 2005	
Andorra	11 May 2006	
Argentina	14 Sep 2005	
Armenia	15 Sep 2005	
Australia	14 Sep 2005	
Austria	15 Sep 2005	14 Sep 2006
Azerbaijan	15 Sep 2005	
Belarus	15 Sep 2005	
Belgium	14 Sep 2005	
Benin	15 Sep 2005	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Dec 2005	
Brazil	16 Sep 2005	
Bulgaria	14 Sep 2005	
Burkina Faso	21 Sep 2005	
Burundi	29 Mar 2006	
Cambodia	7 Dec 2006	
Canada	14 Sep 2005	
Chile	22 Sep 2005	
China	14 Sep 2005	
Colombia	1 Nov 2006	
Costa Rica	15 Sep 2005	
Croatia	16 Sep 2005	
Cyprus	15 Sep 2005	
Czech Republic	15 Sep 2005	25 Jul 2006
Denmark	14 Sep 2005	
Djibouti	14 Jun 2006	
Ecuador	15 Sep 2005	
Egypt	20 Sep 2005	
El Salvador	16 Sep 2005	27 Nov 2006
Estonia	14 Sep 2005	
Finland	14 Sep 2005	
France	14 Sep 2005	
Gabon	15 Sep 2005	
Germany	15 Sep 2005	
Ghana	6 Nov 2006	
Greece	15 Sep 2005	
Guatemala	20 Sep 2005	
Guinea	16 Sep 2005	
Guyana	15 Sep 2005	
Hungary	14 Sep 2005	
Iceland	16 Sep 2005	
India	24 Jul 2006	1 Dec 2006
Ireland	15 Sep 2005	
Israel	27 Dec 2006	
Italy	14 Sep 2005	
Jamaica	5 Dec 2006	
Japan	15 Sep 2005	
Jordan	16 Nov 2005	
Kazakhstan	16 Sep 2005	
Kenya	15 Sep 2005	13 Apr 2006
Kiribati	15 Sep 2005	
Kuwait	16 Sep 2005	
Kyrgyzstan	5 May 2006	
Latvia	16 Sep 2005	25 Jul 2006
Lebanon	23 Sep 2005	13 Nov 2006
Lesotho	16 Sep 2005	
Liberia	16 Sep 2005	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	16 Sep 2005	
Liechtenstein	16 Sep 2005	
Lithuania	16 Sep 2005	
Luxembourg	15 Sep 2005	
Madagascar	15 Sep 2005	
Malaysia	16 Sep 2005	
Malta	15 Sep 2005	
Mauritius	14 Sep 2005	
Mexico	12 Jan 2006	27 Jun 2006
Moldova	16 Sep 2005	
Monaco	14 Sep 2005	
Mongolia	3 Nov 2005	6 Oct 2006
Montenegro[1]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Morocco	19 Apr 2006	
Mozambique	1 May 2006	
Netherlands	16 Sep 2005	
New Zealand	14 Sep 2005	
Nicaragua	15 Sep 2005	
Norway	16 Sep 2005	
Palau	15 Sep 2005	
Panama	21 Feb 2006	
Paraguay	16 Sep 2005	
Peru	14 Sep 2005	
Philippines	15 Sep 2005	
Poland	14 Sep 2005	
Portugal	21 Sep 2005	

Participant	Signature, Succession to signature (d)	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Qatar	16 Feb 2006	
Republic of Korea	16 Sep 2005	
Romania	14 Sep 2005	
Russian Federation	14 Sep 2005	
Rwanda	6 Mar 2006	
Sao Tome and Principe	19 Dec 2005	
Saudi Arabia	26 Dec 2006	
Senegal	21 Sep 2005	
Serbia	15 Sep 2005	26 Sep 2006
Seychelles	7 Oct 2005	
Sierra Leone	14 Sep 2005	
Singapore	1 Dec 2006	
Slovakia	15 Sep 2005	23 Mar 2006
Slovenia	14 Sep 2005	
South Africa	14 Sep 2005	
Spain	14 Sep 2005	
Sri Lanka	14 Sep 2005	
Swaziland	15 Sep 2005	
Sweden	14 Sep 2005	
Switzerland	14 Sep 2005	
Syrian Arab Republic	14 Sep 2005	
Tajikistan	14 Sep 2005	
Thailand	14 Sep 2005	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	16 Sep 2005	
Timor-Leste	16 Sep 2005	
Togo	15 Sep 2005	
Turkey	14 Sep 2005	
Ukraine	14 Sep 2005	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Sep 2005	
United States of America	14 Sep 2005	
Uruguay	16 Sep 2005	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ARGENTINA

Reservation made upon signature:

Pursuant to article 23, paragraph 2, the Republic of Argentina declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 23 and, as a consequence, does not recognize either the compulsory arbitration or the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

AZERBAIJAN

Reservation made upon signature:

"In accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 23 the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 23 of the Convention."

Declaration made upon signature:

"The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that it will be unable to guarantee compliance with the provisions of the Convention in its territories occupied by the Republic of Armenia until these territories are liberated from that occupation."

EGYPT[2]

Reservation made upon signature:

1. The Arab Republic of Egypt declares its commitment to article 4 of the Convention provided that the armed forces of a State do not violate the rules and principles of international law in the exercise of their duties under that article, and also provided that the article is not interpreted as excluding the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict from the scope of application of this Convention on the grounds that the activities of States - under certain legal circumstances - are not considered terrorist activities.

2. The Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 23 of the Convention.

EL SALVADOR

Reservations:

With reference to article 13 of this Convention, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by the provisions of this article because it does not consider the Convention to be a legal basis for cooperation in extradition matters. Similarly, with reference to article 23 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article because it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

INDIA

Reservation:

"India does not consider itself bound by the provision of Paragraph (1) of Article 23."

QATAR

Upon signature:

Rerservation :

"... with reservation on the provisions of paragraph (1) of article 23 of the Convention."

TURKEY[3]

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"It is the understanding of the Republic of Turkey that the term international humanitarian law in Article 4(2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, refers to the legal instruments to which Turkey is already party to. The Article should not be interpreted as giving a different status to the armed forces and groups other than the armed forces of a state as currently understood and applied in international law and thereby creating new obligations for the Republic of Turkey."

Reservation:

"Pursuant to Article 23 (2) of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 23(1) of the Convention.

Notifications pursuant to article 9, paragraph 3
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC

"In accordance with article 9, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Czech Republic notifies that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases referred to in article 9, subparagraph 2 (c) and 2 (d) of the Convention."

LATVIA

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of the Article 9 of the Convention, the Republic of Latvia notifies that it has established its jurisdiction over all the offences enumerated in the paragraph 2 of the Article 9 of the Convention."

SLOVAKIA

"Pursuant to article 9, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, the Slovak Republic notifies that it has established its jurisdiction in accordance with article 9, paragraph 2, subparagraphs (c), (d) and (e) of the Convention."

Notifications of designation of administrative or judicial authority in accordance with article 7 paragraph 4 of the Convention
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

Participant :	*Sending and Receiving agency*
Czech Republic	POLICE OF THE CZECH REPUBLIC Organized Crime Detection Unit Arms Traffic Division P.O. Box 41 - V2 15680 Praha 5 - Zbraslav Czech Republic Tel.: +420974842420 Fax: +420974842596 e-mail: v2uuoz@mvcr.cz (24-hour phone service: - Operations Center: +420974842690, +420974842694 - Cpt. Pavel Osvald: +420603191064 - Lt.Col. Jan Svoboda: +420603190355)
Latvia	Security Police Kr. Barona Str. 99a, Rïga, LV-1012 Latvia Phone: +371 7208964 Fax: +371 7273373 E-mail: dp@dp.gov.lv

---

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The Secretary-General received from the following State, on the date indicated hereinafter, a communication with regard to the reservation made by Egypt upon signature:

Latvia (6 December 2006):

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has examined the reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention on the Suppression of the Acts of Nuclear Terrorism upon signature to the Convention regarding Article 4.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that this reservation contradicts to the objectives and purposes of the International Convention to suppress the acts of nuclear terrorism wherever and by whomsoever they may be carried out.

he Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the Arab Republic of Egypt. Thus, the International Convention will become operative without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation.

[3] The Secretary-General received from the following State, on the date indicated hereinafter, a communication with regard to the declaration and reservation made by Turkey upon signature :

Latvia (22 December 2006):

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has examined the reservation and declaration made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Convention on the Suppression of the Acts of Nuclear Terrorism upon signature to the Convention regarding Article 4 (2).

The Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that this declaration is in fact unilateral act that is deemed to limit the scope of the Convention and therefore should be regarded as reservation. Thus,

this reservation contradicts to the objectives and purposes of the Convention on the suppression the commitment of the acts of nuclear terrorism wherever and by whomsoever they may be carried out.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the reservation named as a declaration conflicts with the terms of Article 4 (1).

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that this declaration reservation contradicts to the objectives and purposes of the International Convention to suppress the acts of nuclear terrorism wherever and by whomsoever they might be carried out.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), sets out that reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation named as declaration made by the Republic of Turkey to the International Convention on the Suppression of the Acts of Nuclear Terrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Turkey. Thus, the International Convention will become operative without the Republic of Turkey benefiting from its reservation."

CHAPTER XIX

COMMODITIES

(An asterisk indicates that an agreement has expired or has terminated, or has been superseded by a subsequent agreement.)

1. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON OLIVE OIL, 1956*

Geneva, 17 October 1955 and New York, 15 November 1955

NOT YET IN FORCE: The International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956, which was drawn up at the first session of the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil held at Geneva from 3 to 17 October 1955 and opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations did not come into force [see the Protocol amending the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956 (chapter XIX.2) and the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956, as amended by the Protocol of 3 April 1958 (chapter XIX.3)].

TEXT: United Nations publications, sales No.: 1956.II.D.1 (E/CONF.19/5). (See also amended text in chapter XIX.3.)

---

2. PROTOCOL AMENDING THE INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON OLIVE OIL, 1956*

Geneva, 31 March 1958 and 3 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 April 1958, in accordance with article 4 . The Protocol was adopted at the second session of the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil held in Geneva from 31 March to 3 April 1958 (see the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956, as amended by the Protocol of 3 April 1958 (chapter XIX.3)].

REGISTRATION: 29 May 1958, No. 4355.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 302, p. 121.

---

3. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON OLIVE OIL, 1956, AS AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOL OF 3 APRIL 1958*

Geneva, 3 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 June 1959, in accordance with article 36 (5) . The Agreement terminated on 30 September 1963, in accordance with the provisions of its article 37 [see the International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives concluded at Geneva on 1 July 1986 (chapter XIX.30)].

REGISTRATION: 26 June 1959, No. 4806.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 336, p. 177.

---

4. INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1962*

New York, 28 September 1962

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 July 1963, in accordance with article 64 (2) and definitively on 27 December 1963, in accordance with article 64 (1) . The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1968.

REGISTRATION: 1 July 1963, No. 6791.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 469, p. 169, and vol. 515, p. 322 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Russian text of the Agreement).

---

5. INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1968*

New York, 18 and 31 March 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 October 1968, in accordance with article 62 (2) and definitively on 30 December 1968, in accordance with article 62 (1) . The Agreement was extended with modifications by Resolution No. 264 approved by the International Coffee Council on 14 April 1973 [see chapter XIX.5 a)].

REGISTRATION: 1 October 1968, No. 9262.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 647, p. 3.

---

5. a) Extension with modifications of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, approved by the International Coffee Council in resolution No. 264 of 14 April 1973*

14 April 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1973 . The Agreement was extended by the Protocol for the continuation in force of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, as extended on 1 October 1975 [see chapter XIX.5 c)].

REGISTRATION: 1 October 1973, No. 9262.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 893, p. 350.

---

5. b) International Coffee Agreement, 1968, as extended with modifications by the International Coffee Council in Resolution No. 264 of 14 April 1973*

14 April 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1973 . The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1975 by the Protocol for the Continuation in Force of the International Coffee Agreement 1968, as extended [see chapter XIX.5 c)].

REGISTRATION: 1 October 1973, No. 9262.

TEXT: Resolution No. 264 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

5. c) Protocol for the continuation in force of the International Coffee Agreement, 1968, as extended*

London, 26 September 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1975, in accordance with article 5 (1) . The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1976.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1975, No. 9262.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 982, p. 332.

---

5. D) INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1968, AS EXTENDED BY THE PROTOCOL OF 26 SEPTEMBER 1974*

26 September 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1975 . The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1976.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1975, No. 9262.

---

6. INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1968*

New York, 3 and 24 December 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 January 1969, in accordance with article 63 (2) and definitively on 17 June 1969, in accordance with article 63 (1) . The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 31 December 1973.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1969, No. 9369.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 654, p. 3.

---

7. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE ASIAN COCONUT COMMUNITY

Bangkok, 12 December 1968

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 July 1969, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 30 July 1969, No. 9733.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 11.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 684, p. 163; vol. 803, p. 514 [amendment to article 11 (2)]and depositary notification C.N.302.1980.TREATIES-1 of 29 October 1980 [amendment to article 5 (3)]. [1]

Note: The Agreement was drawn up at the meeting of the Inter-Governmental Consultations on the Asian Coconut Community, held at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East in Bangkok from 26 to 28 November 1968, which was attended by the representatives of the Governments of Sri Lanka, India, Indonesia, the Philippines, Singapore and Thailand and of the United Nations Development Programme and the Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*
India	12 Dec 1968	18 Jun 1969
Indonesia	12 Dec 1968	30 Jul 1969 A
Kiribati		8 Nov 2004 a
Malaysia	30 Jun 1969	22 Feb 1972
Marshall Islands		30 Aug 2004 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		24 May 2004 a
Papua New Guinea		11 Nov 1976 a
Philippines	12 Dec 1968	26 Aug 1969
Samoa		28 Dec 1972 a
Sri Lanka	11 Mar 1969	25 Apr 1969
Thailand	26 Jun 1969	
Viet Nam		13 Apr 2004 a

Notes :

[1] Amendments were adopted in accordance with article 15 of the Agreement as follows, to enter into force upon adoption:

– On 21 December 1971, at the fifth regular session of the Asian Coconut Community, held in Jakarta (amendment to article 11 (2));

– On 30 August 1980, at the eighteenth regular session of the Asian Coconut Community, held at Port Moresby (amendment to article 5 (3)).

8. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE INTERNATIONAL PEPPER COMMUNITY

Bangkok, 16 April 1971

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 March 1972, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 29 March 1972, No. 11654.
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 6.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 818, p. 89; C.N.136.2002.TREATIES-2 of 20 February 2002 (amendments).

Note: This Agreement was drawn up at the meeting of the Inter-Governmental Consultations on the Pepper Community, held at the headquarters of the Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East in Bangkok from 24 to 27 February 1971, which wasattended by the representatives of the Governments of Sri Lanka, India, Indonesia and Malaysia and of the United Nations Food and Agriculture Organization (FAO) and the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development.

At its Eighth Session, held in Cochin, India, from 15 to 17 September 1980, and at its Twentieth Session held in Madras, India, from 20 to 21 August 1992, the International Pepper Community amended the above Agreement, in accordance with article 15 of the Agreement.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*
Brazil		30 Mar 1981 a	Sri Lanka		27 Jul 2002 a
India	21 Apr 1971	29 Mar 1972	Viet Nam		21 Mar 2005 a
Indonesia	21 Apr 1971	1 Nov 1971			
Malaysia	21 Apr 1971	22 Mar 1972			

Notes:

[1] State having become an Associate Member of the International Pepper Community, in accordance with its article 2(3) of the Agreement: Papua New Guinea.

9. INTERNATIONAL COCOA AGREEMENT, 1972*

Geneva, 21 October 1972

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 30 June 1973, in accordance with article 67 (2) . The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1976.
REGISTRATION: 30 June 1973, No. 12652.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 882, p. 67.

10. International Sugar Agreement, 1973*

Geneva, 13 October 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 January 1974, in accordance with article 36 (2) and definitively on 15 October 1974, in accordance with article 36 (1) . The Agreement was extended by Resolution No. 1 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 30 September 1975 [see chapter XIX.10 a)].
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1974, No. 12951.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 906, p. 69 and vol. 958, p. 279 (rectification of authentic texts).

---

10. a) Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1973*

Geneva, 30 September 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1976 , in accordance with paragraph 2 of Resolution No. 1 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 30 September 1975. The Agreement was extended by Resolution No. 2 approved by the International Sugar Council on 18 June 1976 [see chapter XIX.10 c)].
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1976, No. 12951.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 993, p. 472.

---

10. b) International Sugar Agreement, 1973*

Geneva, 30 September 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 September 1976 , in accordance with paragraph 2 of Resolution No. 1 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 30 September 1975. The Agreement was extended by Resolution No. 2 of 18 June 1976 adopted by the International Sugar Council [see chapter XIX.10 c)].
REGISTRATION: 1 September 1976, No. 12951.
TEXT: See under chapter XIX.10, and annex to resolution No. 1.

---

10. c) Second extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1973, as extended*

Geneva, 18 June 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1977 , in accordance with pargraph 2 of Resolution No. 2 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 18 June 1976. The Agreement expired on 31 December 1977 in accordance with its provisions.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1977, No. 12951.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1031, p. 402.

---

10. D) INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1973*

Geneva, 18 June 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1977 , in accordance with paragraph 2 of Resolution No. 2 adopted by the International Sugar Council on 18 June 1976. The Agreement expired on 31 December 1977 in accordance with its provisions.
REGISTRATION: 26 December 1976, No. 12951.
TEXT: See chapter XIX.10, and annex to resolution No. 2.

---

10. E) THIRD EXTENSION OF THE INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1973, AS FURTHER EXTENDED*

Geneva, 31 August 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1978 . The Agreement was superseded, prior to its entry into force by the International Sugar Agreement, 1977 (see chapter XIX.18).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1978, No. 12951.
TEXT: Resolution No. 3 of the Internationa.l Sugar Council.

---

11. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE ASIAN RICE TRADE FUND

Bangkok, 16 March 1973

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 December 1974, in accordance with article 19.
REGISTRATION: 1 December 1974, No. 13679.
STATUS: Signatories: 5. Parties: 4.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 955, p. 195; depositary notifications C.N.26.1979.TREATIES-1 of 28 February 1979 and C.N.101.TREATIES-2 of 22 May 1979 [amendments to paragraphs (i) and (iii) of article 1].

Note: The text of the Agreement was drawn up by the intergovernmental meeting on the establishment of an Asian Rice Trade Fund convened by the United Nations Economic Commission for Asia and the Far East at Bangkok, Thailand, from 12 to 16 March 1973; it was approved and initialled by the representatives of Democratic Kampuchea, the Philippines, Sri Lanka and Thailand.

The signatories agreed on 29 November 1973 to extend to 31 May and 1 December 1974, respectively, the time-limits provided for by articles 17 and 19 of the Agreement for signature and deposit of instruments of acceptance.

The Board of Directors of the Asian Rice Trade Fund, in a resolution adopted at Manila on 10 January 1979, proposed certain amendments to article 1 (i) and (iii) of the Agreement. In accordance with the provisions of article 13 of the Agreement the proposed amendments have come into force on 15 December 1981 upon acceptance by all members of the Fund. Following is a list of the States which have accepted the amendments and the dates of their acceptance:

Participant	*Date of acceptance*
Sri Lanka	1 Jun 1979
Bangladesh	14 Jun 1979
India	24 Jun 1980
Philippines	15 Déc 1981

Participant[1,2]	*Signature*	*Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*
Bangladesh	29 Jun 1973	1 Dec 1974 A
Cambodia	18 Apr 1973	
India	29 Jun 1973	28 Nov 1974 A
Philippines[2]	19 Apr 1973	11 Mar 1975 a
Sri Lanka	31 May 1974	29 Nov 1974 A

Notes:

[1] The Republic of Viet Nam had signed the Agreement on 16 April 1974 and deposited an instrument of acceptance on 11 March 1975. In this regard see note 2 and note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The States Parties unanimously decided that the instruments of acceptance by the Governments of the Philippines and of the Republic of Viet Nam, having been received after the time-limit of 1 December 1974, should be treated as instruments of accession.

12. PROTOCOL FOR THE CONTINUATION IN FORCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1968, AS EXTENDED*

London, 26 September 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1975, in accordance with article 5 (1) . The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1976.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1975, No. 9262.
TEXT: United Nations,*Treaty Series*, vol. 982, p. 332.

---

13. FIFTH INTERNATIONAL TIN AGREEMENT, 1975*

Geneva, 21 June 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 July 1976, in accordance with article 50 (a) and definitively on 14 June 1977, in accordance with article 49 (a) . The Agreement was extended until 30 June 1982 by Resolution No. 121 adopted by the International Tin Council on 14 January 1981 and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 30 June 1982.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1976, No. 14851.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1014, p. 43.

---

14. INTERNATIONAL COCOA AGREEMENT, 1975*

Geneva, 20 October 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 October 1976, in accordance with article 69 (2) and definitively on 7 November 1978, in accordance with article 69 (1) . The Agreement was extended until 31 March 1980, and expired in accordance with its provisions on 31 March 1980.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1976, No. 15033.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1023, p. 253.

---

15. INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT, 1976*

London, 3 December 1975

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 October 1976, in accordance with article 61 (2) and definitively on 1 August 1977, in accordance with article 61 (1) . The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1982 by Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 25 September 1981 [see chaptre XIX.15 a)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1976, No. 15034.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1024, p. 3.

---

15. a) Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1976*

London, 25 September 1981

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1982, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 25 September 1981. The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1983.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1982, No. 15034.
TEXT: Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

15. b) International Coffee Agreement, 1976, as extended*

London, 25 September 1981

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1982, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 25 September 1981. The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1983.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1982, No. 15034.
TEXT: Resolution No. 318 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

16. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE INTERNATIONAL TEA PROMOTION ASSOCIATION

Geneva, 31 March 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 February 1979, in accordance with article 19 (1).
REGISTRATION: 23 February 1979, No. 17582.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 8.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1128, p. 367.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up by the Intergovernmental Conference of the Tea Producing Countries for the establishment of an International Tea Promotion Association, which met in Geneva from 7 to 17 September 1976. (The Conference had been convened by the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT.) In accordance with the provisions of the resolution adopted on 17 September 1976 by the Conference, the Governments of nine countries whose total volume of exports of tea accounted for more than two-thirds of the total volume of exports of tea of all countries qualified to participate in the Agreement had, as at 31 March 1977, notified the Director of the International Trade Centre UNCTAD/GATT their approval of the text of the Agreement.

In accordance with the provisions of article 18, the Agreement has been opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 15 April 1977 until and including 15 October 1977.

By a Resolution adopted by the Governing Board of the International Tea Promotion Association on 21 November 1984, it was decided to suspend for an initial period of two years the following articles of the Agreement establishing the International Tea Promotion Association: article 1, paragraph 2, but only with regard to the phrase "and to formulate programmes to achieve this objective"; article 1, paragraph 3; article 11; article 12 and article 13.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Bangladesh		2 Apr 1979 a
India[1]	[20 Jul 1977	1 Nov 1977]
Indonesia	7 Jul 1977	31 Aug 1978
Kenya	2 Aug 1977	17 May 1978
Malawi	17 Aug 1977	22 Feb 1978
Mauritius	2 Aug 1977	25 Nov 1977
Mozambique		29 Mar 1984 a
Sri Lanka[1]	[22 Sep 1977	1 Nov 1977]
Uganda	14 Oct 1977	23 Aug 1978
United Republic of Tanzania	27 Jul 1977	28 Jul 1978

Notes:

[1] Notifications of withdrawal received by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Participant:	*Date of the notification:*
India	25 Jul 1984
Sri Lanka	29 Sep 982

17. Agreement establishing the Southeast Asia Tin Research and Development Centre

Bangkok, 28 April 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 February 1978, in accordance with article 8.
REGISTRATION: 10 February 1978, No. 16434[1].
STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 3.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1075, p. 3.

Note: The Agreement was drawn up within the framework of the United Nations Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific. It was open for signature at the headquarters of the Commission, in Bangkok, until 30 April 1977.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A)*
Indonesia[1]	28 Apr 1977	11 Jan 1978
Malaysia[1]	28 Apr 1977	11 Jan 1978
Thailand[1]	28 Apr 1977	11 Jan 1978

Notes:

[1] By notifications, the last of which was received by the Secretary-General on 11 January 1978, the Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand agreed to extend until 31 October 1977 the time-limit for lodging their instrument of ratification previously set at 31 July 1977 under article 7 (c) of the Agreement.

The instruments of ratification by the Governments of Indonesia, Malaysia and Thailand, which were lodged with the Secretary-General on 12 and 20 September and 18 October 1977, respectively, were officially deposited with the Secretary-General on 11 January 1978, the date of receipt of the last notification of acceptance referred to in the preceding paragraphs.

18. International Sugar Agreement, 1977*

Geneva, 7 October 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 January 1978, in accordance with article 75 (2) and definitively on 2 January 1980, in accordance with article 75 (1). The Agreement was extended by Decisions Nos. 13 and 14 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 20 November 1981 and 21 May 1982, respectively [see chapter XIX.18 a)].

REGISTRATION: 1 January 1978, No. 16200.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1064, p. 219; vol. 1102, p. 355; vol. 1103, p. 398; vol. 1119, p. 388; vol. 1122, p. 391; vol. 1132, p. 444; vol. 1157, p. 459 (procès-verbaux of rectification of the original French and Russian, French and Spanish, Russian, French, and French, Spanish and Russian, respectively).

---

18. a) Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1977*

Washington, 20 November 1981 and 21 May 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1983, in accordance with Decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982 adopted by the International Sugar Council. The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 31 December 1984.

REGISTRATION: 1 January 1993, No. 16200.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1297, p. 433.

---

18. b) Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1977*

Geneva, 21 May 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1983. The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 31 December 1984.

REGISTRATION: 1 January 1983, No. 16200.

TEXT: Decisions No. 13 of 20 November 1981 and No. 14 of 21 May 1982 adopted by the International Sugar Council.

---

19. Agreement establishing the International Tropical Timber Bureau*

Geneva, 9 November 1977

NOT YET IN FORCE: (see article 24).

TEXT: Doc. TT/CONF.2.

---

20. International Natural Rubber Agreement, 1979*

Geneva, 6 October 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 23 October 1980, in accordance with article 61 (2) and definitively on 15 April 1982, in accordance with article 61 (1). The Agreement was extended until 22 October 1987, and was termnated in accordance with its provisions on 22 October 1987.

REGISTRATION: 23 October 1980, No. 19184.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1201, p. 191.

---

21. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE COMMON FUND FOR COMMODITIES

Geneva, 27 June 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 June 1989, in accordance with article 57 (1) (see "Note.").
REGISTRATION: 19 June 1989, No. 26691.
STATUS: Signatories: 115. Parties: 111.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.1538, p. 3.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 27 June 1980 by the United Nations Negotiating Conference on a Common Fund under the Integrated Programme for Commodities, which met at Geneva from 5 to 27 June 1980 under the auspices of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development (UNCTAD). The Agreement was opened for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations, New York, on 1 October 1980, and will remain open for signature until one year after the date of its entry into force.

At a meeting convened on 3 June 1982 in Geneva by the Secretary-General of UNCTAD, under article 57 (1) of the Agreement, the Contracting Parties decided to extend until 30 September 1983 the time-limit for the fulfilment of the requirements for its entry into force.

Subsequently, by a later decision taken at a Meeting of those States which had deposited prior to 30 September 1983 an instrument of ratification, approval or acceptance, which was held on 19 June 1989, it was decided further to extend to 19 June 1989 [the date of the decision] the date by which the requirements should be fulfilled.

Further, the Governing Council notifiied the Secretary-General of the following:

Date of receipt of the notification:	*Subject:*
11 November 2002	Establishment of conditions of accession by Costa Rica.
20 November 2002	Establishment of conditions of accession by the Lao People's Democratic Republic.
24 October 2005	Establishment of conditions of accession by the East African Community.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*	
Afghanistan	11 Sep 1981	28 Mar 1984	
Algeria	15 Mar 1982	31 Mar 1982	
Angola	29 Jun 1983	28 Jan 1986	
Argentina	22 Sep 1982	1 Jul 1983	
Australia[1]	[20 May 1981	9 Oct 1981]	
Austria	8 Jul 1981	4 May 1983	
Bangladesh	23 Dec 1980	1 Jun 1981	
Barbados	2 Jan 1985		
Belgium[3]	31 Mar 1981	6 Jun 1985	
Benin	10 Sep 1981	25 Oct 1982	
Bhutan	22 Sep 1983	18 Sep 1984	
Botswana	18 Nov 1981	22 Apr 1982	
Brazil	16 Apr 1981	28 Jun 1984	
Bulgaria	29 Jul 1987	24 Sep 1987	AA
Burkina Faso	20 Aug 1981	8 Jul 1983	
Burundi	8 Apr 1981	1 Jun 1982	
Cameroon	30 Jun 1981	1 Feb 1983	
Canada[1]	[15 Jan 1981	27 Sep 1983]	
Cape Verde	9 Oct 1981	30 Jul 1984	
Central African Republic	28 Jan 1982	2 Aug 1983	
Chad	16 Dec 1981	6 Jun 1984	
China	5 Nov 1980	2 Sep 1981	AA
Colombia	14 Jun 1983	8 Apr 1986	
Common Market for Eastern and Southern Africa		3 Feb 1998	a
Comoros	10 Sep 1981	27 Jan 1984	
Congo	22 Oct 1981	4 Nov 1987	
Costa Rica	29 Jul 1981	21 Nov 2002	a
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Jul 1987	29 Oct 1996	a
Cuba	22 Jun 1983	21 Jul 1988	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	29 Jun 1983	5 Jun 1987	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	17 Mar 1981	27 Oct 1983	
Denmark	27 Oct 1980	13 May 1981	
Djibouti	9 Oct 1984	25 Nov 1985	
Dominican Republic	15 Jun 1983		
East African Community		25 Apr 2006	a
Ecuador	3 Oct 1980	4 May 1982	
Egypt	19 Oct 1981	11 Jun 1982	
El Salvador	28 Jun 1983		
Equatorial Guinea	22 Jul 1983	22 Jul 1983	
Ethiopia	30 Sep 1981	19 Nov 1981	
European Community	21 Oct 1981	6 Jul 1990	AA
Finland	27 Oct 1980	30 Dec 1981	
France	4 Nov 1980	17 Sep 1982	AA
Gabon	10 Sep 1981	30 Nov 1981	
Gambia	23 Oct 1981	14 Apr 1983	
Germany[4,5]	10 Mar 1981	15 Aug 1985	
Ghana	1 Dec 1982	19 Jan 1983	
Greece	21 Jul 1981	10 Aug 1984	
Grenada	28 Jun 1983		
Guatemala	1 Jun 1983	22 Mar 1985	
Guinea	6 Oct 1981	9 Dec 1982	
Guinea-Bissau	11 Sep 1981	7 Jun 1983	
Guyana	8 Jun 1983		
Haiti	19 Jan 1981	20 Jul 1981	
Honduras	28 Jun 1983	26 May 1988	
India	18 Sep 1981	22 Dec 1981	A

Participant[2]	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Indonesia	1 Oct 1980	24 Feb 1981
Iraq	7 Apr 1981	10 Sep 1981
Ireland	24 Feb 1981	11 Aug 1982
Italy	17 Dec 1980	20 Nov 1984
Jamaica	6 Jan 1983	7 Jan 1985
Japan	28 Nov 1980	15 Jun 1981 A
Kenya	10 Mar 1982	6 Apr 1982
Kuwait	1 Dec 1981	26 Apr 1983
Lao People's Democratic Republic		17 Dec 2002 a
Lesotho	7 Sep 1981	6 Dec 1983
Liberia	21 Oct 1981	
Luxembourg	29 Dec 1980	4 Oct 1985
Madagascar	8 Jun 1983	21 Oct 1987
Malawi	17 Mar 1981	15 Dec 1981
Malaysia	30 Dec 1980	22 Sep 1983
Maldives	19 May 1988	11 Jul 1988
Mali	17 Jun 1981	11 Jan 1982
Mauritania	18 Oct 1988	28 Aug 1990
Mexico	19 Dec 1980	11 Feb 1982
Morocco	22 Jan 1981	29 May 1987
Mozambique	21 Dec 1982	30 Sep 1993 a
Myanmar		21 Nov 1996 a
Nepal	7 Sep 1981	3 Apr 1984
Netherlands[6]	1 Oct 1980	9 Jun 1983 A
New Zealand[1,7]	[12 Feb 1982	27 Sep 1983]
Nicaragua	7 Sep 1981	5 Mar 1984
Niger	19 Oct 1981	19 Oct 1981 AA
Nigeria	20 Jul 1981	30 Sep 1983
Norway	27 Oct 1980	15 Jul 1981
Organization of African Unity		16 Mar 1998 a
Pakistan	4 May 1982	9 Jun 1983
Papua New Guinea	27 Oct 1981	27 Jan 1982
Peru	25 Sep 1981	29 Jul 1987
Philippines	24 Feb 1981	13 May 1981
Portugal	30 Jan 1981	3 Jul 1989
Republic of Korea	27 Nov 1981	30 Mar 1982
Russian Federation	14 Jul 1987	8 Dec 1987 AA
Rwanda	6 Oct 1981	23 Mar 1983
Saint Lucia	20 Dec 1984	
Samoa	2 Apr 1982	6 Mar 1984
Sao Tome and Principe	20 Jun 1983	6 Dec 1983
Saudi Arabia	11 Jan 1983	16 Mar 1983
Senegal	11 Nov 1981	20 Jun 1983
Sierra Leone	24 Sep 1981	7 Oct 1982
Singapore	17 Dec 1982	16 Dec 1983
Somalia	27 Oct 1981	27 Aug 1984
Spain	27 May 1981	5 Jan 1984
Sri Lanka	21 Jan 1981	4 Sep 1981
Sudan	13 May 1981	30 Sep 1983
Suriname	20 Jun 1983	
Swaziland	18 Nov 1987	29 Jun 1988
Sweden	27 Oct 1980	6 Jul 1981
Switzerland	30 Mar 1981	27 Aug 1982
Syrian Arab Republic	26 Mar 1982	8 Sep 1983
Thailand	8 Jun 1983	6 Aug 1992 a
Togo	29 Jun 1983	10 Apr 1984
Trinidad and Tobago		22 Jan 1998 a
Tunisia	2 Mar 1982	15 Dec 1982
Turkey[1]	[7 Sep 1981	29 Aug 1990]
Uganda	19 Mar 1982	19 Mar 1982
United Arab Emirates	8 Jun 1982	26 Apr 1983
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	16 Dec 1980	31 Dec 1981
United Republic of Tanzania	7 Sep 1981	11 Jun 1982
United States of America	5 Nov 1980	
Uruguay	13 Feb 1986	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	5 Dec 1980	31 Mar 1982
Yemen[8]	16 Dec 1981	8 Jan 1986
Zambia	3 Feb 1981	16 Mar 1983
Zimbabwe	8 Jun 1983	28 Sep 1983

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ARGENTINA

Reservation made upon signature and maintained upon ratification:

The Argentine Republic, exercising its prerogative under article 58 of the Agreement, enters a reservation regarding article 53 of that Agreement as it cannot accept compulsory arbitration as the only means of settling disputes of the kind referred to in this article, and as it believes that the parties to such disputes must be free to determine by mutual agreement the means of settlement best suited to each particular case.

BELGIUM

In accordance with article 11, paragraph 3, of the Agreement, the payment of the Paid-in Shares subscribed by Belgium (2,640,699 Units of Account) will be effected in three instalments in accordance with the specified procedure, the first of which will take place within 60 days after the entry into force of the Agreement.

With regard to the amount subscribed by Belgium for Payable Shares (915,543 Units of Account), it shall be subject to call by the Fund, in accordance with article 11, paragraph 4, only as provided in article 17, paragraph 12.

BULGARIA

Upon signature:

[Same declaration identical in substance, mutatis mutandis, *as that made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.]*

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, in conformity with article 58 of the Agreement, that it does not consider itself bound by the arbitration procedures for the settlement of disputes established in article 53.

JAPAN

"The Government of Japan shall contribute to the initial resources of the Second Account of the Common Fund an amount in Japanese yen that is equivalent to twenty-seven million United States dollars (U.S.$27 million) in accordance with article 13 of the Agreement."

"The Government of Japan opts for payment of the above contribution in three equal annual instalments, with the first one to be made in cash or in notes within one year after the entry into force of the Agreement. The notes are understood to be irrevocable, non-negotiable, non-interest bearing promissory notes, issued in lieu of a cash payment and payable to the Fund at par value upon demand. It is also understood that the notes are to be treated in the same manner as notes of the same kind from other contributors."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon approval:

In view of its well known position, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics cannot recognize the legality of the names "Republic of Korea" and "Democratic Kampuchea" contained in the schedules to the Agreement establishing the Common Fund for Commodities.

SINGAPORE

"The Government of the Republic of Singapore declares that it is not in agreement with the manner in which the share of individual countries to the Directly Contributed Capital was determined. Nevertheless, the Government of the Republic of Singapore will make contributions as presently indicated in schedule A of the Agreement. This should not however prejudice in any way Singapore's position on its share of any contributions to be made under other agreements."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

Our accession to and ratification of the Agreement shall not in any way imply recognition of Israel and shall not, consequently, lead to involvement with it in any transactions as are regulated by the provisions of the Agreement.

Reservation:

The Syrian Arab Republic enters a reservation in respect of article 53 of the Agreement, with regard to the binding nature of arbitration.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature, maintained upon ratification:

With reservation as to article 53.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ISRAEL

14 November 1983

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument deposited by the Syrian Arab Republic contains a declaration of a political character in respect of the State of Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel this Agreement is not the place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic under general international law or under specific conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in regard to the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Declarations under article 11 (1) of the Agreement[9]
(Procedure for the payment of Shares of Directly Contributed Capital)
Voluntary contribution for the use in the Second Account (article 13)

Participant	*Procedure selected [formula (a) or (b)] under article 11 (1)*	*Currency selected (by States having chosen procedure of payment (b))*	*Amended option*[10] *(currency selection indicates option (b))*
Argentina	(b)	French francs	
Australia[1]	[(a)]		[French franc]
Austria[11]	(b)	Deutsche mark	French franc
Bangladesh	(b)	US dollar	French franc
Belgium	(b)	French franc	
Canada1	[(b)]	[French franc]	
Central African Republic	(b)	French franc	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	(a)		French franc
Denmark	(b)	French franc	
Finland	(b)	French franc	
Germany[4,5, 12]	(b)	[Deutsche mark]	
Ghana	(b)	French franc	

Participant	*Procedure selected [formula (a) or (b)] under article 11 (1)*	*Currency selected (by States having chosen procedure of payment (b))*	*Amended option*[10] *(currency selection indicates option (b))*
Greece	(b)	French franc	
India	(a)		French franc
Ireland	(b)	French franc	
Italy	(b)	French franc	
Jamaica	(a)		French franc
Japan	(a)		
Lao People's Democratic Republic	(b)	French franc[13]	
Malawi	(b)	US dollar	
Malaysia	(b)	US dollar	French franc
Mauritania	(b)	French franc	
Morocco	(b)	French franc	
Mozambique		French franc	
New Zealand[1]	[(b)]	[French franc]	
Niger	(b)	US dollar	
Norway	(a)		French franc
Pakistan	(b)	US dollar	(a)
Papua New Guinea	(b)	US dollar	
Peru	(b)	French franc	
Republic of Korea	(a)		French franc
Singapore	(b)	Pound sterling	French franc
Spain	(b)	French franc	
Sri Lanka	(a)		French franc
Swaziland	(b)	French franc	
Sweden	(a)		French franc
Switzerland	(a)		French franc
Tunisia	(b)	French franc	
Turkey[1]	[(a)]		[French franc]
Trinidad and Tobago		US dollar	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	(b)	Pound sterling	
United Republic of Tanzania	(b)	US dollar	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	(a)		French franc

Notes:

[1] The Secretary-General was informed by the Common Fund for Commodities that, pursuant to article 30 of the Agreement, the following Governments had notified the Common Fund, by a letter on the following dates, their decision to withdraw from the Common Fund. The withdrawal became effective on the dates specified by the Governments, which were not less than twelve months after the receipt of their notice by the Fund, as indicated hereinafter:

Participant:	*Date of the notification:*	*Effective date:*
Australia	15 Aug 1991	20 Aug 1992
Canada	8 Jun 1992	9 Jun 1993
New Zealand	15 Feb 1993	17 Feb 1994
Turkey	29 Jul 1994	1 Aug 1995

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Agreement on 7 January 1982 and 14 February 1983, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The payment of the voluntary contribution will be made after the entry into force of the Common Fund, the terms of which are specified in article 57 of the Agreement.

[4] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The Agreement shall also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue. See also note 1.

[8] The Yemen Arab Republic had signed and ratified the Agreement on 7 September 1981 and 14 January 1986, respectively. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] At its 9th session held on 20 July 1989, the Governing Council decided that any Member State which had not yet made known its selection of one of the payment procedures provided for in article 11, paragraph 1 (see table), was to notify in writing the Secretary-General of UNCTAD of its selection not later than 18 August 1989, and that any Member State which had not notified its selection by 18 August 1989 would be deemed to have selected the procedure provided for under article 11, paragraph 1 (a).

At its 10th session, held on 21 July 1989, the Governing Council decided that the rates of conversion deemed to apply at the date of payment shall be the rate of the Unit of Account as defined in Schedule F of the Agreement and as determined by the International Monetary Fund, on the thirtieth business day before the actual date of payment.

[10] Prior to the entry into force of the Agreement, a number of States had notified a change in the option which they had exercised under article 11 (1) (see depositary notification of 17 July 1989). See also note 9.

[11] In notification received on 10 August 1983, the Government of Austria indicated that, in accordance with article 11 (1) (b), Austria's contribution to the Common Fund for Commodities will be paid in German marks until such time as payment in Austrian shillings becomes possible.

[12] On 8 June 1989, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its notification under article 11 (1).

[13] As converted into the Euro on 1 January 2002.

22. INTERNATIONAL COCOA AGREEMENT, 1980*

Geneva, 19 November 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 August 1981 , in accordance with the decision taken on 30 June 1981 by the meeting of Governments convened by the Secretary-General under article 66 (3). The Agreement was extended until 30 September 1985 and 30 September 1986, respectively, and expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1986.

REGISTRATION: 1 August 1981, No. 20313.

TEXT : United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1245, p. 221; vol. 1276, p. 520 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English, French and Russian texts); and United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1288, p. 437 (rectification of the authentic Russian text).

---

23. SIXTH INTERNATIONAL TIN AGREEMENT*

Geneva, 26 June 1981

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 July 1982, in accordance with article 55 , in whole, in accordance with a decision taken on 23 June 1982 by a meeting of Governments convened by the Secretary-General under article 55 (3) of the Agreement. The Agreement was extended until 31 June 1989 by resolution adopted by the International Tin Council on 27 April 1987, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 31 June 1989.

REGISTRATION: 1 July 1982, No. 21139.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1282, p. 205; vol. 1287, p. 360 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Spanish authentic text); vol. 1294, p. 412 (procès-verbal of rectification of original Arabic, French and Spanish texts) and vol. 1300, p. 413 (procès-verbal of rectification of the French authentic text).

---

24. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON JUTE AND JUTE PRODUCTS, 1982*

Geneva, 1 October 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 9 January 1984, in accordance with article 40 (3) and definitively on 26 August 1986, in accordance with article 40 (1) . The Agreement was extended until 8 January 1991, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 8 January 1991.

REGISTRATION: 9 January 1984, No. 22672.

TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1346, p. 59; depositary notifications C.N.218.1985.TREATIES-4 of 13 Decmeber 1985 (adoption of an authentic Chinese text and C.N.143.1988.TREATIES-2 of 22 August 1988 [Decision 2 (IX) Renegotiation of the Agreement].

---

25. International Coffee Agreement, 1983*

New York, 16 September 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 October 1983, in accordance with article 61 (2) and definitively on 11 September 1985, in accordance with article 61 (1) . The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1989 by Resolution No. 347 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 3 July 1989 [see chapter XIX.25 a)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1983, No. 22376.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1333, p. 119.

---

25. a) Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983*

London, 3 July 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1989 , in accordance with paragraph 5 and 6 of Resolution No. 347 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 3 July 1989. The Agreement was superseded on 1 October 1991 by the International Coffee Agreement, 1983 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 16 September 1982, as modified and extended by Resolution No. 352 of 28 September 1990 [see chapter XIX.25 c)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1991, No. 22376.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1546, p. 389.

---

25. b) International Coffee Agreement, 1983*

London, 16 September 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1989 , in accordance with paragraphs 5 and 6 of Resolution No. 347. The Agreement was supposed to expire on 30 September 1991. The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1991 by Resolution No. 352 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 28 September 1990 [see chapter XIX.25 c)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1989, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 347 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

25. c) Second Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as modified*

London, 28 September 1990

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1991 , in accordance with paragraphs 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 352 adopted by the International Coffe Council on 28 September 1990. The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1992 by Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 27 September 1991 [see chapter XIX.25 e)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1991, No. 22376.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1651, p. 572.

---

25. d) International Coffee Agreement, 1983*

London, 16 September 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1991 , in accordance with paragraphs 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 352. The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1992 by Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 27 September 1991 [see chapter XIX.25 e)].
TEXT: Resolution No. 352 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

25. e) Third Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as modified*

London, 27 September 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1992 , in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 27 September 1991. The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1993 by Resolution No. 363 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1993 [see chapter XIX.25 g)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1992, No. 22376.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1691, p. 449.

---

25. f) International Coffee Agreement, 1983*

London, 1 October 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1992 , in accordance with paragraphs 3, 4 and 5 of Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 27 September 1991. The Agreement was extended on 1 October 1993 by Resolution No. 363 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1993 [see chapter XIX.25 g)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1992, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 355 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

25. g) Fourth Extension of the International Coffee Agreement, 1983, as modified*

London, 1 October 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1993 , in accordance with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Resolution No. 363 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1993. The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1994.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1993, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 363 adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

25. h) International Coffee Agreement, 1983*

London, 1 October 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1993 , in accordance with paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of Resolution No. 363 adopted by the International Coffee Council on 4 June 1993. The Agreement expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1994.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1993, No. 22376.
TEXT: Resolution No. 363, adopted by the International Coffee Council.

---

26. International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983*

Geneva, 18 November 1983

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 April 1985, in accordance with article 37 (2) . The Agreement was extended until 31 March 1992 [by Decsion 3 (VI) confirmed by the International Tropical Timber Council at its session held in Abidjan, Côte d'Ivoire on 24 May 1989] , and further until 31 March 1994 [by Decision 4 (X) taken at its session held in Quito, Ecuador from 29 May to 6 June 1991], respectively, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 31 March 1994.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 1985, No. 23317.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1393, p. 671 and depositary notification C.N.204.1984.TREATIES-10 of 19 September 1984 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Russian and Spanish texts); and vol. 1457, p. 389 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Chinese authentic text).

27. International Sugar Agreement, 1984*

Geneva, 5 July 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 January 1985, in accordance with article 38 (2) and definitively on 4 April 1985, in accordance with article 38 (1) . The Agreement was extended until 31 December 1987, 1 March 1988 and 23 March 1988, respectively, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 23 March 1988, upon the entry into force of the International Sugar Agreement, 1987 (see chapter XIX.33).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1985, No. 23225.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1388, p. 3.

---

28. a) International Wheat Agreement, 1986: (a) Wheat Trade Convention, 1986*

London, 14 March 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1986, in accordance with article 28 (1) . The Agreement was extended until 30 June 1993 and 30 June 1995, respectively, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 30 June 1995.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1986, No. 24237.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1429, p. 71 and depositary notification C.N.139.1986.TREATIES-4/4 of 18 September 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original).

---

28. b) International Wheat Agreement, 1986: (b) Food Aid Convention, 1986*

London, 13 March 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1986, in accordance with article XXI (2) . The Agreement was extended until 30 June 1991, 30 June 1993 and 30 June 1995, respectively, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 30 June 1995.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1986, No. 24237.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 23.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1429, p. 71 and depositary notification C.N.139.1986. TREATIES-4/4 of 18 September 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original).

---

29. Terms of Reference of the International Nickel Study Group*

Geneva, 2 May 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 May 1990, in accordance with paragraph 19 (b).

REGISTRATION: 23 May 1990, No. 27296.

TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1566, p. 29 and depositary notification C.N.145.1986.TREATIES-1 of 28 August 1986.

Note: The depositary functions of the Terms of Reference of the International Nickel Study Group, which had been discharged by the Secretary-General of the United Nations, were transferred to the Secretary-General of the International Nickel Study Group as from 22 October 1990, in accordance with paragraph 19 (c) of the Terms of Reference.

It will be recalled, that under paragraph 19 (c) of the Terms of Reference "[a]ny State referred to in paragraph 5 which desires to become a Member of the Group shall give written notice that it intends to apply these Terms of Reference either provisionally, pending the conclusion of its internal procedures, or definitively. Pending the coming into effect of these Terms of Reference and the assumption of office by the Secretary-General of the Group, such notice shall be given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations; thereafter it shall be given to the Secretary-General of the Group...".

On 28 May 1991, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was informed by the Secretary-General of the International Study Group of the latter's appointment to that office effective of 22 October 1990.

Consequently, notifications of provisional application or definitive application are henceforth to be submitted to the Secretary-General of the International Nickel Study Group, in accordance with paragraph 19 (c) of the Terms of Reference, at the following address: The Secretary-General, International Nickel Study Group, Scheveningseweg 62, 2517 KX The Hague, The Netherlands.

For a status of the Terms of Reference, the website of the International Nickel Study Group can be accessed at http://www.insg.org.

---

30. International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986*

Geneva, 1 July 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 January 1987, in accordance with article 55 (2) and definitively on 1 December 1988, in accordance with article 55 (1) . The Agreement superseded the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1956, as amended by the Protocol of 3 April 1958 (see chapter XIX.3), the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1963 and the International Agreement on Olive Oil, 1979 (both deposited with the Government of Spain). The Agreement was extended until 31 December 1992 (by Resolution 1/63-IV90 adopted by the International Olive Oil Council on 13 December 1990), and until 13 December 1993 (by decision taken in Resolution 1/63-IV90 of 13 December 1990), respectively. The Agreement was further extended and amended by the Protocol of 1993 extending the International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, with amendments [see chapter XIX.30 (a) and (b).].

REGISTRATION: 1 January 1987, No. 24591.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1445, p. 13; and depositary notifications C.N.33.1987.TREATIES.-1 of 12 August 1987 [proposed correction to the original of the Agreement (Arabic, English, French, Italian and Spanish texts)]; C.N.262.1990.TREATIES-2 of 14 November 1990 (amendment to article 26 (1) (C)); C.N.169.1991.TREATIES-4 of 14 October 1991 [(amendment to article 26, section 1-A, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b)]; C.N.177.1992.TREATIES-1 of 13 August 1992 [modification to article 17 (1)]; and C.N.143.1994.TREATIES-1/2/3 of 20 June 1994 (modification of annexes A and B)

---

30. a) Protocol of 1993 extending the International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986

Geneva, 10 March 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 26 January 1994 and definitively on 25 March 1994, in accordance with article 8 (1). The International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986 and the Protocol of 1993 extending that Agreement, were consolidated into one single instrument in accordance with the provisions of the Protocol [see chapter XIX.30(b)].

REGISTRATION: 26 January 1994, No. 24591.

STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 11.[1]

TEXT: Doc. TD/OLIVE OIL.9/6; and depositary notification C.N.343.1995.TREATIES-4 of 10 November 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic italian text).

Note: The Protocol, of which the Arabic, English, French, Italian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted at the United Nations Conference on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1993, held in Geneva on 8, 9 and 10 March 1993. The Protocol was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, in New York, from 1 May until 31 December 1993 in accordance with its article 5. In accordance with article 1, paragraph 2, so far as the Parties to the Protocol are concerned, the Agreement and the Protocol shall be read and interpreted as one single instrument and shall be known as the "International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, as amended and extended, 1993". Subsequently, the International Olive Oil Council took the following decisions:

Date of the decision:	*Subject:*
28 January 1994	Extension until 31 March 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval in the case of those Governments which have not made a notification of provisional application of the Agreement as amended and extended.
	Extension until 30 June 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by Governments which have made a notification of provisional application of the Agreement as amended and extended.
11 April 1994	Extension until 30 June 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by signatory Governments.
31 May 1994	Extension until 31 December 1994 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval of the Protocol and accession by Lebanon to the Agreement.
17 November 1994	Extension until 30 June 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval by Algeria, Egypt, Morocco and accession by Lebanon and the Syrian Arab Republic.
1 June 1995	Extension until 31 December 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval by Algeria, Egypt, Morocco and accession by Lebanon, Morocco and the Syrian Arab Republic.
24 November 1995	Extension until 30 June 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval by Morocco and accession by the Syrian Arab Republic.
6 June 1996	Extension until 31 December 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification by Morocco and accession by Croatia and the Syrian Arab Republic.
20 November 1996	Extension until 30 June 1997 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification by Morocco and accession by Croatia and the Syrian Arab Republic.
5 June 1997	Extension until 31 December 1997 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification by Morocco and accession by Croatia and the Syrian Arab Republic.
20 November 1997	Extension until 30 June 1998 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instrument of ratification by Morocco.
4 June 1998	Extension until 30 December 1998 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instrument of ratification by Morocco.
25 November 1998	Extension until 30 June 1999 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification by Morocco and accession by Croatia and Slovenia.
10 June 1999	Extension until 31 December 1999 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification by Morocco and accession by Slovenia.
17 November 1999	Extension until 30 June 2000 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instrument of ratification by Morocco.
8 June 2000	Extension until 31 December 2000 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instrument of ratification by Morocco.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application of the Agreement as amended and extended*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Algeria	29 Dec 1993		8 Feb 1995
Croatia			27 Apr 1999 a
Cyprus	17 Dec 1993		26 Jan 1994
Egypt	30 Dec 1993		18 Jan 1995
European Community	21 Dec 1993		21 Dec 1993 AA
Israel	30 Dec 1993		30 Dec 1993
Lebanon			7 Jul 1995 a
Morocco	23 Jun 1993		2 Oct 2000
Slovenia			30 Jun 1999 a
Syrian Arab Republic			29 Dec 1997 a
Tunisia	23 Aug 1993	30 Dec 1993	30 Jun 1994
Turkey[1]	[21 Dec 1993		25 Mar 1994]

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or notification of provisional application.)

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

"The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the above-mentioned Agreement does not mean recognition of Israel or establishing any kind of relations with it."

TURKEY

Upon signature:

"The signature, acceptance or ratification of this Protocol by the Republic of Turkey shall in no way imply the recognition of the `Republic of Cyprus' by Turkey. Nor should it imply any change in Turkey's well-known position that the Greek Cypriot side does not possess the right or authority to become party to international instruments on behalf of Cyprus as a whole. Turkey's accession to this Protocol, therefore, should not signify any obligation on the part of Turkey to enter into any dealings with `Republic of Cyprus' as are regulated by the Protocol."

Notes:

[1] On 26 August 1998, the Government of Turkey notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw from the International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, as amended and extended, 1993, with effect from 24 November 1998.

30. b) International Agreement on Olive Oil and Table Olives, 1986, as amended and extended, 1993

Geneva, 1 July 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 26 January 1994, in accordance with article 8 (1) of the Protocol and definitively on 25 March 1994, in accordance with article 8 (1) of the Protocol.

REGISTRATION: 25 March 1994, No. 24591.

STATUS: Parties: 15.[1]

TEXT: Doc. TD/OLIVE OIL.9/4 and depositary notifications C.N.284.1994.TREATIES-3 of 11 November 1994; C.N.39.1997.TREATIES-1 of 28 February 1997 [amendment of designations and definitions in article 26, paragraph 1 A, sub-paragraphs (a) and (b)]; C.N.870.1998.TREATIES-6 of 24 May 1999 (revision of annexes A and B); and C.N. 1229.1999.TREATIES-6 of 19 January 2000 (revision of annexes A and B); C.N.1424.2001.TREATIES-4 of 11 December 2001 (revision of annexes A and B); C.N.708.2003.TREATIES-5 of 7 July 2003 (modification of the participation shares); C.N.704. 2003.TREATIES-3 OF 16 July 2003 (modification of designations and definitions of olive oils and olive-pomace oils); C.N.1135.2004.TREATIES-3 of 4 November 2004 (modification of the participation shares).

Note: See *"Note:"* in chapter XIX.30 a).

The International Olive Oil Council took the following decisions:

Date of the decision:	*Subject:*
4 June 1998	Extension of the Agreement until 31 December 2000.
16 November 2000	Extension of the Agreement until 31 December 2002.
11 - 15 June 2001	Establishment of conditions of accession for Monaco.
3 - 7 June 2002	Establishment of conditions of accession for Jordan, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya and Yugoslavia.
19 -20 December 2002	Extension of the Agreement until 30 June 2003;
	Extension of the time-limit until 30 June 2003 for the deposit of the instrument of accession by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya; and
	Establishment of conditions of accession for Iran (Islamic Republic of).
23 - 25 June 2003	Extension of the Agreement for a period of eighteen months, until 31 December 2004, with effect from 1 July 2003; and
	Extension of the time-limit until 31 December 2003 for the deposit of the instrument of accession by Iran (Islamic Republic of).
5 December 2003	Extension of the time-limit until 30 June 2004 for the deposit of the instrument of accession by Iran (Islamic Republic of).
29 November - 2 December 2004	Extension of the Agreement for a period of one year, until 31 December 2005, with effect from 1 January 2005; and
30 June 2005	Extension of the time-limit until 30 June 2005 for the deposit of the instrument of accession by Turkey.

Participant	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Algeria		8 Feb 1995
Croatia		27 Apr 1999 a
Cyprus		26 Jan 1994
Egypt		18 Jan 1995
European Community		21 Dec 1993 AA
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		6 Jan 2004 a
Israel		30 Dec 1993
Jordan		2 Dec 2002 a
Lebanon		7 Jul 1995 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		28 Jan 2003 a
Monaco[1]		[10 Jul 2001 a]
Morocco	31 Mar 1994 n	2 Oct 2000
Serbia		22 Nov 2002 a
Slovenia		30 Jun 1999 a
Syrian Arab Republic		29 Dec 1997 a
Tunisia	30 Dec 1993 n	30 Jun 1994
Turkey[1]		[25 Mar 1994]

Notes:

[1] The follwoing States informed the Secretary-General, that they had decided to withdraw from the International Agreeement on Olive Oil, 1993, as amended and extended, on the dates and with effect:

Participant	*Date of deposit*	*Date of effect*
Turkey	26 Aug 1998	24 Nov 1998
Monaco	16 Mar 2005	15 Jun 2005

31. INTERNATIONAL COCOA AGREEMENT, 1986*

Geneva, 25 July 1986

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 20 January 1987, in accordance with article 70 (3) . The Agreement was extended until 30 September 1992 and 30 September 1993, respectively, and expired in accordance with its provisions on 30 September 1993.

REGISTRATION: 20 January 1987, No. 24604.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1446, p. 103; depositary notifications C.N.189.1986.TREATIES-1 of 29 September 1986; C.N.51.1987.TREATIES-4 of 5 May 1987 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English text); C.N.186.1987.TREATIES-10 of 10 September 1987 (adoption of the authentic Chinese text); C.N.20.1988.TREATIES-1 of 8 April 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Chinese text); C.N.267.1987.TREATIES-13 of 7 December 1987 (communication by the International Cocoa Council concerning the inclusion of Mexico in Annex B); C.N.115.1990.TREATIES-1 of 29 May 1990 (partial extension of the Agreement with list of provisions extended: see "Note" below) and C.N.77.1991.TREATIES-1 of 25 June 1991 [procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic text of Annex E (Russian version)].

---

32. INTERNATIONAL NATURAL RUBBER AGREEMENT, 1987*

Geneva, 20 March 1987

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 29 December 1988, in accordance with article 60 (2) and definitively on 3 April 1989, in accordance with article 61 (1) . The Agreement was extended until 28 December 1994 [by Resolution 152 (XXVIII) adopted by the International Rubber Council at its twenty-eigth session held from 25 to 30 November 1993], and further until 28 December 1995 [by Resolution 164 (XXX) adopted by the International Rubber Council during its thirtieth session held from 1 to 2 December 1994], and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 28 December 1995.

REGISTRATION: 29 December 1988, No. 26364.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1521, p. 3 and doc. TD/RUBBER.2/EX/R.1/Add.7 and depositary notification C.N.82.1988.TREATIES-2 of 26 May 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Russian texts).

---

33. INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1987*

London, 11 September 1987

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 24 March 1988 . The Agreement was extended until 31 December 1991 and 31 December 1992, respectively, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 31 December 1992.

REGISTRATION: 24 March 1988, No. 25811.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol 1499, p. 31

---

34. Terms of Reference of the International Tin Study Group

New York, 7 April 1989

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 21 which reads as follows: "(a) These terms of reference shall enter into force when States together accounting for at least 70 per cent of trade in tin, as set out in the annex to these terms of reference, have notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as "the depositary") pursuant to subparabraph (b) below of their acceptance of these terms of reference. (b) Any State or any intergovernmental organization referred to in paragraph 5 which desires to become a member of the Group shall notify the depositary that it accepts these terms of reference either provisionally, pending the conclusion of its internal procedures, or definitively. Any State or intergovernmental organization which has notified its provisional acceptance of these terms of reference shall endeavour to complete its procedures as quickly as possible and shall notify the depositary of their completion. (c) If the requirements for entry into force of these terms of reference have not been met on 31 December 1989, the depositary shall invite those States and intergovernmental organizations that have notified their acceptance of these terms of reference pursuant to subparagraph (b) above to decide whether or not to put these terms of reference into force among themselves. (d) When these terms of reference enter into force, the depositary shall convene an inaugural meeting of the Group as soon as possible thereafter. Members shall be notified at least one month, where possible, prior to that meeting.".

STATUS: Parties: 12.

TEXT: Doc.TD/TIN.7/13.

Note: The Terms of Reference, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were adopted on 7 April 1989 by the United Nations Tin Conference, 1988 which met in Geneva from 21 November to 2 December 1988 and from 29 March to 7 April 1989. The terms of reference are open to acceptance at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Participant	*Provisional acceptance/ accession*	*Definitive acceptance*	*Participant*	*Provisional acceptance/ accession*	*Definitive acceptance*
Belgium	6 Nov 1991		Malaysia		18 Oct 1989
European Community		6 Nov 1991	Netherlands[1]		6 Nov 1991
France	26 Nov 1991	7 Aug 1992	Nigeria		19 Dec 1989
Greece	29 Jun 1990	11 May 1993	Portugal		6 Nov 1991
Indonesia		9 Mar 1990	Thailand		16 Apr 1990
Italy		15 May 1992			
Luxembourg	6 Nov 1991				

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

35. TERMS OF REFERENCE OF THE INTERNATIONAL COPPER STUDY GROUP

Geneva, 24 February 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 January 1992, in accordance with article 22 (d).
REGISTRATION: 23 January 1992, No. 28603.
STATUS: Parties: 23.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1662, p. 229 and depositary notification C.N.314.1992.TREATIES-7 of 16 November 1992 (amendments to paragraphs 13 and 14); C.N.505.2005.TREATIES- of 29 June 2005 [Entry into force of the amendment to paragraph 15 (A) of the Terms of reference][2].

Note: The Terms of Reference, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were adopted on 24 February 1989 by the United Nations Conference on Copper, 1988 which met in Geneva from 13 to 24 June 1988 and from 20 to 24 February 1989. The terms of reference are open to acceptance at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York.

Subsequently, the International Copper Study Group took the following decision:

Date of decision:	*Subject:*
7-9 June 1999	Extension until 30 June 2000 of the time-limit for the deposit of notifications of definitive acceptance by Belgium and Luxembourg .

Participant	*Provisional acceptance*	*Definitive acceptance*
Argentina	18 Apr 2001	
Belgium	6 Nov 1991	14 Oct 1999
Canada[1]		[19 Jun 1992]
Chile	29 Jun 1990	25 Oct 1994
China		12 Jul 1990
European Community		6 Nov 1991
Finland		19 Jun 1990
France	26 Nov 1991	7 Aug 1992
Germany	22 Jan 1992	16 Dec 1992
Greece	29 Jun 1990	11 May 1993
India		30 Jul 1997
Indonesia[1]		[30 Jul 1992]
Italy	22 Jan 1992	
Japan[1]		12 Nov 2004
Luxembourg		14 Oct 1999
Mexico		3 Apr 1995
Netherlands[3]		6 Nov 1991
Norway[1]		[27 Feb 1991]
Peru	28 Jun 1990	16 May 1995
Philippines[1]	[13 Jan 1992	10 Sep 1993]
Poland	29 Jun 1990	6 Feb 1991
Portugal		6 Nov 1991
Russian Federation		21 Jan 1997
Serbia[4]		23 May 2000
Spain	6 Nov 1991	1 Feb 1994
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[1]		[17 Mar 2000]
United States of America	15 Mar 1990	11 Nov 1994
Zambia		18 Nov 1992

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 23 (3) of the Terms of Reference, the following Governments notified the Secretary-General that they had decided to withdraw from the International Copper Study Group as from the dates indicated hereinafter:

Participant:	*Date of notification:*	*Date of effect:*
Philippines	4 Dec 1995	2 Feb 1996
Norway	14 July 2000	12 Sep 2000
Japan	31 Oct 2002	30 Dec 2002
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	22 July 2003	20 Sep 2003
Indonesia	31 July 2003	29 Sep 2003
Canada	29 Sep 2003	28 Nov 2003

[2] At the Group's 3rd Special session held from 16-17 March 2005 in Lisbon, the members of the International Copper Study Group decided by consensus (See Annex B - Decision) to amend paragraph 15 (a) of the above-mentioned Terms of Reference pursuant to article 21 thereof. In accordance with paragraph 2 of the above Decision, the amendment to paragraph 15 (a) entered into force for all parties immediately and apply to member assessments for 2006 and future years.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia", and note 1 under "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

36. INTERNATIONAL AGREEMENT ON JUTE AND JUTE PRODUCTS, 1989*

Geneva, 3 November 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 12 April 1991, in accordance with article 40 (3) . The Agreement was extended until 11 April 1998 and 11 April 2000, respectively, by International Jute Council Decisions I (XXIII) and I (XXIV) adopted at its twenty-third and twenty-fourth sessions held in Dhaka from 22 to 25 April 1995, and from 20 to 22 April 1996. The Agreement was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 11 April 2000.

REGISTRATION: 12 April 1991, No. 28026.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1605, p. 211.

37. INTERNATIONAL SUGAR AGREEMENT, 1992

Geneva, 20 March 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 20 January 1993, in accordance with article 40 (3) and definitively on 10 December 1996, in accordance with article 40 (1).
REGISTRATION: 20 January 1993, No. 29467.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 52.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1703, p. 203.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 20 March 1992 by the United Nations Sugar Conference, 1992, and is the successor Agreement to the International Sugar Agreement, 1987 (see chapter XIX.27), which expires on 31 December 1992. The International Sugar Agreement, 1992, was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters from 1 May 1992 until 31 December 1992, in accordance with its article 36. Subsequently, the International Sugar Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision:		*Subject:*
20 January	1993	Establishment of conditions for accession to the Agreement for the States listed in Annex A of the Agreement and extension until 31 December 1993 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of the 1992 International Sugar Agreement of their instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval.
2 December	1993	Extension until 31 December 1994 the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of the Agreement of their instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval.
24 November	1994	Extension until 31 December 1995 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
1 December	1995	Extension until 31 December 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval and extension of the Agreement for a period of two years, i.e., until 31 December 1997.
29 May	1997	Extension of the Agreement for a period of two years, i.e., until 31 December 1999.
28 November	1997	Extension until 31 December 1998 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
27 November	1998	Extension until 31 December 1999 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
27 May	1999	Extension of the Agreement for a period of two years, i.e., until 31 December 2001.
20 October	1999	Establishment of condition of accession by Nigeria.
26 November	1999	Extension until 31 December 2000 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
6 December	1999	Establishment of conditions of accession for Romania.
28 June	2000	Establishment of conditions of ratification for Zambia.
20 July	2000	Establishment of conditions of accession for Pakistan.
24 August	2000	Establishment of conditions of accession for Viet Nam.
24 November	2000	Extension until 31 December 2001 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
30 May	2001	Extension of the Agreement until 31 December 2003.
30 November	2001	Extension until 31 December 2002 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
1 April	2002	Establishment of conditions of accession for Iran (Islamic Republic of).
15 May	2002	Establishment of conditions of accession for Yugoslavia.
24 July	2002	Establishment of conditions of accession for Ethiopia.
11 Sep	2002	Establishment of conditions of accession for the United Republic of Tanzania.
29 November	2002	Extension until 31 December 2003 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
19 May	2003	Establishment of conditions of accession for Mozambique.
29 May	2003	Extension of the Agreement until 31 December 2005.
3 July	2003	Establishment of conditions of accession for Tunisia.

Date of decision:		*Subject:*
8 July	2003	Establishment of conditions of accession for Venezuela.
28 November	2003	Extension until 31 December 2004 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
29 November	2004	Extension until 31 December 2005 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
26 May	2005	Extension of the International Sugar Agreement, 1992, until 31 December 2007.
14 July	2005	Establishment of conditions of accession for Paraguay and Uganda (both Paraguay and Uganda will have 6 votes as a Member of the 1992 International Sugar Agreement).
25 July	2005	Establishment of conditions of accession for Mongolia.
25 November	2005	Extension until 31 December 2006 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.
20 February	2006	Establishment of conditions of accession for Cameroon.
15 March	2006	Establishment of conditions of accession for Angola and Bangladesh.
4 May	2006	Establishment of conditions of accession for Indonesia, Morocco, Saudi Arabia and the United Arab Emirates.
24 November	2006	Extension until 31 December 2007 of the time-limit for the deposit by signatories of their instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Argentina	29 Dec 1992	29 Dec 1992 n	
Australia	24 Dec 1992		24 Dec 1992
Austria[1]	[29 Dec 1992		19 Jul 1993]
Barbados[1]	[31 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993 n	20 Jan 1993]
Belarus			27 Sep 1993 a
Belize			24 Jan 1994 a
Brazil	30 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993 n	10 Dec 1996
Cameroon			20 Feb 2006 a
Colombia	31 Dec 1992	31 Dec 1992 n	13 Dec 1996
Costa Rica			11 Oct 1996 a
Côte d'Ivoire			23 Mar 1993 a
Cuba	3 Nov 1992	3 Nov 1992 n	14 Oct 1994
Dominican Republic	25 Nov 1992	19 Jan 1993 n	19 Mar 1998
Ecuador			29 Dec 1993 a
Egypt			20 Oct 1998 a
El Salvador		1 Dec 1995 n	
Ethiopia			8 Aug 2002 a
European Community	20 Nov 1992		20 Nov 1992 AA
Fiji	4 Dec 1992		21 Dec 1992
Finland[1]	[22 Dec 1992	22 Dec 1992 n	21 Sep 1993]
Guatemala	31 Dec 1992	18 Mar 1993 n	31 May 2006
Guyana	24 Dec 1992		24 Dec 1992
Honduras			27 Oct 1998 a
Hungary	31 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993 n	19 Mar 1993 AA
India	31 Dec 1992	19 Jan 1993 n	20 Jan 1993
Iran (Islamic Republic of)			29 Apr 2002 a
Jamaica	23 Dec 1992	18 Jan 1993 n	23 Mar 1993
Japan[1]	[29 Dec 1992		29 Dec 1992 A]
Kenya			6 Nov 1995 a
Latvia			7 Jul 1994 a
Malawi			13 Sep 1993 a
Mauritius	18 Dec 1992		18 Dec 1992
Mexico			16 Jun 1997 a
Moldova			9 Jun 1998 a
Mozambique			18 Jan 2005 a
Nigeria			19 Oct 1999 a
Pakistan			22 Jan 2002 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Panama	23 Dec 1992	23 Dec 1992 n	
Paraguay			19 Sep 2005 a
Philippines		23 Oct 1996 n	14 Nov 1996 a
Republic of Korea	23 Dec 1992		15 Apr 1993
Romania			10 Dec 1999 a
Russian Federation			7 Jan 2003 a
Serbia			14 May 2002 a
South Africa	22 Dec 1992		22 Dec 1992
Sudan		9 May 1997 n	
Swaziland	23 Dec 1992		23 Dec 1992
Sweden[1]	[18Dec 1992		21 Jan 1993]
Switzerland	30 Dec 1992	30 Dec 1992 n	27 Jan 1994
Thailand	30 Dec 1992	30 Dec 1992 n	8 Apr 1993
Trinidad and Tobago	31 Dec 1992		9 Sep 1993
Turkey			21 Jan 1998 a
Ukraine			28 Oct 1994 a
United Republic of Tanzania			31 Oct 2002 a
Viet Nam			16 Nov 2000 a
Zambia	31 Dec 1992		21 Jun 2000
Zimbabwe			14 Dec 1994 a

Notes:

[1] Notifications of withdrawal received by the following States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

States:	*Notification received on :*		*Date of effect :*	
Barbados	1 Sep	1994	1 Oct	1994
Finland	27 Jun	1995	27 Jul	1995
Sweden	23 Jun	1995	23 Jul	1995
Austria	25 Jul	1996	24 Aug	1996
Japan	25 Nov	2002	25 Dec	2002

38. INTERNATIONAL COCOA AGREEMENT, 1993*

Geneva, 16 July 1993

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 22 February 1994, in accordance with article 56 . This Agreement was extended, in whole, until 30 September 2001 and 30 September 2003, respectively, by International Cocoa Council decisions taken at its fifty-eighth regular, and twenty-third special sessions held in London from 3 to 9 September 1998, and 9 to 10 July 2001. The Agreement was terminated and replaced on 1 October 2003 in accordance its provisions.

REGISTRATION: 22 February 1994, No. 30692.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1766, p. 3.

Note: The Agreement was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Cocoa on 16 July 1993, and is the successor Agreement to the International Cocoa Agreement, 1986. The International Cocoa Agreement, 1993, was open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters from 16 August 1993 until 30 September 1993, by Parties to the International Cocoa Agreement, 1986, and Governments invited to the United Nations Cocoa Conference, 1992, in accordance with its article 52.

39. International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994

Geneva, 26 January 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 January 1997, in accordance with article 41 (3)[1].
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1997, No. 33484.
STATUS: Signatories: 49. Parties: 60.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series,* vol. 1955, p. 81 and depositary notification C.N.89.1995.TREATIES-2 of 22 May 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts).

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 26 January 1994 at Geneva by the United Nations Conference on Tropical Timber, 1993. It is the successor agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983, which expired on 31 March 1994. It was opened for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 1 April 1994 until one month after the date of its entry into force, by Governments invited to the United Nations Conference for the Negotiation of a Successor Agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1983, in accordance with article 38 (1).

Subsequently, the International Tropical Timber Council, at its twenty-second session, held in Bolivia, from 21 to 29 May 1997, by Decision 2 (XXII) dated 23 May 1997, established the conditions for accession to the Agreement and decided that the time limit for the deposit of instruments of accession shall be the duration of the Agreement.

Further, the International Tropical Timber Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision:	*Subject:*
30 May 2000	Extension of the Agreement for a period of three years with effect from 1 January 2001 i.e, until 31 December 2003.
4 Nov 2002	Extension of the Agreement for a period of three years with effect from 1 January 2004 i.e, until 31 December 2006.
6-11 Nov 2006	Extension of the Agreement until the provisional or definitive entry into force of the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 2006.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Definitive signature (s)*
Australia			2 Feb 1996 s
Austria	13 May 1996		16 May 1997
Belgium	13 May 1996	13 May 1996 n	
Bolivia	17 Aug 1995		17 Aug 1995
Brazil	13 Dec 1996		28 Nov 1997
Cambodia	3 Feb 1995		3 Feb 1995 A
Cameroon	22 Dec 1994	31 Aug 1995 n	
Canada	3 May 1995		23 May 1996
Central African Republic		23 May 1997 n	
China	22 Feb 1996		31 Jul 1996 AA
Colombia	8 Nov 1995	9 Oct 1996 n	16 Aug 1999
Congo	22 Jun 1994	25 Oct 1995 n	
Côte d'Ivoire	9 Sep 1996	9 Sep 1996 n	31 Jan 1997
Democratic Republic of the Congo	17 Dec 1996	27 Mar 1997 n	
Denmark	13 May 1996		13 May 1996
Ecuador	1 Jun 1994		6 Sep 1995
Egypt	8 Nov 1994	15 May 1996 n	13 Apr 2000
European Community	13 May 1996	13 May 1996 n	
Fiji	27 Jan 1995	27 Jan 1995 n	
Finland	13 May 1996	13 May 1996 n	
France	13 May 1996	28 Oct 1996 n	17 Aug 2006 AA
Gabon	27 May 1994	2 Aug 1995 n	
Germany	30 Aug 1995	30 Aug 1995 n	
Ghana	12 Jul 1995		28 Aug 1995
Greece	13 May 1996		13 Oct 1997
Guatemala			3 May 2001 a
Guyana	13 Sep 1996		27 Aug 1997
Honduras	9 May 1995	2 Nov 1995 n	
India	17 Sep 1996		17 Oct 1996
Indonesia	21 Apr 1994		17 Feb 1995

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Definitive signature (s)*
Ireland	14 May 1996		18 Aug 2000
Italy	7 May 1996		25 Jun 1998
Japan	13 Dec 1994	13 Dec 1994 n	9 May 1995 A
Liberia			9 Dec 1994 s
Luxembourg	13 May 1996	13 May 1996 n	
Malaysia	14 Feb 1995		1 Mar 1995
Mexico			11 Mar 2004 a
Myanmar	6 Jul 1995		31 Jan 1996
Nepal		23 May 1997 n	
Netherlands[2]	6 Jul 1995	6 Jul 1995 n	
New Zealand			6 Jun 1995 s
Nigeria			28 Feb 2002 a
Norway	25 Jan 1995		1 Feb 1995
Panama	22 Jun 1994	4 May 1995 n	4 Apr 1996
Papua New Guinea	28 Aug 1995	28 Aug 1995 n	13 May 1996
Peru	29 Aug 1994	1 Jan 1997 n	21 Sep 1995
Philippines	29 Sep 1995	26 Feb 1996 n	
Portugal	13 May 1996		4 Nov 1999
Republic of Korea	12 Sep 1995		12 Sep 1995
Spain	12 Jan 1996	12 Jan 1996 n	15 Jan 1997
Suriname			24 Aug 1998 a
Sweden	13 May 1996		13 May 1996
Switzerland	29 Aug 1995		10 Jun 1996
Thailand	10 Apr 1996		25 Jul 1996
Togo	12 Jul 1994		4 Oct 1995 A
Trinidad and Tobago			29 Dec 1998 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	13 May 1996	13 May 1996 n	
United States of America	1 Jul 1994		14 Nov 1996 A
Vanuatu			19 May 2000 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	4 Oct 1995		2 Mar 1998

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval or definitive signature.)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Italy.]

ITALY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Italy interprets the terms of ITTA 1994 as follows:

a) unless the scope of the agreement is changed pursuant to article 35, the agreement shall refer solely to tropical timber and tropical forests;

b) any financial contribution other than the contribution to the administrative budget provided for in article 19 shall be entirely voluntary."

Notes:

[1] The conditions required under paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 56 of the Agreement not having been fulfilled, the Secretary-General convened on 13 September 1996 a meeting of the Governments and intergovernmental organization which had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval, or signed the Agreement definitively or had notified the provisional application of the Agreement, in accordance with its article 41 (3). At this meeting it was decided to put the Agreement into force provisionally and in whole among them as of 1 January 1997. It was also decided that the Governments of Bolivia, Liberia, Norway, Peru and Togo (which did not participate in the meeting) could notify to the Secretary-General their acceptance of the above decision and in the event of such notification, they would be deemed to apply the Agreement provisionally as of 1 January 1997. Subsequently, Peru and Norway notified the Secretary-General of their acceptance.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

40. International Coffee Agreement, 1994*

London,

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 October 1994 and definitively on 19 May 1995, in accordance with article 40 (3) . The Agreement was extended with modification until 30 September 2001 [see chapter XIX.40 a)].
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1994, No. 31252.
STATUS: Signatories: 49. Parties: 65.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1827, p. 3.

---

40. a) International Coffee Agreement, 1994, as extended until 30 September 2001, with modifications, by Resolution No. 384 adopted by the International Coffee Council in London on 21 July 1999*

London, 30 March 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1999 (see article 47). The Agreement expired on 30 September 2001 in accordance with its provisions.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1999, No. 31252.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2086, p. 147.

---

41. a) Grains Trade Convention, 1995

London, 7 December 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1995, in accordance with article 28 (2)[1].
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1995, No. 32022.
STATUS: Signatories: 15. Parties: 27.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1882, p. 195.

Note: The International Grains Agreement, 1995, consists of the Grains Trade Convention, 1995, concluded at London on 7 December 1994, and the Food Aid Convention, concluded at London on 5 December 1994 (see hereinafter under chapter IX.41 b). The Grains Trade Convention, was established at a Conference of governments organized by the International Wheat Council on 7 December 1994, while the Food Aid Convention, 1995, was established by the Food Aid Committee at its 69th session on 5 December 1994. Both Conventions, of which the English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, were open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 1 May 1995 until and including 30 June 1995, in accordance with their respective articles 24 and XVII.

At its first session, held in London on 6 July 1995, the International Grains Council took the following decision:

Date of decision:		*Subject:*
6 July	1995	Extension until 30 June 1996 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States/Organization: Algeria, Argentina, Barbados, Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Ecuador, Egypt, European Community, Iraq, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Japan, Jordan, Korea (Republic of), Malta, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Switzerland, Tunisia, Turkey, United States of America and Yemen.
17 June	1996	Extension until 30 June 1997 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Algeria, Argentina, Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Norway, Pakistan, Panama, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, South Africa, Tunisia, Turkey and United States of America. (Subsequently, the International Grains Council agreed to grant Malta an extension to 30 June 1997 of the time-limit for the deposit of its instrument of accession.)
3 December	1996	Extension until 30 June 1997 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instrument of accession by Yemen.
18 June	1997	Extension until 30 June 1998 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instruments of ratification or accession for Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, Ecuador, Egypt, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Morocco, Norway, Panama, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, United States of America.
15 to 16 June	1998	Extension until 30 June 1999 of the Convention and of the time-limit for the deposit of the instruments of ratification or accession for Bolivia, Côte d'Ivoire, Iraq, Jordan, Kazakhstan, Kenya, Panama, Russian Federation, Saudi Arabia, Ukraine, United States of America and Yemen.
8 June	1999	Extension of the Convention until 30 June 2001
8 December	1999	Extension until 30 June 2000 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instrument of accession for the Islamic Republic of Iran.
13 to 14 June	2000	Extension until 30 June 2001 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession for Côte d'Ivoire, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Panama, Russian Federation and Ukraine.
12 to 13 June	2001	Extension until 30 June 2002 of the time-limit for the deposit of the instruments of ratification or accession for Côte d'Ivoire, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Kazakhstan, Panama, Russian Federation and Ukraine; and extension of the Convention until 30 June 2003.
18 to 19 June	2002	Extension until 30 June 2003 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Côte d'Ivoire, Kazakhstan, Panama, Russian Federation and Ukraine.
23 - 24 June	2003	Extension of the Convention until 30 June 2005, with effect from 1 July 2003; and Extension until 30 June 2004 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Kazakhstan, Panama, Russian Federation and Ukraine.
14 June	2005	Extension of the Convention until 30 June 2007, with effect from 1 July 2005; and Extension until 30 June 2006 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Panama, Russian Federation and Ukraine.

Date of decision:		*Subject:*
13 June	2006	Extension until 30 June 2007 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Panama, Russian Federation and Ukraine.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Algeria		20 Jun 1995 n	23 Apr 1997 a
Argentina		30 Jun 1995 n	6 Jan 1997 a
Australia			28 Jun 1995 a
Canada	26 Jun 1995		26 Jun 1995
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Jun 1995		14 Nov 2002
Cuba	22 Jun 1995	22 Jun 1995 n	16 Oct 1995
Ecuador			4 Nov 1997 a
Egypt	30 Jun 1995		27 May 1998
European Community	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995 n	1 Feb 1996 AA
Holy See	20 Jun 1995		28 Jun 1995
Hungary	29 Jun 1995		29 Jun 1995 AA
India	22 Jun 1995		27 Jun 1995
Iran (Islamic Republic of)			29 Apr 2002 a
Japan	21 Jun 1995	21 Jun 1995 n	1 Dec 1995 A
Kazakhstan			9 Jul 2003 a
Kenya			15 Jun 1998 a
Malta			31 Oct 1996 a
Mauritius			29 Jun 1995 a
Morocco	26 Jun 1995	26 Jun 1995 n	10 Jul 1997
Norway	21 Jun 1995	21 Jun 1995 n	6 Oct 1997
Pakistan		7 Aug 1996 n	3 Apr 1997 a
Panama	30 Jun 1995		
Republic of Korea		23 Jun 1995 n	4 Mar 1996 a
South Africa		16 Aug 1995 n	14 Nov 1996 a
Switzerland	16 Jun 1995	16 Jun 1995 n	16 Apr 1996
Tunisia	30 Jun 1995	30 Jun 1995 n	31 Jul 1996
Turkey		30 Jun 1995 n	10 Jul 1996 a
United States of America	26 Jun 1995		21 May 1999

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession .)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

The Argentine Republic declares that the inclusion of the "Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands" under the incorrect designation of "of Falkland Islands and dependencies" does not in any way affect its rights over those islands and the surrounding waters, which form an integral part of its national territory.

The Argentine Republic likewise rejects the inclusion of the so-called "British Antarctic Territory", while reaffirming its rights to the Argentine Antarctic sector, including sovereignty and the corresponding maritime jurisdiction. It also recalls the safeguards against claims of territorial sovereignty in Antarctica est.

ablished by article IV of the Antarctic Treaty of 1 December 1959, to which the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are parties.

The Argentine Republic does not accept that the provisions of article XV of the Food Aid Convention, 1995, and article 8 of the International Wheat Agreement, 1995, apply to disputes relating to territories under foreign occupation or colonial domination in respect of which there is a sovereignty dispute to resolve for which the United Nations has recommended specific action.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria, the Republic of Finland and the Kingdom of Sweden, having become Member States of the European Community on 1 January 1995, will no longer be individual members of this Convention but will be covered by Community membership thereof. The European Community accordingly also undertakes to exercise the rights and perform the undertakings laid down in this Convention for those three States."

Notes:

[1] A Conference of Governments held in London on 6 July 1995 decided to bring the Grains Trade Convention, 1995 into force as of 1 July 1995, among the Governments and International Organisation which had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or notifications of provisional application, pursuant to the provisions of article 28 (2) of the Convention.

41. b) Food Aid Convention, 1995*

London, 5 December 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1995, in accordance with article XXI (2) . The Agreement was extended until 30 June 1999, and was terminated in accordance with its provisions on 30 June 1999.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1995, No. 32022.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1882, p. 195.

---

41. c) Food Aid Convention, 1999

London, 13 April 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1999, in accordance with article XXIV (b)[1].
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1999, No. 32022.
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 22.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2073, p. 135; et C.N.954.1999.TREATIES-22 of 22 October 1999 (procès-verbal of correction to the original English, French, Russian and Spanish texts of the Convention).

Note: The Convention was adopted on 13 April 1999 at London. In accordance with its article XXII (a), the Convention will be open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York by the Governments and organization referred to in paragraph (e) of article III, from 1 May 1999 until and including 30 June 1999.

In accordance with articles XXII (b) and XXIII (a) of the Convention the Conference of Governments held initially in London on 2 July 1999, and on the following dates thereafter, took the following decisions:

Date of decision		*Subject*
2 July	1999	Extension until 30 June 2000 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession by the following States/Organisation : Argentina, Australia, the European Community and the following member States: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Japan, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America .
12 to 13 June	2000	Extension until 30 June 2001 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession by the following States/Organisation : Argentina, the European Community and the following member States: Austria, Belgium, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland; Norway and the United States of America.
11 to 12 June	2001	Extension until 30 June 2002 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Argentina, Austria, Belgium, France, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg and Portugal.
17 to 18 June	2002	Extension of the Convention until 30 June 2003; and Extension until 30 June 2003 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Argentina, Austria, France, Luxembourg and Portugal.
23 - 24 June	2003	Extension of the Convention until 30 June 2005, with effect from 1 July 2003; and Extension until 30 June 2004 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Argentina, France, Luxembourg and Portugal.
14 June	2004	Extension until 30 June 2005 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Argentina, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia.
13 June	2005	Extension of the Convention until 30 June 2007 with effect from 1 July 2005; and Extension until 30 June 2006 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Argentina, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia.
15 June	2006	Extension until 30 June 2007 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification or accession by the following States: Argentina, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia and Slovenia.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Australia			7 Dec 1999 a
Austria			7 Aug 2002 a
Belgium	30 Jun 1999	30 Jun 1999 n	14 Dec 2001
Canada	21 Jun 1999		21 Jun 1999
Denmark	29 Jun 1999		2 Jul 1999
European Community	29 Jun 1999	29 Jun 1999 n	19 Jul 2000 AA
Finland	30 Jun 1999		19 Jul 1999 A
France	29 Jun 1999	30 Jun 1999 n	17 Oct 2002
Germany	29 Jun 1999	29 Jun 1999 n	24 Jul 2000
Greece			23 Apr 2002 a
Ireland	29 Jun 1999		29 Jun 1999
Italy			21 Mar 2001 a
Japan	25 Jun 1999	25 Jun 1999 n	20 Dec 1999 A
Luxembourg	29 Jun 1999		27 Jul 2004
Netherlands[2]			23 Jun 2000 a
Norway	30 Jun 1999	30 Jun 1999 n	20 Jun 2000
Poland			15 Sep 2006 a
Spain	29 Jun 1999	29 Jun 1999 n	9 Jan 2001
Sweden			26 May 2000 a
Switzerland			29 Jun 1999 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	29 Jun 1999	29 Jun 1999 n	27 Jun 2000
United States of America	16 Jun 1999		5 Jan 2001

Notes:

[1] In accordance with paragraph (b) of Article XXIV (b) of the Convention, a Conference of Governments held in London on 2 July 1999 decided to bring the Food Aid Convention, 1999 into force as of 1 July 1999 among the Governments and the intergovernmental organization which had by 30 June 1999 deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or declarations of provisional application of the Convention.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

42. INTERNATIONAL NATURAL RUBBER AGREEMENT, 1994*

Geneva, 17 February 1995

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 6 February 1997 and definitively on 14 February 1997, in accordance with article 61 . The Agreement was terminated with effect from 13 October 1999 in accordance with Resolution 212 (XXXXI) adopted by the International Rubber Council at its Forty-first session held in Kuala Lumpur on 30 September 1999.

REGISTRATION: 6 February 1997, No. 33546.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1964, p. 3 and depositary notification C.N.466.1995.TREATIES-5 of 8 February 1996 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic text).

43. INTERNATIONAL COFFEE AGREEMENT 2001

London, 28 September 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 October 2001 and definitively on 17 May 2005, in accordance with article 45 which reads as follows: "(1) This Agreement shall enter into force definitively on 1 October 2001 if by that date Governments representing at least 15 exporting Members holding at least 70 percent of the votes of the exporting Members and at least 10 importing Members holding at least 70 percent of the votes importing Members, calculated as at 25 September 2001, without reference to possible suspension under the terms of Articles 25 and 42, have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval. Alternatively, it shall enter into force definitively at any time after 1 October 2001 if it is provisionally in force in accordance with the provisons of paragraph (2) of this Article and these percentage requirements are satisfied by the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval. (2) This Agreement may enter into force provisionally on 1 October 2001. For this purpose, a notification by a signatory Government or by any other Contracting Party to the International Coffee Agreement 1994 as extended, containing an undertaking to apply this new Agreement provisionally, in accordance with its constitutional procedures as rapidly as possible, which is recieved by the Secretary-General of the United Nations not later than 25 September 2001, shall be regarded as equal in effect to an instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval. A Government which undertakes to apply this Agreement provisionally, in accordance with its laws and regulations acceptance or approval shall be regarded as a provisional Party thereto until it deposits its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval or until and including 30 June 2002 whichever is the earlier. The Council may grant an extension of the time within which any Government which is applying this Agreement provisionally may deposit its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval. (3) If this Agreement has not entered into force definitively or provisionally on 1 October 2001 under the provisions of paragraph (1) or (2) of this Article those Governments which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession or made notifications containing an undertaking to apply this Agreement provisionally, in accordance with their laws an regulations, and to seek ratification, acceptance or approval may, by mutual consent, decide that it shall enter into force among themselves. Similarly, if this Agreement has entered into force provisionally but has not entered into force definitively on 31 March 2002, those Governments which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession or made the notifications referred to in paragraph (2) of this Article, may, by mutual consent, decide that it shall continue in force provisionally or enter into force definitively among themselves."[1].

REGISTRATION: 1 October 2001, No. 37769.
STATUS: Signatories: 35. Parties: 67.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2161, p. 308.

Note: At its eighty-second session held in London from 27 to 28 September 2000, the International Coffee Council approved, by Resolution No. 393, the International Coffee Agreement 2001. The Agreement will be open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 1 November 2000 until and including 25 September 2001 by Contracting Parties to the International Coffee Agreement 1994 or the International Coffee Agreement 1994 as extended until 30 September 2001, with modifications, by Resolution 384 of the International Coffee Council on 21 July 1999, and Governments invited to the session of the International Coffee Council at which this Agreement was negotiated, in accordance with its article 43.

Further, International Coffee Council took the following decisions:

Date of decision:		***Subject:***
28 September	2001	Extension until 31 May 2002 of the period for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval, or notifications of provisional application and establishment of special conditions for accession.
21 May	2002	Extension to 25 September 2002 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval, notification of provisional application or accession; and extension until 31 May 2003 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States applying the Agreement provisionally.
26 September	2002	Extension to 31 May 2003 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.
21 May	2003	Extension to 31 May 2004 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.
21 May	2003	Extension to 31 May 2004 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States applying the Agreement provisionally

Date of decision:		*Subject:*
19 to 21 May	2004	Extension to 31 May 2005 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval or accession.
		Extension to 31 May 2005 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States applying the Agreement provisionally.
18 to 20 May	2005	Extension to 31 May 2006 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval or accession.
		Extension to 31 May 2006 of the time-limit for deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States applying the Agreement provisionally.
22 to 25 May	2006	Extension to 31 May 2007 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.
		Extension to 31 May 2007 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval by States applying the Agreement provisionally.
		Establishment of conditions of accession for Timor-Leste.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Angola			2 Jan 2002 a
Austria			23 Sep 2002 a
Belgium[2]	25 Sep 2001	25 Sep 2001 n	
Benin			21 Mar 2003 a
Bolivia			30 May 2002 a
Brazil	18 Sep 2001		21 Sep 2001
Burundi	24 Sep 2001		24 Sep 2001 A
Cameroon			28 May 2002 a
Central African Republic			19 Dec 2002 a
Colombia	20 Jun 2001	20 Jun 2001 n	17 Feb 2004
Congo	25 Sep 2001		25 Sep 2001
Costa Rica	20 Dec 2000		25 Sep 2002
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 2001		29 Jan 2002 AA
Cuba	25 Sep 2001	30 Nov 2001 n	26 Dec 2001
Cyprus			23 Jan 2002 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo			12 Apr 2002 a
Denmark	25 Sep 2001		5 Jun 2002
Dominican Republic	10 Aug 2001		5 Mar 2004
Ecuador	15 Aug 2001		5 Feb 2002
El Salvador			25 Jan 2002 a
Ethiopia	23 Mar 2001		16 Apr 2003
European Community	25 Sep 2001		25 Sep 2001 AA
France	24 Sep 2001		25 Apr 2005 AA
Gabon	25 Sep 2001		25 Sep 2001 A
Germany	25 Sep 2001	25 Sep 2001 n	20 Dec 2002
Ghana[3]	24 Sep 2001	24 Sep 2001 n	31 May 2006
Greece			4 Mar 2004 a
Guatemala			5 Feb 2003 a
Guinea			21 May 2003 a
Haiti			24 Sep 2002 a
Honduras	25 Sep 2001		24 Sep 2002
India	10 Aug 2001		10 Sep 2001
Indonesia			23 Aug 2002 a
Ireland	25 Sep 2001	25 Sep 2001 n	11 Jun 2002
Italy	25 Sep 2001		17 May 2005
Jamaica	25 Sep 2001		1 Nov 2001
Japan	11 Jul 2001		11 Jul 2001 A
Kenya			1 Nov 2001 a
Latvia			4 Jan 2006 a
Luxembourg[2]	25 Sep 2001	25 Sep 2001 n	
Madagascar	24 Sep 2001		24 Sep 2001 A
Malawi			12 Feb 2003 a
Mexico	24 Sep 2001	25 Jan 2002 n	9 Jul 2002

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Nicaragua			12 Dec 2002 a
Nigeria			26 Feb 2002 a
Norway			21 May 2002 a
Panama			26 Jul 2006 a
Papua New Guinea			23 Jan 2002 a
Paraguay			10 Mar 2004 a
Philippines			28 May 2002 a
Poland			15 Sep 2006 a
Portugal	25 Sep 2001		21 May 2003
Rwanda	4 Sep 2001		13 Sep 2001
Slovakia			1 Jun 2006 a
Spain	20 Sep 2001	20 Sep 2001 n	7 Jun 2002
Sweden			19 Nov 2001 a
Switzerland	25 Sep 2001	28 Jan 2002 n	30 Apr 2002
Thailand	24 Sep 2001		24 Sep 2001
Togo			9 May 2003 a
Uganda	9 May 2001		5 Oct 2001
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	25 Sep 2001	25 Sep 2001 n	2 Jun 2003
United Republic of Tanzania	26 Jan 2001		31 Oct 2002
United States of America			3 Feb 2005 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)			8 Jul 2004 a
Viet Nam	22 Aug 2001		2 May 2002 AA
Zambia			26 Mar 2003 a
Zimbabwe			3 Jun 2004 a

Notes:

[1] At a meeting held in London, from 26 to 28 September 2001, the representatives of the States and Organization listed below decided to put the Agreement into force provisionally among themselves as of 1 October 2001, pursuant to the provisions of article 45 (3) of the Agreement:

Exporting Countries: Brazil, Colombia, Congo (Republic of), Gabon, Ghana, India, Rwanda and Thailand; *Importing countries*: Belgium, Germany, Ireland, Japan, Luxembourg, Spain, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and European Community.

[2] In the name of the Kingdom of Belgium and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and by virtue of Article 31 of the Consolidated Convention between Belgium and the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg instituting the Belgo-Luxembourg Economic Union.

[3] In its notification of provisional application, the Government of Ghana notified the Secretary-General that:

"[The Government of the Republic of Ghana] ... will apply the Agreemnt provisionally, as an exporting member, with effect from 26 September 2001, pending its ratification.".

[4] In respect of the United Kingdom, the Bailiwick of Jersey and Saint Helena.

44. International Cocoa Agreement, 2001

Geneva, 2 March 2001

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 1 Octobcr 2003, in accordance with article 58 (3) and definitively on 2 November 2005, in accordance with article 58 (1) which read as follows. "1. This Agreement shall enter into force definitively on 1 October 2003, or any time thereafter, if by such date Governments representing at least five exporting countries accounting for at least 80 per cent of the total exports of countries listed in Annex A and Government representing importing countries having at least 60 per cent of total imports as set out in annex B have deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the depositary. It shall also enter into force definitively once it has entered into force provisionally and these percentage requirements are satisfied by the deposit of instruments or ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. This Agreement shall enter into force provisionally on 1 January 2002 if by such date Governments representing at least five exporting countries accounting for at least 80 per cent of the total exports of countries listed in annex A and Governments representing importing countries having at least 60 per cent of total imports as set out in annex B have deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or have notified the depositary that they will apply this Agreement provisionally when it enters into force. Such Governments shall be provisional Members. 3. If the requirements for entry into force under paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 of this article have not been met by 1 September 2002, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall, at the earliest time practical, convene a meeting of those governments which have deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or have notified the depositary that they will apply this Agreement provisionally. These governments may decide whether to put this Agreement into force definitively or provisionally among themselves, in whole or in part, on such date as they may determine or to adopt any other arrangement as they may deem necessary. 4. For a Government on whose behalf an instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession or a notification of provisional application is deposited after the entry into force of this Agreement in accordance with paragraph 1, paragraph 2 or paragraph 3 of this article, the instrument or notification shall take effect on the date of such deposit and, with regard to notification of provisional application, in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 57."[1].

REGISTRATION: 1 October 2003, No. 39640.
STATUS: Signatories: 11. Parties: 17.
TEXT: Doc.TD/COCOA.9/7.

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 2 March 2001 at Geneva by the United Nations Conference on Cocoa, 2000. In accordance with its article 54, the Agreement will be opened for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 1 May 2001 until 31 December 2002, by parties to the International Cocoa Agreement, 1993, and Governments invited to the United Nations Cocoa Conference, 2000.

Further, International Cocoa Council took the following decision:

Date of decision:		*Subject:*
11 to 14 March	2003	Extension until 30 September 2010 of the period for signature.
4 June	2003	Provisional entry into force of the Agreement on 1 October 2003.[1]
9 to 12 September	2003	Extension until 30 September 2010 of the time-limit for the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Brazil	20 Nov 2001		24 Sep 2004
Cameroon	5 Oct 2001		30 Jun 2003
Côte d'Ivoire[2]	6 Nov 2001		14 Nov 2002
Dominican Republic	22 May 2003		2 Nov 2005
Ecuador			13 Oct 2003 a
European Community	12 Dec 2002		12 Dec 2002 AA
Gabon			25 Feb 2003 a
Ghana	17 Jun 2002		21 Feb 2003
Malaysia[2]	16 May 2002	16 May 2002 n	
Nigeria			11 Mar 2003 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Papua New Guinea[2]	8 Aug 2003		27 Sep 2004
Russian Federation[3]			24 Dec 2002 a
Slovakia	4 Dec 2002		28 Mar 2003 AA
Switzerland	17 Dec 2002		3 Jun 2003
Togo[2]	26 Oct 2001	26 Oct 2001 n	
Trinidad and Tobago			17 Feb 2004 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)			20 Apr 2005 a

Notes :

[1] In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 58 of the Agreement, a meeting of Governments and an international organization held in London on 4 June 2003 decided to bring the Agreement into force as of 1 October 2003 among the Governments and the intergovernmental organization which had deposited instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or notifications of provisional application of the Agreement.

[2] As an exporting Member.

[3] As an importing State.

45. Agreement establishing the Terms of Reference of the International Jute Study Group, 2001

Geneva, 13 March 2001

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 23 which reads as follows: "(a) These Terms of Reference shall enter into force when States, the European Community or any intergovernmental organization referred to in paragraph 5 above together accounting for 60 per cent of trade (imports and exports combined) in jute and jute products, as set out in Annex A to these Terms of Reference, have notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations (hereinafter referred to as "the depositary") pursuant to sub-paragraph (b) below of their provisional application or definitve acceptance of these Terms of Reference; (b) Any State, the European Community or any intergovernmental organization referred to in paragraph 5 above which desires to become a member of the Group shall notify the depositary that it accepts definitively these Terms of Reference or that it accepts to apply them provisionally, pending the conclusion of its internal procedures. Any State, the European Community or intergovernmental organization which has notified its provisional application of these Terms of Reference shall endeavour to complete its internal procedures as soon as possible, and shall notify the depositary of its definitive acceptance of these Terms of Reference; (c) if the requirements for entry into force of these Terms of Reference have not been met on 31 December 2001, the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on trade and Development shall invite those States, the European Community and intergovernmental organizations that have notified their acceptance or provisional application of these Terms of Reference to decide whether or not to put these Terms of Reference into force among themselves; (d) When these Terms of Reference enter into force, the Secretary-General of the United Nations Conference on Trade and Development shall convene an inaugural meeting of the Council as soon as possible thereafter, Members shall be notified at least one month where possible, prior to that meeting."[1].

STATUS: Parties: 4.

TEXT: Doc. TD/JUTE.4/6.

Note: The above Agreement was adopted by the United Nations Conference on Jute and Jute Products, convened in Geneva from 12 to 13 March 2001. In accordance with its paragraph 23 (b), the Agreement is subject to definitive acceptance or provisional acceptance by any State, the European Community or any intergovernmental organization which desires to become a member of the Group.

Participant	*Provisional application (n)*	*Definitive acceptance*	*Participant*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Definitive acceptance*
Bangladesh		27 Jul 2001	India		25 Apr 2002
European Community		26 Apr 2002	Switzerland	20 Dec 2001 n	3 Sep 2002

Notes:

[1] "The Secretariat of the International Jute Organisation (IJO) ... has the honour to inform that the IJO completes the process of its liquidation on 11 October 2001 and will be succeeded by International Jute Study Group (IJSG) as was established at the United Nations Conference on Jute and Jute Products 2001 held on 12-13 March 2001 at UNCTAD, Geneva. However, the process of accession by the desiring Members is expected to be completed by December 2001 following which, the IJSG is likely to enter into force in early 2002. As decided by the International Jute Council (ICJ) at its 29th Session held on 14 March 2001 also at UNCTAD, Geneva, the interim period from 12 October 2001 till the new organisation enters into force will be administered by a Trust under the Government of Bangladesh represented by the Ministry of Jute (MOJ).

Accordingly, a Trustee Deed has been executed by the undersigned as its Executant. The physical and financial assets have been handed over to the Chairman of the Board of the Trust. The Trust will continue the function from the same office as of the IJO Secretariat."...

46. International Tropical Timber Agreement, 2006

Geneva, 27 January 2006

NOT YET IN FORCE: which reads, in part, as follows: "1. This Agreement shall enter into force definitively on 1 February 2008 or on any date thereafter, if 12 Governments of producers holding at least 60 per cent of the total votes as set out in Annex A to this Agreement and 10 Governments of consumers as listed in Annex B and accounting for 60 per cent of the global import volume of tropical timber in the reference year 2005 have signed this Agreement definitively or have ratified, accepted or approved it pursuant to article 36, paragraph 2, or article 37. 2. If this Agreement has not entered into force definitively on 1 February 2008, it shall enter into force provisionally on that date or on any date within six months thereafter if 10 Governments of producers holding at least 50 per cent of the total votes as set out in Annex A to this Agreement and seven Governments of consumers as listed in Annex B and accounting for 50 per cent of the global import volume of tropical timber in the reference year 2005 have signed this Agreement definitively or have ratified, accepted or approved it pursuant to article 36, paragraph 2 or have notified the depositary under article 38 that they will apply this Agreement provisionally.".

STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 1.

TEXT: Doc. TD/TIMBER.3/12.

Note: The above Agreement was adopted on 27 January 2006 at Geneva by the United Nations Conference for the Negotiation of a Successor Agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994. In accordance with its article 36, the Agreement shall be open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 3 April 2006 until one month after the date of its entry into force, by Governments invited to the United Nations Conference for the Negotiation of a Successor Agreement to the International Tropical Timber Agreement, 1994.

Participant	*Signature*	*Provisional application (n)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Guatemala	14 Jul 2006		
Indonesia	7 Apr 2006		
Madagascar	19 Sep 2006		
Norway	13 Sep 2006		
Panama	8 Dec 2006		
Ploland			19 Dec 2006 a
Switzerland	13 Dec 2006		
Togo	21 Apr 2006		

CHAPTER XX

MAINTENANCE OBLIGATIONS

1. CONVENTION ON THE RECOVERY ABROAD OF MAINTENANCE

New York, 20 June 1956

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 May 1957, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 25 May 1957, No. 3850.
STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 64.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 268, p. 3, and vol. 649, p. 330 (procès-verbal of rectification of authentic Spanish text).

Note: The Convention was adopted and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on Maintenance Obligations convened pursuant to resolution 572 (XIX)[1] of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations, adopted on 17 May 1955. The Conference met at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 29 May to 20 June 1956. For the text of the Final Act of the Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 268, p. 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Algeria		10 Sep 1969 a
Argentina		29 Nov 1972 a
Australia		12 Feb 1985 a
Austria	21 Dec 1956	16 Jul 1969
Barbados		18 Jun 1970 a
Belarus		14 Nov 1996 a
Belgium		1 Jul 1966 a
Bolivia	20 Jun 1956	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil	31 Dec 1956	14 Nov 1960
Burkina Faso		27 Aug 1962 a
Cambodia	20 Jun 1956	
Cape Verde		13 Sep 1985 a
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 a
Chile		9 Jan 1961 a
China[3]		
Colombia	16 Jul 1956	10 Nov 1999
Croatia[2]		20 Sep 1993 d
Cuba	20 Jun 1956	
Cyprus		8 May 1986 a
Czech Republic[4]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark	28 Dec 1956	22 Jun 1959
Dominican Republic	20 Jun 1956	
Ecuador	20 Jun 1956	4 Jun 1974
El Salvador	20 Jun 1956	
Estonia		8 Jan 1997 a
Finland		13 Sep 1962 a
France[5]	5 Sep 1956	24 Jun 1960
Germany[6,7]	20 Jun 1956	20 Jul 1959
Greece	20 Jun 1956	1 Nov 1965
Guatemala	26 Dec 1956	25 Apr 1957
Haiti	21 Dec 1956	12 Feb 1958
Holy See	20 Jun 1956	5 Oct 1964
Hungary		23 Jul 1957 a
Ireland		26 Oct 1995 a
Israel	20 Jun 1956	4 Apr 1957
Italy	1 Aug 1956	28 Jul 1958
Kazakhstan		28 Mar 2000 a
Kyrgyzstan		27 May 2004 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Luxembourg		1 Nov 1971 a
Mexico	20 Jun 1956	23 Jul 1992
Moldova		24 Jul 2006 a
Monaco	20 Jun 1956	28 Jun 1961
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		18 Mar 1957 a
Netherlands	20 Jun 1956	31 Jul 1962
New Zealand[9]		26 Feb 1986 a
Niger		15 Feb 1965 a
Norway		25 Oct 1957 a
Pakistan		14 Jul 1959 a
Philippines	20 Jun 1956	21 Mar 1968
Poland		13 Oct 1960 a
Portugal		25 Jan 1965 a
Romania		10 Apr 1991 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		1 Nov 2004 a
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		6 Oct 1966 a
Sri Lanka	20 Jun 1956	7 Aug 1958
Suriname		12 Oct 1979 a
Sweden	4 Dec 1956	1 Oct 1958
Switzerland		5 Oct 1977 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		10 Mar 1994 d
Tunisia		16 Oct 1968 a
Turkey		2 Jun 1971 a
Ukraine		19 Sep 2006 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[10]		13 Mar 1975 a
Uruguay		18 Sep 1995 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16 of the Convention concerning the competence of the International Court of Justice and affirms that the agreement of all the parties concerned is required in each case before a dispute can be brought before the International Court of Justice.

(a) The Argentine Republic reserves the right, with respect to article 10 of the Convention, to restrict the application of the expression "highest priority" in the light of the provisions governing exchange controls in Argentina.

(b) In the event that another Contracting Party extends the application of the Convention to territories over which the Argentine Republic exercises sovereignty, such extension shall in no way affect the latter's rights (the reference is to article 12 of the Convention).

(c) The Argentine Government reserves the right not to apply the procedure provided for in article16 of the Convention in any dispute directly or indirectly related to the territories referred to in its declaration concerning article 12.

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"Australia wishes to declare, in accordance with Article 12, that with the exception of the Territory of Norfolk Island, the Convention shall not be applicable to the territories for the International relations of which Australia is responsible."

ISRAEL

"*Article 5:* The Transmitting Agency shall transmit under paragraph 1 any order, final or provisional, and any other judicial act, obtained by the claimant for the payment of maintenance in a competent tribunal of Israel, and, where necessary and possible, the record of the proceedings in which such order was made.

"*Article 10:* Israel reserves the right:

"a) to take the necessary measures to prevent transfers of funds under this Article for purposes other than the bona fide payment of existing maintenance obligations;

"b) to limit the amounts transferable pursuant to this Article, to amounts necessary for subsistence."

MOLDOVA

Declaration:

"Until the full re-establishment of the territorial integrity of the Republic of Moldova, the provisions of the Convention shall be applied only on the territory controlled effectively by the authorities of the Republic of Moldova."

NETHERLANDS

The Government of the Kingdom makes the following reservation with regard to article 1 of the Convention: the recovery of maintenance shall not be facilitated by virtue of this article if, the claimant and the respondent being both in the Netherlands, or, respectively, in Surinam, the Netherlands Antilles or Netherlands New Guinea, and assistance having been granted or similar arrangements made under the Assistance to the Needy Act (*Loi sur l'Assistance des Pauvres*), no recovery was in general obtained for such assistance from the respondent, having regard to the circumstances of the case in question.

"The Convention has for the time being been ratified for the Kingdom of the Netherlands in Europe only. If, in accordance with article 12, the application of the Convention will at any time be extended to the parts of the Kingdom outside Europe, the Secretary-General will be duly notified thereof. In that event the notification will contain such reservation as may be made on behalf of any of these parts of the Kingdom."

SEYCHELLES

Reservation:

"The Republic of Seychelles reserves the right, with respect to article 10 of the Convention, to restrict the application of the expression ' highest priority ' in the light of the legal provisions governing exchange control in Seychelles."

SWEDEN[11]

Article 1: Sweden reserves the right to reject, where the circumstances of the case under consideration appear to make this necessary, any application for legal support aimed at the recovery of maintenance from a person who entered Sweden as a political refugee.

11 November 1988

Article 9: "Where the proceedings are pending in Sweden, the exemptions in the payment of costs and the facilities provided in paragraph 1 shall be granted only to persons resident in a State Party to the Convention or to any person who would otherwise enjoy such advantages under an agreement concluded with the State of which he is a national."

TUNISIA

(1) Persons living abroad may only claim the advantages provided for in the Convention when considered non-residents under the exchange regulations in force in Tunisia.

(2) A dispute may only be referred to the International Court of Justice with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC[4]

POLAND

5 February 1969

The Government of the Polish People's Republic wishes to express its objection, in accordance with article 17, paragraph 1, of the said Convention, to the first two reservations made by the Government of Tunisia in its instrument of accession.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

13 March 1975

"With reference to article 17 (1) of the Convention . . . the Government of the United Kingdom [objects] to reservations (b) and (c) made by Argentina in respect of articles 12 and 16 upon accession to the Convention."

SLOVAKIA[4]

Notifications of designation of administrative or judicial authority in accordance with article 2 of the Convention

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
Algeria	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
Argentina	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
Australia	Child Support Agency GPO Box 9815 Hobart, Tasmania 7001 Australia Phone: +61 3 6221 0187 Facsimile: +61 3 6221 0180	Child Support Agency GPO Box 9815 Hobart, Tasmania 7001 Australia Phone: +61 3 6221 0187 Facsimile: +61 3 6221 0180
Austria	District Court (Bezirksgericht) exercising judicial jurisdiction in civil law matters in whose territory the claimant has his permanent residence, or if he has none in the country, his actual residence to act in its territory as Transmitting Agency.	The Federal Ministry of Justice
Vienna		
Districts I-XX	District Court of the Inner City of Vienna	
Districts XXI, XXII	District Court of Florisdorf	
Districts XXIII	District Court of Liesing	
Barbados	Attorney General of Barbados	Attorney General of Barbados
Belarus*	of Justice *(See attachment 1)*	District Courts *(See attachment 1)*
Belgium	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
Brazil	Procuradoria Geral da República (Attorney General's Office)	Procuradoria Geral da República (Attorney General's Office)
Bosnia and Herzegovina	Ministry for Civil Affairs and Communications: Ministaratvo civilnih poslova i komunikacija Bosne i Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Musala 9 Tel: 665-718, Fax: 444-557	Ministry for Civil Affairs and Communications: Ministaratvo civilnih poslova i komunikacija Bosne i Herzegovina, Sarajevo, Musala 9 Tel: 665-718, Fax: 444-557
Burkina Faso	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
Cape Verde	Regional Courts	Procuradoria-Geral da República

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
Central African Republic	A. *First situation:* the Central African Republic has concluded a judicial convention: 1. With France, under the Agreement on Co-operation in Judicial matters, dated 18 January 1965, the Agency which transmits or receives the maintenance claims is the Minister of Justice, Keeper of the Seals. Claims are received or sent in the form of writs of debt, judgements or decrees, and the Ministers of Justice of the two States transmit them to the competent official, in this case the Procureur Général at the Court of Appeals of the respondent's residence, for execution. 2. With the African countries signatories of the Tananarive Convention of 12 September 1961, the exchanges are made through the Procureurs Généraux at the Court of Appeals. B. *Second situation*: The Central African Republic has not concluded a judicial convention with a particular country. Claims for recovery of maintenance are transmitted by the *Procureur général* at the Court of Appeals or the Minister of Justice, who refers them to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Central African Republic, who refers them to the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the country where the respondent resides. Claims originated abroad follow the same procedure.	
Chile	Corporación de Asistencia Judicial de la Región Metropolitana Calle Augustinas 1419 Telephone: (56) (2) 6982829 Facsimile: (56) (2) 6728700	Corporación de Asistencia Judicial de la Región Metropolitana Calle Augustinas 1419 Telephone: (56) (2) 6982829 Facsimile: (56) (2) 6728700
China	*Upon ratification (depositary notification C.N.80.1957.TREATIES-6 of 5 July 1957), the Government of the Republic of China designated the Ministry of Justice as Transmitting Agency and the National Bar Association of the Republic of China as Receiving Agency, both located in Taipei, Taiwan, China. With reference to signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China, see United Nations publication Multilateral Treaties deposited with the Secretary-General, Status as at 31 December 2002 (document ST/LEG/SER/E/22/Add.1), notes 1, 2 and 3 in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.*	
Colombia	Consejo Superior de la Judicatura Presidencia de la Sala Administrativa Calle 12 No. 7-65, En Bogotá D.C. PBX 57-1-5658500	Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar Subdirección de Intervenciones Directas Avenida 68 No. 64-01, en Bogotá D.C. PBX 57-1-4377630-página Web: www.bienestarfamiliar.gov.co
Croatia	Ministry of Finance	Ministry of Work and Welfare
Cyprus	Ministry of Justice of the Republic	Ministry of Justice of the Republic
Czech Republic	Contact: Office for International Legal Protection of Children Benesova 22 602 00 Brno Czech Republic tel.: +420-54 221 5443 fax: + 420-54 221 2836 Contact persons: Mr. R. Zalesky tel.: +420-54 221 2836 email: rzalesky@iol.cz Ms. M. Novakova tel.: +420-54 221 5443 ext 27 email: marketa.novakova@dcti.wosa.cz	Contact: Office for International Legal Protection of Children Benesova 22 602 00 Brno Czech Republic tel.: +420-54 221 5443 fax: + 420-54 221 2836 Contact persons: Mr. R. Zalesky tel.: +420-54 221 2836 email: rzalesky@iol.cz Ms. M. Novakova tel.: +420-54 221 5443 ext 27 email: marketa.novakova@dcti.wosa.cz
Denmark	Familiestyrelsen (Department of Family Affairs) Stormgade 2-6 DK - 1470 Kobenhavn K Denmark	Familiestyrelsen (Department of Family Affairs) Stormgade 2-6 DK - 1470 Kobenhavn K Denmark
Ecuador	National Court of Minors	President of National Court of Minors
Estonia	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
Finland	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Ministry of Foreign Affairs

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
France	Ministère des affaires étrangères Division du contentieux service du recouvrement des aliments à l'étranger (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Contentious Matters Recovery Abroad of Maintenance Service) 23, rue la Pérouse Paris (XVIème), France	Ministère des affaires étrangères Division du contentieux service du recouvrement des aliments à l'étranger (Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Contentious Matters Recovery Abroad of Maintenance Service) 23, rue la Pérouse Paris (XVIème), France
Germany	Präsident des Oberlandesgerichts Dresden, Postfach 12 07032 010008 Dresden	Bundesverwaltungsamt, 50728 Koeln, telephone: +49 1888.358-0 telefax: +49 1888.358-8099 e-mail: bva-poststelle@bva.bund.de
Land Baden-Württemberg	Ministry of Justice of Land Baden-Württenberg in Stuttgard	BundesverwaltungsamtAußenstelle BonnPostfach 20 03 5153133 BonnE-mail address: bva-poststelle@bva.bund.deInternet: www.bundesverwaltungsamt.de
Land Bayern (Bavaria)	Bavarian Ministry of Justice in Munich/ Bayerisches Staatsministerium der Justiz, 80097 Muenchen	
Land Berlin	Senator of Justice at Berlin-Schoneberg	
Land Bremen	Senator of Justice and Constitution in Bremen	
Land Hamburg	Senate of Hamburg - Justice Administration - in Hamburg	
Land Hessen (Hesse)	Hessian Minister of Justice in Wiesbaden	
Land Niedersachsen (Lower Saxony)	Minister of Justice of Land Lower Saxony in Hanover	
Land Nordrhein -Westfalen (North Rhine/Westphalia)	Minister of Justice of Land North-Rhine / Westphalia in Dusserldorf	
Land Rheinland-Pfalz (Rhineland/ Palatinate)	Minister of Justice of Land Rhineland-Palatinate in Mainz	
Saarland	Minister of Justice in Saarbrücken	
Land Schleswig-Holstein	Minister of Justice of Land Schleswig-Holstein in Kiel	
Land Brandenburg	Brandenburg Ministry of Justice, Potsdam	
Land Mecklenburg - Western Pomerania	Minister of Justice, Federal and European Affairs of Mecklenburg - Western Pomerania, Schwerin	
Land Saxony	Saxon Ministry of Justice, Dresden	
Land Saxony-Anhalt	Minister of Justice of Saxony-Anhalt, Magdeburg	
Land Thuringia	Thurigian Minister of Justice, Erfurt	
Greece	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Guatemala	Attorney-General of the Nation (Procurador General de la Nación, Jefe del Ministerio Público)	Attorney-General of the Nation (Procurador General de la Nación, Jefe del Ministerio Público)
Haiti	Commissaire du Gouvernement près de la Cour de cassation et Juriste du Ministère des Affaires étrangères	Département de la Justice, par le truchement du Minstère des Affaires étrangères

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
Hungary	Ministry of Justice (Igazságügyi Minisztérium)Private International Law Department Postal address: POB 54, Budapest 1363, Hungary	Ministry of Youth, Family, Social Affairs and Equal Opportunities (Ifjúsági, Családügyi, Szociális és Esélyegyenlöségi Minisztérium) Department for Legal Protection of Children and Youth Postal Address: POB 609, Budapest 1373, Hungary
Ireland	Central Authority for Maintenance Recovery, Department of Equality and Law Reform43/49 Mespil RoadDublin 4, Ireland	Central Authority for Maintenance Recovery, Department of Equality and Law Reform43/49 Mespil RoadDublin 4, Ireland
Israel	Legal Aid Bureaux at Jerusalem, Tel Aviv and Haifa	Legal Aid Bureau at Jerusalem
Italy	Ministry of InteriorMinistry of Foreign Affairs	Ministry of Interior
Kazakhstan	Committee on Judicial Administration to the Supreme Court of the Republic of Kazakhstan	
Kyrgyzstan	Judicial Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Kyrgyz Republic	Judicial Department under the Ministry of Justice of the Kyrgyz Republic
Luxembourg	M. le Procureur général d'État12, Côte D'EichBoîte postale 15L-2010 Luxembourg	M. le Procureur général d'État12, Côte D'EichBoîte postale 15L-2010 Luxembourg
Mexico	Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, Consultoría JuridicaHomero 213, Piso 16,Col. Chapultepec MoralesMexico, D.F.	Secretaria de Relaciones Exteriores, Consultoría JuridicaHomero 213, Piso 16,Col. Chapultepec MoralesMexico, D.F.
Monaco	Parquet général	Direction des Relations extérieures
Morocco	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
Netherlands	Raad voor de Kinderbescherming's Gravenhage Dependance Gouda, LBIOBureau Verdrag van New YorkPostbus 8002800 AV Gouda	Raad voor de Kinderbescherming's Gravenhage Dependance Gouda, LBIOBureau Verdrag van New YorkPostbus 8002800 AV Gouda
New Zealand	Department of JusticePrivate Bag Postal CenterWellington, New Zealand	Department of JusticePrivate BagPostal CenterWellington, New Zealand
Niger	Department of General Administrative and Consular Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Department of General Administrative and Consular Affairs of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Norway	Folketrygdkontoret for Utenlandssaker (The National Insurance Office for Social Insurance Abroad) Bidragskontoret (Child Maintenance Division)PB 8138 DEP. 0032 Oslo	Folketrygdkontoret for Utenlandssaker (The National Insurance Office for Social Insurance Abroad) Bidragskontoret (Child Maintenance Division)PB 8138 DEP. 0032 Oslo
Pakistan		
Province of East Pakistan	Judicial Department, Government of East Pakistan	Judicial Department, Government of East Pakistan
Province of West Pakistan (excluding the Territory of Karachi)	Solicitor to the Government of West Pakistan Society, Lahore	The West Pakistan Provincial Branch of the Pakistan Red Cross Society, Lahore
Federal Territory of Karachi	City and Additional Dist. Magistrate, Karachi	Public Prosecutor, Karachi
Antilles néerlandaises	de Voogdijraad (Court of Guardianship) on Curaçao	de Voogdijraad (Court of Guardianship) on Curaçao
Portugal	Direcçao Geral de Justiça(Metropolitan Portugal)	Instituo de Assistência à Familia (Metropolitan Portugal)
	Direcçao Geral dos Serviços da Administraçao civil (Overseas Provinces)	Procuradoria da Republica of each Province in each Juridical District and through the respective Delegates
Romania	Ministry of Justice of RomaniaBd. Mihail Kogalniceanu 33Bucharest 70749	Baroul de Avocati al Municipiului BucarestiBd. Magheru 22Bucharest 70158

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
Serbia	Ministry of Finance and Economy of the Republic of Serbia, Nemanjina 22-24, 11000 Belgrade, telephone No. 381.11.681.245 and fax No. + 381.11.3614.954; Ministry of Finance of the Republic of Montenegro, Ul. Stanka Dragojevica 2, 81000 Podgorica, telephone No. +381.81.242.835 and fax No. +381.81.224.450; and Ministry of Labour and Social Care of the Republic of Montenegro, Ul. Cetinjski put bb, Trg Vektre, 81000 Podgorica, telephone No. + 381.81.482.148 and fax No. +381.81.234.227	The Office for Human and Minority Rights of the Government of the Republic of Serbia and that the Contact point is Mrs. Milica Ivkovic (address: 11 Nemanjina Street, 11000 Belgrade, Republic of Serbia; telephone: +381 11 311 17 10; +381 11 301 48 90)."
Seychelles	Ministry of Foreign Affairs	Ministry of Foreign Affairs
Slovakia	Centrum pre medzinárodnosprávnu ochranu deté a mládeze (Centre for the international legal protection of children and youth)Spitálska 6P.O. Box 5781499 BRATISLAVASlovakia	Centrum pre medzinárodnosprávnu ochranu deté a mládeze (Centre for the international legal protection of children and youth)Spitálska 6P.O. Box 5781499 BRATISLAVASlovakia
Slovenia	Ministry for Health, Family and Social Security	Ministry for Health, Family and Social Security
Spain	Dirección General de Codificación y Cooperación Juridica Internacional del Ministerio de Justicia e Interior	Dirección General de Codificación y Cooperación Juridica Internacional del Ministerio de Justicia e Interior
Sri Lanka	Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs	Permanent Secretary to the Ministry of External Affairs
Suriname	Bureau for Family Law Affairs	Bureau for Family Law Affairs
Sweden	"FÖRSÄKRINGSKASSAN (Swedish Social Insurance Agency), the Swedish transmitting and receiving agency according to the above mentioned convention, has a new address as from 1 January 2006. General questions and questions regarding policy decisions concerning the convention are to be sent to the Försäkringskassan's head office at the following address. Försäkringskassan SE-103 51 STOCKHOLM Sweden Tel: 46 8 786 90 00 (switchboard) Fax: 46 8 786 91 60 Email: huvudkontoret@forsakringskassan.se All applications and requests for assistance in specific cases in accordance with the above mentioned convention are to e sent to the following address. Försäkringskassan Box 1164 SE-621 22 Visby Sweden Tell 46 498 200 700 Fax: 46 498 200 411 Email: international.gotland@forsakringskassan.se"	"FÖRSÄKRINGSKASSAN (Swedish Social Insurance Agency), the Swedish transmitting and receiving agency according to the above mentioned convention, has a new address as from 1 January 2006. General questions and questions regarding policy decisions concerning the convention are to be sent to the Försäkringskassan's head office at the following address. Försäkringskassan SE-103 51 STOCKHOLM Sweden Tel: 46 8 786 90 00 (switchboard) Fax: 46 8 786 91 60 Email: huvudkontoret@forsakringskassan.se All applications and requests for assistance in specific cases in accordance with the above mentioned convention are to e sent to the following address. Försäkringskassan Box 1164 SE-621 22 Visby Sweden Tell 46 498 200 700 Fax: 46 498 200 411 Email: international.gotland@forsakringskassan.se"
Switzerland	Office fédéral de la justice Bundesrain 203003 BerneTel.: 0041/31/322 43 45Fax.: 0041/31/322 42 79	Office fédéral de la justice Bundesrain 203003 BerneTel.: 0041/31/322 43 45Fax.: 0041/31/322 42 79

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Ministry of Justice	
Tunisia	Directorate of Consular Affairs of the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs	Directorate of Consular Affairs of the Secretariat of State for Foreign Affairs
Turkey	General Directorate for International Law and Foreign Affairs of the Ministry of Justice	General Directorate for International Law and Foreign Affairs of the Ministry of Justice
Ukraine	Ministry of Justice	Ministry of Justice
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		
England and Wales	The Secretary of State Home Office (C2 Division)50 Queen Anne's GateLondon SW1H 9AT	The Secretary of State Home Office (C2 Division)50 Queen Anne's GateLondon SW1H 9AT
Scotland	The Scottish Courts Administration 26/27 Royal TerraceEdinburgh EH7 5AH	The Scottish Courts Administration 26/27 Royal TerraceEdinburgh EH7 5AH
Northern Ireland	The Lord Chancellor's DepartmentWindsor House9/15 Bedford Street Belfast BT2 7EA	The Lord Chancellor's DepartmentWindsor House9/15 Bedford Street Belfast BT2 7EA
Ile of Man	The Secretary of State Home Offcie (C2 Division)50 Queen Anne's GateLondon SW1H 9AT	The Secretary of State Home Offcie (C2 Division)50 Queen Anne's GateLondon SW1H 9AT
Bailiwick of Jersey	Attorney General in Jersey	Attorney General in Jersey

*Attachment 1: Belarus

Pursuant to the provisions of article 2, paragraph 3, of the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, adopted under the United Nations auspices on 20 June 1956, we have the honour to inform you that in the Republic of Belarus the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Belarus is the Transmitting Agency, and the Republic's district (municipal) courts are the Receiving Agencies.

Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 2, we have the honour to inform you that, for the recovery of maintenance in the territory of the Republic of Belarus, the Transmitting Agencies of the States parties to the Convention are obliged to submit the following documents:

1. Claimant's application for the recognition and execution of the court decision.
2. The court decision or a certified copy thereof and the official document concerning the decision's entry into force.
3. The document indicating that the party against whom the decision was taken and who did not take part in the court proceedings was duly notified or represented.
4. The document confirming partial execution of decisions at the time of its transmittal.

Samples of the aforementioned documents are annexed hereto.

We also wish to inform you that the aforementioned documents should be sent by the Transmitting Agencies of the States parties to the regional courts and the Minsk Municipal Court depending on the respondent's place of residence:

1. Brest Regional Court
   224000, Brest, ul. Sovetskikh pogranichnikov, 41
2. Vitebsk Regional Court
   210015, Vitebsk, ul. Shubina, 4
3. Gomel Regional Court
   246000, ul. Sovetskaya, 20
4. Grodno Regional Court
   230023, Grodno, ul. Karbysheva, 20
5. Mogilev Regional Court
   21203, Mogilev, ul. Pervomaiskaya, 28a
6. Minsk Regional Court
   220 030, Minsk, ul. Lenina, 28
7. Minsk Municipal Court
   220092, Minsk, ul. D. Martsinkevicha, 1

Address of the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Belarus:

Participant :	*Transmitting Agency:*	*Receiving Agency:*
	220084, Minsk, ul. Kollektornaya, 10 Tel./fax: 20 97 55 Tel.. 20 83 81	
Uruguay	Asesoría Autoridad Central de Cooperación Jurídica Internacional Ministerio de Educación y Cultura Cerrito 586, planta Alta 11000 Montevideo - Uruguay Tel/Fax: (00598-2) 916 6228 o 915 8836 Director: Dr. Eduardo Tellechea Bergman E-mail: tellechea@mec.gub.uy	Fiscalía de Corte y Procuraduría General de la Nación Paysandú 1266 11100 Montevideo - Uruguay Tel/ Fax: (00598-2) 900 8387 o 903 0064 E-mail: fiscorte@adinet.com.uy Responsable: Sra. Fiscal Letrado Adjunta Dra. Nerina Hernández

Notifications under article 3 of the Convention

COLOMBIA

27 October 2003

Proceedings relating to maintenance for minors

"Maintenance" is understood to mean everything essential for the support, housing, clothing, medical treatment, recreation, comprehensive training and education or instruction of the minor. Maintenance shall include the obligation to pay the mother's pregnancy and childbirth expenses. Article 133, Decree No. 2737 of 1989, Minors' Code.

Every minor is entitled to the protection, care and assistance necessary to achieve adequate physical, mental, moral and social development, and such rights are recognized from the time of conception. Article 3 of Decree No. 2737, Minors' Code.

In the event of non-compliance with the maintenance obligation towards a minor, a request for conciliation may be submitted to the Family Ombudsman, the competent judges, the Family Commissioner or the Corrections Inspector of the minor's place of residence by either parent, by the child's relatives, by the guardian or person caring for the child or motu proprio. Article 136, Decree No. 2737 of 1989, Minors' Code.

The right to claim maintenance may not be waived and is non-transferable in the event of death. The right to claim maintenance may not be sold or assigned in any way.

The person owing maintenance (respondent) may not ask the claimant to offset that debt with sums owed to him by the claimant.

Even if the parents have been deprived of parental authority, their maintenance obligation does not cease. This obligation ceases when the minor is adopted.

As long as the respondent does not fulfil or agree to fulfil the maintenance obligation towards the minor, he may not claim custody and personal care or exercise other rights over the minor.

When necessary, the judge will decide who is to have custody and care of the minor(s) on whose behalf the proceedings were instituted, without prejudice to the relevant judicial actions. Article 150, Decree No. 2737, Minors' Code.

An expectant mother may claim maintenance in respect of the offspring of the legitimate father (husband) or of the man who has recognized paternity in the case of a child to be born out of wedlock. Article 135, Decree No. 2737 of 1989, Minors' Code.

Conciliation

Act No. 23 of 1991, Act No. 446 of 1998 and Act No. 640 of 2001

Article 35 of Act No. 640 of 2001. "Admissibility requirement. In cases suitable for conciliation, extrajudicial conciliation as of right is an admissibility requirement for application to the civil, administrative law, labour and family courts, as specified in this Act for each of these areas."

Accordingly, in requests for imposition of maintenance payments for a minor, the child's mother or father or the child's relatives or officials dealing with the case may initiate conciliation with the person obligated to pay such maintenance.

In this case, the (non-compliant) person obligated to pay maintenance will be summoned to the office of the Family Commissioner, the Family Ombudsman or the competent judge to try to reach agreement on the amount of the maintenance payments, the means of making them, their timing and guarantees of observance. The respondent may authorize deduction from his salary of the agreed amounts.

When conciliation has produced agreement on the maintenance figure, method of payment, timing of the payments and relevant guarantee, a record will be prepared for signature by the presiding official and the parties. The official will then approve it by means of a writ and the conciliation will thus become enforceable; in other words, in case of non-compliance by the respondent, maintenance enforcement proceedings will be initiated.

If the person summoned does not appear, after being summoned twice and after the reason for the summons has been given, or if the conciliation fails, the official may establish a provisional maintenance figure and the writ establishing it will be enforceable. The official must submit the claim for maintenance to the competent judge in order for the figure provisionally established to be confirmed by the judge.

Maintenance conciliations may vary depending on the circumstances of the person obligated to pay maintenance and the needs of the person receiving the financial support. In addition, the judicial decision awarding maintenance may be reviewed in order to revise the maintenance figure, when the respondent is the father of another minor or other minors.

The conciliation record must contain the following information:

Place, date and time of the conciliation hearing;

Name of the Conciliator;

Name of the persons summoned to the conciliation and indication of who attended the proceedings;

Brief account of the claims that are the subject of the conciliation;

Agreement reached by the parties during the proceedings.

Each of the parties participating in the conciliation must receive a copy of the record.

Claims for maintenance for minors

Claims for maintenance for minors are dealt with in the manner established in Decree No. 2737 of 1989 (Minors' Code); as specified in Decree No. 2272 of 1989, the decision is not subject to appeal.

Claims for maintenance must contain the name of the parties, their address for notification purposes (place of residence,

domicile, whereabouts or place of work), the amount of maintenance claimed, the justification for the claim and the evidence adduced and must be accompanied by any documents in the possession of the claimant. Claims may be submitted orally or in writing. If any document is missing that the claimant is unable to attach, the judge may, at the request of a party or ex officio, order the relevant authority to issue the document.

If he deems it necessary, the judge may order attachment of the respondent's salary (in an amount that he considers appropriate) in the writ authorizing submission of the claim (in order to guarantee fulfilment of the maintenance obligation), for which purpose he shall communicate officially with the respondent's employer. He may also order retention of an amount that he considers appropriate from the respondent's severance pay, in order to guarantee the minor's maintenance in the event that the respondent resigns or is laid off from his employment.

Evidence

Any judicial decision must be based on the evidence duly and regularly produced in the proceedings. Article 174 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Means of proof. The means of proof are statements by the parties, responses under oath, testimony of third parties, expert opinions, physical examination of exhibits, documents, circumstantial evidence and any other means that may help the judge to form an opinion. Article 175 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Evidence located abroad

When the civil proceedings require formalities on foreign territory, the judge may, depending on the nature and urgency of the matter:

1. Send letters rogatory, through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, to one of the judicial authorities in the country where the formalities are to take place so that it may conduct them and send the evidence back through the diplomatic or consular agent of Colombia or of a friendly country.

2. Directly request the consul or diplomatic agent of Colombia in the country concerned to conduct the formalities in accordance with national legislation and to send the evidence back directly. The consuls and diplomatic agents of Colombia abroad are authorized to conduct all the judicial formalities in civil cases entrusted to them under article 193 of the Code of Civil Procedure.

Evidence is provided at the request of the parties or following an official order from the judge, if he considers it necessary for verification of the facts alleged by the parties. The cost of providing evidence is shared equally by the parties, without prejudice to the judge's decision regarding the costs of the proceedings.

Deposition. Statement made before the judge in exercise of his functions. Other statements are extra-judicial.

Questioning. The judge may officially summon the parties to answer under oath any questions he wishes to put to them. He may also summon one of the parties, at the request of the other, provided that the request is made in due form.

Oath. When the law authorizes the judge to request any of the parties to take an oath, the oath must be taken at the time when the evidence is to be presented, at the date and time appointed.

Statements by third parties. All persons are obliged to make statements if requested, except in the cases specified by law.

Expert opinion. An opinion requiring the participation of experts or persons specializing in specific scientific, technical or artistic subjects.

Physical examination of exhibits. Proof established by verification of certain facts germane to the proceedings.

Circumstantial evidence. In order for a fact to be considered as circumstantial evidence, it must be fully proved in the proceedings. The judge is authorized to deduce circumstantial evidence from the behaviour of the parties.

Documents. Documents may be public or private. Public documents are those issued by a public official in the performance of his duties or with his intervention. Private documents are those not meeting the requirements to be considered as public documents.

Authentic document. A document regarding which certainty exists as to the person who drafted, wrote or signed it. A public document is presumed to be authentic, unless the contrary is proved by evidence of forgery. Private documents are authentic if they meet the requirements specified by law.

In order for proceedings to be initiated for recovery of maintenance for minors, the relationship between the minor claiming maintenance and the person obligated to provide it must be proved. This shall be done by reference to the Civil Registry where the minor's birth is recorded. The financial ability of the respondent to provide maintenance must also be proved, even summarily (reason to believe). If such ability cannot be proved, an analysis will have to be made of the respondent's social position and habits and it will ultimately be presumed that the respondent will pay the minor the minimum wage.

In order to demonstrate the respondent's ability to pay, a certificate of income and statutory allowances, if he is employed, may be requested as evidence (documentary or oral). The Land Registry Office may be requested to report on immovable property owned by the respondent. The Transit and Transport Secretariat may be asked to determine the ownership of automobiles registered to the respondent. The Chamber of Commerce may be asked to establish the respondent's ownership of or participation in commercial firms. The national Tax Office may be asked to provide the respondent's tax return, and credit or banking institutions may be asked to report on the respondent's balances and on credit card usage. Oral evidence may also be sought, in which persons are asked about the respondent's income.

Maintenance is due at the time of the first claim and must be paid monthly in advance, during the first five days of the month in question. Article 421 of the Civil Code, in conformity with the second paragraph of article 498 of the Code of Civil Procedure, Decree No. 2282 of 1989.

The maintenance order may specify:

An amount to be deducted from the respondent's pay or salary, which may not exceed 50 per cent of his monthly income.

Establishment of a fund, the income from which will be used to make the established maintenance payments.

A specific sum of money, depending on the respondent's demonstrated ability to pay.

Maintenance payments will increase annually, either in order to reflect cost-of-living increases or as agreed between the parties during the conciliation.

Maintenance enforcement proceedings

In the event of non-compliance with the maintenance obligation agreed during the conciliation or decreed by decision of the judge, the family judge concerned may initiate maintenance enforcement proceedings, with the legal consequences, if necessary, of attachment and auction of property.

Complaints of failure to provide maintenance

"Any person who without good reason fails to provide maintenance legally due to his relatives in the ascending line, descendants, adopter or adoptee, or spouse shall be liable to imprisonment for a term ranging from one (1) to three (3) years and a fine ranging from ten (10) to twenty (20) times the monthly legal minimum wage in force."

"The penalty shall be imprisonment ranging from two (2) to four (4) years and a fine ranging from fifteen (15) to twenty-five (25) times the monthly legal minimum wage in force if the failure to provide maintenance concerns a minor under fourteen (14) years of age." Article 233 of the Penal Code.

"Aggravating circumstances. The penalty specified in the preceding article shall be increased by up to one third if the respondent has fraudulently concealed, reduced or encumbered his income or assets in order to avoid paying maintenance." Article 234 of the Penal Code.

"Repetition. Enforcement of the sentence shall not preclude the initiation of further proceedings if the person concerned again fails to make maintenance payments." Article 235 of the Penal Code.

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Australia	12 Feb 1985	Norfolk Island
France	24 Jun 1960	Comoro Archipelago, French Polynesia, French Somaliland, New Caledonia and Dependencies, St. Pierre and Miquelon
Netherlands[11]	12 Aug 1969	Netherlands Antilles
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	29 Nov 1984	Isle of Man
	30 Jul 2003	Bailiwick of Jersey

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Nineteenth Session, Supplement No. 1A* (E/2730/Add.1), p. 5.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 December 1956 and 29 May 1959. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 4 December 1956 and 25 June 1957 respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

With reference to the above-mentioned accession, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Poland on the one hand, and of China on the other hand. The objection made on that occasion by the Government of Poland and the communication from the Government of the Republic of China are identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, to the corresponding communications referred to in note 3 in chapter VI.14.

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 3 October 1958. Subsequently, on 21 April 1973, Czechoslovakia notified an objection with regard to the reservation made by the Government of Argentina to article 10 of the Convention. For the text of the objection see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 867, p. 214. See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The instrument of ratification by France contains the following declaration:

(a) That the Convention shall apply to the territories of the French Republic, namely: the metropolitan departments, the departments of Algeria. the departments of the Oases and of Saoura, the departments of Guadeloupe, Guiana, Martinique and Réunion and the Overseas Territories (St. Pierre and Miquelon, French Somaliland, the Comoro Archipelago, New Caledonia and Dependencies and French Polynesia);

(b) That its application may be extended, by subsequent notification, to the other States of the Community or to one or more such States.

[6] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The Convention shall not extend to the Cook Islands nor to Niue or Tokelau.

In a communication received on 30 June 2000, the Government of New Zealand informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"Pursuant to Article 58 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, [the Government of New Zealand] has the honour to notify the United Nations, in its capacity as depository for [the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance] of the intention to conclude an Agreement between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Australia on Child and Spousal Maintenance ("the Agreement") which will suspend the operation of the Convention as between New Zealand and Australia.

[The Government of New Zealand] assures the United Nations that the conclusion of the Agreement will not affect the enjoyment by the other Parties to the Convention of their rights under the Convention vis-a-vis the Parties to the Agreement, or the performance of their obligations to other Parties under the Convention. Furthermore, the Agreement to be concluded between the Government of New Zealand and Australia is not considered by them to be inconsistent with the object and purpose of the Convention."

See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] "In accordance with article 12 of the Convention, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland hereby gives notice that the provisions of the Convention shall not apply to any of the territories for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible." *See also under "Territorial Applications".*

[11] Subject to the reservation with regard to article 1 which was made by the Netherlands upon ratification of the Convention. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regardng Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XXI

LAW OF THE SEA

1. Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone

Geneva, 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 September 1964, in accordance with article 29.
REGISTRATION: 22 November 1964, No. 7477.
STATUS: Signatories: 41. Parties: 52.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516, p. 205.

Note: The four Conventions and the Optional Protocol of Signature listed in this chapter were prepared and opened for signature by the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 1105 (XI)[1], adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 21 February 1957, and met at the European Office of the United Nations at Geneva from 24 February to 27 April 1958. The Conference also adopted the Final Act and nine resolutions for the text of which, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450, p. 11. For the *travaux préparatoires* and the proceedings of the Conference, see *Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea*, vols. I to VII, United Nations publication, Sales No.: 58.V.4, vols. I to VII.

Participant[2]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Austria	27 Oct 1958	
Belarus	30 Oct 1958	27 Feb 1961
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 a
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	31 Oct 1958	31 Aug 1962
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 a
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
China[4]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	
Croatia[3]		3 Aug 1992 d
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 d
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Guatemala	29 Apr 1958	
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Holy See	30 Apr 1958	
Hungary	31 Oct 1958	6 Dec 1961
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	6 Sep 1961
Italy		17 Dec 1964 a
Jamaica		8 Oct 1965 d
Japan		10 Jun 1968 a
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 a
Latvia		17 Nov 1992 a
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 d
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Lithuania		31 Jan 1992 a
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 a
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 a
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 a
Malta		19 May 1966 d
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 d
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 a
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	
Netherlands[7]	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Romania	31 Oct 1958	12 Dec 1961
Russian Federation	30 Oct 1958	22 Nov 1960
Senegal[8]		25 Apr 1961 a
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 a
Spain		25 Feb 1971 a
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Swaziland		16 Oct 1970 a
Switzerland	22 Oct 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 a

Participant[2]	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Ukraine	30 Oct 1958	12 Jan 1961
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	9 Sep 1958	14 Mar 1960
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	30 Oct 1958	15 Aug 1961

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BELARUS

Article 20: The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that government ships in foreign territorial waters have immunity and that the measures mentioned in this article may therefore be applied to them only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-section D. Rules applicable to warships): The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

BULGARIA

Article 20: The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that government ships in foreign waters have immunity and that the measures set forth in this article may therefore apply to such ships only with the consent of the flag state.

Article 23 (Sub-section D. Rules applicable to warships): The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

Article 20: The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that government ships in the territorial sea of another State have immunity and that the measures set forth in this article may therefore apply to such ships only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-section D. Rules applicable to warships): The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial sea.

COLOMBIA

With respect to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, the delegation of Colombia declares that, under article 98 of the Colombian Constitution, authorization by the Senate is required for the passage of foreign troops through Colombian territory and that, by analogy, such authorization is accordingly also required for the passage of foreign warships through Colombian territorial waters.

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

HUNGARY

Articles 14 and 23: "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that the coastal State is entitled to make the passage of warships through its territorial waters subject to previous authorization."

Article 21: "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that the rules contained in Sub-Section B of Section III of Part I of the Convention are generally inapplicable to government ships operated for commercial purposes so far as they encroach on the immunities enjoyed under international law by all government ships, whether commercial or non-commercial, on foreign territorial waters. Consequently, the provisions of Sub-Section B restricting the immunities of government ships operated for commercial purposes are applicable only upon consent of the State whose flag the ship flies."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Reservation:

Article 14: The Iranian Government maintains the objection on the ground of excess of competence, expressed by its delegation at the twelfth plenary meeting of the Conference on the Law of the Sea on 24 April 1958, to the articles recommended by the Fifth Committee of the Conference and incorporated in part in article 14 of this Convention. The Iranian Government accordingly reserves all rights regarding the contents of this article in so far as it relates to countries having no sea coast.

ITALY

The Government of the Republic of Italy, beside exercising control for the purposes of article 24, paragraph 1 in the zone of the high seas contiguous to the territorial sea, reserves the right to exercise surveillance within the belt of sea extending twelve nautical miles from the coast for the purpose of preventing and punishing infringements of the customs regulations in whatever point of this belt such infringements may be committed.

LITHUANIA

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

". . .The Republic of Lithuania declares the establishing of the procedure for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters for the warships of those

States which have established the procedure for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters."

Mexico

The Government of Mexico considers that government ships, irrespective of the use to which they are put, enjoy immunity, and it therefore enters an express reservation with regard to article 21 of Sub-Section C (Rules applicable to government ships other than warships) in so far as it applies to article 19, paragraphs 1, 2 and 3, and article 20, paragraphs 2 and 3, of Sub-Section B (Rules applicable to merchant ships).

Romania

Article 20: The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that government ships have immunity in foreign territorial waters and that the measures envisaged in this article may not be applied to such ships except with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23: The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the coastal State has the right to provide that the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters shall be subject to previous approval.

Russian Federation

Article 20: The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that government ships in foreign territorial waters have immunity and that the measures mentioned in this article may therefore be applied to them only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-Section D. Rule applicable to warships): The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

Slovakia[5]

Solomon Islands

"The succession of Solomon Islands to the said Treaty shall be without prejudice to the right of Solomon Islands

(1) to employ straight base lines drawn between its islands as the basis for the delimitation of its territorial sea and contiguous zone, and

(2)to designate all waters enclosed by the said straight base lines as internal or archipelagic water."

Spain

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

Tunisia

Reservation:

The Government of the Tunisian Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 4 of this Convention.

Ukraine

Article 20: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that government ships in foreign territorial waters have immunity and that the measures mentioned in this article may therefore be applied to them only with the consent of the flag State.

Article 23 (Sub-Section D. Rule applicable to warships): The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the coastal State has the right to establish procedures for the authorization of the passage of foreign warships through its territorial waters.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

"Save as may be stated in any further and separate notices that may hereafter be given, ratification of this Convention on behalf of the United Kingdom does not extend to the States in the Persian Gulf enjoying British protection. Multilateral conventions to which the United Kingdom becomes a party are not extended to these States until such times as an extension is requested by the Ruler of the State concerned."

Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)

With reference to article 12 that there are special circumstances to be taken into consideration in the following areas: The Gulf of Paria and zones adjacent thereto; the area between the coast of Venezuela and the island of Aruba; and the Gulf of Venezuela.

Reservation made upon ratification:

With express reservation in respect of article 12 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 24 of the said Convention.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Australia

Objections to the following reservations:

"(a) The declaration made with reference to article 12 by Venezuela on signature and the reservation made to that article by Venezuela on ratification.

"(b) The reservation made to article 14 by Iran on signature.

"(c) The reservations made to articles 14 and 23 by Czechoslovakia and Hungary on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(d) The reservation made to paragraph 4 of article 16 by Tunisia on signature.

"(e) The reservation made with regard to the application of articles 19 and 20 to government ships operated for commercial purposes by Czechoslovakia on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(f) The reservations made to article 20 by Bulgaria on signature and on ratification.

"(g) The reservations made to article 20 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(h) The reservation made to article 21 by Hungary on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(i) The reservations made to article 23 by Bulgaria on signature and on ratification.

"(j) the reservations made to article 23 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on signature and confirmed on ratification.

"(k) The reservation made to paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 24 by Venezuela on ratification.

If the statements referred to above with regard to article 23 are juridically in the nature of declarations rather than of reservations strictly so-called, the objections recorded by [the Government of Australia] will serve to record disagreement with the opinions so declared."

31 January 1968

"The Government of Australia places on record the formal objection to the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

29 September 1976

"Objection to the reservation by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, 1958, and contained in the instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic to the said Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone."

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark declares that it does not find acceptable:

"The reservations made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Hungary to article 14;

"The reservations made by the Government of Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4;

"The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19;

"The reservations made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20 and the reservations made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Hungary and Mexico to article 21.

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Convention, according to article 29, as between Denmark and the Contracting Parties concerned."

31 October 1974

"The Government of Denmark does not find acceptable the reservations made by the German Democratic Republic on December 27, 1973 to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

"The Government of Denmark also finds unacceptable the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic on the same date to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas.

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Conventions as between Denmark and the German Democratic Republic."

FIJI

"The Government of Fiji maintains all other objections communicated to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom Government to the reservations or declarations made by certain States with respect to this Convention, reserving only its position on that Government's observation bearing on the application of the Optional Protocol of Signature pending final disposition of the question of the succession by the Government of Fiji to the said Protocol."

ISRAEL

"Objection to all reservations and declarations made in connection with the signing or ratification of or accession to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and the Convention on the High Seas which are incompatible with the purposes and objects of these Conventions. This objection applies in particular to the declaration or reservation made by Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4, of the first of the above-mentioned Conventions on the occasion of signature."

JAPAN

"1. The Government of Japan wishes to state that it does not consider acceptable any unilateral statement in whatever form, made by a State upon signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, which is intended to exclude or modify for such State legal effects of the provisions of the Convention.

"2. In particular, the Government of Japan finds unacceptable the following reservations:

"(a) The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, and by the Government of Hungary to article 21.

"(b) The reservation made by the Government of Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4.

"The reservation made by the Government of Italy to article 24 in its instrument of accession.

"The reservation made by the Government of Mexico to article 21 in its instrument of accession."

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Republic formally expresses its objection to all reservations and statements made in connexion with signature or ratification of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone or in connexion with accession to the said Convention which are inconsistent with the aims and purposes of this Convention.

This objection applies in particular to the statements or reservations made with regard to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, Tunisia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declare that they do not find acceptable

--"the reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, and by the Governments of Hungary and Czechoslovakia to article 21;

--"the reservations made by the Iranian Government to article 14;

--"the declaration by the Government of Colombia as far as it amounts to a reservation on article 14;

--"the reservation made by the Government of the Tunisian Republic to article 16, paragraph 4;

--"the declarations made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on article 23, and the declarations made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia and Hungary on the arti-

cles 14 and 23 as far as these declarations amount to a reservation to the said articles;

--"the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Italy to article 24, paragraph 1.

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserve all rights regarding the reservations made by the Government of Venezuela on ratifying the present Convention in respect of article 12 and article 24, paragraphs 2 and 3."

17 March 1967

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands do not find acceptable the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

PORTUGAL

27 December 1966

"The Government of Portugal cannot accept the reservation proposed by the Mexican Government requiring the exemption of government ships from the dispositions laid down in the Convention, irrespective of the use to which these ships are put."

THAILAND

Objections to the following reservations:

"1. the reservations to article 20 made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR;

"2. the reservations to article 21 made by the Governments of Czechoslovakia, Mexico and Hungary;

"3. the reservations to article 23 made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Colombia, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR."

TONGA

"The Government of Tonga affirms that in the absence of any other statement expressing a contrary intention, it wishes to maintain all objections communicated to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom to the reservations or declarations made by States with respect to any conventions of which the Secretary-General is the depositary."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

6 November 1959

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objections to the following reservations and declarations:

"(a) The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, and the USSR to article 20, and by Hungary to article 21.

"(b) The reservation made by the Government of Iran to article 14.

"(c) The reservation made by the Government of the Tunisian Republic to article 16, paragraph 4."

5 April 1962

"The reservations made by the Government of Venezuela to article 12 and paragraphs 2 and 3 of article 24."

2 November 1966

"The reservation to article 21 of Sub-section C contained in the Mexican instrument of accession."

13 May 1975

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objection to the reservations by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone". *(In this connexion, the Government of the United Kingdom indicated that they had not received the circular letter reproducing the text of the reservations made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic until early in August 1974.)*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[9]

19 September 1962

"The United States does not find the following reservations acceptable:

"1. The reservations made by the Government of Czechoslovakia to article 19, by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, and by Hungary to article 21.

"2. The reservations made by the Government of the Tunisian Republic to article 16, paragraph 4.

"3. The reservation made by the Government of Venezuela to article 12 and to article 24, paragraphs 2 and 3."

17 June 1965

"Objection to the reservation made by the Government of Italy in its instrument of accession."

28 September 1966

"Objection to the reservation made by the Government of Mexico in its instrument of accession."

11 July 1974

"The Government of the United States does not find acceptable the reservations made by the German Democratic Republic to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas. The Government of the United States, however, considers those Conventions as continuing in force between it and the German Democratic Republic except that provisions to which the above-mentioned reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Eleventh Session, Supplement No. 17* (A/3572), p. 54.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 27 December 1973 with a reservation and a declaration. For the text of the reservation and the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 84. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 April 1958 and 28 January 1966, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 30 October 1958 and 31 August 1961, respectively, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 516, p. 256. See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In respect of the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherland Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands Antilles" and "Suriname" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The Secretary-General received, on 9 June 1971, a communication from the Government of Senegal denouncing this Convention as well as the Convention on the Living Resources of the High Seas, and specifying that the denunciation would take effect on the thirtieth day from its receipt. The said communication, as well as the related exchange of correspondence between the Secretariat and the Government of Senegal, was circulated by the Secretary-General to all States entitled to become parties to the Conventions concerned under their respective clauses.

The notification of denunciation was registered by the Government of Senegal as at 9 June 1971, under Nos. 7477 and 8164. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 781, p. 332.

In this connection, a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom was received by the Secretary-General on 2 January 1973, stating *inter alia*:

". . . As regards the notification by the Government of Senegal purporting to denounce the two Conventions of 1958, the Government of the United Kingdom wish to place on record that in their view those Conventions are not susceptible to unilateral denunciation by a State which is a party to them and they therefore cannot accept the validity or effectiveness of the purported denunciation by the Government of Senegal. Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom regard the Government of Senegal as still bound by the obligations which they assumed when they became a party to those Conventions and the Government of the United Kingdom fully reserve all their rights under them as well as their rights and the rights of their nationals in respect of any action which the Government of Senegal have taken or may take as a consequence of the said purported denunciation.

"As regards the various arguments that are set out in the correspondence referred to above with reference to certain other questions relating to the law of treaties, including in particular the question of the functions of the Secretary-General as a depositary of the Conventions of 1958 and the question of the duties of the Secretariat in relation to the registration of treaties and in relation to acts, notifications and communications, relating to treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom do not consider it necessary at this stage to express any view on those matters but they fully reserve their position in relation thereto and expressly reserve their right formally to make their views known at a later date.

"The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations requests that copies of this Note should be transmitted by the Secretariat to all States concerned, that is to say, all States Members of the United Nations or Members of any of the Specialised Agencies, and, since the notification by the Government of Senegal was registered by Senegal, further requests that the statement of the position of the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to that notification, as set out in the second paragraph of the present Note, should similarly be registered."

The said communication was registered in the name of the Government of the United Kingdom on 2 January 1973 under Nos. 7477 and 8164. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 854, pp. 214 and 220.

[9] On 27 October 1967, the Government of the United States of America transmitted to the Secretary-General the following communication with reference to its previous communications regarding ratifications and accessions to the Law of the Sea Conventions with reservations which were unacceptable to the United States of America:

"The Government of the United States of America has received an inquiry regarding the applicability of several of the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 between the United States and States which ratified or acceded to those Conventions with reservations which the United States found to be unacceptable. The Government of the United States wishes to state that it has considered and will continue to consider all the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 as being in force between it and all other States that have ratified or acceded thereto, including States that have ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States. With respect to States which ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States, the Conventions are considered by the United States to be in force between it and each of those States except that provisions to which such reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations. The United States considers that such application of the Convention does not in any manner constitute any concurrence by the United States in the substance of any of the reservations involved."

2. Convention on the High Seas

Geneva, 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 September 1962, in accordance with article 34.
REGISTRATION: 3 January 1963, No. 6465.
STATUS: Signatories: 46. Parties: 63.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 450, p. 11.

Note: See "Note:" in same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	28 Apr 1959
Albania		7 Dec 1964 a
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Austria	27 Oct 1958	10 Jan 1974
Belarus	30 Oct 1958	27 Feb 1961
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 a
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	31 Oct 1958	31 Aug 1962
Burkina Faso		4 Oct 1965 a
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 a
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 a
China[2]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	16 Feb 1972
Croatia[1]		3 Aug 1992 d
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Cyprus		23 May 1988 a
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 d
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France	30 Oct 1958	
Germany[4,5]	30 Oct 1958	26 Jul 1973
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Guatemala	29 Apr 1958	27 Nov 1961
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Holy See	30 Apr 1958	
Hungary	31 Oct 1958	6 Dec 1961
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Indonesia	8 May 1958	10 Aug 1961
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	6 Sep 1961
Italy		17 Dec 1964 a
Jamaica		8 Oct 1965 d
Japan		10 Jun 1968 a
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 a
Latvia		17 Nov 1992 a
Lebanon	29 May 1958	
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 d
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 a
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 a
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 a
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 d
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 a
Mongolia		15 Oct 1976 a
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	28 Dec 1962
Netherlands[7]	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Poland	31 Oct 1958	29 Jun 1962
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Romania	31 Oct 1958	12 Dec 1961
Russian Federation	30 Oct 1958	22 Nov 1960
Senegal		25 Apr 1961 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 a
Spain		25 Feb 1971 a
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Swaziland		16 Oct 1970 a
Switzerland	24 May 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 a
Ukraine	30 Oct 1958	12 Jan 1961
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	9 Sep 1958	14 Mar 1960
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	30 Oct 1958	15 Aug 1961

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALBANIA

Article 9: The Government of the People's Republic of Albania considers that, in virtue of well-known principles of international law, all Government ships owned or operated by a State, without exception, irrespective of the purpose for which they are used, are subject to the jurisdiction only of the State under whose flag they sail.

Declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of Albania declares that the definition of piracy as given in the Convention is not consistent with present international law and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on the high seas.

BELARUS

Article 9: The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration:

The Government of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

BULGARIA

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Article 9: The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration made upon signature:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

Declaration made upon ratification:

The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

CZECH REPUBLIC[3]

HUNGARY

Article 9: "The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic is of the opinion that, according to the general rules of international law, ships owned or operated by a State and used on government service whether commercial or non-commercial, enjoy on the high seas the same immunity as warships."

Declaration:

"The Government of the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the definition of piracy as given in the Convention is not consistent with present international law and does not serve the general interests of the freedom of navigation on the high seas."

INDONESIA

Reservation:

"The terms `territorial sea' and `internal waters' mentioned in the Convention, as far as the Republic of Indonesia is concerned, are interpreted in accordance with Article 1 of the Government Regulation in Lieu of an Act No. 4 of the Year 1960 (State Gazette 1960, No. 22) concerning Indonesian Waters, which, in accordance with Article 1 of the Act No. 1 of the Year 1961 (State Gazette 1961, No. 3) concerning the Enactment of All Emergency Acts and All Government Regulations in Lieu of an Act which were promulgated before January 1, 1961, has become Act, which Article word by word is as follows:

Article 1:

"1.The Indonesian Waters consist of the territorial sea and the internal waters of Indonesia.

"2.The Indonesian territorial sea is a maritime belt of a width of twelve nautical miles, the outer limit of which is measured perpendicular to the baselines or points on the baselines which consist of straight lines connecting the outermost point on the low water mark of the outermost islands or part of such islands comprising Indonesian territory with the provision that in case of straits of a width of not more than twenty-four nautical miles and Indonesia is not the only coastal state the outer limit of the Indonesian territorial sea shall be drawn at the middle of the strait.

"3.The Indonesian internal waters are all waters lying within the baselines mentioned in paragraph 2.

"4.One nautical mile is sixty to one degree of latitude."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Reservations:

Article 2: With respect to the words "no State may validly purport to subject any part of them to its sovereignty", it shall be understood that this prohibition does not apply to the continental shelf, which is governed by article 2 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf.

Articles 2, 3 and 4: The Iranian Government maintains the objection on the ground of excess of competence, expressed by its delegation at the twelfth plenary meeting of the Conference on the Law of the Sea on 24 April 1958, to the articles recommended by the Fifth Committee of the Conference and incorporated in the afore-mentioned articles of the Convention on the High Seas. The Iranian Government accordingly reserves all rights regarding the contents of these articles in so far as they relate to countries having no sea coast.

Article 2(3)–article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2: Application of the provisions of these articles relating to the laying of submarine cables and pipelines shall be subject to the authorization of the coastal State, in so far as the continental shelf is concerned.

MEXICO

Article 9: The Government of Mexico enters an express reservation with regard to article 9, since it considers that government ships, irrespective of the use to which they are put, enjoy immunity; it therefore does not accept the limitation imposed in the article in question, which provides that only ships owned or

operated by a State and used only on government non-commercial service shall have immunity from the jurisdiction of other States on the high seas.

MONGOLIA[8]

a) . . .

b) Subject to the following declaration in respect of article 15:

The Government of the Mongolian People's Republic considers that the definition of piracy given in article 15 of the Convention does not cover acts which under contemporary international law should be regarded as acts of piracy and thus does not adequately reflect the requirements that must be fulfilled in order to fully ensure freedom of navigation on international waterways.

POLAND

Article 9: "The Government of the Polish People's Republic considers that the rule expressed in article 9 applies to all ships owned or operated by a State."

Declaration:

"The Government of the Polish People's Republic considers that the definition of piracy as contained in the Convention does not fully correspond with the present state of international law in this respect."

ROMANIA

Article 9: The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies to all government ships regardless of the purpose for which they are used.

Declaration:

The Government of the Romanian People's Republic considers that the definition of piracy as given in article 15 of the Convention on the High Seas does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Article 9: The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration:

The Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

SLOVAKIA[3]

SPAIN

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

UKRAINE

Article 9: The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the principle of international law according to which a ship on the high seas is not subject to any jurisdiction except that of the flag State applies without restriction to all government ships.

Declaration:

The Government of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the definition of piracy given in the Convention does not cover certain acts which under contemporary international law should be considered as acts of piracy and does not serve to ensure freedom of navigation on international sea routes.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"In depositing their instrument of ratification Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and North ern Ireland declare that, save as may be stated in any further and separate notices that may hereafter be given, ratification of this Convention on behalf of the United Kingdom does not extend to the States in the Persian Gulf enjoying British protection. Multilateral conventions to which the United Kingdom becomes a party are not extended to these States until such time as an extension is requested by the Ruler of the State concerned."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA

"*Objections to the reservations hereunder:*

(a) The reservation made to articles 2, 3 and 4 by Iran on signature.

(b) The reservation made to paragraph 3 of article 2 and to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 26 by Iran on signature.

(c) The reservation made to article 9 by Bulgaria on signature and on ratification.

(d) The reservations made to article 9 by the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on signature and confirmed on ratification.

(e) The reservation made by Indonesia on ratification.

In relation to the reservation made by Indonesia [...] the Australian Government has previously informed the Indonesian Government that it does not recognize the validity in international law of the Regulation referred to in the reservation and that it does not consider itself bound by it."

1 February 1965

"Objection of the Government of Australia to the reservation contained in the instrument of accession by Albania to the

Convention on the High Seas done at Geneva on 29 April 1958."

31 January 1968

"The Government of Australia places on record the formal objection to the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

29 September 1976

"Objection of the Australian Government to the reservation by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas, 1958, and contained in the instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic to that Convention."

DENMARK

"The Government of Denmark declares that it does not find acceptable:

"The reservations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 9;

"The reservation made by the Government of Iran to article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2:

"The reservation made by the Government of Indonesia regarding the interpretation of the terms `territorial sea' and `internal waters';

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Convention, according to article 34, as between Denmark and the Contracting Parties concerned."

31 October 1974

"The Government of Denmark does not find acceptable the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic on December 27, 1973 to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone.

"The Government of Denmark also finds unacceptable the reservation made by the German Democratic Republic on the same date to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas.

"The above-mentioned objections shall not affect the coming into force of the Conventions as between Denmark and the German Democratic Republic."

FIJI

"The Government of Fiji declares that it withdraws the observations made by the United Kingdom with respect to the reservation made on ratification of the Convention by the Government of Indonesia and substitutes therefore the following observation:

"With respect to the reservation made by the Government of Indonesia on ratification of the above-mentioned Convention on the High Seas, the Government of Fiji states that it considers that the extent of Indonesian national waters referred to therein is subject to the rule of international law that, where the establishment of a straight baseline has the effect of enclosing as internal waters areas which previously had been considered as part of the high seas, a right of innocent passage shall exist in those waters, subject to the regulations of the national authorities respecting police, customs, quarantine and control of pollution, and without prejudice to the exclusive right of such authorities in respect of the exploration and exploitation of the natural resources of such waters and of the subjacent seabed and subsoil.

"Furthermore, the Government of Fiji maintains all other objections communicated to the Secretary-General by the United Kingdom Government to the reservations or declarations made by certain States with respect to this Convention, reserving only its position on that Government's observations bearing on the application of the Optional Protocol of Signature pending final disposition of the question of the succession by the Government of Fiji to the said Protocol."

GERMANY[4]

15 July 1974

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the following reservations to be inconsistent with the aims and purposes of the Convention of 29 April 1958 on the High Seas and therefore to be unacceptable:

"1. The reservation made to the Convention by the Government of Indonesia;

"2. The reservation declared at signature of the Convention by the Government of Iran to articles 2, 3 and 4 and to article 2, item 3, in conjunction with article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention, the latter in so far as that reservation is to open up the possibility of refusing permission to lay submarine cables and pipelines even where certain conditions have been fulfilled;

"3. The reservations and the declarations to be qualified in substance as reservations made to article 9 of the Convention by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Mexico, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

"4. The declarations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia and Hungary to the definition of piracy as given in the Convention in so far as the said declarations are to be qualified as reservations.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany furthermore considers the reservation made on 27 December 1973 by the German Democratic Republic to article 9 of the Convention to be inconsistent with the aims and purposes of the Convention and therefore to be unacceptable.

"This also applies to the declaration made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic on the same date to the definition of piracy as given in the Convention in so far as that declaration is to be qualified as a reservation. "The present declaration does not affect the applicability, in all other respects, of the Convention under international law as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Parties to the Convention having made the reservations and declarations referred to above."

2 March 1977

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the reservation made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic to article 9 of the Convention of 29 April 1958 on the High Seas as well as the declaration made by the Government of the Mongolian People's Republic to article 15 of that Convention, in so far as the latter is in substance to be qualified as a reservation, to be inconsistent with the aims and purposes of the Convention and therefore unacceptable.

"The present declaration does not affect the applicability, in all other respects, of the Convention under international law as between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Mongolian People's Republic."

ISRAEL

"Objection to all reservations and declarations made in connection with the signing or ratification of or accession to the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and the Convention on the High Seas which are incompatible with the purposes and objects of these Conventions. This objection applies in particular to the declaration or reservation made by Tunisia to article 16, paragraph 4, of the first of the above-mentioned Conventions on the occasion of signature."

JAPAN

"1. The Government of Japan wishes to state that it does not consider acceptable any unilateral statement in whatever form, made by a State upon signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention on the High Seas, which is intended to exclude or modify for such State legal effects of the provisions of the Convention.

"2. In particular, the Government of Japan finds unacceptable the following reservations:

"(a) The reservations made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary. Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 9.

"(b) The reservations made by the Government of Iran to article 2 and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"The reservations made by the Government of Indonesia.

"The reservation made by the Government of Albania to article 9 in its instrument of accession.

"The reservation made by the Government of Mexico to article 9 in its instrument of accession."

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Republic formally expresses its objection to all reservations and statements made in connexion with signature or ratification of the Convention on the High Seas or in connexion with accession to the said Convention which are inconsistent with the aims and purposes of this Convention.

This objection applies in particular to the statements or reservations made with regard to the Convention on the High Seas by Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Indonesia, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

NETHERLANDS

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands declare that they do not find acceptable

"the reservations to article 9 made by the Governments of Albania. Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics;

"the declarations made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the definition of piracy given in the Convention, as far as these declarations amount to a reservation:

"the reservations made by the Iranian Government to articles 2, 3 and 4, and

"to articles 2, paragraph 3, and 26, paragraphs 1 and 2;

"the declaration made by the Government of Iran on article 2 as far as it amounts to a reservation to the said article;

"the reservation made by the Government of Indonesia."

17 March 1967

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands do not find acceptable the reservation made by the Government of Mexico."

PORTUGAL

27 December 1966

"The Government of Portugal cannot accept the reservation proposed by the Mexican Government requiring the exemption of government ships from the dispositions laid down in the Convention, irrespective of the use to which these ships are put."

THAILAND

Objection to the following reservations and declarations:

"Reservations to article 9 made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Mexico, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR;

"Declarations to article 15 made by the Governments of Albania, Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the USSR;

"Reservation made by the Government of Indonesia."

TONGA

"The Government of the Kingdom of Tonga withdraws the observations made by the United Kingdom with respect to the reservation made on ratification of the Convention by the Government of Indonesia and substitute therefore the following observation:

"With respect to the reservation made by the Government of Indonesia on ratification of the above-mentioned Convention on the High Seas, the Government of Tonga states that it considers that the extent of Indonesian national waters referred to therein is subject to the rule of international law that, where the establishment of a straight baseline has the effect of enclosing as internal waters areas which previously had been considered as part of the high seas, a right of innocent passage shall exist in those waters, subject to the regulations of the national authorities respecting police, customs, quarantine and control of pollution, and without prejudice to the exclusive right of such authorities in respect of the exploration and exploitation of the natural resources of such waters and of the subjacent seabed and subsoil."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

6 November 1959

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objections to the following reservations and declarations:

"The reservations to article 9, made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR, and the USSR.

"The reservations to articles 2, 3 and 4, and article 2(3) made by the Iranian Government."

5 April 1962

"Objection to the reservation made on ratification by the Government of Indonesia.

Her Majesty's Government have already stated to the Indonesian Government that they cannot regard as valid under international law the provisions of 'Government Regulation No. 4, 1960, in lieu of an Act concerning Indonesian Waters' to the extent that these provisions embody a claim to territorial waters extending to 12 miles or purport to demarcate territorial waters by the drawing of straight base lines between the outermost islands, or points, of a group of islands or purport to treat as internal waters all waters enclosed by those lines."

17 June 1965

"Objection to the reservation to article 9 contained in the Albanian instrument of accession to the Convention."

2 November 1966

"Objection to the reservation to article 9 contained in the Mexican instrument of accession."

13 May 1975

"Her Majesty's Government desire to place on record their formal objection to the reservations by the German Democratic Republic concerning article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas." (*In this connection, the Government of the United King-*

dom indicated that they had not received the depositary notification reproducing the text of the reservations made by the Government of the German Democratic Republic until early in August 1974.)

10 January 1977

"The views of the United Kingdom Government regarding reservations and declarations made in connection with this Convention were set out in the letter of the 5th of November 1959 from the Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

"The United Kingdom Government now desire to place on record their formal objection to the reservation by the Government of Mongolia concerning article 9 of this Convention."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[9]

19 September 1962

"The United States does not find the following reservations acceptable:

"1.The reservations to article 9 made by the Governments of Bulgaria, the Byelorussian SSR, Czechoslovakia, Hungary, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.

"2. The reservations made by the Iranian Government to articles 2, 3, and 4 and article 26, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"3. The reservation made by the Government of Indonesia."

19 August 1965

"The reservation to article 9 made by the Government of Albania in its instrument of accession."

28 September 1966

"The reservation made by the Government of Mexico in its instrument of accession."

11 July 1974

"The Government of the United States does not find acceptable the reservations made by the German Democratic Republic to article 20 of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone and to article 9 of the Convention on the High Seas. The Government of the United States, however, considers those Conventions as continuing in force between it and the German Democratic Republic except that provisions to which the above-mentioned reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 April 1958 and 28 January 1966, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China, on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified on 30 October 1958 and 31 August 1961, respectively, with reservations. For the text of the reservations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 450, p. 142. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 27 December 1973 with a reservation and declarations. For the text of the reservation and declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 80. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In respect of the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherland Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands Antilles" and "Suriname" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession concerning article 9. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1025, p. 370.

[9] On 27 October 1967, the Government of the United States of America transmitted to the Secretary-General the following communication with reference to its previous communications regarding ratifications and accessions to the Law of the Sea Conventions with reservations which were unacceptable to the United States of America:

"The Government of the United States of America has received an inquiry regarding the applicability of several of the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 between the United States and States which ratified or acceded to those Conventions with reservations which the United States found to be unacceptable. The Government of the United States wishes to state that it has considered and will continue to consider all the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 as being in force between it and all other States that have ratified or acceded thereto, including States that have ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States. With respect to States which ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States, the Conventions are considered by the United States to be in force between it and each of those States except that provisions to which such reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations. The United States considers that such application of the Convention does not in any manner constitute any concurrence by the United States in the substance of any of the reservations involved."

3. Convention on Fishing and Conservation of the Living Resources of the High Seas

Geneva, 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 March 1966, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 20 March 1966, No. 8164.
STATUS: Signatories: 35. Parties: 38.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 559, p. 285.
Note: See "Note:" in the same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 a
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		12 Jan 1994 d
Burkina Faso		4 Oct 1965 a
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 a
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
China[2]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	3 Jan 1963
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 d
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France	30 Oct 1958	18 Sep 1970
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Indonesia	8 May 1958	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	
Jamaica		16 Apr 1964 d
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 a
Lebanon	29 May 1958	
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 d
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 a
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 a
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 a
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 d
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 a
Montenegro[3]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	
Netherlands[4]	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	
Nigeria		26 Jun 1961 d
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Senegal[5]		25 Apr 1961 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		13 Mar 1962 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 a
Spain		25 Feb 1971 a
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Switzerland	22 Oct 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Apr 1966 d
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	9 Sep 1958	14 Mar 1960
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	30 Oct 1958	10 Jul 1963

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Denmark

Denmark does not consider itself bound by the last sentence of article 2 of the Convention.

Spain

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

"In depositing their instrument of ratification . . . Her Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that, save as may be stated in any fur-

ther and separate notices that may hereafter be given, ratification of this Convention on behalf of the United Kingdom does not extend to the States in the Persian Gulf enjoying British protection. Multilateral conventions to which the United Kingdom becomes a party are not extended to these States until such time as an extension is requested by the Ruler of the State concerned."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Subject to the understanding that such ratification shall not be construed to impair the applicability of the principle of 'abstention', as defined in paragraph A.1 of the documents of record in the proceedings of the Conference [on the Law of the Sea, held at Geneva from 24 February to 27 April 1958], identified as A/CONF.13/ C.3/L.69, 8 April 1958."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 April 1958 and 28 January 1966, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In respect of the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherland Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands Antilles" and "Suriname" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The Secretary-General received, on 9 June 1971, a communication from the Government of Senegal denouncing this Convention on the High Sees as well as the Convention on the Living Resources of the High Seas, and specifying that the denunciation would take effect on the thirtieth day from its receipt. The said communication, as well as the related exchange of correspondence between the Secretariat and the Govern- ment of Senegal, was circulated by the Secretary-General to all States entitled to become parties to the Conventions concerned under their respective clauses.

The notification of denunciation was registered by the Government of Senegal as at 9 June 1971, under Nos. 7477 and 8164. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 781, p. 332.

In this connection, a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom was received by the Secretary-General on 2 January 1973, stating *inter alia*:

". . . As regards the notification by the Government of Senegal purporting to denounce the two Conventions of 1958, the Government of the United Kingdom wish to place on record that in their view those Conventions are not susceptible to unilateral denunciation by a State which is a party to them and they therefore cannot accept the validity or effectiveness of the purported denunciation by the Government of Senegal. Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom regard the Government of Senegal as still bound by the obligations which they assumed when they became a party to those Conventions and the Government of the United Kingdom fully reserve all their rights under them as well as their rights and the rights of their nationals in respect of any action which the Government of Senegal have taken or may take as a consequence of the said purported denunciation.

"As regards the various arguments that are set out in the correspondence referred to above with reference to certain other questions relating to the law of treaties, including in particular the question of the functions of the Secretary-General as a depositary of the Conventions of 1958 and the question of the duties of the Secretariat in relation to the registration of treaties and in relation to acts, notifications and communications, relating to treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom do not consider it necessary at this stage to express any view on those matters but they fully reserve their position in relation thereto and expressly reserve their right formally to make their views known at a later date.

"The Permanent Representative of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the United Nations requests that copies of this Note should be transmitted by the Secretariat to all States concerned, that is to say, all States Members of the United Nations or Members of any of the Specialised Agencies, and, since the notification by the Government of Senegal was registered by Senegal, further requests that the statement of the position of the Government of the United Kingdom in relation to that notification, as set out in the second paragraph of the present Note, should similarly be registered."

The said communication was registered in the name of the Government of the United Kingdom on 2 January 1973 under Nos. 7477 and 8164. See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 854, pp. 214 and 220.

4. Convention on the Continental Shelf

Geneva, 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 June 1964, in accordance with article 11.

REGISTRATION: 10 June 1964, No. 7302.

STATUS: Signatories: 43. Parties: 58.

TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 499, p. 311.

Note: See "Note:" in the same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	30 Oct 1958	
Albania		7 Dec 1964 a
Argentina	29 Apr 1958	
Australia	30 Oct 1958	14 May 1963
Belarus	31 Oct 1958	27 Feb 1961
Bolivia	17 Oct 1958	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		12 Jan 1994 d
Bulgaria		31 Aug 1962 a
Cambodia		18 Mar 1960 a
Canada	29 Apr 1958	6 Feb 1970
Chile	31 Oct 1958	
China[2]		
Colombia	29 Apr 1958	8 Jan 1962
Costa Rica	29 Apr 1958	16 Feb 1972
Croatia[1]		3 Aug 1992 d
Cuba	29 Apr 1958	
Cyprus		11 Apr 1974 a
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	12 Jun 1963
Dominican Republic	29 Apr 1958	11 Aug 1964
Ecuador	31 Oct 1958	
Fiji		25 Mar 1971 d
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France		14 Jun 1965 a
Germany[4]	30 Oct 1958	
Ghana	29 Apr 1958	
Greece		6 Nov 1972 a
Guatemala	29 Apr 1958	27 Nov 1961
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Iceland	29 Apr 1958	
Indonesia	8 May 1958	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	28 May 1958	
Ireland	2 Oct 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	6 Sep 1961
Jamaica		8 Oct 1965 a
Kenya		20 Jun 1969 a
Latvia		2 Dec 1992 a
Lebanon	29 May 1958	
Lesotho		23 Oct 1973 d
Liberia	27 May 1958	
Madagascar		31 Jul 1962 a
Malawi		3 Nov 1965 a
Malaysia		21 Dec 1960 a
Malta		19 May 1966 d
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 d
Mexico		2 Aug 1966 a
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nepal	29 Apr 1958	
Netherlands[6]	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand	29 Oct 1958	18 Jan 1965
Nigeria		28 Apr 1971 a
Norway		9 Sep 1971 a
Pakistan	31 Oct 1958	
Panama	2 May 1958	
Peru	31 Oct 1958	
Poland	31 Oct 1958	29 Jun 1962
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Romania		12 Dec 1961 a
Russian Federation	31 Oct 1958	22 Nov 1960
Senegal[7]		25 Apr 1961 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		25 Nov 1966 a
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa		9 Apr 1963 a
Spain		25 Feb 1971 a
Sri Lanka	30 Oct 1958	
Swaziland		16 Oct 1970 a
Sweden		1 Jun 1966 a
Switzerland	22 Oct 1958	18 May 1966
Thailand	29 Apr 1958	2 Jul 1968
Tonga		29 Jun 1971 d
Trinidad and Tobago		11 Jul 1968 a
Tunisia	30 Oct 1958	
Uganda		14 Sep 1964 a
Ukraine	31 Oct 1958	12 Jan 1961
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	9 Sep 1958	11 May 1964
United States of America	15 Sep 1958	12 Apr 1961
Uruguay	29 Apr 1958	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	30 Oct 1958	15 Aug 1961

CANADA

"The Government of Canada wishes to make the following declaration with respect to article 1 of the Convention:

"In the view of the Canadian Government the presence of an accidental feature such as a depression or a channel in a submerged area should not be regarded as constituting an interruption in the natural prolongation of the land territory of the coastal state into and under the sea."

CHINA

"With regard to the determination of the boundary of the continental shelf as provided in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 6 of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of China considers:

(1) that the boundary of the continental shelf appertaining to two or more States whose coasts are adjacent to and/or opposite each other shall be determined in accordance with the principle of the natural prolongation of their land territories; and

(2) that in determining the boundary of the continental shelf of the Republic of China, exposed rocks and islets shall not be taken into account."

FRANCE

In depositing this instrument of accession, the Government of the French Republic declares:

Article 1

In the view of the Government of the French Republic, the expression "adjacent" areas implies a notion of geophysical, geological and geographical dependence which *ipso facto* rules out an unlimited extension of the continental shelf.

Article 2 (paragraph 4)

The Government of the French Republic considers that the expression "living organisms belonging to sedentary species" must be interpreted as excluding crustaceans, with the exception of the species of crab termed "barnacle"; and it makes the following reservations:

Article 4

The Government of the French Republic accepts this article only on condition that the coastal State claiming that the measures it intends to take are "reasonable" agrees that if their reasonableness is contested it shall be determined by arbitration.

Article 5 (paragraph 1)

The Government of the French Republic accepts the provisions of article 5, paragraph 1, with the following reservations:

(a) An essential element which should serve as the basis for appreciating any "interference" with the conservation of the living resources of the sea, resulting from the exploitation of the continental shelf, particularly in breeding areas for maintenance of stocks, shall be the technical report of the international scientific bodies responsible for the conservation of the living resources of the sea in the areas specified respectively in article 1 of the Convention for the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries of 8 February 1949 and article 1 of the Convention for the Northeast Atlantic Fisheries of 24 January 1959.

(b) Any restrictions placed on the exercise of acquired fishing rights in waters above the continental shelf shall give rise to a right to compensation.

(c) It must be possible to establish by means of arbitration, if the matter is contested, whether the exploration of the continental shelf and the exploitation of its natural resources result in an interference with the other activities protected by article 5, paragraph 1, which is "unjustifiable".

Article 6 (paragraphs 1 and 2)

In the absence of a specific agreement, the Government of the French Republic will not accept that any boundary of the continental shelf determined by application of the principle of equidistance shall be invoked against it:

-- if such boundary is calculated from baselines established after 29 April 1958;

-- if it extends beyond the 200-metre isobath;

-- if it lies in areas where, in the Government's opinion, there are "special circumstances" within the meaning of article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, that is to say: the Bay of Biscay, the Bay of Granville, and the sea areas of the Straits of Dover and of the North Sea off the French coast.

GERMANY[4]

"In signing the Convention on the Continental Shelf of 29 April 1958, the Federal Republic of Germany declares with reference to article 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf that in the opinion of the Federal Government article 5, paragraph 1 guarantees the exercise of fishing rights (*Fischerei*) in the waters above the continental shelf in the manner hitherto generally in practice."

GREECE

. . . Pursuant to article 12 of the Convention, the Kingdom of Greece makes a reservation with respect to the system of delimiting the boundaries of the continental shelf appertaining to States whose coasts are adjacent or opposite each other, provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention. In such cases, the Kingdom of Greece will apply, in the absence of international agreement, the normal baseline system for the purpose of measuring the breadth of the territorial sea.

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature

Reservations:

(a) *Article 4:* With respect to the phrase "the Coastal State may not impede the laying or maintenance of submarine cables or pipe-lines on the continental shelf", the Iranian Government reserves its right to allow or not to allow the laying or maintenance of submarine cables or pipe-lines on its continental shelf.

(b) *Article 6:* With respect to the phrase "and unless another boundary line is justified by special circumstances" included in paragraphs 1 and 2 of this article, the Iranian Government accepts this phrase on the understanding that one method of determining the boundary line in special circumstances would be that of measurement from the high water mark."

MONTENEGRO[5]

Confirmed upon succession:

Reservation in respect of article 6 of the Convention:

In determining its continental shelf, Yugoslavia recognizes no "special circumstances" which should influence that delimitation.

SERBIA[1]

Confirmed upon succession:

Reservation in respect of article 6 of the Convention:

In determining its continental shelf, Yugoslavia recognizes no "special circumstances" which should influence that delimitation.

SPAIN

Spain's accession is not to be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations in connexion with the waters of Gibraltar other than those referred to in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht, of 13 July 1713, between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain.

Spain also declares, in connexion with article 1 of the Convention, that the existence of any accident of the surface, such as a depression or a channel, in a submerged zone shall not be deemed to constitute an interruption of the natural extension of the coastal territory into or under the sea.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

In signing the present Convention, the Republic of Venezuela declares with reference to article 6 that there are special circumstances to be taken into consideration in the following areas: the Gulf of Paria, in so far as the boundary is not determined by existing agreements, and in zones adjacent thereto; the area between the coast of Venezuela and the island of Aruba; and the Gulf of Venezuela.

Reservation made upon ratification: . . . with express reservation in respect of article 6 of the said Convention.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

CANADA

"The Government of Canada wishes to declare as follows:

"(i) That it does not find acceptable the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany with respect to article 5, paragraph 1.

"(ii) That it reserves its position concerning the declaration of the Government of the French Republic with respect to article 1 and article 2, paragraph 4; and further that it does not find acceptable the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic to articles 4, and 5, paragraph 1.

"(iii) That it does not find acceptable the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic to article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, insofar as that reservation relates to a boundary calculated from baselines established after 29 April 1958 or to a boundary extending beyond the 200 metre isobath.

"(iv) That it reserves its position concerning the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic to article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, insofar as that reservation relates to a boundary in areas where there are `special circumstances' within the meaning of article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"(v) That it does not find acceptable the reservation made by the Iranian Government to article 4."

FIJI

[As under the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, see chapter XXI.1.]

FRANCE

The Government of the French Republic does not accept the reservations made by the Government of Iran with respect to article 4 of the Convention.

NETHERLANDS

Objections to:

"the reservations made by the Iranian Government to article 4;

"the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic to articles 5, paragraph 1, and 6, paragraphs 1 and 2.

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserve all rights regarding the reservations in respect of article 6 made by the Government of Venezuela when ratifying the present Convention."

MONTENEGRO[5]

Confirmed upon succession:

"The Government of Yugoslavia does not accept the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic with respect to article 6 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf."

NORWAY

"In depositing their instrument of accession regarding the said Convention, the Government of Norway declare that they do not find acceptable the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic to article 5, paragraph 1, and to article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2."

SERBIA[1]

Confirmed upon succession:

"The Government of Yugoslavia does not accept the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic with respect to article 6 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf."

SPAIN

Spain declares the following:

1. That it reserves its position with respect to the declaration made by the Government of the French Republic in connexion with article 1;

2. That it deems unacceptable the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic to article 6, paragraph 2, especially as concerns the Bay of Biscay.

THAILAND

On depositing the instrument of ratification, the Government of Thailand made objections to "the reservations to articles 1, 4, 5 (paragraph 1) and 6 (paragraphs 1 and 2) made by the Government of France."

TONGA[8]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

14 January 1966

"*Article 1:* The Government of the United Kingdom take note of the declaration made by the Government of the French Republic and reserve their position concerning it.

"*Article 2 (paragraph 4):* This declaration does not call for any observations on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom.

"*Article 4:* The Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the French Republic are both parties to the Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes done at Geneva on the 29th of April, 1958. The Government of the United Kingdom assume that the declaration made by the Government of the French Republic is not intended to derogate from the rights and obligations of the parties to the Optional Protocol.

"*Article 5 (paragraph 1):* Reservation (a) does not call for any observations on the part of the Government of the United Kingdom.

"The Government of the United Kingdom are unable to accept reservation *(b)*.

"The Government of the United Kingdom are prepared to accept reservation *(c)* on the understanding that it is not intended to derogate from the rights and obligations of parties to the Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes.

"*Article 6 (paragraphs 1 and 2):* The Government of the United Kingdom are unable to accept the reservations made by the Government of the French Republic."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA[9]

19 September 1962

"The United States does not find the following reservations acceptable:

"1. The reservation made by the Iranian Government to article 4.

"2. The reservation made by the Federal Republic of Germany to article 5, paragraph 1."

9 September 1965

"The reservations [made by France] to articles 4, 5 and 6. The declarations by France with respect to articles 1 and 2 are noted without prejudice."

16 July 1970

"The Government of the United States does not find acceptable the declaration made by the Government of Canada with respect to article 1 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf. The United States considers that Convention to be in force and applicable between it and Canada, but that such application does not in any manner constitute any concurrence by the United States in the substance of the declaration made by Canada with respect to article 1 of that Convention."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 April 1958 and 28 January 1966, respectively, with the following reservation:

Reservation in respect of article 6 of the Convention:

In determining its continental shelf, Yugoslavia recognizes no "special circumstances" which should influence that delimitation.

On 29 September 1965, the Government of the former Yugoslavia had communicated the following objection:

"The Government of Yugoslavia does not accept the reservation made by the Government of the French Republic with respect to article 6 of the Convention on the Continental Shelf."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Signed and ratified on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958 and 12 October 1970, respectively. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

In communications addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned ratification, the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Poland, Romania, the Ukrainian SSR and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the said ratification was illegal since the so-called "Government of China" represented no one and did not have the right to speak on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State in the world, the People's Republic of China, and one Government entitled to represent it, the Government of the People's Republic of China.

In letters addressed to the Secretary-General concerning the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated the following:

"The Republic of China, a sovereign state and member of the United Nations, attended the first United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in 1958, contributed to the formulation of the Convention on the Continental Shelf, signed the said Convention on 29 April 1958 and duly deposited its instrument of ratification with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 12 October 1970. Any statement relating to the said Convention that is incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China under the said Convention."

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 October 1958 and 31 August 1961, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with a declaration on 27 December 1973. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 905, p. 82. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] In respect of the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherland Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands Antilles" and "Suriname" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The Secretary-General received on 1 March 1976, a communication from the Government of Senegal denouncing this Convention and specifying that the denunciation would take effect on the thirtieth day from its receipt, i.e., on 30 March 1976. The said communication was circulated by the Secretary-General to all States entitled to become parties to the Convention under its respective clauses.

The notification of denunciation was registered by the Government of Senegal on 1 March 1976 under No. 7302. (See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 997, p. 486).

In this connection, a communication from the Government of the United Kingdom was received by the Secretary-General on 1 September 1976 and registered on that same date under No. 7302.

(See United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1021, p. 433). The content of this communication is, in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, identical to the first paragraph of the communication by the Government of the United Kingdom reproduced in note 5 in chapter XXI.1.

[8] The Secretary-General received on 22 October 1971, a communication from the Government of Tonga to the effect that the latter wishes to maintain all objections made by the United Kingdom to the reservations or declarations made by States with respect to this Convention.

[9] On 27 October 1967, the Government of the United States of America transmitted to the Secretary-General the following communication with reference to its previous communications regarding ratifications and accessions to the Law of the Sea Conventions with reservations which were unacceptable to the United States of America:

"The Government of the United States of America has received an inquiry regarding the applicability of several of the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 between the United States and States which ratified or acceded to those Conventions with reservations which the United States found to be unacceptable. The Government of the United States wishes to state that it has considered and will continue to consider all the Geneva Law of the Sea Conventions of 1958 as being in force between it and all other States that have ratified or acceded thereto, including States that have ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States. With respect to States which ratified or acceded with reservations unacceptable to the United States, the Conventions are considered by the United States to be in force between it and each of those States except that provisions to which such reservations are addressed shall apply only to the extent that they are not affected by those reservations. The United States considers that such application of the Convention does not in any manner constitute any concurrence by the United States in the substance of any of the reservations involved."

5. Optional Protocol of Signature concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes

Geneva, 29 April 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 September 1962.
REGISTRATION: 3 January 1963, No. 6466.
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 38.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 450, p. 169.

Note: See Note" in the same place in chapter XXI.1.

Participant[1]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Definitive signature (s), Succession (d)*
Australia		14 May 1963 s
Austria	27 Oct 1958	
Belgium		6 Jan 1972 s
Bolivia		17 Oct 1958 s
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		12 Jan 1994 d
Cambodia	22 Jan 1970	
Canada	29 Apr 1958	
China[3]		
Colombia[4]		29 Apr 1958 s
Costa Rica		29 Apr 1958 s
Cuba		29 Apr 1958 s
Denmark	29 Apr 1958	26 Sep 1968
Dominican Republic		29 Apr 1958 s
Finland	27 Oct 1958	16 Feb 1965
France		30 Oct 1958 s
Germany[5,6]	30 Oct 1958	26 Jul 1973
Ghana		29 Apr 1958 s
Haiti	29 Apr 1958	29 Mar 1960
Holy See		30 Apr 1958 s
Hungary		8 Dec 1989 s
Indonesia[7]	8 May 1958	
Israel	29 Apr 1958	
Liberia		27 May 1958 s
Madagascar		10 Aug 1962 s
Malawi		17 Dec 1965 s
Malaysia		1 May 1961 s
Malta		19 May 1966 d
Mauritius		5 Oct 1970 d
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Nepal		29 Apr 1958 s
Netherlands[9]	31 Oct 1958	18 Feb 1966
New Zealand		29 Oct 1958 s
Pakistan		6 Nov 1958 s
Panama		2 May 1958 s
Portugal	28 Oct 1958	8 Jan 1963
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Sierra Leone		14 Feb 1963 s
Solomon Islands		3 Sep 1981 d
Sri Lanka		30 Oct 1958 s
Sweden	1 Jun 1966	28 Jun 1966
Switzerland	24 May 1958	18 May 1966
Uganda		15 Sep 1964 s
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		9 Sep 1958 s
United States of America[10]	15 Sep 1958	
Uruguay		29 Apr 1958 s

Notes:

[1] Article V of the Protocol provides that the latter "shall remain open for signature by all States who become Parties to any Convention on the Law of the Sea and is subject to ratification, where necessary, according to the constitutional requirements of the signatory States". Consequently, the signatures listed above appear in the second or third column according to whether they have been affixed subject or not to ratification.

The States listed herein are bound by this Protocol to the extent that they have signed it definitively, ratified it or succeeded to it, and that they are bound by one at least of the four Law of the Sea Conventions.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Optional Protocol on 29 April 1958 and 28 January 1966, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Signature affixed without reservation as to ratification on behalf of the Republic of China on 29 April 1958. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

[4] In signing the Optional Protocol, the delegation of Colombia reserved the obligations of Colombia arising out of conventions concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes which Colombia has ratified and out of any previous conventions concerning the same subject which Colombia may ratify.

[5] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In a communication received on 24 December 1958, the Government of Indonesia informed the Secretary-General that according to the constitutional requirements of Indonesia, the signature affixed on its behalf to this Protocol is subject to ratification.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] In respect of the Kingdom in Europe, Surinam and the Netherland Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands Antilles" and "Suri-

name" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] In a communication received on 10 June 1963, the Government of the United States of America informed the Secretary-General that the Protocol "will not enter into force with respect to the United States until the Protocol has been ratified on the part of the United States and instrument of ratification has been deposited".

6. United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea

Montego Bay, 10 December 1982

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 November 1994, in accordance with article 308 (1).
REGISTRATION: 16 November 1994, No. 31363.
STATUS: Signatories: 157. Parties: 152.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1833, p. 3; depositary notifications C.N.236.1984.TREATIES-7 of 5 October 1984 (procès-verbal of rectification of the English and Spanish authentic texts); C.N.202.1985.TREATIES-17 of 23 August 1985 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English text); C.N.17.1986.TREATIES-1 of 7 April 1986 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Spanish texts of the Final Act); C.N.166.1993.TREATIES-4 of 9 August 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Arabic, Chinese, English, French and Spanish texts of the Final Act); and vol. 1904, p. 320 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original French text); C.N.694.2005.TREATIES-5 of 7 September 2005 (Proposal of correction to Article 5 of Annex II of the of the authentic Spanish text of the Convention) and C.N.1023.2005.TREATIES-7 of 7 October 2005 [procès-verbal of rectification of the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)].

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and opened for signature, together with the Final Act of the Conference, at Montego Bay, Jamaica, on 10 December 1982. The Conference was convened pursuant to resolution 3067 (XXVIII)[1] adopted by the General Assembly on 16 November 1973. The Conference held eleven sessions, from 1973 to 1982, as follows:

-First session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 3 to 15 December 1973;
-Second session: Parque Central, Caracas, 20 June to 29 August 1974;
-Third session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 17 March to 9 May 1975;
-Fourth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 15 March to 7 May 1976;
-Fifth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 2 August to 17 September 1976;
-Sixth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 23 May to 15 July 1977;
-Seventh session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 28 March to 19 May 1978;
-Resumed seventh session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 21 August to 15 September 1978;
-Eighth session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 19 March to 27 April 1979;
-Resumed eighth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 19 July to 24 August 1979;
-Ninth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 3 March to 4 April 1980;
-Resumed ninth session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 28 July to 29 August 1980;
-Tenth session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 9 March to 24 April 1981;
-Resumed tenth session: United Nations Office at Geneva, 3 to 28 August 1981;
-Eleventh session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 8 March to 30 April 1982;
-Resumed eleventh session: United Nations Headquarters, New York, 22 to 24 September 1982;
-Final Part of the eleventh session: Montego Bay, Jamaica, 6 to 10 December 1982.

The Conference also adopted a Final Act [2]

with, annexed thereto, nine resolutions and a statement of understanding. The text of the Final Act has been reproduced as document A/CONF.62/121 and Corr. 1 to 8.

Participant[3]	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Formal confirmation (c), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	18 Mar 1983	
Albania		23 Jun 2003 a
Algeria	10 Dec 1982	11 Jun 1996
Angola	10 Dec 1982	5 Dec 1990
Antigua and Barbuda	7 Feb 1983	2 Feb 1989
Argentina	5 Oct 1984	1 Dec 1995
Armenia		9 Dec 2002 a
Australia	10 Dec 1982	5 Oct 1994
Austria	10 Dec 1982	14 Jul 1995
Bahamas	10 Dec 1982	29 Jul 1983
Bahrain	10 Dec 1982	30 May 1985
Bangladesh	10 Dec 1982	27 Jul 2001
Barbados	10 Dec 1982	12 Oct 1993
Belarus	10 Dec 1982	30 Aug 2006
Belgium	5 Dec 1984	13 Nov 1998
Belize	10 Dec 1982	13 Aug 1983
Benin	30 Aug 1983	16 Oct 1997
Bhutan	10 Dec 1982	
Bolivia	27 Nov 1984	28 Apr 1995
Bosnia and Herzegovina[4]		12 Jan 1994 d
Botswana	5 Dec 1984	2 May 1990
Brazil	10 Dec 1982	22 Dec 1988
Brunei Darussalam	5 Dec 1984	5 Nov 1996

Participant[3]	Signature, Succession to signature (d)	Ratification, Formal confirmation (c), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Bulgaria	10 Dec 1982	15 May 1996
Burkina Faso	10 Dec 1982	25 Jan 2005
Burundi	10 Dec 1982	
Cambodia	1 Jul 1983	
Cameroon	10 Dec 1982	19 Nov 1985
Canada	10 Dec 1982	7 Nov 2003
Cape Verde	10 Dec 1982	10 Aug 1987
Central African Republic	4 Dec 1984	
Chad	10 Dec 1982	
Chile	10 Dec 1982	25 Aug 1997
China	10 Dec 1982	7 Jun 1996
Colombia	10 Dec 1982	
Comoros	6 Dec 1984	21 Jun 1994
Congo	10 Dec 1982	
Cook Islands	10 Dec 1982	15 Feb 1995
Costa Rica	10 Dec 1982	21 Sep 1992
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Dec 1982	26 Mar 1984
Croatia[4]		5 Apr 1995 d
Cuba	10 Dec 1982	15 Aug 1984
Cyprus	10 Dec 1982	12 Dec 1988
Czech Republic[5]	22 Feb 1993 d	21 Jun 1996
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	10 Dec 1982	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	22 Aug 1983	17 Feb 1989
Denmark	10 Dec 1982	16 Nov 2004
Djibouti	10 Dec 1982	8 Oct 1991
Dominica	28 Mar 1983	24 Oct 1991
Dominican Republic	10 Dec 1982	
Egypt	10 Dec 1982	26 Aug 1983
El Salvador	5 Dec 1984	
Equatorial Guinea	30 Jan 1984	21 Jul 1997
Estonia		26 Aug 2005 a
Ethiopia	10 Dec 1982	
European Community	7 Dec 1984	1 Apr 1998 c
Fiji	10 Dec 1982	10 Dec 1982
Finland	10 Dec 1982	21 Jun 1996
France	10 Dec 1982	11 Apr 1996
Gabon	10 Dec 1982	11 Mar 1998
Gambia	10 Dec 1982	22 May 1984
Georgia		21 Mar 1996 a
Germany		14 Oct 1994 a
Ghana	10 Dec 1982	7 Jun 1983
Greece	10 Dec 1982	21 Jul 1995
Grenada	10 Dec 1982	25 Apr 1991
Guatemala	8 Jul 1983	11 Feb 1997
Guinea	4 Oct 1984	6 Sep 1985
Guinea-Bissau	10 Dec 1982	25 Aug 1986
Guyana	10 Dec 1982	16 Nov 1993
Haiti	10 Dec 1982	31 Jul 1996
Honduras	10 Dec 1982	5 Oct 1993
Hungary	10 Dec 1982	5 Feb 2002
Iceland	10 Dec 1982	21 Jun 1985
India	10 Dec 1982	29 Jun 1995
Indonesia	10 Dec 1982	3 Feb 1986
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10 Dec 1982	
Iraq	10 Dec 1982	30 Jul 1985
Ireland	10 Dec 1982	21 Jun 1996
Italy	7 Dec 1984	13 Jan 1995
Jamaica	10 Dec 1982	21 Mar 1983
Japan	7 Feb 1983	20 Jun 1996
Jordan		27 Nov 1995 a
Kenya	10 Dec 1982	2 Mar 1989
Kiribati		24 Feb 2003 a
Kuwait	10 Dec 1982	2 May 1986
Lao People's Democratic Republic	10 Dec 1982	5 Jun 1998
Latvia		23 Dec 2004 a
Lebanon	7 Dec 1984	5 Jan 1995
Lesotho	10 Dec 1982	
Liberia	10 Dec 1982	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	3 Dec 1984	
Liechtenstein	30 Nov 1984	
Lithuania		12 Nov 2003 a
Luxembourg	5 Dec 1984	5 Oct 2000
Madagascar	25 Feb 1983	22 Aug 2001
Malawi	7 Dec 1984	
Malaysia	10 Dec 1982	14 Oct 1996
Maldives	10 Dec 1982	7 Sep 2000
Mali	19 Oct 1983	16 Jul 1985
Malta	10 Dec 1982	20 May 1993
Marshall Islands		9 Aug 1991 a
Mauritania	10 Dec 1982	17 Jul 1996
Mauritius	10 Dec 1982	4 Nov 1994
Mexico	10 Dec 1982	18 Mar 1983
Micronesia (Federated States of)		29 Apr 1991 a
Monaco	10 Dec 1982	20 Mar 1996
Mongolia	10 Dec 1982	13 Aug 1996
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	10 Dec 1982	
Mozambique	10 Dec 1982	13 Mar 1997
Myanmar	10 Dec 1982	21 May 1996
Namibia[7]	10 Dec 1982	18 Apr 1983
Nauru	10 Dec 1982	23 Jan 1996
Nepal	10 Dec 1982	2 Nov 1998
Netherlands[9]	10 Dec 1982	28 Jun 1996
New Zealand	10 Dec 1982	19 Jul 1996
Nicaragua	9 Dec 1984	3 May 2000
Niger	10 Dec 1982	
Nigeria	10 Dec 1982	14 Aug 1986
Niue	5 Dec 1984	11 Oct 2006
Norway	10 Dec 1982	24 Jun 1996
Oman	1 Jul 1983	17 Aug 1989
Pakistan	10 Dec 1982	26 Feb 1997
Palau		30 Sep 1996 a
Panama	10 Dec 1982	1 Jul 1996
Papua New Guinea	10 Dec 1982	14 Jan 1997
Paraguay	10 Dec 1982	26 Sep 1986
Philippines	10 Dec 1982	8 May 1984
Poland	10 Dec 1982	13 Nov 1998
Portugal	10 Dec 1982	3 Nov 1997
Qatar	27 Nov 1984	9 Dec 2002
Republic of Korea	14 Mar 1983	29 Jan 1996
Romania	10 Dec 1982	17 Dec 1996
Russian Federation	10 Dec 1982	12 Mar 1997
Rwanda	10 Dec 1982	
Saint Kitts and Nevis	7 Dec 1984	7 Jan 1993
Saint Lucia	10 Dec 1982	27 Mar 1985
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	10 Dec 1982	1 Oct 1993
Samoa	28 Sep 1984	14 Aug 1995
Sao Tome and Principe	13 Jul 1983	3 Nov 1987

Participant[3]	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Formal confirmation (c), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Saudi Arabia	7 Dec 1984	24 Apr 1996
Senegal	10 Dec 1982	25 Oct 1984
Serbia[4]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles	10 Dec 1982	16 Sep 1991
Sierra Leone	10 Dec 1982	12 Dec 1994
Singapore	10 Dec 1982	17 Nov 1994
Slovakia[5]	28 May 1993 d	8 May 1996
Slovenia[4]		16 Jun 1995 d
Solomon Islands	10 Dec 1982	23 Jun 1997
Somalia	10 Dec 1982	24 Jul 1989
South Africa	5 Dec 1984	23 Dec 1997
Spain	4 Dec 1984	15 Jan 1997
Sri Lanka	10 Dec 1982	19 Jul 1994
Sudan	10 Dec 1982	23 Jan 1985
Suriname	10 Dec 1982	9 Jul 1998
Swaziland	18 Jan 1984	
Sweden	10 Dec 1982	25 Jun 1996
Switzerland	17 Oct 1984	
Thailand	10 Dec 1982	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[4]		19 Aug 1994 d
Togo	10 Dec 1982	16 Apr 1985
Tonga		2 Aug 1995 a
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Dec 1982	25 Apr 1986
Tunisia	10 Dec 1982	24 Apr 1985
Tuvalu	10 Dec 1982	9 Dec 2002
Uganda	10 Dec 1982	9 Nov 1990
Ukraine	10 Dec 1982	26 Jul 1999
United Arab Emirates	10 Dec 1982	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[10]		25 Jul 1997 a
United Republic of Tanzania	10 Dec 1982	30 Sep 1985
Uruguay	10 Dec 1982	10 Dec 1992
Vanuatu	10 Dec 1982	10 Aug 1999
Viet Nam	10 Dec 1982	25 Jul 1994
Yemen[11]	10 Dec 1982	21 Jul 1987
Zambia	10 Dec 1982	7 Mar 1983
Zimbabwe	10 Dec 1982	24 Feb 1993

Declarations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, formal confirmation, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

Upon signature:

It is the view of the Government of Algeria that its signing the Final Act and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not entail any change in its position on the non-recognition of certain other signatories, nor any obligation to cooperate in any field whatsoever with those signatories.

Upon ratification:

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 287, paragraph 1 (b), of the [said Convention] dealing with the submission of disputes to the International Court of Justice.

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that, in order to submit a dispute to the International Court of Justice, prior agreement between all the Parties concerned is necessary in each case.

The Algerian Government declares that, in conformity with the provisions of Part II, Section 3, Subsections A and C of the Convention, the passage of warships in the territorial sea of Algeria is subject to an authorization fifteen (15) days in advance, except in cases of *force majeure*

as provided for in the Convention.

ANGOLA

Upon signature:

"The Government of the People's Republic of Angola reserves the right to interpret any and all articles of the Convention in the context of and with due regard to Angolan Sovereignty and territorial integrity as it applies to land, space and sea. Details of these interpretations will be placed on record at the time of ratification of the Convention.

The present signature is without prejudice to the position taken by the Government of Angola or to be taken by it on the Convention at the time of ratification."

ARGENTINA

Upon signature:

The signing of the Convention by the Argentine Government does not imply acceptance of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In that regard, the Argentine Republic, as in its written statement of 8 December 1982 (A/CONF.62/WS/35), places on record its reservation to the effect that resolution III, in annex I to the final Act, in no way affects the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which is governed by the following specific resolutions of the General Assembly: 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9 and 38/12, adopted within the framework of the decolonization process.

In this connection, and bearing in mind that the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands form an integral part of Argentine territory, the Argentine Government declares that it neither recognizes nor will it recognize the title of any other State, community or entity or the exercise by it of any right of maritime jurisdiction which is claimed to be protected under any interpretation of resolution III that violates the rights of Argentina over the Malvinas and the South Sandwich and South Georgia Islands and their respective maritime zones. Consequently, it likewise neither recognizes nor will recognize and will consider null and void any activity or measure that may be carried out or adopted without its consent with regard to this question, which the Argentine Government considers to be of major importance.

The Argentine Government will accordingly interpret the occurrence of acts of the kind referred to above as contrary to the aforementioned resolutions adopted by the United Nations, the patent objective of which is the peaceful settlement of the sovereignty dispute concerning the islands by means of bilateral negotiations and through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that, whereas the Final Act states in paragraph 42 that the Convention "together with resolutions I to IV, [forms] an integral whole", it is merely describing the procedure that was followed at the Conference to avoid a series of separate votes on the Convention and the resolutions. The Convention itself clearly establishes in article 318 that only the Annexes form an integral part of the Convention; thus, any other instrument or document, even one adopted by the Conference, does not form an integral part of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Upon ratification:

(a) With regard to those provisions of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of the Argentine Republic to continue to apply the regime currently in force to the passage of foreign warships through the Argentine territorial sea, since that regime is totally compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

(b) With regard to Part III of the Convention, the Argentine Government declares that in the Treaty of Peace and Friendship signed with the Republic of Chile on 29 November 1984, which entered into force on 2 May 1985 and was registered with the United Nations Secretariat in accordance with Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations, both States reaffirmed the validity of article V of the Boundary Treaty of 1881 whereby the Strait of Magellan (Estrecho de Magallanes) is neutralized forever with free navigation assured for the flags of all nations. The aforementioned Treaty of Peace and Friendship includes regulations for vessels flying the flags of third countries in the Beagle Channel and other straits and channels of the Tierra del Fuego archipelago.

(c) The Argentine Republic accepts the provisions on the conservation and management of the living resources of the high seas, but considers that they are insufficient, particularly the provisions relating to straddling fish stocks or highly migratory fish stocks, and that they should be supplemented by an effective and binding multilateral regime which, *inter alia*, would facilitate cooperation to prevent and avoid over-fishing, and would permit the monitoring of the activities of fishing vessels on the high seas and of the use of fishing methods and gear.

The Argentine Government, bearing in mind its priority interest in conserving the resources of its exclusive economic zone and the area of the high seas adjacent thereto, considers that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in the area of the high seas adjacent thereto, the Argentine Republic, as the coastal State, and other States fishing for such stocks in the area adjacent to its exclusive economic zone should agree upon the measures necessary for the conservation of those stocks or stocks of associated species in the highs seas.

Independently of this, it is the understanding of the Argentine Government, that in order to comply with the obligation laid down in the Convention concerning the conservation of the living resources in its exclusive economic zone and the area adjacent thereto, it is authorized to adopt, in accordance with international law, all the measures it may deem necessary for the purpose.

(d) The ratification of the Convention by the Argentine Republic does not imply acceptance of the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea. In that regard, the Argentine Republic, as in its written statement of 8 December 1982 (A/CONF.62/WS/35), places on record its reservation to the effect that resolution III, in annex I to the Final Act, in no way affects the "Question of the Falkland Islands (Malvinas)", which is governed by the following specific resolutions of the General Assembly: 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19, 43/25, 44/406, 45/424, 46/406, 47/408 and 48/408, adopted within the framework of the decolonization process. *[See paragraphs 2, 3 and 4 of the declaration made upon signature above.]*

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its legitimate and inalienable sovereignty over the Malvinas and the South Sandwich Islands and their respective maritime and island zones, which form an integral part of its national territory. The recovery of those territories and the full exercise of sovereignty, respecting the way of life of the inhabitants of the territories and in accordance with the principles of international law, constitute a permanent objective of the Argentine people that cannot be renounced.

Furthermore, it is the understanding of the Argentine Republic that the Final Act, in referring in paragraph 42 to the Convention together with resolutions I to IV as forming an integral whole, is merely describing the procedure that was followed at the Conference to avoid a series of separate votes on the Convention and the resolutions. The Convention itself clearly establishes in article 318 that only the Annexes form an integral part of the Convention; thus, any other instrument or document, even one adopted by the Conference, does not form an integral part of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

(e) The Argentine Republic fully respects the right of free navigation as embodied in the Convention, however, it considers that the transit by sea of vessels carrying highly radioactive substances must be duly regulated.

The Argentine Government accepts the provisions on prevention of pollution of the marine environment contained in Part XII of the Convention, but considers that, in the light of events subsequent to the adoption of that international instrument, the measures to prevent, control and minimize the effects of the pollution of the sea by noxious and potentially dangerous substances and highly active radioactive substances must be supplemented and reinforced.

(f) In accordance with the provisions of article 287, the Argentine Government declares that it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention: (a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea; (b) an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, in accordance with Annex VIII, article 1. The Argentine Government also declares that it does not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, with respect to the disputes specified in article 298, paragraph 1 (a), (b) and (c).

AUSTRALIA

22 March 2002

Declaration under articles 287 and 298:

"The Government of Australia declares, under paragraph 1 of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea done at Montego Bay on the tenth day of December one thousand nine hundred and eighty-two that it chooses the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, without specifying that one has precedence over the other:

(a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention; and

(b) the International Court of Justice.

The Government of Australia further declares, under paragraph 1 (a) of article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea done at Montego Bay on the tenth day of December one thousand nine hundred and eighty-two, that it does not accept any of the procedures provided for in section 2 of Part XV (including the procedures referred to in paragraphs (a) and (b) of this declaration) with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations as well as those involving historic bays or titles.

These declarations by the Government of Australia are effective immediately."

AUSTRIA

Declarations:

"In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it would give preference the Government of the Republic of Austria hereby chooses one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the two Conventions in accordance with article 287 of the [said Convention], in the following order:

1. The international Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;

2. A special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;

3. The International Court of Justice.

Also in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Republic of Austria hereby recognizes as of today the validity of special arbitration for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping."

BANGLADESH

Declarations:

"1. The Government of the People's Republic of Bangladesh understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorise other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf military exercise or manoeuvres, in particular, those involving the use of weapons or explosives, without the consent of the coastal State.

2. The Bangladesh Government is not bound by any domestic legislation or by any declaration issued by other States upon signature or ratification of this Convention. Bangladesh reserves the right to state its position concerning all such legislation or declarations at the appropriate time. In particular, Bangladesh ratification of the Convention in no way constitutes recognition of the maritime claims of any other State having signed or ratified the Convention, where such claims are inconsistent with the relevant principles of international law and which are prejudicial to the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of Bangladesh in its maritime areas.

3. The exercise of the right of innocent passage of warships through the territorial sea of other States should also be perceived to be a peaceful one. Effective and speedy means of communication are easily available and make the prior notification of the exercise of the right of innocent passage of warships reasonable and not incompatible with the Convention. Such notification is already required by some States. Bangladesh reserves the right to legislate on this point.

4. Bangladesh is of the view that such a notification requirement is needed in respect of nuclear-powered ships or ships carrying nuclear or other inherently dangerous or noxious substances. Furthermore, no such ships shall be allowed within Bangladesh waters without the necessary authorisation.

5. Bangladesh is of the view that the sovereign immunity as envisaged in article 236 does not relieve a State from the obligation, moral or otherwise, in accepting responsibility and liability for compensation and relief in respect of damage caused by pollution of the marine environment by any warship, naval auxiliary, other vessels or aircraft owned or operated by the State and used on government non-commercial service.

6. Ratification of the Convention by Bangladesh does not ipso facto imply recognition or acceptance of any territorial claim made by a State party to the Convention, nor automatic recognition of any land or sea border.

7. The Bangladesh Government does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations or statements, however phrased or named, made by other States when signing, accepting, ratifying or acceding to the Convention and that it reserves the right to state its position on any of those declarations or statements at any time.

8. The Bangladesh Government declares, without prejudice to article 303 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, that any objects of an archaeological and historical nature found within the marine areas over which it exercises sovereignty or jurisdiction shall not be removed, without its prior notification and consent.

9. The Government of Bangladesh shall, at an appropriate time, make declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298 relating to the settlement of disputes.

10. The Government of Bangladesh intends to undertake a comprehensive review of existing domestic laws and regulations with a view to harmonizing them with the provisions of the Convention."

BELARUS

Upon signature:

1. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it accepts, as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in relation to questions of the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292.

2. The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions in the consideration of disputes concerned with the delimitation of marine limits, disputes relating to military activity and disputes in relation to which the United Nations Security Council performs functions entrusted to it under the United Nations Charter.

Upon ratification:

1. In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus accepts as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the settlement of disputes concerning fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Republic of Belarus will use

a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Republic of Belarus recognizes the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea over questions concerning the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews, as envisaged in article 292 of the Convention;

2. In accordance with article 298 of the Convention, the Republic of Belarus does not accept compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions for the consideration of disputes concerning military activities, including by government vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, or disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction, or disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because the Convention has a very large number of positive features and achieves a compromise on them which is acceptable to most States. Nevertheless, with regard to the status of maritime space, it regrets that the concept of equity, adopted for the delimitation of the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone, was not applied again in the provisions for delimiting the territorial sea. It welcomes, however, the distinctions established by the Convention between the nature of the rights which riparian States exercise over their territorial sea, on the one hand, and over the continental shelf and their exclusive economic zone, on the other.

It is common knowledge that the Belgian Government cannot declare itself also satisfied with certain provisions of the international régime of the sea-bed which, though based on a principle that it would not think of challenging, seems not to have chosen the most suitable way of achieving the desired result as quickly and surely as possible, at the risk of jeopardizing the success of a generous undertaking which Belgium consistently encourages and supports. Indeed, certain provisions of Part XI and of Annexes III and IV appear to it to be marred by serious defects and shortcomings which explain why consensus was not reached on this text at the last session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, in New York, in April 1982. These shortcomings and defects concern in particular the restriction of access to the Area, the limitations on production and certain procedures for the transfer of technology, not to mention the vexatious implications of the cost and financing of the future International Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. The Belgian Government sincerely hopes that these shortcomings and defects will in fact be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures which the Preparatory Commission should draw up with the twofold intent of facilitating acceptance of the new régime by the whole international community and enabling the common heritage of mankind to be properly exploited for the benefit of all and, preferably, for the benefit of the least favoured countries. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium is not alone in thinking that the success of this new régime, the effective establishment of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the economic viability of the Enterprise will depend to a large extent on the quality and seriousness of the Preparatory Commission's work: it therefore considers that all decisions of the Commission should be adopted by consensus, that being the only way of protecting the legitimate interests of all.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, the Belgian Government wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Kingdom of Belgium is not here and now determined to ratify it. It will take a separate decision on this point at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all, focusing mainly on the questions to which attention has been drawn above.

The Belgian Government also wishes to recall that Belgium is a member of the European Economic Community, to which it has transferred powers in certain areas covered by the Convention; detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

It also wishes to draw attention formally to several points which it considers particularly crucial. For example, it attaches great importance to the conditions to which Articles 21 and 23 of the Convention subject the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, and it intends to ensure that the criteria prescribed by the relevant international agreements are strictly applied, whether the flag States are parties thereto or not. The limitation of the breadth of the territorial sea, as established by Article 3 of the Convention, confirms and codifies a widely observed customary practice which it is incumbent on every State to respect, as it is the only one admitted by international law: the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium will not therefore recognize, as territorial sea, waters which are, or may be, claimed to be such beyond 12 nautical miles measured from baselines determined by the riparian State in accordance with the Convention. Having underlined the close linkage which it perceives between Article 33, paragraph 1 (a), and Article 27, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium intends to reserve the right, in emergencies and especially in cases of blatant violation, to exercise the powers accorded to the riparian State by the latter text, without notifying beforehand a diplomatic agent or consular officer of the flag State, on the understanding that such notification shall be given as soon as it is physically possible. Finally, everyone will understand that the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium chooses to emphasize those provisions of the Convention which entitle it to protect itself, beyond the limit of the territorial sea, against any threat of pollution and, *a fortiori*, against any existing pollution resulting from an accident at sea, as well as those provisions which recognize the validity of rights and obligations deriving from specific conventions and agreements concluded previously or which may be concluded subsequently in furtherance of the general principles set forth in the Convention.

In the absence of any other peaceful means to which it obviously gives priority, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium deems it expedient to choose alternatively, and in order of preference, as Article 287 of the Convention leaves it free to do, the following means of settling disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;
2. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;
3. the International Court of Justice.

Still in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium wishes here and now to recognize the validity of the special arbitration procedure for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the provisions of the Convention in respect of fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research or navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

For the time being, the Belgian Government does not wish to make any declaration in accordance with Article 298, confining itself to the one made above in accordance with Article 287. Finally, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other

States have made, or may make, upon signing or ratifying the Convention, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

The Kingdom of Belgium Notes that , as a State member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community for some matters provided for in the Convention, which are listed in the declaration made by the European Community upon formal confirmation of the Convention by the European Community on 1st April 1998.

In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, the Kingdom of Belgium hereby declares that it chooses, as a means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, in view of its preference for pre-established jurisdictions, either the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI (art. 287.1 (a)) or the International Court of Justice (art. 287.1(b)), in the absence of any other means of peaceful settlement of disputes that it might prefer.

BOLIVIA

Upon signature:

On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Bolivia hereby makes the following declaration before the International community:

1. The Convention on the Law of the Sea is a perfectible instrument and, according to its own provisions, is subject to revision As a party to it, Bolivia will, when the time comes, put forward proposals and revisions which are in keeping with its national interests.

2. Bolivia is confident that the Convention will ensure, in the near future, the joint development of the resources of the sea-bed, with equal opportunities and rights for all nations, especially developing countries.

3. Freedom of access to and from the sea, which the Convention grants to land-locked nations, is a right that Bolivia has been exercising by virtue of bilateral treaties and will continue to exercise by virtue of the norms of positive international law contained in the Convention.

4. Bolivia wishes to place on record that it is a country that has no maritime sovereignty as a result of a war and not as a result of its natural geographic position and that it will assert all the rights of coastal States under the Convention once it recovers the legal status in question as a consequence of negotiations on the restoration to Bolivia of its own sovereign outlet to the Pacific Ocean.

BRAZIL

Upon signature:

"I. Signature by Brazil is *ad referendum*, subject to ratification of the Convention in conformity with Brazilian constitutional procedures, which include approval by the National Congress.

II. The Brazilian Government understands that the régime which is applied in practice in maritime areas adjacent to the coast of Brazil is compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

III. The Brazilian Government understands that the provision of article 301, which prohibits "any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity or political independence of any State, or in any other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations", apply, in particular, to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or the jurisdiction of the coastal State.

IV. The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those that imply the use of weapons or explosives, without the consent of the coastal State.

V. The Brazilian Government understands that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, the coastal State has, in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and regulate the construction, operation and use of all types of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose.

VI. Brazil exercises sovereignty rights over the continental shelf, beyond the distance of two hundred nautical miles from the baselines, up to the outer edge of the continental margin, as defined in article 76.

VII. The Brazilian Government reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298, concerning the settlement of disputes."

Upon ratification:

"I. The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of article 301 prohibiting "any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State, or in other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations apply in particular to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the coastal State.

"II. The Brazilian Government understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those involving the use of weapons or explosives, in the Exclusive Economic Zone without the consent of the coastal State.

"III. The Brazilian Government understands that in accordance with the provisions of the Convention the coastal State has, in the Exclusive Economic Zone and on the continental shelf, the exclusive right to construct and to authorize and to regulate the construction, operation and use of all kinds of installations and structures, without exception, whatever their nature or purpose".

CANADA

Declaration:

"With regard to article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Canada hereby chooses the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention without specifying that one has precedence over the other:

(a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention; and

(b) an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII of the Convention.

With regard to Article 298, paragraph 1 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, Canada does not accept any of the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, with respect to the following disputes:

-Disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles;

-Disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, and disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraph 2 or 3;

-Disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations, unless the Security Council de-

cides to remove the matter from its agenda or calls upon the parties to settle it by the means provided for in the Convention.

According to Article 309 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, no reservations or exceptions may be made to the Convention unless expressly permitted by other articles of the Convention. A declaration or statement made pursuant to article 310 of the Convention cannot purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Convention in their application to the state, entity or international organization making it. Consequently, the Government of Canada declares that it does not consider itself bound by declarations or statements that have been made or will be made by other states, entities and international organizations pursuant to article 310 of the Convention and that exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Convention and their application to the State, entity or international organization making it. Lack of response by the Government of Canada to any declaration or statement shall not be interpreted as tacit acceptance of that declaration or statement. The Government of Canada reserves the right at any time to take a position on any declaration or statement in the manner deemed appropriate."

CAPE VERDE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the Republic of Cape Verde signs the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea with the following understandings:

I. This Convention recognizes the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea or archipelagic waters. This right is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it was clearly stated in the Declaration made by the President of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on April 26, 1982.

II. The provisions of the Convention relating to the archipelagic waters, territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf are compatible with the fundamental objectives and aims that inspire the legislation of the Republic of Cape Verde concerning its sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to and within its coasts and over the seabed and subsoil thereof up to the limit of 200 miles.

III. The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights recognized therein to the coastal state leave no doubt as to its character of a *sui generis* zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and which is not a part of the high seas.

IV. The regulations of the uses or activities which are not expressly provided for in the Convention but are related to the sovereign rights and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of the said State, provided that such regulation does not hinder the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication which are recognized to other States.

V. In the exclusive economic zone, the enjoyment of the freedoms of international communication, in conformity with its definition and with other relevant provisions of the Convention, excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State, such as exercises with weapons or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of the said state; and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State.

VI. This Convention does not entitle any State to construct, operate or use installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, either those provided for in the Convention or those of any other nature, without the consent of the coastal State.

VII. In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to enter into arrangements with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stock or stocks of associated species."

Upon ratification:

I. [. . .]

II. The Republic of Cape Verde declares, without prejudice of article 303 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, that any objects of an archaeological and historical nature found within the maritime areas over which it exerts sovereignty or jurisdiction, shall not be removed without its prior notification and consent.

III. The Republic of Cape Verde declares that, in the absence of or failing any other peaceful means, it chooses, in order of preference and in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the following procedures for the settlement of disputes regarding the interpretation or application of the said Convention:

a) the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea;

b) the International Court of Justice.

IV. The Republic of Cape Verde, in accordance with article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, declares that it does not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, Section 2, of the said Convention for the settlement of disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government operated vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, as well as disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraphs 2 and 3 of the aforementioned Convention."

CHILE

Statement made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

In exercise of the right conferred by article 310 of the Convention, the delegation of Chile wishes first of all to reiterate in its entirety the statement it made at last April's meeting when the Convention was adopted. That statement is reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164. . . . in particular to the Convention's pivotal legal concept, that of the 200 mile exclusive economic zone to the elaboration of which [the Government of Chile] country made an important contribution, having been the first to declare such a concept, 35 years ago in 1947, and having subsequently helped to define and earn it international acceptance. The exclusive economic zone has a *sui*

generis

legal character distinct from that of the territorial sea and the high seas. It is a zone under national jurisdiction, over which the coastal State exercises economic sovereignty and in which third States enjoy freedom of navigation and overflight and the freedoms inherent in international communication. The Convention defines it as a maritime space under the jurisdiction of the coastal State, bound to the latters' territorial sovereignty and actual territory, on terms similar to those governing other maritime spaces, namely the territorial sea and the continental shelf. With regard to straits used for international navigation, the delegation of Chile wishes to reaffirm and reiterate in full the statement made last April, as reproduced in document A/CONF.62/SR.164 referred to above, as well as the content of

the supplementary written statement dated 7 April 1982 contained in documentA/CONF.62/WS/19.

With regard to the international sea-bed régime, [the Government of Chile wishes] to reiterate the statement made by the Group of 77 at last April's meeting regarding the legal concept of the common heritage of mankind, the existence of which was solemnly confirmed by consensus by the General Assembly in 1970 and which the present Convention defines as a part of *jus cogens*. Any action taken in contravention of this principle and outside the framework of the sea-bed régime would, as last April's debate showed, be totally invalid and illegal.

Upon ratification:

...

2. The Republic of Chile declares that the Treaty of Peace and Friendship signed with the Argentine Republic on 29 November 1984, which entered into force on 2 May 1985, shall define the boundaries between the respective sovereignties over the sea, seabed and subsoil of the Argentine Republic and the Republic of Chile in the sea of the southern zone in the terms laid down in articles 7 to 9.

3. With regard to part II of the Convention:

(a) In accordance with article 13 of the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1984, the Republic of Chile, in exercise of its sovereign rights, grants to the Argentine Republic the navigation facilities through Chilean internal waters described in that Treaty, which are specified in annex 2, articles 1 to 9.

In addition, the Republic of Chile declares that by virtue of this Treaty, ships flying the flag of third countries may navigate without obstacles through the internal waters along the routes specified in annex 2, articles 1 and 8, subject to the relevant Chilean regulations.

In the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1984, the two Parties agreed on the system of navigation and pilotage in the Beagle Channel defined in annex 2, articles 11 to 16. The provisions on navigation set forth in that annex replace any previous agreement on the subject that might exist between the Parties.

We reiterate that the navigation systems and facilities referred to in this paragraph were established in the 1984 Treaty of Peace and Friendship for the sole purpose of facilitating maritime communication between specific maritime points and areas, along the specific routes indicated, so that they do not apply to other routes existing in the zone which have not been specifically agreed on.

b) The Republic of Chile reaffirms the full validity and force of Supreme Decree No. 416 of 1977, of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, which, in accordance with the principles of article 7 of the Convention -- which have been fully recognized by Chile -- established the straight baselines which were confirmed in article 11 of the 1984 Treaty of Peace and Friendship.

c) In cases in which the State places restrictions on the right of innocent passage for foreign warships, the Republic of Chile reserves the right to apply similar restrictive measures.

4. With regard to part III of the Convention, it should be noted that in accordance with article 35 (c), the provisions of this part do not affect the legal regime of the Strait of Magellan, since passage through that strait is "regulated by long-standing international conventions in force specifically relating to such straits" such as the 1881 Boundary Treaty, a regime which is reaffirmed in the Treaty of Peace and Friendship of 1984.

In article 10 of the latter Treaty, Chile and Argentina agreed on the boundary at the eastern end of the Strait of Magellan and agreed that this boundary in no way alters the provisions of the 1881 Boundary Treaty, whereby, as Chile declared unilaterally in 1873, the Strait of Magellan is neutralized forever with free navigation assured for the flags of all nations under the terms laid down in article V. For its part, the Argentine Republic undertook to maintain, at any time and in whatever circumstances, the right of ships of all flags to navigate expeditiously and without obstacles through its jurisdictional waters to and from the Strait of Magellan.

Furthermore, we reiterate that Chilean maritime traffic to and from the north through the Estrecho de Le Maire shall enjoy the facilities laid down in annex 2, article 10 of the 1984 Treaty of Peace and Friendship.

5. Having regard for its interest in the conservation of the resources in its exclusive economic zone and the adjacent area of the high seas, the Republic of Chile believes that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in the adjacent area of the high seas, the Republic of Chile, as the coastal State, and the States fishing for such stocks in the area adjacent to its exclusive economic zone must agree upon the measures necessary for the conservation in the high seas of these stocks or associated species. In the absence of such agreement, Chile reserves the right to exercise its rights under article 116 and other provisions of the [said Convention], and the other rights accorded to it under international law.

6. With reference to part XI of the Convention and its supplementary Agreement, it is Chile's understanding that, in respect of the prevention of pollution in exploration and exploitation activities, the Authority must apply the general criterion that underwater mining shall be subject to standards which are at least as stringent as comparable standards on land.

7. With regard to part XV of the Convention, the Republic of Chile declares that:

(a) In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

i) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI;

ii) A special arbitral tribunal, established in accordance with annex VIII, for the categories of disputes specified therein relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, and marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

(b) In accordance with articles 280 to 282 of the Convention, the choice of means for the settlement of disputes indicated in the preceding paragraph shall in no way affect the obligations deriving from the general, regional or bilateral agreements to which the Republic of Chile is a party concerning the peaceful settlement of disputes.

(c) In accordance with article 298 of the Convention, Chile declares that it does not accept any of the procedures provided for in part XV, section 2 with respect to the disputes referred to in article 298, paragraphs 1(a), (b) and (c) of the Convention.

CHINA[12]

Declaration:

1. In accordance with the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the People's Republic of China shall enjoy sovereign rights and jurisdiction over an exclusive economic zone of 200 nautical miles and the continental shelf.

2. The People's Republic of China will effect, through consultations, the delimitation of boundary of the maritime jurisdiction with the states with coasts opposite or adjacent to China respectively on the basis of international law and in accordance with the equitable principle.

3. The People's Republic of China reaffirms its sovereignty over all its archipelagoes and islands as listed in article 2 of the Law of the People's Republic of China on the Territorial Sea

and Contiguous Zone which was promulgated on 25 February 1992.

4. The People's Republic of China reaffirms that the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea concerning innocent passage through the territorial sea shall not prejudice the right of a coastal state to request, in accordance with its laws and regulations, a foreign state to obtain advance approval from or give prior notification to the coastal state for the passage of its warships through the territorial sea of the coastal state.

25 August 2006

Declaration under article 298:

The Government of the People's Republic of China does not accept any of the procedures provided for in Section 2 of Part XV of the Convention with respect to all the categories of disputes referred to in paragraph 1 (a) (b) and (c) of Article 298 of the Convention.

COSTA RICA

Upon signature:

The Government of Costa Rica declares that the provisions of Costa Rican law under which foreign vessels must pay for licences to fish in its exclusive economic zone, shall apply also to fishing for highly migratory species, pursuant to the provisions of articles 62 and 64, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

CROATIA[13]

Declaration:

"The Republic of Croatia considers that, in accordance with article 53 the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 29 May 1969, there is no peremptory norm of general international law, which would forbid a coastal state to request by its laws and regulations foreign warships to notify their intention of innocent passage through its territorial waters, and to limit the number of warships allowed to exercise the right of innocent passage at the same time (articles 17-32 of the Convention)."

4 November 1999

Declaration under article 287:

In implementation of article 287 of the [Convention], the Government of Croatia [declares] that, for the settlement of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of the Convention and of the Agreement adopted on 28 July 1994 relating to the Implementation of Part XI, it chooses, in order of preference, the following means:

i) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI;

ii) The International Court of Justice."

CUBA

Upon signature:

"At the time of signing the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Cuban Delegation declares that, having gained possession of the definitive text of the Convention just a few hours ago, it will leave for the time of the ratification of the Convention the issuing of any statement it deems pertinent with respect to articles:

287 --on the election of the procedure for the settlement of controversies pertaining to the interpretation or implementation of the Convention;

292 --on the prompt release of ships and their crews;

298 --on the optional exceptions to the applicability of Section 2;

as well as whatever statement or declaration it might deem appropriate to make in conformity with article 310 of the Convention."

Upon ratification:

With regard to article 287 on the choice of procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and, consequently, will not accept either the jurisdiction of the Court with respect to the provisions of either article 297 or 298.

With regard to article 292, the Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that once financial security has been posted, the detaining State should proceed promptly and without delay to release the vessel and its crew and declares that where this procedure is not followed with respect to its vessels or members of their crew it will not agree to submit the matter to the International Court of Justice.

DENMARK

Declarations:

"The Kingdom of Denmark makes the following declaration:

It is the position of the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark that the exception from the transit passage regime provided for in article 35 (c) of the Convention applies to the specific regime in the Danish straits (the Great Belt, the Little Belt and the Danish part of the Sound), which has developed on the basis of the Copenhagen Treaty of 1857. The present legal regime of the Danish straits will therefore remain unchanged.

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark declares pursuant to article 287 of the Convention that it chooses the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark declares pursuant to article 298 of the Convention that it does not accept an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII for any of the categories of disputes mentioned in article 298.

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark declares, in accordance with article 310 of the Convention, its objection to any declaration or position excluding or amending the legal scope of the provisions of the Convention. Passivity with respect to such declarations or positions shall be interpreted neither as acceptance nor rejection of such declarations or positions.

The Kingdom of Denmark recalls that, as a member of the European Community, it has transferred competence in respect of certain matters governed by the Convention. In accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention, a detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community was made by the European Community upon deposit of its instrument of formal confirmation. This transfer of competence does not extend to the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

EGYPT

1. The Arab Republic of Egypt establishes the breadth of its territorial sea at 12 nautical miles, pursuant to article 5 of the Ordinance of 18 January 1951 as amended by the Decree of 17 February 1958, in line with the provisions of article 3 of the Convention.

2. The Arab Republic of Egypt will publish, at the earliest opportunity, charts showing the baselines from which the breadth of its territorial sea in the Mediterranean Sea and in the Red Sea is measured, as well as the lines marking the outer limit of the territorial sea, in accordance with usual practice.

Declaration concerning the contiguous zone

The Arab Republic of Egypt has decided that its contiguous zone (as defined in the Ordinance of 18 January 1951 as amend-

ed by the Presidential Decree of 17 February 1958) extends to 24 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured, as provided for in article 33 of the Convention.

Declaration concerning the passage of nuclear-powered and similar ships through the territorial sea of Egypt

Pursuant to the provisions of the Convention relating to the right of the coastal State to regulate the passage of ships through its territorial sea and whereas the passage of foreign nuclear-powered ships and ships carrying nuclear or other inherently dangerous and noxious substances poses a number of hazards,

Whereas article 23 of the Convention stipulates that the ships in question shall, when exercising the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea, carry documents and observe special precautionary measures established for such ships by international agreements, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it will require the aforementioned ships to obtain authorization before entering the territorial sea of Egypt, until such international agreements are concluded and Egypt becomes a party to them.

Declaration concerning the passage of warships through the territorial sea of Egypt

[With reference to the provisions of the Convention relating to the right of the coastal State to regulate the passage of ships through its territorial sea] Warships shall be ensured innocent passage through the territorial sea of Egypt, subject to prior notification.

Declaration concerning passage through the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba

The provisions of the 1979 Peace Treaty between Egypt and Israel concerning passage through the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba come within the framework of the general régime of waters forming straits referred to in part III of the Convention, wherein it is stipulated that the general régime shall not affect the legal status of waters forming straits and shall include certain obligations with regard to security and the maintenance of order in the State bordering the strait.

Declaration concerning the exercise by Egypt of its rights in the exclusive economic zone

The Arab Republic of Egypt will exercise as from this day the rights attributed to it by the provisions of parts V and VI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in the exclusive economic zone situated beyond and adjacent to its territorial sea in the Mediterranean Sea and in the Red Sea.

The Arab Republic of Egypt will also exercise its sovereign rights in this zone for the purpose of exploring and exploiting, conserving and managing the natural resources, whether living or non-living, of the sea-bed and subsoil and the super-adjacent waters, and with regard to all other activities for the economic exploration and exploitation of the zone, such as the production of energy from the water, currents and winds.

The Arab Republic of Egypt will exercise its jurisdiction over the exclusive economic zone according to the modalities laid down in the Convention with regard to the establishment and use of artificial islands, installations and structures, marine scientific research, the protection and preservation of the marine environment and the other rights and duties provided for in the Convention.

The Arab Republic of Egypt proclaims that, in exercising its rights and performing its duties under the Convention in the exclusive economic zone, it will have due regard for the rights and duties of other States and will act in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

The Arab Republic of Egypt undertakes to establish the outer limits of its exclusive economic zone in accordance with the rules, criteria and modalities laid down in the Convention.

[The Arab Republic of] Egypt declares that it will take the necessary action and make the necessary arrangements to regulate all matters relating to its exclusive economic zone.

Declaration concerning the procedures chosen for the settlement of disputes in conformity with the Convention

[With reference to the provisions of article 287 of the Convention] the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it accepts the arbitral procedure, the modalities of which are defined in annex VII to the Convention, as the procedure for the settlement of any dispute which might arise between Egypt and any other State relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention.

The Arab Republic of Egypt further declares that it excludes from the scope of application of this procedure those disputes contemplated in article 297 of the Convention.

Statement concerning the Arabic version of the text of the Convention

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is gratified that the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea adopted the new Convention in six languages, including Arabic, with all the texts being equally authentic, thus establishing absolute equality between all the versions and preventing any one from prevailing over another.

However, when the official Arabic version of the Convention is compared with the other official versions, it becomes clear that, in some cases, the official Arabic text does not exactly correspond to the other versions, in that it fails to reflect precisely the content of certain provisions of the Convention which were found acceptable and adopted by the States in establishing a legal régime governing the seas.

For these reasons, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt takes the opportunity afforded by the deposit of the instrument of ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea to declare that it will adopt the interpretation which is best corroborated by the various official texts of the Convention.

EQUATORIAL GUINEA

20 February 2002

Declaration under article 298

The Government of the Republic of Equatorial Guinea hereby enters a reservation and declares that, under article 298, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Convention of 1982 on the Law of the Sea, it does not recognize as mandatory ipso facto with respect to any other State any of the procedures provided for in part XV, section 2, of the Convention as regards the categories of disputes set forth in article 298, paragraph 1 (a).

ESTONIA

Declarations

"1. As a member state of the European Community, the Republic of Estonia has transferred competence in certain matters governed by the Convention to the European Community according to the declaration made by the European Community on April 1, 1998 while acceding to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

2. Pursuant to Article 287, paragraph 1 of the Convention the Republic of Estonia chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI and the International Court of Justice as means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the European Economic Community declares that it considers that the Convention constitutes, within the framework of the Law of the Sea, a major effort in the codification and progressive development of international law in the fields to which its declaration pursuant to Article 2 of Annex IX of the Convention refers. The Community would like to express the hope that this development will become a useful means for promoting cooperation and stable relations between all countries in these fields.

The Community, however, considers that significant provisions of Part XI of the Convention are not conducive to the development of the activities to which that Part refers in view of the fact that several Member States of the Community have already expressed their position that this Part contains considerable deficiencies and flaws which require rectification. The Community recognises the importance of the work which remains to be done and hopes that conditions for the implementation of a sea bed mining regime, which are generally acceptable and which are therefore likely to promote activities in the international sea bed area, can be agreed. The Community, within the limits of its competence, will play a full part in contributing to the task of finding satisfactory solutions.

A separate decision on formal confirmation(*) will have to be taken at a later stage. It will be taken in the light of the results of the efforts made to attain a universally acceptable Convention."

Competence of the European Communities with regard to matters governed by the Convention on the Law of the Sea (Declaration made pursuant to article 2 of Annex IX to the Convention)

Article 2 of Annex IX to the Convention on the Law of the Sea stipulates that the participation of an international organisation shall be subject to a declaration specifying the matters governed by the Convention in respect of which competence has been transferred to the organisation by its member states.

The European Communities were established by the Treaties of Paris and of Rome, signed on 18 April 1951 and 25 1957, respectively. After being ratified by the Signatory States the Treaties entered into force on 25 July 1952 and 1 January 1958(**).

In accordance with the provisions referred to above this declaration indicates the competence of the European Economic Community in matters governed by the Convention.

The Community points out that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to the conservation and management of sea fishing resources. Hence, in the field of sea fishing it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which are enforced by the Member States) and to enter into external undertakings with third states or competent international organisations.

(*) Formal confirmation is the term used in the Convention for ratification by international organisations (see Article 306 and Annex IX, Article 3).

(**)The Treaty of Paris establishing the European Coal and Steel Community was registered at the Secretariat of the United Nations on 15.3.1957 under No. 3729; the Treaties of Rome establishing the European Economic Community and the European Atomic Energy Community (Euratom) were registered on 21 April and 24 April 1958, respectively under Nos 4300 and 4301. The current members of the Communities are the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea shall apply, with regard to matters transferred to the European Economic Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Economic Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty.

Furthermore, with regard to rules and regulations for the protection and preservation of the marine environment, the Member States have transferred to the Community competences as formulated in provisions adopted by the Community and as reflected by its participation in certain international agreements (see Annex).

With regard to the provisions of Part X, the Community has certain powers as its purpose is to bring about an economic union based on a customs union.

With regard to the provisions of Part XI, the Community enjoys competence in matters of commercial policy, including the control of unfair economic practices.

The exercise of the competence that the Member States have transferred to the Community under the Treaties is, by its very nature, subject to continuous development. As a result the Community reserves the right to make new declarations at a later date.

Annex

Community texts applicable in the sector of the protection and preservation of the marine environment and relating directly to subjects covered by the Convention

Council Decision of 3 December 1981 establishing a Community information system for the control and reduction of pollution caused by hydrocarbons discharged at sea (81/971/EEC) (OJ No L 355, 10.12.1981, p. 52).

Council Directive of 4 May 1976 on pollution caused by certain dangerous substances discharged into the aquatic environment of the Community (76/464/EEC) (OJ No L 129, 18.5.1976, p. 23).

Council Directive of 16 June 1975 on the disposal of waste oils (75/439/EEC)(OJ No L 194, 25.7.1975, p. 23).

Council Directive of 20 February 1978 on waste from the titanium dioxide industry (78/176/EEC) (OJ No L 54, 25.2.1978, p. 19).

Council Directive of 30 October 1979 on the quality required of shellfish waters (79/923/EEC) (OJ No L 281, 10.11.1979, p. 47).

Council Directive of 22 March 1982 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (82/176/EEC) (OJ No L 81, 27.3.1982, p. 29).

Council Directive of 26 September 1983 on limit values and quality objectives for cadmium discharges (83/513/EEC) (OJ No L 291, 24.10.1983, p. 1 *et seq.*

).

Council Directive of 8 March 1984 on limit values and quality objectives for mercury discharges by sectors other than the chlor-alkali electrolysis industry (84/156/EEC) (OJ No L 74, 17.3.1984, p. 49 *et seq.*).

Annex

The Community has also concluded the following Conventions:

"Convention for the prevention of marine pollution from land-based sources (Council Decision 75/437/EEC of 3 March 1975 published in OJ No L 194, 25.7.1975, p. 5).

Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution (Council Decision of 11 June 1981 published in OJ No L 171, 27.6.1981, p. 11).

Convention for the protection of the Mediterranean Sea against pollution and the Protocol for the prevention of pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by dumping from ships and aircraft (Council Decision 77/585/EEC of 25 July 1977 published in OJ No L 240, 19.9.1977, p. 1).

Protocol concerning co-operation in combating pollution of the Mediterranean Sea by oil and other harmful substances in cases of emergency (Council Decision 81/420/EEC of 19 May 1981 published in OJ No L 162, 19.6.1981, p. 4).

Protocol of 2 and 3 April 1983 concerning Mediterranean specially protected areas (OJ No L 68/36, 10.3.1984)."

Upon formal confirmation:

"By depositing [the instrument of formal confirmation], the Community has the honour of declaring its acceptance, in respect of matters for which competence has been transferred to it by those of its Members States which are parties to the Convention, of the rights and obligations laid down for States in the Convention and the Agreement. The delclaration concerning the competence provided for in Article 5(1) of Annex IX to the Convention [follows].

The Community also wishes to declare, in accordance with Article 310 of the Convention, its objection to any declaration or position excluding or amending the legal scope of the provisions of the [said Convention], and in particular those relating to fishing activities. The Community does not consider the Convention to recognize the rights or jurisdiction of coastal States regarding the exploitation, conservation and managmenet of fishery resources other than sedentary species outside their exclusive economic zone.

The Community reserves the right to make subsequent declarations in respect of the Convention and the Agreement and in response to future declarations and positions.

Declaration concerning the competence of the European Community with regard to matters governed by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 and the Agreement of 28 July 1994 relating to the implementation of Part XI of the Convention (Declaration made pursuant to article 5(1) of annex IX to the Convention and to article 4(4) of the Agreement):

Article 5 (1) of Annex IX of [the said] Convention provides that the instrument of formal confirmation of an international organization shall contain a declaration specifying the matters governed by the Convention in respect of which competence has been transferred to the organization by its member States which are Parties to the Convention.

Article 4 (4) of [said Agreement] provides that formal confirmation by an international organization shall be in accordance with Annex IX of the Convention.

The European Communities were established by the Treaties of Paris (ECSC) and of Rome (EEC and Euratom), signed on 18 April 1951 and 25 March 1957 respectively. After being ratified by the Signatory States, the Treaties entered into force on 25 July 1952 and 1 January 1958. They have been amended by the Treaty on European Union, which was signed in Maastricht on 7 February 1992, and most recently by the Accession Treaty signed in Corfu on 24 June 1994, which entered into force on 1 January 1995.

The current Members of the Communites are the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of Spain, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of Austria, the Portuguese Republic, the Republic of Finland, the Kingdom of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The [said Convention and Agreement] shall apply, with regard to the competences transferred to the European Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty, in particular Article 227 thereof.

The declaration is not applicable to the territories of Member States in which the said Treaty does not apply and is without prejudice to such acts or positions as may be adopted under the Convention and the Agreement by the Member States concerned on behalf of and in the interests of those territories.

In accordance with the provisions referred to above, this declaration indicates the competence that the Members States have transferred to the Community under the Treaties in matters governed by the Convention and the Agreement.

The scope and the exercise of such Community competence are, by their nature, subject to continuous development, and the Community will complete or amend this declaration, if necessary, in accordance with article 5(4) of Annex IX to the Convention.

The Community has exclusive competence for certain matters and shares competence with its Member States for certain other matters.

1. Matters for which the Community has exclusive competence:

The Community points out that its Member Sates have transferred competence to it with regard to the conservation and management of sea fishing resources. Hence in this field it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which are enforced by the Member States) and, within its competence, to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent international organizations. This competence applies to waters under national fisheries jurisdiction and to the high seas. Nevertheless, in respect of measures relating to the exercise of jurisdiction over vessels, flagging and registration of vessels and the enforcement of penal and administrative sanctions, competence rests with the Member States whilst respecting Community law. Community law also provides for administrative sanctions.

By virtue of its commercial and customs policy, the Community has competence in respect of those provisions of Parts X and XI of the Convention and of the Agreement of 28 July 1994 which are related to international trade.

2. Matters for which the Community shares competence with its Member States:

With regard to fisheries, for a certain number of matters that are not directely related to the conservation and management of sea fishing resources, for example research and technological development and development cooperation, there is shared competence.

With regard to the provisions on maritime transport, safety of shipping and the prevention of marine pollution contained *inter alia* in Parts II, III, V, VII and XII of the Convention, the Community has exclusive competence only to the extent that such provisions of the Convention or legal instruments adopted in implementation thereof affect common rules established by the Community. When Community rules exist but are not affected, in particular in cases of Community provisions establishing only minimum standards, the Member States have competence, without prejudice to the competence of the Community to act in this field.

A list of relevant Community acts appears in the Appendix. The extent of Community competence ensuing from these acts must be assessed by reference to the precise provisions of each measure, and in particular, the extent to which these provisions establish common rules.

With regard to the provisions of Parts XIII and XIV of the Convention, the Community's competence relates mainly to the promotion of coopeation on research and technological development with non-member countries and international organizations. The activities carried out by the Community here complement the activities of the Member States. Competence in this instance is implemented by the adoption of the programmes listed in the Appendix.

3. Possible impact of other Community policies:

Mention should also be made of the Community's policies and activities in the fields of control of unfair economic practices, government procurement and industrial competitiveness as well as in the area of development aid. These policies may also have some relevance to the Convention and the Agreement, in particular with regard to certain provisions of Parts VI and XI of the Convention."

FINLAND

Upon signature:

As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Finland to continue to apply the present régime to the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Finnish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention."

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"It is the understanding of the Government of Finland that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits provided for in article 35 (c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Finland (the Aland Islands) and Sweden. Since in that strait the passage is regulated in part by a long-standing international convention in force, the present legal régime in that strait will remain unchanged after the entry into force of the Convention.

Declarations made upon ratification :

"In accordance with article 287 of the Convention, Finland chooses the International Court of Justice and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea as means for settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention as well as of the Agreement relating to the Implementation of its Part XI.

Finland recalls that, as a Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

1. The provisions of the Convention relating to the status of the different maritime spaces and to the legal régime of the uses and protection of the marine environment confirm and consolidate the general rules of the law of the sea and thus entitle the French Republic not to recognize as enforceable against it any foreign laws or regulations that are not in conformity with those general rules.

2. The provisions of the Convention relating to the area of the sea-bed and ocean floor beyond the limits of national jurisdiction show considerable deficiencies and flaws with respect to the exploration and exploitation of the said area which will require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of draft rules, regulations and procedures to ensure the establishment and effective functioning of the International Sea-Bed Authority.

To this end, all efforts must be made within the Preparatory Commission to reach general agreement on any matter of substance, in accordance with the procedure set out in rule 37 of the rules of procedure of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

3. With reference to article 140, the signing of the Convention by France shall not be interpreted as implying any change in its position in respect of resolution 1514 (XV).

4. The provisions of article 230, paragraph 2, of the Convention shall not preclude interim or preventive measures against the parties responsible for the operation of foreign vessels, such as immobilization of the vessel. They shall also not preclude the imposition of penalties other than monetary penalties for any willful and serious act which causes pollution.

Upon ratification :

1. France recalls that, as a Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in certain areas covered under the Convention. A detailed statement of the nature and scope of the areas of competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

2. France rejects declarations or reservations that are contrary to the provisions of the Convention. France also rejects unilateral measures or measures resulting from an agreement between States which would have effects contrary to the provisions of the Convention.

3. With reference to the provisions of article 298, paragraph 1, France does not accept any of the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, with respect to the following disputes:

Disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles;

Disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, and disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraph 2 or 3;

Disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations, unless the Security Council decides to remove the matter from its agenda or calls upon the parties to settle it by the means provided for in this Convention.

GERMANY[13]

Statements :

The Federal Republic of Germany recalls that, as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

For the Federal Republic of Germany the link between Part IX of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 and the Agreement of 28 July 1994 relating to the implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea as foreseen in article 2 (1) of that Agreement is fundamental.

In the absence of any other peaceful means, which would be given preference by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, that Government considers it useful to choose one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the two Conventions, as it is free to do under article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the following order:

1. the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;

2. An arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII;

3. the International Court of Justice.

Also in the absence of any other peaceful means, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby recognizes as of today the validity of special arbitration for any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping.

With reference to similar declarations made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, in the light of declarations already made or yet to be made by States upon signature, ratification of or accession to the Convention on the Law of the Sea declares as follows:

Territorial Sea, Archipelagic Waters, Straits

The provisions on the territorial sea represent in general a set of rules reconciling the legitimate desire of coastal States to protect their sovereignty and that of the international community to exercise the right of passage. The right to extend the breadth of the territorial sea up to 12 nautical miles will significantly increase the importance of the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea for all ships including warships, merchant ships and fishing vessels; this is a fundamental right of the community of nations.

None of the provisions of the Convention, which in so far reflect existing international law, can be regarded as entitling the coastal State to make the innocent passage of any specific category of foreign ships dependent on prior consent or notification.

A prerequisite for the recognition of the coastal State's right to extend the territorial sea is the régime of transit passage through straits used for international navigation. Article 38 limits the right of transit passage only in cases where a route of similar convenience exists in respect of navigational and hydrographical characteristics, which include the economic aspect of shipping.

According to the provisions of the Convention, archipelagic sea-lane passage is not dependent on the designation by the archipelagic States of specific sea-lanes or air routes in so far as there are existing routes through the archipelago normally used for international navigation.

Exclusive Economic Zone

In the exclusive economic zone, which is a new concept of international law, coastal States will be granted precise resource-related rights and jurisdiction. All other States will continue to enjoy the high seas freedoms of navigation and overflight and of all other international lawful uses of the sea. These uses will be exercised in a peaceful manner, and that is, in accordance with the principles embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

The exercise of these rights can therefore not be construed as affecting the security of the coastal State or affecting its rights and obligations under international law. Accordingly, the notion of a 200-mile zone of general rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction of the coastal State cannot be sustained either in general international law or under the relevant provisions of the Convention.

In articles 56 and 58 a careful and delicate balance has been struck between the interests of the coastal State and the freedoms and rights of all other States. This balance includes the reference contained in article 58, paragraph 2, to articles 88 to 115 which apply to the exclusive economic zone in so far as they are not incompatible with Part V. Nothing in Part V is incompatible with article 89 which invalidates claims of sovereignty.

According to the Convention, the coastal State does not enjoy residual rights in the exclusive economic zone. In particular, the rights and jurisdiction of the coastal State in such zone do not include the rights to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them.

Apart from artificial islands, the coastal State enjoys the right in the exclusive economic zone to authorize, construct, operate and use only those installations and structures which have economic purposes.

The High Seas

As geographically disadvantaged State with important interests in the traditional uses of the seas, the Federal Republic of Germany remains committed to the established principle of the freedom of the high seas. This principle, which has governed all uses of the sea for centuries, has been affirmed and in various fields, adapted to new requirements in the provisions of the Convention, which will therefore have to be interpreted to the furthest extent possible in accordance with that traditional principle.

Land-Locked States

As to the regulation of the freedom of transit enjoyed by land-locked States, transit through the territory of transit States must not interfere with the sovereignty of these States. In accordance with article 125, paragraph 3, the rights and facilities provided for in Part X in no way infringe upon the sovereignty and legitimate interests of transit States. The precise content of the freedom of transit has in each single case to be agreed upon by the transit State and the land-locked State concerned. in the absence of such agreement concerning the terms and modalities for exercising the right of access of persons and goods to transit through the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany is only regulated by national law, in particular with regard to means and ways of transport and the use of traffic infrastructure.

Marine Scientific Research

Although the traditional freedom of research suffered a considerable erosion by the Convention, this freedom will remain in force for States, international organizations and private entities in some maritime areas, e.g., the sea-bed beyond the continental shelf and the high seas. However, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf, which are of particular interest to marine scientific research, will be subject to a consent régime, a basic element of which is the obligation of the coastal State under article 246, paragraph 3, to grant its consent in normal circumstances. In this regard, promotion and creation of favourable conditions for scientific research, as postulated in the Convention, are general principles governing the application and interpretation of all relevant provisions of the Convention.

The marine scientific research régime on the continental shelf beyond 200 nautical miles denies the coastal State the discretion to withhold consent under article 246, paragraph 5 (a), outside areas it has publicly designated in accordance with the prerequisites stipulated in paragraph 6. Relating to the obligation, to disclose information about exploitation or exploratory operations in the process of designation is taken into account in article 246, paragraph 6, which explicitly excluded details from the information to be provided.

GREECE[14]

Interpretative declaration on the subject of straits made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The present declaration concerns the provisions of Part III `on straits used for international navigation' and more especially the application in practice of articles 36, 38, 41 and 42 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In areas where there are numerous spread out islands that form a great number of alternative straits which serve in fact one and the same route of international navigation, it is the understanding of Greece, that the coastal state concerned has the responsibility to designate the route or routes, in the said alter-

native straits, through which ships and aircrafts of third countries could pass under transit passage régime, in such a way as on the one hand the requirements of international navigation and overflight are satisfied, and on the other hand the minimum security requirements of both the ships and aircrafts in transit as well as those of the coastal state are fulfilled."

Upon ratification:

"1. In ratifying the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, Greece secures all the rights and assumes all the obligations deriving from the Convention.

Greece shall determine when and how it shall exercise these rights, according to its national strategy. This shall not imply that Greece renounces these rights in any way.

2. Greece wishes to reiterate the interpretative declaration on straits which it deposited at the time of the Convention's adoption and at the time of its signature. *[See **"Interpretative declaration made upon signature on the subject of straits and confirmed upon ratification"** above.]*

3. Pursuant to article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Hellenic Republic hereby choose, the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI of the Convention as the means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

4. Greece, as a State member of the European Union, has given the latter jurisdiction with respect to certain issues relating to the Convention. Following the deposit by the European Union of its instrument of formal confirmation, Greece will make a special declaration specifying in detail the issues dealt with in the Convention for which it has transferred jurisdiction to the European Union.

5. Greece's ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not imply that it recognizes the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia and does not, therefore, constitute the establishment of treaty relations with the latter."

GUATEMALA

Declaration:

[The Government of Guatemala] declares, that:

(a) approval of the Convention by the Congress of the Republic of Guatemala shall under no circumstances affect the rights of Guatemala over the territory of Belize, including the islands, cays and islets, or its historical rights over Bahía de Amatique, and (b) accordingly, the territorial sea and maritime zones cannot be delimited until such time as the existing dispute is resolved.

GUINEA

Upon signature:

The Government of the Republic of Guinea reserves the right to interpret any article of the Convention in the context and taking due account of the sovereignty of Guinea and of its territorial integrity as it applies to the land, space and sea.

GUINEA-BISSAU

As regards article 287 on the choice of a procedure for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, [the Government of Guinea-Bissau] does not accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and consequently will not accept that jurisdiction with respect to articles 297 and 298.

HONDURAS

18 June 2002

Declaration under article 287:

In accordance with article 287, paragraph 1, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the State of Honduras chooses the International Court of Justice as the means for the settlement of disputes of any kind concerning the interpretation or application of the said Convention.

Notwithstanding the foregoing, the State of Honduras reserves the possibility of considering any other means of peaceful settlement, including the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as agreed on a case-by-case basis.

HUNGARY

Declaration:

"... the Government of the Republic of Hungary makes the following declaration in relation to Article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea adopted in Montego Bay on 10 December 1982:

In accordance with the Article 287 of the said Convention the Government of the Republic of Hungary shall choose the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention in the following order:

1. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea,
2. The International Court of Justice,
3. A special tribunal constructed in accordance with Annex VIII for all of the categories of disputes specified therein."

ICELAND

"Under article 298 of the Convention the right is reserved [by the Government of Iceland] that any interpretation of article 83 shall be submitted to conciliation under Annex V, Section 2 of the Convention."

INDIA

Declarations:

"(a) The Government of the Republic of India reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298, concerning the settlement of disputes.

(b) The Government of the Republic of India understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those involving the use of weapons or explosives without the consent of the coastal State."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Interpretative declaration on the subject of straits

"In accordance with article 310 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran seizes the opportunity at this solemn moment of signing the Convention, to place on the records its "understanding" in relation to certain provisions of the Convention. The main objective for submitting these declarations is the avoidance of eventual future interpretation of the following articles in a manner incompatible with the original intention and previous positions or in disharmony with national laws and regulations of the Islamic Republic of Iran. It is, . . . , the understanding of the Islamic Republic of Iran that:

1) Notwithstanding the intended character of the Convention being one of general application and of law making nature, certain of its provisions are merely product of *quid pro quo*

which do not necessarily purport to codify the existing customs or established usage (practice) regarded as having an obligatory character. Therefore, it seems natural and in harmony with article 34 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, that only states parties to the Law of the Sea Convention shall be entitled to benefit from the contractual rights created therein.

The above considerations pertain specifically (but not exclusively) to the following:

-- The right of Transit passage through straits used for international navigation (Part III, Section 2, article 38).

-- The notion of "Exclusive Economic Zone" (Part V). -All matters regarding the International Seabed Area and the Concept of "Common Heritage of mankind" (Part XI).

2) In the light of customary international law, the provisions of article 21, read in association with article 19 (on the Meaning of Innocent Passage) and article 25 (on the Rights of Protection of the Coastal States), recognize (though implicitly) the rights of the Coastal States to take measures to safeguard their security interests including the adoption of laws and regulations regarding, *inter alia*, the requirements of prior authorization for warships willing to exercise the right of innocent passage through the territorial sea.

3) The right referred to in article 125 regarding access to and from the sea and freedom of transit of Land-locked States is one which is derived from mutual agreement of States concerned based on the principle of reciprocity.

4) The provisions of article 70, regarding "Right of States with Special Geographical Characteristics" are without prejudice to the *exclusive right*

of the Coastal States of enclosed and semi-enclosed maritime regions (such as the Persian Gulf and the Sea of Oman) with large population predominantly dependent upon relatively poor stocks of living resources of the same regions.

5) Islets situated in enclosed and semi-enclosed seas which potentially can sustain human habitation or economic life of their own, but due to climatic conditions, resource restriction or other limitations, have not yet been put to development, fall within the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 121 concerning "Regime of Islands", and have, therefore, full effect in boundary delimitation of various maritime zones of the interested Coastal States.

Furthermore, with regard to "Compulsory Procedures Entailing Binding Decisions" the Government of the Islamic Republic of Iran, while fully endorsing the Concept of settlement of all international disputes by peaceful means, and recognizing the necessity and desirability of settling, in an atmosphere of mutual understanding and cooperation, issues relating to the interpretation and application of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, at this time will not pronounce on the choice of procedures pursuant to articles 287 and 298 and reserves its positions to be declared in due time."

IRAQ[15]

Upon signature:

Pursuant to article 310 of the present Convention and with a view to harmonizing Iraqi laws and regulations with the provisions of the Convention, the Republic of Iraq has decided to issue the following statement:

1. The present signature in no way signifies recognition of Israel and implies no relationship with it.

2. Iraq interprets the provisions applying to all types of straits set forth in Part III of the Convention as applying also to navigation between islands situated near those straits if the shipping lanes leaving or entering those straits and defined by the competent international organization lie near such islands.

IRELAND

Declaration:

"Ireland recalls that, as a member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in regard to certain matters which are governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention."

ITALY

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982, Italy wishes to state that in its opinion part XI and annexes III and IV contain considerable flaws and deficiencies which require rectification through the adoption by the Preparatory Commission of the International Sea-Bed Authority and the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea of appropriate draft rules, regulations and procedures.

Italy wishes also to confirm the following points made in its written statement dated 7 March 1983:

-- according to the Convention, the Coastal State does not enjoy residual rights in the exclusive economic zone. In particular, the rights and jurisdiction of the Coastal State in such zone do not include the right to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them.

Moreover, the rights of the Coastal State to build and to authorize the construction operation and the use of installations and structures in the exclusive economic zone and on the continental shelf is limited only to the categories of such installations and structures as listed in art. 60 of the Convention.

-- None of the provisions of the Convention, which corresponds on this matter to customary International Law, can be regarded as entitling the Coastal State to make innocent passage of particular categories of foreign ships dependent on prior consent or notification."

Upon ratification:

"Upon depositing its instrument of ratification Italy recalls that, as Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community with respect to certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extension of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions in Annex IX of the Convention.

Italy has the honour to declare, under paragraph 1(a) of article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept any of the procedures provided for in section 2 of Part XV with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations as well as those involving historic bays or titles.

In any case, the present declarations should not be interpreted as entailing acceptance or rejection by Italy of declarations concerning matters other than those considered in it, made by other States upon signature or ratification.

Italy reserves the right to make further declarations relating to the Convention and to the Agreement."

26 February 1997

In implementation of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Italy has the honour to declare that, for the settlement of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of the Convention and of the Agreement adopted on 28 July 1994 relating to the Implemen-

tation of Part XI. it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the International Court of Justice, without specifying that one has precedence over the other.

In making this declaration under article 287 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Italy is reaffirming its confidence in the existing international judicial organs. In accordance with article 287, paragraph 4, Italy considers that it has chosen "the same procedure" as any other State Party that has chosen the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea or the International Court of Justice.

KIRIBATI

Declaration:

"In exercise of the right conferred by Article 310 of the Convention, the Republic of Kiribati, upon accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS), declares that in accepting the provisions of Part IV of Article 47 of the said Convention, wishes to highlight its concerns relating to the formula used for drawing archipelagic baselines.

Part IV calculations for archipelagic waters do not allow a baseline to be drawn around all the islands of each of the three Groups of islands that make up the Republic of Kiribati. These Group of islands are spread over an expanse of over three million square kilometres of ocean, and the existing formula as spelt out in Part IV of the Convention, will divide Kiribati's three island groups into three distinct exclusive zone waters and international waters.

The Government of Kiribati wishes to propose that the formula used for drawing archipelagic baselines be revisited in the future to take into consideration the above-mentioned concerns of Kiribati

Accession by Kiribati to the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea does not in any way prejudice its status as an archipelagic state or its legal rights to declare all or part of its maritime territory as archipelagic waters under the said Convention."

KUWAIT[15]

Understanding:

The ratification by Kuwait of the said Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel nor that treaty relations will arise with Israel.

LATVIA

Declaration under article 287:

"In accordance with paragraph 1 of the Article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea the Republic of Latvia declares that it chooses the following means for the settlement of dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention:

1) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI of the Convention,

2) The International Court of Justice."

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

".... in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 287 of the Convention, the Republic of Lithuania chooses the following means for the settlement of dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention:

a) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with Annex VI;

b) The International Court of Justice."

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

The Government of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg has decided to sign the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea because it represents, in the context of the law of the sea, a major contribution to the codification and progressive development of international law.

Nevertheless, in the view of the Government of Luxembourg, certain provisions of Part XI and Annexes III and IV of the Convention are marred by serious shortcomings and defects which, moreover, explain why it was not possible to reach a consensus on the text at the last session of the Third Conference on the Law of the Sea, held in New York in April 1982.

These shortcomings and defects concern, in particular, the mandatory transfer of technology and the cost and financing of the future Sea-Bed Authority and the first mine site of the Enterprise. They will have to be rectified by the rules, regulations and procedures to be drawn up by the Preparatory Commission. The Government of Luxembourg recognizes that the work remaining to be done is of great importance and hopes that it will be possible to reach agreement on the modalities for operating a sea-bed mining régime that will be generally acceptable and therefore conducive to promoting the activities of the international zone of the sea-bed.

As the representatives of France and the Netherlands pointed out two years ago, [the Government of Luxembourg] wishes to make it abundantly clear that, notwithstanding its decision to sign the Convention today, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg is not here and now determined to ratify it.

It will take a separate decision on this point, at a later date, which will take account of what the Preparatory Commission has accomplished to make the international régime of the sea-bed acceptable to all.

[The Government of Luxembourg] also wishes to recall that Luxembourg is a member of the European Economic Community and, by virtue thereof, has transferred to the Community powers in certain areas covered by the Convention. Detailed declarations on the nature and extent of the powers transferred will be made in due course, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

Like other members of the Community, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg also reserves its position on all declarations made at the final session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, at Montego Bay, that may contain elements of interpretation concerning the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

MALAYSIA

Declarations:

"1. The Malaysian Government is not bound by any domestic legislation or by any declaration issued by other States upon signature or ratification of this Convention. Malaysia reserves the right to state its positions concerning all such legislations or declarations at the appropriate time, in particular the maritime claims of any other State having signed or ratified the Convention, where such claims are inconsistent with the relevant principles of international laws and the provisions of the Convention on the Law of the Sea and which are prejudicial to the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of Malaysia in its maritime areas.

2. The Malaysian Government understands that the provisions of article 301 prohibiting 'any threat or use of force against the territorial integrity of any State, or in other manner inconsistent with the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations' apply in particular to the maritime areas under the sovereignty or jurisdiction of the coastal state.

3. The Malaysian Government also understands that the provisions of the Convention do not authorize other States to carry out military exercises or manoeuvres, in particular those involving the use of weapon or explosives in the exclusive economic zone without the consent of the coastal state.

4. In view of the inherent danger entailed in the passage of nuclear-powered vessels or vessels carrying nuclear material or other material of a similar nature and in view of the provision of article 22, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Law of the Sea concerning the right of the coastal State to confine the passage of such vessels to sea lanes designated by the State within its territorial sea, as well as that of article 23 of the Convention, which requires such vessels to carry documents and observe special precautionary measures as specified by international agreements, the Malaysian Government, with all of the above in mind, requires the aforesaid vessels to obtain prior authorization of passage before entering the territorial sea of Malaysia until such time as the international agreements referred to in article 23 are concluded and Malaysia becomes a party thereto. Under all circumstances, the flag State of such vessels shall assume all responsibility for any loss or damage resulting from the passage of such vessels within the territorial sea of Malaysia.

5. The Malaysian Government also wishes to reiterate the statement relating to article 233 of the Convention in its application to the Straits of Malacca and Singapore which has been annexed to a letter dated 28th April 1982 transmitted to the President of UNCLOS III and as contained in Document A/CONF.62/L.145, UNCLOS III Off.Rec., vol. XVI, p. 250-251.

6. The ratification of the Convention by the Malaysian Government shall not in any manner affect its rights and obligations under any agreements and treaties on maritime matters entered into to which the Malaysian Government is a party.

7. The Malaysian Government interprets article 74 and article 83 to the effect that in the absence of agreement on the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone or continental shelf or other maritime zones, for an equitable solution to be achieved, the boundary shall be the median line, namely a line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of Malaysia and of such other States is measured.

Malaysia is also of the view that in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, namely article 56 and article 76, if the maritime area is less or to a distance of 200 nautical miles from the baselines, the boundary for continental shelf and exclusive economic zone shall be on the same line (identical).

8. The Malaysian Government declares, without prejudice to article 303 of the Convention of the Law of the Sea, that any objects of an archeological and historical nature found within the maritime areas over which it exerts sovereignty or jurisdiction shall not be removed, without its prior notification and consent."

MALI

Upon signature:

On signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Republic of Mali remains convinced of the interdependence of the interests of all peoples and of the need to base international co-operation on, in particular, mutual respect, equality, solidarity at the international, regional and sub-regional levels, and positive good-neighbourliness between States.

It thus reiterates its statement of 30 April 1982, reaffirming that the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the negotiation and adoption of which the Government of Mali participated in good faith, constitutes a perfectible international legal instrument.

Nevertheless, Mali's signature of the said Convention is without prejudice to any other instrument concluded or to be concluded by the Republic of Mali with a view to improving its status as a geographically disadvantaged and land-locked State. It is likewise without prejudice to the elements of any position which the Government of Mali may deem it necessary to take with regard to any question of the Law of the Sea pursuant to article 310.

In any case, the present signature has no effect on the course of Mali's foreign policy or on the rights it derives from its sovereignty under its Constitution or the Charter of the United Nations and any other relevant rule of international law.

MALTA[16]

Declaration:

The ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is a reflection of Malta's recognition of the many positive elements it contains, including its comprehensiveness, and its role in the application of the concept of the common heritage of mankind.

At the same time, it is realised that the effectiveness of the regime established by the Convention depends to a great extent on the attainment of its universal acceptance, not least by major maritime States and those with technology which are most affected by the regime.

The effectiveness of the provisions of Part IX on 'enclosed or semi-enclosed seas', which provide for cooperation of States bordering such seas, like the Mediterranean, depends on the acceptance of the Convention by the States concerned. To this end, the Government of Malta encourages and actively supports all efforts at achieving this universality.

The Government of Malta interprets articles 69 and 70 of the Convention as meaning that access to fishing in the exclusive economic zone of third States by vessels of developed land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States is dependent upon the prior granting of access by the coastal States in question to the nationals of other States which have habitually fished in the said zone.

The baselines as established by Maltese legislation for the delimitation of the territorial sea, and related areas, for the archipelago of the islands of Malta and which incorporate the island of Filfla as one of the points from which baselines are drawn, are fully in line with the relevant provisions of the Convention.

The Government of Malta interprets article 74 and article 83 to the effect that in the absence of agreement on the delimitation of the exclusive economic zone or the continental shelf or other maritime zones, for an equitable solution to be achieved, the boundary shall be the median line, namely a line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points of the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial waters of Malta and of such other States is measured.

The exercise of the right of innocent passage of warships through the territorial sea of other States, should also be perceived to be a peaceful one. Effective and speedy means of communication are easily available, and make the prior notification of the exercise of the right of innocent passage of warships, reasonable and not incompatible with the Convention. Such notification is already required by some States. Malta reserves the right to legislate on this point.

Malta is also of the view that such a notification requirement is needed in respect of nuclear-powered ships or ships carrying nuclear or other inherently dangerous or noxious substances. Furthermore, no such ships shall be allowed within Maltese internal waters without the necessary authorisation.

Malta is of the view that the sovereign immunity contemplated in article 236, does not exonerate a State from such obligation, moral or otherwise, in accepting responsibility and liability for compensation and relief in respect of damage

caused by pollution of the marine environment by any warship, naval auxiliary, other vessels or aircraft owned or operated by the State and used on government non-commercial service.

Legislation and regulations concerning the passage of ships through Malta's territorial sea are compatible with the provisions of the Convention. At the same time, the right is reserved to develop further this legislation in conformity with the Convention as may be required.

Malta declares itself in favour of establishing sea-lanes and special regimes for foreign fishing vessels transversing its territorial sea.

Note is taken of the statement by the European Community made at the time of signature of the Convention regarding the fact that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to certain aspects of the Convention. In view of Malta's application to join the European Community, it is understood that this will also become applicable to Malta on membership.

The Government of Malta does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other States may have made, or will make, upon signing or ratifying the Convention, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time. In particular, ratification of the Convention does not imply automatic recognition of maritime or territorial claims by any signatory or ratifying State.

MEXICO

Declarations under articles 287 and 298:

In accordance with the terms of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Mexico declares that it chooses, in no order of preference, one of the following means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention:

1. The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea established in accordance with annex VI;

2. The International Court of Justice;

3. A special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with annex VIII for one or more of the categories of disputes specified therein.

"The Government of Mexico declares that, pursuant to article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept the procedures provided for in part XV, section 2, with respect to the following categories of disputes:

1. Disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles, pursuant to paragraph 1 (a) of article 298;

2. Disputes concerning military activities and the other activities referred to in paragraph 1 (b) of article 298.

MONTENEGRO[6]

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

"1. Proceeding from the right that State Parties have on the basis of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the [Government of Montenegro] considers that a coastal State may, by its laws and regulations, subject the passage of foreign warships to the requirement of previous notification to the respective coastal State and limit the number of ships simultaneously passing, on the basis of the international customary law and in compliance with the right of innocent passage (articles 17-32 of the Convention).

2. The [Government of Montenegro] also considers that it may, on the basis of article 38, para.1, and article 45, para. 1 (a) of the Convention, determine by its laws and regulations which of the straits used for international navigation in the territorial sea of [Montenegro] will retain the regime of innocent passage, as appropriate.

3. Due to the fact that the provisions of the Convention relating to the contiguous zone

(article 33) do not provide rules on the delimitation of the contiguous zone between States with opposite or adjacent coasts, the [Government of Montenegro] considers that the principles of the customary international law, codified in article 24, para. 3, of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, signed in Geneva on 29 April 1958, will apply to the delimitation of the contiguous zone between the Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

NETHERLANDS

A. Declaration pursuant to article 287 of the Convention:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that, having regard to article 287 of the Convention, it accepts the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention with State Parties to the Convention which have likewise accepted the said jurisdiction.

Objections:

The Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to any declaration or statement excluding or modifying the legal effect of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

This is particularly the case with regard to the following matters:

I. Innocent passage in the territorial sea

The Convention permits innocent passage in the territorial sea for all ships, including foreign warships, nuclear-powered ships and ships carrying nuclear or hazardous waste, without any prior consent or notification, and with due observance of special precautionary measures established for such ships by international agreements.

II. Exclusive economic zone

1. Passage through the Exclusive Economic Zone

Nothing in the Convention restricts the freedom of navigation of nuclear-powered ships or ships carrying nuclear or hazardous waste in the Exclusive Economic Zone, provided such navigation is in accordance with the applicable rules of international law. In particular, the Convention does not authorize the coastal state to make the navigation of such ships in the EEZ dependent on prior consent or notification.

2. Military exercises in the Exclusive Economic Zone

The Convention does not authorize the coastal state to prohibit military exercises in its EEZ. The rights of the coastal state in its EEZ are listed in article 56 of the Convention, and no such authority is given to the coastal state. In the EEZ all states enjoy the freedoms of navigation and overflight, subject to the relevant provisions of the Convention.

3. Installations in the Exclusive Economic Zone

The coastal state enjoys the right to authorize, operate and use installations and structures in the EEZ for economic purposes. Jurisdiction over the establishment and use of installations and structures is limited to the rules contained in article 56 paragraph 1, and is subject to the obligations contained in article 56 paragraph 2, article 58 and article 60 of the Convention.

4. Residual rights

The coastal state does not enjoy residual rights in the EEZ. The rights of the coastal state in its EEZ are listed in article 56 of the Convention, and can not be extended unilaterally.

III. Passage through Straits

Routes and sea lanes through straits shall be established in accordance with the rules provided for in the Convention. Considerations with respect to domestic security and public order shall not affect navigation in straits used for international navi-

gation. The application of other international instruments to straits is subject to the relevant articles of the Convention.

IV. Archipelagic States

The application of Part IV of the Convention is limited to a state constituted wholly by one or more archipelagos, and may include other islands. Claims to archipelagic status in contravention of article 46 are not acceptable.

The status of archipelagic state, and the rights and obligations deriving from such status can only be invoked under the conditions of Part IV of the Convention.

V. Fisheries

The Convention confers no jurisdiction on the coastal state with respect to the exploitation, conservation and management of living marine resources other than sedentary species beyond the Exclusive Economic Zone.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory species should, in accordance with articles 63 and 64 of the Convention, take place on the basis of international cooperation in appropriate sub-regional and regional organizations.

VI. Underwater cultural heritage

Jurisdiction over objects of an archaeological and historical nature found at sea is limited to articles 149 and 303 of the Convention.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands does however consider that there may be a need to further develop, in international cooperation, the international law on the protection of underwater cultural heritage.

VII. Baselines and delimitation

A claim that the drawing of baselines or the delimitation of maritime zones is in accordance with the Convention will only be acceptable if such lines and zones have been established in accordance with Convention.

VIII. National Legislation

As a general rule of international law, as stated in articles 27 and 46 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, states may not rely on national legislation as a justification for a failure to implement the Convention.

IX. Territorial Claims

Ratification by the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not imply recognition or acceptance of any territorial claim made by a State Party to the Convention.

X. Article 301

Article 301 must be interpreted, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as applying to the territory and the territorial sea of a coastal state.

XI. General Declaration

The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the right to make further declarations relative to the Convention and to the Agreement, in response to future declarations and statements.

C. Declaration in accordance with annex IX of the Convention

Upon depositing its instrument of ratification the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, as Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community with respect to certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions in annex IX of the Convention."

NICARAGUA

Upon signature:

In accordance with article 310, Nicaragua declares that such adjustments of its domestic law as may be required in order to harmonize it with the Convention will follow from the process of constitutional change initiated by the revolutionary State of Nicaragua, it being understood that the Convention and the Resolutions adopted on 10 December 1982 and the Annexes to the Convention constitute an inseparable whole.

For the purposes of articles 287 and 298 and of other articles concerning the interpretation and application of the Convention, the Government of Nicaragua shall, if and as the occasion demands, exercise the right conferred by the Convention to make further supplementary or clarificatory declarations.

Upon ratification:

In accordance with article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Nicaragua hereby declares:

1.That it does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations or statements, however phrased or named, made by other States when signing, accepting, ratifying or acceding to the Convention and that it reserves the right to state its position on any of those declarations or statements at any time.

2.That ratification of the Convention does not imply recognition or acceptance of any territorial claim made by a State party to the Convention, nor automatic recognition of any land or sea border.

In accordance with article 287, paragraph 1, of the Convention, Nicaragua hereby declares that it accepts only recourse to the International Court of Justice as a means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Nicaragua hereby declares that it accepts only recourse to the International Court of Justice as a means for the settlement of the categories of disputes set forth in subparagraphs (a), (b) and (c) of paragraph 1 of article 298 of the Convention.

NORWAY

Declaration pursuant to article 310 of the Convention:

"According to article 309 of the Convention, no reservations or exceptions other than those expressly permitted by its provisions may be made. A declaration pursuant to its article 310 can not have the effect of an exception or reservation for the State making it. Consequently, the Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares that it does not consider itself bound by declarations pursuant to article 310 of the Convention that are or will be made by other States or international organizations. Passivity with respect to such declarations shall be interpreted neither as acceptance nor rejection of such declarations. The Government reserves Norway's right at any time to take a position on such declarations in the manner deemed appropriate."

Declaration pursuant to article 287 of the Convention:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares pursuant to article 287 of the Convention that it chooses the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention."

Declaration pursuant to article 298 of the Convention:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares pursuant to article 298 of the Convention that it does not accept an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII of any of the categories of disputes mentioned in article 298."

OMAN

Upon signature:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman that the application of the provisions of articles 19, 25, 34, 38 and 45 of the Convention does not preclude a coastal State from taking such appropriate measures as are necessary to protect its interest of peace and security."

Declarations made upon ratification:

Pursuant to the provisions of article 310 of the Convention and further to the earlier declaration by the Sultanate of Oman

dated 1 June 1982 concerning the establishment of straight baselines at any point on the coastline of the Sultanate of Oman and the lines enclosing waters within inlets and bays and waters between islands and the coast-line, in accordance with article 2(c) of Royal Decree No. 15/81 and in view of the desire of the Sultananic of Oman to bring its laws into line with the provisions of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman issues the following declarations:

Declaration No. 1, on the territorial sea

1. The Sultanate of Oman determines that its territorial sea, in accordance with article 2 of Royal Decree No. 15/81 dated 10 February 1981, extends 12 nautical miles in a seaward direction, measured from the nearest point of the baselines.

2. The Sultanate of Oman exercises full sovereignty over its territorial sea, the space above the territorial sea and its bed and subsoil, pursuant to the relevant laws and regulations of the Sultanate and in conformity with the provisions of this Convention concerning the principle of innocent passage.

Declaration No. 2, on the passage of warships throughout Omani territorial waters

Innocent passage is guaranteed to warships through Omani territorial waters, subject to prior permission. This also applies to submarines, on condition that they navigate on the surface and fly the flag of their home state.

Declaration No. 3, on the passage of nuclear-powered ships and the like through Omani territorial waters

With regard to foreign nuclear-powered ships and ships carrying nuclear or other substances that are inherently dangerous or harmful to health or the environment, the right of innocent passage, subject to prior permission, is guaranteed to the types of vessel, whether or not warships, to which the descriptions apply. This right is also guaranteed to submarines to which the descriptions apply, on condition that they navigate on the surface and fly the flag of their home State.

Declaration No. 4, on the contiguous zone

The contiguous zone extends for a distance of 12 nautical miles measured from the outer limit of the territorial waters and the Sultanate of Oman exercises the same prerogatives over it as are established by the Convention.

Declaration No. 5, on the exclusive economic zone

1. The Sultanate of Oman determines that its exclusive economic zone, in accordance with article 5 of Royal Decree No. 15/81 dated 10 February 1981, extends 200 nautical miles in a seaward direction, measured from the baselines from which the territorial sea is measured.

2. The Sultanate of Oman possesses sovereign rights over its economic zone and also exercises jurisdiction over that zone as provided for in the Convention. It further declares that, in exercising its rights and performing its duties under the Convention in the exclusive economic zone, it will have due regard to the rights and duties of other States and will act in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

Declaration No. 6, on the continental shelf

The Sultanate of Oman exercises over its continental shelf sovereign rights for the purpose of exploring it and exploiting its natural resources, as permitted by geographical conditions and in accordance with this Convention.

Declaration No. 7, on the procedure chosen for the settlement of disputes under the Convention

Pursuant to article 287 of the Convention, the Sultanate of Oman declares its acceptance of the jurisdiction of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as set forth in annex VI to the Convention, and the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, with a view to the settlement of any dispute that may arise between it and another State concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

PAKISTAN

Declarations:

" i) The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan shall, at an appropriate time, make declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298 relating to the settlement of disputes.

ii) The Law of the Sea Convention, while dealing with transit through the territory of the transit State, fully safeguards the sovereignty of the transit State. Consequently, in accordance with article 125 of the rights and facilities of transit to the land locked State ensures that it shall not in any way infringe upon the sovereignty and the legitimate interest of the transit State. The precise content of the freedom of transit consequently, in each case, has to be agreed upon by the transit State and the land locked State concerned. In the absence of such an agreement concerning the terms and modalities for exercising the right of transit, through the territory of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan shall be regulated only by national laws of Pakistan.

iii) It is the understanding of the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan that the provisions of the Convention on the Law of the Sea do not in any way authorize the carrying out in the Exclusive Economic Zone and in the Continental Shelf of any coastal State military exercises or manoeuvres by other States, in particular where the use of weapons or explosives are involved, without the consent of the coastal State concerned."

PALAU

27 April 2006

Declaration under article 298:

"The Government of the Republic of Palau declares under paragraph 1 (a) of Article 298 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea that it does not accept compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions relating to the delimitation and/or interpretation of maritime boundaries."

PANAMA

Declaration:

[The Republic of Panama] declares that it has exclusive sovereignty over the "historic Panamanian bay" of the Golfo de Panamá, a well-marked geographic configuration the coasts of which belong entirely to the Republic of Panama. It is a large indentation or inlet to the south of the Panamanian isthmus, where sea-waters superjacent to the seabed and subsoil cover the area between latitudes 70 28' 00" North and 70 31' 00" North and longitudes 70 59' 53" and 78 11' 40", both west of Greenwich, these being the positions of Punta Mala and Punta Jaqué, respectively, west and east of the entrance of the Golfo de Panamá. This large indentation penetrates fairly deep into the Panamanian isthmus. The width of its entrance, from Punta Mala to Punta de Jaqué, is some 200 kilometres and it penetrates inland a distance of 165 kilometres (measured from the imaginary line joining Punta Mala and Punta Jaqué to the mouths of the Rio Chico east of Panama City).

Given its present and potential resources, the historic bay of the Golfo de Panamá is a vital necessity for the Republic of Panama, both in terms of security and defence (this had been the case since time immemorial) and in economic terms, as its marine resources have been utilized since ancient times by the inhabitants of the Panamanian isthmus.

It is oblong in shape, with a coast outline that roughly resembles a calf's head, and its coastal perimeter, which measures some 668 kilometres, is under the maritime control of Panama. According to this delimitation, the historic bay of the Golfo de Panama has an area of approximately 30,000 km^2.

The Republic of Panama declares that, in the exercise of its sovereign and territorial rights and in compliance with its du-

ties, it will act in a manner compatible with the provisions of the Convention and reserves the right to issue further statements on the Convention if necessary.

PHILIPPINES[17,20]

Understanding made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"1. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines under and arising from the Constitution of the Philippines;

2. Such signing shall not in any manner affect the sovereign rights of the Republic of the Philippines as successor of the United States of America, under and arising out of the Treaty of Paris between Spain and the United States of America of December 10, 1898, and the Treaty of Washington between the United States of America and Great Britain of January 2, 1930;

3. Such signing shall not diminish or in any manner affect the rights and obligations of the contracting parties under the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of August 30, 1951, and its related interpretative instruments; nor those under any other pertinent bilateral or multilateral treaty or agreement to which the Philippines is a party;

4. Such signing shall not in any manner impair or prejudice the sovereignty of the Republic of the Philippines over any territory over which it exercises sovereign authority, such as the Kalayaan Islands, and the waters appurtenant thereto;

5. The Convention shall not be construed as amending in any manner any pertinent laws and Presidential Decrees or Proclamations of the Republic of the Philippines; the Government of the Republic of the Philippines maintains and reserves the right and authority to make any amendments to such laws, decrees or proclamations pursuant to the provisions of the Philippine Constitution;

6. The provisions of the Convention on archipelagic passage through sea lanes do not nullify or impair the sovereignty of the Philippines as an archipelagic state over the sea lanes and do not deprive it of authority to enact legislation to protect its sovereignty, independence, and security;

7. The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels to transit passage for international navigation;

8. The agreement of the Republic of the Philippines to the submission for peaceful resolution, under any of the procedures provided in the Convention, of disputes under Article 298 shall not be considered as a derogation of Philippine sovereignty."

PORTUGAL

Declarations:

1. Portugal reaffirms, for the purposes of delimitation of the territorial sea, the continental shelf and the exclusive economic zone, its rights under domestic law in respect of the mainland and of the archipelagos and the islands incorporated therein;

2. Portugal declares that, within a 12-nautical mile zone contiguous to its territorial sea, it will take such control measures as it deems to be necessary, in accordance with the provisions of article 33 of this Convention;

3. Pursuant to the provisions of the [said Convention], Portugal enjoys sovereign rights and jurisdiction over an exclusive economic zone of 200 nautical miles from the baseline from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured;

4. The maritime boundary lines between Portugal and the States whose coasts are opposite or adjacent to its own coasts are those which historically have been established on the basis of international law;

5. Portugal expresses its understanding that Resolution III of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea shall fully apply to the non-self-governing Territory of East Timor, of which it remains the administering Power, under the United Nations Charter and the relevant Resolutions of the General Assembly and of the Security Council. Accordingly the application of the Convention, in particular a delimitation, if any, of the maritime areas of the territory of East Timor, shall take into consideration the rights of its people under the Charter and the said Resolutions, and, furthermore, the responsibilities incumbent upon Portugal as administering Power of the Territory of East Timor;

6. Portugal declares that, without prejudice to the provisions of article 303 of the [said Convention] and to the application of other legal instruments of international law regarding the protection of the underwater archaeological heritage, any objects of a historical or archaeological nature found in the maritime zones under its sovereignty or jurisdiction may be removed only after prior notice to and subject to the consent of the competent Portuguese authorities.

7. Ratification by Portugal of this Convention does not imply the automatic recognition of any maritime or land boundary;

8. Portugal does not consider itself bound by the declarations made by other States and it reserves its position as regards each declaration to be expressed in due time;

9. Bearing in mind the available scientific information and with a view to the protection of the environment and of the sustained growth of economic activities based on the sea, Portugal will, preferably through international co-operation and taking into account the precautionary principle, carry out control activities beyond the areas under national jurisdiction;

10. For the purposes of article 287 of the Convention, Portugal declares that, in the absence of non-judicial means for the settlement of disputes arising out of the application of this Convention, it will choose one of the following means for the settlement of disputes:

a) The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, established in pursuance of Annex VI;

b) The International Court of Justice;

c) An arbitral tribunal, constituted in accordance with Annex VII;

d) A special arbitral tribunal, constituted in accordance with Annex VIII;

11. In the absence of other peaceful means for the settlement of disputes Portugal will in accordance with Annex VIII to the Convention, choose the recourse to a special arbitral tribunal in so far as the application of the provisions of this Convention, or the interpretation thereof, to the matters relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of marine living resources and marine environment, scientific research, navigation and marine pollution are concerned;

12. Portugal declares that, without prejudice to the provisions contained in Section 2, Part XV of this Convention, it does not accept the compulsory procedures referred to in Section 1 of the said Part, with respect to one or more of the categories specified in article 298 (a) (b) (c) of this Convention;

13. Portugal Notes that, as a Member State of the European community, it has transferred to the Community competence over a few matters governed by this Convention. A detailed declaration will be submitted in due time, specifying the nature and extent of the matters in respect of which it has transferred competence to the Community, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX to the Convention.

QATAR[15]

Upon signature:

The State of Qatar declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea shall in no way imply recognition of Israel or any dealing with Israel or, lead to entry with Israel into any of the relations governed by the Convention or entailed by the implementation of the provisions thereof.

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

18 April 2006

Declaration pursuant to Article 298:

"1. In accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 298 of the Convention, the Republic of Korea does not accept any of the procedures provided for in section 2 of Part XV of the Convention with respect to all the categories of disputes referred to in paragraph 1 (a), (b) and (c) of Article 298 of the Convention.

2. The present declaration shall be effective immediately.

3. Nothing in the present declaration shall affect the right of the Republic of Korea to submit a request to a court or tribunal referred to in Article 287 of the Convention to be permitted to intervene in the proceedings of any dispute between other States Parties, should it consider that it has an interest of a legal nature which may be affected by the decision in that dispute."

ROMANIA

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"1. As a geographically disadvantaged country bordering a sea poor in living resources, Romania reaffirms the necessity to develop international cooperation for the exploitation of the living resources of the economic zones, on the basis of just and equitable agreements that should ensure the access of the countries from this category to the fishing resources in the economic zones of other regions or subregions.

2. Romania reaffirms the right of coastal States to adopt measures to safeguard their security interests, including the right to adopt national laws and regulations relating to the passage of foreign warships through their territorial sea.

The right to adopt such measures is in full conformity with articles 19 and 25 of the Convention, as it is also specified in the Statement by the President of the United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in the plenary meeting of the Conference on April 26, 1982.

3. Romania states that according to the requirements of equity as it results from articles 74 and 83 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea the uninhabited islands and without economic life can in no way affect the delimitation of the maritime spaces belonging to the main land coasts of the coastal States."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Upon signature:

1. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, under article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII as the basic means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention. It opts for a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII for the consideration of matters relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research, and navigation, including pollution from vessels and dumping. It recognizes the competence of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, as provided for in article 292, in matters relating to the prompt release of detained vessels and crews.

2. The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, it does not accept the compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities, or disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

Upon ratification:

The Russian Federation declares that, in accordance with article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it does not accept the procedures, provided for in section 2 of Part XV of the Convention, entailing binding decisions with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles 15, 74 and 83 of the Convention, relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles; disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government vessels and aircraft, and disputes concerning law-enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction; and disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

The Russian Federation, bearing in mind articles 309 and 310 of the Convention, declares that it objects to any declarations and statements made in the past or which may be made in future when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention, or made for any other reason in connection with the Convention, that are not in keeping with the provisions of article 310 of the Convention. The Russian Federation believes that such declarations and statements, however phrased or named, cannot exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Convention in their application to the party to the Convention that made such declarations or statements, and for this reason they shall not be taken into account by the Russian Federation in its relations with that party to the Convention.

SAO TOME AND PRINCIPE

Upon signature:

I. The signing of the Convention by the Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe will in no way affect or prejudice the sovereign rights of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe embodied in and flowing from the Constitution of Sao Tome and Principe;

II. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations relating to the innocent passage of foreign warships through its territorial sea or its archipelagic waters and to take any other measures aimed at safeguarding its security;

III. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that the provisions of the Convention relating to archipelagic waters, the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the legislation of the Republic of Sao Tome and Principe as regards its sovereignty and its jurisdiction over the maritime space adjacent to its coasts;

IV. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe considers that, in accordance with the provisions of the Convention, where the same stock area adjacent thereto, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are under an obligation to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of the stock or stocks of associated species;

V. The Government of the Democratic Republic of Sao Tome and Principe, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, reserves the right to adopt laws and regulations to ensure the conservation of highly migratory species and

to co-operate with the States whose nationals harvest these species in order to promote the optimum utilization thereof.

Saudi Arabia

Declarations:

1. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is not bound by any domestic legislation or by any declaration issued by other States upon signature or ratification of this Convention. The Kingdom reserves the right to state its position concerning all such legislation or declarations at the appropriate time. In particular, the Kingdom's ratification of the Convention in no way constitutes recognition of the maritime claims of any other State having signed or ratified the Convention, where such claims are inconsistent with the provisions of the Convention on the Law of the Sea and are prejudicial to the sovereign rights and jurisdiction over its maritime areas.

2. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia is not bound by any international treaty or agreement which contains provisions that are inconsistent with the Convention on the Law of the Sea and prejudicial to the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of the Kingdom in its maritime areas.

3. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia considers that the application of the provisions of part IX of the Convention concerning the cooperation of States bordering enclosed or semi-enclosed areas is subject to the acceptance of the Convention by all the States concerned.

4. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia considers that the provisions of the Convention relating to the application of the system of transit passage through straits used for international navigation which connect one part of the high seas or an exclusive economic zone with another part of the high seas or an exclusive economic zone also apply to navigation between islands adjacent or contiguous to such straits, particularly where the sea lanes used for entrance to or exit from the strait, as designated by the competent international organization, are situated near such islands.

5. The Government of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia considers that innocent passage does not apply to its territorial sea where there is a route to the high seas or an exclusive economic zone which is equally suitable as regards navigational and hydrographical features.

6. In view of the inherent danger entailed in the passage of nuclear-powered vessels and vessels carrying nuclear or other material of a similar nature and in view of the provision of article 22, paragraph 2, of the [the said Convention] concerning the right of coastal State to confine the passage of such vessels to sea lanes designated by that State within its territorial sea, as well as that of article 23 of the Convention which requires such vessels to carry documents and observe special precautionary measures as specified by international agreements, the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, with all the above in mind, requires the aforesaid vessels to obtain prior authorization of passage before entering the territorial sea of the Kingdom until such time as the international agreements referred to in article 23 are concluded and the Kingdom becomes a party thereto. Under all circumstances the flag State of such vessels shall assume all responsibility for any loss or damage resulting from the innocent passage of such vessels within the territorial sea of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia.

7. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia shall issue its internal procedures for the maritime areas subject to its sovereignty and jurisdiction, so as to affirm the sovereign rights and jurisdiction and guarantee the interests of the Kingdom in those areas.

Serbia[4]

Confirmed upon succession:

"1. Proceeding from the right that State Parties have on the basis of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the [Government of Yugoslavia] considers that a coastal State may, by its laws and regulations, subject the passage of foreign warships to the requirement of previous notification to the respective coastal State and limit the number of ships simultaneously passing, on the basis of the international customary law and in compliance with the right of innocent passage (articles 17-32 of the Convention).

2. The [Government of Yugoslavia] also considers that it may, on the basis of article 38, para. 1, and article 45. para. 1 (a) of the Convention, determine by its laws and regulations which of the straits used for international navigation in the territorial sea of [Yugoslavia] will retain the regime of innocent passage, as appropriate.

3. Due to the fact that the provisions of the Convention relating to the contiguous zone (article 33) do not provide rules on the delimitation of the contiguous zone between States with opposite or adjacent coasts, the [Government of Yugoslavia] considers that the principles of the customary international law, codified in article 24, para. 3, of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, signed in Geneva on 29 April 1958, will apply to the delimitation of the contiguous zone between the Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Slovenia[4]

Declarations:

"Proceeding from the right that State Parties have on the basis of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Republic of Slovenia considers that its Part V Exclusive Economic Zone, including the provisions of article 70 Right of Geographically Disadvantaged States, forms part of the general customary international law."

The Republic of Slovenia does not consider itself to be bound by the declaratory statement on the basis of article 310 of the Convention, given by the former SFR of Yugoslavia."

11 October 2001

"Declaration pursuant to article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea:

The Government of the Republic of Slovenia declares pursuant to article 287 of the Convention that it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Declaration pursuant to article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea:

The Government of the Republic of Slovenia declares pursuant to article 298 of the Convention that it does not accept an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII of any of the categories disputes mentioned in article 298."

South Africa[18]

"The Government of the Republic of South Africa shall, at the appropriate time, make declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298 of the Convention relating to the settlement of disputes."

Spain

Upon signature:

1. The Spanish Government, upon signing this Convention, declares that this act cannot be interpreted as recognition of any rights or situations relating to the maritime spaces of Gi-

braltar which are not included in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht of 13 July 1713 between the Spanish and British Crowns. The Spanish Government also considers that Resolution III of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is not applicable in the case of the Colony of Gibraltar, which is undergoing a decolonization process in which only the relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly apply.

2. It is the Spanish Government's interpretation that the régime established in Part III of the Convention is compatible with the right of the coastal State to issue and apply its own air regulations in the air space of the straits used for international navigation so long as this does not impede the transit passage of aircraft.

3. With regard to article 39, paragraph 3, it takes the word "normally" to mean "except in cases of *force majeure* or distress".

4. With regard to Article 42, it considers that the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) do not prevent it from issuing, in accordance with international law, laws and regulations giving effect to generally accepted international regulations.

5. The Spanish Government interprets articles 69 and 70 of the Convention as meaning that access to fishing in the economic zones of third States by the fleets of developed land-locked and geographically disadvantaged States is dependent upon the prior granting of access by the coastal States in question to the nationals of other States who have habitually fished in the economic zone concerned.

6. It interprets the provisions of Article 221 as not depriving the coastal State of a strait used for international navigation of its powers, recognized by international law, to intervene in the case of the casualties referred to in that article.

7. It considers that Article 233 must be interpreted, in any case, in conjunction with the provisions of Article 34.

8. It considers that, without prejudice to the provisions of Article 297 regarding the settlement of disputes, Articles 56, 61 and 62 of the Convention preclude considering as discretionary the powers of the coastal State to determine the allowable catch, its harvesting capacity and the allocation of surpluses to other States.

9. Its interpretation of Annex III, Article 9, is that the provisions thereof shall not obstruct participation, in the joint ventures referred to in paragraph 2, of the States Parties whose industrial potential precludes them from participating directly as contractors in the exploitation and resources of the Area.

Upon ratification:

1. The Kingdom of Spain recalls that, as a member of the European Union, it has transferred competence over certain matters governed by the Convention to the European Community. A detailed declaration will be made in due course as to the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community, in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

2. In ratifying the Convention, Spain wishes to make it known that this act cannot be construed as recognition of any rights or status regarding the maritime space of Gibraltar that are not included in article 10 of the Treaty of Utrecht of 13 July 1713 concluded between the Crowns of Spain and Great Britain. Furthermore, Spain does not consider that Resolution III of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea is applicable to the colony of Gibraltar, which is subject to a process of decolonization in which only relevant resolutions adopted by the United Nations General Assembly are applicable.

3. Spain understands that:

a) The provisions laid down in Part III of the Convention are compatible with the right of a coastal State to dictate and apply its own regulations in straits used for international navigation, provided that this does not impede the right of transit passage.

(b) In article 39, paragraph 3 (a), the word 'normally' means 'unless by *force majeure*

or by distress'.

(c) The provisions of article 221 shall not deprive a State bordering a strait used for international navigation of its competence under international law regarding intervention in the event of the casualties referred to in that article.

4. Spain interprets that:

(a) Articles 69 and 70 of the Convention mean that access to fisheries in the exclusive economic zone of third States by the fleets of developed landlocked or geographically disadvantaged States shall depend on whether the relevant coastal States have previously granted access to the fleets of States which habitually fish in the relevant exclusive economic zone.

(b) With regard to article 297, and without prejudice to the provisions of that article in respect of settlement of disputes, articles 56, 61 and 62 of the Convention do not allow of an interpretation whereby the rights of the coastal State to determine permissible catches, its capacity for exploitation and the allocation of surpluses to other States may be considered discretionary.

5. The provisions of article 9 of Annex III shall not prevent States Parties whose industrial potential does not enable them to participate directly as contractors in the exploitation of the resources of the zone from participating in the joint ventures referred to in paragraph 2 of that article.

6. In accordance with the provisions of article 287, paragraph 1, Spain chooses the International Court of Justice as the means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

19 July 2002

Declarations under articles 287 and 298:

Pursuant to article 287, paragraph 1, the Government of Spain declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea and the International Court of Justice as means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

The Government of Spain declares, pursuant to the provisions of article 298, para. 1(a) of the Convention, that it does not accept the procedures provided for in part XV, section 2, with respect to the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles.

SUDAN

Upon signature:

Declarations made in plenary meeting at the Final Part of the Eleventh Session of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, held at Montego Bay, Jamaica, from 6 to 10 December 1982, and reiterated upon signature

[1] In accordance with article 310 of the Convention, the Sudanese Government will make such declarations as it deems necessary in order to clarify its position regarding the content of certain provisions of this instrument.

[2] [The Sudan] wishes to reiterate [the statement by the President of the Conference] in plenary meeting during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, on 26 April 1982, concerning article 21, in which deals with the laws and regulations of the coastal State relating to innocent passage: namely, that the withdrawal of the amendment submitted at the time by a number of States did not prejudge the right of coastal States to take all necessary measures, particularly in order to protect their security, in accordance with article 19 on the mean-

ing of the term "innocent passage" and article 25 on the rights of protection of the coastal State.

[3] The Sudan also wishes to state that, according to its interpretation, the definition of the term "geographically disadvantaged States" given in article 70, paragraph 2, applies to all the parts of the Convention in which this term appears.

[4] The fact that [the Sudan] is signing this Convention and the Final Act of the Conference in no way means that [it] recognizes any State whatsoever which it does not recognize or with which it has no relations.

SWEDEN

Upon signature:

"As regards those parts of the Convention which deal with innocent passage through the territorial sea, it is the intention of the Government of Sweden to continue to apply the present régime for the passage of foreign warships and other government-owned vessels used for non-commercial purposes through the Swedish territorial sea, that régime being fully compatible with the Convention.

It is also the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the Convention does not affect the rights and duties of a neutral State provided for in the Convention concerning the Rights and Duties of Neutral Powers in case of Naval Warfare (XIII Convention), adopted at The Hague on 18 October 1907."

Upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"It is the understanding of the Government of Sweden that the exception from the transit passage régime in straits, provided for in Article 35 (c) of the Convention is applicable to the strait between Sweden and Denmark (Oresund) as well as to the strait between Sweden and Finland (the Aland islands). Since in both those straits the passage is regulated in whole or in part by long-standing international conventions in force, the present legal régime in the two straits will remain unchanged."

Upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of Sweden hereby chooses, in accordance with article 287 of the Convention, the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention and the Agreement Implementing Part XI of the Convention.

The Kingdom of Sweden recalls that as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence in respect of certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention."

TUNISIA

Declaration 1:

The Republic of Tunisia, on the basis of resolution 4262 of the council of the League of Arab States, dated 31 March 1983, declares that its accession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea does not imply recognition of or dealings with any States which the Republic of Tunisia does not recognize or have dealings with.

Declaration 2:

The Republic of Tunisia, in accordance with the provisions of article 311, and, in particular, paragraph 6 thereof, declares its adherence to the basic principles relating to the common heritage of mankind and that it will not be a party to any agreement in derogation thereof. The Republic of Tunisia calls upon all States to avoid any unilateral measure or legislation of this kind that would lead to disregard of the provisions of the Convention or to the exploitation of the resources of the seabed and ocean floor and the subsoil thereof outside of the legal régime of the seas and oceans provided for in this convention and in the other legal instruments pertaining thereto, in particular resolution I and resolution II.

Declaration 3:

The Republic of Tunisia, in accordance with the provisions of article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, declares that it does not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2, of the said Convention with respect to the following categories of disputes:

(a) (i) disputes concerning the interpretation of application of articles 15, 74 and 83 relating to sea boundary delimitations, or those involving historic bays or titles, provided that a State having made such a declaration shall, when such a dispute arises subsequent to the entry into force of this Convention and where no agreement within a reasonable period of time is reached in negotiations between the parties, at the request of any party to the dispute, accept submission of the matter to conciliation under Annex V, section 2; and provided further that any dispute that necessarily involves the concurrent consideration of any unsettled dispute concerning sovereignty or other rights over continental or insular land territory shall be excluded from such submission;

(ii) after the conciliation commission has presented its report, which shall state the reasons on which it is based, the parties shall negotiate an agreement on the basis of that report; if these negotiations do not result in an agreement, the parties shall, by mutual consent, submit the question to one of the procedures provided for in section 2, unless the parties otherwise agree;

(iii) this subparagraph does not apply to any sea boundary dispute finally settled by an arrangement between the parties, or to any such dispute which is to be settled in accordance with a bilateral or multilateral agreement binding upon those parties;

(b) disputes concerning military activities, including military activities by government vessels and aircraft engaged in non-commercial service, and disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraph 2 or 3;

(c) disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations, unless the Security council decides to remove the matter from its agenda or calls upon the parties to settle it by the means provided for in this Convention.

Declaration 4:

The Republic of Tunisia, in accordance with the provisions of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, declares that its legislation currently in force does not conflict with the provisions of this Convention. However, laws and regulations will be adopted as soon as possible in order to ensure closer harmony between the provisions of the Convention and the requirements for completing Tunisian legislation in the maritime sphere.

22 May 2001

Declaration under article 287:

In accordance with the provisions of article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of Tunisia declares that it accepts, in order of preference, the following means for the settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or implementation of the above-mentioned Convention:

a)- The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea

b)- An Arbitral Tribunal established in accordance with Annex VII.

UKRAINE

Upon signature:

1. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, the Ukrainian SSR chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII. The Ukrainian SSR recognizes the competence, as stipulated in article 292, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews.

2. The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept compulsory procedures, involving binding decisions, for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes concerning military activities and disputes in respect of which the Security Council of the United Nations is exercising the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations.

Upon ratification:

1. Ukraine declares that, in accordance with article 287 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982, it chooses as the principal means for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII. For the consideration of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention in respect of questions relating to fisheries, protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping, Ukraine chooses a special arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VIII.

Ukraine recognises the competence, as stipulated in article 292 of the Convention, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in respect of questions relating to the prompt release of detained vessels or their crews.

2. Ukraine declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept, unless otherwise provided by specific international treaties of Ukraine with relevant States, the compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions for the consideration of disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations, disputes involving historic bays or titles, and disputes concerning military activities.

3. Ukraine declares, taking into account articles 309 and 310 of the Convention, that it objects to any statements or declarations, irrespective of when such statements or declarations were or may be made, that may result in a failure to interpret the provisions of the Convention in good faith, or are contrary to the ordinary meaning of terms in the context of the Convention or its object and purpose.

4. As a geographically disadvantaged country bordering a sea poor in living resources, Ukraine reaffirms the necessity to develop international cooperation for the exploitation of the living resources of economic zones, on the basis of just and equitable agreements that should ensure the access to fishing resources in the economic zones of other regions and sub-regions.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declarations:

"*(a) General*

The United Kingdom cannot accept any declaration or statement made or to be made in the future which is not in conformity with articles 309 and 310 of the Convention. Article 309 of the Convention prohibits reservations and exceptions (except those expressly permitted by other articles of the Convention). Under article 310 declarations and statements made by a State cannot exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Convention in their application to the State concerned.

The United Kingdom considers that declarations and statements not in conformity with articles 309 and 310 include, *inter alia*, the following:

-- Those which relate to baselines not drawn in conformity with the Convention;

-- Those which purport to require any form of notification or permission before warships or other ships exercise the right of innocent passage or freedom of navigation or which otherwise purport to limit navigational rights in ways not permitted by the Convention;

-- Those which are incompatible with the provisions of the Convention relating to straits used for international navigation, including the right of transit passage;

-- Those which are incompatible with the provisions of the Convention relating to archipelagic states or waters, including archipelagic baselines and archipelagic sea lanes passage;

-- Those which are not in conformity with the provisions of the Convention relating to the exclusive economic zone or the continental shelf, including those which claim coastal state jurisdiction over all installations and structures in the exclusive economic zone or on the continental shelf, and those which purport to require consent for exercises or manoeuvres (including weapons exercises) in those areas;

-- Those which purport to subordinate the interpretation or application of the Convention to national laws and regulations, including constitutional provisions.

(b) *European Community*

The United Kingdom recalls that, as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Convention. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence to the European Community will be made in due course in accordance with the provisions of Annex IX of the Convention.

(c) *The Falkland Islands*

With regard to paragraph (d) of the Declaration made upon ratification of the Convention by the Government of the Argentine Republic, the Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands and over South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering authority of both Territories, has extended the United Kingdom's accession to the Falkland Islands and to South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom, therefore, rejects as unfounded paragraph (d) of the Argentine declaration.

(d) *Gibraltar*

With regard to point 2 of the declaration made upon ratification of the convention by the Government of Spain, the Government of the United Kingdom has no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over Gibraltar, including its territorial waters. The Government of the United Kingdom, as the administering authority of Gibraltar, has extended the United Kingdom's accession to the Convention and ratification of the Agreement to Gibraltar. The Government of the United Kingdom, therefore, rejects as unfounded point 2 of the Spanish declaration."

12 January 1998

"In accordance with article 287, paragraph 1, of the [said Convention], the Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ire-

land chooses the International Court of Justice for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

The International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea is a new institution, which the United Kingdom hopes will make an important contribution to the peaceful settlement of disputes concerning the law of the sea. In addition to those cases where the Convention itself provides for the compulsory jurisdiction of the Tribunal, the United Kingdom remains ready to consider the submission of disputes to the Tribunal as may be agreed on a case-by-case basis."

7 April 2003

Declaration pursuant to article 298, paragraph 1 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea:

".....the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland does not accept any of the procedures provided for in section 2 of Part XV of the Convention with respect to the categories of disputes referred to in paragraph 1(b) and (c) of article 298."

United Republic of Tanzania

"The United Republic of Tanzania declares that is chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention."

Uruguay

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

(A) The provisions of the Convention concerning the territorial sea and the exclusive economic zone are compatible with the main purposes and principles underlying Uruguayan legislation in respect of Uruguay's sovereignty and jurisdiction over the sea adjacent to its coast and over its bed and sub-soil up to a limit of 200 miles.

(B) The legal nature of the exclusive economic zone as defined in the Convention and the scope of the rights which the Convention recognizes to the coastal State leave room for no doubt that it is a "*sui generis*

" zone of national jurisdiction different from the territorial sea and that it is not part of the high seas.

(C) Regulation of the uses and activities not provided for expressly in the Convention (residual rights and obligations) relating to the rights of sovereignty and to the jurisdiction of the coastal State in its exclusive economic zone falls within the competence of that State, provided that such regulation does not prevent enjoyment of the freedom of international communication which is recognized to other States.

(D) In the exclusive economic zone, enjoyment of the freedom of international communication in accordance with the way it is defined and in accordance with other relevant provisions of the Convention excludes any non-peaceful use without the consent of the coastal State for instance, military exercises or other activities which may affect the rights or interests of that State and it also excludes the threat or use of force against the territorial integrity, political independence, peace or security of the coastal State.

(E) This Convention does not empower any State to build, operate or utilize installations or structures in the exclusive economic zone of another State, neither those referred to in the Convention nor any other kind, without the consent of the coastal State.

(F) In accordance with all the relevant provisions of the Convention, where the same stock or stocks of associated species occur both within the exclusive economic zone and in an area beyond and adjacent to the zone, the States fishing for such stocks in the adjacent area are duty bound to agree with the coastal State upon the measures necessary for the conservation of these stocks or associated species.

(G)When the Convention enters into force, Uruguay will apply, with respect to other States Parties, the provisions established by the Convention and by Uruguayan legislation, on the basis of reciprocity.

(H) Pursuant to the provisions of article 287, Uruguay declares that it chooses the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea for the settlement of such disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention as are not subject to other procedures, without prejudice to its recognition of the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and of such agreements with other States as may provide for other means for peaceful settlement.

(I) Pursuant to the provisions of article 298, Uruguay declares that it will not accept the procedures provided for in Part XV, section 2 of the Convention, in respect of disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraphs 2 and 3.

(J) Reaffirms that, as stated in article 76, the continental shelf is the natural prolongation of the territory of the coastal State to the outer edge of the continental margin.

Viet Nam[19]

Declarations:

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam, by ratifying the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, expresses its determination to join the international community in the establishment of an equitable legal order and in the promotion of maritime development and cooperation.

The National Assembly reaffirms the sovereignty of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam over its internal waters and territorial sea; the sovereign rights and jurisdiction in the contiguous zone, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf of Vietnam, based on the provisions of the Convention and principles of international law and calls on other countries to respect the above-said rights of Vietnam.

The National Assembly reiterates Vietnam's sovereignty over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa archipelagoes and its position to settle those disputes relating to territorial claims as well as other disputes in the Eastern Sea through peaceful negotiations in the spirit of equality, mutual respect and understanding, and with due respect of international law, particularly the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and of the sovereign rights and jurisdiction of the coastal states over their respective continental shelves and exclusive economic zones; the concerned parties should, while exerting active efforts to promote negotiations for a fundamental and long-term solution, maintain stability on the basis of the status quo, refrain from any act that may further complicate the situation and from the use of force or threat of force.

The National Assembly emphasizes that it is necessary to identify between the settlement of dispute over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa archipelagoes and the defense of the continental shelf and maritime zones falling under Vietnam's sovereignty, rights and jurisdiction, based on the principles and standards and specified in the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea.

The National Assembly entitles the National Assembly's Standing Committee and the Government to review all relevant national legislation to consider necessary amendments in conformity with the 1982 UN Convention on the Law of the Sea, and to safeguard the interest of Vietnam.

The National Assembly authorizes the Government to undertake effective measures for the management and defense of the continental shelf and maritime zones of Vietnam.

YEMEN[11,15]

1. The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen will give precedence to its national laws in force which require prior permission for the entry or transit of foreign warships or of submarines or ships operated by nuclear power or carrying radioactive materials

2. With regard to the delimitation of the maritime borders between the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and any State having coasts opposite or adjacent to it, the median line basically adopted shall be drawn in a way such that every point of it is equidistant from the nearest points on the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea of any State is measured. This shall be applicable to the maritime borders of the mainland territory of the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen and also of its islands.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, formal confirmation, accession or succession.)

AUSTRALIA[20]

3 August 1988

"Australia considers that [the] declaration made by the Republic of the Philippines is not consistent with article 309 of the Law of the Sea Convention, which prohibits the making of reservations, nor with article 310 which permits declarations to be made "provided that such declarations or statements do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effects of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State.

The declaration of the Republic of the Philippines asserts that the Convention shall not affect the sovereign rights of the Philippines arising from its Constitution, its domestic legislation and any treaties to which the Philippines is a party. This indicates, in effect, that the Philippines does not consider that it is obliged to harmonise its law with the provisions of the Convention. By making such an assertion, the Philippines is seeking to modify the legal effect of the Convention's provisions.

This view is supported by the specific reference in the declaration to the status of archipelagic waters. The declaration states that the concept of archipelagic waters in the Convention is similar to the concept of internal waters held under former constitutions of the Philippines and recently reaffirmed in article 1 of the New Constitution of the Philippines in 1987. It is clear, however, that the Convention distinguishes the two concepts and that different obligations and rights are applicable to archipelagic waters from those which apply to internal waters. In particular, the Convention provides for the exercise by foreign ships of the rights of innocent passage and of archipelagic sea lanes passage in archipelagic waters.

Australia cannot, therefore, accept that the statement of the Philippines has any legal effect or will have any effect when the Convention comes into force and considers that the provisions of the Convention should be observed without being made subject to the restrictions asserted in the declaration of the Republic of the Philippines."

BELARUS

24 June 1985

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that the statement which was made by the Government of the Philippines upon signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and confirmed subsequently upon ratification of that Convention in essence contains reservations and exceptions to the said Convention, contrary to the provisions of article 309 thereof. The statement by the Government of the Philippines is also inconsistent with article 310 of the Convention, under which any declarations or statements made by a State when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention are admissible only "provided that such declarations or statements do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State".

The Government of the Philippines in its statement repeatedly emphasizes its intention to continue to be governed in ocean affairs not by the Convention or by obligations thereunder, but by its national laws and previously concluded agreements, which are not in conformity with the provisions of the Convention. The Philippine side therefore declines to harmonize its national legislation with the provisions of the Convention and fails to perform one of its most fundamental obligations thereunder -- to comply with the régime of archipelagic waters, which provides for the right of archipelagic passage of foreign ships and aircraft through or over such waters.

For the above reasons, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic cannot recognize the validity of the statement by the Government of the Philippines and regards it as having no legal force in the light of the provisions of the Convention.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that if the similar statements which were likewise made by certain other States when signing the Convention and which are inconsistent with the provisions thereof also occur at the stage of ratification or accession, the result could be to undermine the object and importance of the Convention and to prejudice that major instrument of international law.

In view of the foregoing, the Permanent Mission of the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic to the United Nations believes that it would be appropriate for the Secretary-General of the United Nations, in accordance with article 319, paragraph 2 (a), of the Convention, to carry out a study of a general nature relating to the universal application of the provisions of the Convention and, *inter alia*, to the issue of harmonizing the national laws of States parties with the Convention. The findings of such a study should be incorporated in the report of the Secretary-General to the General Assembly at its fortieth session under the agenda item entitled "Law of the sea".

BELIZE

11 September 1997

"Belize cannot accept any declaration or statement made by a State which is not in conformity with articles 309 and 310 of the Convention.

Article 309 prohibits reservations or exceptions unless expressly permitted by other articles of the Convention. Under article 310, declarations or statements made by a State cannot exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Convention in their application to that State.

Belize considers that declarations and statements not in conformity with articles 309 and 310 of the Convention include, *inter alia*, those which are not compatible with the dispute resolution mechanism provided in Part XV of the Convention as well as those which purport to subordinate the interpretation or application of the Convention to national laws and regulations, including constitutional provisions.

The recent declaration made by the Government of Guatemala on ratification of the Convention is inconsistent with the aforesaid articles 309 and 310 in the following respects:

(a) Any alleged `rights' over land territory referred to in paragraph (a) of the declaration are outside the scope of the Convention, so that part of the declaration does not fall within the range permitted by article 310.

(b) With regard to the alleged `historical rights' over Bahia de Amatique, the declaration purports to preclude the application of the Convention, in particular article 310 which defines bays, and Part XV which enjoins that State Parties shall settle any disputes between them concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention in accordance with the procedure prescribed therein.

(c) With regard to paragraph (b) of the Guatemalan declaration that `the territorial sea and maritime zones cannot be delimited until such time as the existing dispute is resolved', article 74 of the Convention requires States with opposite or adjacent coasts to delimit their respective Exclusive Economic Zones by agreement or, if no agreement can be reached within a reasonable time, by recourse to the dispute settlement mechanism under Part XV of the Convention. As for the delimitation of territorial sea, article 15 of the Convention provides that States with opposite or adjacent coast may not extend their respective territorial seas beyond the median line unless they so agree. To the extent that Guatemala is purporting to make a reservation as to, or to exclude or modify the effect of the aforesaid articles 15 or 74, or Part XV of the Convention, the declaration is inconsistent with articles 309 and 310 of the Convention.

For the reasons given above, the Government of Belize hereby categorically rejects as unfounded and misconceived the Guatemala declaration *in toto*."

Bulgaria

17 September 1985

"The People's Republic of Bulgaria is seriously concerned by the actions of a number of States which, upon signature or ratification of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, have made reservations conflicting with the Convention itself or have enacted national legislation which excludes or modifies the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to those States. Such actions contravene article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and are at variance with the norms of customary international law and with the explicit provision of article 18 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Such a tendency undermines the purport and meaning of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, which establishes a universal and uniform regime for the use of the oceans and seas and their resources. In the note verbale of the Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of Bulgaria to the Embassy of the Philippines in Belgrade, [...] the Bulgarian Government has rejected as devoid of legal force the statement made by the Philippines upon signature, and confirmed upon ratification, of the Convention.

The People's Republic of Bulgaria will oppose in the future as well any attempts aimed at unilaterally modifying the legal regime, established by the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

Czech Republic[5]

Ethiopia

8 November 1984

"Paragraph 3 of the declaration relates to claims of sovereignty over unspecified islands in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean which clearly is outside the purview of the Convention. Although the declaration, not constituting a reservation as it is prohibited by article 309 of the Convention, is made under article 310 of same and as such is not governed by articles 19-23 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties providing for acceptance of and objections to reservations, nevertheless, the Provisional Military Government of Socialist Ethiopia wishes to place on record that paragraph 3 of the declaration by the Yemen Arab Republic cannot in any way affect Ethiopia's sovereignty over all the islands in the Red Sea forming part of its national territory."

Israel

11 December 1984

"The concerns of the Government of Israel, with regard to the law of the sea, relate principally to ensuring maximum freedom of navigation and overflight everywhere and particularly through straits used for international navigation.

In this regard, the Government of Israel states that the regime of navigation and overflight, confirmed by the 1979 Treaty of Peace between Israel and Egypt, in which the Strait of Tiran and the Gulf of Aqaba are considered by the Parties to be international waterways open to all nations for unimpeded and non-suspendable freedom of navigation and overflight, is applicable to the said areas. Moreover, being fully compatible with the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the regime of the Peace Treaty will continue to prevail and to be applicable to the said areas.

It is the understanding of the Government of Israel that the declaration of the Arab Republic of Egypt in this regard, upon its ratification of the [said] Convention, is consonant with the above declaration [made by Egypt]."

Italy

24 November 1995

With respect to the declaration made by India upon ratification, as well as for the similar ones made previously by Brazil, Cape Verde and Uruguay:

"Italy wishes to reiterate the declaration it made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification according to which `the rights of the coastal State in such zone do not include the right to obtain notification of military exercises or manoeuvres or to authorize them'. According to the declaration made by Italy upon ratification this declaration applies as a reply to all past and future declarations by other States concerning the matters covered by it".

Russian Federation

25 February 1985

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics considers that the statement made by the Philippines upon signature, and then confirmed upon ratification, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea in essence contains reservations and exceptions to the Convention, which is prohibited under article 309 of the Convention. At the same time, the statement of the Philippines is incompatible with article 310 of the Convention, under which a State, when signing or ratifying the Convention, may make declarations or statements only "provided that such declarations or statements do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State".

The discrepancy between the Philippine statement and the Convention can be seen, *inter alia*, from the affirmation by the Philippines that "The concept of archipelagic waters is similar to the concept of internal waters under the Constitution of the Philippines, and removes straits connecting these waters with the economic zone or high sea from the rights of foreign vessels

to transit passage for international navigation". Moreover, the statement emphasizes more than once that, despite its ratification of the Convention, the Philippines will continue to be guided in matters relating to the sea, not by the Convention and the obligations under it, but by its domestic law and by agreements it has already concluded which are not in line with the Convention. Thus, the Philippines not only is evading the harmonization of its legislation with the Convention but also is refusing to fulfil one of its most fundamental obligations under the Convention namely, to respect the régime of archipelagic waters, which provides that foreign ships enjoy the right of archipelagic passage through, and foreign aircraft the right of overflight over, such waters.

In view of the foregoing, the USSR cannot recognize as lawful the statement of the Philippines and considers it to be without legal effect in the light of the provisions of the Convention.

Furthermore, the Soviet Union is gravely concerned by the fact that, upon signing the Convention, a number of other States have also made statements of a similar type conflicting with the Convention. If such statements are also made later on, at the ratification stage or upon accession to the Convention, the purport and meaning of the Convention, which establishes a universal and uniform régime for the use of the oceans and seas and their resources, could be undermined and this important instrument of international law impaired.

Taking into account the statement of the Philippines and the statements made by a number of other countries upon signing the Convention, together with the statements that might possibly be made subsequently upon ratification of and accession to the Convention, the Permanent Mission of the USSR considers that it would be appropriate for the Secretary-General of the United Nations to conduct, in accordance with article 319, paragraph 2 (a), a study of a general nature on the problem of ensuring universal application of the provisions of the Convention, including the question of the harmonization of the national legislation of States with the Convention. The results of such a study should be included in the report of the Secretary-General to the United Nations General Assembly at its fortieth session under the agenda item entitled "Law of the sea".

SLOVAKIA[5]

UKRAINE

8 July 1985

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic believes that the statement which was made by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines when signing the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea and subsequently confirmed upon ratification thereof contains elements which are inconsistent with articles 309 and 310 of the Convention. In accordance with those articles, statements which a State may make upon signature, ratification or accession should not purport "to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention in their application to that State" (art. 310). Such exceptions or reservations are legitimate only when they are "expressly permitted by other articles of this Convention" (art. 309). Article 310 also emphasizes that statements may be made by a State "with a view, *inter alia*, to the harmonization of its laws and regulations with the provisions of this Convention".

However, the statement by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines not only provides no evidence of the intention to harmonize the laws of that State with the Convention, but on the contrary has the purpose, as implied particularly in paragraphs 2, 3 and 5 of the statement, of granting precedence over the Convention to domestic legislation and international agreements to which the Republic of the Philippines is a party. For example, this applies, *inter alia*, to the Mutual Defense Treaty between the Philippines and the United States of America of 30 August 1951.

Furthermore, paragraph 5 of the statement not only grants priority over the Convention to the pertinent laws of the Republic of the Philippines which are currently in force, but also reserves the right to amend such laws in future pursuant only to the Constitution of the Philippines, and consequently without harmonizing them with the provisions of the Convention. Paragraph 7 of the statement draws an analogy between internal waters of the Republic of the Philippines and archipelagic waters and contains a reservation, which is inadmissible in the light of article 309 of the Convention, depriving foreign vessels of the right of transit passage for international navigation through the straits connecting the archipelagic waters with the economic zone or high sea. This reservation is evidence of the intention not to carry out the obligation under the Convention of parties thereto to comply with the régime of archipelagic waters and transit passage and to respect the rights of other States with regard to international navigation and overflight by aircraft. Failure to comply with this obligation would seriously undermine the effectiveness and significance of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

It follows from the above that the statement by the Government of the Republic of the Philippines has the purpose of establishing unjustified exceptions for that State and in fact of modifying the legal effect of important provisions of the Convention as applied thereto. In view of this, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic cannot regard the [said] statement as having legal force. Such statements can only be described as harmful to the unified international legal régime for seas and oceans which is being established under the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In the opinion of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, the harmonization of national laws with the Convention would be facilitated by an examination within the framework of the United Nations Secretariat of the uniform and universal application of the Convention and the preparation of an appropriate study by the Secretary-General.

List of conciliators and arbitrators nominated under article 2 of annexes V and VII to the Convention

Participant:	*Nominations:*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:*
Australia	Sir Gerard Brennan AC KBE, Arbitrator Mr. Henry Burmester QC, Arbitrator Professor Ivan Shearer AM, Arbitrator	19 Aug 1999
Brazil	Walter de Sá Leitão, Conciliator and Arbitrator	10 Sep 2001
Chile	Helmut Brunner Nöer, Conciliator Rodrigo Díaz Albónico, Conciliator Carlos Martínez Sotomayor, Conciliator Eduardo Vío Grossi, Conciliator José Miguel Barros Franco, Arbitrator María Teresa Infante Caffi, Arbitrator Edmundo Vargas Carreño, Arbtirator Fernando Zegers Santa Cruz, Arbitrator	18 Nov 1998
Costa Rica	Carlos Fernando Alvarado Valverde, Conciliator and Arbitrator	15 Mar 2000
Czech Republic	Dr. Vladimir Kopal, Conciliator and Arbitrator	18 Dec 1996
Germany	Dr. (Ms.) Renate Platzoeder, Arbitrator	25 Mar 1996
Finland	Professor Kari Hakapää, Conciliator and Arbitrator Professor Martti Koskenniemi, Conciliator and Arbitrator Justice Gutav Möller, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
	Justice Pekka Vihervuori, Conciliator and Arbitrator	25 May 2001
Estonia	"... in accordance with article 2 of annex V, article 2 of annex VII and article 2 of annex VIII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea the Government of the Republic of Estonia has nominated its experts. Mrs. ENE LILLIPUU, Head of the Legal Department of the Estonian Maritime Administration, and Mr. HEIKI LINDPERE, the Director of the Institute of Law of the University of Tartu, as the conciliators of the United Nations Convention of the Law of the Sea. Mrs. ENE LILLIPUU, Head of the Legal Department of the Estonian Maritime Administration, and Mr. HEIKI LINDPERE, the Director of the Institute of Law of the University of Tartu, as the arbitrators. Mr. HEIKI LINDPERE, the Director of the Institute of Law of the University of Tartu, as the expert for special arbitration in the field of protection and preservation of the marine environment and as the expert for special arbitration in the field of navigation, including pollution from vessels and by dumping."	18 Dec 2001
France	Daniel Bardonnet, Arbitrator Pierre-Marie Dupuy, Arbitrator Jean-Pierre Queneudec, Arbitrator Laurent Lucchini, Arbitrator	4 Feb 1998
Indonesia	Prof. Dr. Hasjim Djalal, M.A., Conciliator and Arbitrator Dr. Etty Rocsmaryati Agoes, SH, LLM, Conciliator and Arbitrator	3 Aug 2001

Participant:	*Nominations:*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:*
	Dr. Sudirman Saad, D.H., M.Hum, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
	Lieutenant Commander Kresno Bruntoro, SH, LLM, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
Italy	Professor Umberto Leanza, Conciliator and Arbitrator	21 Sep 1999
	Ambassdor Luigi Vittorio Ferraris, Conciliator	
	Ambassador Giuseppe Jacoangeli, Conciliator	
	Professor Tullio Scovazzi, Arbitrator	
Japan	Ambassador Hisashi Owada, President of the Japan Institute of International Affairs, Arbitrator	28 Sep 2000
	Ambassador Chusei Yamada, Professor, Waseda University, Japan, Arbitrator	
	Dr. Soji Yamamoto, Professor Emeritus, Tohoku University, Japan, Arbitrator	
	Dr. Nisuke Ando, Professor, Doshisha University, Japan, Arbitrator	
	Dr. Soji Yamamoto; Professor Emeritus, Tohoku University, Japan, Conciliator	2 May 2006
	Ambassador Chusei Yamada; Member of the UN International Law Commission, Conciliator	
Mexico	Ambassador Alberto Székely Sánchez	9 Dec 2002
	Special Adviser to the Secretary for International Waters Affairs, Arbitrator	
	Dr. Alonso Gómez Robledo Verduzco	
	Researcher, Institute of Legal Research	
	National Autonomous University of Mexico	
	Member of the Inter-American Legal Committee of the Organization of American States, Arbitrator	
	Frigate Captain JN. LD.DEM. Agustín Rodríguez Malpica Esquivel	
	Chief, Legal Unit	
	Secretariat of the Navy, Arbitrator	
	Frigate Lieutenant SJN.LD. Juan Jorge Quiroz Richards	
	Secretariat of the Navy, Arbitrator	
	Ambassador José Luis Vallarta Marrón	
	Former Permanent Representative of Mexico to the International Seabed Authority, Concilator	
	Dr. Alejandro Sobarzo	
	Member of the national delegation to the Permanent Court of Arbitration, Conciliator	
	Joel Hernández García	
	Deputy Legal Adviser	
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Concilator	
	Dr. Erasmo Lara Cabrera	
	Director of International Law III	
	Legal Adviser	
	Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Conciliator	
Mongolia	Professor Rüdiger Wolfrum, Arbitraor	
	Professor Jean-Pierre Cot, Arbitrator	22 Feb 2005
Netherlands	E. Hey, Arbitrator	9 Feb 1998
	Professor A. Soons, Arbitrator	
	A. Bos, Arbitrator	
	Professor Dr. Barbara Kwiatkowska, Arbitrator	29 May 2002
Norway	Carsten Smith, President of the Supreme Court, Conciliator and Arbitrator	22 Nov 1999

Participant:	*Nominations:*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:*
	Karin Bruzelius, Supreme Court Judge, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
	Hans Wilhelm Longva, Director General, Department of Legal Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
	Ambassador Per Tresselt, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
Poland	Mr. Janusz Symonides, Conciliator and Arbitrator	14 May 2004
	Mr. Stanislaw Pawlak, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
	Mrs. Maria Dragun-Gertner, Conciliator and Arbitrator	
Russian Federation	Vladimir S. Kotliar, Arbitrator	26 May 1997
	Professor Kamil A. Bekyashev, Arbitrator	4 Mar 1998
	Mr. Alexander N. Vylegjanin, Director of the Legal Department of the Council for the Study of Productive Forces of the Russian Academy of Science, Arbitrator	17 Jan 2003
Slovakia	Dr. Marek Smid, International Law Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia, Conciliator	
	Dr. Peter Tomka, Judge of the International Court of Justice, Arbitrator	9 July 2004
Spain	José Antonio de Yturriaga Barberán, Arbitrator	23 Jun 1999
	José Manuel Lacleta Muños, Ambassador of Spain, Conciliator and Arbitrator	7 Feb 2002
	José Antonio de Yturriaga Barberán, Ambassador at large, Conciliator	
	Juan Antonio Yáñez-Barnuevo García, Ambassador at large, Conciliator	
	Aurelio Pérez Giralda, Chief, International Legal Advisory Assistance, Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Conciliator	
	José Antonio Pastor Ridruejo, Judge, European Court of Human Rights, Arbitrator	
	Julio D. González Campos, Professor of Private International Law, Universidad Autónoma de Madrid, former Constitutional Court Judge, Arbitrator	
Sri Lanka	Hon. M.S. Aziz, P.C., Conciliator and Arbitrator	17 Jan 1996
	C. W. Pinto, Secretary-General of the Iran-US Tribunal in the Hague, Conciliator and Arbitrator[21]	8 Apr 2002
	(Prof.) Dr. C.F. Amerasinghe, Conciliator and Arbitrator	17 Jan 1996
	A.R. Perera, Conciliator and Arbitrator	17 Jan 1996
Sudan	Sayed/Shawgi Hussain, Arbitrator	8 Sept 1995
	Dr. Ahmed Elmufti, Arbitrator	
	Dr. Abd Elrahman Elkhalifa, Conciliator	
	Sayed/Eltahir Hamadalla, Conciliator	
Sweden	Dr. Marie Jacobsson, Principal Legal Advisor on International Law, Ministry for Foreign Affairs, Arbitrator	2 June 2006
	Dr. Said Mahmoudi, Professor of International Law, University of Stockholm, Arbitrator	
Trinidad and Tobago	Mr. Justice Cecil Bernard, Judge of the Industrial Court of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, Arbitrator	17 Nov 2004

Participant:	*Nominations:*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:*
United Kingdom	Professor Christopher Greenwood, Arbitrator	19 Feb 1998
	Professor Elihu Lautherpacht CBE QC, Arbitrator	
	Sir Arthur Watts KCMG QC, Arbitrator	
	Judge David Anderson, CMG, Arbitrator	14 Sept 2005

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-eighth Session, Supplement No. 30* (A/9030), vol. 1, p. 13 and 14.

[2] The Final Act was signed, in each instance, on 10 December 1982:

"In the name of the following States:

Algeria, Angola, Australia, Austria, Bahamas, Bahrain, Bangladesh, Barbados, Belgium, Belize, Benin, Bhutan, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Burma, Burundi, Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, Cameroon, Canada, Cape Verde, Chad, Chile, China, Colombia, Congo, Costa Rica, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Democratic Yemen, Denmark, Djibouti, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Egypt, Equatorial Guinea, Ethiopia, Fiji, Finland, France, Gabon, Gambia, German Democratic Republic, Germany (Federal Republic of), Ghana, Greece, Grenada, Guinea-Bissau, Guyana, Haiti, Holy See, Honduras, Hungary, Iceland, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Iraq, Ireland, Israel, Italy, Ivory Coast, Jamaica, Japan, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Maldives, Malta, Mauritania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nauru, Nepal, Netherlands, New Zealand, Niger, Nigeria, Norway, Oman, Pakistan, Panama, Papua, New Guinea, Paraguay, Peru, Philippines, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Korea, Romania, Rwanda, Saint-Lucia, Saint-Vincent and the Grenadines, Samoa, Senegal, Seychelles, Sierra Leone, Singapore, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Spain, Sri Lanka, Sudan, Suriname, Sweden, Switzerland, Thailand, Togo. Trinidad and Tobago, Tunisia, Tuvalu, Uganda, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Arab Emirates, United Kingdom, United Republic of Tanzania, United States of America, Uruguay, Vanuatu, Venezuela, Viet Nam, Yemen, Yugoslavia, Zaire, Zambia, Zimbabwe;

In the name of Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia as stipulated in article 305, paragraph 1 b), of the Convention;

In the name of the following self-governing associated States referred to in article 305, paragraph 1 c), of the Convention:

Cook Islands;

In the name of the following international organizations referred to in article 305, paragraph 1 f), and in article 1 of Annex IX of the Convention:

European Economic Community;

In the name of the following Observers invited to participate in the Conference as stipulated in United Nations General Assembly Resolution 3334 (XXIX):

Netherlands Antilles

Trust Territory of the Pacific Islands (Federated States of Micronesia, Republic of the Marshall Islands);

In the name of the following National Liberation Movements invited in accordance with rule 62 of the rules of procedure, as decided in resolution IV of the Conference:

African National Congress

Palestine Liberation Organization

Pan Africanist Congress

South West Africa People's Organization.

The following declarations were made in connexion with the Final Act:

Algeria

[See declaration under the Convention]

Ecuador

On 30 April 1982, in New York, the Convention on the Law of the Sea was adopted by a vote. On that occasion the delegation of Ecuador made an official declaration saying that it had decided not to participate in the vote and stating, for the record, the reasons behind that decision. [The delegation also wishes] to recall the official declarations made by the delegation of Ecuador, particularly at the tenth and eleventh sessions of the Conference, clearly setting for the position of Ecuador.

On this occasion, [the delegation of Ecuador] must state for the record that, notwithstanding the significant progress made in the negotiations carried out during the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea and notwithstanding the establishment in the Convention of fundamental principles and rights of developing coastal States, and of the international community in general, the Convention which is today being opened for signature by States does not fully meet Ecuador's rights and interests. Ecuador has always exercised and will continue to exercise such rights in accordance with its national legislation. That legislation was drawn up without violating any principle or norm of international law long before any of the three conferences held under the auspices of the United Nations was convened.

Recognition of the exclusive rights of sovereignty and jurisdiction over all the living and non-living resources contained in the adjacent seas up to a distance of 200 miles and their respective beds, constitutes a victory for the coastal States, one that began with the visionary Declaration of Santiago of 1952. The territorialist group, which is coordinated on a permanent basis by the delegation of Ecuador, has played an important role in this achievement.

[Ecuador] has participated actively in the negotiations of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea, spanning an eight-year period, and in the preparatory meetings and, given the importance of the issue because of Ecuador's long continental and island shorelines and its rich sea-beds Ecuador will remain attached to that evolving law of the sea in the interest of better defence and promotion of national rights. In affirmation of this it is signing the Final Act of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea.

On the occasion of the signing of the Final Act and notwithstanding the progress made in the law of the sea [the Delegation of Ecuador] wishes to reiterate its position in defence of its territorial sea of 200 miles.

Israel

"This signature of this Final Act in no way implies recognition in any manner whatsoever of the group calling itself the Palestine Liberation Organization or of any rights whatsoever conferred upon it within the framework of any of the documents attached to this Final Act, and is subject to the statements of the Delegation of Israel at the 163rd, 182nd, 184th and 190th meetings of the Conference and document A/CONF.62/WS/33."

Sudan

[See declaration No. [4] under the Convention.]

Venezuela

Venezuela is signing the Final Act on the understanding that it is merely noting the work of the Conference without making any value judgement about its results. Its signing does not signify, nor can it be construed as signifying, any change in its position with regard to articles 15, 74, 83 and 121, paragraph 3, of the Convention. For the reasons stated by the delegation of Venezuela at the plenary meeting on 30 April 1982, those provisions are unacceptable to Venezuela, which is therefore not bound by them and is not prepared to agree to be bound by them in any way.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 10 December 1982 with the following declarations:

[1] "The German Democratic Republic declares that it accepts an arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1 (c), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, which cannot be settled by the States involved by recourse to other peaceful means of dispute settlement agreed between them.

The German Democratic Republic further declares that it accepts a special arbitral tribunal as provided for in article 287, paragraph 1 (d), which is to be constituted in accordance with Annex VIII, as competent for the settlement of disputes concerning the in terpretation or application of articles of this Convention relating to fisheries, the protection and preservation of the marine environment, marine scientific research and navigation, including pollution from ships and through dumping.

The German Democratic Republic recognizes the competence, provided for in article 292 of the Convention, of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea in matters relating to the prompt release of vessels and crews.

The German Democratic Republic declares, in accordance with article 298 of the Convention, that it does not accept any compulsory procedures entailing binding decisions

--in disputes relating to sea boundary delimitations,

--in disputes relating to military activities and

--in disputes concerning which the United Nations Security Council exercises the functions assigned to it by the Charter of the United Nations."

[2] "The German Democratic Republic reserves the right, in connection with the ratification of the Convention on the Law of the Sea, to make declarations and statements pursuant to article 310 of the Convention and to present its views on declarations and statements made by other States when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Convention."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 10 December 1982 and 5 May 1986, respectively, with the following declaration:

"1. Proceeding from the right that State Parties have on the basis of article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia considers that a coastal State may, by its laws and regulations, subject the passage of foreign warships to the requirement of previous notification to the respective coastal State and limit the number of ships simultaneously passing, on the basis of the international customary law and in compliance with the right of innocent passage (articles 17-32 of the Convention).

2. The Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia also considers that it may, on the basis of article 38, para. 1, and article 45, para. 1 (a) of the Convention, determine by its laws and regulations which of the straits used for international navigation in the territorial sea of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will retain the regime of innocent passage, as appropriate.

3. Due to the fact that the provisions of the Convention relating to the contiguous zone (article 33) do not provide rules on the delimitation of the contiguous zone between States with opposite or adjacent coasts, the Government of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia considers that the principles of the customary international law, codified in article 24, para. 3, of the Convention on the Territorial Sea and the Contiguous Zone, signed in Geneva on 29 April 1958, will apply to the delimitation of the contiguous zone between the Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea."

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", Croatia, "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 10 December 1982. On 29 May 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Czechoslovakia the following objection:

"[The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic] wishes to draw the Secretary-General's attention to the concern of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic about the fact that certain States made upon signature of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea declarations which are incompatible with the Convention and which, if reaffirmed upon ratification of the Convention by those States, would constitute a violation of the obligations to be assumed by them under the Convention. Such approach would lead to a breach of the universality of the obligations embodied in the Convention, to the disruption of the legal regime established thereunder and, in the long run, even to the undermining of the Convention as such.

A concrete example of such declaration as referred to above is the understanding made upon signature and reaffirmed upon ratification of the Convention by the Philippines which was communicated to Member States by notification [. . .] dated 22 May 1984.

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers that this understanding of the Philippines

--is inconsistent with Article 309 of the Convention on the Law of the Sea because it contains, in essence, reservations to the provisions of the Convention;

--contravenes Article 310 of the Convention which stipulates that declarations can be made by States upon signature or ratification of or accession to the Convention only provided that they 'do not purport to exclude or to modify the legal effect of the provisions of this Convention';

--indicates that in spite of having ratified the Convention, the Philippines intends to follow its national laws and previous agreements rather than the obligations under the Convention, not only taking no account of whether those laws and agreements are in harmony with the Convention but even, as proved in paragraphs 6 and 7 of the Philippine understanding, deliberately contravening the obligations set forth therein.

Given the above-mentioned circumstances, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic cannot recognize the above-mentioned understanding of the Philippines as having any legal effect.

In view of the significance of the matter, the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic considers it necessary that the problem of such declarations made upon signature or ratification of the Convention which endanger the universality of the Convention and the unified mode of its implementation be dealt with by the Secretary-General in his capacity as depositary of the Convention and that the Member States of the United Nations be informed thereof."

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Namibia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Namibia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[10] Upon depositing its instrument of accession, the Government of the United Kingdom also stated the following:

"*Extent*

[This] instrument of accession [..] extend[s] to:

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Bailiwick of Jersey

The Bailiwick of Guernsey

The Isle of Man

Anguilla

Bermuda

British Antarctic Territory

British Indian Ocean Territory

British Virgin Islands

The Cayman Islands

Falkland Islands

Gibraltar

Montserrat

Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands

St. Helena and Dependencies

South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands

Turks and Caicos Islands."

[11] The Yemen Arab Republic had signed the Convention on 10 December 1982 with the following declarations:

1. The Yemen Arabic Republic adheres to the rules of general international law concerning rights to national sovereignty over coastal territorial waters, even in the case of the waters of a strait linking two seas.

2. The Yemen Arab Republic adheres to the concept of general international law concerning free passage as applying exclusively to merchant ships and aircraft; nuclear-powered craft, as well as warships and warplanes in general, must obtain the prior agreement of the Yemen Arab Republic before passing through its territorial waters, in accordance with the established norm of general international law relating to national sovereignty.

3. The Yemen Arab Republic confirms its national sovereignty over all the islands in the Red Sea and the Indian Ocean which have been its dependencies since the period when the Yemen and the Arab countries were a Turkish administration.

4. The Yemen Arab Republic declares that its signature of the Convention on the Law of the Sea is subject to the provisions of this declaration and the completion of the constitutional procedures in effect.

The fact that we have signed the said Convention in no way implies that we recognize Israel or are entering into relations with it.

See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[12] In this regard, on 7 June 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Viet Nam, the following declaration:

1. The People's Republic of China's establishment of the territorial baselines of the Hoang Sa archipelago (Paracel), part of the territory of Viet Nam, constitutes a serious violation of the Vietnamese sovereignty over the archipelago. the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has on many occasions reaffirmed its indisputable sovereignty over the Hoang Sa as well as the Truong Sa (Spratly) archipelagoes. The above-mentioned act of the People's Republic of China which runs counter to the international law, is absolutely null and void. Furthermore, the People's Republic of China correspondingly violated the provisions of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea by giving the Hoang Sa archipelago the status of an archipelagic state to illegally annex a vast sea area into the so-called internal water of the archipelago.

2. In drawing the baseline at the segment east of the Leizhou peninsula from point 31 to 32, the People's Republic of China has also failed to comply with the provisions, particularly articles 7 and 38, of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. By so drawing, the People's Republic of China has turned a considerable sea area into its internal water which obstructs the rights and freedom of international navigation including those of Viet Nam through the Qiongzhou strait. This is totally unacceptable to the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

[13] The modification to the statement (the statement previously read: "A *special* arbitral....article *VIII*") was made on the basis of a communication received from the Government of Germany on 29 May 1996.

Subsequently, upon depositing its instrument of ratification, the Government of the Czech Republic made the following declaration:

"The Government of the Czech Republic having considered the declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany of 14 October 1994 pertaining to the interpretation of the provisions of Part X of the [said Convention], which deals with the right of access of land-locked States to and from the sea and freedom of transit, states that the [said] declaration of the Federal Republic of Germany cannot be interpreted with regard to the Czech Republic in contradiction with the provisions of Part X of the Convention."

[14] On 21 December 1995, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Turkey the following communication:

"1. The signature and ratification of the Convention by Greece and the subsequent declaration in this regard shall neither prejudice nor affect the existing rights and legitimate interests of Turkey with respect to maritime jurisdiction areas in the Aegean. Turkey fully reserves her rights under international law.

Turkey wishes to state that she will not acquiesce in any claim or attempt designed to upset the long-standing status quo in this respect, that would deprive Turkey of her existing rights and interests. Any unilateral act in this respect that would constitute an abuse of the provisions of the Convention would entail totally unacceptable consequences. Turkey has registered her opposition in this regard actively and persistently from the very outset.

2. In view of the interpretative statement of Greece concerning the provisions of the Convention on the Law of the Sea on the 'Straits used for International Navigation', Turkey wishes to reiterate her statement of 15 November 1982, contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/34, which remains fully valid at present and reads as follows:

'In connection with the views expressed by the Greek delegation in the written statement contained in document A/CONF.62/WS/26 of May 1982 the Delegation of Turkey wishes to make the following statement:

The scope of the regime of straits used for international navigation and the rights and duties of States bordering straits are clearly defined in the provisions contained in Part III of the Convention on the Law of the Sea. With the limited exceptions provided in articles 35, 36, 38, paragraph 1 and 45, all straits used for international navigation are subject to the regime of transit passage.

In the written statement referred to above Greece is attempting to create a separate category of straits, i.e. spread out islands that form a great number of alternative straits' which is not envisaged in the Convention nor in international law. Thereby Greece wishes to retain the power to exclude some of the straits which link the Aegean Sea to the Mediterranean from the regime of transit passage. Such arbitrary action is not permissible under the Convention nor under the rules and principles of international law.

It seems that Greece, failing in the Conference in its efforts to ensure the application of the regime of archipelagic States to the islands of the continental States, is now trying to circumvent the provisions of the Convention by a unilateral and arbitrary statement of understanding.

The reference in the Greek written statement to article 36 is of particular concern as it is an indication of Greece's intention to exercise discretionary powers not only over straits, but also over high seas.

With regard to the air routes, the Greek statement is contrary to the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO) rules according to which air routes are established by ICAO regional meetings with the consent of all interested parties and approved by the ICAO Council.

In view of the above considerations, the Delegation of Turkey finds the Greek views expressed in the document A/CONF.62/WS/26 legally unfounded and totally unacceptable.'

3. Turkey reserves its right to make further declarations as may be required under the circumstances in the future."

Subsequently, on 30 June 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Greece, the following communication:

"Turkey has neither signed nor acceded to the [said Convention]. It is, therefore, clear the above-mentioned notification cannot have any legal effect, whatsoever.

With regard to the substance of the Turkish notification, Greece rejects all the allegations therein and would like to make the following observations, in this connection:

The purpose of the Greek statement is to interpret certain provisions of the Convention in full accordance with the spirit and the true meaning of the Convention. It is clear, therefore, that Greece neither wishes nor intends, in any way whatsoever, to create any separate category of straits used for international navigation, nor does she intend to circumvent the provisions of the Convention, in any manner.

Greece observes, in particular, that the reference of Turkey to art. 36 is misleading, since the part of the high seas referred to in that article constitutes simply an element of the straits in question. Therefore, reference of Greece to this article in no way can be interpreted as an intention to exercise any discretionary powers over the high seas.

Regarding the allegation that Greece violates ICAO rules and regulations. Greece states emphatically that she respects all the rules and regulations established within the ICAO framework. It must be noted, in this respect, that the institution of transit passage is new and, for the time being, it does not influence the ICAO rules and regulations. In view of this, Greece does not see how her statement could interfere with the ICAO international air routes, in any way.

The Turkish allegations amount to a direct and unequivocal threat by a non-party to the Convention, addressed to a party thereto, with the obvious purpose of compelling Greece to abstain from exercising legitimate rights deriving from international law.

Finally, Greece Notes that Turkey makes in her statement repeatedly reference to the provision of the United Nations Law of the Sea, 1982, attempting to draw legal conclusions. Greece interprets these references as an indication that Turkey--a non signatory to the Covention--accepts its provisions as reflecting general customary law."

[15] In a communication received on 23 May 1983, the Government of Israel stated the following:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that declarations made by Iraq and Yemen upon signing the Convention contain explicit statements of a political character in respect of Israel.

In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements.

Furthermore, the Government of the State of Israel objects to all reservations, declarations and statements of a political nature in respect of States, made in connection with the signing of the Final Act of the Convention, which are incompatible with the purposes and objects of this Convention.

Such reservations, declarations and statements cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the above-mentioned States under general international law or under particular conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Governments of the States in question, an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Subsequently, similar communications were received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel, with respect to the following:

--On 10 April 1985 re: declaration by Qatar;

--On 15 August 1986 re: understanding by Kuwait.

[16] On 22 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Tunisia the following communication with regard to the declaration concerning articles 74 and 83 of the Convention:

... In that declaration, articles 74 and 83 of the Convention are interpreted to mean that, in the absence of any agreement on delimitation of the exclusive economic zone, the continental shelf or other maritime zones, the search for an equitable solution assumes that the boundary is the median line, in other words, a line every point of which is equidistant from the nearest points on the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial waters is measured.

The Tunisian Government believes that such an interpretation is not in the least consistent with the spirit and letter of the provisions of these articles, which do not provide for automatic application of the median line with regard to delimitation of the exclusive economic zone or the continental shelf.

[17] On 12 June 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of China the following communication:

"The so-called Kalayaan Islands are part of the Nansha Islands, which have always been Chinese territory. The Chinese Government has stated on many occasions that China has indisputable sovereignty over the Nansha Islands and at the adjacent waters and resources."

On 23 February 1987, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Viet Nam the following communication concerning the declarations made by the Philippines and by China:

. . . The Republic of the Philippines, upon its signature and ratification of the 1982 U.N. Convention on the Law of the Sea, has claimed sovereignty over the islands called by the Philippines as the Kalaysan [see paragraph 4 of the declaration]. The People's Republic of China has likewise claimed that the islands, called by the Philippines as the Kalaysan, constitute part of the Nansha Islands which are Chinese territory. The so-called "Kalaysan Islands" or "Nansha Islands" mentioned above are in fact the Truong Sa Archipelago which has always been under the sovereignty of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam. The Socialist Republic of Vietnam has so far published two White Books confirming the legality of its sovereignty over the Hoang Sa and Truong Sa Archipelagoes.

The Socialist Republic of Vietnam once again reaffirms its indisputable sovereignty over the Truong Sa Archipelago and hence its determination to defend its territorial integrity.

[18] Upon ratification, the Government of South Africa informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the declaration made upon signature which read as follows:

"Pursuant to the provisions of Article 310 of the Convention the South African Government declares that the signature of this Convention by South Africa in no way implies recognition by South Africa of the United Nations Council for Namibia or its competence to act on behalf of South West Africa/Namibia."

[19] Subsequently, on 7 June 1996, the Government of Viet Nam made the following declaration:

1. The People's Republic of China's establishment of the territorial baselines of the Hoang Sa archipelago (Paracel), part of the territory of Viet Nam, constitutes a serious violation of the Vietnamese sovereignty over the archipelago. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam has on many occasions reaffirmed its indisputable sovereignty over the Hoang Sa as well as the Tuong Sa (Spratly) archipelagoes. The above-mentioned act of the People's Republic of China which runs counter to the international law, is absolutely null and void. Furthermore, the People's Republic of China correspondingly violated the provisions of the 1982 United Nations Law of the Sea by giving the Hoang Sa archipelago the status of an archipelagic state to illegally annex a vast sea area into the so-called internal water of the archipelago.

2. In drawing the baseline at the segment east of the Leishou peninsula from point 31 to point 32, the People's Republic of China has also failed to comply with the provisions, particularly articles 7 and 38, of the 1982 United Nations Law of the Sea. By so drawing, the People's Republic of China has turned a considerable sea area into its internal water which obstructs the rights and freedom of international navigation including those of Vietnam through the Qiongzhou strait. This is totally unacceptable to the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam.

[20] In regard to the objection made by Australia the Secretary-General received, on 26 October 1988, from the Government of the Philippines the following declaration:

"The Philippines declaration was made in conformity with article 310 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. The declaration consists of interpretative statements concerning certain provisions of the Convention.

The Philippine Government intends to harmonize its domestic legislation with the provisions of the Convention.

The necessary steps are being undertaken to enact legislation dealing with archipelagic sea lanes passage and the exercise of Philippine sovereign rights over archipelagic waters, in accordance with the Convention.

The Philippine Government, therefore, wishes to assure the Australian Government and the States Parties to the Convention that the Philippines will abide by the provisions of the said Convention."

[21] Notification of designation as Arbitrator received on 17 September 2002.

6. a) Agreement relating to the implementation of Part XI of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982

New York, 28 July 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: provisionally on 16 November 1994, in accordance with article 7 (1) and definitively on 28 July 1996, in accordance with article 6 (1)[1].
REGISTRATION: 16 November 1994, No. 31364.
STATUS: Signatories: 79. Parties: 126.[2]
TEXT: Doc. A/RES.48/263; and depositary notification C.N.1.1995.TREATIES-1 of 9 February 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original French text).

Note: The Agreement was adopted by Resolution 48/263, on 28 July 1994, by the General Assembly of the United Nations during its resumed 48th session, held from 27 to 29 July 1994 in New York. In accordance with its article 3, the Agreement shall remain open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York by the States and entities referred to in article 305, paragraphs 1 (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea for 12 months from the date of its adoption i.e. until 28 July 1995.

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), Provisional application by virtue of signature, adoption of the Agreement or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, Formal confirmation (c), Accession (a), Definitive signature (s), Simplified procedure (p), Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		16 Nov 1994		
Albania		16 Nov 1994		23 Jun 2003 P
Algeria	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		11 Jun 1996 P
Andorra		16 Nov 1994		
Argentina	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		1 Dec 1995
Armenia		16 Nov 1994		9 Dec 2002 a
Australia	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		5 Oct 1994
Austria	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		14 Jul 1995
Bahamas[4]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Bahrain		16 Nov 1994		
Bangladesh[5]		16 Nov 1994		27 Jul 2001 a
Barbados[4]	15 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Belarus		16 Nov 1994		30 Aug 2006 a
Belgium[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		13 Nov 1998 P
Belize		16 Nov 1994		21 Oct 1994 s
Benin		16 Nov 1994		16 Oct 1997 P
Bhutan		16 Nov 1994		
Bolivia		16 Nov 1994		28 Apr 1995 P
Botswana		16 Nov 1994		31 Jan 2005 a
Brazil[6]	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	
Brunei Darussalam		16 Nov 1994		5 Nov 1996 P
Bulgaria		15 May 1996	15 Nov 1994	15 May 1996 a
Burkina Faso	30 Nov 1994	30 Nov 1994		25 Jan 2005 P
Burundi		16 Nov 1994		
Cambodia[5]		16 Nov 1994		
Cameroon	24 May 1995	24 May 1995	15 Nov 1994	28 Aug 2002
Canada[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		7 Nov 2003
Cape Verde[6]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Chile[5]		16 Nov 1994		25 Aug 1997 a
China	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		7 Jun 1996 P
Congo[5]		16 Nov 1994		
Cook Islands				15 Feb 1995 a
Costa Rica				20 Sep 2001 a
Côte d'Ivoire[4]	25 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Croatia				5 Apr 1995 P
Cuba		16 Nov 1994		17 Oct 2002 a
Cyprus	1 Nov 1994	27 Jul 1995	15 Nov 1994	27 Jul 1995
Czech Republic	16 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		21 Jun 1996

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), Provisional application by virtue of signature, adoption of the Agreement or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, Formal confirmation (c), Accession (a), Definitive signature (s), Simplified procedure (p), Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*
Denmark	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 2004
Egypt[6]	22 Mar 1995	16 Nov 1994		
Equatorial Guinea				21 Jul 1997 P
Eritrea		16 Nov 1994		
Estonia		16 Nov 1994		26 Aug 2005 a
Ethiopia		16 Nov 1994		
European Community[5,7]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		1 Apr 1998 c
Fiji	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995
Finland	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		21 Jun 1996
France	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		11 Apr 1996
Gabon[5]	4 Apr 1995	16 Nov 1994		11 Mar 1998 P
Georgia				21 Mar 1996 P
Germany	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		14 Oct 1994
Ghana		16 Nov 1994		
Greece	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		21 Jul 1995
Grenada[4]	14 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Guatemala				11 Feb 1997 P
Guinea[4]	26 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Guyana		16 Nov 1994		
Haiti				31 Jul 1996 P
Honduras		16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 2003 a
Hungary		16 Nov 1994		5 Feb 2002 a
Iceland[4]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
India	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		29 Jun 1995
Indonesia[6]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		2 Jun 2000
Iran (Islamic Republic of)			1 Nov 1994	
Iraq		16 Nov 1994		
Ireland	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	21 Jun 1996
Italy[7,8]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994	29 Jul 1994	13 Jan 1995
Jamaica[4]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Japan	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		20 Jun 1996
Jordan			14 Nov 1994	27 Nov 1995 P
Kenya		16 Nov 1994		29 Jul 1994 s
Kiribati				24 Feb 2003 P
Kuwait		16 Nov 1994		2 Aug 2002 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic[5]	27 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		5 Jun 1998 P
Latvia				23 Dec 2004 a
Lebanon				5 Jan 1995 P
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		16 Nov 1994		
Liechtenstein		16 Nov 1994		
Lithuania				12 Nov 2003 a
Luxembourg[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		5 Oct 2000
Madagascar		16 Nov 1994		22 Aug 2001 P
Malaysia[5]	2 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		14 Oct 1996 P
Maldives	10 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		7 Sep 2000 P
Malta[6]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		26 Jun 1996
Marshall Islands		16 Nov 1994		
Mauritania	2 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		17 Jul 1996 P
Mauritius		16 Nov 1994		4 Nov 1994 P
Mexico			2 Nov 1994	10 Apr 2003 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)[6]	10 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		6 Sep 1995
Moldova		16 Nov 1994		
Monaco	30 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		20 Mar 1996 P
Mongolia	17 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		13 Aug 1996 P
Montenegro[9]				23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	19 Oct 1994		19 Oct 1994	
Mozambique		16 Nov 1994		13 Mar 1997 a
Myanmar		16 Nov 1994		21 May 1996 a
Namibia	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p

Participant[3]	*Signature*	*Provisional application by virtue of a notification (n), Provisional application by virtue of signature, adoption of the Agreement or accession thereto*	*Notification of non-provisional application under article 7 (1) (b)*	*Ratification, Formal confirmation (c), Accession (a), Definitive signature (s), Simplified procedure (p), Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*
Nauru				23 Jan 1996 P
Nepal[5]		16 Nov 1994		2 Nov 1998 P
Netherlands[10]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jun 1996
New Zealand[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		19 Jul 1996
Nicaragua				3 May 2000 P
Nigeria[4]	25 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Niue				11 Oct 2006 P
Norway		16 Nov 1994		24 Jun 1996 a
Oman		16 Nov 1994		26 Feb 1997 a
Pakistan	10 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		26 Feb 1997 P
Palau				30 Sep 1996 P
Panama				1 Jul 1996 P
Papua New Guinea[5]		16 Nov 1994		14 Jan 1997 P
Paraguay	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		10 Jul 1995
Philippines[6]	15 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		23 Jul 1997
Poland[7]	29 Jul 1994	23 Feb 1995		13 Nov 1998 P
Portugal	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	3 Nov 1997
Qatar		16 Nov 1994		9 Dec 2002 P
Republic of Korea	7 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		29 Jan 1996
Romania			4 Oct 1994	17 Dec 1996 a
Russian Federation[5]		11 Jan 1995		12 Mar 1997 a
Samoa	7 Jul 1995	16 Nov 1994		14 Aug 1995 P
Saudi Arabia			9 Nov 1994	24 Apr 1996 P
Senegal	9 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		25 Jul 1995
Serbia[12]	12 May 1995			28 Jul 1995 p
Seychelles	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		15 Dec 1994
Sierra Leone		16 Nov 1994		12 Dec 1994 P
Singapore		16 Nov 1994		17 Nov 1994 P
Slovakia	14 Nov 1994	16 Nov 1994		8 May 1996
Slovenia	19 Jan 1995	16 Jun 1995	15 Nov 1994	16 Jun 1995
Solomon Islands		8 Feb 1995		23 Jun 1997 P
South Africa[5]	3 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		23 Dec 1997
Spain[7]	29 Jul 1994			15 Jan 1997
Sri Lanka[4]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Sudan[6]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Suriname[5]		16 Nov 1994		9 Jul 1998 P
Swaziland	12 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Sweden	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	25 Jun 1996
Switzerland[5]	26 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		16 Nov 1994		19 Aug 1994 P
Togo[4]	3 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Tonga				2 Aug 1995 P
Trinidad and Tobago[4]	10 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Tunisia[6]	15 May 1995	16 Nov 1994		24 May 2002
Tuvalu				9 Dec 2002 P
Uganda[4]	9 Aug 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Ukraine[5]	28 Feb 1995	16 Nov 1994		26 Jul 1999
United Arab Emirates[5]		16 Nov 1994		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5,11]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		25 Jul 1997
United Republic of Tanzania[6]	7 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		25 Jun 1998
United States of America[5]	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		
Uruguay[6]	29 Jul 1994		29 Jul 1994	
Vanuatu	29 Jul 1994	16 Nov 1994		10 Aug 1999 P
Viet Nam		16 Nov 1994		27 Apr 2006 a
Zambia[4]	13 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p
Zimbabwe[4]	28 Oct 1994	16 Nov 1994		28 Jul 1995 p

Declarations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon notification of provisional application, ratification, formal confirmation, accession, definitive signature or participation.)

AUSTRIA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Austria declares that it understands the provisions of its article 7 paragraph 2 to signify with regard to its own position that pending parliamentary approval of the Convention and of the Agreement and their subsequent ratification it will have access to the organs for the International Sea-Bed authority."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

This signature also commits the Flemish region, the Wallone region and the region of the capital Brussels.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

According to expert opinion, industrial exploitation of deep sea-bed mineral resources will not start earlier than in ten to fifteen years. Therefore, the International body for the sea-bed will not have a subject of real activity for a long time yet, which fact highlights especially the financial aspects of activities of the newly established organization. It is important to avoid non-productive administrative and other expenditures, to abstain from establishing yet unnecessary structures and positions, and to strictly observe the agreements concerning the economy regime reflected in the Agreement.

The efforts aimed at rendering universal the UN Convention on the Law of the Sea of 1982 can, in the long run, produce a positive result only if all the States act on the basis of the above-mentioned agreements without trying to seek any unilateral advantages, and if they succeed in establishing a cooperation free of discrimination and with a due account of the interests of potential investors in deep sea-bed mining.

UKRAINE

[See chapter XXI.6.]

Notes:

[1] On 28 June 1996, the requirements for the entry into force of the Agreement were fulfilled. Consequently the Agreement entered into force on 28 July 1996, in accordance with article 6 (1).

In accordance with its article 7 (3), the provisional application of the Agreement shall terminate upon the date of its entry into force, i.e., on 28 July 1996. In accordance with the provisions of section 1, paragraph 12 (a) of the Annex to the said Agreement, " ... Upon entry into force of this Agreement, States and entities referred to in article 3 of this Agreement which have been applying it provisionally in accordance with article 7 and for which it is not in force, may continue to be members of the Authority on a provisional basis pending its entry into force of such States and entities, in accordance with the following subparagraphs:

(a) If this Agreement enters into force before 16 November 1996, such States and entities shall be entitled to continue to participate as members of the Authority on a provisional basis upon notification to the depositary of the Agreement by such a State or entity of its intention to participate as a member on a provisional basis. Such membership shall terminate either on 16 November 1996 or upon the entry into force of this Agreement and the Convention for such member, whichever is earlier. The Council may, upon the request of the State or entity concerned, extend such membership beyond 16 November 1996 for a further period or periods not exceeding a total of two years...".

[2] Number of Parties does not include the Provisional members of the International Seabed Authority (see note 5).

[3] States and regional economic integration organizations listed under "***Participants***" include those States and regional economic integration organizations having either signed or adopted the Agreement. According to article 7 (1) (a) of the Agreement, the Agreement shall be applied provisionally as of 16 November pending its entry into force by a) States which have consented to its adoption in the General Assembly of the United Nations, except any such State which before 16 November 1994 notifies the depositary either that it will not apply the Agreement or that it will consent to such application only upon subsequent signature or notification; b) States and entities which sign the Agreement (unless notification to the contrary at the time of signature); c) States and entities which consent to its provisional application; and/or d) States which accede to the Agreement.

[4] State which upon signature or at a later date, notified that it has selected the application of the simplified procedure set out in articles 4 (3) (c) and 5.

[5] State or regional economic integration organization which, upon the entry into force of the Agreement, notified the Secretary-General of its intention to continue to participate as a member of the International Seabed Authority on a provisional basis, in accordance with paragraph 12 (a), first sentence, section 1 of the Annex (see note 1).

[6] State which, upon signature or at a later date, notified that it is not availing itself of the simplified procedure set out in article 5 and that consequently it will establish its consent to be bound by the Agreement under the provisions of article 4, paragraph 3 (b), by subsequent ratification.

[7] State or regional economic integration organization which has specified that its consent to the provisional application will be subject to subsequent notification to the depositary in writing, in accordance with article 7 (1) (a), or that it will not apply the Agreement provisionally in accordance with article 7 (1) (b).

[8] On 14 November 1994, the Government of Italy notified the Secretary-General that it would apply the Agreement provisionally.

[9] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[11] Upon depositing its instrument of ratification, the Government of the United Kingdom also stated the following

"*Extent*

[This] instrument of [...] ratification extend[s] to:

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

The Bailiwick of Jersey

The Bailiwick of Guernsey

The Isle of Man

Anguilla

Bermuda

British Antarctic Territory

British Indian Ocean Territory

British Virgin Islands

The Cayman Islands

Falkland Islands

Gibraltar, Montserrat

Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands

St. Helena and Dependencies

South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands

Turks and Caicos Islands."

[12] Upon depositing its notification of succession to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea on 12 March 2001, the Government of Yugoslavia confirmed the signature affixed to the Agreement on 12 May 1995 and its notification of application of the simplified procedure under article 5 of the Agreement.

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks

New York, 4 August 1995

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 December 2001, in accordance with article 40 (1).
REGISTRATION: 11 December 2001, No. 37924.
STATUS: Signatories: 59. Parties: 63.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2167, p. 3; and depositary notification C.N.99.1996.TREATIES-4 of 7 April 1996 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic text).

Note: The above Agreement was adopted on 4 August 1995 at New York, by the United Nations Conference on Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. In accordance with its article 37, the Agreement will be open for signature at United Nations Headquarters, from 4 December 1995 until and including 4 December 1996 by all States and the other entities referred to in article 305 (1) (a), (c), (d), (e) and (f) of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*
Argentina	4 Dec 1995	
Australia	4 Dec 1995	23 Dec 1999
Austria	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Bahamas		16 Jan 1997 a
Bangladesh	4 Dec 1995	
Barbados		22 Sep 2000 a
Belgium	3 Oct 1996	19 Dec 2003
Belize	4 Dec 1995	14 Jul 2005
Brazil	4 Dec 1995	8 Mar 2000
Bulgaria		13 Dec 2006 a
Burkina Faso	15 Oct 1996	
Canada	4 Dec 1995	3 Aug 1999
China	6 Nov 1996	
Cook Islands		1 Apr 1999 a
Costa Rica		18 Jun 2001 a
Côte d'Ivoire	24 Jan 1996	
Cyprus		25 Sep 2002 a
Denmark	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Egypt	5 Dec 1995	
Estonia		7 Aug 2006 a
European Community	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Fiji	4 Dec 1995	12 Dec 1996
Finland	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
France	4 Dec 1996	19 Dec 2003
Gabon	7 Oct 1996	
Germany	28 Aug 1996	19 Dec 2003
Greece	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Guinea		16 Sep 2005 a
Guinea-Bissau	4 Dec 1995	
Iceland	4 Dec 1995	14 Feb 1997
India		19 Aug 2003 a
Indonesia	4 Dec 1995	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		17 Apr 1998 a
Ireland	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Israel	4 Dec 1995	
Italy[1]	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Jamaica	4 Dec 1995	
Japan	19 Nov 1996	7 Aug 2006
Kenya		13 Jul 2004 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Luxembourg[2]	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Maldives	8 Oct 1996	30 Dec 1998
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Marshall Islands	4 Dec 1995	19 Mar 2003
Mauritania	21 Dec 1995	
Mauritius		25 Mar 1997 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)	4 Dec 1995	23 May 1997
Monaco		9 Jun 1999 a
Morocco	4 Dec 1995	
Namibia	19 Apr 1996	8 Apr 1998
Nauru		10 Jan 1997 a
Netherlands[3]	28 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
New Zealand[4]	4 Dec 1995	18 Apr 2001
Niue	4 Dec 1995	11 Oct 2006
Norway	4 Dec 1995	30 Dec 1996
Pakistan	15 Feb 1996	
Papua New Guinea	4 Dec 1995	4 Jun 1999
Philippines	30 Aug 1996	
Poland		14 Mar 2006 a
Portugal	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Republic of Korea	26 Nov 1996	
Russian Federation	4 Dec 1995	4 Aug 1997
Saint Lucia	12 Dec 1995	9 Aug 1996
Samoa	4 Dec 1995	25 Oct 1996
Senegal	4 Dec 1995	30 Jan 1997
Seychelles	4 Dec 1996	20 Mar 1998
Slovenia		15 Jun 2006 a
Solomon Islands		13 Feb 1997 a
South Africa		14 Aug 2003 a
Spain	3 Dec 1996	19 Dec 2003
Sri Lanka	9 Oct 1996	24 Oct 1996
Sweden	27 Jun 1996	19 Dec 2003
Tonga	4 Dec 1995	31 Jul 1996
Trinidad and Tobago		13 Sep 2006 a
Uganda	10 Oct 1996	
Ukraine	4 Dec 1995	27 Feb 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	4 Dec 1995	10 Dec 2001
United States of America	4 Dec 1995	21 Aug 1996
Uruguay	16 Jan 1996	10 Sep 1999
Vanuatu	23 Jul 1996	

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declarations:

"Declaration concerning the competence of the Republic of Austria with regard to matters governed by the Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks.

The Republic of Austria declares upon ratification of the Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks that she has, as a Member State of the European Community, transferred competence to the Community in respect of the following matters governed by the Agreement:

I. Matters for which the Community has exclusive competence

1. Member States have transferred competence to the Community with regard to the conservation and management of living marine resources. Hence, in this field, it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which the Member States enforce) and within its competence to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent organisations. This competence applies in regard of waters under national fisheries jurisdiction and to the high seas.

2. The Community enjoys the regulatory competence granted under international law to the flag State of a vessel to determine the conservation and management measures for marine fisheries resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Member States and to ensure that Member States adopt provisions allowing for the implementation of the said measures.

3. Nevertheless, measures applicable in respect of masters and other officers of fishing vessels, for example refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorisations to serve as such, are within the competence of the Member States in accordance with their national legislation. Measures relating to the exercise of jurisdiction by the flag State over its vessels on the high seas, in particular provisions such as those related to the taking and relinquishing of control of fishing vessels by States other than the flag State, international cooperation in respect of enforcement and the recovery of the control of their vessels, are within the competence of the Member States in compliance with Community law.

II. Matters for which both the Community and its Member States have competence

4. The Community shares competence with its Member States on the following matters governed by this Agreement: requirements of developing States, scientific research, port-State measures and measures adopted in respect of non-members of regional fisheries organisations and non-Parties to the Agreement. The following provisions of the Agreement apply both to the Community and to its Member States:

- general provisions: (articles 1, 4, and 34 to 50)
- dispute settlement: (Part VIII)."

Interpretative Declarations by the Republic of Austria with regard to the Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks

1. The Republic of Austria understands that the terms 'geographical particularities', 'specific characteristics of the subregion or region', 'socioeconomic geographical and environment factors', 'natural characteristics of that sea' or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

2. The Republic of Austria understands that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, recognised by international law.

3. The Republic of Austria understands that the term 'States whose nationals fish on the high seas' shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

4. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in article 21 (3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

5. Regarding the application of article 21, the Republic of Austria understands that, when a flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with the provisions in article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any further authority under the provisions of article 21 over such a vessel. Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures provided for in Part VIII of the Agreement. No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel which does not fly its flag. In addition, the Republic of Austria considers that the word 'unlawful' in article 21 (18) of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, and in particular, articles 4 and 35 thereof.

6. The Republic of Austria reiterates that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In addition, the Republic of Austria underlines that the use of force as referred to in article 22 constitutes an exceptional measure which must be based on the strictest compliance with the principle of proportionality and that any abuse thereof shall imply the international liability of the inspecting State. Any case of non-compliance shall be resolved by peaceful means and in accordance with the applicable dispute-settlement procedures. Furthermore, the Republic of Austria considers that the relevant terms and conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the relevant principles of international law in the framework of the appropriate regional and subregional fisheries management organisations and arrangements.

7. The Republic of Austria understands that in the application of the provisions of article 21 (6), (7) and (8), the flag State may rely on the requirements of its legal system under which the prosecuting authorities enjoy a discretion to decide whether or not to prosecute in the light of all the facts of a case. Decisions of the flag State based on such requirements shall not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action."

Confirmation by the Republic of Austria of the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the implementing of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks

The Republic of Austria hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the implementing of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks,... :"

[See declarations under "European Community".]

BELGIUM

Declaration:

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium recalls that as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement.

The Kingdom of Belgium hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 198[2] relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

BULGARIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the 1995 Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, with regard to the transfer of competence by the Member States to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, shall be also applicable to the Republic of Bulgaria as from the date of its accession to the European Union."

CANADA

Declarations:

"Pursuant to article 30, paragraph 4 of the Agreement, the Government of Canada declares that it chooses an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 as the means for the settlement of disputes under Part VIII of the Agreement. In light of article 30, paragraph 1 of the Agreement, the Government of Canada also declares that it does not accept any of the procedures provided for in section 2 of Part XV of the Convention with respect to disputes referred to in article 298, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

According to article 42 of the Agreement, no reservations or exceptions may be made to the Agreement. A declaration or statement pursuant to article 43 of the Agreement cannot purport to exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Agreement in their application to the State or entity making it. Consequently, the Government of Canada declares that it does not consider itself bound by declarations or statements pursuant to article 43 of the Agreement that have been made or will be made by other States or by entities described in article 2 (b) of the Agreement and that exclude or modify the legal effect of the provisions of the Agreement in their application to the State or entity making it. Lack of response by the Government of Canada to any declaration or statement shall not be interpreted as tacit acceptance of that declaration or statement. The Government of Canada reserves the right at any time to take a position on any declaration or statement in the manner deemed appropriate."

CHINA

Upon signature:

Statement:

"It is the belief of the Government of the People's Republic of China that the [said Agreement] is an important development of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. This Agreement will have a significant impact on the conservation and management of living marine resources, especially fish resources in the high seas as well as on the international cooperation in fishery. Upon signing the Agreement, the Government of the People's Republic of China wish to make the following statement in accordance with article 43 of the Agreement:

1. About the understanding of paragraph 7 of article 21 of the Agreement: The Government of China is of the view that the enforcement action taken by the inspecting State with the authorization of the flag State involves state sovereignty and national legislation of the States concerned. The authorized enforcement action should be limited to the mode and scope as specified in the authorization by the flag State. Enforcement action by the inspecting State under such circumstances should only be that of executing the authorization of the flag state.

2. About the understanding of subparagraph (f), paragraph 1 of article 22 of the Agreement: This subparagraph provides that the inspecting State shall ensure that its duly authorized inspectors `avoid the use of force except when and to the degree necessary to ensure the safety of the inspectors and where the inspectors are obstructed in the execution of their duties. The degree of force used shall not exceed that reasonably required in the circumstances'. The understanding of the Chinese Government on this provision is that only when the personal safety of the authorized inspectors whose authorization has been duly verified is endangered and their normal inspecting activities are obstructed by violence committed by crew members of fishermen of the fishing vessel under inspection, may the inspectors take appropriate compulsory measures necessary to stop such violence. It should be emphasized that the action of force by the inspectors shall only be taken against those crew members or fishermen committing the violence and must never be taken against the vessel as a whole or other crew members or fishermen."

DENMARK

Declaration:

"In this respect, the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark recalls that as a Member of the European Community, Denmark has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in the Annex to this letter. This Annex also contains interpretative declarations by the European Community and its Member States to the Agreement.

At the same time, [Denmark] hereby confirms the declarations1 made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

ESTONIA

Declarations:

"- As a Member State of the European Community the Republic of Estonia has transferred its competence for certain matters governed by the Agreement to the European Community. These matters are mentioned in the Declaration of 19 December

2003 made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement.

- The Republic of Estonia confirms the interpretative declarations of 19 December 2003 made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

Declaration concerning the competence of the European Community with regard to matters governed by the [said Agreement]

(Declaration made pursuant to article 47 of the Agreement)

"1. Article 47(1) of the Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks provides that in cases where an international organization referred to in annex IX, article 1, of the Convention does not have competence over all the matter governed by the Agreement, annex IX of the Convention [with the exception of article 2, first sentence, and article 3(1)] shall apply *mutatis mutandis* to participation by such international organization in the Agreement.

2. The current members of the Community are the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of Spain, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of Austria, the Portuguese Republic, the Republic of Finland, the Kingdom of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

3. The Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the [said Convention] shall apply, with regard to the competences transferred to the European Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty, in particular article 227 thereof.

4. This declaration is not applicable in the case of the territories of the Member States in which the said Treaty does not apply and is without prejudice to such acts or positions as may be adopted under the Agreement by the Member States concerned on behalf of and in the interests of those territories.

I. Matters for which the Community has exclusive competence

5. The Community points out that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to the conservation and management of living marine resources. Hence, in this field, it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which the Member States enforce) and within its competence to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent organizations.

This competence applies in regard of waters under national fisheries jurisdiction and to the high seas.

6. The Community enjoys the regulatory competence granted under international law to the flag State of a vessel to determine the conservation and management measures for marine fisheries resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Member States and to ensure that Member States adopt provisions allowing for the implementation of the said measures.

7. Nevertheless, measures applicable in respect of masters and other officers of fishing vessels, e.g., refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorizations to serve as such, are within the competence of the Member States in accordance with their national legislation.

Measures relating to the exercise of jurisdiction by the flag State over its vessels on the high seas, in particular provisions such as those related to the taking and relinquishing of control of fishing vessels by States other than the flag State, international cooperation in respect of enforcement and the recovery of the control of their vessels, are within the competence of the Member States in compliance with Community law.

II. Matters relating for which both the Community and its Member States have competence

8. The Community shares competence with its Member States on the following matters governed by this Agreement: requirements of developing States, scientific research, port State measures and measures adopted in respect of non-members of regional fisheries organizations and non-Parties to the Agreement.

The following provisions of the Agreement apply both to the Community and to its Member States:

-- *general provisions:* (Articles 1, 4 and 34 to 50)

-- *dispute settlement:* (Part VIII)

Interpretative declarations:

1. The European Community and its Member States understand that the terms "geographical particularities", "specific characteristics of the sub-region", "socio-economic geographical and environmental factors", "natural characteristics of that sea" or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under International law.

2. The European Community and its Member States understand that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, as recognized by international law.

3. The European Community and its Member States understand that the term "States whose nationals fish on the high seas" shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

4. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in article 21 (3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

5. Regarding the application of article 21, the European Community and its Member States understand that, when a flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with the provisions in article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any other authority under the provisions of article 21 over such vessel.

Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures provided for in Part VIII of the Agreement. No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel which does not fly its flag.

In addition, the European Community and its Member States consider that the word "unlawful" in article 21, paragraph 18 of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, and in particular, articles 4 and 35 thereof.

6. The European Community and its Member States reiterate that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Law of the Sea.

Furthermore, the European Community and its Member States consider that the relevant terms and conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the relevant principles of international law in the framework of the appropriate regional and sub-regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements.

7. The European Community and its Member States understand that in the application of the provisions of article 21 paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, the flag State may rely on the requirements of its legal system under which the prosecuting authorities enjoy a discretion to decide whether or not to prosecute in the light of

all the facts of a case. Decisions of the flag State based on such requirements shall not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

"(Declaration)

"Pursuant to article 4 of Annex IX of the Convention, rendered applicable mutatis mutandis in the context of the Agreement by virtue of its article 47 (1), the European Community accepts the rights and obligations of States under the Agreement in respect of matters relating to which competence has been transferred to it by Member States which are parties to the Agreement."

Declaration made pursuant to article 47 of the Agreement

"1. Article 47 (1) of the Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks provides that in cases where an international organization referred to in Annex IX, article 1, of the Convention does not have competence over all the matters governed by the Agreement, Annex IX of the Convention (with the exception of article 2, first sentence, and article 3 (1)) shall apply mutatis mutandis to participation by such international organization in the Agreement.

2. The current members of the Community are the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom ofDenmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of Spain, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of Austria, the Portuguese Republic, the Republic of Finland, the Kingdom of Sweden and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

3. The Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks shall apply, with regard to the competences transferred to the European Community, to the territories in which the Treaty establishing the European Community is applied and under the conditions laid down in that Treaty, in particular article 227 thereof.

4. This declaration is not applicable in the case of the territories of the Member States in which the said Treaty does not apply and is without prejudice to such acts or positions as may be adopted under the Agreement by the Member States concerned on behalf of and in the interests of those territories.

I. MATTERS FOR WHICH THE COMMUNITY HAS EXCLUSIVE COMPETENCE

5. The Community points out that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to the conservation and management of living marine resources. Hence, in this field, it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which the Member States enforce) and within its competence to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent organizations. This competence applies in regard of waters under national fisheries jurisdiction and to the high seas.

6. The Community enjoys the regulatory competence granted under international law to the flag State of a vessel to determine the conservation and management measures for marine fisheries resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Member States and to ensure that Member States adopt provisions allowing for the implementation of the said measures.

7. Nevertheless, measures applicable in respect of masters and other officers of fishing vessels, e.g., refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorizations to serve as such, are within the competence of the Member States in accordance with their national legislation.

Measures relating to the exercise of jurisdiction by the flag State over its vessels on the high seas, in particular provisions such as those related to the taking and relinquishing of control of fishing vessels by States other than the flag State, international cooperation in respect of enforcement and the recovery of the control of their vessels, are within the competence of the Member States in compliance with Community law.

II. MATTERS FOR WHICH BOTH THE COMMUNITY AND ITS MEMBER STATES HAVE COMPETENCE

8. The Community shares competence with its Member States on the following matters governed by this Agreement: requirements of developing States, scientific research, port-State measures and measures adopted in respect of non-members of regional fisheries organizations and non-Parties to the Agreement.

The following provisions of the Agreement apply both to the Community and to its Member States:

- general provisions: (Articles 1, 4 and 34 to 50)
- dispute settlement: (Part VIII)."

Interpretative declarations deposited by the Community and its Member States upon ratification of the Agreement

"1. The European Community and its Member States understand that the terms 'geographical particularities', 'specific characteristics of the sub-region or region', 'socio-economic geographical and environmental factors', 'natural characteristics of that sea' or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

2. The European Community and its Member States understand that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, recognized by international law.

3. The European Community and its Member States understand that the term 'States whose nationals fish on the high seas' shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

4. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in article 21 (3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

5. Regarding the application of article 21, the European Community and its Member States understand that, when a flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with the provisions in article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any further authority under the provisions of article 21 over such a vessel.

Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures provided for in Part VIII of the Agreement. No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel which does not fly its flag.

In addition, the European Community and its Member States consider that the word 'unlawful' in article 21, para 18 of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, and in particular, articles 4 and 35 thereof.

6.The European Community and its Member States reiterate that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In addition, the European Community and its Member States underline that the use of force as referred to in article 22 constitutes an exceptional measure which must be based upon the strictest compliance with the principle of proportionality and that any abuse thereof shall imply the international liability of the inspecting State. Any case of non-compliance shall be re-

solved by peaceful means and in accordance with the applicable dispute-settlement procedures.

Furthermore, the European Community and its Member States consider that the relevant terms and conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the relevant principles of international law in the framework of the appropriate regional and subregional fisheries management organizations and arrangements.

7. The European Community and its Member States understand that in the application of the provisions of article 21, paragraphs 6. 7 and 8, the flag State may rely on the requirements of its legal system under which the prosecuting authorities enjoy a discretion to decide whether or not to prosecute in the light of all the facts of a case. Decisions of the flag State based on such requirements shall not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action."

FINLAND

Declarations:

"Finland recalls that, as a Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in the Annex to the instrument of ratification.

Finland hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

FRANCE

Upon signature

Declarations:

1. The Government of the French Republic recalls that the requirements for implementing the Agreement must be strictly in conformity with the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

2. The Government of the French Republic hereby declares that the provisions of article 21 and 22 apply only to maritime fishing operations.

3. These provisions cannot be regarded as capable of being extended to cover vessels engaged in maritime transport under another international instrument, or of being transferred to any instrument not dealing directly with the conservation and management of fisheries resources covered by the Agreement.

Upon ratification:

Declarations

Declaration :

In accordance with article 47.1 of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks (with two annexes), done at New York on 4 December 1995, of which the United Nations is the depository, and in accordance with article 5.2 of annex IX to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, the Government of the French Republic hereby declares that, as a member of the European Community, France has transferred competences dealt with in the Agreement to the European Community. These competences are listed in an annex to this declaration.

The Government of the French Republic also confirms the content of the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

Interpretative declarations:

1. In ratifying the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, the Government of the French Republic declares that it considers that the Agreement constitutes an important effort to ensure the long-term conservation and sustainable use of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks and to promote international cooperation to that end.

2. The Government of the French Republic understands that the terms "geographical particularities", "specific characteristics of the subregion or region", "socio-economic, geographical and environmental factors", "natural characteristics of that sea" or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

3. The Government of the French Republic understands that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas recognized by international law.

4. The Government of the French Republic understands that the term "States whose nationals fish on the high seas" shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

5. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transition period as referred to in article 21, paragraph 3. Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, the States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

6. Regarding the application of article 21 of the Agreement, the Government of the French Republic understands that, when the flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag within the framework of an alleged violation committed on the high seas, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any further authority under the provisions of article 21 over such a vessel. Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures set forth in Part VIII of the Agreement (Peaceful settlement of disputes). No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel which does not fly its flag for an alleged violation committed on the high seas. In addition, the Government of the French Republic considers that the word "unlawful" in article 21, paragraph 18, of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, and, in particular, articles 4 and 35 thereof.

7. The Government of the French Republic reiterates that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the Charter of the United Nations and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

8. In addition, the Government of the French Republic stresses that the use of force as referred to in article 22 constitutes an exceptional measure which must be based on the strictest compliance with the principle of proportionality and that any abuse thereof shall entail the international liability of the inspecting State. Any case of non-compliance must be resolved by peaceful means, in accordance with the applicable dispute-settlement procedures. It considers, moreover, that the relevant conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the applicable principles of international law, within the framework of the appropriate subregional and regional fisheries management organizations and arrangements.

9. The Government of the French Republic understands that, in the application of the provisions of article 21, paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, the flag State may avail itself of its legal provisions under which the prosecuting authorities have the power to decide whether or not there are grounds for prosecution in the light of all the facts of the case. Decisions by the flag State

based on such provisions must not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action.

10. The Government of the French Republic declares that the provisions of articles 21 and 22 apply only to the sole sector of sea fishing.

11. The Government of the French Republic is of the view that the provisions of articles 21 and 22 could not be considered as liable to be extended to vessels engaged in maritime transport within the framework of another international instrument or to be transposed to any instrument that does not deal directly with the conservation and management of the fish resources dealt with in the Agreement.

GERMANY

Declaration:

"The Federal Republic of Germany recalls that as a Member of the European Community, the Federal Republic of Germany has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in Annex I to this declaration.

The Federal Republic of Germany hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement (see Annex II)."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

GREECE

Declaration:

"In this respect, the Government of the Hellenic Republic recalls that as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in the Annex to this letter. The Hellenic Republic confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

INDIA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of India reserves the right to make at the appropriate time the declarations provided for in articles 287 and 298 concerning the settlement of disputes."

IRELAND

Declarations:

"Pursuant to article 47 (1) of the Agreement (applying mutatis mutandis article 5 (2) and 5 (6) of Annex IX of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 1982), the Government of Ireland hereby declares that as a Member State of the European Community, Ireland has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in the Annex to this Declaration.

The Government of Ireland hereby confirms the Declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

Annex

I. Matters for which the Community has exclusive competence

1. As a Member State of the European Community, Ireland recalls that it has transferred competence to the Community with regard to the conservation and management of living marine resources. Hence, in this field, it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which the Member States enforce) and within its competence to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent organisations. This competence applies in regard of waters under national fisheries jurisdiction and to the high seas.

2. The Community enjoys the regulatory competence granted under international law to the flag State of a vessel to determine the conservation and management measures for marine fisheries resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Member States and to ensure that Member States adopt provisions allowing for the implementation of the said measures.

3. Nevertheless, measures applicable in respect of masters and other officers of fishing vessels, for example refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorisations to serve as such, are within the competence of the Member States in accordance with their national legislation. Measures relating to the exercise of jurisdiction by the flag State over its vessels on the high seas, in particular provisions such as those related to the taking and relinquishing of control of fishing vessels by States other than the flag State, international cooperation in respect of enforcement and the recovery of the control of their vessels, are within the competence of the Member States in compliance with Community law.

II. Matters for which both the Community and its Member States have competence

4. The Community shares competence with its Member States on the following matters governed by this Agreement: requirements of developing States, scientific research, port-State measures and measures adopted in respect of non-members of regional fisheries organisations and non-Parties to the Agreement. The following provisions of the Agreement apply both to the Community and to its Member States:

- general provisions: (articles 1, 4, and 34 to 50)
- dispute settlement: (Part VIII)."

ITALY

Declaration:

"..., the Government of Italy recalls that as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in the Annex to this letter. Italy confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

... [As a] member of the European Community, Luxembourg has transferred competence with regard to the matters governed by this Agreement to the European Community.

[Luxembourg has] the honour to confirm, ... , the declaration concerning the competence of the European Community with regard to all the matters governed by the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, included in annex B, as well as the declarations made by the European Community regarding the ratification of the aforementioned Agreement, included in annex C.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

MALTA

Declaration:

"... in terms of article 43 of the Agreement, the Government of Malta, enters the following declaration:

1. In the view of the Malta Government, the requirements of implementing the 1995 Agreement must be in conformity with the 1982 Convention on the Law of the Sea.

2. Malta understands that the terms "geographical particularities", specific characteristics of the sub-region", "socio-economic geographical and environmental factors", "natural characteristics of that sea" or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

3. Malta understands that no Provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, and of flag state exclusive jurisdiction over its vessels on the high seas as recognised by international law.

4. Malta understands that the term "States whose nationals fish on the high seas" shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

5. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in article 21 (3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

6. Regarding the application of article 21, Malta understands that, when a flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with the provisions in article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any other authority under the provisions of article 21 over such vessel.

Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures provided for in Part VIII of the Agreement. No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel, which does not fly its flag.

In addition, Malta considers that the word "unlawful" in article 21, para. 18 of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, and in particular, articles 4 and 35 thereof.

7. Malta reiterates that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

Furthermore, Malta considers that the relevant terms and conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the relevant principles of international law in the framework of the appropriate regional and sub-regional fisheries management organisations and arrangements.

8. Malta understands that in the application of the provisions of article 21 paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, the flag State may rely on the requirements of its legal system under which the prosecuting authorities enjoy a discretion to decide whether or not to prosecute in the light of all the facts of a case. Decisions of the flag State based on such requirements shall not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action.

9. Malta hereby declares that the provisions of article 21 and 22 apply only to maritime fishing.

10. These provisions cannot be regarded as capable of being extended to cover vessels engaged in maritime transport under another international instrument, or of being transferred to any instrument not dealing directly with the conservation and management of fisheries resources covered by the Agreement.

11. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in article 21 (3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached[,] States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in article 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

12. Malta does not consider itself bound by any of the declarations which other States may have made, or will make, upon signing or ratifying the Agreement, reserving the right, as necessary, to determine its position with regard to each of them at the appropriate time, in particular, ratification of the Agreement does not imply automatic recognition of maritime or territorial claims by any signatory or ratifying State.

13. Note is taken of the statement by the European Community made at the time of signature of the Agreement regarding the fact that its Member States have transferred competence to it with regard to certain aspects of the Agreement. In view of Malta's application to join the European Community, it is understood that this will also become applicable to Malta on membership.

Furthermore, the Government of Malta would like to state that should Malta accede to the European Union, it reserves the right to submit a further Declaration in line with future declarations by the European Union."

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

Declaration in respect of article 47:

Upon signing the Agreement the Netherlands recalls that, as a Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community with respect to certain matters governed by the Agreement. A detailed declaration on the nature and extent of the competence transferred to the European Community has been made by the European Community on the occasion of its signature of the Agreement, in accordance with article 47 of the Agreement.

Interpretative declarations made upon signature of the Agreement:

[Same interpretative declarations, mutatis mutandis, *as those made under European Community.]*

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that as a member of the European Community it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement.

... the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands [confirms] the declarations1 made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementing of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks. In this respect, ... [the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands confirms] the declarations1 made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementing of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

NORWAY

"Declaration pursuant to article 43 of the Agreement:

According to article 42 of the Agreement, no reservations or exceptions may be made to the Agreement. A declaration pursuant to its article 43 cannot have the effect of an exception or reservation for the State making it. Consequently, the Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares that it does not consider itself bound by declarations pursuant to article 43 of the

Agreement that are or will be made by other States or international Organisations. Passivity with respect to such declarations shall be interpreted neither as acceptance nor rejection of such declarations. The Government reserves Norway's right at any time to take a position on such declarations in the manner deemed appropriate.

Declaration pursuant to article 30 of the Agreement:

The Government of the Kingdom of Norway declares pursuant to article 30 of the Agreement, cf. article 298 of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, that it does not accept an arbitral tribunal constituted in accordance with Annex VII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea for disputes concerning law enforcement activities in regard to the exercise of sovereign rights or jurisdiction excluded from the jurisdiction of a court or tribunal under article 297, paragraph 3, of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, in the event that such disputes might be considered to be covered by this Agreement."

POLAND

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Poland recalls that, as a Member State of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement.

At the same time, the Republic of Poland confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

PORTUGAL

Declaration:

"The Government of Portugal recalls that [as] a Member of the European Community it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement. Portugal hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementing of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Declaration:

The Russian Federation states that it considers that the procedures for the settlement of disputes set forth in article 30 of [the said Agreement] include all the provisions of part XV of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea that are applicable to the consideration of disputes between States Parties to the Agreement.

The Russian Federation states that, taking into account articles 42 and 43 of the Agreement, it objects to all declarations and statements which were made in the past and which may be made in the future when signing, ratifying or acceding to the Agreement or on any other occasion in connection with the Agreement and which are not in accordance with article 43 of the Agreement. It is the position of the Russian Federation that such declarations and statements, in whatever form they may be made and however they may be named, cannot exclude or modify the legal force of the provisions of the Agreement in their application to a Party to the Agreement that has made such a declaration or statement, and therefore will not be taken into consideration by the Russian Federation in its relations with that Party to the Agreement.

SLOVENIA

Declarations:

"Declaration

The Republic of Slovenia declares upon the deposit of the Instrument of Accession of the Agreement on the implementation of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks that she has, as a Member State of the European Community, transferred competence to the Community in respect of the following matters governed by the Agreement:

I. Matters for which the Community has exclusive competence

1. Member States have transferred competence to the Community with regard to the conservation and management of living marine resources. Hence, in this field, it is for the Community to adopt the relevant rules and regulations (which the Member States enforce) and within its competence to enter into external undertakings with third States or competent organisations. This competence applies in regard of waters under national fisheries jurisdiction and to the high seas.

2. The Community enjoys the regulatory competence granted under international law to the flag State of a vessel to determine the conservation and management measures for marine fisheries resources applicable to vessels flying the flag of Member States and to ensure that Member States adopt provisions allowing for the implementation of the said measures.

3. Nevertheless, measures applicable in respect of masters and other officers of fishing vessels, for example refusal, withdrawal or suspension of authorisations to serve as such, are within the competence of the Member States in accordance with their national legislation.

Measures relating to the exercise of jurisdiction by the flag State over its vessels on the high seas, in particular provisions such as those related to the taking and relinquishing of control of fishing vessels by States other than the flag State, international cooperation in respect of enforcement and the recovery of the control of their vessels, are within the competence of the Member States in compliance with Community law.

II. Matters for which both the Community and its Member States have competence

The Community shares competence with its Member States on the following matters governed by this Agreement: requirements of developing States, scientific research, port-State measures and measures adopted in respect of non-members of regional fisheries organisations and non-Parties to the Agreement. The following provisions of the Agreement apply both to the Community and to its Member States:

- general provisions: (Articles 1, 4, and 34 to 50)
- dispute settlement: (Part VIII).

Interpretative Declaration

1. The Republic of Slovenia understands that the terms 'geographical particularities', 'specific characteristics of the sub-region or region', 'socioeconomic geographical and environment factors', 'natural characteristics of that sea' or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

2. The Republic of Slovenia understands that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, recognised by international law.

3. The Republic of Slovenia understands that the term 'States whose nationals fish on the high seas' shall not provide

any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

4. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in Article 21 (3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in Articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

5. Regarding the application of Article 21, the Republic of Slovenia understands that, when a flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with the provisions in Article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any further authority under the provisions of Article 21 over such a vessel.

Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures provided for in Part VIII of the Agreement. No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel which does not fly its flag. In addition, the Republic of Slovenia considers that the word 'unlawful' in Article 21 (18) of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, and in particular, Articles 4 and 35 thereof.

6. The Republic of Slovenia reiterates that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea. In addition, the Republic of Slovenia underlines that the use of force as referred to in Article 22 constitutes an exceptional measure which must be based on the strictest compliance with the principle of proportionality and that any abuse thereof shall imply the international liability of the inspecting State. Any case of non-compliance shall be resolved by peaceful means and in accordance with the applicable dispute-settlement procedures. Furthermore, the Republic of Slovenia considers that the relevant terms and conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the relevant principles of international law in the framework of the appropriate regional and subregional fisheries management organisations and arrangements.

7. The Republic of Slovenia understands that in the application of the provisions of Article 21 (6), (7) and (8), the flag State may rely on the requirements of its legal system under which the prosecuting authorities enjoy a discretion to decide whether or not to prosecute in the light of all the facts of a case. Decisions of the flag State based on such requirements shall not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action."

Confirmation of the declarations made by the European Community

The Republic of Slovenia hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the implementing of the provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks."

SPAIN

Declarations:

Declaration:

Spain, as a member of the European Community, points out that it has transferred competence to the Community with regard to a number of matters regulated by the Fish Stocks Convention. Spain hereby reaffirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratifying the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

Interpretative declarations:

1. Spain understand that the terms "geographical particularities", "specific characteristics of the subregion or region", "socio-economic, geographical and environmental factors", "natural characteristics of that sea" or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

2. Spain understands that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, recognized by international law.

3. Spain understand that the term "States whose nationals fish on the high seas" shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

4. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in article 21, paragraph 3. Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, States shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement.

5. Regarding the application of article 21, Spain understands that, when a flag State declares that it intends to exercise its authority, in accordance with the provisions of article 19, over a fishing vessel flying its flag, the authorities of the inspecting State shall not purport to exercise any further authority under the provisions of article 21 over such a vessel.

Any dispute related to this issue shall be settled in accordance with the procedures provided for in part VIII of the Agreement. No State may invoke this type of dispute to remain in control of a vessel which does not fly its flag.

In addition, Spain considers that the word "unlawful" in article 21, paragraph 18 of the Agreement should be interpreted in the light of the whole Agreement, particularly, articles 4 and 35 thereof.

6. Spain reiterates that all States shall refrain in their relations from the threat or use of force in accordance with general principles of international law, the United Nations Charter and the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea.

In addition, Spain underlines that the use of force as referred to in article 22 constitutes an exceptional measure which must be based upon the strictest compliance with the principle of proportionality and that any abuse thereof shall imply the international liability of the inspecting State. Any case of non-compliance shall be resolved by peaceful means and in accordance with the applicable dispute-settlement procedures.

Furthermore, Spain considers that the relevant terms and conditions for boarding and inspection should be further elaborated in accordance with the relevant principles of international law in the framework of the appropriate regional and subregional fisheries management organizations and arrangements.

7. Spain understand that in the application of the provisions of article 21, paragraphs 6, 7 and 8, the flag State may rely on the requirements of its legal system under which the prosecuting authorities enjoy a discretion to decide whether or not to prosecute in the light of all the facts of a case. Decisions of the flag State based on such requirements shall not be interpreted as failure to respond or to take action.

8. Spain is of the view that the constituent conventions of regional fisheries management organizations such as the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries Organization, the North-East Atlantic Fisheries Commission and the International Commission for the Conservation of Atlantic Tunas, given their status as special international agreements, have legal precedence over the New York Agreement, which sets forth general rules on the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks. Part VI of the Agreement, "Compliance and

enforcement", laying down boarding and inspection procedures, is therefore to be regarded as a regulation subordinate to alternative mechanisms established by subregional or regional fisheries management organizations which effectively discharge the obligations under the New York Agreement of their members or participants to ensure compliance with the conservation and management measures established by such organizations or arrangements.

9. Spain understands that in article 8, paragraph 3, of the Agreement the term "a real interest" used with reference to States which may be members of a regional fisheries management organization shall be regarded as meaning that a regional fisheries management organization must in all circumstances be open to any State whose fleet fishes or has fished in the area covered by the constituent convention of such organization, in respect of which fleet the flag State has the authority to ensure compliance and enforcement. Participation in such organizations by the States in question shall indicate their real interest in the fisheries.

SWEDEN

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of Sweden recalls that, as a Member of the European Community, it has transferred competence to the Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement. The Kingdom of Sweden hereby confirms the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration:

"[The Government of the United Kingdom has the honour to declare], in accordance with article 47 (1) of the Agreement (applying mutatis mutandis article 5 (2) and (6) of Annex IX of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea 1982), that as a Member of the European Community, the United Kingdom has transferred competence to the European Community in respect of certain matters governed by the Agreement, which are specified in the Annex to this declaration.

[See declarations under "European Community".]

[The Government of the United Kingdom hereby confirms] the declarations made by the European Community upon ratification of the Agreement, and confirm that the interpretative declarations made by the European Community shall apply also to the United Kingdom's ratification of the said Agreement in respect of certain Overseas Territories, namely Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Falkland Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, Bermuda, Turks and Caicos Islands, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands and Anguilla."

[See declarations under "European Community".]

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 30 (4) of the Agreement, the Government of the United States of America declares that it chooses a special arbitral tribunal to be constituted in accordance with Annex VIII of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 for the settlement of disputes pursuant to Part VIII of the Agreement."

URUGUAY

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. The objective of the Agreement, as set out in article 2, is to establish an appropriate legal framework and a comprehensive and effective set of measures for the conservation and management of straddling fish stocks and highly migratory fish stocks.

2. The effectiveness of the regime established will depend, *inter alia*, on whether the conservation and management measures that are applied in areas beyond national jurisdiction take duly into account and are compatible with, those adopted by the relevant coastal States with respect to the same stocks in areas under their national jurisdiction, as provided for in article 7.

3. Among the biological characteristics of a fish stock as a factor of which special account must be taken in determining compatible conservation and management measures, in accordance with article 7, paragraph 2(d), Uruguay attaches particular importance to the reproduction period of the fish stock in question, in order to ensure a sound and balanced approach to protection.

4. Moreover, in order for the above-mentioned regime to be fully effective, in accordance with the objective and purpose of the Agreement, it is necessary to adopt emergency conservation and management measures, as stated in article 6, paragraph 7, where a serious threat exists to the survival of one or more straddling fish stocks or highly migratory fish stocks as a result of a natural phenomenon or human activity.

5. Uruguay is of the view that, if an inspection carried out by a port State on a fishing vessel which is voluntarily present in one of its ports reveals that there are evident grounds for believing that the said fishing vessel has been involved in an activity that is contrary to the sub-regional or regional conservation and management measures on the high seas, then, in exercise of its right and duty to cooperate in conformity with article 23 of the Agreement, the port State should so inform the flag State and request that it take over responsibility for the vessel for the purpose of ensuring compliance with the said measures.

Notifications made under article 21 (4)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification or accession.)

JAPAN

".... designates the following authority to receive the notifications referred to in article 21, paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned agreement;

Fisheries Agency
International Affairs Division
Kasumigaseki 1-2-1, Chiyoda-ku
Tokyo, Japan
Telephone: 03-3591-1086
Fax: 03-3502-0571"

Notes:

[1] It will be recalled that, the Government of Italy had deposited an instrument of ratification on 4 March 1999 which it withdrew on 4 June 1999, indicating the following : "Italy indends to withdraw the instrument of ratification it deposited on 4 March 1999, in order to proceed subsequently to complete that formalilty in conjuction with all the States members of the European Union.".

[2] It will be recalled that the Government of Luxembourgh had deposited an instrument of ratification on 5 October 2000, which it withdrew on 21 December 2000, indicating the following:

The Permanent Mission of the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg had indeed received instructions to deposit the instrument of ratification of the above-mentioned Agreement with the Secretary-General of the United Nations; this was done on 5 October 2000. It turned out, however, that deposit on that date was premature since, in accordance with decision 98/414/CE of the Council of the European Union, of 8 June 1998, the instrument was to be deposited simultaneously with the instruments of ratification of all States members of the European Union.

Accordingly, [the Government of Luxembourg would] be grateful if [the Secretary-General] would note that Luxembourg wishes to withdraw the instrument of ratification deposited on 5 October 2000. A simultaneous deposit of the instruments of the Community and of all member States is to take place subsequently.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] With a territorial application in respect of Tokelau.

[5] On 19 December 2003, an instrument of ratification was lodged by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland ("on behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland").

It will be recalled that on 4 December 1995, the Agreement was signed by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland "... on behalf of Bermuda, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Falkland Islands, Pitcairn Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, St. Helena including Ascension Island, and Turks and Caicos Islands". Further, in a communication received on 19 January 1996, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General that the signature of 4 December 1995 "... would also apply to Anguilla".

Subsequently, on 27 June 1996, the Agreement was signed by the United Kingdom for the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

On 3 December 1999, an instrument of ratification was lodged by the United Kingdom "... in respect of Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Falkland Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, Bermuda, Turks and Caicos Islands, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands [and] Anguilla" with the following declarations:

"1. The United Kingdom understands that the terms 'geographical particularities', 'specific characteristics of the sub-region or region', 'socio-economic geographical and environmental factors', 'natural characteristics of that sea' or any other similar terms employed in reference to a geographical region do not prejudice the rights and duties of States under international law.

2. The United Kingdom understands that no provision of this Agreement may be interpreted in such a way as to conflict with the principle of freedom of the high seas, recognized by international law.

3. The United Kingdom understands that the term 'States whose nationals fish on the high seas' shall not provide any new grounds for jurisdiction based on the nationality of persons involved in fishing on the high seas rather than on the principle of flag State jurisdiction.

4. The Agreement does not grant any State the right to maintain or apply unilateral measures during the transitional period as referred to in Article 21(3). Thereafter, if no agreement has been reached, states shall act only in accordance with the provisions provided for in Articles 21 and 22 of the Agreement."

Upon a request for clarification as to why the above ratification excluded the metropolitan territory of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and subsequent consultations, the following additional declaration was provided by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 10 December 2001:

"1.The United Kingdom is a keen supporter of the Straddling Fish Stocks Agreement. Legislation of the European Communities (Council decision 10176/97 of 8 June 1998) binds the United Kingdom as a matter of EC law to deposit its instrument of ratification in relation to the metropolitan territory simultaneously with the European Community and the other Member States.

It is hoped that this event will take place later this year. The constraints imposed by that Council decision only apply in respect of the United Kingdom metropolitan territory and those overseas territories to which the EC treaties apply.

2. In the light of its temporary inability to ratify the Agreement in relation to the metropolitan territory, and the strong desire of the United Kingdom to implement the Agreement in respect of those overseas territories to which the EC treaty does not apply, because of the advantages it will bring to them, the United Kingdom lodged its instrument of ratification to the Agreement, with declarations, in respect of those overseas territories on 3 December 1999.

3. The United Kingdom is concerned that upon entry into force of the Agreement, the overseas territories covered by this ratification should enjoy the rights and obligations accruing under the Agreement. I would therefore be grateful if you would arrange for the above formal declaration to be circulated in order in order to make it clear to all concerned the nature of the United Kingdom's approach to ratification of this convention. ..."

Accordingly, the above action was accepted in deposit on 10 December 2001, the date on which the second declaration was lodged with the Secretary-General.

It will be recalled that the Secretary-General had received from the following States the following:

Argentina (4 December 1995):

The Argentine Republic rejects the inclusion of and reference to the Malvinas, South Georgian and South Sandwich Islands by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as dependent territories in its signing of the [said] Agreement, and reaffirms its sovereignty over those islands, which form an integral part of its national territory, and over their surrounding maritime spaces.

The Argentine Republic recalls that the United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute and requests the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the problems pending between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

United Kingdom (19 January 1996):

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have noted the declaration of the Government of Argentina. The British Government have no doubt about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands, as well as South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and have no doubt, therefore, about their right to extend the said Agreement to these territories. The British Government can only reject as unfounded the claim by the Government of Argentina that they are a part of Argentine territory."

Mauritius (upon accession):

Declaration:

"The Republic of Mauritius rejects the inclusion of any reference to the so-called British Indian Ocean Territory by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland as territories on whose behalf it could sign the said Agreement, and reaffirms its sovereignty over these islands, namely the Chagos Archipelago which form an integral part of the national territory of Mauritius and over their surrounding maritime spaces."

United Kingdom (30 July 1997):

"...[the Government of the United Kingdom declares that it] has no doubt as to the United Kingdom sovereignty over the British Indian Ocean Territory."

Mauritius (8 February 2000):

"... The Republic of Mauritius rejects as unfounded the claim by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of its sovereignty over the so-called British Indian Ocean Territory (Chagos Archipelago) and reaffirms its sovereignty and sovereign rights over the Chagos Archipelago which forms an integral part of the national territory of the Republic of Mauritius and over their surrounding maritime zones."

Further, on 8 February 2002, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina, the following communication:

In that regard, the Argentine Republic rejects the claim of extension of the application of the Agreement to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands communicated by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and lodged on 10 December 2001.

With regard to the question of the Malvinas, United Nations General Assembly resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25 recognize the existence of a dispute over sovereignty and request the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom to resume negotiations in order to find a peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute, with assistance from the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is required to inform the General Assembly of the progress made.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas, which are an integral part of its national territory.

The Argentine Republic reserves the right to express, at the appropriate time, its opinion concerning other aspects of the communication by the United Kingdom.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom on 17 June 2002,the following communication:

".....the United Kingdom rejects the Argentine objection to the ratification of the Agreement by the United Kingdom on behalf of the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the assertion by Argentina of rights of sovereignty over those territories and their surrounding maritime areas.

The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas."

8. Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea

New York, 23 May 1997

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 December 2001, in accordance with article 30 (1).
REGISTRATION: 30 December 2001, No. 37925.
STATUS: Signatories: 21. Parties: 29.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2167, p. 271; and depositary notifications C.N.495.1998.TREATIES-5 of 7 October 1998 (procès-verbal of rectification of the French authentique texte); C.N.858.2006.TREATIES-7 of 19 October 2006 (Corrections to the authentique Russian text of the Agreement).

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 23 May 1997 at the Seventh Meeting of the States Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982. In accordance with its article 27, the Agreement was opened for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters for a period of twenty-four months as from 1 July 1997.

Participant	*Signature*	*Undertaking of provisional application in accordance with article 31*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*
Argentina	2 Jun 1998		20 Oct 2006
Australia	26 May 1999		11 May 2001
Austria			1 Oct 2001 a
Belgium	19 Mar 1999		
Belize			14 Sep 2005 a
Bolivia			18 May 2006 a
Cameroon			30 Jul 2001 a
Croatia	27 May 1999		8 Sep 2000
Cyprus			12 Jun 2003 a
Czech Republic			26 Oct 2001 a
Denmark			16 Nov 2004 a
Finland	31 Mar 1999		28 Jul 2006
Germany	18 May 1999		
Ghana	30 Jun 1999		
Greece	1 Jul 1997		
India			14 Nov 2005 a
Italy			19 Jul 2006 a
Jamaica			1 Dec 2005 a
Jordan	17 Apr 1998		
Kuwait	15 Jun 1999		2 Aug 2002
Lebanon	15 Jun 1999		23 Jul 2002
Liberia			16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania			1 Nov 2005 a
Netherlands[1]	28 Aug 1998		25 Mar 1999
Norway	1 Jul 1997	1 Jul 1997	1 Aug 1997
Oman	28 Sep 1998		
Panama			1 Mar 2005 a
Portugal	30 Jun 1999		
Qatar			27 Jul 2005 a
Republic of Korea			26 Oct 2004 a
Saudi Arabia			30 Nov 2001 a
Senegal	1 Jul 1997		
Slovakia	22 Jun 1999		20 Apr 2000
Slovenia			15 Jun 2006 a
Spain			9 Jan 2001 a
Sri Lanka	30 Jun 1999		
Tunisia	9 Apr 1999		
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	3 Dec 1997		17 May 2006
United Republic of Tanzania	17 Dec 1998		
Uruguay			6 Jul 2006 a

Declarations and reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon notification of undertaking of provisional application, ratification or accession.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

The Republic of Argentina will accord such privileges and immunities as are specified in the Agreement on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea, adopted in New York on 23 May 1997, to members of the Secretariat of the International Tribunal for the Law of the Sea who are nationals or permanent residents in its territory to the extent necessary for the adequate fulfillment of their duties. With regard to fiscal and customs matters those members will be subject to the national norms application in its territory.

ITALY

Declaration:

"With regard to the above-mentioned Agreement, Italy interprets Article 11, par. 2, and Article 16, paragraph 4 as referred exclusively to income paid by the Court, this excluding any exemption for income from other sources."

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

9. Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Seabed Authority

Kingston, 27 March 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 31 May 2003, in accordance with article 18 see article 18 which reads as follows : "1. The Protocol shall enter into force 30 days after the date of deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification, approval, acceptance or accession. 2. For each member of the Authority which ratifies, approves or accepts this Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification, approval, acceptance or accession. This Protocol shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the deposit of its instrument of ratification approval, acceptance or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 31 May 2003, No. 39357.

STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 21.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2214. p. 133.

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Assembly of the International Seabed Authority in Kingston, Jamaica, on 27 March 1998, during its first part of the fourth session. In accordance with its article 15, the Protocol will be opened for signature by all Members of the Authority at the Headquarters of the International Seabed Authority in Kingston, Jamaica, from 17 until 28 August 1998. The formal signing ceremony is scheduled for 26-27 August 1998. Subsequently, it will be opened for signature until 16 August 2000 at United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Approval (AA), Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*
Argentina		20 Oct 2006 a
Austria		25 Sep 2003 a
Bahamas	26 Aug 1998	
Brazil	27 Aug 1998	
Cameroon		28 Aug 2002 a
Chile	14 Apr 1999	8 Feb 2005
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 1998	
Croatia		8 Sep 2000 a
Czech Republic	1 Aug 2000	26 Oct 2001
Denmark		16 Nov 2004 a
Egypt	26 Apr 2000	20 Jun 2001
Finland	31 Mar 1999	
Ghana	12 Jan 1999	
Greece	14 Oct 1998	
India		14 Nov 2005 a
Indonesia	26 Aug 1998	
Italy	18 May 2000	19 Jul 2006
Jamaica	26 Aug 1998	25 Sep 2002
Kenya	26 Aug 1998	
Malta	26 Jul 2000	
Mauritius		22 Dec 2004 a
Namibia	24 Sep 1999	
Netherlands	26 Aug 1998	21 Nov 2002 A
Nigeria		1 May 2003 a
Norway		10 May 2006 a
Oman	19 Aug 1999	12 Mar 2004
Pakistan	9 Sep 1999	
Portugal	6 Apr 2000	
Saudi Arabia	11 Oct 1999	
Senegal	11 Jun 1999	
Slovakia	22 Jun 1999	20 Apr 2000
Spain	14 Sep 1999	9 Jan 2001
Sudan	6 Aug 1999	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	17 Sep 1998	
Trinidad and Tobago	26 Aug 1998	10 Aug 2005
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	19 Aug 1999	2 Nov 2000
Uruguay	21 Oct 1998	6 Jul 2006 a

Declarations and reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, approval, acceptance or accession.)

Argentina

Declaration:

The Republic of Argentina will accord such privileges and immunities as are specified in the Protocol on the Privileges and Immunities of the International Seabed Authority, adopted in Kingston on 27 March1998, to members of the Secretariat of the International Seabed Authority who are nationals or permanent residents in its territory to the extent necessary for the adequate fulfillment of their duties. With regard to fiscal and customs matters those members will be subject to the national norms applied in its territory.

Chile

Reservation:

The Government of Chile expresses a reservation with respect to article 8, paragraph 2 (d) of the Protocol, as that provision will not exempt its nationals from national service obligations.

CHAPTER XXII

COMMERCIAL ARBITRATION

1. CONVENTION ON THE RECOGNITION AND ENFORCEMENT OF FOREIGN ARBITRAL AWARDS

New York, 10 June 1958

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 June 1959, in accordance with article XII.
REGISTRATION: 7 June 1959, No. 4739.
STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 142.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 330, p. 3.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature on 10 June 1958 by the United Nations Conference on International Commercial Arbitration, convened in accordance with resolution 604 (XXI)[1] of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations adopted on 3 May 1956. The Conference met at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 20 May to 10 June 1958. For the text of the Final Act of this Conference, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 330, p. 3.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		30 Nov 2004 a
Albania		27 Jun 2001 a
Algeria		7 Feb 1989 a
Antigua and Barbuda		2 Feb 1989 a
Argentina	26 Aug 1958	14 Mar 1989
Armenia		29 Dec 1997 a
Australia		26 Mar 1975 a
Austria		2 May 1961 a
Azerbaijan		29 Feb 2000 a
Bahamas		20 Dec 2006 a
Bahrain		6 Apr 1988 a
Bangladesh		6 May 1992 a
Barbados		16 Mar 1993 a
Belarus	29 Dec 1958	15 Nov 1960
Belgium	10 Jun 1958	18 Aug 1975
Benin		16 May 1974 a
Bolivia		28 Apr 1995 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		20 Dec 1971 a
Brazil		7 Jun 2002 a
Brunei Darussalam		25 Jul 1996 a
Bulgaria	17 Dec 1958	10 Oct 1961
Burkina Faso		23 Mar 1987 a
Cambodia		5 Jan 1960 a
Cameroon		19 Feb 1988 a
Canada		12 May 1986 a
Central African Republic		15 Oct 1962 a
Chile		4 Sep 1975 a
China[3]		22 Jan 1987 a
Colombia		25 Sep 1979 a
Costa Rica	10 Jun 1958	26 Oct 1987
Côte d'Ivoire		1 Feb 1991 a
Croatia[2]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		30 Dec 1974 a
Cyprus		29 Dec 1980 a
Czech Republic[4]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark		22 Dec 1972 a
Djibouti		14 Jun 1983 d
Dominica		28 Oct 1988 a
Dominican Republic		11 Apr 2002 a
Ecuador	17 Dec 1958	3 Jan 1962
Egypt		9 Mar 1959 a
El Salvador	10 Jun 1958	26 Feb 1998
Estonia		30 Aug 1993 a
Finland	29 Dec 1958	19 Jan 1962
France	25 Nov 1958	26 Jun 1959
Gabon		15 Dec 2006 a
Georgia		2 Jun 1994 a
Germany[5,6]	10 Jun 1958	30 Jun 1961
Ghana		9 Apr 1968 a
Greece		16 Jul 1962 a
Guatemala		21 Mar 1984 a
Guinea		23 Jan 1991 a
Haiti		5 Dec 1983 a
Holy See		14 May 1975 a
Honduras		3 Oct 2000 a
Hungary		5 Mar 1962 a
Iceland		24 Jan 2002 a
India	10 Jun 1958	13 Jul 1960
Indonesia		7 Oct 1981 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		15 Oct 2001 a
Ireland		12 May 1981 a
Israel	10 Jun 1958	5 Jan 1959
Italy		31 Jan 1969 a
Jamaica		10 Jul 2002 a
Japan		20 Jun 1961 a
Jordan	10 Jun 1958	15 Nov 1979
Kazakhstan		20 Nov 1995 a
Kenya		10 Feb 1989 a
Kuwait		28 Apr 1978 a
Kyrgyzstan		18 Dec 1996 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		17 Jun 1998 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		11 Aug 1998 a
Lesotho		13 Jun 1989 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania		14 Mar 1995 a
Luxembourg	11 Nov 1958	9 Sep 1983
Madagascar		16 Jul 1962 a
Malaysia		5 Nov 1985 a
Mali		8 Sep 1994 a
Malta		22 Jun 2000 a
Marshall Islands		21 Dec 2006 a
Mauritania		30 Jan 1997 a
Mauritius		19 Jun 1996 a
Mexico		14 Apr 1971 a
Moldova		18 Sep 1998 a
Monaco	31 Dec 1958	2 Jun 1982
Mongolia		24 Oct 1994 a
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		12 Feb 1959 a
Mozambique		11 Jun 1998 a
Nepal		4 Mar 1998 a
Netherlands	10 Jun 1958	24 Apr 1964
New Zealand		6 Jan 1983 a
Nicaragua		24 Sep 2003 a
Niger		14 Oct 1964 a
Nigeria		17 Mar 1970 a
Norway		14 Mar 1961 a
Oman		25 Feb 1999 a
Pakistan	30 Dec 1958	14 Jul 2005
Panama		10 Oct 1984 a
Paraguay		8 Oct 1997 a
Peru		7 Jul 1988 a
Philippines	10 Jun 1958	6 Jul 1967
Poland	10 Jun 1958	3 Oct 1961
Portugal[8]		18 Oct 1994 a
Qatar		30 Dec 2002 a
Republic of Korea		8 Feb 1973 a
Romania		13 Sep 1961 a
Russian Federation	29 Dec 1958	24 Aug 1960
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		12 Sep 2000 a
San Marino		17 May 1979 a
Saudi Arabia		19 Apr 1994 a
Senegal		17 Oct 1994 a
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Singapore		21 Aug 1986 a
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa		3 May 1976 a
Spain		12 May 1977 a
Sri Lanka	30 Dec 1958	9 Apr 1962
Sweden	23 Dec 1958	28 Jan 1972
Switzerland	29 Dec 1958	1 Jun 1965
Syrian Arab Republic[9]		9 Mar 1959 a
Thailand		21 Dec 1959 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		10 Mar 1994 d
Trinidad and Tobago		14 Feb 1966 a
Tunisia		17 Jul 1967 a
Turkey		2 Jul 1992 a
Uganda		12 Feb 1992 a
Ukraine	29 Dec 1958	10 Oct 1960
United Arab Emirates		21 Aug 2006 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		24 Sep 1975 a
United Republic of Tanzania		13 Oct 1964 a
United States of America		30 Sep 1970 a
Uruguay		30 Mar 1983 a
Uzbekistan		7 Feb 1996 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		8 Feb 1995 a
Viet Nam		12 Sep 1995 a
Zambia		14 Mar 2002 a
Zimbabwe		29 Sep 1994 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto and territorial applications, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Declaration:

"Afghanistan will apply the Convention only to : (i) recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State; and (ii) differences arising out of legal relationships whether contractual or not which are considered as commercial under the national law of Afghanistan."

ALGERIA

Declaration:

Referring to the possibility offered by article I, paragraph 3, of the Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that it will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State and only where such awards have been made with respect to differences arising out of legal relationships whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Algerian law.

ANTIGUA AND BARBUDA

Declarations:

"In accordance with article I, the Government of Antigua and Barbuda declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another contracting state.

The Government of Antigua and Barbuda also declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of Antigua and Barbuda."

ARGENTINA[10]

Upon signature:

Subject to the declaration contained in the Final Act.

Upon ratification:

On the basis of reciprocity, the Republic of Argentina will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. It will also apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

The Convention will be interpreted in accordance with the principles and clauses of the National Constitution in force or those resulting from modification made by virtue of the Constitution.

ARMENIA

Declarations:

"1. The Republic of Armenia will apply the Convention only to recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

2. The Republic of Armenia will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of the Republic of Armenia."

AUSTRIA[11]

BAHRAIN[12]

"1. The accession by the State of Bahrain to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, 1958 shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

"2. In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the State of Bahrain will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State party to the Convention.

"3. In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the State of Bahrain will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the State of Bahrain."

BARBADOS

Declaration:

"(i) In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the Government of Barbados declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

(ii) The Government of Barbados will also apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not which are considered as commercial under the laws of Barbados."

BELARUS

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic will apply the provisions of this Convention in respect to arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States only to the extent to which they grant reciprocal treatment.

BELGIUM

In accordance with article I, paragraph 3, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of a Contracting State.

BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA[2]

Declaration:

"The Convention will be applied to the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina only relating [to] those arbitral awards that have been brought after entering into force of the Convention.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

The Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina."

BOTSWANA

"The Republic of Botswana will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationship, whether contractual or not, which are considered commercial under Botswana law.

"The Republic of Botswana will apply the Convention to the Recognition and Enforcement of Awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

BRUNEI DARUSSALAM

Declaration:

"... Brunei Darussalam will on the basis of reciprocity apply the said Convention to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards which are made in the territory of another Contracting State."

BULGARIA

"Bulgaria will apply the Convention to recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another contracting State. With regard to awards made in the territory of non-contracting States it will apply the Convention only to the extent to which these States grant reciprocal treatment."

CANADA[13]

27 May 1987

"The Government of Canada declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of Canada, except in the case of the Province of Quebec where the law does not provide for such limitation."

CENTRAL AFRICAN REPUBLIC

Referring to the possibility offered by paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, the Central African Republic declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; it further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

China

1. The People's Republic of China will apply the Convention, only on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State;

2. The People's Republic of China will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the People's Republic of China.

Cuba

Cuba will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. With respect to arbitral awards made by other non-contracting States it will apply the Convention only in so far as those States grant reciprocal treatment as established by mutual agreement between the parties. Moreover, it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Cuban legislation.

Cyprus

"The Republic of Cyprus will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State; furthermore it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law."

Czech Republic[4]

Denmark

In accordance with the terms of article I, paragraph 3, [the Convention] shall have effect only as regards the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made by another Contracting State and [it] shall be valid only with respect to commercial relationships.

Ecuador

Ecuador, on a basis of reciprocity, will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State only if such awards have been made with respect to differences arising out of legal relationships which are regarded as commercial under Ecuadorian law.

France[14]

Referring to the possibility offered by paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, France declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State.

Referring to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article X of the Convention, France declares that this Convention will extend to all the territories of the French Republic.

Germany[5,15]

"With respect to paragraph 1 of article I, and in accordance with paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

Greece[16]

18 April 1980

The present Convention is approved on condition of the two limitations set forth in article I (3) of the Convention.

Guatemala

On the basis of reciprocity, the Republic of Guatemala will apply the above Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; and will apply it only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Holy See

The State of Vatican City will apply the said Convention on the basis of reciprocity, on the one hand, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State, and on the other hand, only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Vatican law.

Hungary

"The Hungarian People's Republic shall apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of such awards only as have been made in the territory of one of the other Contracting States and are dealing with differences arising in respect of a legal relationship considered by the Hungarian law as a commercial relationship."

India

"In accordance with Article I of the Convention, the Government of India declare that they will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of a State, party to this Convention. They further declare that they will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the law of India."

Indonesia

"Pursuant to the provision of article I (3) of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State, and that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Indonesian Law".

Iran (Islamic Republic of)

Declarations:

"(a) In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the Islamic Republic of Iran will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the Islamic Republic of Iran;

(b) In accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention, the Islamic Republic of Iran will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State Party to the Convention."

IRELAND

"In accordance with article I (3) of the said Convention the Government of Ireland declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State".

JAMAICA[17]

17 October 2003

Reservation:

"The Government of Jamaica, on the basis of Reciprocity, will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State, in accordance with article 1 (3).

The Government of Jamaica further declares that the Convention will only be applied to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered to be commercial under the national laws of Jamaica in accordance with article 1 (3) of the Convention."

JAPAN

"It will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State."

JORDAN[12]

The Government of Jordan shall not be bound by any awards which are made by Israel or to which an Israeli is a party.

KENYA

Declaration:

"In accordance with article I (3) of the said Convention the Government of Kenya declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another contracting state."

KUWAIT

The State of Kuwait will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

It is understood that the accession of the State of Kuwait to the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, done at New York, on the 10th of June 1958, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel or entering with it into relations governed by the Convention thereto acceded by the State of Kuwait.

LEBANON

Declaration:

The Government of Lebanon declares that it will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

[The Republic of Lithuania] will apply the provisions of the said Convention to the recognition of arbitral awards made in the territories of the Non-Contracting States, only on the basis of reciprocity."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

The Convention is applied on the basis of reciprocity to the recognition and enforcement of only those arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

MADAGASCAR

The Malagasy Republic declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; it further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MALAYSIA

Declaration:

The Government of Malaysia will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. Malaysia further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under Malaysian law.

MALTA

Declarations:

"1. In accordance with the relevant provisions of the Convention, Malta will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

2. The Convention only applies in regard to Malta with respect to arbitration agreements concluded after the date of Malta's accession to the Convention."

MAURITIUS

Declarations:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 1 of the Convention, the Republic of Mauritius declares that it will, on the basis of reciprocity, apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

Referring to paragraphs 1 and 2 of article X of the Convention, the Republic of Mauritius declares that this Convention will extend to all the territories forming part of the Republic of Mauritius."

MOLDOVA

"The Convention will be applied to the Republic of Moldova only relating those arbitral awards that have been brought after entering into force of the Convention.

The Convention will be applied tot he Republic of Moldova. on the basis of reciprocity, only relating those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

MONACO

Referring to the possibility offered by article I (3) of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State; furthermore, it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationship. whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

MONGOLIA

Declaration:

"1. Mongolia will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

2. Mongolia will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of Mongolia."

MONTENEGRO[7]

Confirmation upon succession:

Reservations:

"1. The Convention is applied in regard to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia only to those arbitral awards which were adopted after the coming of the Convention into effect.

"2. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention on a reciprocal basis only to those arbitral awards which were adopted on the territory of the other State Party to the Convention.

"3. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention [only] with respect to the disputes arising from the legal relations, contractual and non-contractual, which, according to its national legislation are considered as economic."

Declaration:

"The first reservation only constituted an affirmation of the legal principle of retroactivity and that the third reservation being essentially in accordance with article I (3) of the Convention, the word "only" was therefore to be added to the original text and note taken that the word "economic" had been used therein as a synonym for "commercial".

MOROCCO

The Government of His Majesty the King of Morocco will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

MOZAMBIQUE

Reservation:

"The Republic of Mozambique reserves itself the right to enforce the provisions of the said Conventions on the base of reciprocity, where the artibral awards have been pronounced in the territory of another Contracting State."

NEPAL

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of Nepal will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting state. [The Government of Nepal] further declares that the Kingdom of Nepal will apply the Convention only to the differences arising out of legal relationship, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the law of the Kingdom of Nepal."

NETHERLANDS

Referring to paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Foreign Arbitral Awards, the Government of the Kingdom declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

NEW ZEALAND

Declarations:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 1 of the Convention, the Government of New Zealand declares that it will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State.

"Accession to the Convention by the Government of New Zealand shall not extend for the time being, pursuant to article X of the Convention, to the Cook Islands and Niue."

NIGERIA

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article I of the Convention, the Federal Military Government of the Federal Republic of Nigeria declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of a State party to this Convention and to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of the Federal Republic of Nigeria."

NORWAY

"1. [The Government of Norway] will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of one of the Contracting States."

"2. [The Government of Norway] will not apply the Convention to differences where the subject matter of the proceedings is immovable property situated in Norway, or a right in or to such property."

PAKISTAN

Declaration:

"The Islamic Republic of Pakistan will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of [a] Contracting State."

PHILIPPINES

Upon signature:

Reservation

"The Philippine delegation signs *ad referendum* this Convention with the reservation that it does so on the basis of reciprocity."

Declaration

"The Philippines will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State pursuant to Article I, paragraph 3 of the Convention."

Declaration made upon ratification: "The Philippines, on the basis of reciprocity, will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State and only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the State making such declaration."

POLAND

"With reservations as mentioned in article I, para. 3."

PORTUGAL

Declaration:

Within the scope of the principle of reciprocity, Portugal will restrict the application of the Convention to arbitral awards pronounced in the territory of a State bound by the said Convention.

Republic of Korea

"By virtue of paragraph 3 of article I of the present Convention, the Government of the Republic of Korea declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. It further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law."

Romania

The Romanian People's Republic will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its legislation.

The Romanian People's Republic will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. As regards awards made in the territory of certain non-contracting States, the Romanian People's Republic will apply the Convention only on the basis of reciprocity established by joint agreement between the parties.

Russian Federation

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will apply the provisions of this Convention in respect of arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States only to the extent to which they grant reciprocal treatment.

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 1 of [the] Convention, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declares that they will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. They further declare that they will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the laws of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines."

Saudi Arabia

Declaration:

On the Basis of reciprocity, the Kingdom declares that it shall restrict the application of the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made in the territory of a Contracting State.

Serbia[2]

Confirmation upon succession:

Reservation:

"1. The Convention is applied in regard to the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia only to those arbitral awards which were adopted after the coming of the Convention into effect.

"2. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention on a reciprocal basis only to those arbitral awards which were adopted on the territory of the other State Party to the Convention.

"3. Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention [only] with respect to the disputes arising from the legal relations, contractual and non-contractual, which, according to its national legislation are considered as economic."

In a latter declaration dated 28 June 1982, the Government of Yugoslavia had specified that :

"the first reservation only constituted an affirmation of the legal principle of retroactivity and that the third reservation being essentially in accordance with article I (3) of the Convention, the word "only" was therefore to be added to the original text and note taken that the word "economic" had been used therein as a synonym for "commercial".

Singapore

"The Republic of Singapore will on the basis of reciprocity apply the said Convention to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards which are made in the territory of another Contracting State."

Slovakia[4]

Slovenia[2]

Declaration:

"In accordance with paragraph 3 of article 1, the Republic of Slovenia will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. The Republic of Slovenia will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the Republic of Slovenia."

Switzerland[18]

Trinidad and Tobago

"In accordance with article I of the Convention, the Government of Trinidad and Tobago declares that it will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Law of Trinidad and Tobago."

Tunisia

With the reservations provided for in article I, paragraph 3, of the Convention, that is to say, the Tunisian State will apply the Convention to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State and only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the Tunisian law.

Turkey

Declaration:

In accordance with the Article I, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Turkey declares that it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of awards made only in the territory of another contracting State. It further declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Uganda

Declaration:

"The Republic of Uganda will only apply the Convention to recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

UKRAINE

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic will apply the provisions of this Convention in respect of arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States only to the extent to which they grant reciprocal treatment.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND[16]

5 May 1980

"The United Kingdom will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State. This declaration is also made on behalf of Gibraltar, Hong Kong and the Isle of Man to which the Convention has been extended."

UNITED REPUBLIC OF TANZANIA

"The Government of the United Republic of Tanganyika and Zanzibar will apply the Convention, in accordance with the first sentence of article I (3) thereof, only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The United States of America will apply the Convention, on the basis of reciprocity, to the recognition and enforcement of only those awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

"The United States of America will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of the United States."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Declarations:

(a) The Republic of Venezuela will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of foreign arbitral awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

(b) The Republic of Venezuela will apply the present Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under its national law.

VIET NAM

Declarations:

1. [The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam] considers the Convention to be applicable to the recognition and enforcement of arbitral awards made only in the territory of another Contracting State. With respect to arbitral awards made in the territories of non-contracting States, it will apply the Convention on the basis of reciprocity.

2. The Convention will be applied only to differences arising out of legal relationships which are considered as commercial under the laws of Viet Nam.

3. Interpretation of the Convention before the Vietnamese Courts or competent authorities should be made in accordance with the Constitution and the law of Viet Nam.

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession or succession.)

GERMANY[5]

29 December 1989

The Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the second paragraph of the declaration of the Argentine Republic represents a reservation and as such is not only contradictory to article I (3) of the Convention but is also vague and hence inadmissible; it therefore raises an objection to that reservation.

In all other respects this objection is not intended to prevent the entry into force of the Convention between the Argentine Republic and the Federal Republic of Germany.

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
Australia	26 Mar 1975	All the external territories for the international relations of which Australia is responsible other than Papua New Guinea
Denmark[19]	10 Feb 1976	Faeroe Islands, Greenland
France	26 Jun 1959	All the territories of the French Republic
Netherlands[20]	24 Apr 1964	Netherlands Antilles, Surinam
United Kingdom[3,21]	24 Sep 1975	Gibraltar
	21 Jan 1977	Hong Kong
	22 Feb 1979	Isle of Man
	14 Nov 1979	Bermuda
	26 Nov 1980	Belize, Cayman Islands
	19 Apr 1985	Guernsey
	28 May 2002	Jersey
United States of America	3 Nov 1970	All the territories for the international relations of which the United States of America is responsible

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Belize, Bermuda, Cayman Islands, Guernsey, Jersey

[The Convention will apply] . . . "in accordance with article I, paragraph 3 thereof, only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 1* (E/2889), p. 5.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 26 February 1982 with the following reservation:

"1. The Convention is applied in regard to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia only to those arbitral awards which were adopted after the coming of the Convention into effect.

"2. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention on a reciprocal basis only to those arbitral awards which were adopted on the territory of the other State Party to the Convention.

"3. The Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia will apply the Convention [only] with respect to the disputes arising from the legal relations, contractual and non-contractual, which, according to its national legislation are considered as economic."

In a latter declaration dated 28 June 1982, the Government of Yugoslavia had specified that the first reservation only constituted an affirmation of the legal principle of retroactivity and that the third reservation being essentially in accordance with article I (3) of the Convention, the word "only" was therefore to be added to the original text and note taken that the word "economic" had been used therein as a synonym for "commercial".

See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", Croatia, "former Yugoslavia" , "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

On 19 July 2005, the Secretary-General received the following declaration from the Government of China:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention on the Recognition and Enforcement of Arbitral Awards shall apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. The statement made by the Government of the People's Republic of China when acceding to the Convention on January 22, 1987, also applies to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 3 October 1958 and 10 July 1959, with a declaration. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 330, p. 69. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention with declarations, on 20 February 1975. For the text of the declarations, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 959, p. 841. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] On 12 November 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Macau.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 9 December 1999, from the Government of Portugal, the following communication:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macau."

[9] Accession by the United Arab Republic. See also note 1 under "United Arab Republic" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The declaration made upon signature and contained in the Final Act read as follows:

"If another Contracting Party extends the application of the Convention to territories which fall within the sovereignty of the Argentine Republic, the rights of the Argentine Republic shall in no way be affected by that extension."

[11] In a communication received on 25 February 1988, the Government of Austria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw as from that date, the reservation made upon accession to the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 395, p. 274.

[12] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 23 June 1980, the Government of Israel declared the following:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Jordan. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Jordan under general international law or under particular conventions.

"Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Jordan an attitude of complete reciprocity."

A communication identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, was received by the Secretary-General, on 22 September 1988, from the Government of Israel in respect of the declaration made by Bahrain upon accession.

[13] The declaration by Canada received on 20 May 1987, and which originally comprised two parts, was made after accession. It was communicated by the Secretary-General to all States. None of the Contracting Parties having expressed an objection within a period of 90 days from the date of the above-mentioned communication [22 July 1987], the declaration was deemed to have been accepted and replaces the declaration made upon accession which read as follows:

"The Government of Canada declares, with respect to the Province of Alberta, that it will apply the Convention only to the recogni tion and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State.

"The Government of Canada declares that it will apply the Convention only to differences arising out of legal relationships, whether contractual or not, which are considered as commercial under the national law of Canada."

Subsequently, on 25 November 1988, the Government of Canada notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, the second part of its revised declaration received on 20 May 1987 which read as follows:

"The Government of Canada declares, with respect to the Province of Saskatchewan, that it will apply the Convention only to the recognition and enforcement of awards made in the territory of another Contracting State."

[14] In a communication received on 27 November 1989, the Government of France notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw, with effect from that date, the declaration relating to the second sentence of its declaration relating to paragraph 3 of article I made upon ratification. For the text of the declaration so withdrawn, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 336, p. 426.

[15] In a communication received on 31 August 1998, the Government of Germany notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 399, p.286.

[16] Since the declaration [by Greece] [by the United Kingdom] had been made after accession, it was communicated by the Secretary-General to all States concerned on 10 June 1980. None of the Contracting Parties having expressed an objection within a period of 90 days from the date of the above-mentioned communication, the declaration was deemed to have been accepted.

[17] In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the reservation in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the depositary itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of one year from the date of the notification (i.e. 17 October 2002). Within a period of one year from the date of the above depositary notification, none of the Contracting Parties to the above Convention notified the Secretary-General of an objection. Consequently, the reservation is deemed to have been accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the one year period, i.e., on 17 October 2003.

[18] On 23 April 1993, the Government of Switzerland notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the declaration made upon ratification. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 536, p. 477.

[19] At the time of acceding to the Convention the Government of Denmark declared, in accordance with article X (1), that it would not apply for the time being to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland.

In a communication received on 12 November 1975, the Government of Denmark declared that it had withdrawn the above-mentioned declaration, this decision to take effect on 1 January 1976.

In a further communication received on 5 January 1978, the Government of Denmark confirmed that the communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 November 1975 should be considered as having taken effect from 10 February 1976, in accordance with article X (2), it being understood that the Convention was applied *de facto* to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland from 1 January to 9 February 1976.

[20] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[21] See also under *"Declarations and Reservations"* for the reservation made by the United Kingdom, which was also made on behalf of Gibraltar, Hong Kong *(see also note 3)* and the Isle of Man.

2. European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration

Geneva, 21 April 1961

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 7 January 1964, in accordance with article X (8), with the exception of paragraphs 3 to 7 of article IV which entered into force on 18 October 1965, in accordance with paragraph 4 of the Annex to the Convention.

REGISTRATION: 7 January 1964, No. 7041.

STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 30.

TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 484, p. 349.

Note: The Convention was prepared and opened for signature on 21 April 1961 by the Special Meeting of Plenipotentiaries for the purpose of negotiating and signing a European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration, which was convened in accordance with resolution 7 (XV)[1] of the Economic Commission for Europe, adopted on 5 May 1960. The Special Meeting was held at the European Office of the United Nations in Geneva from 10 to 21 April 1961. For the text of the Final Act of the Special Meeting, see United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 484, p. 349.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania		27 Jun 2001 a
Austria	21 Apr 1961	6 Mar 1964
Azerbaijan		17 Jan 2005 a
Belarus	21 Apr 1961	14 Oct 1963
Belgium	21 Apr 1961	9 Oct 1975
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	21 Apr 1961	13 May 1964
Burkina Faso		26 Jan 1965 a
Croatia[2]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cuba		1 Sep 1965 a
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark[4]	21 Apr 1961	22 Dec 1972
Finland	21 Dec 1961	
France	21 Apr 1961	16 Dec 1966
Germany[5,6]	21 Apr 1961	27 Oct 1964
Hungary	21 Apr 1961	9 Oct 1963
Italy	21 Apr 1961	3 Aug 1970
Kazakhstan		20 Nov 1995 a
Latvia		20 Mar 2003 a
Luxembourg		26 Mar 1982 a
Moldova		5 Mar 1998 a
Poland	21 Apr 1961	15 Sep 1964
Romania	21 Apr 1961	16 Aug 1963
Russian Federation	21 Apr 1961	27 Jun 1962
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain	14 Dec 1961	12 May 1975
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		10 Mar 1994 d
Turkey	21 Apr 1961	24 Jan 1992
Ukraine	21 Apr 1961	18 Mar 1963

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Belgium

In accordance with article II, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Belgian Government declares that in Belgium only the State has, in the cases referred to in article I, paragraph 1, the faculty to conclude arbitration agreements.

Latvia

Declaration:

"In accordance with article II, paragraph 2, of the European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration, the Republic of Latvia declares that article II, paragraph 1, does not apply for state authorities and local government authorities."

Luxembourg

Except where otherwise expressly provided for in the arbitration agreement, the presiding judges of the local courts shall assume the functions entrusted to the presidents of the chambers of commerce under article IV of the Convention. The presiding judges shall hear the disputes in chambers.

Notifications made in accordance with article X (6) of the Convention
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, accession or succesion.)

AZERBAIJAN

"In connection with the requirement contained in Article X (6) of the above-mentioned Convention, the [...] the Republic of Azerbaijan would like to inform that the functions referred to in Article IV of the Convention are exercised by the Economic Court of the Republic of Azerbaijan, in accordance with Article 6 of the law on International Arbitration of the Republic of Azerbaijan."

CROATIA

11 December 2001

"....the following institution in the Republic of Croatia has been designated to exercise the functions referred to in Article IV of the Convention.

Permanent Arbitration Court to the Croatian Chamber of Commerce
Rooseveltov trg 2
10000 ZABREB
Croatia
tel: 385 1 4606-733
fax: 385 1 4606-752
email sudiste@hgk.hr"

LATVIA

"In accordance with article X, paragraph 6, of the European Convention on International Commercial Arbitration, the Republic of Latvia communicates that functions conferred by article IV will exercise:

Latvian Chamber of Commerce and Industry
Address: K. Valdemara street 35,
Riga, LV-1010, Latvia
Phone: + 371 7 225 595
Fax: + 371 7 820 092
e-mail: info@chamber.lv."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council, Fifteenth Session, Supplement No. 3* (E/3349), p. 55.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 April 1961 and 25 September 1963, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", Croatia, "former Yugoslavia" , "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 21 April 1961 and 13 November 1963, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The instrument of ratification contained a declaration to the effect that the Convention for the time being would not extend to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland.

In a communication received on 12 November 1975, the Government of Denmark declared that it had withdrawn the above-mentioned reservation, the decision to take effect on 1 January 1976.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 20 February 1975. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XXIII

LAW OF TREATIES

1. VIENNA CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF TREATIES

Vienna, 23 May 1969

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 January 1980, in accordance with article 84 (1).
REGISTRATION: 27 January 1980, No. 18232.
STATUS: Signatories: 45. Parties: 108.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1155, p. 331.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 May 1969 and opened for signature on 23 May 1969 by the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2166 (XXI)[1] of 5 December 1966 and 2287 (XXII)[2] of 6 December 1967. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 26 March to 24 May 1968 and the second session from 9 April to 22 May 1969. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain declarations and resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. The text of the Final Act is included in document A/CONF.39/11/Add.2.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	23 May 1969	
Albania		27 Jun 2001 a
Algeria		8 Nov 1988 a
Andorra		5 Apr 2004 a
Argentina	23 May 1969	5 Dec 1972
Armenia		17 May 2005 a
Australia		13 Jun 1974 a
Austria		30 Apr 1979 a
Barbados	23 May 1969	24 Jun 1971
Belarus		1 May 1986 a
Belgium		1 Sep 1992 a
Bolivia	23 May 1969	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil	23 May 1969	
Bulgaria		21 Apr 1987 a
Burkina Faso		25 May 2006 a
Cambodia	23 May 1969	
Cameroon		23 Oct 1991 a
Canada		14 Oct 1970 a
Central African Republic		10 Dec 1971 a
Chile	23 May 1969	9 Apr 1981
China[4]		3 Sep 1997 a
Colombia	23 May 1969	10 Apr 1985
Congo	23 May 1969	12 Apr 1982
Costa Rica	23 May 1969	22 Nov 1996
Côte d'Ivoire	23 Jul 1969	
Croatia[3]		12 Oct 1992 d
Cuba		9 Sep 1998 a
Cyprus		28 Dec 1976 a
Czech Republic[5]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		25 Jul 1977 a
Denmark	18 Apr 1970	1 Jun 1976
Ecuador	23 May 1969	11 Feb 2005
Egypt		11 Feb 1982 a
El Salvador	16 Feb 1970	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia	30 Apr 1970	
Finland	23 May 1969	19 Aug 1977
Gabon		5 Nov 2004 a
Georgia		8 Jun 1995 a
Germany[6,7]	30 Apr 1970	21 Jul 1987
Ghana	23 May 1969	
Greece		30 Oct 1974 a
Guatemala	23 May 1969	21 Jul 1997
Guinea		16 Sep 2005 a
Guyana	23 May 1969	15 Sep 2005
Haiti		25 Aug 1980 a
Holy See	30 Sep 1969	25 Feb 1977
Honduras	23 May 1969	20 Sep 1979
Hungary		19 Jun 1987 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	23 May 1969	
Ireland		7 Aug 2006 a
Italy	22 Apr 1970	25 Jul 1974
Jamaica	23 May 1969	28 Jul 1970
Japan		2 Jul 1981 a
Kazakhstan		5 Jan 1994 a
Kenya	23 May 1969	
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		11 Nov 1975 a
Kyrgyzstan		11 May 1999 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		31 Mar 1998 a
Latvia		4 May 1993 a
Lesotho		3 Mar 1972 a
Liberia	23 May 1969	29 Aug 1985
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1990 a
Lithuania		15 Jan 1992 a
Luxembourg	4 Sep 1969	23 May 2003

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Madagascar	23 May 1969	
Malawi		23 Aug 1983 a
Malaysia		27 Jul 1994 a
Maldives		14 Sep 2005 a
Mali		31 Aug 1998 a
Mauritius		18 Jan 1973 a
Mexico	23 May 1969	25 Sep 1974
Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Mongolia		16 May 1988 a
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	23 May 1969	26 Sep 1972
Mozambique		8 May 2001 a
Myanmar		16 Sep 1998 a
Nauru		5 May 1978 a
Nepal	23 May 1969	
Netherlands[9]		9 Apr 1985 a
New Zealand	29 Apr 1970	4 Aug 1971
Niger		27 Oct 1971 a
Nigeria	23 May 1969	31 Jul 1969
Oman		18 Oct 1990 a
Pakistan	29 Apr 1970	
Panama		28 Jul 1980 a
Paraguay		3 Feb 1972 a
Peru	23 May 1969	14 Sep 2000
Philippines	23 May 1969	15 Nov 1972
Poland		2 Jul 1990 a
Portugal		6 Feb 2004 a
Republic of Korea[10]	27 Nov 1969	27 Apr 1977
Russian Federation		29 Apr 1986 a
Rwanda		3 Jan 1980 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 a
Saudi Arabia		14 Apr 2003 a
Senegal		11 Apr 1986 a
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		9 Aug 1989 a
Spain		16 May 1972 a
Sudan	23 May 1969	18 Apr 1990
Suriname		31 Jan 1991 a
Sweden	23 Apr 1970	4 Feb 1975
Switzerland		7 May 1990 a
Syrian Arab Republic		2 Oct 1970 a
Tajikistan		6 May 1996 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[3]		8 Jul 1999 d
Togo		28 Dec 1979 a
Trinidad and Tobago	23 May 1969	
Tunisia		23 Jun 1971 a
Turkmenistan		4 Jan 1996 a
Ukraine		14 May 1986 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	20 Apr 1970	25 Jun 1971
United Republic of Tanzania		12 Apr 1976 a
United States of America	24 Apr 1970	
Uruguay	23 May 1969	5 Mar 1982
Uzbekistan		12 Jul 1995 a
Viet Nam		10 Oct 2001 a
Zambia	23 May 1969	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

AFGHANISTAN

Upon signature:

"Afghanistan's understanding of article 62 (fundamental change of circumstances) is as follows:

"Sub-paragraph 2 (a) of this article does not cover unequal and illegal treaties, or any treaties which were contrary to the principle of self-determination. This view was also supported by the Expert Consultant in his statement of 11 May 1968 in the Committee of the Whole and on 14 May 1969 (doc. A/CONF.39/L.40) to the Conference."

ALGERIA

Declaration:

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria to the present Convention does not in any way mean recognition of Israel.

This accession shall not be interpreted as involving the establishment of relations of any kind whatever with Israel.

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that the competence of the International Court of Justice cannot be exercised with respect to a dispute such as that envisaged in article 66 (a) at the request of one of the parties alone.

It declares that, in each case, the prior agreement of all the parties concerned is necessary for the dispute to be submitted to the said Court.

ARGENTINA

(a) The Argentine Republic does not regard the rule contained in article 45 *(b)* as applicable to it inasmuch as the rule in question provides for the renunciation of rights in advance.

(b) The Argentine Republic does not accept the idea that a fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty; moreover, it objects to the reservations made by Afghanistan, Morocco and Syria with respect to article 62, paragraph 2 *(a)*, and to any reservations to the same effect as those of the States referred to which may be made in the future with respect to article 62.

The application of this Convention to territories whose sovereignty is a subject of dispute between two or more States, whether or not they are parties to it, cannot be deemed to imply

a modification, renunciation or abandonment of the position heretofore maintained by each of them.

ARMENIA[11]

13 July 2006

Reservation

"The Republic of Armenia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the application or the interpretation of any article of part V of the Convention to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to the Conciliation Commission for consideration the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case."

BELARUS

[Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by the Russian Federation.]*

BELGIUM[12]

21 June 1993

Reservation:

The Belgian State will not be bound by articles 53 and 64 of the Convention with regard to any party which, in formulating a reservation concerning article 66 (a), objects to the settlement procedure established by this article.

BOLIVIA

Upon signature:

1. The shortcomings of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties are such as to postpone the realization of the aspirations of mankind.

2. Nevertheless, the rules endorsed by the Convention do represent significant advances, based on the principles of international justice which Bolivia has traditionally supported.

BULGARIA[13]

Declaration:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to underline that articles 81 and 83 of the Convention, which preclude a number of States from becoming parties to it, are of an unjustifiably restrictive character. These provisions are incompatible with the very nature of the Convention, which is of a universal character and should be open for accession by all States.

CANADA

"In acceding to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of Canada declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relation to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of Canada declares that it does not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of paragraph 2 (a) of the declaration of the Government of Canada accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on April 7, 1970."

CHILE

Reservation:

The Republic of Chile declares its adherence to the general principle of the immutability of treaties, without prejudice to the right of States to stipulate, in particular, rules which modify this principle, and for this reason formulates a reservation relating to the provisions of article 62, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Convention, which it considers inapplicable to Chile.

CHINA

Reservation:

1. The People's Republic of China makes its reservation to article 66 of the said Convention.

Declaration:

2. The signature to the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities on 27 April 1970 in the name of "China" is illegal and therefore null and void.

COLOMBIA

Reservation:

With regard to article 25, Colombia formulates the reservation that the Political Constitution of Colombia does not recognize the provisional application of treaties; it is the responsibility of the National Congress to approve or disapprove any treaties and conventions which the Government concludes with other States or with international legal entities.

COSTA RICA[14]

Reservations and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. With regard to articles 11 and 12, the delegation of Costa Rica wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Costa Rican system of constitutional law does not authorize any form of consent which is not subject to ratification by the Legislative Assembly.

2. With regard to article 25, it wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Political Constitution of Costa Rica does not permit the provisional application of treaties, either.

3. With regard to article 27, it interprets this article as referring to secondary law and not to the provisions of the Political Constitution.

4. With regard to article 38, its interpretation is that no customary rule of general international law shall take precedence over any rule of the Inter-American System to which, in its view, this Convention is supplementary.

CUBA

Reservation:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba enters an explicit reservation to the procedure established under article 66 of the Convention, since it believes that any dispute should be settled by any means adopted by agreement between the parties to the dispute; the Republic of Cuba therefore cannot accept solutions which provide means for one of the parties, without the consent of the other to submit the dispute to procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation.

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties essentially codified and systematized the norms that had been established by custom and other sources of international law concerning negotiation, signature, ratification, entry into force, termination and other stipulations relating to international treaties; hence, those provisions, owing to their compulsory character, by virtue of having been established by universally recognized sources of interna-

tional law, particularly those relating to invalidity, termination and suspension of the application of treaties, are applicable [to] any treaty negotiated by the Republic of Cuba prior to the aforesaid convention, essentially, treaties, covenants and concessions negotiated under conditions of inequality or which disregard or diminish its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

CZECH REPUBLIC[5]

DENMARK

As between itself and any State which formulates, wholly or in part, a reservation relating to the provisions of article 66 of the Convention concerning the compulsory settlement of certain disputes, Denmark will not consider itself bound by those provisions of part V of the Convention, according to which the procedures for settlement set forth in article 66 are not to apply in the event of reservations formulated by other States.

ECUADOR

Upon signature:

In signing this Convention, Ecuador has not considered it necessary to make any reservation in regard to article 4 of the Convention because it understands that the rules referred to in the first part of article 4 include the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is set forth in Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations and which, as *jus cogens*, has universal and mandatory force.

Ecuador also considers that the first part of article 4 is applicable to existing treaties.

It wishes to place on record, in this form, its view that the said article 4 incorporates the indisputable principle that, in cases where the Convention codifies rules of *lex lata*, these rules, as pre-existing rules, may be invoked and applied to treaties signed before the entry into force of this Convention, which is the instrument codifying the rules.

Upon ratification :

In ratifying this Convention, Ecuador wishes to place on record its adherence to the principles, norms and methods of peaceful settlement of disputes provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and in other international instruments on the subject, which have been expressly included in the Ecuadorian legal system in article 4, paragraph 3, of the Political Constitution of the Republic.

FINLAND[15]

"Finland also declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, Finland will consider itself bound neither by those procedural provisions nor by the substantive provisions of part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation."

GERMANY[6]

Upon signature:

"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to state its views on the declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

Upon ratification:

2. The Federal Republic of Germany assumes that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice brought about by consent of States outside the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties cannot be excluded by invoking the provisions of article 66 (b) of the Convention.

3. The Federal Republic of Germany interprets 'measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations', as referred to in article 75, to mean future decisions by the Security Council of the United Nations in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter for the maintenance of international peace and security.

GUATEMALA[16]

Upon signature:

Reservations:

I. Guatemala cannot accept any provision of this Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the Territory of Belize.

II. Guatemala will not apply articles 11, 12, 25 and 66 in so far as they are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic.

III. Guatemala will apply the provision contained in article 38 only in cases where it considers that it is in the national interest to do so.

Upon ratification:

Reservations:

(a) The Republic of Guatemala formally confirms reservations I and III which it formulated upon signing the [said Convention], to the effect, respectively, that Guatemala could not accept any provision of the Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the territory of Belize and that it would apply the provision contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so;

(b) With respect to reservation II, which was formulated on the same occasion and which indicated that the Republic of Guatemala would not apply articles 11, 12, 25 and 66 of the [said Convention] insofar as they were contrary to the Constitution, Guatemala states:

(b) (I)That it confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 25 and 66 of the Convention, insofar as both are incompatible with provisions of the Political Constitution currently in force;

(b) (II)That it also confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.

Guatemala's consent to be bound by a treaty is subject to compliance with the requirements and procedures established in its Political Constitution. For Guatemala, the signature or initialling of a treaty by its representative is always understood to be *ad referendum* and subject, in either case, to confirmation by its Government.

(c) A reservation is hereby formulated with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

HUNGARY[17]

KUWAIT

The participation of Kuwait in this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and that furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

MONGOLIA[18]

Declarations:

1. The Mongolian People's Republic declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the case of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of article 81 and 83 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that the Convention should be open for accession by all States.

MOROCCO

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

1. Morocco interprets paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 (Fundamental change of circumstances) as not applying to unlawful or inequitable treaties, or to any treaty contrary to the principle of self-determination. Morocco's views on paragraph 2 (a) were supported by the Expert Consultant in his statements in the Committee of the Whole on 11 May1968 and before the Conference in plenary on 14 May 1969 (see Document A/CONF.39/L.40).

2. It shall be understood that Morocco's signature of this Convention does not in any way imply that it recognized Israel. Furthermore, no treaty relationships will be established between Morocco and Israel.

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard the provisions of Article 66 (b) of the Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of the declaration of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 August 1956."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

The Government of New Zealand declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relations to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of New Zealand declares that it will not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of this phrase where it appears in the declaration of the Government of New Zealand accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on 8 April 1940."

OMAN

Declaration:

According to the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman the implementation of paragraph (2) of article (62) of the said Convention does not include those Treaties which are contrary to the right to self-determination.

PERU[19]

Reservation:

For the Government of Peru, the application of articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention must be understood in accordance with, and subject to, the process of treaty signature, approval, ratification, accession and entry into force stipulated by its constitutional provisions.

PORTUGAL

Declaration :

"Article 66" of the Vienna of the Convention is inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which it relates. Therefore, Portugal declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, it will consider itself bound neither by those procedural norms nor by the substantive norms of Part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in Article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation. However, Portugal does not object to the entry into force of the remaining of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and such a State and considers that the absence of treaty relations between itself and that State with regard to all or certain norms of Part V will not in any way impair the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Convention".

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that, in order for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or for any dispute concerning the application or interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to be submitted for consideration by the Conciliation Commission, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the Conciliation Commission may only be persons appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will consider that it is not obligated by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 3 or of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

Declaration:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

SAUDI ARABIA

Reservation :

"... with a reservation regarding Article 66 so that the recourse to judgement or to arbitration should be preceded by agreement between the two countries concerned."

SLOVAKIA[5]

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

A–Acceptance of this Convention by the Syrian Arab Republic and ratification of it by its Government shall in no way signify recognition of Israel and cannot have as a result the establishment with the latter of any contact governed by the provisions of this Convention.

B–The Syrian Arab Republic considers that article 81 is not in conformity with the aims and purposes of the Convention in that it does not allow all States, without distinction or discrimination, to become parties to it.

C–The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic does not in any case accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, referred to in article 62, paragraph 2 (a), inasmuch as it regards this as a flagrant violation of an obligatory norm which forms part of general international law and which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination.

D–The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic interprets the provisions in article 52 as follows:

The expression "the threat or use of force" used in this article extends also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests.

E–The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention and the ratification of it by its Government shall not apply to the Annex to the Convention, which concerns obligatory conciliation.

Tunisia

The dispute referred to in article 66 *(a)* requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision.

Ukraine

[*Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence*, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.*]

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[20]

Upon signature:

"In signing the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare their understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph *(b)* of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

"The Government of the United Kingdom, while reserving their position for the time being with regard to other declarations and reservations made by various States on signing the Convention, consider it necessary to state that the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim in respect of the territory of British Honduras."

Upon ratification:

It is [the United Kingdom's] understanding that nothing in Article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court, the United Kingdom will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph *(b)* of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

United Republic of Tanzania

"Article 66 of the Convention shall not be applied to the United Republic of Tanzania by any State which enters a reservation on any provision of part V or the whole of that part of the Convention."

Viet Nam

Reservation:

"Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam makes its reservation to article 66 of the said Convention."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Algeria

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, dedicated to the principle of the inviolability of the frontiers inherited on accession to independence, expresses an objection to the reservation entered by the Kingdom of Morocco with regard to paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 of the Convention.

Austria

16 September 1998

With respect to the reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:

"Austria is of the view that the Guatemalan reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of [the said Convention] many of which are solidly based on international customary law. The reservations could call into question well-established and universally accepted norms. Austria is of the view that the rservations also raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the [said Convention]. Austria therefore objects to these reservations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the [said Convention] between Austria and Guatemala."

Canada

22 October 1971

". . . Canada does not consider itself in treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic in respect of those provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties to which the compulsory conciliation procedures set out in the annex to that Convention are applicable."

CHILE

The Republic of Chile formulates an objection to the reservations which have been made or may be made in the future relating to article 62, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

DENMARK

With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:

"These reservations refer to general rules of [the said Convention], many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservation - if accepted - could call to question well established and universally accepted norms.

It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that the reservations are not compatible with the object and purpose of [said Convention].

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to [the said Convention].

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of [the said Convention] between Guatemala and Denmark and will thus enter into force between Guatemala and Denmark without Guatemala benefitting from these reservations."

EGYPT

The Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider itself bound by part V of the Convention vis-à-vis States which formulate reservations concerning the procedures for judicial settlement and compulsory arbitration set forth in article 66 and in the annex to the Convention, and it rejects reservations made to the provisions of part V of the Convention.

FINLAND

16 September 1998

With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:

"These reservations which consist of general references to national law and which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the Convention, may create serious doubts about the Committment of the reserving State as to the object and purpose of the Convention and may contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. In addition, the Government of Finland considers the reservation to article 27 of the Convention particularly problematic as it is a well-established rule of customary international law. The Government of Finland would like to recall that according to article 19 c of the [said] Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to these reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to the [said] Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Guatemala and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Guatemala benefitting from these reservations."

GERMANY[6]

1. The Federal Republic of Germany rejects the reservations made by Tunisia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic and with regard to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. In this connection it wishes to point out that, as stressed on numerous other occasions, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers articles 53 and 64 to be inextricably linked to article 66 (a).

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 27 January 1988: in respect of reservations formulated by Bulgaria, the Hungarian People's Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.

(ii) 21 September 1988: in respect of the reservation made by Mongolia;

(iii) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

12 June 2002

With respect to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservation to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that the dispute settlement procedure provided for by article 66 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V of the Convention and was indeed the basis on which the Vienna Conference accepted elements of Part V. The dispute settlement set forth in article 66 therefore is an essential part of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Germany is thus of the view that the reservation excluding that procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation to be followed in case of a dispute, raises doubts as to the full commitment of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to the object and purpose of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Republic of Germany, therefore, objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam".

ISRAEL

16 March 1970

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of paragraph 2 in the declaration made by the Government of Morocco on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, that declaration cannot in any way affect the obligations of Morocco already existing under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Morocco an attitude of complete reciprocity."

16 November 1970

[With respect of declaration "A" made by the Syrian Arab Republic, same declaration, in essence, as the one above.]

JAPAN

1. "The Government of Japan objects to any reservation intended to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions of article 66 and the Annex concerning the obligatory procedures for settlement of disputes and does not consider Ja-

pan to be in treaty relations with any State which has formulated or will formulate such reservation, in respect of those provisions of Part V of the Convention regarding which the application of the obligatory procedures mentioned above are to be excluded as a result of the said reservation. Accordingly, the treaty relations between Japan and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between Japan and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan does not accept the interpretation of article 52 put forward by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, since that interpretation does not correctly reflect the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion."

3 April 1987

"[In view of its declaration made upon accession] . . . . the Government of Japan objects to the reservations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 66 and the Annex of the Convention and reaffirms the position of Japan that [it] will not be in treaty relations with the above States in respect of the provisions of Part V of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, paragraph 3.

3. The Government of Japan objects to the declarations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reserving their right to take any measures to safeguard their interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Convention."

NETHERLANDS

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66 of the Convention, are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers it necessary to object to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that their treaty relations will not include the provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of the procedures regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66, wholly or in part is excluded.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the absence of treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State with regard to all or certain provisions of Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Convention.

For the reasons set out above, the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the submission to the International Court of Justice of a dispute referred to in Article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties there to. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include the provisions to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Tunisia will not include Article 53 and 64 of the Convention."

Objections, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, were also formulated by the Government of the Netherlands in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 25 September 1987: in respect of reservations formulated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic;

(ii) 14 July 1988: in respect of reservations made by the Government of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

(iii) 28 July 1988: in respect of one of the reservations made by Mongolia;

(iv) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

v) 14 September 1998: in respect of the reservation to article 66 made by Guatemala.

15 November 1999

In regard to the reservation made by Cuba upon accession:

"In conformity with the terms of the objections the Kingdom of the Netherlands must be deemed to have objected to the reservation, excluding wholly or in part the procedures for the settlement of disputes, contained in article 66 of the Convention, as formulated by Cuba.

Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Cuba under the Convention do not include any of the provisions contained in Part V of the Convention.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands reiterates that the absence of treaty relations between itself and Cuba in respect of Part V of the Convention will not in any way impair the duty of Cuba to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independent of the Convention."

11 October 2001

In regard to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Peru.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru as to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Peru."

4 December 2001

In regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation with regard to article 66 made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam at the time of its accession to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, concluded on 23 May 1969, and refers to the objections

formulated by the Kingdom of the Netherlands upon its accession to the above-mentioned Convention on 9 April 1985.

In conformity with the terms of the objections the Kingdom of the Netherlands must be deemed to have objected to the reservation formulated by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, excluding wholly the procedures for the settlement of disputes contained in article 66 of the Convention. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam under the Convention do not include any of the provisions contained in Part V of the Convention.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands stresses that the absence of treaty relations between itself and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in respect of Part V of the Convention will not in any way impair the duty of Viet Nam to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions, to which it is bound under international law, independent of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

14 October 1971

". . . The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria to the obligatory conciliation procedures contained in the Annex to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between New Zealand and Syria."

10 August 1972

". . . The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 *(a)* of the Convention and does not consider New Zealand to be in treaty relations with Tunisia in respect of those provisions of the Convention to which the dispute settlement procedure provided for in Article 66 *(a)* is applicable."

SWEDEN

4 February 1975

"Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and con ciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called *jus cogens*, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion.

"The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.

"For the reasons set out above, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the dispute referred to in article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision. In view of these reservations, the Swedish Government considers, *firstly*, that the treaty relations between Sweden and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and, *secondly*, that the treaty relations between Sweden and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

"The Swedish Government has also taken note of the declaration of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which it interprets the expression "the threat or use of force" as used in article 52 of the Convention so as to extend also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests. On this point, the Swedish Government observes that since article 52 refers to threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, it should be interpreted in the light of the practice which has developed or will develop on the basis of the Charter."

16 September 1998

With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that these reservations raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservaitons could call into question well established and universally accepted norms.

The Govenrment of Sweden notes in particular that the Government of Guatemala has entered a reservation that it would apply the provisions contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so; and furthermore a reservation with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to the [said] Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Guatemala and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Guatemala benefiting from this reservation."

17 November 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Cuba upon accession:

"The Government of Sweden wishes to recall its statements of the 4th of February 1975, made in connection with its ratification of the Convention, relating to the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Tunisia respectively, which reads as follows:

'Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called jus cogens, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion.

The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections

to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.'

For the reasons set out above, which also apply to the reservation made by the Republic of Cuba, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of the Republic of Cuba to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

25 July 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of Sweden notes that articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Peru.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Peru and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Peru benefiting from its reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The United Kingdom does not accept that the interpretation of Article 52 put forward by the Government of Syria correctly reflects the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion; the Conference dealt with this matter by adopting a Declaration on this subject which forms part of the Final Act;

"The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria in respect of the Annex to the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Syria;

"With reference to a reservation in relation to the territory of British Honduras made by Guatemala on signing the Convention, the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim with respect to that territory; "The United Kingdom fully reserves its position in other respects with regard to the declarations made by various States on signature, to some of which the United Kingdom would object, if they were to be confirmed on ratification."

22 June 1972

". . . The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 *(a)* of the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Tunisia."

7 December 1977

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland note that the instrument of ratification of the Government of Finland, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 19 August 1977, contains a declaration relating to paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention. The Government of the United Kingdom wish to inform the Secretary-General that they do not regard that declaration as in any way affecting the interpretation or application of article 7."

5 June 1987

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation entered by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by which it rejects the application of article 66 of the Convention. Article 66 provides in certain circumstances for the compulsory settlement of disputes by the International Court of Justice (in the case of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of articles 53 or 64) or by a conciliation procedure (in the case of the rest of Part V of the Convention). These provisions are inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which they relate. Their inclusion was the basis on which those parts of Part V which represent progressive development of international law were accepted by the Vienna Conference. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the Soviet Union include Part V of the Convention.

With respect to any other reservation the intention of which is to exclude the application, in whole or in part, of the provisions of article 66, to which the United Kingdom has already objected or which is made after the reservation by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom will not consider its treaty relations with the State which has formulated or will formulate such a reservation as including those provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of article 66 is rejected by the reservation.

The instrument of accession deposited by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics included also a declaration that it reserves the right to take "any measures" to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Convention. The purpose and scope of this statement is unclear; but, given that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has rejected the application of article 66 of the Convention, it would seem to apply rather to acts by Parties to the Convention in respect of treaties where such acts are in breach of the Convention. In such circumstances a State would not be limited in its response to the measures in article 60: under customary international law it would be entitled to take other measures, provided always that they are reasonable and in proportion to the breach."

11 October 1989

With regard to the reservation made by Algeria upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 [in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] which in accordance with its terms applies to the reservations mentioned above, and will similarly apply to any like reservations which any other State may formulate."

19 November 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Cuba upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland objects to the reservation [...]. The Government of the United Kingdom wishes in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 (in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics) which in accordance with its terms applies to the reservation mentioned above, and

will apply similarly to any like reservation which any other State may formulate. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the Republic of Cuba include Part V of the Convention."

22 July 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The instrument of accession deposited by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam contains a reservation in respect of article 66 of the Convention. The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in respect of article 66 and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

26 May 1971

The Government of the United States of America objects to reservation E of the Syrian instrument of accession:

"In the view of the United States Government that reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and undermines the principle of impartial settlement of disputes concerning the invalidity, termination, and suspension of the operation of treaties, which was the subject of extensive negotiation at the Vienna Conference.

"The United States Government intends, at such time as it may become a party to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to reaffirm its objection to the foregoing reservation and to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V of the Convention with regard to which the Syrian Arab Republic has rejected the obligatory conciliation procedures set forth in the Annex to the Convention.

"The United States Government is also concerned about Syrian reservation C declaring that the Syrian Arab Republic does not accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, as stated in Article 62, 2 *(a)*, and Syrian reservation D concerning its interpretation of the expression 'the threat or use of force' in Article 52. However, in view of the United States Government's intention to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V to which reservations C and D relate, we do not consider it necessary at this time to object formally to those reservations.

"The United States Government will consider that the absence of treaty relations between the United States of America and the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to certain provisions in Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

29 September 1972

". . . The United States of America objects to the reservation by Tunisia to paragraph *(a)* of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties regarding a dispute as to the interpretation or application of Article 53 or 64. The right of a party to invoke the provisions of Article 53 or 64 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Article 42 regarding impeachment of the validity of a treaty and paragraph *(a)* of Article 66 regarding the right of any party to submit to the International Court of Justice for decision any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of Article 53 or 64.

"Accordingly, the United States Government intends, at such time as it becomes a party to the Convention, to reaffirm its objection to the Tunisian reservation and declare that it will not consider that Article 53 or 64 of the Convention is in force between the United States of America and Tunisia."-

List of conciliators nominated for the purpose of constituting a conciliation commission in accordance with paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Annex to the Convention (For the list of conciliators whose nomination was not renewed, see note 21 hereinafter).

Participant:	*Nominations:*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:*
Austria	Ambassador Helmut Türk	8 Jan 2001
	Professor Karl Zemanek	8 Jan 2001[22]
Croatia	Dr. Stanko Nick	
	Professor Dr. Budislav Vukas	14 Dec 1992
Denmark	Prof. Isi Foighel	7 Mar 1995[22]
	Ambassador Skjold Gustav Mellbin	7 Mar 1995
Germany	Prof. Dr. Wolff Heintschel von Heinegg	12 Mar 2001
	Dr. Andreas Zimmermann	
Paraguay	Dr. Luis María Ramírez Boettner	22 Sep 1994
	Dr. Jerónimo Irala Burgos	
Slovakia	Dr. Igor Grexa, Director-General for Legal and Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia	9 Jul 2004
Spain	Sr. D. José Antonio Pastor Ridruejo	3 Jan 2001
	Sr. D. Aurelio Pérez Giralda	
Sweden	Mr. Hans Danelius	
	Mr. Love Gustav-Adolf Kellberg	17 Feb 1994[22]
Switzerland	Mr. Lucius Caflisch, Judge at the European Court of Human Rights	26 Jun 2001

List of conciliators nominated for the purpose of constituting a conciliation commission in accordance with paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Annex to the Convention (For the list of conciliators whose nomination was not renewed, see note 21 hereinafter).

Participant:	*Nominations:*	*Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:*
	Mr. Walter Kälin, Professor of Public Law and International Law at the University of Berne	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	Mrs. Elena Andreevska Director of the Directorate on International Law	3 Mar 1999

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-first Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/6316), p. 95.

[2] *Ibid., Twenty-second Session, Supplement No. 16* (A/6716), p. 80.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 23 May 1969 and 27 August 1970, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 27 April 1970. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the said signature was irregular since the so-called "Government of China" represented no one and had no right to speak on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State in the world the People's Republic of China.

The Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the United Nations later addressed to the Secretary-General a similar communication.

In two letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties in 1968 and 1969, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned and signed it, and that "any statements or reservations to the said Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said Convention".

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 July 1987, with a reservation. By a communication received on 19 October 1990, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 66 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention and declares that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to the International Court of Justice or to a conciliation procedure, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 20 October 1986 with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention.

In order to submit a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to submit a dispute on the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles of Part V of the Convention to the Conciliation Commission for consideration it shall be necessary in every single case to have the consent of all Parties to the dispute. The members of the Conciliation commission shall be appointed jointly by the Parties to the dispute.

Declarations:

The German Democratic Republic declares that it reserves itself the right to take measures to protect its interests in the case that other States would not comply with the provisions of the Convention.

The German Democratic Republic holds the view that the provisions of articles 81 and 83 of the Convention are in contradiction to the principle according to which any State, the policy of which is guided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, has the right to become a Party to Conventions affecting the interests of all States.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] With reference to this signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stating that the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not under any circumstances speak on behalf of Korea.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations declared that the above-mentioned statement by the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was without legal foundation and therefore neither affected the legitimate act of signing the Convention by the Government of the Republic of Korea nor prejudiced the rights and obligations of the Republic of Korea under it. He further stated that "in this connexion, it should be noted that the General Assembly of the United Nations declared at its third session and has continuously reaffirmed thereafter that the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful Government in Korea".

Subsequently, in a communication received on 24 October 2002, the Government of Bulgaria informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... upon signature of the above Convention by the Republic of Korea, in 1971, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria[,] in [a] communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, ... stated that its Government considered the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not speak on behalf of Korea.

Now therefore [the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria declares] that the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria, having reviewed the said declaration, hereby withdraws the same."

[11] Within a period of one year from the date of the depositary notification transmitting the reservation (i.e. 13 July 2005), none of the Contracting Parties to the said Convention had notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged. Consequently, the reservation in question was accepted for deposit upon the above-stipulated one year period, that is on 13 July 2006.

[12] On 18 February 1993, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General that its instrument of accession should have specified that the said accession was made subject to the said reservation. None of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement having notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date its circulation (23 March 1993), the reservation is deemed to have been accepted.

[13] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 66 (a), which read as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 66, paragraph a) of the Convention, according to which any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 may, by a written application, submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision unless the parties by common consent agree to submit the dispute to arbitration. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that for the submission of such a dispute to the International Court of Justice for a decision, the preliminary consent of all parties to the dispute is needed.

[14] In this regard, on 13 October 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom object to the reservation entered by Costa Rica in respect of article 27 and reiterate their observation in respect of the similar reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala." *(See also note [16]).*

[15] On 20 April 2001, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration in respect of article 7 (2) made upon ratification. The text of the declaration reads as follows:

"Finland declares its understanding that nothing in paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention is intended to modify any provisions of internal law in force in any Contracting State concerning competence to conclude treaties. Under the Constitution of Finland the competence to conclude treaties is given to the President of the Republic, who also decides on the issuance of full powers to the Head of Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

[16] In this regard, the Secretary-General received communications from the various States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (21 September 1998):

These reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of the Convention many of which are solidly based on customary international law.

The reservations could call into question well-established and universally-accepted norms of international law, especially insofar as the reservations concern articles 27 and 38 of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservations also raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to these reservations.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Germany and Guatemala.

Belgium (30 September 1998):

The reservations entered by Guatemala essentially concern general rules laid down in the [said Convention], many of which form part of customary international law. These reservations could call into question firmly established and universally accepted norms. The Kingdom of Belgium therefore raises an objection to the reservations. This objection does not prevent the [said Convention] from taking effect between the Kingdom of Belgium and Guatemala.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northen Ireland (13 October 1998):

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 27, and wish to observe that the customary international law rule set out in that article applies to constitutional as well as to other internal laws.

The Government of the United Kingdom object also to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 38, by which the Republic of Guatemala seek subjective application of the rule of customary international law set out in that article.

The Government of the United Kingdom wish to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 (in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), which, in accordance with its terms, applies to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 66 and will similarly apply to any like reservation which any other State may formulate."

[17] In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw as from that date, its reservation regarding article 66 made upon accession which reservation reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall have been nominated exclusively with the common consent of the parties to the dispute.

[18] In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession, which reads as follows:

1. The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention.

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 and 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision as well as submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall be appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic is not obligated by the provisions of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

[19] On 14 November 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Austria the following communication:

"Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, regarding the application of articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention.

The fact that Peru is making the application of the said articles subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing national legislation, in the absence of further clarification raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru to the object and purpose of the Convention. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. In Austria's view the reservation in question is therefore inadmissible to the extent that its application could negatively affect the compliance by Peru with its obligations under articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention.

For these reasons, Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Peru and Austria, without Peru benefiting from its reservation."

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 21 January 2002, from the Government of Peru the following communcation:

[The Government of Peru refers to the communication made by the Government of Austria relating to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification]. In this document, Member States are informed of a communication from the Government of Austria stating its objection to the reservation entered in respect of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties by the Government of Peru on 14 September 2000 when depositing the corresponding instrument of ratification.

As the [Secretariat] is aware, article 20, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention states that "a reservation is considered to have been accepted by a State if it shall have raised no objection to the reservation by the end of a period of twelve months after it was notified of the reservation (...)". The ratification and reservation by Peru in respect of the Vienna Convention were communicated to Member States on 9 November 2000.

Since the communication from the Austrian Government was received by the Secretariat on 14 November 2001 and circulated to Member States on 28 November 2001, the Peruvian Mission is of the view that there is tacit acceptance on the part of the Austrian Government of the reservation entered by Peru, the 12-month period referred to in article 20, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention having elapsed without any objection being raised. The Peruvian Government considers the communication from the Austrian Government as being without legal effect, since it was not submitted in a timely manner.

[20] On 24 February 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala the following communication:.

Guatemala maintains a territorial dispute over the illegal occupation of part of its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, succeeded by the Government of Belize, and Guatemala therefore continues to assert a valid claim based on international law which must be settled by restoring to it the territory which historically and legally belongs to it.

[21] The nomination of the conciliators listed hereinafter was not renewed after five years. For the date of their nomination and their titles, see the preceding editions of the present publication:

State:	*Conciliators:*
Australia	Mr. Patrick Brazil
Austria	Professorr Stephen Verosta Dr. Helmut Tuerk, Dr. Karl Zemanek M. Criton Tornaritis, Mr. Michalakis Triantafillides,
Cyprus	Mrs. Stella Soulioti
Denmark	Ambassador Paul Fischer Professor Isi Foighel,
Finland	Professor Erik Castrén Professor Thomas Oppermann,
Germany*	ProfessorGüntherJaenicke
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	Mr. Morteza Kalantarian Professor Riccardo Monaco,
Italy	Professor Luigi Ferrari-Bravo Professor Shigejiro Tabata,
Japan	Judge Masato Fujisaki
Kenya	Mr. John Maximian Nazareth Mr. S. Amos Wako
Mexico	Mr. Antonio Gomez Robledo, Mr. César Sepúlveda, Ambassador Alfonso de Rosenzweig-Diáz Mr. Abdelaziz Amine Filali,
Morocco	Mr. Ibrahim Keddara, Mr. Abdelaziz Benjelloun
Netherlands	Professor W. Riphagen, Professor A.M. Stuyt,
Panama	Mr. Jorge E. Illueca, Mr. Nanader A. Pitty Velasquez
Spain	Professor Julio Diego González Campos, Professor Manuel Diez de VelascoVallejo
Sweden	Mr. Gunnar Lagergren, Mr. Ivan Wallenberg
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	Professor R.Y. Jennings, Sir Ian Sinclaire
Serbia (former)**	Dr. Milan Bulajic, Dr. Milivoj Despot, Dr. Budislav Vukas, Dr. Borut Bohte

2. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties

Vienna, 23 August 1978

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 November 1996, in accordance with article 49 (1).
REGISTRATION: 6 November 1996, No. 33356.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 21.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1946, p. 3.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 August 1978 by the United Nations Conference on the Succession of States in respect of Treaties and was opened for signature at Vienna from 23 August 1978 to 28 February 1979, then at the Headquarters of the United Nations, in New York until 31 August 1979. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolution 3496 (XXX)[1] of 15 December 1975. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 4 April to 6 May 1977 and the second session from 31 July to 23 August 1978. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decisions of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria.

Participant[2]	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Angola	23 Aug 1978	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[3]		22 Jul 1993 d
Brazil	23 Aug 1978	
Chile	23 Aug 1978	
Côte d'Ivoire	23 Aug 1978	
Croatia[3]		22 Oct 1992 d
Cyprus		12 Mar 2004 a
Czech Republic[4]	22 Feb 1993 d	26 Jul 1999
Democratic Republic of the Congo	23 Aug 1978	
Dominica		24 Jun 1988 a
Ecuador		25 Jul 2006 a
Egypt		17 Jul 1986 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Ethiopia	23 Aug 1978	28 May 1980
Holy See	23 Aug 1978	
Iraq	23 May 1979	5 Dec 1979
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Madagascar	23 Aug 1978	
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		31 Mar 1983 a
Niger	23 Aug 1978	
Pakistan	10 Jan 1979	
Paraguay	31 Aug 1979	
Peru	30 Aug 1978	
Poland	16 Aug 1979	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 a
Senegal	23 Aug 1978	
Serbia[3]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		22 Feb 1980 a
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 d	24 Apr 1995
Slovenia[3]		6 Jul 1992 d
Sudan	23 Aug 1978	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[3]		7 Oct 1996 d
Tunisia		16 Sep 1981 a
Ukraine		26 Oct 1992 a
Uruguay	23 Aug 1978	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

Czech Republic

Pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 2 and 3, of the Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties, adopted in Vienna on August 23, 1978, the Czech Republic declares that it will apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of its own succession of States which has occurred before the entry into force of the Convention in relation to any other Contracting State of State Party to the Convention accepting the declaration.

The Czech Republic simultaneously declares its acceptance or the declaration made by the Slovak Republic at the time of its ratification of the Convention pursuant to Article 7, paragraph 2 and 3 thereof.

Iraq[6]

"Entry into the above Convention by the Republic of Iraq shall, however, in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any agreement therewith."

Morocco[6]

Reservation:

The accession of Morocco to this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the Kingdom of Morocco and that furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Morocco and Israel.

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

The Slovak Republic declares, under article 7, paragraphs 2 and 3 of [the said] Convention, that it will apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of its own succession which has occurred before the entry into force of the Convention in relation to any signatory State (paragraph 3), contracting State or State Party (paragraphs 2 and 3) which makes a declaration accepting the declaration of the successor State.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 10* (A/9610/Rev.1).

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 22 August 1979. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 6 February 1979 and 28 April 1980, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 30 August 1979. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The Secretary-General received on 23 June 1980 from the Government of Israel the following communication concerning this declaration:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Iraq. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Iraq under general international law or under particular conventions. Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Iraq an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Subsequently, on 23 May 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel a declaration concerning the declaration made by Morocco, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made regarding the declaration made by Iraq.

3. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations

Vienna, 21 March 1986

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 85 which reads as follows : "1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession by States or by Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia. 2. For each State or for Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the condition specified in paragraph 1 has been fulfilled, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State or by Namibia of its instrument of ratification or accession. 3. For each international organization depositing an instrument relating to an act of formal confirmation or an instrument of accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after such deposit, or at the date the Convention enters into force pursuant to paragraph 1, whichever is later.".

STATUS: Signatories: 39. Parties: 40.[1]

TEXT: Doc. A/CONF.129/15.

Note: The Convention was open for signature by all States, Namibia and international organizations invited to the Conference, until 31 December 1986 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria, and subsequently, until 30 June 1987, at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Formal confirmation (c), Succession (d)*
Argentina	30 Jan 1987	17 Aug 1990
Australia		16 Jun 1993 a
Austria	21 Mar 1986	26 Aug 1987
Belarus		30 Dec 1999 a
Belgium	9 Jun 1987	1 Sep 1992
Benin	24 Jun 1987	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]	12 Jan 1994 d	
Brazil	21 Mar 1986	
Bulgaria		10 Mar 1988 a
Burkina Faso	21 Mar 1986	
Côte d'Ivoire	21 Mar 1986	
Council of Europe	11 May 1987	
Croatia		11 Apr 1994 a
Cyprus	29 Jun 1987	5 Nov 1991
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo	21 Mar 1986	
Denmark	8 Jun 1987	26 Jul 1994
Egypt	21 Mar 1986	
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Food and Agriculture Organization of the United Nations	29 Jun 1987	
Gabon		5 Nov 2004 a
Germany[4]	27 Apr 1987	20 Jun 1991
Greece	15 Jul 1986	28 Jan 1992
Hungary		17 Aug 1988 a
International Atomic Energy Agency		26 Apr 2001 a
International Civil Aviation Organization	29 Jun 1987	24 Dec 2001 c
International Criminal Police Organization		3 Jan 2001 a
International Labour Organisation	31 Mar 1987	31 Jul 2000 c
International Maritime Organization	30 Jun 1987	14 Feb 2000 c
International Telecommunication Union	29 Jun 1987	
Italy	17 Dec 1986	20 Jun 1991
Japan	24 Apr 1987	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1990 a
Malawi	30 Jun 1987	
Mexico	21 Mar 1986	10 Mar 1988
Moldova		26 Jan 1993 a
Montenegro[5]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Morocco	21 Mar 1986	
Netherlands[6]	12 Jun 1987	18 Sep 1997
Organisation for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons		2 Jun 2000 a
Preparatory Commission for the Comprehensive Nuclear Test-Ban Treaty Organization		11 Jun 2002 a
Republic of Korea	29 Jun 1987	
Senegal	9 Jul 1986	6 Aug 1987
Serbia[2]	12 Mar 2001 d	
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Spain		24 Jul 1990 a
Sudan	21 Mar 1986	
Sweden	18 Jun 1987	10 Feb 1988
Switzerland		7 May 1990 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24 Feb 1987	20 Jun 1991
United Nations	12 Feb 1987	21 Dec 1998 c
United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization	23 Jun 1987	

Participant	Signature, Succession to signature (d)	Ratification, Accession (a), Formal confirmation (c), Succession (d)
United Nations Industrial Development Organization		4 Mar 2002 a
United States of America	26 Jun 1987	
Universal Postal Union		19 Oct 2004 a
Uruguay		10 Mar 1999 a
World Health Organization	30 Apr 1987	22 Jun 2000 c
World Intellectual Property Organization		24 Oct 2000 a
World Meteorological Organization	30 Jun 1987	
Zambia	21 Mar 1986	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or formal confirmation. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

BELGIUM[7]

21 June 1993

Reservation:

The Belgian State will not be bound by articles 53 and 64 of the Convention with regard to any party which, in formulating a reservation concerning article 66 (2), objects to the settlement procedure established by this article.

BULGARIA[8]

Declaration on article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph j:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the practice of an individual International Organization may be considered as established according to article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph j, only when it has been adopted as such by all Member States of this Organization.

Declaration on article 62, paragraph 2:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that the term "Boundary" as it is used in the text of article 62, paragraph 2, means State Boundary and it may be established only by States.

Declaration on article 74, paragraph 3:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that a treaty which an International Organization is a party to, may establish obligations for Members States of this Organization only if the Member States have expressed their consent in advance in each individual case.

DENMARK

Reservation:

... Where parties formulate reservations or partial reservations with respect to the provisions of article 66 of the Convention concerning the obligatory settlement of certain disputes, Denmark does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Part V of the Convention whereby the procedures for settlement set forth in article 66 shall not be applied if reservations have been formulated by other parties.

GERMANY

Declarations:

1. The Federal Republic of Germany presumes that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice brought about by consent of States outside the [said] Convention cannot be excluded by invoking the provisions of article 66, paragraph 4 of the Convention.

2. The Federal Republic of Germany interprets "measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations" as referred to in article 76 of the [said] Convention to mean decisions taken in future by the United Nations Security Council in conformity with Chapter VII of the Charter on the maintenance of international peace and security.

HUNGARY[9]

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard the provisions of article 66 (b), (c) and (d) of the Convention as providing `some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of the declaration of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 August 1956;

The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in article 66 of the Convention, are in important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected."

SENEGAL

Upon signature:

In signing this Convention, [the Government of Senegal declares] that the completion of this formality shall not be interpreted in so far as Senegal is concerned as a recognition of the right of international organizations to appear as parties before the International Court of Justice.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or formal confirmation.)

GERMANY

The Federal Republic of Germany rejects the reservation made by the Republic of Bulgaria with regard to article 66, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. In this connection it wishes to point out that the Federal Republic of Germany considers articles 53 and 64 of the Convention, on the one hand, and article 66, paragraph 2, on the other, to be inextricably linked.

Notes:

[1] International organizations, which are party to the Convention, are not counted for entry into force purposes, pursuant to article 85 of the Convention.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 21 March 1986. See also notes 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "Slovenia, "former Yugoslavia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 19 October 1990. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[7] On 18 February 1993, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General that its instrument of ratification should have specified that the said ratification was made subject to the said reservation. None of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement having notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (23 March 1993), the reservation is deemed to have been accepted.

[8] In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 66, which reads as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66, paragraph 2 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations under the terms of which each party to a dispute concerning the interpretation and application of article 53 and 64 may submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria declares that submission of such dispute to the International Court of Justice requires the preliminary consent of all parties to it in each individual case.

[9] In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation to the Convention with regard to article 66 which reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 (a) of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations and declares that submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute and the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall have been nominated exclusively with the common consent of the parties to the dispute.

CHAPTER XXIV

OUTER SPACE

1. CONVENTION ON REGISTRATION OF OBJECTS LAUNCHED INTO OUTER SPACE

New York, 12 November 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 September 1976, in accordance with article VIII (3).

REGISTRATION: 15 September 1976, No. 15020.

STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 50.

TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1023, p. 15.

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution 3235 (XXIX)[1] of the General Assembly dated 12 November 1974, pursuant to resolution 3182 (XXVIII)[2] dated 18 December 1973 and taking into account the report of the Committee on the Pacific Uses of Outer Space. The Convention was opened for signature on 14 January 1975.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		13 Dec 1988 d
Argentina	26 Mar 1975	5 May 1993
Australia		11 Mar 1986 a
Austria	14 Oct 1975	6 Mar 1980
Belarus	30 Jun 1975	26 Jan 1978
Belgium	19 Mar 1975	24 Feb 1977
Brazil		17 Mar 2006 a
Bulgaria	4 Feb 1976	11 May 1976
Burundi	13 Nov 1975	
Canada	14 Feb 1975	4 Aug 1976
Chile		17 Sep 1981 a
China[3]		12 Dec 1988 a
Cuba		10 Apr 1978 a
Cyprus		6 Jul 1978 a
Czech Republic[4]		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	12 Dec 1975	1 Apr 1977
France	14 Jan 1975	17 Dec 1975
Germany[5,6]	2 Mar 1976	16 Oct 1979
Greece		27 May 2003 a
Hungary	13 Oct 1975	26 Oct 1977
India		18 Jan 1982 a
Indonesia		16 Jul 1997 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	27 May 1975	
Italy		8 Dec 2005 a
Japan		20 Jun 1983 a
Kazakhstan		11 Jan 2001 a
Lebanon		12 Apr 2006 a
Liechtenstein		26 Feb 1999 a
Mexico	19 Dec 1975	1 Mar 1977
Mongolia	30 Oct 1975	10 Apr 1985
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[8]		26 Jan 1981 a
Nicaragua	13 May 1975	
Niger	5 Aug 1976	22 Dec 1976
Norway		28 Jun 1995 a
Pakistan	1 Dec 1975	27 Feb 1986
Peru		21 Mar 1979 a
Poland	4 Dec 1975	22 Nov 1978
Republic of Korea		14 Oct 1981 a
Russian Federation	17 Jun 1975	13 Jan 1978
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Serbia[9]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		28 Dec 1977 a
Singapore	31 Aug 1976	
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Spain		20 Dec 1978 a
Sweden	9 Jun 1976	9 Jun 1976
Switzerland	14 Apr 1975	15 Feb 1978
Turkey		21 Jun 2006 a
Ukraine	11 Jul 1975	14 Sep 1977
United Arab Emirates		7 Nov 2000 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	6 May 1975	30 Mar 1978
United States of America	24 Jan 1975	15 Sep 1976
Uruguay		18 Aug 1977 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

TURKEY

Statement :

"The Republic of Turkey declares that it will implement the provisions of this Convention only to the State Parties with which it has diplomatic relations."

Organizations having declared acceptance of the rights and obligations of the Convention (article VII)

Organization:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*
European Space Agency	2 Jan 1979
European Organisation for the Exploitation of Meteorological Satellites	10 Jul 1997

Territorial Application

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*	*Territories:*
United Kingdom[3]	30 Mar 1978	Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, St. Kitts Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent). Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, Solomon Islands, the State of Brunei

---

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Twenty-ninth Session, Supplement No. 31* (A/9631), p. 16.

[2] *Ibid., Supplement No. 30* (A/9030), p. 19.

[3] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 5 April 1976 and 26 July 1977, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 27 August 1975 and 12 May 1977. respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Ariba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Convention on 24 February 1978. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. AGREEMENT GOVERNING THE ACTIVITIES OF STATES ON THE MOON AND OTHER CELESTIAL BODIES

New York, 5 December 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 July 1984, in accordance with article 19 (3).
REGISTRATION: 11 July 1984, No. 23002.
STATUS: Signatories: 11. Parties: 13.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1363, p. 3; and depositary notification C.N.107.1981.TREATIES-2 of 27 May 1981 [procès-verbal of rectification of the English authentic text of article 5 (1)].

Note: The Agreement was adopted by resolution 34/68[1] of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 5 December 1979. It was opened for signature on 18 December 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a)*
Australia		7 Jul 1986 a
Austria	21 May 1980	11 Jun 1984
Belgium		29 Jun 2004 a
Chile	3 Jan 1980	12 Nov 1981
France	29 Jan 1980	
Guatemala	20 Nov 1980	
India	18 Jan 1982	
Kazakhstan		11 Jan 2001 a
Lebanon		12 Apr 2006 a
Mexico		11 Oct 1991 a
Morocco	25 Jul 1980	21 Jan 1993
Netherlands[2]	27 Jan 1981	17 Feb 1983
Pakistan		27 Feb 1986 a
Peru	23 Jun 1981	23 Nov 2005
Philippines	23 Apr 1980	26 May 1981
Romania	17 Apr 1980	
Uruguay	1 Jun 1981	9 Nov 1981

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Interpretative statement:

France is of the view that the provisions of article 3, paragraph 2, of the Agreement relating to the use or threat of force cannot be construed as anything other than a reaffirmation, for the purposes of the field of endeavour covered by the Agreement, of the principle of the prohibition of the threat or use of force, which States are obliged to observe in their international relations, as set forth in the United Nations Charter.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46* (A/34/46), p. 77.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XXV

TELECOMMUNICATIONS

1. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE DISTRIBUTION OF PROGRAMME-CARRYING SIGNALS TRANSMITTED BY SATELLITE

Brussels, 21 May 1974

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 August 1979, in accordance with article 10 (1).
REGISTRATION: 25 August 1979, No. 17949.
STATUS: Signatories: 18. Parties: 29.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1144, p. 3.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the International Conference of States on the Distribution of Programme-Carrying Signals, transmitted by Satellite, convened jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization and the World Intellectual Property Organization. The Conference held discussions on the basis of the Draft Convention drawn up by the Committee of Governmental Experts on Problems in the Field of Copyright and of the Protection of Performers, Producers of Phonograms and Broadcasting Organizations Raised by Transmission via Space Satellites held at Nairobi (Kenya) from 2 to 11 July 1973.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Argentina	26 Mar 1975	
Armenia		13 Sep 1993 a
Australia		26 Jul 1990 a
Austria	26 Mar 1975	6 May 1982
Belgium	21 May 1974	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		12 Jan 1994 d
Brazil	21 May 1974	
Costa Rica		25 Mar 1999 a
Côte d'Ivoire	21 May 1974	
Croatia[1]		26 Jul 1993 d
Cyprus	21 May 1974	
France	27 Mar 1975	
Germany[2,3]	21 May 1974	25 May 1979
Greece		22 Jul 1991 a
Israel	21 May 1974	
Italy	21 May 1974	7 Apr 1981
Jamaica		12 Oct 1999 a
Kenya	21 May 1974	6 Jan 1976
Lebanon	21 May 1974	
Mexico	21 May 1974	18 Mar 1976
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	21 May 1974	31 Mar 1983
Nicaragua		1 Dec 1975 a
Panama		25 Jun 1985 a
Peru		7 May 1985 a
Portugal		11 Dec 1995 a
Russian Federation		20 Oct 1988 a
Rwanda		25 Apr 2001 a
Senegal	21 May 1974	
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Singapore		27 Jan 2005 a
Slovenia[1]		3 Nov 1992 d
Spain	21 May 1974	
Switzerland	21 May 1974	24 Jun 1993
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1]		2 Sep 1997 d
Togo		10 Mar 2003 a
Trinidad and Tobago		1 Aug 1996 a
United States of America	21 May 1974	7 Dec 1984
Viet Nam		12 Oct 2005 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

With reference to article 8 (2) the Government of the Argentine Republic states that the words "where the originating organization is a national of another Contracting State" appearing in article 2 (1) are to be considered as if they were replaced by the words "where the signal is emitted from the territory of another Contracting State".

GERMANY[2]

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany herewith declares in pursuance of article 2 (2) of the Convention that the protection accorded pursuant to article 2 (1) is restricted in its territory to a period of 25 years after the expiry of the calendar year in which the transmission by satellite has occurred.

ITALY

The Italian Government declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 2 (2) of the Convention, that the protection accorded pursuant to article 2 (1) shall be limited in its territory to a period of 25 years following the end of the year in which the satellite transmission took place.

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago has decided that the duration of time referred to in article 2 of the said Convention shall be twenty (20) years."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 31 March 1975 and 29 December 1976, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] See note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. CONSTITUTION OF THE ASIA-PACIFIC TELECOMMUNITY

Bangkok, 27 March 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 February 1979, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 25 February 1979, No. 17583.
STATUS: Signatories: 18. Parties: 36.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1129, p. 3.

Note: The Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity was adopted on 27 March 1976 by resolution 163 (XXXII)[2] of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific at its thirty-second session, which took place at Bangkok, Thailand, from 24 March 1976 to 2 April 1976. The Constitution was open for signature at Bangkok from 1 April 1976 to 31 October 1976 and at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York from 1 November 1976 to 24 February 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*
Afghanistan	12 Jan 1977	17 May 1977
Australia	26 Jul 1977	26 Jul 1977
Bangladesh	1 Apr 1976	22 Oct 1976
Bhutan		23 Jun 1998 a
Brunei Darussalam[3]		27 Mar 1986 a
China[1,6]	25 Oct 1976	2 Jun 1977 A
Cook Islands		21 Jul 1987 a
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		22 Feb 1994 a
Fiji		29 Nov 1999 a
India	28 Oct 1976	26 Nov 1976
Indonesia		29 Apr 1985 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	15 Sep 1976	3 Mar 1980
Japan	22 Mar 1977	25 Nov 1977 A
Lao People's Democratic Republic		20 Oct 1989 a
Malaysia	23 Jun 1977	23 Jun 1977
Maldives		17 Mar 1980 a
Marshall Islands		25 Jan 2005 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		28 Dec 1993 a
Mongolia		14 Aug 1991 a
Myanmar	20 Oct 1976	9 Dec 1976
Nauru	1 Apr 1976	22 Nov 1976
Nepal	15 Sep 1976	12 May 1977
New Zealand[4]		13 Jan 1993 a
Niue[5]		14 Nov 1994 a
Pakistan	25 Jan 1977	1 Jul 1977
Palau		19 Jun 1996 a
Papua New Guinea	29 Sep 1976	17 Dec 1992
Philippines	28 Oct 1976	17 Jun 1977
Republic of Korea	8 Jul 1977	8 Jul 1977
Samoa		6 Nov 2000 a
Singapore	23 Jun 1977	6 Oct 1977
Sri Lanka		3 Oct 1979 a
Thailand	15 Sep 1976	26 Jan 1979
Tonga		14 Feb 1992 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	31 Aug 1977	31 Aug 1977
Viet Nam		11 Sep 1979 a

Notes:

[1] In addition, Macau is an associate Member. The deposit of the instrument of accession on 9 February 1993 was accompanied by a declaration made by the Government of Portugal in accordance with article 20 of the Constitution to the effect that:

...The Government of the Portuguese Republic confirms that Macau, as an associate member of ESCAP, is authorized to be a party to the Constitution of the Asia Pacific Telecommunity and to assume the rights and obligations contained therein. ... In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed in Beijing on April 13, 1987, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau from December 20 1999, while the Government of the Portuguese Republic remains responsible for the external relations of Macau until December 19, 1999.

Also, on 9 February 1993, and in relation to the said deposit, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the Republic of China, the following communication:

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau as of 20 December 1999. Macau, as a part of the territory of the People's Republic of China, will thereupon become a special administrative region of the People's Republic of China and its foreign affairs will be the responsibility of the People's Republic of China.

The People's Republic of China is one of the founding members of the Asia Pacific Telecommunity.

The Government of the People's Republic of China hereby declares that as of 20 December 1999, the Macau Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China may continue to stay in the Asia Pacific Telecommunity as an associate member in the name of "Macau, China" as it still meets the essential requirements for such a membership."

See also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Commission for Asia and the Pacific, Sixty-first Session, Supplement No. 9* (E/5786) p. 40.

[3] Brunei Darussalam had been admitted as an associate Member from 2 March 1981. Upon becoming an associate Member, it had declared that it wished to be regarded as having been an associate member of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity with effect from 1 January 1980, the date upon which it became a financial contributor.

[4] With a declaration of non-application to Niue and Tokelau.

[5] As an associate member.

[6] See note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. a) Amendment to article 11, paragraph 2 (a), of the Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity

Bangkok, 13 November 1981

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 January 1985, in accordance with article 22 (3) of the Constitution, for all Members of the Telecommunity.
REGISTRATION: 2 January 1985, No. 17583.
STATUS: Parties: 19.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1388, p. 371.

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Participation (P)*
Afghanistan	22 Jul 1983
Australia	16 Aug 1983 A
Bangladesh	9 Feb 1988 A
Bhutan	23 Jun 1998 P
China	26 Jul 1982 A
Fiji	29 Nov 1999 P
India	15 Jul 1983
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	10 Apr 1986
Malaysia	7 Jan 1986 A
Maldives	28 May 1982 A
Myanmar	27 Sep 1984
Nepal	3 Dec 1984
Pakistan	24 Aug 1984 A
Republic of Korea	2 Jul 1982 A
Samoa	6 Nov 2000 P
Singapore	22 Jul 1982 A
Sri Lanka	26 Mar 1982 A
Thailand	1 Nov 1982
Viet Nam	28 Dec 1983 A

2. b) Amendments to articles 3 (5) and 9 (8) of the Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity

Colombo, 29 November 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 March 2000, in accordance with article 22 (3) of the Constitution, for all Members of the Telecommunity.
REGISTRATION: 16 March 2000, No. 17583.
STATUS: Parties: 19.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.2102, p. 419.

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a)*
Australia	11 Mar 1996
Bhutan	8 Dec 1998
Brunei Darussalam	4 Feb 1994
China	25 May 1993 A
Indonesia	26 Sep 1994
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	29 Nov 2000 A
Lao People's Democratic Republic	3 Jul 2000 A
Malaysia	6 May 1997 A
Maldives	3 Feb 1993 A
Mongolia	7 Jan 1999 A
Nepal	15 Feb 2000
New Zealand	10 Apr 1996 A
Palau	12 Oct 1998 A
Republic of Korea	18 Feb 1993
Singapore	6 Nov 1998 A
Sri Lanka	9 Dec 1998 A
Thailand	14 Jan 1994
Tonga	5 Feb 1998
Viet Nam	7 Jan 1997 A

2. c) Amendments to the Constitution of the Asia-Pacific Telecommunity

New Delhi, 23 October 2002

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 22 of the Convention which reads as follows: "1. Any Member may propose amendments to this Constitution. 2. Adoption of an amendment to this Constitution shall require a two-thirds of the Members present and voting in the General Assembly. 3. The amendments shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit with the Depositary of instruments of ratification or acceptance of such amendments by two-thirds of the Members.".

STATUS: Parties: 18.

TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.1348.2002.TREATIES-1 of 30 December 2002.

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan	5 Jan 2005
Australia	7 Sep 2005
Bhutan	14 Jul 2004
Brunei Darussalam	26 Nov 2003 A
China[1]	27 Feb 2006 A
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	14 Jul 2003
Indonesia	30 Dec 2004
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	21 Jul 2006 A
Lao People's Democratic Republic	2 Oct 2003 A
Malaysia	28 Apr 2003
Myanmar	10 Sep 2003
Republic of Korea	23 Sep 2003 A
Samoa	27 Feb 2003
Singapore	7 Mar 2005
Sri Lanka	27 Aug 2003
Thailand	31 Jan 2005
Tonga	17 Jul 2003
Viet Nam	19 Sep 2003 A

Notes:

[1] With the following:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Amendments to the Constitution of the Asia Pacific Telecommunity shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

3. AGREEMENT ESTABLISHING THE ASIA-PACIFIC INSTITUTE FOR BROADCASTING DEVELOPMENT

Kuala Lumpur, 12 August 1977

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 March 1981, in accordance with article 16.
REGISTRATION: 6 March 1981, No. 19609.
STATUS: Signatories: 14. Parties: 26.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1216, p. 81[1]; depositary notifications C.N.130.1986.TREATIES-1 of 13 June 1986 (amended authentic text in Chinese, English, French and Russian) and C.N.195.1986.TREATIES-3 of 15 October 1986 (Adoption of the amended text of the Agreement)[2]; and C.N.707.1999.TREATIES-1 of 6 August 1999 [amendments *(see chapter XXV.3 a)*].

Note: The Agreement was adopted on 12 August 1977 by the Intergovernmental Meeting on the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development convened by the United Nations Development Programme at Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, from 10 to 12 August 1977.

According to paragraph 3 of its article 14, the Agreement was to remain open for signature at the UNESCO Headquarters in Paris until 31 March 1978 and would then be transmitted for deposit to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Instead, signatures on behalf of 11 States were affixed individually during the period 12 September 1977 - 11 October 1978 on separate copies of the text of the Agreement established by the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development which were transmitted to the Secretary-General in June 1979. By depositary notification of 3 August 1979, the Secretary-General, in his capacity as the designated depositary, submitted for approval by all States having participated in the adoption of the Agreement or having signed the separate copies, the original text of the Agreement, similar to the text adopted at Kuala Lumpur on 12 August 1977 except for minor changes in the formal clauses as were warranted by the circumstances. No objection having been received from the States concerned within ninety days from the notification, the original of the Agreement was deposited with the Secretary-General on 2 November 1979.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan	23 Aug 1978	23 Dec 1999 A
Bangladesh	14 Sep 1977	11 Aug 1981
Bhutan		5 Jun 2000 a
Brunei Darussalam		6 Dec 1988 a
Cambodia		10 Jul 2001 a
China[3]		5 Feb 1988 a
Fiji	2 Jun 1978	26 Mar 1981
France		14 Dec 1988 a
India	20 May 1980	25 Feb 1986
Indonesia	12 Aug 1978	31 Aug 1989
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		18 Nov 1996 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		12 Sep 1986 a
Malaysia	11 Oct 1978	10 Nov 1980
Maldives		25 Jun 1985 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		28 Dec 1993 a
Myanmar		29 Jul 1999 a
Nepal	15 May 1980	11 Sep 1980
Pakistan	10 Apr 1978	7 Jul 1981
Papua New Guinea	9 Mar 1978	1 May 1980
Philippines	12 Sep 1977	11 Sep 1986 A
Republic of Korea	11 Oct 1978	6 Mar 1981
Samoa		25 Nov 1999 a
Singapore		29 Jun 1982 a
Sri Lanka	15 Sep 1978	7 Nov 1988
Thailand	25 Apr 1981	11 Sep 1986 A
Viet Nam	8 Sep 1978	23 Feb 1981 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

FRANCE[4]

With regard to paragraph 2 (a) (iv) of article 11:

1. Whether the remuneration of employees of the Institute is exempted from the tax levied in France shall depend on the establishment by the Institute of an internal tax on such remuneration;

2. This exemption shall not apply to pensions and like income;

3. Salaries and emoluments may be taken into account for purposes of calculating the tax due on income from other sources.

Notes:

[1] Published as a UNESCO and WIPO document (vol. 19609). The signatures were affixed on separate copies of the Agreement (see "*Note*" above). In accordance with the provision of article 14 (3) of the Agreement in the text established by the Secretary-General and accepted by the signatory States, these signatures were considered, in the absence of notification to the contrary, as tantamount to signatures under paragraph 1 of the same article 14.

[2] In accordance with a request made by the Governing Council of the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development the Secretary-General circulated on 13 June 1986 a proposed amended text of the Agreement (drawn up in Chinese, English, French and Russian) which was deemed adopted in the absence within 90 days of objections to the proposed amended text or to the amendment procedure thus adopted.

[3] On 29 January 2001, the Government of China notified the Secretary-General of the following:

The People's Republic of China confirmed that "in accordance with the declaration contained in the instrument of acceptance by China to the Amendments [of 21 July 1999], which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 10 April 2000, the Agreement as amended by the Amendments of 21 July 1999 is applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region."

[4] In connection with "the question of imposition of taxes on the income earned by the French nationals and the permanent residents in France while working at AIDB, the Council noted the position that in view of the articles 12.2 (a) (ii) and (iv) of the Agreement establishing AIBD and the article V.1. (B) of the supplementary Agreement signed by AIBD and the Government of Malaysia, the French nationals and the permanent residents of France will enjoy tax free benefits on the emoluments earned while working at AIBD and further recognised the right of the Government of France to levy taxes on such incomes derived by the French nationals and permanent residents in France during their secondment to, or employment at the AIBDSZ".

3. a) Amendments to the Agreement establishing the Asia-Pacific Institute for Broadcasting Development

Islamabad, 21 July 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 December 2001, in accordance with article 14 (1).
REGISTRATION: 14 December 2001, No. 19609.
STATUS: Parties: 18.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2167, p. 422.

Note: On 21 July 1999, the Governing Council adopted unanimously, at its meeting in Islamabad, the Amendments proposed by the Government of Iran to the above Agreement. The Council also determined under article 14 (2) that the Amendments were of such a nature as to require implementation by all Contracting Parties.

Participant	*Acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan	23 Dec 1999 A
Bangladesh	21 Jun 2000 A
Bhutan	12 Oct 2000 A
Brunei Darussalam	5 Jul 2000 A
Cambodia	10 Jul 2001 A
China[1]	10 Apr 2000 A
Fiji	11 Feb 2000 A
Indonesia	23 Apr 2001 A
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	30 Nov 1999 A
Micronesia (Federated States of)	22 Jun 2001 A
Myanmar	3 Apr 2000 A
Pakistan	17 Aug 2001 A
Republic of Korea	14 Sep 2001 A
Samoa	25 Nov 1999 A
Singapore	10 Jan 2000 A
Sri Lanka	20 Aug 1999 A
Thailand	2 Jul 2001 A
Viet Nam	27 Jan 2000 A

Notes:

[1] With a declaration to the effect that "...The State Council has also decided that the Amendment is applicable to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. However, the Amendment does not apply tentatively to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China until further notice."

4. Tampere Convention on the Provision of Telecommunication Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations

Tampere, 18 June 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 8 January 2005, in accordance with article 12 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall be open for signature by all States which are members of the United Nations or of the International Telecommunication Union at the Intergovernmental Conference on Emergency Telecommunications in Tampere on 18 June 1998, and thereafter at the headquarters of the United Nations, New York, from 22 June 1998 to 21 June 2003. 2. A State may express its consent to be bound by this Convention: a) by signature (definitive signature); b) by signature subject to ratification, acceptance or approval followed by deposit of an instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval; or c) by deposit of an instrument of accession. 3. The Convention shall enter into force thirty (30) days after the deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession or definitive signature of thirty (30) States. 4. For each State which signs definitively or deposits an instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, after the requirement set out in paragraph 3 of this Article has been fulfilled, this Convention shall enter into force thirty (30) days after the date of the definitive signature or consent to be bound.".

REGISTRATION: 8 January 2005, No. 40906.

STATUS: Signatories: 60. Parties: 35.

TEXT: Depositary notifications C.N.608.1998.TREATIES-8 of 4 December 1998; and C.N.782.1999.TREATIES-13 of 28 September 1999 (rectification of the Convention and transmission of relevant procès-verbal).

Note: The Convention was opened for signature at Tampere by all States Members of the United Nations or of the International Telecommunication Union on 18 June 1998, and thereafter at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 22 June 1998 where it will remain open until 21 June 2003, in accordance with its article 12.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Argentina	11 May 1999	
Barbados		25 Jul 2003 a
Benin	18 Jun 1998	
Brazil	12 Mar 1999	
Bulgaria	22 Sep 1999	20 Jun 2000
Burundi	18 Jun 1998	
Canada	15 Jun 1999	18 May 2001
Chad	20 Oct 1999	
Chile	18 Jun 1998	
Congo	18 Jun 1998	
Costa Rica	20 Jun 2003	
Cyprus	18 Jun 1998	14 Jul 2000
Czech Republic	4 Sep 2002	17 Jun 2003
Denmark[1]	18 Jun 1998	2 Jun 2003
Dominica		26 Dec 2000 a
El Salvador	9 Aug 2000	18 Apr 2002
Estonia	25 May 1999	
Finland	18 Jun 1998	1 Apr 1999 A
Gabon	27 Apr 2001	
Germany	18 Jun 1998	
Ghana	18 Jun 1998	
Guinea		8 Oct 2002 a
Haiti	11 Feb 1999	
Honduras	25 Feb 1999	
Hungary	20 Jun 2003	7 Apr 2004
Iceland	20 Jun 2003	
India	29 Nov 1999	29 Nov 1999
Italy	18 Jun 1998	
Kenya	18 Jun 1998	12 Feb 2003
Kuwait	18 Jun 1998	13 Jun 2002
Lebanon	17 Nov 1998	27 Jan 2006
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein		8 Jun 2004 a
Lithuania		9 Dec 2004 a
Madagascar	12 Sep 2002	
Mali	18 Jun 1998	
Malta	18 Jun 1998	
Marshall Islands	11 Nov 1998	
Mauritania	18 Jun 1998	
Mongolia	18 Jun 1998	
Morocco	1 Dec 1998	11 Mar 2003
Nepal	23 Apr 1999	
Netherlands[2]	19 Dec 2000	6 Jul 2001 A
Nicaragua	18 Jun 1998	18 Nov 1999
Niger	18 Jun 1998	
Oman	19 Aug 1999	16 Apr 2003
Panama	20 Sep 2001	5 Mar 2003
Peru	14 Jan 1999	27 Oct 2003
Poland	18 Jun 1998	
Portugal	18 Jun 1998	
Romania	18 Jun 1998	17 Nov 2005
Russian Federation	14 Mar 2002	
Saint Lucia	31 Jan 2000	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		14 Aug 2003 a
Senegal	20 Nov 1998	
Slovakia	16 Feb 2000	6 Feb 2001
Spain		27 Feb 2006 a
Sri Lanka	5 Aug 1999	13 Oct 1999

Participant	Signature	Definitive signature (s), Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Sudan	4 Dec 1998	
Sweden	10 Jun 2003	13 Sep 2004
Switzerland	18 Jun 1998	24 Apr 2002
Tajikistan	18 Jun 1998	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3 Dec 1998	
Tonga		8 May 2003 a
Uganda	28 Oct 1998	5 Sep 2002
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland		18 Jun 2003 s
United States of America	17 Nov 1998	
Uruguay	13 May 2003	
Uzbekistan	6 Oct 1998	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	3 Apr 2003	13 May 2005

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon definitive signature, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

DENMARK

Declaration:

"In connexion with Denmark's ratification of the Tampere Convention on the Provision of Telecommunications Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations ("the Convention") Denmark declares that to the extent to which certain provisions of the Convention fall within the area of responsibility of the European Community, the full implementation of the Convention by Denmark has to be done in accordance with the procedures of this international Organisation."

SPAIN

Reservation:

To the extent to which certain provisions of the Tampere Convention on the Provision of Telecommunication Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations fall within the area of responsibility of the European Community, Spain cannot implement those decisions unless the European Community becomes a party to the Convention.

SWEDEN

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"To the extent to which certain provisions of the Tampere Convention on the Provision of Telecommunications Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations fall within the area of responsibility of the European Community, the full implementation of the Convention by Sweden has to be done in accordance with the procedures of this international organisation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Reservation:

"To the extent to which certain provisions of the Tampere Convention on the Provisions of Telecommunications Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations ("the Convention") fall within the area of responsibility of the European Community, the full implementation of the Convention by the United Kingdom has to be done in accordance with the procedures of this international organisation."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Reservation made upon signature:

Under the provisions of article 11, paragraph 6, of the Tampere Convention on the Provision of Telecommunication Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations (ICET-98), the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela makes a specific reservation to paragraph 3 of that article. It therefore does not consider itself bound by arbitration as a means of dispute settlement, nor does it recognize the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Reservation made upon ratification:

Under the provisions of article 14, paragraph 1, of the Tampere Convention on the Provision of Telecommunication Resources for Disaster Mitigation and Relief Operations, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela makes a specific reservation to paragraphs 3 and 4 of article 11. Therefore, it does not consider itself bound by arbitration as a means of dispute settlement, nor does it recognize the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Notes:

[1] In a communication received on 22 July 2003, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that "... Denmark's ratifications normally include the entire Kingdom of Denmark including the Faroe Islands and Greenland. Consequently, no Territorial Application applies in connection with the above-mentioned ratification."

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. On 17 July 2001, in respect of Aruba.

CHAPTER XXVI

DISARMAMENT

1. CONVENTION ON THE PROHIBITION OF MILITARY OR ANY OTHER HOSTILE USE OF ENVIRONMENTAL MODIFICATION TECHNIQUES

New York, 10 December 1976

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 October 1978, in accordance with article IX (3).
REGISTRATION: 5 October 1978, No. 17119.
STATUS: Signatories: 48. Parties: 72.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1108, p. 151 and depositary notification C.N.263.1978.TREATIES-12 of 27 October 1978 (rectification of the English text).

Note: The Convention was approved by the General Assembly of the United Nations in its resolution 31/72[1] of 10 December 1976. In application of paragraph 2 of the said resolution, the Secretary-General decided to open the Convention for signature and ratification by States from 18 to 31 May 1977 at Geneva, Switzerland. Subsequently, the Convention was transmitted to the Headquarters of the Organization of the United Nations at New York, where it was open for signature by States until 4 October 1978.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		22 Oct 1985 a
Algeria		19 Dec 1991 a
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Argentina		20 Mar 1987 a
Armenia		15 May 2002 a
Australia	31 May 1978	7 Sep 1984
Austria		17 Jan 1990 a
Bangladesh		3 Oct 1979 a
Belarus	18 May 1977	7 Jun 1978
Belgium	18 May 1977	12 Jul 1982
Benin	10 Jun 1977	30 Jun 1986
Bolivia	18 May 1977	
Brazil	9 Nov 1977	12 Oct 1984
Bulgaria	18 May 1977	31 May 1978
Canada	18 May 1977	11 Jun 1981
Cape Verde		3 Oct 1979 a
Chile		26 Apr 1994 a
China[2]		8 Jun 2005 a
Costa Rica		7 Feb 1996 a
Cuba	23 Sep 1977	10 Apr 1978
Cyprus	7 Oct 1977	12 Apr 1978
Czech Republic[3]		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		8 Nov 1984 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	28 Feb 1978	
Denmark	18 May 1977	19 Apr 1978
Dominica		9 Nov 1992 d
Egypt		1 Apr 1982 a
Ethiopia	18 May 1977	
Finland	18 May 1977	12 May 1978
Germany[4,5]	18 May 1977	24 May 1983
Ghana	21 Mar 1978	22 Jun 1978
Greece		23 Aug 1983 a
Guatemala		21 Mar 1988 a
Holy See	27 May 1977	
Hungary	18 May 1977	19 Apr 1978
Iceland	18 May 1977	
India	15 Dec 1977	15 Dec 1978
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	18 May 1977	
Iraq	15 Aug 1977	
Ireland	18 May 1977	16 Dec 1982
Italy	18 May 1977	27 Nov 1981
Japan		9 Jun 1982 a
Kazakhstan		25 Apr 2005 a
Kuwait		2 Jan 1980 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	13 Apr 1978	5 Oct 1978
Lebanon	18 May 1977	
Liberia	18 May 1977	
Lithuania		16 Apr 2002 a
Luxembourg	18 May 1977	
Malawi		5 Oct 1978 a
Mauritius		9 Dec 1992 a
Mongolia	18 May 1977	19 May 1978
Morocco	18 May 1977	
Netherlands[6]	18 May 1977	15 Apr 1983
New Zealand[7]		7 Sep 1984 a
Nicaragua	11 Aug 1977	
Niger		17 Feb 1993 a
Norway	18 May 1977	15 Feb 1979
Pakistan		27 Feb 1986 a
Panama		13 May 2003 a
Papua New Guinea		28 Oct 1980 a
Poland	18 May 1977	8 Jun 1978
Portugal	18 May 1977	
Republic of Korea		2 Dec 1986 a
Romania	18 May 1977	6 May 1983
Russian Federation	18 May 1977	30 May 1978
Saint Lucia		27 May 1993 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Apr 1999 d
Sao Tome and Principe		5 Oct 1979 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)
Sierra Leone	12 Apr 1978	
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		20 Apr 2005 a
Solomon Islands		19 Jun 1981 d
Spain	18 May 1977	19 Jul 1978
Sri Lanka	8 Jun 1977	25 Apr 1978
Sweden		27 Apr 1984 a
Switzerland		5 Aug 1988 a
Syrian Arab Republic	4 Aug 1977	
Tajikistan		12 Oct 1999 a
Tunisia	11 May 1978	11 May 1978
Turkey	18 May 1977	
Uganda	18 May 1977	
Ukraine	18 May 1977	13 Jun 1978
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	18 May 1977	16 May 1978
United States of America	18 May 1977	17 Jan 1980
Uruguay		16 Sep 1993 a
Uzbekistan		26 May 1993 a
Viet Nam		26 Aug 1980 a
Yemen[8]	18 May 1977	20 Jul 1977

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA[9]

The Argentine Republic interprets the terms "widespread, long-lasting or severe effects" in article I, paragraph 1, of the Convention in accordance with the definitions agreed upon in the understanding on that article. It likewise interprets articles II, III and VIII in accordance with the relevant understandings.

AUSTRIA

Reservation:

"Considering the obligations resulting from its status as a permanently neutral state, the Republic of Austria declares a reservation to the effect that its co-operation within the frame work of this Convention cannot exceed the limits determined by the Status of permanent neutrality and membership with the United Nations."

GERMANY[4]

Upon signature:

"With the proviso that the correct designation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the Russian language is `Federativnuju Respubliku Germaniju'."

16 June 1977

"The correct designation of the Federal Republic of Germany in the Russian language following the preposition `sa' in the Russian text was spelled out in the afore-mentioned proviso as `Federativnuju Respubliku Germaniju'."

GUATEMALA

Reservation:

Guatemala accepts the text of article III, on condition that the use of environmental modification techniques for peaceful purposes does not adversely affect its territory or the use of its natural resources.

KUWAIT[10]

Reservation:

This Convention binds the State of Kuwait only towards States Parties thereto. Its obligatory character shall *ipso facto* terminate with respect to any hostile state which does not abide by the prohibition contained therein.

Understanding:

"It is understood that accession to the Convention on the Prohibition of Military or any other hostile use of Environmental Modification Techniques, done in Geneva, 1977, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the obligations laid down in article 1 of the said Convention as extending to states which are not a party to the Convention and which act in conformity with article 1 of the Convention."

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government of New Zealand hereby declares its interpretation that nothing in the Convention detracts from or limits the obligations of States to refrain from military or any other hostile use of environmental modification techniques which are contrary to international law".

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Republic of Korea that any technique for deliberately changing the natural state of rivers falls within the meaning of the term 'environmental modification techniques' as defined in article II of the Convention.

"It is further understood that military or any other hostile use of such techniques, which could cause flooding, inundation, reduction in the water-level, drying up, destruction of hydrotechnical installations or other harmful consequences, comes within the scope of the Convention, provided it meets the criteria set out in article I therefore."

SWITZERLAND

Because of the obligation incumbent upon it by virtue of its status of perpetual neutrality, Switzerland must make a general reservation specifying that its co-operation in the framework of this Convention cannot go beyond the limits imposed by this status. This reservation refers, in particular, to article V, paragraph 5, of the Convention, and to any similar clause which may

replace or supplement this provision in the Convention (or in any other arrangement).

TURKEY

Upon signature:

Interpretative statement:

"In the opinion of the Turkish Government the terms 'widespread', 'long lasting' and 'severe effects' contained in the Convention need to be clearly defined. So long as this clarification is not made the Government of Turkey will be compelled to interpret itself the terms in question and consequently it reserves the right to do so as and when required.

"Furthermore, the Government of Turkey believes that the difference between `military or any other hostile purposes' and `peaceful purposes' should be more clearly defined so as to prevent subjective evaluations."

Territorial Application

Participant:	***Date of receipt of the notification:***	***Territories:***
United Kingdom[11]	16 May 1978	Associated States (Antigua, Dominica, St. Kitts Nevis-Anguilla, St. Lucia and St. Vincent), Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom, the Solomon Islands, State of Brunei, United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus

---

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-first Session, Supplement No. 39* (A/31/39), p. 36.

[2] With the following declaration with respect of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 May 1977 and 12 May 1978, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 18 May 1977 and 25 May 1978, respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles. See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The accession shall also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue.

[8] Democratic Yemen had acceded to the Convention on 12 June 1979. See also note 1 under "Yemen" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The Government of Argentina has specified that the understandings referred to in the declaration are the Understandings adopted as part of the report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly at its thirty-first session, published under the symbol A/31/27. [Report of the Conference of the Committee on Disarmament to the General Assembly (Volume I, Annex I).]

[10] On 23 June 1980, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following communication concerning the abovementioned understanding:

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of the statement made by the Government of Kuwait. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, the said declaration cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Kuwait, under general international law or under particular conventions. Insofar as concerns the substance of the matter, the Government of Israel will adopt towards the Government of Kuwait an attitude of complete reciprocity."

[11] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (with Protocols I, II and III)

Geneva, 10 October 1980

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 December 1983 in accordance with article 5 (1) and (3).
REGISTRATION: 2 December 1983, No. 22495.
STATUS: Signatories: 50. Parties: 102.
TEXT: United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1342, p. 137; depositary notifications C.N.356.1981. TREATIES-7 of 14 January 1982 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Chinese authentic text) and C.N.320.1982. TREATIES-11 of 21 January 1983 (procès-verbal of rectification of the Final Act).

Note: The Convention and its annexed Protocols were adopted by the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions of the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, held in Geneva from 10 to 28 September 1979 and from 15 September to 10 October 1980. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 32/152 of 19 December 1977 and 33/70 of 14 December 1978. The original of the Convention with the annexed Protocols, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, is deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Convention was open for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters in New York for a period of twelve months from 10 April 1981.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	10 Apr 1981	
Albania		28 Aug 2002 a
Argentina	2 Dec 1981	2 Oct 1995
Australia	8 Apr 1982	29 Sep 1983
Austria	10 Apr 1981	14 Mar 1983
Bangladesh		6 Sep 2000 a
Belarus	10 Apr 1981	23 Jun 1982
Belgium	10 Apr 1981	7 Feb 1995
Benin		27 Mar 1989 a
Bolivia		21 Sep 2001 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina		1 Sep 1993 d
Brazil		3 Oct 1995 a
Bulgaria	10 Apr 1981	15 Oct 1982
Burkina Faso		26 Nov 2003 a
Cambodia		25 Mar 1997 a
Cameroon		7 Dec 2006 a
Canada	10 Apr 1981	24 Jun 1994
Cape Verde		16 Sep 1997 a
Chile		15 Oct 2003 A
China	14 Sep 1981	7 Apr 1982
Colombia		6 Mar 2000 a
Costa Rica		17 Dec 1998 a
Croatia		2 Dec 1993 d
Cuba	10 Apr 1981	2 Mar 1987
Cyprus		12 Dec 1988 a
Czech Republic		22 Feb 1993 d
Denmark	10 Apr 1981	7 Jul 1982
Djibouti		29 Jul 1996 a
Ecuador	9 Sep 1981	4 May 1982
Egypt	10 Apr 1981	
El Salvador		26 Jan 2000 a
Estonia		20 Apr 2000 a
Finland	10 Apr 1981	8 Apr 1982
France	10 Apr 1981	4 Mar 1988
Georgia		29 Apr 1996 a
Germany	10 Apr 1981	25 Nov 1992
Greece	10 Apr 1981	28 Jan 1992
Guatemala		21 Jul 1983 a
Holy See		22 Jul 1997 a
Honduras		30 Oct 2003 a
Hungary	10 Apr 1981	14 Jun 1982
Iceland	10 Apr 1981	
India	15 May 1981	1 Mar 1984
Ireland	10 Apr 1981	13 Mar 1995
Israel		22 Mar 1995 a
Italy	10 Apr 1981	20 Jan 1995
Japan	22 Sep 1981	9 Jun 1982 A
Jordan		19 Oct 1995 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Jan 1983 a
Latvia		4 Jan 1993 a
Lesotho		6 Sep 2000 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein	11 Feb 1982	16 Aug 1989
Lithuania		3 Jun 1998 a
Luxembourg	10 Apr 1981	21 May 1996
Maldives		7 Sep 2000 a
Mali		24 Oct 2001 a
Malta		26 Jun 1995 a
Mauritius		6 May 1996 a
Mexico	10 Apr 1981	11 Feb 1982
Moldova		8 Sep 2000 a
Monaco		12 Aug 1997 a
Mongolia	10 Apr 1981	8 Jun 1982
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	10 Apr 1981	19 Mar 2002
Nauru		12 Nov 2001 a
Netherlands	10 Apr 1981	18 Jun 1987 A
New Zealand	10 Apr 1981	18 Oct 1993
Nicaragua	20 May 1981	5 Dec 2000
Niger		10 Nov 1992 a
Nigeria	26 Jan 1982	
Norway	10 Apr 1981	7 Jun 1983
Pakistan	26 Jan 1982	1 Apr 1985

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Panama		26 Mar 1997 a
Paraguay		22 Sep 2004 a
Peru		3 Jul 1997 a
Philippines	15 May 1981	15 Jul 1996
Poland	10 Apr 1981	2 Jun 1983
Portugal	10 Apr 1981	4 Apr 1997
Republic of Korea		9 May 2001 a
Romania	8 Apr 1982	26 Jul 1995
Russian Federation	10 Apr 1981	10 Jun 1982
Senegal		29 Nov 1999 a
Serbia		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		8 Jun 2000 a
Sierra Leone	1 May 1981	30 Sep 2004
Slovakia		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		6 Jul 1992 d
South Africa		13 Sep 1995 a
Spain	10 Apr 1981	29 Dec 1993
Sri Lanka		24 Sep 2004 a
Sudan	10 Apr 1981	
Sweden	10 Apr 1981	7 Jul 1982
Switzerland	18 Jun 1981	20 Aug 1982
Tajikistan		12 Oct 1999 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		30 Dec 1996 d
Togo	15 Sep 1981	4 Dec 1995 A
Tunisia		15 May 1987 a
Turkey	26 Mar 1982	2 Mar 2005
Turkmenistan		19 Mar 2004 a
Uganda		14 Nov 1995 a
Ukraine	10 Apr 1981	23 Jun 1982
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	10 Apr 1981	13 Feb 1995
United States of America	8 Apr 1982	24 Mar 1995
Uruguay		6 Oct 1994 a
Uzbekistan		29 Sep 1997 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		19 Apr 2005 a
Viet Nam	10 Apr 1981	

Consent to be bound by Protocols I, II, and III, adopted on 10 October 1980, pursuant to article 4 (3) and (4) of the Convention[8]

Participant	*Protocol I*	*Protocol II*	*Protocol III*	
Albania	x	x	x	
Argentina	x	x	x	
Australia	x	x	x	
Austria	x	x	x	
Bangladesh	x	x	x	
Belarus	x	x	x	
Belgium	x	x	x	
Benin	x		x	
Bolivia	x	x	x	
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]	x	x	x	
Brazil	x	x	x	
Bulgaria	x	x	x	
Burkina Faso	x	x	x	
Cambodia	x	x	x	
Cameroon	x	x	x	
Canada	x	x	x	
Cape Verde	x	x	x	
Chile	x		x	
China	x	x	x	
Colombia	x	x	x	
Costa Rica	x	x	x	
Croatia[2]	x	x	x	
Cuba	x	x	x	
Cyprus	x	x	x	
Czech Republic	x	x	x	
Denmark	x	x	x	
Djibouti	x	x	x	
Ecuador	x	x	x	
El Salvador	x	x	x	
Estonia	x		x	
Finland	x	x	x	
France	x	x	x	*(18 Jul 2002)*
Georgia	x	x	x	
Germany	x	x	x	
Greece	x	x	x	
Guatemala	x	x	x	
Holy See	x	x	x	
Honduras	x	x	x	
Hungary	x	x	x	
India	x	x	x	
Ireland	x	x	x	
Israel	x	x		
Italy	x	x	x	
Japan	x	x	x	
Jordan	x		x	

Participant	*Protocol I*	*Protocol II*	*Protocol III*
Lao People's Democratic Republic	x	x	x
Latvia	x	x	x
Lesotho	x	x	x
Liberia	x	x	x
Liechtenstein	x	x	x
Lithuania	x		x
Luxembourg	x	x	x
Maldives	x		x
Mali	x	x	x
Malta	x	x	x
Mauritius	x	x	x
Mexico	x	x	x
Monaco	x		
Mongolia	x	x	x
Montenegro[1]	x	x	x
Morocco		x	
Nauru	x	x	x
Netherlands	x	x	x
New Zealand	x	x	x
Nicaragua	x		x
Niger	x	x	x
Norway	x	x	x
Pakistan	x	x	x
Panama	x	x	x
Paraguay	x	x	x
Peru	x		x
Philippines	x	x	x
Poland	x	x	x
Portugal	x	x	x
Republic of Korea	x		
Moldova	x	x	x
Romania	x	x	x
Russian Federation	x	x	x
Senegal			x
Serbia[2]	x	x	x
Seychelles	x	x	x
Sierra Leone	x		x
Slovakia	x	x	x
Slovenia[2]	x	x	x
South Africa	x	x	x
Spain	x	x	x
Sri Lanka	x	x	x
Sweden	x	x	x
Switzerland	x	x	x
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]	x	x	x
Tajikistan	x	x	x
Togo	x	x	x

Participant	*Protocol I*	*Protocol II*	*Protocol III*
Tunisia	x	x	x
Turkey	x		
Turkmenistan	x	x	
Uganda	x	x	x
Ukraine	x	x	x
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	x	x	x
United States of America	x	x	
Uruguay	x	x	x
Uzbekistan	x	x	x
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	x	x	x

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Reservation:

The Argentine Republic makes the express reservation that any references to the 1977 Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 that are contained in the [said Convention and its Protocols I, II and III] shall be interpreted in the light of the interpretative declarations in the instrument of accession of the Argentine Republic to the afore-mentioned additional Protocols of 1977.

CANADA

Declarations:

"1. It is the understanding of the Government of Canada that:

(a) The compliance of commanders and others responsible for planning, deciding upon, or executing attacks to which the Convention and its Protocols apply cannot be judged on the basis of information which subsequently comes to light but must be assessed on the basis of the information available to them at the time that such actions were taken; and

(b) Where terms are not defined in the present Convention and its Protocols they shall, so far as is relevant, be construed in the same sense as terms contained in additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of August 12, 1949.

2. With respect to Protocol I, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that the use of plastics or similar materials for detonators or other weapons parts not designed to cause injury is not prohibited.

3. With respect to Protocol II, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that:

(a) Any obligation to record the location of remotely delivered mines pursuant to sub-paragraph 1 (a) of article 5 refers to the location of mine fields and not to the location of individual remotely delivered mines;

(b) The term 'pre-planned', as used in sub-paragraph 1 (a) of article 7 means that the position of the minefield in question should have been determined in advance so that an accurate record of the location of the minefield, when laid, can be made;

(c) The phrase 'similar functions' used in article 8, includes the concepts of 'peace-making, preventive peace-keeping and peace enforcement' as defined in an agenda for peace (United Nations document A/47/277 S/2411 of 17 June 1992).

4. With respect to Protocol III, it is the understanding of the Government of Canada that the expression 'clearly separated' in paragraph 3 of article 2 includes both spatial separation or separation by means of an effective physical barrier between the military objective and the concentration of civilians."

CHINA

Upon signature:

Statement:

1. The Government of the People's Republic of China has decided to sign the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects adopted at the United Nations Conference held in Geneva on 10 October 1980.

2. The Government of the People's Republic of China deems that the basic spirit of the Convention reflects the reasonable demand and good intention of numerous countries and peoples of the world regarding prohibitions or restrictions on the use of certain conventional weapons which are excessively injurious or have indiscriminate effects. This basic spirit conforms to China's consistent position and serves the interest of opposing aggression and maintaining peace.

3. However, it should be pointed out that the Convention fails to provide for supervision or verification of any violation of its clauses, thus weakening its binding force. The Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby Traps and Other Devices fails to lay down strict restrictions on the use of such weapons by the aggressor on the territory of his victim and to provide adequately for the right of a state victim of an aggression to defend itself by all necessary means. The Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Incendiary Weapons does not stipulate restrictions on the use of such weapons against combat personnel. Furthermore, the Chinese texts of the Convention and Protocol are not accurate or satisfactory enough. It is the hope of the Chinese Government that these inadequacies can be remedied in due course.

CYPRUS

Declaration:

"The provisions of article 7 of paragraph (3b) and article 8 of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices (Protocol II) will be in-

terpreted in such a way that neither the status of peace-keeping forces or missions of the United Nations in Cyprus will be affected nor will additional rights be, *ipso jure*, granted to them."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

After signing the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, the French Government, as it has already had occasion to state

-through its representative to the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons in Geneva, during the discussion of the proposal concerning verification arrangements submitted by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and of which the French Government became a sponsor, and at the final meeting on 10 October 1980;

-on 20 November 1980 through the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community in the First Committee at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly;

Regrets that thus far it has not been possible for the States which participated in the negotiation of the Convention to reach agreement on the provisions concerning the verification of facts which might be alleged and which might constitute violations of the undertakings subscribed to.

It therefore reserves the right to submit, possibly in association with other States, proposals aimed at filling that gap at the first conference to be held pursuant to article 8 of the Convention and to utilize, as appropriate, procedures that would make it possible to bring before the international community facts and information which, if verified, could constitute violations of the provisions of the Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto.

Interpretative statement

The application of this Convention will have no effect on the legal status of the parties to a conflict.

Reservation:

France, which is not bound by Additional Protocol I of 10 June 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949:

Considers that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, which reproduces the provisions of article 35, paragraph 3, of Additional Protocol I, applies only to States parties to that Protocol;

States, with reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, that it will apply the provisions of the Convention and its three Protocols to all the armed conflicts referred to in articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949;

States that as regards the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, the declaration of acceptance and application provided for in article 7, paragraph 4 (b), of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons will have no effects other than those provided for in article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions, in so far as that article is applicable.

18 July 2002

Interpretative declarations [made upon consent to be bound by Protocol III]:

The French Republic accepts the provisions of article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, insofar as the terms used in these paragraphs do not lead to the assumption that an attack using incendiary weapons launched from an aircraft would involve any greater risk of indiscriminate hits than one launched by any other means.

It is the understanding of the French Republic that the term "clearly separated"used in article 2, paragraph 3, can be interpreted as meaning either a separation in terms of space or a separation by means of a physical barrier between the military target and the concentration of civilians.

ISRAEL

Declarations:

"(a) With reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Israel will apply the provisions of the Convention and those annexed Protocols to which Israel has agreed become bound to all armed conflicts involving regular armed forces of States referred to in article 2 common to the General Conventions of 12 August 1949, as well as to all armed conflicts referred to in article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949.

(b) Article 7, paragraph 4 of the Convention will have no effect.

(c) The application of this Convention will have no effect on the legal status of the parties to a conflict.

Understandings:

(a) It is the understanding of the Government of the State of Israel that the compliance of commanders and others responsible for planning, deciding upon, or executing attacks to which the Convention and its Protocols apply, cannot be judged on the basis of information which subsequently comes to light, but must be assessed on the basis of the information available to them at the time that such actions were taken.

(b) With respect to Protocol I, it is the understanding of the Government of Israel that the use of plastics or similar materials for detonators or other weapon parts not designed to cause injury is not prohibited.

(c) With respect to Protocol I, it is the understanding of the Government of Israel that:

(i) Any obligation to record the location of remotely delivered mines pursuant to sub-paragraph 1 (a) of article 5 refers to the location of mine fields and not to the location of individual remotely delivered mines;

(ii) The term pre-planned, as used in sub-paragraph 1 (a) of article 7 means that the position of the minefield in question should have been determined in advance so that an accurate record of the location of the minefield, when laid, can be made."

HOLY SEE

Declaration:

"The Holy See, as a signatory of the [said Convention and annexed Protocols], in keeping with its proper nature and with the particular condition of Vatican City State, intends to renew its encouragement to the International Community to continue on the path it has taken for the reduction of human suffering caused by armed conflict.

Every step in this direction contributes to increasing awareness that war and the cruelty of war must be done away with in order to resolve tensions by dialogue and negotiation, and also by ensuring that international law is respected.

The Holy See, while maintaining that the above-mentioned Convention and Protocols constitute an important instrument for humanitarian international law, reiterates the objective hoped for by many parties: an agreement that would totally ban anti-personnel mines, the effects of which are tragically well-known.

In this regard, the Holy See considers that the modifications made so far in the second Protocol are insufficient and inadequate. It wishes, by means of its own accession to the Convention, to offer support to every effort aimed at effectively banning anti-personnel mines, in the conviction that all possible means must be used in order to build a safer and more fraternal world."

ITALY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

On 10 October 1980 in Geneva, the representative of Italy at the Conference speaking at the closing meeting, emphasized that the Conference, in an effort to reach a compromise between what was desirable and what was possible, had probably achieved the maximum results feasible in the circumstances prevailing at that time.

However, he observed in his statement that one of the objectives which had not been achieved at the Conference, to his Government's great regret, was the inclusion in the text of the Convention, in accordance with a proposal originated by the Federal Republic of Germany, of an article on the establishment of a consultative committee of experts competent to verify facts which might be alleged and which might constitute violations of the undertakings subscribed to.

On the same occasion, the representative of Italy expressed the wish that the proposal, which was aimed at strengthening the credibility and effectiveness of the Convention, should be reconsidered at the earliest opportunity within the framework of the mechanisms for the amendment of the Convention expressly provided for in that instrument.

Subsequently, through the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of nine States members of the European Community in the First Committee of the United Nations General Assembly on 20 November 1980, when it adopted draft resolution A/C.1/31/L.15 (subsequently adopted as General Assembly Resolution 35/153), Italy once again expressed regret that the States which had participated in the preparation of the texts of the Convention and its Protocols had been unable to reach agreement on provisions that would ensure respect for the obligations deriving from those texts.

In the same spirit, Italy - which has just signed the Convention in accordance with the wishes expressed by the General Assembly in its resolution 35/153 - wishes to confirm solemnly that it intends to undertake active efforts to ensure that the problem of the establishment of a mechanism that would make it possible to fill a gap in the Convention and thus ensure that it achieves maximum effectiveness and maximum credibility vis-à-vis the international community is taken up again at the earliest opportunity in every competent forum.

NETHERLANDS

"1. With regard to article 2, paragraph 4, of Protocol II: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that a specific area of land may also be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in paragraph 4, its total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definitive military advantage;

"2. With regard to article 3, paragraph 3, under c, of Protocol II: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that military advantage refers to the advantage anticipated from the attack considered as a whole and not only from isolated or particular parts of the attack;

"3. With regard to article 8, paragraph 1, of Protocol II: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that the words 'as far as it is able' mean 'as far as it is technically able'.

"4. With regard to article 1, paragraph 3, of Protocol III: It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands that a specific area of land may also be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in paragraph 3, its total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definitive military advantage."

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

2. Romania considers that the Convention and the three Protocols annexed thereto constitute a positive step within the framework of the efforts which have been made for the gradual development of international humanitarian law applicable during armed conflicts and which aim at providing very broad and reliable protection for the civilian population and the combatants.

3. At the same time, Romania would like to emphasize that the provisions of the Convention and its Protocols have a restricted character and do not ensure adequate protection either to the civilian population or to the combatants as the fundamental principles of international humanitarian law require.

4. The Romanian Government wishes to state on this occasion also that real and effective protection for each individual and for peoples and assurance of their right to a free and independent life necessarily presuppose the elimination of all acts of aggression and the renunciation once and for all of the use of force and the threat of the use of force, of intervention in the domestic affairs of other States and of the policy of domination and diktat and strict observation of the sovereignty and independence of peoples and their legitimate right to self-determination.

In the present circumstances, when a vast quantity of nuclear weapons has been accumulated in the world, the protection of each individual and of all peoples is closely linked with the struggle for peace and disarmament and with the adoption of authentic measures to halt the arms race and ensure the gradual reduction of nuclear weapons until they are totally eliminated.

5. The Romanian Government states once again its decision to act, together with other States, to ensure the prohibition or restriction of all conventional weapons which are excessively injurious or have indiscriminate effects, and the adoption of urgent and effective measures for nuclear disarmament which would protect peoples from the nuclear war which seriously threatens their right to life--a fundamental condition for the protection which international humanitarian law must ensure for the individual, the civilian population and the combatants.

TURKEY

Reservation:

"Turkey is not bound by Additional Protocol I of 10 June 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949:

Therefore, Turkey, with reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, states that it will apply the Convention to all armed conflicts referred to in articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949.

Turkey also states that paragraph 4 of article 7 of this Convention shall not apply with respect to Turkey."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland will give further consideration to certain provisions of the Convention, particularly in relation to the provisions of Protocol I additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and may wish to make formal declarations in relation to these provisions at the time of ratification."

Upon ratification:

(a) *Generally*

(i) The term "armed conflict" of itself and in its context denotes a situation of a kind which is not constituted by the commission of ordinary crimes, including acts of terrorism, whether concerted or in isolation.

(ii) The United Kingdom will not, in relation to any situation in which it is involved, consider itself bound in consequence of any declaration purporting to be made for the purposes of article 7 (4), unless the United Kingdom shall have expressly recognised that it has been made by a body which is genuinely an authority representing a people engaged in an armed conflict of the type to which that paragraph applies.

(iii) The terms "civilian" and "civilian population" have the same meaning as in article 50 of the 1st Additional Protocol of 1977 to the 1949 Geneva Conventions. Civilians shall enjoy the protection afforded by this Convention unless and for such time as they take a direct part in hostilities.

(iv) Military commanders and others responsible for planning, deciding upon, or executing attacks necessarily have to reach decisions on the basis of their assessment of the information from all sources which is reasonably available to them at the relevant time.

(b) *Re: Protocol II, article 2; and Protocol III, article 1*

A specific area of land may be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in this article, its total or partial destruction, capture or neutralisation in the circumstances ruling at the time offers a definite military advantage.

(c) *Re: Protocol II, article 3*

In the view of the United Kingdom, the military advantage anticipated from an attack is intended to refer to the advantage anticipated from the attack considered as a whole and not only from isolated or particular parts of the attack.

(d) *Re: Protocol III, article 2*

The United Kingdom accepts the provisions of article 2 (2) and (3) on the understanding that the terms of those paragraphs of that article do not imply that the air-delivery of incendiary weapons, or of any other weapons, projectiles or munitions, is less accurate or less capable of being carried out discriminately than all or any other means of delivery.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

"The United States Government welcomes the adoption of this Convention, and hopes that all States will give the most serious consideration to ratification or accession. We believe that the Convention represents a positive step forward in efforts to minimize injury or damage to the civilian population in time of armed conflict. Our signature of this Convention reflects the general willingness of the United States to adopt practical and reasonable provisions concerning the conduct of military operations, for the purpose of protecting noncombatants.

"At the same time, we want to emphasize that formal adherence by States to agreements restricting the use of weapons in armed conflict would be of little purpose if the parties were not firmly committed to taking every appropriate step to ensure compliance with those restrictions after their entry into force. It would be the firm intention of the United States and, we trust, all other parties to utilize the procedures and remedies provided by this Convention, and by the general laws of war, to see to it that all parties to the Convention meet their obligations under it. The United States strongly supported proposals by other countries during the Conference to include special procedures for dealing with compliance matters, and reserves the right to propose at a later date additional procedures and remedies, should this prove necessary, to deal with such problems.

"In addition, the United States of course reserves the right, at the time of ratification, to exercise the option provided by article 4 (3) of the Convention, and to make statements of understanding and/or reservations, to the extent that it may deem that to be necessary to ensure that the Convention and its Protocols conform to humanitarian and military requirements. As indicated in the negotiating record of the 1980 Conference, the prohibitions and restrictions contained in the Convention and its Protocols are of course new contractual rules (with the exception of certain provisions which restate existing international law) which will only bind States upon their ratification of, or accession to, the Convention and their consent to be bound by the Protocols in question."

Upon ratification:

Reservation:

"Article 7 (4) (b) of the Convention shall not apply with respect to the United States.

Declaration:

The United States declares, with reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention, that the United States will apply the provisions of the Convention, Protocol I, and Protocol II to all armed conflicts referred to in articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949.

Understandings :

The United States understands that article 6 (1) of the Protocol II does not prohibit the adaptation for use as booby-traps of portable objects created for a purpose other than as a booby-trap if the adaptation does not violate paragraph (1)(b) of the article.

The United States considers that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Convention, which refers to the substance of provisions of article 35 (3) and article 55 (1) of additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions for the Protection of War Victims of August 12, 1949, applies only to States which have accepted those provisions.

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 5 May 1981 and 24 May 1983, respectively, consenting to be bound by Protocols I, II and III adopted on 10 October 1980. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 2 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention accepting Protocols I, II and III, on 10 April 1981 and 31 August 1982, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under

"Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 10 April 1981 and 20 July 1982, respectively, accepting all three Protocols. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] A signature was affixed on behalf of the Lao People's Democratic Republic on 2 November 1982, i.e. after the time-limit of 10 April 1982 prescribed by article 3 of the Convention, as a result of an administrative oversight. The signature was cancelled; the Government of the Lao People's Democratic Republic subsequently acceded (on 3 January 1983) to the Convention, accepting the three Protocols.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[8] The protocols concerned are:

– Protocol on non-detectable fragments (Protocol I);

– Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of mines, booby-traps and other devices (Protocol II);

– Protocol on prohibitions or restrictions on the use of incendiary weapons (Protocol III).

Each participant must consent to be bound by any two or more of the Protocols. Acceptance of a Protocol is denoted by an "X". Unless otherwise indicated, acceptance was notified upon ratification, acceptance, approval of, accession or succession to the Convention.

Subsequent to the adoption of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (with Protocols I, II and III), the following Protocols were adopted:

- Additional Protocol to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol IV, entitled Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons) *(see chapter xxvi.2 a)*;

- Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996) annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects *(see chapter xxvi.2 b)*;

- Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol V) *(see chapter xxvi. 2 d)*.

Participants may also consent to be bound by these Protocols in order to comply with the requirement set forth in article 4 (3) of the Convention which provides as follows:

"Expressions of consent to be bound by any of the Protocols annexed to this Convention shall be optional for each State, provided that at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or of accession thereto, that State shall notify the Depositary of its consent to be bound by any annexed Protocol by which it is not already bound."

2. a) Additional Protocol to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol IV, entitled Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons)

Vienna, 13 October 1995

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 July 1998, in accordance with article 2 of the Additional Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 30 July 1998, No. 22495.
STATUS: Parties: 84.
TEXT: Doc. CCW/CONF.I/16 Part I).

Note: At its 8th plenary meeting on 13 October 1995, the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects adopted pursuant to article 8.3 (b) of the Convention an additional Protocol entitled "Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons (Protocol IV)".

Participant	*Consent to be bound (P)*	*Succession (d)*
Albania	28 Aug 2002 P	
Argentina	21 Oct 1998 P	
Australia	22 Aug 1997 P	
Austria	27 Jul 1998 P	
Bangladesh	6 Sep 2000 P	
Belarus	13 Sep 2000 P	
Belgium	10 Mar 1999 P	
Bolivia	21 Sep 2001 P	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11 Oct 2001 P	
Brazil	4 Oct 1999 P	
Bulgaria	3 Dec 1998 P	
Burkina Faso	26 Nov 2003 P	
Cambodia	25 Mar 1997 P	
Cameroon	7 Dec 2006 P	
Canada	5 Jan 1998 P	
Cape Verde	16 Sep 1997 P	
Chile	15 Oct 2003 P	
China	4 Nov 1998 P	
Colombia	6 Mar 2000 P	
Costa Rica	17 Dec 1998 P	
Croatia	25 Apr 2002 P	
Cyprus	22 Jul 2003 P	
Czech Republic	10 Aug 1998 P	
Denmark	30 Apr 1997 P	
Ecuador	16 Dec 2003 P	
El Salvador	26 Jan 2000 P	
Estonia	20 Apr 2000 P	
Finland	11 Jan 1996 P	
France	30 Jun 1998 P	
Georgia	14 Jul 2006 P	
Germany	27 Jun 1997 P	
Greece	5 Aug 1997 P	
Guatemala	30 Aug 2002 P	
Holy See	22 Jul 1997 P	
Honduras	30 Oct 2003 P	
Hungary	30 Jan 1998 P	
India	2 Sep 1999 P	
Ireland	27 Mar 1997 P	
Israel	30 Oct 2000 P	
Italy	13 Jan 1999 P	
Japan	10 Jun 1997 P	
Latvia	11 Mar 1998 P	
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 P	
Liechtenstein	19 Nov 1997 P	
Lithuania	3 Jun 1998 P	
Luxembourg	5 Aug 1999 P	
Maldives	7 Sep 2000 P	
Mali	24 Oct 2001 P	
Malta	24 Sep 2004 P	
Mauritius	24 Dec 2002 P	
Mexico	10 Mar 1998 P	
Moldova	8 Sep 2000 P	
Mongolia	6 Apr 1999 P	
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	19 Mar 2002 P	
Nauru	12 Nov 2001 P	
Netherlands[2]	25 Mar 1999 P	
New Zealand	8 Jan 1998 P	
Nicaragua	5 Dec 2000 P	
Norway	20 Apr 1998 P	
Pakistan	5 Dec 2000 P	
Panama	26 Mar 1997 P	
Peru	3 Jul 1997 P	
Philippines	12 Jun 1997 P	
Poland	23 Sep 2004 P	
Portugal	12 Nov 2001 P	
Romania	25 Aug 2003 P	
Russian Federation	9 Sep 1999 P	
Serbia	12 Aug 2003 P	
Seychelles	8 Jun 2000 P	
Sierra Leone	30 Sep 2004 P	
Slovakia	30 Nov 1999 P	
Slovenia	3 Dec 2002 P	
South Africa	26 Jun 1998 P	
Spain	19 Jan 1998 P	
Sri Lanka	24 Sep 2004 P	
Sweden	15 Jan 1997 P	
Switzerland	24 Mar 1998 P	
Tajikistan	12 Oct 1999 P	
Tunisia	23 Mar 2006 P	
Turkey	2 Mar 2005 P	
Ukraine	28 May 2003 P	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Feb 1999 P	
Uruguay	18 Sep 1998 P	
Uzbekistan	29 Sep 1997 P	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon acceptance.)

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"It is the understanding of the Government of Australia that the provisions of Protocol IV shall apply in all circumstances."

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

BELGIUM

Declaration:

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium that the provisions of Protocol IV which by their contents or nature may also be applied in peacetime, shall be observed at all times.

CANADA[3]

19 October 1998

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

GERMANY

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

GREECE

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

IRELAND

Declaration in relation to article 1:

"It is the understanding of Ireland that the provisions of the Additional Protocol which by their contents or nature may also be applied in peacetime, shall be observed at all times."

ISRAEL

Declaration:

"With reference to the scope of application defined in Article 1 of the Convention, the Government of the State of Israel will apply the provisions of the Protocol on Blinding Laser Weapons as well as the Convention and those annexed Protocols to which Israel has agreed to become bound, to all armed conflicts involving regular armed forces of States referred to in article 2 common to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949, as well as to all armed conflicts referred to in Article 3 common to the Geneva Convention of 12 August 1949."

ITALY

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

With regard to Article 1:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that the provisions of Protocol IV which, given their content or nature, can also be applied in peacetime must be observed in all circumstances."

POLAND

Declaration:

The Republic of Poland believes that the provisions of the Additional Protocol should also be applied during peacetime.

SOUTH AFRICA

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

SWEDEN

Declarations:

"--Sweden intends to apply the Protocol to all types of armed conflict;

--Sweden intends to pursue an international agreement by which the provisions of the Protocol shall be applicable to all types of armed conflict;

--Sweden has since long strived for explicit prohibition of the use of blinding laser which would risk causing permanent blindness to soldiers. Such an effect, in Sweden's view is contrary to the principle of international law prohibiting means and methods of warfare which cause unnecessary suffering."

SWITZERLAND

Declaration:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Australia.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration:

"In relation to Protocol IV, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that their application of its provisions will not be limited to the situations set out in Article 1 of the [1980] Convention."

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the declaration for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (i.e. 21 July 1998). None of the Contracting Parties to the Protocol having notified the Secretary-General of an objection within the 90 days period, the declaration was deemed to have been accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the 90 day period in question, i.e. on 19 october 1998.

2. b) Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996) annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects

Geneva, 3 May 1996

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 3 December 1998, in accordance with article 2 of the Protocol.
REGISTRATION: 3 December 1998, No. 22495.
STATUS: Parties: 87.
TEXT: Doc. CCW/CONF.I/16 (Part I).

Note: At its 14th plenary meeting on 3 May 1996, the Conference of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1980 adopted, pursuant to article 8 (1) (b) of the Convention, Protocol II, as amended.

Participant	*Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*	*Participant*	*Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*
Albania	28 Aug 2002 P	Liechtenstein	19 Nov 1997 P
Argentina	21 Oct 1998 P	Lithuania	3 Jun 1998 P
Australia	22 Aug 1997 P	Luxembourg	5 Aug 1999 P
Austria	27 Jul 1998 P	Maldives	7 Sep 2000 P
Bangladesh	6 Sep 2000 P	Mali	24 Oct 2001 P
Belarus	2 Mar 2004 P	Malta	24 Sep 2004 P
Belgium	10 Mar 1999 P	Moldova	16 Jul 2001 P
Bolivia	21 Sep 2001 P	Monaco	12 Aug 1997 P
Bosnia and Herzegovina	7 Sep 2000 P	Morocco	19 Mar 2002 P
Brazil	4 Oct 1999 P	Nauru	12 Nov 2001 P
Bulgaria	3 Dec 1998 P	Netherlands	25 Mar 1999 P
Burkina Faso	26 Nov 2003 P	New Zealand	8 Jan 1998 P
Cambodia	25 Mar 1997 P	Nicaragua	5 Dec 2000 P
Cameroon	7 Dec 2006 P	Norway	20 Apr 1998 P
Canada	5 Jan 1998 P	Pakistan	9 Mar 1999 P
Cape Verde	16 Sep 1997 P	Panama	3 Nov 1999 P
Chile	15 Oct 2003 P	Paraguay	22 Sep 2004 P
China	4 Nov 1998 P	Peru	3 Jul 1997 P
Colombia	6 Mar 2000 P	Philippines	12 Jun 1997 P
Costa Rica	17 Dec 1998 P	Poland	14 Oct 2003 P
Croatia	25 Apr 2002 P	Portugal	31 Mar 1999 P
Cyprus	22 Jul 2003 P	Republic of Korea	9 May 2001 P
Czech Republic	10 Aug 1998 P	Romania	25 Aug 2003 P
Denmark	30 Apr 1997 P	Russian Federation	2 Mar 2005 P
Ecuador	14 Aug 2000 P	Senegal	29 Nov 1999 P
El Salvador	26 Jan 2000 P	Seychelles	8 Jun 2000 P
Estonia	20 Apr 2000 P	Sierra Leone	30 Sep 2004 P
Finland	3 Apr 1998 P	Slovakia	30 Nov 1999 P
France	23 Jul 1998 P	Slovenia	3 Dec 2002 P
Germany	2 May 1997 P	South Africa	26 Jun 1998 P
Greece	20 Jan 1999 P	Spain	27 Jan 1998 P
Guatemala	29 Oct 2001 P	Sri Lanka	24 Sep 2004 P
Holy See	22 Jul 1997 P	Sweden	16 Jul 1997 P
Honduras	30 Oct 2003 P	Switzerland	24 Mar 1998 P
Hungary	30 Jan 1998 P	Tajikistan	12 Oct 1999 P
India	2 Sep 1999 P	The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	31 May 2005 P
Ireland	27 Mar 1997 P	Tunisia	23 Mar 2006 P
Israel	30 Oct 2000 P	Turkey	2 Mar 2005 P
Italy	13 Jan 1999 P	Turkmenistan	19 Mar 2004 P
Japan	10 Jun 1997 P	Ukraine	15 Dec 1999 P
Jordan	6 Sep 2000 P	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Feb 1999 P
Latvia	22 Aug 2002 P		
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 P		

Participant	*Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*
United States of America	24 May 1999 P
Uruguay.....	18 Aug 1998 P
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of) ...	19 Apr 2005 P

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon acceptance.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration in respect of article 1:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Ireland.]

Declaration in respect of article 2 (3):

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Ireland.]

BELARUS

Declaration:

"declared that according to paragraph 3 c) of the Technical annex of the Amended Protocol II the Republic of Belarus defers the implementation of paragraph 3 b) of the Amended Protocol II for a period of 9 years from the date on which the Amended Protocol II enters into force."

BELGIUM

Interpretative declarations:

Article 1:

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium that the provisions of Protocol II as amended which by their contents or nature may be applied also in peacetime, shall be observed at all times.

Article 2:

It is the understanding of the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium that the word 'primarily' is included in article 2, paragraph 3 of amended Protocol II to clarify that mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped.

CANADA[1]

19 October 1998

Reservation:

"Canada reserves the right to transfer and use a small number of mines prohibited under this Protocol to be used exclusively for training and testing purposes. Canada will ensure that the number of such mines shall not exceed that absolutely necessary for such purposes."

Statements of Understanding:

" 1. It is understood that the provisions of Amended Protocol II shall, as the context requires, be observed at all times.

2. It is understood that the word "primarily" is included in Article 2, paragraph 3 of Amended Protocol II to clarify that mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped.

3. It is understood that the maintenance of a minefield referred to in Article 10, in accordance with the standards on marking, monitoring and protection by fencing or other means set out in Amended Protocol II, would not be considered as a use of the mines contained therein."

CHINA

Declaration:

1. According to the provisions contained in Technical Annex 2 (c) and 3 (c) of the Amended Protocol II, China will defer compliance with 2 (b), 3 (a) and 3 (b);

Declaration in respect of article 2 (3):

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Ireland.]

DENMARK

Declarations:

[Same declarations, mutatis mutandis , as those made by Ireland.]

FINLAND

Declarations:

[Same declarations, mutatis mutandis , as those made by Ireland.]

FRANCE

Declarations concerning the scope of amended Protocol II:

[Same declarations, mutatis mutandis , as those made by Ireland in regard to article 1 and 2 of the Protocol.]

Article 4:

France takes it that article 4 and Technical Annex to amended Protocol II do not require the removal or replacement of mines that have already been laid.

Declaration concerning standards on marking, monitoring and protection:

The provisions of amended Protocol II such as those concerning the marking, monitoring and protection of zones which contain anti-personnel mines and are under the control of a party, are applicable to all zones containing mines, irrespective of the date on which those mines were laid.

GERMANY

Declarations in respect of articles 1 and 2:

[Same declarations, *mutatis mutandis*, as those made by Ireland.]

Declaration:

Article 5 paragraph 2 (b):

It is understood that article 5, paragraph 2 (b) does not preclude agreement among the states concerned, in connection with peace treaties or similar arrangements, to allocate respon-

sibilities under paragraph 2 (b) in another manner which nevertheless respects the essential spirit and purpose of the article.

GREECE

Declaration in respect of article 1:

"It is understood that the provisions of the protocol shall, as the context requires, be observed at all times."

Declaration in respect of article 2 (3):

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Ireland.]

Declaration in respect of article 5, paragraph 2 (b):

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Germany.]

HUNGARY

Declaration:

The Republic of Hungary

1) declines to observe the 9 year period of deferral on compliance as allowed for in Paragraphs 2 (c) and 3 (c) of the Technical Annex to Amended Protocol II, and even prior to the entry into force of Amended Protocol II intends to be bound by its implementation measures as stipulated therein, as well as the rules of procedure regarding record keeping, detectability, self-destruction and self-deactivation and perimeter marking as stipulated in the Technical Annex;

2) intends to eliminate and eventually destroy its entire stockpile of anti-personnel landmines by December 31, 2000 the latest, in addition to the already undertaken destruction of stockpiled landmines, as initiated in August of 1996 and completed in 40%;

3) refrains from the emplacement of anti-personnel landmines and, for the duration of their complete destruction, intends to designate a central storage facility to pool the remainder stock of anti-personnel landmines as a way to facilitate inspection by international monitors;

4) announces a total ban on the development, production, acquisition, export and transfer of all types of anti-personnel landmines;

5) refrains from the operational use of anti-personnel landmines, unless a policy-revision becomes necessitated by a significant deterioration in the national security environment of the country, in which case due attention shall be paid to compliance with laws governing international warfare;

6) stands ready to engage in implementing appropriate confidence building measures, as a way to be enabled to present the implementation of the measures announced unilaterally by the Republic of Hungary in the course of joint military, educational, and training and other cooperational activities conducted with other armed forces;

7) offers appropriate technical and training assistance to international organizations engaged in de-mining activities;

8) urges her neighbours and other countries in the region to seek unilateral or coordinated measures designed to achieve the total elimination of all types of anti-personnel landmines from the weapons arsenal of the countries in the region, and expresses her readiness to engage in further negotiations to advance this cause;

9) reiterates her commitment to promote the early conclusion of and wide adherence to an international convention stipulating a total and comprehensive ban on anti-personnel landmines, by reaffirming her determination to contribute actively to the success of international efforts furthering this goal.

IRELAND

Declarations:

Article 1 :

"It is the understanding of Ireland that the provisions of the amended Protocol which by their contents or nature may be applied also in peacetime, shall be observed at all times."

Article 2 (3):

"It is the understanding of Ireland that the word 'primarily' is included in article 2, paragraph 3 of the amended Protocol to clarify that mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped."

ISRAEL

Declaration:

"*Article 1:*

The declaration made by Israel upon accession to the [Convention], shall be equally applicable regarding the Amended Protocol II.

Article 2 (3):

Israel understands that the word 'primarily' is included in article 2, paragraph 3 of the Amended Protocol II, to clarify that mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of vehicles as opposed to persons, that are equipped with anti-handling devices are not considered Anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped.

Article 3 (9):

Israel understands, regarding article 3, paragraph 9, that an area of land can itself be a legitimate military objective for the purpose of the use of landmines, if its neutralization or denial of its use, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.

Article 4:

It is the understanding of the State of Israel, regarding article 4 of the Amended Protocol II and the Technical Annex, that article 4 of the Amended Protocol II shall not apply to mines already emplaced. However, provisions of the Amended Protocol II, such as those regarding marking, monitoring and protection of areas containing mines under the control of a high contracting party, shall apply to all areas containing mines, regardless of when the mines were emplaced.

Article 5 (2) (b):

Israel understands that article 5 paragraph 2 (b) does not apply to the transfer of areas pursuant to peace treaties, agreements on the cessation of hostilities, or as part of a peace process or steps leading thereto.

Article 7 (f) (1):

Israel reserves the right to use other devices (as defined in Article 2 (5) of the Amended Protocol II) to destroy any stock of food or drink that is judged likely to be used by an enemy military force, if due precautions are taken for the safety of the civilian population.

Article 11 (7):

(a) Israel understands that the provision on technical assitance mentioned on article 11 paragraph 7, will be without prejudice to a High contracting Party's constitutional and other legal provisions.

(b) No provision of the Amended Protocol II may be construed as affecting the discretion of the State of Israel to refuse assisstance or to restrict or deny permission for the export equipment, material or scientific or technological information for any reason.

Article 14:

a) It is the understanding of the Government of the State of Israel that the compliance of commanders and others responsi-

ble for planning, deciding upon, or executing military actions to which the Convention on Conventional Weapons and its Protocols apply, cannot be judged on the basis of information which subsequently but comes to light, but must be assessed on the basis of the information available to them at the time that such actions were taken.

b) Article 14 of the Amended Protocol II (insofar as it relates to penal sanctions) shall apply only in a situation in which an individual-

1) Knew, or should have known, that his action was prohibited under the Amended Protocol II,

2) intended to kill or cause serious injury to a civilian; and

3) knew or should have known, that the person he intended to kill or cause serious injury to was a civilian.

c) Israel understands that the provisions of article 14 of the amended Protocol II relating to penal sanctions refer to measures by authorities of States Parties to the Protocol and do not authorize the trial of any person before an international criminal tribunal. Israel shall not recognize the jurisdiction of any international tribunal to prosecute an Israel citizen for violation of the Protocol or the Convention on Covnentional Weapons.

General:

Israel understands that nothing in the Amended Protocol II may be construed as restriction or affecting in any way non-lethal weapon technology that is designed to temporarily disable, stun, signal the presence of a person, or operate in any other fashion, but not to cause permanent incapacity."

ITALY

Declaration in respect of article 1:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Ireland.]

Declaration in respect of article 2:

"Under article 2 of the amended Protocol II, in order to fully address the humanitarian concerns raised by anti-personnel land-mines, the Italian Parliament has enacted and brought into force a legislation containing a far more stringent definition of those devices. In this regard, while reaffirming its commitment to promote the further development of international humanitarian law, the Italian Government confirms its understanding that the word 'primarily' is included in article 2, paragraph 3 of the amended Protocol II to clarify that mines designed to be detonated by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle as opposed to a person, that are equipped with anti-handling devices, are not considered anti-personnel mines as a result of being so equipped."

Declaration in respect of article 5, paragraph 2 (b):

"Under article 5 of the amended Protocol II, it is the understanding of the Italian Government that article 5 (paragraph 2) does not preclude agreement in connection with peace treaties and related agreements among concerned states to allocate responsibilites under this paragraph in another manner which reflects the spirit and purpose of the article."

LATVIA

Declaration:

"According to the sub-paragraph (c) of paragraph 2 of the Technical Annex of the Protocol on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Mines, Booby-Traps and Other Devices as amended on 3 May 1996 (Protocol II as amended on 3 May 1996), the Republic of Latvia declares that it will defer compliance with sub-paragraph (b) for a period of 9 years from the entry into force of the said Protocol."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration in respect of article 1:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Ireland.]

NETHERLANDS

Declarations:

With regard to Article 1, paragraph 2:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that the provisions of the Protocol which, given their content or nature, can also be applied in peacetime, must be observed in all circumstances."

With regard to Article 2, paragraph 3:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that the word 'primarily' means only that mines that are designed to be exploded by the presence, proximity or contact of a vehicle and that are equipped with an anti-handling device are not regarded as anti-personnel mines because of that device."

With regard to Article 2, paragraph 6:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that a specific area of land may also be a military objective if, because of its location or other reasons specified in paragraph six, its total or partial destruction, capture, or neutralization in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definitive military advantage."

With regard to Article 3, paragraph 8, under c:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that military advantage refers to the advantage anticipated from the attack considered as a whole and not only from isolated or particular parts of the attack.

With regard to Article 12, paragraph 2, under b:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands takes the view that the words 'as far as it is able' mean 'as far as it is technically able'."

PAKISTAN

Declarations:

"Article 1:

- It is understood that for the purposes of interpretation the provisions of article 1 take precedence over provisions or undertakings in any other article.
- The rights and obligations arising from situations described in article 1 are absolute and immutable and the observance of any other provision of the Protocol cannot be construed, either directly or indirectly, as affecting the right of peoples struggling against colonial or other forms of alien domination and foreign occupation in the exercise of their inalienable right of self-determination, as enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations and the Declaration on Principles of International Law Concerning Friendly Relations and Co-operation among states in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.
- The provisions of the Protocol must be observed at all times, depending on the circumstances.

Article 2 (Paragraph 3):

- In the context of the word "primarily", it is understood that such anti-tank mines which use anti-personnel mines as a fuse but do not explode on contact with a person are not anti-personnel mines.

Article 3 (Paragraph 9):

- It is understood that an area of land can itself be a legitimate military objective for the purposes of the use of land-

mines, if its neutralisation or denial, in the circumstances ruling at the time, offers a definite military advantage.

Sub-paras 2(c) and 3(c) of Technical Annex:

- It is declared that compliance with sub-paras 2(b) and 3(a) and (b) is deferred as provided for in sub-paras 2(c) and 3(c), respectively."

South Africa

Declarations in respect of articles 1 and 2 (3):

[Same declarations, mutatis mutandis, as those made by Ireland.]

Article 5 paragraph 2 (b):

"It is understood that Article 5 (2) (b) does not preclude agreement among the States concerned, in connection with peace treaties or similar arrangements, to allocate responsibilities under this paragraph in another manner which nevertheless respects the essential spirit and purpose of the Article."

Republic of Korea

Reservation and declarations :

"I. Reservation

With respect to the application of Protocol II to the 1980 Convention, as amended on 3 May 1996 ("Amended Mines Protocol"), the Republic of Korea reserves the right to use a small number of mines prohibited under this Protocol exclusively for training and testing purposes.

II. Declarations

It is the understanding of the Republic of Korea that:

1. With respect to Article 3(8)(a) of the Amended Mines Protocol, in case there is an evident indication that an object which is normally dedicated to civilian purposes, such as a place of worship, a house or other dwelling or a school, is being used to make an effective contribution to military action, it shall be considered as a military object.

2. Article 4 and the Technical Annex of the Amended Mines Protocol do not require the removal or replacement of mines that have already been laid.

3. "Cessation of active hostilities" provided for in Articles 9(2) and 10(1) of the Amended Mines Protocol is interpreted as meaning the time when the present Armistice regime on the Korean peninsula has been transformed into a peace regime, establishing a stable peace on the Korean peninsula.

4. Any decision by any military commander, military personnel, or any other person responsible for planning, authorizing, or executing military action shall only be judged on the basis of that person's assessment of the information reasonably available to the person at the time the person planned, authorized, or executed that action under review, and shall not be judged on the basis of information that comes to light after the action under review was taken."

Russian Federation

Declarations:

1. For the purposes of interpreting subparagraph 10 (c) of article 3, of Protocol II, the Russian Federation understands alternatives as non-flying devices and technologies which are not anti-personnel mines and may temporarily disable, paralyse or indicate the presence of one or several persons without causing irreversible harm to them;

2. In implementing subparagraph 2 (a) of article 5, of Protocol II, the Russian Federation holds the position that anti-personnel mines which are not remotely-delivered will be placed within perimeter-marked areas which are monitored by military personnel and protected by fencing or other means, to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians from such areas. Such marking must be of a distinct and durable character and must at least be visible to a person who is about to enter the perimeter-marked area. The line of the State border designated in the locality may be considered as the marking (designation) of part of the perimeter of a mined area within the border zone when there are active and repeated attempts to traverse it by armed intruders or when military, economic, physical and geographic, or other conditions make it impossible to use armed forces. The civilian population will be informed in good time about the danger of the mines and will not be allowed into the mined area;

3. For the purposes of interpreting subparagraph 1 (i) of article 7, of Protocol II, the Russian Federation understands the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples as cultural property in the terms of article 1 of the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict of 1954;

4. The Russian Federation understands the commonly available technical mine detection equipment referred to in paragraph 2 (a) of the Technical Annex to Protocol II as the mine-searching equipment which is available in the Russian Federation and meets the requirements of the aforementioned paragraph;

5. In accordance with paragraph 2 (c) and paragraph 3 (c) of the Technical Annex to Protocol II, the Russian Federation will ensure the observance of paragraph 2 (b) and paragraphs 3 (a) and 3 (b) of the Technical Annex to Protocol II not later than nine years from the date of the entry into force of the said Protocol.

Sweden

Declarations in respect of articles 1 and 2:

"Sweden intends to apply the Protocol also in time of peace."

Declaration in respect of article 2 (3):

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by Ireland.]

Declaration in respect of articles 5, paragraph 2:

"Sweden is of the opinion that the obligations ensuing from article 5, paragraph 2 shall not be interpreted to the effect that the High Contracting Parties or parties in a conflict are prevented from entering into an agreement allowing another party to conduct mine clearance."

Ukraine

Declaration:

Ukraine declares that it shall defer implementation of the provisions of subparagraphs 3 (a) and (b) of the technical annex for a period of nine years from the date on which this Protocol enters into force.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Declarations:

"(a)the [declaration conveying consent to be bound by Protocols I, II and III to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Conventional Weapons which may be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects, concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1980], in so far as it applies to Protocol II to the [1980] Convention, continues to apply to Protocol II as amended;

(b) the [declaration dated 28 January 1998 accompanying the United Kingdom's ratification of Additional Protocol I to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 relating to the Protection of Victims of Armed Conflicts, opened for signature at Geneva on 12 December 1977], in so far as it is relevant, also applies to the provisions of Protocol II as amended;

(c) nothing in the present declaration or in Protocol II as amended shall be taken as limiting the obligations of the United Kingdom under the [Convention on the Prohibition and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction concluded at Oslo on 18 September 1997 (the "Ottawa Convention")] nor its rights in relation to other Parties to that Convention;

(d) Article 2 (14) is interpreted to have the same meaning as Article 2 (3) of the Ottawa Convention;

(e) the references in Article 12 (2) to "force" and "mission" are interpreted as including forces and missions authorised by the United Nations Security Council under Chapter VII or Chapter VIII of the Charter of the United Nations which are deployed by a regional arrangement or agency. This applies to all such forces or missions, whether or not they include contingents contributed by non-member States of the regional arrangement or agency."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"I. The senate's advice and consent is subject to the following reservation:

"The United States reserves the right to use other devices (as defined in Article 2(5) of the Amended Mines Protocol) to destroy any stock of food or drink that is judged likely to be used by an enemy military force, if due precautions are taken for the safety of the civilian population."

II. The Senate's advice and consent is subject to the following understandings:

(1)UNITED STATES COMPLIANCE, - The United States understands that -

(A) any decision by any military commander, military personnel, or any other person responsible for planning, authorizing, or executing military action shall only be judged on the basis of that person's assessment of the information reasonably available to the person at the time the person planned, authorized, or executed the action under review, and shall not be judged on the basis of information that comes to light after the action under review was taken; and

(B) Article 14 of the Amended Mines Protocol (insofar as it relates to penal sanctions) shall apply only in a situation in which an individual -

(i) knew, or should have known, that his action was prohibited under the Amended Mines Protocol;

(ii) intended to kill or cause serious injury to a civilian; and

(iii) knew or should have known, that the person he intended to kill or cause serious injury was a civilian.

(2) EFFECTIVE EXCLUSION. - The United States understands that, for the purposes of Article 5(6)(b) of the Amended Mines Protocol, the maintenance of observation over avenues of approach where mines subject to that Article are deployed constitutes one acceptable form of monitoring to ensure the effective exclusion of civilians.

(3) HISTORIC MONUMENTS. - The United states understands that Article 7(1)(i) of the Amended Mines Protocol refers only to a limited class of objects that, because of their clearly recognizable characteristics and because of their widely recognized importance, constitute a part of the cultural or spiritual heritage of peoples.

(4) LEGITIMATE MILITARY OBJECTIVES. - The United States understands that an area of land itself can be a legitimate military objective for the purpose of the use of landmines, if its neutralization or denial, in the circumstances applicable at the time, offers a military advantage.

(5) PEACE TREATIES. - The United States understands that the allocation of responsibilities for landmines in Article 5(2)(b) of the Amended Mines Protocol does not preclude agreement, in connection with peace treaties or similar arrangements, to allocate responsibilities under that Article in a manner that respects the essential spirit and purpose of the Article.

(6) BOOBY-TRAPS AND OTHER DEVICES. - For the purposes of the Amended Mines Protocol, the United States understands that -

(A) the prohibition contained in Article 7(2) of the Amended Mines Protocol does not preclude the expedient adaptation or adaptation in advance of other objects for use as booby-traps or other devices;

(B) a trip-wired hand grenade shall be considered a "booby-trap" under Article 2(4) of the Amended Mines Protocol and shall not be considered a "mine" or an "anti-personnel mine" under Article 2(1) or Article 2(3), respectively; and

(C) none of the provisions of the Amended Mines Protocol, including Article 2(5), applies to hand grenades other than trip-wired hand grenades.

(7) NON-LETHAL CAPABILITIES. - The United States understands that nothing in the Amended Mines Protocol may be construed as restricting or affecting in any way non-lethal weapon technology that is designed to temporarily disable, stun, signal the presence of a person, or operate in any other fashion, but not to cause permanent incapacity.

(8) INTERNATIONAL TRIBUNAL JURISDICTION. - The United States understands that the provisions of Article 14 of the Amended Mines Protocol relating to penal sanctions refer to measures by the authorities of States Parties to the Protocol and do not authorize the trial of any person before an international criminal tribunal. The United States shall not recognize the jurisdiction of any international tribunal to prosecute a United States citizen for a violation of the Protocol or the Convention on Conventional Weapons.

(9) TECHNICAL COOPERATION AND ASSISTANCE. - The United States understands that -

(A) no provision of the Protocol may be construed as affecting the discretion of the United States to refuse assistance or to restrict or deny permission for the export of equipment, material, or scientific or technological information for any reason; and

(B) the Amended Mines Protocol may not be used as a pretext for the transfer of weapons technology or the provision of assistance to the military mining or military counter-mining capabilities of a State Party to the Protocol."

Notes:

[1] In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the declaration for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (i.e. 21 July 1998). None of the Contracting Parties to the Protocol having notified the Secretary-General of an objection within the 90 days period, the declaration was deemed to have been accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the 90 day period in question, i.e., on 19 October 1998.

2. c) Amendment to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects

Geneva, 21 December 2001

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 18 May 2004 , in accordance with article 8, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention which reads, in part, as follows: "amendments ... shall enter into force in the same manner as the Convention and the annexed Protocols (i.e. ... six months after the date of deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. ".

REGISTRATION: 18 May 2004, No. 22495.

STATUS: Parties: 49.

TEXT: Doc. CCW/CONF/II/2 and depositary notification C.N.104.2002.TREATIES-1 of 11 February 2002; C.N.1329.2005.TREATIES-9 of 3 January 2006 (Proposal of correction to the authentic Russian text) and C.N.130.2006.TREATIES-1 of 9 February 2006 (Correction to the Authentic Russian text).

Note: At the Second Review Conference, held in Geneva from 11 to 21 December 2001, the Parties to the Convention on the Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Convention Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects concluded at Geneva on 10 October 1980 adopted, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 8 (1) (b) of the Convention, the Amendment to Article 1 of the said Convention as set out in the Final Declaration of the Second Review Conference (Doc. CCW/CONF/II/2).

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania	12 May 2006 a
Argentina	25 Feb 2004 a
Australia	3 Dec 2002 A
Austria	25 Sep 2003 A
Belgium	12 Feb 2004
Bulgaria	28 Feb 2003
Burkina Faso	26 Nov 2003 a
Canada	22 Jul 2002 A
China	11 Aug 2003
Croatia	27 May 2003
Czech Republic	6 Jun 2006
Denmark	15 Sep 2004 A
Estonia	12 May 2003
Finland	22 Jun 2004 A
France	10 Dec 2002 AA
Germany	26 Jan 2005 A
Greece	26 Nov 2004
Holy See	9 Dec 2002 A
Hungary	27 Dec 2002
India	18 May 2005 a
Ireland	8 Nov 2006 A
Italy	1 Sep 2004
Japan	10 Jul 2003 A
Latvia	23 Apr 2003 a
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Liechtenstein	18 Jun 2004 A
Lithuania	12 May 2003 A
Luxembourg	13 Jun 2005
Malta	24 Sep 2004 a
Mexico	22 May 2003 A
Moldova	5 Jan 2005 a
Montenegro[1]	23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[3]	19 May 2004 A
Norway	18 Nov 2003 AA
Panama	16 Aug 2004 a
Peru	14 Feb 2005
Poland	15 Sep 2006
Republic of Korea	13 Feb 2003 A
Romania	25 Aug 2003 a
Serbia	11 Nov 2003 A
Sierra Leone	30 Sep 2004
Slovakia	11 Feb 2004
Spain	9 Feb 2004
Sri Lanka	24 Sep 2004 a
Sweden	3 Dec 2002 A
Switzerland	19 Jan 2004 A
Turkey	2 Mar 2005
Ukraine	29 Jun 2005 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	25 Jul 2002 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the reservations and declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

HOLY SEE

Declaration:

".... declares the acceptance on the part of the Holy See of said amendment to Article I of the Convention, considering that in accordance with paragraph 4 of amended Article 1 the right of the Parties, "by all legitimate means, to maintain or re-establish law and order in the State or to defend the national unity and territorial integrity of the State" should be interpreted in conformity with international humanitarian law, the United Nations' Charter and other international rules."

MEXICO

Interpretative declaration:

The Government of Mexico understands that the conflicts not of an international character referred to in article 1, paragraph 3 as amended correspond to the situations referred to in article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 1949.

The Government of Mexico further understands that article 1, paragraph 7, as amended does not prejudice the applicability of future protocols to such situations as those defined in article 1, paragraph 2, as amended, and reserves the right to take positions that best accommodate its interests in negotiating future additional protocols.

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Upon ratification, the Government of China communicated the following:

"In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1990 and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1993, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Amendment to Article I of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China."

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

2. d) Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons which may be deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to have Indiscriminate Effects (Protocol V)

Geneva, 28 November 2003

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 12 November 2006, in accordance with article 5 (3) and (4) of the Convention.

REGISTRATION: 12 November 2006, No. 22495.

STATUS: Parties: 28.

TEXT: Doc.CCW/MSP/2003/2 and depositary notification C.N.42.2004.TREATIES-2 of 11 March 2004; C.N.181.2004.TREATIES-9 of 26 February 2004 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Chinese version)] and C.N.542.2004.TREATIES-10 of 27 May 2004 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Chinese version); C.N.693.2004.TREATIES-8 of 6 July 2004 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Spanish version)] and C.N.1084.TREATIES-12 of 7 October 2004 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Spanish version)]; C.N.1076.2004.TREATIES-11 of 4 October 2004 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (French version)], C.N.1347.2004.TREATIES-12 of 18 February 2005 (Objection to the proposed corrections to the authentic French text of the Protocol) and C.N.105.2005.TREATIES-2 of 18 February 2005 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (French version)]; C.N.1110.2004.TREATIES-11 OF 26 October 2004 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Spanish version)] and C.N.37.2005.TREATIES-1 of 25 January 2005 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Spanish version)]; C.N.375.2006.TREATIES-4 of 15 May 2006 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Spanish version)]; C.N.123.2005.TREATIES-2 of 24 February 2005 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (French version)] and C.N.222.2005.TREATIES-4 of 29 March 2005 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (French version)]; C.N.138.2006.TREATIES-1 of 10 February 2006 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Russian version) and C.N.385.2006.TREATIES-7 of 16 May 2006 [Corrections to the original text of the Protocol (Russian version); C.N.437.2006.TREATIES-9 of 1 June 2006, C.N.241.2006.TREATIES-1 of 22 March 2006, C.N.440.2006.TREATIES-9 of 1 June 2006 and C.N.379.2006.TREATIES-4 of 16 May 2006, (Corrected versions of the Chinese, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts of the Protocol, respectively).

Note: The above Protocol was adopted by the Meeting of the States Parties to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects held in Geneva on 28 November 2003. The Protocol shall be open to all States for consent to be bound in accordance with article 4 of the Convention.

Participant	*Consent to be bound (P), Succession (d)*		
Albania	12	May 2006	P
Bulgaria	7	Nov 2005	P
Croatia	7	Feb 2005	P
Czech Republic	6	Jun 2006	P
Denmark	28	Jun 2005	P
El Salvador	23	Mar 2006	P
Estonia	18	Dec 2006	P
Finland	23	Mar 2005	P
France	31	Oct 2006	P
Germany	3	Mar 2005	P
Holy See	13	Dec 2005	P
Hungary	13	Nov 2006	P
India	18	May 2005	P
Ireland	8	Nov 2006	P
Liberia	16	Sep 2005	P
Liechtenstein	12	May 2006	P
Lithuania	29	Sep 2004	P
Luxembourg	13	Jun 2005	P
Malta	22	Sep 2006	P
Netherlands	18	Jul 2005	P
Nicaragua	15	Sep 2005	P
Norway	8	Dec 2005	P
Sierra Leone	30	Sep 2004	P
Slovakia	23	Mar 2006	P
Sweden	2	Jun 2004	P
Switzerland	12	May 2006	P
Tajikistan	18	May 2006	P
Ukraine	17	May 2005	P

HOLY SEE

Declaration :

In acceding to the Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War (ERW) annexed to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May be Deemed to be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects (CCW), adopted on November 28, 2003, at the meeting of the States Parties to the CCW, the Holy See, as it did on June 16, 1997 when it acceded to the Convention and its first four Protocols, "in keeping with its proper nature and with the particular condition of Vatican City State, intends to renew its encouragement to the International Community to continue on the path it has taken for the reduction of human suffering caused by armed conflict".

With the approval of the fifth Protocol, the CCW is confirmed as a "forward-looking living instrument"of international humanitarian law, intended to address the problems arising from modern armed conflicts and to improve its effectiveness for the protection of civilians and combatants in such situations. Although one could have wished for a greater incisiveness in the Protocol in responding to the problems originating from the ERW, the adoption of this instrument represents an important multilateral tool for the control of arms for humanitarian reasons, capable of calling States to responsibility for eh ERW and for damages caused by them.

In keeping with it own commitment to encouraging the development and implementation of humanitarian law on the part of all States and in all circumstances, the Holy See is convinced that the Fifth Protocol signifies a concretely promoting the culture of life and of peace, based upon the dignity of the human person and the primacy of the rule of law, through a responsible, hones and consistent cooperation of all the members of the community of nations.

3. Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction

Geneva, 3 September 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 April 1997, in accordance with article XXI (1).
REGISTRATION: 29 April 1997, No. 33757.
STATUS: Signatories: 165. Parties: 181.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1974, p. 45; and depositary notifications C.N.246.1994.TREATIES-5 of 31 August 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original of the Convention: Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts); C.N.359.1994.TREATIES-8 of 27 January 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original of the Convention: Spanish text); C.N.454.1995.TREATIES-12 of 2 February 1996 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original of the Convention: Arabic and Russian texts); C.N.916.1999.TREATIES-7 of 8 October 1999 [acceptance of amendment for a change to Section B of Part VI of the Annex on Implementation and Verification ("Verification Annex"), effective 31 October 1999] and C.N.610.2005.TREATIES-4 of 29 July 2005 [Approval of changes to Part V of the Annex on Implementation and Verification ("Verification Annex")]; and C.N.157.2000.TREATIES-1 of 13 March 2000 [acceptance of corrections to amendments, effective 9 March 2000].

Note: At its 635th plenary meeting on 3 September 1992 held in Geneva, the Conference on Disarmament adopted the "Report of the *Ad Hoc* Committee on Chemical Weapons to the Conference on Disarmament", including the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, contained in the Appendix to the Report. At its 47th session held in New York, the General Assembly, by resolution A/RES/47/39[1] adopted on 30 November 1992, commended the Convention. In the same resolution, the General Assembly also welcomed the invitation of the President of the French Republic to participate in a ceremony to sign the Convention in Paris on 13 January 1993 and requested the Secretary-General, as Depositary of the Convention, to open it for signature in Paris on that date. The Convention was opened for signature in Paris, from 13 January to 15 January 1993. Thereafter, it remained open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York, until its entry into force, in accordance with article XVIII.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	14 Jan 1993	24 Sep 2003
Albania	14 Jan 1993	11 May 1994
Algeria	13 Jan 1993	14 Aug 1995
Andorra		27 Feb 2003 a
Antigua and Barbuda		29 Aug 2005 a
Argentina	13 Jan 1993	2 Oct 1995
Armenia	19 Mar 1993	27 Jan 1995
Australia	13 Jan 1993	6 May 1994
Austria	13 Jan 1993	17 Aug 1995
Azerbaijan	13 Jan 1993	29 Feb 2000
Bahamas	2 Mar 1994	
Bahrain	24 Feb 1993	28 Apr 1997
Bangladesh	14 Jan 1993	25 Apr 1997
Belarus	14 Jan 1993	11 Jul 1996
Belgium	13 Jan 1993	27 Jan 1997
Belize		1 Dec 2003 a
Benin	14 Jan 1993	14 May 1998
Bhutan	24 Apr 1997	18 Aug 2005
Bolivia	14 Jan 1993	14 Aug 1998
Bosnia and Herzegovina	16 Jan 1997	25 Feb 1997
Botswana		31 Aug 1998 a
Brazil	13 Jan 1993	13 Mar 1996
Brunei Darussalam	13 Jan 1993	28 Jul 1997
Bulgaria	13 Jan 1993	10 Aug 1994
Burkina Faso	14 Jan 1993	8 Jul 1997
Burundi	15 Jan 1993	4 Sep 1998
Cambodia	15 Jan 1993	19 Jul 2005
Cameroon	14 Jan 1993	16 Sep 1996
Canada	13 Jan 1993	26 Sep 1995
Cape Verde	15 Jan 1993	10 Oct 2003
Central African Republic	14 Jan 1993	20 Sep 2006
Chad	11 Oct 1994	13 Feb 2004
Chile	14 Jan 1993	12 Jul 1996
China	13 Jan 1993	25 Apr 1997
Colombia	13 Jan 1993	5 Apr 2000
Comoros	13 Jan 1993	18 Aug 2006
Congo	15 Jan 1993	
Cook Islands	14 Jan 1993	15 Jul 1994
Costa Rica	14 Jan 1993	31 May 1996
Côte d'Ivoire	13 Jan 1993	18 Dec 1995
Croatia	13 Jan 1993	23 May 1995
Cuba	13 Jan 1993	29 Apr 1997
Cyprus	13 Jan 1993	28 Aug 1998
Czech Republic	14 Jan 1993	6 Mar 1996
Democratic Republic of the Congo	14 Jan 1993	12 Oct 2005
Denmark	14 Jan 1993	13 Jul 1995
Djibouti	28 Sep 1993	25 Jan 2006
Dominica	2 Aug 1993	12 Feb 2001
Dominican Republic	13 Jan 1993	
Ecuador	14 Jan 1993	6 Sep 1995
El Salvador	14 Jan 1993	30 Oct 1995
Equatorial Guinea	14 Jan 1993	25 Apr 1997
Eritrea		14 Feb 2000 a
Estonia	14 Jan 1993	26 May 1999
Ethiopia	14 Jan 1993	13 May 1996
Fiji	14 Jan 1993	20 Jan 1993

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Succession (d)*
Finland	14 Jan 1993	7 Feb 1995
France	13 Jan 1993	2 Mar 1995
Gabon	13 Jan 1993	8 Sep 2000
Gambia	13 Jan 1993	19 May 1998
Georgia	14 Jan 1993	27 Nov 1995
Germany	13 Jan 1993	12 Aug 1994
Ghana	14 Jan 1993	9 Jul 1997
Greece	13 Jan 1993	22 Dec 1994
Grenada	9 Apr 1997	3 Jun 2005
Guatemala	14 Jan 1993	12 Feb 2003
Guinea	14 Jan 1993	9 Jun 1997
Guinea-Bissau	14 Jan 1993	
Guyana	6 Oct 1993	12 Sep 1997
Haiti	14 Jan 1993	22 Feb 2006
Holy See	14 Jan 1993	12 May 1999
Honduras	13 Jan 1993	29 Aug 2005
Hungary	13 Jan 1993	31 Oct 1996
Iceland	13 Jan 1993	28 Apr 1997
India	14 Jan 1993	3 Sep 1996
Indonesia	13 Jan 1993	12 Nov 1998
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	13 Jan 1993	3 Nov 1997
Ireland	14 Jan 1993	24 Jun 1996
Israel	13 Jan 1993	
Italy	13 Jan 1993	8 Dec 1995
Jamaica	18 Apr 1997	8 Sep 2000
Japan	13 Jan 1993	15 Sep 1995
Jordan		29 Oct 1997 a
Kazakhstan	14 Jan 1993	23 Mar 2000
Kenya	15 Jan 1993	25 Apr 1997
Kiribati		7 Sep 2000 a
Kuwait	27 Jan 1993	29 May 1997
Kyrgyzstan	22 Feb 1993	29 Sep 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic	13 May 1993	25 Feb 1997
Latvia	6 May 1993	23 Jul 1996
Lesotho	7 Dec 1994	7 Dec 1994
Liberia	15 Jan 1993	23 Feb 2006
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		6 Jan 2004 a
Liechtenstein	21 Jul 1993	24 Nov 1999
Lithuania	13 Jan 1993	15 Apr 1998
Luxembourg	13 Jan 1993	15 Apr 1997
Madagascar	15 Jan 1993	20 Oct 2004
Malawi	14 Jan 1993	11 Jun 1998
Malaysia	13 Jan 1993	20 Apr 2000
Maldives	4 Oct 1993	31 May 1994
Mali	13 Jan 1993	28 Apr 1997
Malta	13 Jan 1993	28 Apr 1997
Marshall Islands	13 Jan 1993	19 May 2004
Mauritania	13 Jan 1993	9 Feb 1998
Mauritius	14 Jan 1993	9 Feb 1993
Mexico	13 Jan 1993	29 Aug 1994
Micronesia (Federated States of)	13 Jan 1993	21 Jun 1999
Moldova	13 Jan 1993	8 Jul 1996
Monaco	13 Jan 1993	1 Jun 1995
Mongolia	14 Jan 1993	17 Jan 1995
Montenegro[2]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	13 Jan 1993	28 Dec 1995
Mozambique		15 Aug 2000 a
Myanmar	14 Jan 1993	
Namibia	13 Jan 1993	24 Nov 1995
Nauru	13 Jan 1993	12 Nov 2001
Nepal	19 Jan 1993	18 Nov 1997
Netherlands[3]	14 Jan 1993	30 Jun 1995
New Zealand	14 Jan 1993	15 Jul 1996
Nicaragua	9 Mar 1993	5 Nov 1999
Niger	14 Jan 1993	9 Apr 1997
Nigeria	13 Jan 1993	20 May 1999
Niue		21 Apr 2005 a
Norway	13 Jan 1993	7 Apr 1994
Oman	2 Feb 1993	8 Feb 1995
Pakistan	13 Jan 1993	28 Oct 1997
Palau		3 Feb 2003 a
Panama	16 Jun 1993	7 Oct 1998
Papua New Guinea	14 Jan 1993	17 Apr 1996
Paraguay	14 Jan 1993	1 Dec 1994
Peru	14 Jan 1993	20 Jul 1995
Philippines	13 Jan 1993	11 Dec 1996
Poland	13 Jan 1993	23 Aug 1995
Portugal	13 Jan 1993	10 Sep 1996
Qatar	1 Feb 1993	3 Sep 1997
Republic of Korea	14 Jan 1993	28 Apr 1997
Romania	13 Jan 1993	15 Feb 1995
Russian Federation	13 Jan 1993	5 Nov 1997
Rwanda	17 May 1993	31 Mar 2004
Saint Kitts and Nevis	16 Mar 1994	21 May 2004
Saint Lucia	29 Mar 1993	9 Apr 1997
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	20 Sep 1993	18 Sep 2002
Samoa	14 Jan 1993	27 Sep 2002
San Marino	13 Jan 1993	10 Dec 1999
Sao Tome and Principe		9 Sep 2003 A
Saudi Arabia	20 Jan 1993	9 Aug 1996
Senegal	13 Jan 1993	20 Jul 1998
Serbia[4]		20 Apr 2000 a
Seychelles	15 Jan 1993	7 Apr 1993
Sierra Leone	15 Jan 1993	30 Sep 2004
Singapore	14 Jan 1993	21 May 1997
Slovakia	14 Jan 1993	27 Oct 1995
Slovenia	14 Jan 1993	11 Jun 1997
Solomon Islands		23 Sep 2004 a
South Africa	14 Jan 1993	13 Sep 1995
Spain	13 Jan 1993	3 Aug 1994
Sri Lanka	14 Jan 1993	19 Aug 1994
Sudan		24 May 1999 a
Suriname	28 Apr 1997	28 Apr 1997
Swaziland	23 Sep 1993	20 Nov 1996
Sweden	13 Jan 1993	17 Jun 1993
Switzerland	14 Jan 1993	10 Mar 1995
Tajikistan	14 Jan 1993	11 Jan 1995
Thailand	14 Jan 1993	10 Dec 2002
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		20 Jun 1997 a
Timor-Leste		7 May 2003 a
Togo	13 Jan 1993	23 Apr 1997
Tonga		29 May 2003 a
Trinidad and Tobago		24 Jun 1997 a
Tunisia	13 Jan 1993	15 Apr 1997
Turkey	14 Jan 1993	12 May 1997
Turkmenistan	12 Oct 1993	29 Sep 1994
Tuvalu		19 Jan 2004 a
Uganda	14 Jan 1993	30 Nov 2001
Ukraine	13 Jan 1993	16 Oct 1998
United Arab Emirates	2 Feb 1993	28 Nov 2000

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Succession (d)
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	13 Jan 1993	13 May 1996
United Republic of Tanzania	25 Feb 1994	25 Jun 1998
United States of America	13 Jan 1993	25 Apr 1997
Uruguay	15 Jan 1993	6 Oct 1994
Uzbekistan	24 Nov 1995	23 Jul 1996
Vanuatu		16 Sep 2005 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	14 Jan 1993	3 Dec 1997
Viet Nam	13 Jan 1993	30 Sep 1998
Yemen	8 Feb 1993	2 Oct 2000
Zambia	13 Jan 1993	9 Feb 2001
Zimbabwe	13 Jan 1993	25 Apr 1997

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

BELGIUM

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

As a Member State of the European Community, the Government of Belgium will implement the provisions of the Convention on the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, in accordance with its obligations arising from the rules of the Treaties establishing the European Communities to the extent that such rules are applicable.

CHINA

Upon signature:

Declarations:

"I. China has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all chemical weapons and their production facilities. The Convention constitutes the legal basis for the realization of this goal. China therefore supports the object and purpose and principles of the Convention.

II. The object and purpose and principles of the Convention should be strictly abided by. The relevant provisions on challenge inspection should not be abused to the detriment of the security interests of States Parties unrelated to chemical weapons. Otherwise, the universality of the Convention is bound to be adversely affected.

III. States Parties that have abandoned chemical weapons on the territories of other States parties should implement in earnest the relevant provisions of the Convention and undertake the obligation to destroy the abandoned chemical weapons.

IV. The Convention should effectively facilitate trade, scientific and technological exchanges and cooperation in the field of chemistry for peaceful purposes. All export controls inconsistent with the Convention should be abolished."

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

1. China has always stood for complete prohibition and thorough destruction of chemical weapons. As CWC has laid an international legal foundation for the realization of this goal, China supports the purpose, objectives and principles of the CWC.

2. China calls upon the countries with the largest chemical weapons arsenals to ratify CWC without delay with a view to attaining its purposes and objectives at an early date.

3. The purposes, objectives and principles of CWC should be strictly observed. The provisions concerning challenge inspection shall not be abused and the national security interests of States parties not related to chemical weapons shall not be compromised. China is firmly opposed to any act of abusing the verification provisions which endangers its sovereignty and security.

4. Any country which has abandoned chemical weapons on the territory of another country should effectively implement the relevant CWC provisions, undertake the obligations to destroy those chemical weapons and ensure the earliest complete destruction of all the chemical weapons it has abandoned on another state's territory.

5. CWC should play a sound role in promoting international trade, scientific and technological exchanges and cooperation for peaceful purposes in the field of chemical industry. It should become the effective legal basis for regulating trade and exchange among the states parties in the field of chemical industry.

CUBA

Declarations:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, in conformity with article III (a) (iii) of the Convention, that there is a colonial enclave in its territory - the Guantanamo Naval Base - a part of Cuban national territory over which the Cuban State does not exercise its rightful jurisdiction, owing to its illegal occupation by the United States of America by reason of a deceitful and fraudulent Treaty.

Consequently, for the purposes of the Convention, the Government of the Republic of Cuba does not assume any responsibility with respect to the aforesaid territory, since it does not know whether or not the United States has installed, possesses, maintains or intends to possess chemical weapons in the part of Cuban territory that it illegally occupies.

The Government of the Republic of Cuba also considers that it has the right to require that the entry of any inspection group mandated by the Organization for the Prohibition of Chemical Weapons, to carry out in the territory of Guantanamo Naval Base the verification activities provided for in the Convention, should be effected through a point of entry in Cuban national territory to be determined by the Cuban Government.

The Government of the Republic of Cuba considers that, under the provisions of article XI of the Convention, the unilateral application by a State party to the Convention against another State party of any restriction which would restrict or impede trade and the development and promotion of scientific and technological knowledge in the field of chemistry for industrial, agricultural, research, medical, pharmaceutical or other purposes not prohibited under the Convention, would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Cuba designates the Ministry of Science, Technology and Environment, in its capacity as the national authority of the Republic of Cuba for the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on Their Destruction, as the body of the central administration of the State responsible for organizing, directing, monitoring and supervising the activities aimed at preparing the Republic of Cuba to fulfil the obligations it is assuming as a State party to the aforementioned Convention.

DENMARK

Upon signature:

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

GERMANY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed uponratification:

[Same declaration, *mutatis mutandis*, as the one made by Belgium.]

GREECE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed uponratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

HOLY SEE

Declaration:

[...] the Holy See, in conformity with the nature and particular condition of Vatican City State, intends to renew its encouragement to the International Community to continue on the path towards a situation of general and complete disarmament, capable of promoting peace and cooperation at world level.

Dialogue and multilateral negotiation are essential values in this process. Through the instruments of international law, they facilitate the peaceful resolution of controversies and help better mutual understanding. In this way they promote the effective affirmation of the culture of life and peace.

While not possessing chemical weapons of any kind, the Holy See accedes to the solemn act of ratification of the Convention in order to lend its moral support to this important area of international relations which seeks to ban weapons which are particularly cruel and inhuman and aimed at producing long-term traumatic effects among the defenceless civilian population."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)

Declarations:

"The Islamic Republic of Iran, on the basis of the Islamic principles and beliefs, considers chemical weapons inhuman, and has consistently been on the vanguard of the international efforts to abolish these weapons and prevent their use.

1. The Islamic Consultative Assembly (the Parliament) of the Islamic Republic of Iran approved the bill presented by the Government to join the [said Convention] on 27 July 1997, and the Guardian Council found the legislation compatible with the Constitution and the Islamic Tenets on 30 July 1997, in accordance with its required Constitutional process. The Islamic Consultative Assembly decided that:

The Government is hereby authorized, at an appropriate time, to accede to the [said Convention] - as annexed to this legislation and to deposit its relevant instrument.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs must pursue in all negotiations and within the framework of the Organization of the Convention, the full and indiscriminate implementation of the Convention, particularly in the areas of inspection and transfer of technology and chemicals for peaceful purposes. In case the afore-mentioned requirements are not materialized, upon the recommendation of the Cabinet and approval of the Supreme National Security Council, steps aimed at withdrawing from the Convention will be put in motion.

2. The Islamic Republic of Iran attaches vital significance to the full, unconditional and indiscriminate implementation of all provisions of the Convention. It reserves the right to withdraw from the Convention under the following circumstances:

-- non-compliance with the principle of equal treatment of all States Parties in implementation of all relevant provisions of the Convention;

-- disclosure of its confidential information contrary to the provisions of the Convention;

-- imposition of restrictions incompatible with the obligations under the Convention.

3. As stipulated in article XI, exclusive and non-transparent regimes impeding free international trade in chemicals and chemical technology for peaceful purposes should be disbanded. The Islamic Republic of Iran rejects any chemical export control mechanism not envisaged in the Convention.

4. The Organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW) is the sole international authority to determine the compliance of States Parties regarding chemical weapons. Accusations by States Parties against other States Parties in the absence of a determination of non-compliance by OPCW will seriously undermine the Convention and its repetition may make the Convention meaningless.

5. One of the objectives of the Convention as stipulated in its preamble is to `promote free trade in chemicals as well as international cooperation and exchange of scientific and technical information in the field of chemical activities for purposes not prohibited under the Convention in order to enhance the economic and technological development of all States Parties.' This fundamental objective of the Convention should be respected and embraced by all States Parties to the Convention. Any form of undermining, either in words or in action, of this overriding objective is considered by the Islamic Republic of Iran a grave breach of the provisions of the Convention.

6. In line with the provisions of the Convention regarding non-discriminatory treatment of States Parties:

- inspection equipment should be commercially available to all States Parties without condition or limitation.

- the OPCW should maintain its international character by ensuring fair and balanced geographical distribution of the personnel of its Technical Secretariat, provision of assistance to and cooperation with States Parties, and equitable membership of States Parties in subsidiary organs of the Organization,

7. The implementation of the Convention should contribute to international peace and security and should not in any way diminish or harm national security or territorial integrity of the States Parties."

IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed uponratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

NETHERLANDS

Upon signature:

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

PAKISTAN

Declaration:

"1. Pakistan has consistently stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of all chemical weapons and their production facilities. The Convention constitutes an international legal framework for the realization of this goal. Pakistan, therefore, supports the objectives and purposes of the Convention.

2. The objectives and purposes of the Convention must be strictly adhered to by all states. The relevant provisions on Challenge Inspections must not be abused to the detriment of the economic and security interests of the States Parties unrelated to chemical weapons. Otherwise, the universality and effectiveness of the Convention is bound to be jeopardized.

3. Abuse of the verification provisions of the Convention, for purposes unrelated to the Convention, will not be acceptable. Pakistan will never allow its sovereignty and national security to be compromised.

4. The Convention should effectively facilitate trade, scientific and technological exchanges and co-operation in the field of chemistry for peaceful purposes. All export control regimes inconsistent with the Convention must be abolished."

PORTUGAL

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

SPAIN

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

SUDAN

Declaration of understanding:

"Firstly, the unilateral application by a State Party to the Convention, runs counter to the objectives and purposes of the Convention.

Secondly, the Convention must be fully and indiscriminately implemented particularly in the areas of inspection and transfer of technology for peaceful purposes.

Thirdly, no restrictions incompatible with the obligations under the Convention shall be imposed.

Fourthly, the Organization for Prohibition of Chemical Weapons (OPCW), is the sole international authority to determine the compliance of States Parties with the provisions of the Convention."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

[Same declaration, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made by Belgium.]*

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"Subject to the condition which relates to the Annex on Implementation and Verification, that no sample collected in the United States pursuant to the Convention will be transferred for analysis to any laboratory outside the territory of the United States."

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-seventh session, Supplement No. 49* (A/47/49), p. 54.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe. On 28 April 1997: For the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[4] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" and note 1 under "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] On 26 October 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland a notification stating that "... the United Kingdom's ratification of the said Convention shall extend to the following territories for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible: Bailiwick of Guernsey, Bailiwick of Jersey, Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, St Helena and Dependencies, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia, Turks and Caicos Islands."

In this regard, on 14 November 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina, the following communcation:

In that connection, the Argentine Republic rejects the declaration made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland extending the territorial scope of the above-mentioned Convention1 to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands which are an integral part of the Argentine national territory.

It likewise rejects the British statement insofar as it refers to the intention to apply the said Convention to the so-called 'British

Antarctic Territory' and affirms that that statement in no way affects the sovereign rights of the Argentine Republic over the Argentine Antarctic Sector which is an integral part of its national territory. In this connection, it is necessary to bear in mind the terms of article IV of the Antarctic Treaty, signed on 1 December 1959, to which the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom are party.

The Argentine Republic also recalls that the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia, the South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime areas are an integral part of the Argentine national territory and, since they are being illegally occupied by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, they form the subject of a sovereignty dispute between both parties, a fact acknowledged by several international bodies.

On this matter, the General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, in which it recognizes the existence of the sovereignty dispute related to the 'Question of the Malvinas Islands' and urges the Governments of the Argentine Republic and of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations with a view to finding a peaceful, just and lasting solution to the dispute as soon as possible. For its part, the Special Committee on Decolonization of the United Nations has repeatedly issued similar calls, most recently through the resolution adopted on 15 June 2005. The General Assembly of the Organization of American States also adopted a further declaration on the question on 7 June 2005.

Further, on 29 December 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Spain, the following communication with regard to the notification by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the extension of the territorial application of the said Convention to Gibraltar:

"...the Kingdom of Spain considers that such an extension has been made exclusively inasmuch as Gibraltar is a territory for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible and, therefore, falls within the category of "any place under [the] jurisdiction or control [of a State Party]", according to the terminology used in the Convention.

Therefore, the Kingdom of Spain considers that the circulation of the United Kingdom's notification in the above-mentioned terms does not prejudge in any way either the legal status of the territory nor the sovereignty claims that the Kingdom of Spain consistently maintains with regard to Gibraltar.

On 27 April 2006, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication:

"In accordance with instructions received from the Government, I have the honour to refer to the communication dated 30 November 2005 from the Government of Argentina to the United Nations relating to the extension of the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and use of Chemical Weapons and their Destruction, to the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the British Antarctic Territory.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are fully entitled to extend the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction to the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the British Antarctic Territory.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubts about the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and the British Antarctic Territory, and their surrounding maritime areas, and reject the claim by the Government of Argentina to soverignty over those islands and areas and that the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands are under illegal occupation by the United Kingdom."

4. Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty

New York, 10 September 1996

NOT YET IN FORCE: [see article XIV]. This Treaty will enter into force 180 days after the date of deposit of the instruments of ratification by all States listed in Annex 2 to this Treaty (that is to say: Algeria, Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bangladesh, Belgium, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile, China, Colombia, Democratic People's Republic of Korea, Egypt, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, India, Indonesia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Israel, Italy, Japan, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Pakistan, Peru, Poland, Republic of Korea, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, South Africa, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America, Viet Nam and Zaire), but in no case earlier than two years after its opening for signature. 2. If this Treaty has not entered into force three years after the date of the anniversary of its opening for signature, the Depositary shall convene a Conference of the States that have already deposited their instruments of ratification upon the request of a majority of those States. That Conference shall examine the extent to which the requirement set out in paragraph 1 has been met and shall consider and decide by consensus what measure consistent with international law may facilitate the early entry into force of this Treaty. 3. Unless otherwise decided by the Conference referred to in paragraph 2 or other such conferences, this process shall be repeated at subseuqent anniversaries of the opening for signature of this Treaty, until its entry into force. 4. All States Signatories shall be invited to attend the Confernece referred to in paragraph 2 and any subsequent conferences as referred to in paragraph 3, as observers. 5. For States whose instruments of ratification or accession are deposited subsequent to the entry into force of this Treaty, it shall enter into force on the 30th day following the date of deposit of their instruments of ratification or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 176. Parties: 137.

TEXT: Doc. A/50/1027; and C.N.429.2002.TREATIES-3 of 6 May 2002 [proposed corrections to the original text of the treaty (Arabic text)] and C.N.629.2002.TREATIES-4 of 11 June 2002 [procès-verbal of rectification (Arabic text)].

Note: At its 50th session, the General Assembly adopted, on 10 September 1996 by resolutionA/RES/50/245 the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty as contained in document A/50/1027. In the same resolution, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General, as depositary of the Treaty, to open it for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York at the earliest possible date. The Treaty was opened for signature on 24 September 1996 and it will remain open for signature until its entry into force, in accordance with article XI.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	24 Sep 2003	24 Sep 2003
Albania	27 Sep 1996	23 Apr 2003
Algeria	15 Oct 1996	11 Jul 2003
Andorra	24 Sep 1996	12 Jul 2006
Angola	27 Sep 1996	
Antigua and Barbuda	16 Apr 1997	11 Jan 2006
Argentina	24 Sep 1996	4 Dec 1998
Armenia	1 Oct 1996	12 Jul 2006
Australia	24 Sep 1996	9 Jul 1998
Austria	24 Sep 1996	13 Mar 1998
Azerbaijan	28 Jul 1997	2 Feb 1999
Bahamas	4 Feb 2005	
Bahrain	24 Sep 1996	12 Apr 2004
Bangladesh	24 Oct 1996	8 Mar 2000
Belarus	24 Sep 1996	13 Sep 2000
Belgium	24 Sep 1996	29 Jun 1999
Belize	14 Nov 2001	26 Mar 2004
Benin	27 Sep 1996	6 Mar 2001
Bolivia	24 Sep 1996	4 Oct 1999
Bosnia and Herzegovina	24 Sep 1996	26 Oct 2006
Botswana	16 Sep 2002	28 Oct 2002
Brazil	24 Sep 1996	24 Jul 1998
Brunei Darussalam	22 Jan 1997	
Bulgaria	24 Sep 1996	29 Sep 1999
Burkina Faso	27 Sep 1996	17 Apr 2002
Burundi	24 Sep 1996	
Cambodia	26 Sep 1996	10 Nov 2000
Cameroon	16 Nov 2001	6 Feb 2006
Canada	24 Sep 1996	18 Dec 1998
Cape Verde	1 Oct 1996	1 Mar 2006
Central African Republic	19 Dec 2001	
Chad	8 Oct 1996	
Chile	24 Sep 1996	12 Jul 2000
China	24 Sep 1996	
Colombia	24 Sep 1996	
Comoros	12 Dec 1996	
Congo	11 Feb 1997	
Cook Islands	5 Dec 1997	6 Sep 2005
Costa Rica	24 Sep 1996	25 Sep 2001
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 1996	11 Mar 2003
Croatia	24 Sep 1996	2 Mar 2001
Cyprus	24 Sep 1996	18 Jul 2003
Czech Republic	12 Nov 1996	11 Sep 1997
Democratic Republic of the Congo	4 Oct 1996	28 Sep 2004
Denmark	24 Sep 1996	21 Dec 1998
Djibouti	21 Oct 1996	15 Jul 2005
Dominican Republic	3 Oct 1996	
Ecuador	24 Sep 1996	12 Nov 2001
Egypt	14 Oct 1996	
El Salvador	24 Sep 1996	11 Sep 1998
Equatorial Guinea	9 Oct 1996	

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Succession (d)
Eritrea	11 Nov 2003	11 Nov 2003
Estonia	20 Nov 1996	13 Aug 1999
Ethiopia	25 Sep 1996	8 Aug 2006
Fiji	24 Sep 1996	10 Oct 1996
Finland	24 Sep 1996	15 Jan 1999
France	24 Sep 1996	6 Apr 1998
Gabon	7 Oct 1996	20 Sep 2000
Gambia	9 Apr 2003	
Georgia	24 Sep 1996	27 Sep 2002
Germany	24 Sep 1996	20 Aug 1998
Ghana	3 Oct 1996	
Greece	24 Sep 1996	21 Apr 1999
Grenada	10 Oct 1996	19 Aug 1998
Guatemala	20 Sep 1999	
Guinea	3 Oct 1996	
Guinea-Bissau	11 Apr 1997	
Guyana	7 Sep 2000	7 Mar 2001
Haiti	24 Sep 1996	1 Dec 2005
Holy See	24 Sep 1996	18 Jul 2001
Honduras	25 Sep 1996	30 Oct 2003
Hungary	25 Sep 1996	13 Jul 1999
Iceland	24 Sep 1996	26 Jun 2000
Indonesia	24 Sep 1996	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	24 Sep 1996	
Ireland	24 Sep 1996	15 Jul 1999
Israel	25 Sep 1996	
Italy	24 Sep 1996	1 Feb 1999
Jamaica	11 Nov 1996	13 Nov 2001
Japan	24 Sep 1996	8 Jul 1997
Jordan	26 Sep 1996	25 Aug 1998
Kazakhstan	30 Sep 1996	14 May 2002
Kenya	14 Nov 1996	30 Nov 2000
Kiribati	7 Sep 2000	7 Sep 2000
Kuwait	24 Sep 1996	6 May 2003
Kyrgyzstan	8 Oct 1996	2 Oct 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic	30 Jul 1997	5 Oct 2000
Latvia	24 Sep 1996	20 Nov 2001
Lebanon	16 Sep 2005	
Lesotho	30 Sep 1996	14 Sep 1999
Liberia	1 Oct 1996	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	6 Jan 2004
Liechtenstein	27 Sep 1996	21 Sep 2004
Lithuania	7 Oct 1996	7 Feb 2000
Luxembourg	24 Sep 1996	26 May 1999
Madagascar	9 Oct 1996	15 Sep 2005
Malawi	9 Oct 1996	
Malaysia	23 Jul 1998	
Maldives	1 Oct 1997	7 Sep 2000
Mali	18 Feb 1997	4 Aug 1999
Malta	24 Sep 1996	23 Jul 2001
Marshall Islands	24 Sep 1996	
Mauritania	24 Sep 1996	30 Apr 2003
Mexico	24 Sep 1996	5 Oct 1999
Micronesia (Federated States of)	24 Sep 1996	25 Jul 1997
Moldova	24 Sep 1997	
Monaco	1 Oct 1996	18 Dec 1998
Mongolia	1 Oct 1996	8 Aug 1997
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	24 Sep 1996	17 Apr 2000
Mozambique	26 Sep 1996	
Myanmar	25 Nov 1996	
Namibia	24 Sep 1996	29 Jun 2001
Nauru	8 Sep 2000	12 Nov 2001
Nepal	8 Oct 1996	
Netherlands[2]	24 Sep 1996	23 Mar 1999
New Zealand	27 Sep 1996	19 Mar 1999
Nicaragua	24 Sep 1996	5 Dec 2000
Niger	3 Oct 1996	9 Sep 2002
Nigeria	8 Sep 2000	27 Sep 2001
Norway	24 Sep 1996	15 Jul 1999
Oman	23 Sep 1999	13 Jun 2003
Palau	12 Aug 2003	
Panama	24 Sep 1996	23 Mar 1999
Papua New Guinea	25 Sep 1996	
Paraguay	25 Sep 1996	4 Oct 2001
Peru	25 Sep 1996	12 Nov 1997
Philippines	24 Sep 1996	23 Feb 2001
Poland	24 Sep 1996	25 May 1999
Portugal	24 Sep 1996	26 Jun 2000
Qatar	24 Sep 1996	3 Mar 1997
Republic of Korea	24 Sep 1996	24 Sep 1999
Romania	24 Sep 1996	5 Oct 1999
Russian Federation	24 Sep 1996	30 Jun 2000
Rwanda	30 Nov 2004	30 Nov 2004
Saint Kitts and Nevis	23 Mar 2004	27 Apr 2005
Saint Lucia	4 Oct 1996	5 Apr 2001
Samoa	9 Oct 1996	27 Sep 2002
San Marino	7 Oct 1996	12 Mar 2002
Sao Tome and Principe	26 Sep 1996	
Senegal	26 Sep 1996	9 Jun 1999
Serbia	8 Jun 2001	19 May 2004
Seychelles	24 Sep 1996	13 Apr 2004
Sierra Leone	8 Sep 2000	17 Sep 2001
Singapore	14 Jan 1999	10 Nov 2001
Slovakia	30 Sep 1996	3 Mar 1998
Slovenia	24 Sep 1996	31 Aug 1999
Solomon Islands	3 Oct 1996	
South Africa	24 Sep 1996	30 Mar 1999
Spain	24 Sep 1996	31 Jul 1998
Sri Lanka	24 Oct 1996	
Sudan	10 Jun 2004	10 Jun 2004
Suriname	14 Jan 1997	7 Feb 2006
Swaziland	24 Sep 1996	
Sweden	24 Sep 1996	2 Dec 1998
Switzerland	24 Sep 1996	1 Oct 1999
Tajikistan	7 Oct 1996	10 Jun 1998
Thailand	12 Nov 1996	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	29 Oct 1998	14 Mar 2000
Togo	2 Oct 1996	2 Jul 2004
Tunisia	16 Oct 1996	23 Sep 2004
Turkey	24 Sep 1996	16 Feb 2000
Turkmenistan	24 Sep 1996	20 Feb 1998
Uganda	7 Nov 1996	14 Mar 2001
Ukraine	27 Sep 1996	23 Feb 2001
United Arab Emirates	25 Sep 1996	18 Sep 2000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24 Sep 1996	6 Apr 1998
United Republic of Tanzania	30 Sep 2004	30 Sep 2004
United States of America	24 Sep 1996	
Uruguay	24 Sep 1996	21 Sep 2001
Uzbekistan	3 Oct 1996	29 May 1997
Vanuatu	24 Sep 1996	16 Sep 2005

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Succession (d)
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	3 Oct 1996	13 May 2002
Viet Nam	24 Sep 1996	10 Mar 2006
Yemen	30 Sep 1996	
Zambia	3 Dec 1996	23 Feb 2006
Zimbabwe	13 Oct 1999	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification.)

CHINA

Declarations made upon signature:

1. China has all along stood for the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons and the realization of a nuclear-weapon-free world. It is in favor of a comprehensive ban on nuclear weapon test explosions in the process towards this objective. China is deeply convinced that the CTBT will facilitate nuclear disarmament and nuclear non-proliferation. Therefore, China supports the conclusion, through negotiation, of a fair, reasonable and verifiable treaty with universal adherence and unlimited duration and is ready to take active measures to promote its ratification and entry into force.

2. Meanwhile, the Chinese Government solemnly makes the following appeals:

(1) Major nuclear weapon states should abandon their policy of nuclear deterrence. States with huge nuclear arsenals should continue to drastically reduce their nuclear stockpiles.

(2) All countries that have deployed nuclear weapons on foreign soil should withdraw all of them to their own land. All nuclear weapon states should undertake not to be the first to use nuclear weapons at any time and under any circumstances, commit themselves unconditionally to the non-use or threat of use of nuclear weapons against non-nuclear weapon states or nuclear weapon-free zones, and conclude, at an early date, international legal instruments to this effect.

(3) All nuclear weapon states should pledge their support to proposals for the establishment of nuclear weapon-free zones, respect their status as such and undertake corresponding obligations.

(4) No country should develop or deploy space weapon systems or missile defence systems undermining strategic security and stability.

(5) An international convention on the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons should be concluded through negotiations.

3. The Chinese Government endorses the application of verification measures consistent with the provisions of the CTBT to ensure its faithful implementation and at the same time it firmly opposes the abuse of verification rights by any country, including the use of espionage or human intelligence, to infringe upon the sovereignty of China and impair its legitimate security interests in violation of universally recognized principles of international law.

4. In the present day world where huge nuclear arsenals and nuclear deterrence policy based on the first use of nuclear weapons still exist, the supreme national interests of China demand that it ensure the safety, reliability and effectiveness of its nuclear weapons before the goal of eliminating all nuclear weapons is achieved.

5. The Chinese Government and people are ready to continue to work together with governments and peoples of other countries for an early realization of the lofty goal of the complete prohibition and thorough destruction of nuclear weapons.

GERMANY

Declaration made upon signature:

It is the understanding of the German Government that nothing in this Treaty shall ever be interpreted or applied in such a way as to prejudice or prevent research into and development of controlled thermonuclear fusion and its economic use.

HOLY SEE

Declaration upon signature:

"The Holy See is convinced that in the sphere of nuclear weapons, the banning of tests and of the further development of these weapons, disarmament and non-proliferation are closely linked and must be achieved as quickly as possible under effective international controls.

Furthermore, the Holy See understands that these are steps towards a general and total disarmament which the international community as a whole should accomplish without delay."

Declaration upon ratification:

"The Holy See, in ratifying the Comprehensive Nuclear Test Ban Treaty (CTBT), adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 10 September 1996 and signed by the Holy See on 24 September of the same year, wishes to repeat what was said when it added its signature: "The Holy See is convinced that in the sphere of nuclear weapons, the banning of tests and of the further development of these weapons, disarmament and non-proliferation are closely linked and must be achieved as quickly as possible under effective international controls".

In conformity with the nature and particular condition of Vatican City State, the Holy See, by this ratification, seeks to advance the genuine promotion of a culture of peace based upon the primacy of law and of respect for human life. At the beginning of the third millennium, the implementation of a system of comprehensive and complete disarmament, capable of fostering a climate of trust, cooperation and respect between all States, represents an indispensable aspect of the concrete realization of a culture of life and peace.

In lending moral support to the CTBT through this solemn act of ratification, the Holy See encourages the whole International Community, which is aware of the various challenges standing in the way of nuclear disarmament, to intensify its efforts to ensure the implementation of the said Treaty."

IRAN (ISLAMIC REPUBLIC OF)[3]

Declarations upon signature:

"1. The Islamic Republic of Iran considers that the Treaty does not meet nuclear disarmament criteria as originally intended. We had not perceived a CTBT only as non-proliferation in-

strument. The Treaty must have terminated fully and comprehensive further development of nuclear weapons. However, the Treaty bans explosions, thus limiting such development only in certain aspects, while leaving others avenues wide open. We see no other way for the CTBT to be meaningful, however, unless it is considered as a step towards a phased program for nuclear disarmament with specific time frames through negotiations on a consecutive series of subsequent treaties.

2. On National Technical Means, based on the deliberation that took place on the issues in the relevant Ad Hoc Committee of the Conference on Disarmament in Geneva, we interpret the text as according a complementary role to them and reiterate that they should be phased out with further development of the International Monitoring System. National Technical Means should not be interpreted to include information received from espionage and human intelligence.

3. The inclusion of Israel in the MESA grouping constitutes a politically-motivated aberration from UN practice and is thus objectionable. We express our strong reservation on the matter and believe that it will impede the implementation of the Treaty, as the confrontation of the States in this regional group would make it tremendously difficult for the Executive Council to form. The Conference of the States Parties would eventually be compelled to find a way to redress this problem."

LEBANON

3 October 2005

Declaration:

"We express our reservation on the inclusion of Israel in MESA grouping, which constitutes an aberration from UN practice and it will impede the implementation of the treaty.

We believe strongly that the confrontation of the states in this regional group would make it tremendously difficult to form the Executive Council. The Conference of the States Parties would be compelled to find a way to redress this problem."

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On behalf of the Kindom in Europe, the Nethelrands Antilles and Aruba.

[3] On 29 January 1997, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following communication with regard to the declaration contained in paragraph 3:

"Israel considers that Iran's declaration on this matter has no legal basis and is entirely motivated by political reasons extraneous to the CTBT.

The Iranian declaration attempts to undermine the implementation of the treaty and is incompatible with both the Treaty and its spirit, as well as with the U.N. Charter principle of sovereign equality of all states.

Israel, by geography, is part of the Middle-East region, and no objection will change this.

Israel calls upon other signatories of the CTBT to express their rejection of the Iranian reservation to Israel's inclusion in the MESA Geographic region, as well as the threat contained therein."

5. Convention on the Prohibition of the Use, Stockpiling, Production and Transfer of Anti-Personnel Mines and on their Destruction

Oslo, 18 September 1997

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 March 1999, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 March 1999, No. 35597.
STATUS: Signatories: 133. Parties: 152.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2056, p. 211; C.N.163.2003.TREATIES-2 of 3 March 2003 [Proposal of corrections to the original of the Convention (authentic Arabic text)] and C.N.270.2003.TREATIES-4 of 7 April 2003 (acceptance).

Note: The Convention was concluded by the Diplomatic Conference on an International Total Ban on Anti-Personnel Land Mines at Oslo on 18 September 1997. In accordance with its article 15, the Convention was opened for signature at Ottawa, Canada, by all States from 3 December 1997 until 4 December 1997, and will remain open thereafter at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until its entry into force. By resolution 52/38/A, the General Assembly of the United Nations welcomed the conclusion of the Convention at Oslo and requested the Secretary-General of the United Nations to render the necessary assistance and to provide such services as may be necessary to fulfil the tasks entrusted to him.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		11 Sep 2002 a
Albania	8 Sep 1998	29 Feb 2000
Algeria	3 Dec 1997	9 Oct 2001
Andorra	3 Dec 1997	29 Jun 1998
Angola	4 Dec 1997	5 Jul 2002
Antigua and Barbuda	3 Dec 1997	3 May 1999
Argentina	4 Dec 1997	14 Sep 1999
Australia	3 Dec 1997	14 Jan 1999
Austria	3 Dec 1997	29 Jun 1998
Bahamas	3 Dec 1997	31 Jul 1998
Bangladesh	7 May 1998	6 Sep 2000
Barbados	3 Dec 1997	26 Jan 1999
Belarus		3 Sep 2003 a
Belgium	3 Dec 1997	4 Sep 1998
Belize	27 Feb 1998	23 Apr 1998
Benin	3 Dec 1997	25 Sep 1998
Bhutan		18 Aug 2005 a
Bolivia	3 Dec 1997	9 Jun 1998
Bosnia and Herzegovina	3 Dec 1997	8 Sep 1998
Botswana	3 Dec 1997	1 Mar 2000
Brazil	3 Dec 1997	30 Apr 1999
Brunei Darussalam	4 Dec 1997	24 Apr 2006
Bulgaria	3 Dec 1997	4 Sep 1998
Burkina Faso	3 Dec 1997	16 Sep 1998
Burundi	3 Dec 1997	22 Oct 2003
Cambodia	3 Dec 1997	28 Jul 1999
Cameroon	3 Dec 1997	19 Sep 2002
Canada	3 Dec 1997	3 Dec 1997
Cape Verde	4 Dec 1997	14 May 2001
Central African Republic		8 Nov 2002 a
Chad	6 Jul 1998	6 May 1999
Chile	3 Dec 1997	10 Sep 2001
Colombia	3 Dec 1997	6 Sep 2000
Comoros		19 Sep 2002 a
Congo		4 May 2001 a
Cook Islands	3 Dec 1997	15 Mar 2006
Costa Rica	3 Dec 1997	17 Mar 1999
Côte d'Ivoire	3 Dec 1997	30 Jun 2000
Croatia	4 Dec 1997	20 May 1998
Cyprus	4 Dec 1997	17 Jan 2003
Czech Republic	3 Dec 1997	26 Oct 1999
Democratic Republic of the Congo		2 May 2002 a
Denmark	4 Dec 1997	8 Jun 1998
Djibouti	3 Dec 1997	18 May 1998
Dominica	3 Dec 1997	26 Mar 1999
Dominican Republic	3 Dec 1997	30 Jun 2000
Ecuador	4 Dec 1997	29 Apr 1999
El Salvador	4 Dec 1997	27 Jan 1999
Equatorial Guinea		16 Sep 1998 a
Eritrea		27 Aug 2001 a
Estonia		12 May 2004 a
Ethiopia	3 Dec 1997	17 Dec 2004
Fiji	3 Dec 1997	10 Jun 1998
France	3 Dec 1997	23 Jul 1998
Gabon	3 Dec 1997	8 Sep 2000
Gambia	4 Dec 1997	23 Sep 2002
Germany	3 Dec 1997	23 Jul 1998
Ghana	4 Dec 1997	30 Jun 2000
Greece	3 Dec 1997	25 Sep 2003
Grenada	3 Dec 1997	19 Aug 1998
Guatemala	3 Dec 1997	26 Mar 1999
Guinea	4 Dec 1997	8 Oct 1998
Guinea-Bissau	3 Dec 1997	22 May 2001
Guyana	4 Dec 1997	5 Aug 2003
Haiti	3 Dec 1997	15 Feb 2006
Holy See	4 Dec 1997	17 Feb 1998
Honduras	3 Dec 1997	24 Sep 1998
Hungary	3 Dec 1997	6 Apr 1998
Iceland	4 Dec 1997	5 May 1999
Indonesia	4 Dec 1997	
Ireland	3 Dec 1997	3 Dec 1997
Italy	3 Dec 1997	23 Apr 1999
Jamaica	3 Dec 1997	17 Jul 1998
Japan	3 Dec 1997	30 Sep 1998 A
Jordan	11 Aug 1998	13 Nov 1998
Kenya	5 Dec 1997	23 Jan 2001
Kiribati		7 Sep 2000 a
Latvia		1 Jul 2005 a
Lesotho	4 Dec 1997	2 Dec 1998

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Liberia		23 Dec 1999 a
Liechtenstein	3 Dec 1997	5 Oct 1999
Lithuania	26 Feb 1999	12 May 2003
Luxembourg	4 Dec 1997	14 Jun 1999
Madagascar	4 Dec 1997	16 Sep 1999
Malawi	4 Dec 1997	13 Aug 1998
Malaysia	3 Dec 1997	22 Apr 1999
Maldives	1 Oct 1998	7 Sep 2000
Mali	3 Dec 1997	2 Jun 1998
Malta	4 Dec 1997	7 May 2001
Marshall Islands	4 Dec 1997	
Mauritania	3 Dec 1997	21 Jul 2000
Mauritius	3 Dec 1997	3 Dec 1997
Mexico	3 Dec 1997	9 Jun 1998
Moldova	3 Dec 1997	8 Sep 2000
Monaco	4 Dec 1997	17 Nov 1998
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Mozambique	3 Dec 1997	25 Aug 1998
Namibia	3 Dec 1997	21 Sep 1998
Nauru		7 Aug 2000 a
Netherlands[2]	3 Dec 1997	12 Apr 1999 A
New Zealand	3 Dec 1997	27 Jan 1999
Nicaragua	4 Dec 1997	30 Nov 1998
Niger	4 Dec 1997	23 Mar 1999
Nigeria		27 Sep 2001 a
Niue	3 Dec 1997	15 Apr 1998
Norway	3 Dec 1997	9 Jul 1998
Panama	4 Dec 1997	7 Oct 1998
Papua New Guinea		28 Jun 2004 a
Paraguay	3 Dec 1997	13 Nov 1998
Peru	3 Dec 1997	17 Jun 1998
Philippines	3 Dec 1997	15 Feb 2000
Poland	4 Dec 1997	
Portugal	3 Dec 1997	19 Feb 1999
Qatar	4 Dec 1997	13 Oct 1998
Romania	3 Dec 1997	30 Nov 2000
Rwanda	3 Dec 1997	8 Jun 2000
Saint Kitts and Nevis	3 Dec 1997	2 Dec 1998
Saint Lucia	3 Dec 1997	13 Apr 1999
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	3 Dec 1997	1 Aug 2001
Samoa	3 Dec 1997	23 Jul 1998
San Marino	3 Dec 1997	18 Mar 1998
Sao Tome and Principe	30 Apr 1998	31 Mar 2003
Senegal	3 Dec 1997	24 Sep 1998
Serbia[3]		18 Sep 2003 a
Seychelles	4 Dec 1997	2 Jun 2000
Sierra Leone	29 Jul 1998	25 Apr 2001
Slovakia	3 Dec 1997	25 Feb 1999 AA
Slovenia	3 Dec 1997	27 Oct 1998
Solomon Islands	4 Dec 1997	26 Jan 1999
South Africa	3 Dec 1997	26 Jun 1998
Spain	3 Dec 1997	19 Jan 1999
Sudan	4 Dec 1997	13 Oct 2003
Suriname	4 Dec 1997	23 May 2002
Swaziland	4 Dec 1997	22 Dec 1998
Sweden	4 Dec 1997	30 Nov 1998
Switzerland	3 Dec 1997	24 Mar 1998
Tajikistan		12 Oct 1999 a
Thailand	3 Dec 1997	27 Nov 1998
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		9 Sep 1998 a
Timor-Leste		7 May 2003 a
Togo	4 Dec 1997	9 Mar 2000
Trinidad and Tobago	4 Dec 1997	27 Apr 1998
Tunisia	4 Dec 1997	9 Jul 1999
Turkey		25 Sep 2003 a
Turkmenistan	3 Dec 1997	19 Jan 1998
Uganda	3 Dec 1997	25 Feb 1999
Ukraine	24 Feb 1999	27 Dec 2005
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	3 Dec 1997	31 Jul 1998
United Republic of Tanzania	3 Dec 1997	13 Nov 2000
Uruguay	3 Dec 1997	7 Jun 2001
Vanuatu	4 Dec 1997	16 Sep 2005
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	3 Dec 1997	14 Apr 1999
Yemen	4 Dec 1997	1 Sep 1998
Zambia	12 Dec 1997	23 Feb 2001
Zimbabwe	3 Dec 1997	18 Jun 1998

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession, or succession.)

ARGENTINA

Interpretative declaration:

The Argentine Republic declares that in its territory, in the Malvinas, there are anti-personnel mines. This situation was brought to the attention of the Secretary-General of the United Nations when providing information within the framework of General Assembly resolutions 48/7; 49/215; 50/82; and 51/149 concerning "Assistance in mine clearance".

Since this part of the Argentine territory is under illegal occupation by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Argentine Republic is effectively prevented from having access to the anti-personnel mines placed in the Malvinas in order to fulfil the obligations undertaken in the present Convention.

The United Nations General Assembly has recognized the existence of a dispute concerning sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich and has urged the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to maintain negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and lasting solution to the dispute, with the good offices of the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress

made (resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25). The Special Committee on decolonization has taken the same position, and has adopted a resolution every year stating that the way to put an end to this colonial situation is the lasting settlement, on a peaceful and negotiated basis, of the sovereignty dispute, and requesting both Governments to resume negotiations to that end. The most recent of these resolutions was adopted on 1 July 1999.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich and the surrounding maritime areas which form an integral part of its national territory.]

AUSTRALIA

Declarations:

"It is the understanding of Australia that, in the context of operations, exercises or other military activity authorised by the United Nations or otherwise conducted in accordance with international law, the participation by the Australian Defence Force, or individual Australian citizens or residents, in such operations, exercises or other military activity conducted in combination with the armed forces of States not party to the Convention which engage in activity prohibited under the Convention would not, by itself, be considered to be in violation of the Convention.

It is the understanding of Australia that, in relation to Article 1(a), the term "use" means the actual physical emplacement of anti-personnel mines and does not include receiving an indirect or incidental benefit from anti-personnel mines laid by another State or person. In Article 1(c) Australia will interpret the word "assist" to mean the actual and direct physical participation in any activity prohibited by the Convention but does not include permissible indirect support such as the provision of security for the personnel of a State not party to the Convention engaging in such activities, "encourage" to mean the actual request for the commission of any activity prohibited by the Convention, and "induce" to mean the active engagement in the offering of threats or incentives to obtain the commission of any activity prohibited by the Convention.

It is the understanding of Australia that in relation to Article 2(1), the definition of "anti-personnel mines" does not include command detonated munitions.

In relation to Articles 4, 5(1) and (2), and 7(1)(b) and (c), it is the understanding of Australia that the phrase "jurisdiction or control" is intended to mean within the sovereign territory of a State Party or over which it exercises legal responsibility by virtue of a United Nations mandate or arrangement with another State and the ownership or physical possession of anti-personnel mines, but does not include the temporary occupation of, or presence on, foreign territory where anti-personnel mines have been laid by other States or persons."

CANADA

Understanding:

"It is the understanding of the Government of Canada that, in the context of operations, exercises or other military activity sanctioned by the United Nations or otherwise conducted in accordance with international law, the mere participation by the Canadian Forces, or individual Canadians, in operations, exercises or other military activity conducted in combination with the armed forces of States not party to the Convention which engage in activity prohibited under the Convention would not, by itself, be considered to be assistance, encouragement or inducement in accordance with the meaning of those terms in article 1, paragraph 1 (c)."

CHILE

Declaration:

The Republic of Chile declares that it will apply provisionally paragraph 1 of article 1 of the Convention.

CZECH REPUBLIC

Declaration:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Czech Republic that the mere participation in the planning or execution of operations, exercises or other military activities by the Armed Forces of the Czech Republic, or individual Czech Republic nationals, conducted in combination with the armed forces of States not party to the [Convention], which engage in activities prohibited under the Convention, is not, by itself, assistance, encouragement or inducement for the purposes of Article 1, paragraph 1 (c) of the Convention."

GREECE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Greece fully subscribes to the principles enshrined within the [Convention] and declares that ratification of this Convention will take place as soon as conditions relating to the implementation of its relevant provisions are fulfilled."

LITHUANIA

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Republic of Lithuania subscribes to the principles and purposes of the [Convention] and declares that ratification of the Convention will take place as soon as [the] relevant conditions relating to the implementation of the provisions of the Convention are fulfilled."

MONTENEGRO[1]

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

".....it is the understanding of Serbia and Montenegro that the mere participation in the planning or conduct of operations, exercises or any other military activities by the armed forces of Serbia and Montenegro, or by any of its nationals, if carried out in conjunction with armed forces of the non-State Parties (to the Convention), which engage in activities prohibited under the Convention, does not in any way imply an assistance, encouragement or inducement as referred to in subparagraph 1 (c) of the Convention."

SERBIA[3]

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

".....it is the understanding of Serbia and Montenegro that the mere participation in the planning or conduct of operations, exercises or any other military activities by the armed forces of Serbia and Montenegro, or by any of its nationals, if carried out in conjunction with armed forces of the non-State Parties (to the Convention), which engage in activities prohibited under the Convention, does not in any way imply an assistance, encouragement or inducement as referred to in subparagraph 1 (c) of the Convention."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the United Kingdom that the mere participation in the planning or execution of operations, exercises or other military activity by the United Kingdom's Armed Forces, or individual United Kingdom nationals, conducted in combination with the armed forces of States not party to the [said Convention], which engage in activity prohibited under that Convention, is not, by itself, assistance, encouragement or inducement for the purposes of Article 1, paragraph (c) of the Convention."

Declaration of provisional application of article 1 (1) in accordance with article 18 of the Convention

AUSTRIA

MAURITIUS

SOUTH AFRICA

SWEDEN

SWITZERLAND

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On behalf of the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] See note 1 under "Serbia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] On 4 December 2001: Extension to the following territories for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible: Anguilla, Bermuda British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Monsterrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, St. Helena and Dependencies, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia and Turks and Caicos Islands.

On 3 April 2002: Extension to the Bailiwick of Guernsey, Bailiwick of Jersey and the Isle of Man.

CHAPTER XXVII

ENVIRONMENT

1. CONVENTION ON LONG-RANGE TRANSBOUNDARY AIR POLLUTION

Geneva, 13 November 1979

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 March 1983, in accordance with article 16 (1)[1].

REGISTRATION: 16 March 1983, No. 21623.

STATUS: Signatories: 32. Parties: 51.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1302, p. 217.

Note: The Convention was adopted on 13 November 1979 by a high-level meeting within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe on the Protection of the Environment. It was open for signature until 16 November 1979 at the United Nations Office in Geneva.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania		2 Dec 2005 a
Armenia		21 Feb 1997 a
Austria	13 Nov 1979	16 Dec 1982
Azerbaijan		3 Jul 2002 a
Belarus	14 Nov 1979	13 Jun 1980
Belgium	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	14 Nov 1979	9 Jun 1981
Canada	13 Nov 1979	15 Dec 1981
Croatia[2]		21 Sep 1992 d
Cyprus		20 Nov 1991 a
Czech Republic[3]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark	14 Nov 1979	18 Jun 1982
Estonia		7 Mar 2000 a
European Community	14 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982 AA
Finland	13 Nov 1979	15 Apr 1981
France	13 Nov 1979	3 Nov 1981 AA
Georgia		11 Feb 1999 a
Germany[4,5]	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Greece	14 Nov 1979	30 Aug 1983
Holy See	14 Nov 1979	
Hungary	13 Nov 1979	22 Sep 1980
Iceland	13 Nov 1979	5 May 1983
Ireland	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Italy	14 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Kazakhstan		11 Jan 2001 a
Kyrgyzstan		25 May 2000 a
Latvia		15 Jul 1994 a
Liechtenstein	14 Nov 1979	22 Nov 1983
Lithuania		25 Jan 1994 a
Luxembourg	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
Malta		14 Mar 1997 a
Moldova		9 Jun 1995 a
Monaco		27 Aug 1999 a
Montenegro[6]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[7]	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982 A
Norway	13 Nov 1979	13 Feb 1981
Poland	13 Nov 1979	19 Jul 1985
Portugal	14 Nov 1979	29 Sep 1980
Romania	14 Nov 1979	27 Feb 1991
Russian Federation	13 Nov 1979	22 May 1980
San Marino	14 Nov 1979	
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain	14 Nov 1979	15 Jun 1982
Sweden	13 Nov 1979	12 Feb 1981
Switzerland	13 Nov 1979	6 May 1983
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		30 Dec 1997 d
Turkey	13 Nov 1979	18 Apr 1983
Ukraine	14 Nov 1979	5 Jun 1980
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[8]	13 Nov 1979	15 Jul 1982
United States of America	13 Nov 1979	30 Nov 1981 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ROMANIA

Upon signature:

Romania interprets article 14 of this Convention, concerning the participation of regional economic integration organizations constituted by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe, to mean that it refers exclusively to international organizations to which States members have transferred their competence in respect of the signature, conclusion and application on their behalf of international agreements and in respect of the exercise of their rights and responsibilities in the field of transboundary pollution.

Notes:

[1] The date of 16 March 1983 has been retained on the basis of the English and Russian authentic texts of article 16 (1) (". . . on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the twenty-fourth instrument."), which differ in that respect from the French text (". . . le quatre-vingt-dixième jour *à compter de la date de dépôt* . . .") but are more in accordance with the computation method generally used for multilateral treaties deposited with the Secretary-General.

[2] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 November 1979 and 18 March 1987 respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 November 1979 and 23 December 1983, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 November 1979 and 7 June 1982, respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[8] Including the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man, Gibraltar, the United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekhelia in the island of Cyprus.

1. a) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution on Long-term Financing of the Co-operative Programme for Monitoring and Evaluation of the Long-range Transmission of Air Pollutants in Europe (EMEP)

Geneva, 28 September 1984

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 January 1988 in accordance with article 10 (a) and (b).
REGISTRATION: 28 January 1988, No. 25638.
STATUS: Signatories: 22. Parties: 42.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1491, p. 167 and doc. EB.AIR/AC.1/4, Annex, and EB.AIR/CRP.1/Add.4.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and adopted by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on 27 September 1984. It was opened for signature at Geneva from 28 September to 5 October 1984, and it remained open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 4 April 1985.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria		4 Jun 1987 a
Belarus	28 Sep 1984	4 Oct 1985 A
Belgium	25 Feb 1985	5 Aug 1987
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Bulgaria	4 Apr 1985	26 Sep 1986 AA
Canada	3 Oct 1984	4 Dec 1985
Croatia[1]		21 Sep 1992 d
Cyprus		20 Nov 1991 a
Czech Republic[2]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark	28 Sep 1984	29 Apr 1986
Estonia		7 Dec 2001 a
European Community	28 Sep 1984	17 Jul 1986 AA
Finland	7 Dec 1984	24 Jun 1986
France	22 Feb 1985	30 Oct 1987 AA
Germany[3,4]	26 Feb 1985	7 Oct 1986
Greece		24 Jun 1988 a
Hungary	27 Mar 1985	8 May 1985 AA
Ireland	4 Apr 1985	26 Jun 1987
Italy	28 Sep 1984	12 Jan 1989
Latvia		18 Feb 1997 a
Liechtenstein		1 May 1985 a
Lithuania		7 Nov 2003 a
Luxembourg	21 Nov 1984	24 Aug 1987
Malta		14 Mar 1997 a
Monaco		27 Aug 1999 a
Montenegro[5]		23 Oct 2006 d
Netherlands[6]	28 Sep 1984	22 Oct 1985 A
Norway	28 Sep 1984	12 Mar 1985 A
Poland		14 Sep 1988 a
Portugal		19 Jan 1989 a
Romania		28 Apr 2003 a
Russian Federation	28 Sep 1984	21 Aug 1985 A
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[2]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		11 Aug 1987 a
Sweden	28 Sep 1984	12 Aug 1985
Switzerland	3 Oct 1984	26 Jul 1985
Turkey	3 Oct 1984	20 Dec 1985
Ukraine	28 Sep 1984	30 Aug 1985 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	20 Nov 1984	12 Aug 1985
United States of America	28 Sep 1984	29 Oct 1984 A

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Protocol on 28 October 1987. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 26 November 1986. See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 17 December 1986 with the following declaration:

. . . In accordance with article 3, paragraph 1 of the Protocol, the German Democratic Republic declares that the contributions of the German Democratic Republic will be made in national currency which can exclusively be used for deliveries and services by the German Democratic Republic.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

1. b) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on the Reduction of Sulphur Emissions or their Transboundary Fluxes by at least 30 per cent

Helsinki, 8 July 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 September 1987, in accordance with article 11 (1).
REGISTRATION: 2 September 1987, No. 25247.
STATUS: Signatories: 19. Parties: 22.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1480, p. 215.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and was adopted on 8 July 1985 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. It was open for signature at Helsinki from 8 to 12 July 1985.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	9 Jul 1985	4 Jun 1987
Belarus	9 Jul 1985	10 Sep 1986 A
Belgium	9 Jul 1985	9 Jun 1989
Bulgaria	9 Jul 1985	26 Sep 1986 AA
Canada	9 Jul 1985	4 Dec 1985
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark	9 Jul 1985	29 Apr 1986
Estonia		7 Mar 2000 a
Finland	9 Jul 1985	24 Jun 1986
France	9 Jul 1985	13 Mar 1986 AA
Germany[2,3]	9 Jul 1985	3 Mar 1987
Hungary	9 Jul 1985	11 Sep 1986
Italy	9 Jul 1985	5 Feb 1990
Liechtenstein	9 Jul 1985	13 Feb 1986
Luxembourg	9 Jul 1985	24 Aug 1987
Netherlands[4]	9 Jul 1985	30 Apr 1986 A
Norway	9 Jul 1985	4 Nov 1986
Russian Federation	9 Jul 1985	10 Sep 1986 A
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 d
Sweden	9 Jul 1985	31 Mar 1986
Switzerland	9 Jul 1985	21 Sep 1987
Ukraine	9 Jul 1985	2 Oct 1986 A

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Protocol on 9 July 1985 and 26 November 1986, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] The German Democratic Republic had signed and approved the Protocol on 9 July 1985 and 26 November 1986, respectively. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

1. c) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on long-range transboundary air pollution concerning the control of emissions of nitrogen oxides or their transboundary fluxes

Sofia, 31 October 1988

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 February 1991, in accordance with article 15 (1).
REGISTRATION: 14 February 1991, No. 27874.
STATUS: Signatories: 25. Parties: 31.
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.252.1988.TREATIES-1 of 6 December 1988.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and was adopted on 31 October 1988 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. It was open for signature at Sofia from 1 to 4 November 1988 and subsequently, at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 5 May 1989.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	1 Nov 1988	15 Jan 1990
Belarus	1 Nov 1988	8 Jun 1989 A
Belgium	1 Nov 1988	8 Nov 2000
Bulgaria	1 Nov 1988	30 Mar 1989
Canada	1 Nov 1988	25 Jan 1991
Cyprus		2 Sep 2004 a
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 d
Denmark[2]	1 Nov 1988	1 Mar 1993 A
Estonia		7 Mar 2000 a
European Community		17 Dec 1993 a
Finland	1 Nov 1988	1 Feb 1990
France	1 Nov 1988	20 Jul 1989 AA
Germany[3]	1 Nov 1988	16 Nov 1990
Greece	1 Nov 1988	29 Apr 1998
Hungary	3 May 1989	12 Nov 1991 AA
Ireland	1 May 1989	17 Oct 1994
Italy	1 Nov 1988	19 May 1992
Liechtenstein	1 Nov 1988	24 Mar 1994
Lithuania		26 May 2006 a
Luxembourg	1 Nov 1988	4 Oct 1990
Netherlands[4]	1 Nov 1988	11 Oct 1989 A
Norway	1 Nov 1988	11 Oct 1989
Poland	1 Nov 1988	
Russian Federation	1 Nov 1988	21 Jun 1989 A
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		5 Jan 2006 a
Spain	1 Nov 1988	4 Dec 1990
Sweden	1 Nov 1988	27 Jul 1990
Switzerland	1 Nov 1988	18 Sep 1990
Ukraine	1 Nov 1988	24 Jul 1989 A
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	1 Nov 1988	15 Oct 1990
United States of America	1 Nov 1988	13 Jul 1989 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

Statement:

"In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 1 of the protocol, the Government of the United States of America specifies 1978 as the applicable calendar year for determining measures to control and/or reduce its national annual emissions of nitrogen oxides or their transboundary fluxes.

The Government of the United States of America believes that there must be a follow-on protocol to establish a control obligation based on scientific, technical and economic factors, including consideration of the protocol's effect on the innovative control technologies program of the United States. If such a protocol is not adopted by 1996, the United States of America will consider withdrawal from this protocol.

The Government of the United States of America understands that nations will have the flexibility to meet the overall requirements of the protocol through the most effective means."

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and approved the Protocol on 1 November 1988 and 17 August 1990, respectively. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] With a declaration of non-application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Protocol on 1 November 1988.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] The instrument specifies that the said Protocol is ratified in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man and the Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus.

1. d) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution concerning the Control of Emissions of Volatile Organic Compounds or their Transboundary Fluxes

Geneva, 18 November 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 September 1997, in accordance with article 16 (1).
REGISTRATION: 29 September 1997, No. 34322.
STATUS: Signatories: 23. Parties: 21.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2001, p. 187.

Note: The Protocol was drawn up within the framework of the Economic Commission for Europe and was adopted on 18 November 1991 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution. It was opened for signature at the United Nations Office at Geneva from 18 to 19 November 1991 and thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 22 May 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Austria	19 Nov 1991	23 Aug 1994
Belgium	19 Nov 1991	8 Nov 2000
Bulgaria	19 Nov 1991	27 Feb 1998
Canada	19 Nov 1991	
Czech Republic		1 Jul 1997 a
Denmark[1]	19 Nov 1991	21 May 1996 A
Estonia		7 Mar 2000 a
European Community	2 Apr 1992	
Finland	19 Nov 1991	11 Jan 1994 A
France	19 Nov 1991	12 Jun 1997 AA
Germany	19 Nov 1991	8 Dec 1994
Greece	19 Nov 1991	
Hungary	19 Nov 1991	10 Nov 1995
Italy	19 Nov 1991	30 Jun 1995
Liechtenstein	19 Nov 1991	24 Mar 1994
Luxembourg	19 Nov 1991	11 Nov 1993
Monaco		26 Jul 2001 a
Netherlands[2]	19 Nov 1991	29 Sep 1993 A
Norway	19 Nov 1991	7 Jan 1993
Portugal	2 Apr 1992	
Slovakia		15 Dec 1999 a
Spain	19 Nov 1991	1 Feb 1994
Sweden	19 Nov 1991	8 Jan 1993
Switzerland	19 Nov 1991	21 Mar 1994
Ukraine	19 Nov 1991	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3]	19 Nov 1991	14 Jun 1994
United States of America	19 Nov 1991	

Declarations made in accordance with article 2 (2) of the Protocol (Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"With regard to article 2 (basic obligations) Austria declares to be bound by the provisions of paragraph 2 (*a*). Furthermore, Austria chooses the year 1988 as a base year with respect to paragraph 2 (*a*)."

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Belgium undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis (article 2, paragraph 2 (*a*)).

BULGARIA

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Bulgaria declares under article 2, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (*c*) that it shall, as soon as possible and as a first step, take effective measures to ensure at least that at the latest by the year 1999 its national annual emissions of VOCs do not exceed the 1988 levels."

CANADA

Upon signature:

"Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, Canada is pleased to inform other Parties to the present Protocol that it selects option (*b*) from among the three options available. Base year: 1988."

FRANCE

Declaration :

[The Government of the French Republic] undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOC's by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis [article 2, paragraph 2 (*a*)]

CZECH REPUBLIC

Declaration :

"[The Government of the Czech Republic] declares that it shall use the 1990 levels as the basis for its reduction of annual emissions of VOCs pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2(*a*) of the Protocol."

DENMARK

Upon signature:

"Denmark hereby declares that it will reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, using 1985 as a basis.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"The European Economic community, taking account in particular of the alternatives available to its Member States in application of Article 2 (2) of the Protocol, hereby declares that its obligations under the Protocol with regard to the objectives for reducing VOC emissions may not be greater than the sum of the obligations entered into by its Member States which have ratified the Protocol."

FINLAND

Upon signature:

"Finland declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30%, using 1988 levels as a basis."

FRANCE

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon approval:

The French Republic undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis (article 2, paragraph 2 (*a*)).

GERMANY

Upon signature:

"Germany specifies that it shall reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999 using 1988 levels as a basis according to article 2, paragraph 2 (*a*)."

GREECE

Upon signature:

"Greece declares under article 2, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph c) that it shall, as soon as possible and as a first step, take effective measures to ensure at least that at the latest by the year 1999 its national annual emissions of VOCs do not exceed the 1988 levels."

HUNGARY

Upon signature:

"The Republic of Hungary shall control and reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs or their transboundary fluxes in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 (*c*) of article 2 of the Protocol."

ITALY

Upon signature:

"Italy declares its intention to meet the requirements of article 2.1 of the Protocol in the way specified at article 2, paragraph 2, letter (*a*) and its intention to indicate as reference year as a basis for reduction: 1990."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Upon signature:

"As a basis to reduce its annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, Liechtenstein will use 1984 levels."

LUXEMBOURG

Upon signature:

Luxembourg undertakes to reduce its national annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1990 levels as a basis (article 2, paragraph 2 (*a*)).

MONACO

Declaration :

The Government of the Principality of Monaco shall reduce its emissions of VOCs by 30% during the year 2001, using 1990 levels as a basis.

NETHERLANDS

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

"The Netherlands declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30% using 1988 levels as a basis."

NORWAY

Upon signature:

"The Government of Norway intends to fulfil the obligations of the VOC Protocol as specified in article 2, paragraph 2 (b). Norway will use the year 1989 as the base year for reductions.

Based on present prognosis of VOC emissions the total Norwegian reduction of VOC will be in the order of 20% by the year 1999.

"Norway will apply equivalent measures based on the best available technologies which are economically feasible, outside the TOMA as inside.

"The Government of Norway will fulfil its obligations in the Exclusive Economic Zone of Norway under the Protocol in conformity with international law."

PORTUGAL

Upon signature:

"Portugal declares under its article 2, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph *a*), that is shall control and reduce its national annual emissions of VOC's or their transboundary fluxes in accordance with the way specified at that article."

SLOVAKIA

"... the Slovak Republic specifies the year 1990 as the base year for purposes of the Protocol."

SPAIN

Upon signature:

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain declares that it accepts the commitment set forth in article 2 [(2)] (*a*) to reduce national annual emissions by at least 30 per cent by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis.

SWEDEN

Upon signature:

"Sweden declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30%, using 1988 levels as a basis."

Upon ratification:

"Sweden declares that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, using 1988 levels as a basis."

SWITZERLAND

Upon signature:

"As a basis to reduce its annual emissions of VOCs by at least 30% by the year 1999, Switzerland will use 1984 levels."

UKRAINE

Upon signature:

[The Government of Ukraine] signs [the said Protocol] on the conditions set out in paragraph 2 (*b*) of article 2 of the Protocol.

In so doing the Government of Ukraine stipulates that the following designated tropospheric ozone management areas (TOMAs) situated in Ukraine should be included in Annex I to the Protocol:

TOMA No. 1: the Poltavian, Dnepropetrovsk, Zaporozhian, Donetsk, Lugantsk, Nikolaivian, Khersonian regions (194.3 thousand square kilometres);

TOMA No. 2: Lvovian, Ternopol, Ivano-Frankovsk, Zakarpatian regions (62.3 thousand square kilometres).

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed uponratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declares] that it intends to reduce its annual national emissions of VOCs by at least 30%, using 1988 levels as a basis."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Upon signature:

"In accordance with article 2, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, the Government of the United States of America specifies 1984 emission levels as the basis for its VOC reductions under this Protocol [article 2, paragraph 2 (*a*)]".

Notes:

[1] Upon signature, decision was reserved as concerns the application of the Protocol to the Faroe Islands and Greenland. Upon acceptance, the Government of Denmark declared that "This acceptance does not apply to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.".

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] Application to the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Bailiwick of Jersey and the Isle of Man.

1. e) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Further Reduction of Sulphur Emissions

Oslo, 14 June 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 August 1998, in accordance with article 15 (1).
REGISTRATION: 5 August 1998, No. 21623.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 27.
TEXT: Doc. EB.AIR/R.84; E/ECE/ENHS/001/2002/l (Adoption of adjustments).[1]

Note: The Protocol, adopted on 13 June 1994 by the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution at its special session held in Oslo on 13 and 14 June 1994, was open for signature at Oslo until 14 June 1994, and thereafter, at United Nations Headquarters, New York, until 12 December 1994, in accordance with its article 12 (1). The Protocol is open to signature by States members of the Economic commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Comission, pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and social Council Resolution 36 (IV)[2] of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations, constituted by sovereign Sates members of the Commission, which have competence in respect of the negotiation, conclusion and application of international agreements in matters covered by the Protocol, provided that the States and organizations concerned are Parties to the 1979 Convention.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Succession (d)*
Austria	14 Jun 1994	27 Aug 1998
Belgium[3]	14 Jun 1994	8 Nov 2000
Bulgaria	14 Jun 1994	5 Jul 2005
Canada	14 Jun 1994	8 Jul 1997
Croatia	14 Jun 1994	27 Apr 1999 A
Cyprus		26 Apr 2006 a
Czech Republic	14 Jun 1994	19 Jun 1997
Denmark[4]	14 Jun 1994	25 Aug 1997 AA
European Community	14 Jun 1994	24 Apr 1998 AA
Finland	14 Jun 1994	8 Jun 1998 A
France	14 Jun 1994	12 Jun 1997 AA
Germany	14 Jun 1994	3 Jun 1998
Greece	14 Jun 1994	24 Feb 1998
Hungary	9 Dec 1994	11 Mar 2002
Ireland	17 Oct 1994	4 Sep 1998
Italy	14 Jun 1994	14 Sep 1998
Liechtenstein	14 Jun 1994	27 Aug 1997 A
Luxembourg	14 Jun 1994	14 Jun 1996
Monaco		9 Apr 2002 a
Netherlands[5]	14 Jun 1994	30 May 1995 A
Norway	14 Jun 1994	3 Jul 1995
Poland	14 Jun 1994	
Russian Federation	14 Jun 1994	
Slovakia	14 Jun 1994	1 Apr 1998
Slovenia	14 Jun 1994	7 May 1998
Spain	14 Jun 1994	7 Aug 1997
Sweden	14 Jun 1994	19 Jul 1995
Switzerland	14 Jun 1994	23 Jan 1998
Ukraine	14 Jun 1994	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	14 Jun 1994	17 Dec 1996

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 9 of the Protocol that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

BULGARIA

Declaration:

" .....[u]nder Article 2, paragraph 5, subparagraph (c): The Republic of Bulgaria declares that it extends the time period for the sulphur content of diesel to 6 years and of gas oil to 9 years after the date of entry into force of the Protocol."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"The European Community states that the ceiling for emissions and the weighted average percentage for the European Community ought not to exceed the sum of the obligations of the Member States of the European Union which have ratified the Protocol, while stressing that all its Member States must reduce their S02 emissions in accordance with the emission ceilings set in Annex II to the Protocol and in line with the relevant Community legislation."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 9 of the [said Protocol], that it accepts both means of dispute settlement referred to in that paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

Notes:

[1] In a letter dated 18 January 2002 and received on 12 March 2002, the Secretary to the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, informed the Secretary-General that at its nineteenth session, the Executive Body adopted by consensus an adjustment to annex II to the Protocol necessary to enable Monaco's accession to the Protocol, agreeing to add its name, together with emission levels, sulphur emission ceilings and percentage emission reductions.

In accordance with article 11 of the Protocol, the adoption of the adjustment will become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of the said letter, that is to say on 18 April 2002.

Subsequently, in a letter dated 8 March 2005 and received on 14 March 2005, the Secretary to the Executive Body for the Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution, informed the Secretary-General that at its twenty-second session, the Executive Body adopted by consensus an adjustment to annex II to the Protocol necessary to enable Cyprus's accession to the Protocol, agreeing to add its name, together with emission levels, sulphur emission ceilings and percentage emission reductions.

In accordance with article 11 of the Protocol, the adoption of the adjustment will become effective on the ninetieth day following the date of the said letter, that is to say on 12 May 2005.

[2] United Nations, *Resolutions of the Economic and Social Council,* 4th session, 28-29 March 1942 (E/437), p. 10.

[3] With a declaration to the effect that this signature also commits the Flemish region, the Wallone region and the region of the capital Brussels.

[4] With reservation for the application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[6] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Bailiwick of Jersey. On 21 November 2003: for the Isle of Man.

1. f) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Heavy Metals

Aarhus, 24 June 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 December 2003, in accordance with article 17 which reads as follows : "1. The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date on which the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession has been deposited with the Depositary. 2. For each State and organization referred to in article 14, paragraph 1, which ratifies, accepts or approves the present Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit by such Party of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 29 December 2003, No. 21623.

STATUS: Signatories: 36. Parties: 28.

TEXT: Document of the Economic and Social Council EB.AIR/1998/1.

Note: Open for signature at Aarhus (Denmark) from 24 to 25 June 1998, then at United Nations Headquarters until 21 December 1998, by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Commission pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and Social Council resoluton 36 (IV)[1] of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations, constituted by sovereign States members of the Commission, which have competence in respect of the negotiation, conclusion and application of international agreements in matters covered by the Protocol, provided that the States and organizations concerned are Parties to the Convention.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Armenia	18 Dec 1998	
Austria	24 Jun 1998	17 Dec 2003
Belgium	24 Jun 1998	8 Jun 2005
Bulgaria	24 Jun 1998	28 Oct 2003
Canada	24 Jun 1998	18 Dec 1998
Croatia	24 Jun 1998	
Cyprus	24 Jun 1998	2 Sep 2004
Czech Republic	24 Jun 1998	6 Aug 2002
Denmark	24 Jun 1998	12 Jul 2001 AA
Estonia		24 Mar 2006 a
European Community	24 Jun 1998	3 May 2001 AA
Finland	24 Jun 1998	20 Jun 2000 A
France	24 Jun 1998	26 Jul 2002 AA
Germany	24 Jun 1998	30 Sep 2003
Greece	24 Jun 1998	
Hungary	18 Dec 1998	19 Apr 2005
Iceland	24 Jun 1998	
Ireland	24 Jun 1998	
Italy	24 Jun 1998	
Latvia	24 Jun 1998	9 Jun 2005
Liechtenstein	24 Jun 1998	23 Dec 2003 A
Lithuania	24 Jun 1998	28 Oct 2004
Luxembourg	24 Jun 1998	1 May 2000
Moldova	24 Jun 1998	1 Oct 2002
Monaco		13 Nov 2003 a
Netherlands[2]	24 Jun 1998	23 Jun 2000 A
Norway	24 Jun 1998	16 Dec 1999
Poland	24 Jun 1998	
Portugal	24 Jun 1998	
Romania	24 Jun 1998	5 Sep 2003
Slovakia	24 Jun 1998	30 Dec 2002 A
Slovenia	24 Jun 1998	9 Feb 2004
Spain	24 Jun 1998	
Sweden	24 Jun 1998	19 Jan 2000
Switzerland	24 Jun 1998	14 Nov 2000
Ukraine	24 Jun 1998	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24 Jun 1998	6 Jul 2005
United States of America	24 Jun 1998	10 Jan 2001 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with Article 3 paragraph 1 and Annex 1 of the Protocol the year 1985 as a reference year for the obligations of this Paragraph.

The Repbulic of Austria declares in accordance with Article 11 of the Protocol that it accepts both the means of dispute settlement mentioned in Paragraph 2 as compulsroy in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

CANADA[3]

26 October 1999

Declaration :

"Canada intends to act in accordance with paragraph 7 of Article 3 of this Protocol."

ESTONIA

"Pursuant to article 3, paragraph 1 and Annex I of the Protocol, the Republic of Estonia set the reference years as follows:

Mercury (Hg) - year 1990

Cadmium (Cd) - year 1990

Lead (Pb) - year 1990."

FINLAND

Declaration:

"The Government of Finland confirms that the reference year set in accordance with the annex I is the year 1990".

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares in accordance with Article 11, paragraph 2, of the Protocol that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

Article 3, paragraph 1, of [the Protocol], provides that each Party shall reduce its total annual emissions into the atmosphere of each of the heavy metals listed in annex I from the level of the emission in the reference year set in accordance with that annex. Annex I sets as the reference year 1990, or an alternative year from 1985 to 1995 inclusive specified by a Party upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

[The Governnment of Luxembourg hereby declares] that the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg intends to choose 1990 as the reference year.

MONACO

Declaration:

Pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 1, and Annex I of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Principality of Monaco declares the year 1992 as its reference year.

NORWAY

Declarations:

"1.With reference to Article 3 no 2 Litra (a) and Annex III, Norway hereby declares that the reference year should be 1990.

2.With reference to Article 11 no 2, Norway hereby declares that, in respect of any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Protocol, it recognizes only the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

a) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

ROMANIA

Declaration:

Romania declares that the reference year set in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 1, and Annex 1 of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Heavy Metals is the year 1989.

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 1, and Annex I of the Protocol on Heavy Metals, the Slovak Republic hereby declares the year 1990 as its reference year."

Notes:

[1] *Official documents of the Economic and Social Council* (E/402), p. 10.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] On 30 June 1999, the Government of Canada informed the Secretary-General, that its instrument of ratification should have included the declaration. The Secretary-General proposed to receive the declaration in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of one of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of its circulation (28 July 1999). No objection having been received, the declaration was accepted for deposit upon the expiration of the above-stipulated 90-day period, that is on 26 October 1999.

1. g) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Aarhus, 24 June 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 October 2003, in accordance with article 18(1) which reads as follows: "1. The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date on which the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession has been deposited with the Depositary. 2. For each State and organization referred to in article 15, paragraph 1, which ratifies, accepts or approves the present Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit by such Party of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 23 October 2003, No. 21623.

STATUS: Signatories: 36. Parties: 28.

TEXT: Document of the Economic and Social Council EB.AIR/1998/2.

Note: Open for signature at Aarhus (Denmark) from 24 to 25 June 1998, then at United Nations Headquarters until 21 December 1998, by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Commission pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and Social Council resolution 36 (IV)[1] of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations, constituted by sovereign States members of the Commission, which have competence in respect of the negotiation, conclusion and application of international agreements in matters covered by the Protocol, provided that the States and organizations concerned are Parties to the Convention.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Armenia	18 Dec 1998	
Austria	24 Jun 1998	27 Aug 2002
Belgium	24 Jun 1998	25 May 2006
Bulgaria	24 Jun 1998	5 Dec 2001
Canada	24 Jun 1998	18 Dec 1998
Croatia	24 Jun 1998	
Cyprus	24 Jun 1998	2 Sep 2004
Czech Republic	24 Jun 1998	6 Aug 2002
Denmark	24 Jun 1998	6 Jul 2001 AA
Estonia		11 May 2005 a
European Community	24 Jun 1998	30 Apr 2004 AA
Finland	24 Jun 1998	3 Sep 2002 A
France	24 Jun 1998	25 Jul 2003 AA
Germany	24 Jun 1998	25 Apr 2002
Greece	24 Jun 1998	
Hungary	18 Dec 1998	7 Jan 2004
Iceland	24 Jun 1998	29 May 2003
Ireland	24 Jun 1998	
Italy	24 Jun 1998	20 Jun 2006
Latvia	24 Jun 1998	28 Oct 2004
Liechtenstein	24 Jun 1998	23 Dec 2003 A
Lithuania	24 Jun 1998	16 Jun 2006
Luxembourg	24 Jun 1998	1 May 2000
Moldova	24 Jun 1998	1 Oct 2002
Netherlands[2]	24 Jun 1998	23 Jun 2000 A
Norway	24 Jun 1998	16 Dec 1999
Poland	24 Jun 1998	
Portugal	24 Jun 1998	
Romania	24 Jun 1998	5 Sep 2003
Slovakia	24 Jun 1998	30 Dec 2002 A
Slovenia	24 Jun 1998	15 Nov 2005
Spain	24 Jun 1998	
Sweden	24 Jun 1998	19 Jan 2000
Switzerland	24 Jun 1998	14 Nov 2000
Ukraine	24 Jun 1998	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24 Jun 1998	2 Sep 2005
United States of America	24 Jun 1998	

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declarations:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with Article 3 Paragraph 5 (a) and Annex III of the Protocol the year 1987 as a reference year for the obligations of this Paragraph.

The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with Article 12 of the Protocol that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in Paragraph 2 as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of disputes settlement."

ESTONIA

Declaration:

".....the Republic of Estonia informs that in accordance with the Article 3 paragraph 5 subparagraph a of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution

on Persistent Organic Pollutants the Republic of Estonia chose reference years as follows:

1) Polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs)-1995;

2) Polychlorinated dibenzo-p-dioxins (PCDD) and polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) - 1990;

3) Hexaclorobenzene (HCB) - 1995."

FINLAND

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 3 (5) of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Republic of Finland specifies 1994 as its reference year in accordance with annex III of the said Protocol."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Protocol that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

Article 3, paragraph 5, of [the Protocol], provides that each Party shall reduce its total annual emissions of each of the substances listed in annex III from the level of the emission in a reference year set in accordance with that annex. Annex III sets as the reference year 1990, or an alternative year from 1985 to 1995 inclusive specified by a Party upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

[The Government of Luxembourg hereby declares] that the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg intends to choose 1990 as the reference year.

NORWAY

Declarations:

"1.With reference to Article 3 no 5 Litra (a) and Annex III, Norway hereby declares that the reference year should be 1990.

2.With reference to Article 12 no 2, Norway hereby declares that, in respect of any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Protocol, it recognizes only the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory *ipso facto* and without special agreement, in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

a) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

ROMANIA

Romania declares that the reference year set in accordance with Article 3, paragraph 5 (a), and Annex III of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution on Persistent Organic Pollutants is the year 1989.

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 3, paragraph 5 (a), and Annex III of the Protocol on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Slovak Republic hereby declares the year 1990 as its reference year."

Notes:

[1] *Official Documents of the Economic and Social Council* (E/437), p. 36.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

1. h) Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-range Transboundary Air Pollution to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-level Ozone

Gothenburg (Sweden), 30 November 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 17 May 2005, in accordance with article 17 which reads as follows: "1. The present Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date on which the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession has been deposited with the Depositary. 2. For each State and organization that meets the requirements of article 14, paragraph 1, which ratifies, accepts or approves the present Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit by such Party of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 17 May 2005, No. 21623.

STATUS: Signatories: 31. Parties: 21.

TEXT: Document of the Economic and Social Council EB.AIR/1999/1.

Note: Open for signature at Gothenburg (Sweden) on 30 November 1999 and 1 December 1999, then at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 30 May 2000, by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Economic Commission for Europe pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and Social Council resolution 36 (IV)[1] of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations, constituted by sovereign States members of the Economic Commission for Europe, which have competence in respect of the negotiation, conclusion and application of international agreements in matters covered by the Protocol, provided that the States and organizations concerned are Parties to the Convention and are listed in annex II.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Armenia	1 Dec 1999	
Austria	1 Dec 1999	
Belgium	4 Feb 2000	
Bulgaria	1 Dec 1999	5 Jul 2005
Canada	1 Dec 1999	
Croatia	1 Dec 1999	
Czech Republic	1 Dec 1999	12 Aug 2004
Denmark[2]	1 Dec 1999	11 Jun 2002 AA
European Community		23 Jun 2003 a
Finland	1 Dec 1999	23 Dec 2003 A
France	1 Dec 1999	
Germany	1 Dec 1999	21 Oct 2004
Greece	1 Mar 2000	
Hungary	1 Dec 1999	13 Nov 2006 AA
Ireland	1 Dec 1999	
Italy	1 Dec 1999	
Latvia	1 Dec 1999	25 May 2004 A
Liechtenstein	1 Dec 1999	
Lithuania		2 Apr 2004 a
Luxembourg	1 Dec 1999	7 Aug 2001
Moldova	23 May 2000	
Netherlands[3]	1 Dec 1999	5 Feb 2004 A
Norway	1 Dec 1999	30 Jan 2002
Poland	30 May 2000	
Portugal	1 Dec 1999	16 Feb 2005 AA
Romania	1 Dec 1999	5 Sep 2003
Slovakia	1 Dec 1999	28 Apr 2005
Slovenia	1 Dec 1999	4 May 2004
Spain	1 Dec 1999	28 Jan 2005
Sweden	1 Dec 1999	28 Mar 2002
Switzerland	1 Dec 1999	14 Sep 2005
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	1 Dec 1999	8 Dec 2005
United States of America	1 Dec 1999	22 Nov 2004 A

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

BULGARIA

Declaration:

The Republic of Bulgaria declares that, for the purposes of paragraphs 1 and 2 of Annex VII and paragraphs 6 and 9 of Annex IX of the Protocol, it wishes to be treated as a country with an economy in transition.

ROMANIA

Declaration:

In accordance with Annex VII paragraph 3 of the Protocol to the 1979 Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution to Abate Acidification, Eutrophication and Ground-Level Ozone, Romania wishes to be treated as a country with an economy in transition for the purposes of paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Annex VII of the Protocol.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Reservation:

"... the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, having considered the Protocol aforesaid, hereby confirms and ratifies the same and undertakes faithfully to perform and carry out all the stipulations therein contained subject to the reservation that the United Kingdom reserves the right not to apply article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol, in so far as it applies to new lean-burn spark ignition 4-stroke engines greater than 1 MWth capacity, believing that it is not likely to be technically feasible to achieve the limit value, specified in table 4 of annex V to the Protocol, of 250 mg/Nm3, for such engines.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Declaration:

"The United States will act in accordance with article 3, paragraph 9."

Notes :

[1] *Official Documents of the Economic and Social Council*, (E/437), p. 36.

[2] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

2. Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer

Vienna, 22 March 1985

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 September 1988, in accordance with article 17 (1).
REGISTRATION: 22 September 1988, No. 26164.
STATUS: Signatories: 28. Parties: 191.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1513, p. 293.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Conference on the Protection of the Ozone Layer and open for signature at Vienna from 22 March 1985 to 21 September 1985, and at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 22 September 1985 until 21 March 1986.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		17 Jun 2004 a
Albania		8 Oct 1999 a
Algeria		20 Oct 1992 a
Angola		17 May 2000 a
Antigua and Barbuda		3 Dec 1992 a
Argentina	22 Mar 1985	18 Jan 1990
Armenia		1 Oct 1999 a
Australia		16 Sep 1987 a
Austria	16 Sep 1985	19 Aug 1987
Azerbaijan		12 Jun 1996 a
Bahamas		1 Apr 1993 a
Bahrain		27 Apr 1990 a
Bangladesh		2 Aug 1990 a
Barbados		16 Oct 1992 a
Belarus	22 Mar 1985	20 Jun 1986 A
Belgium	22 Mar 1985	17 Oct 1988
Belize		6 Jun 1997 a
Benin		1 Jul 1993 a
Bhutan		23 Aug 2004 a
Bolivia		3 Oct 1994 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[1]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		4 Dec 1991 a
Brazil		19 Mar 1990 a
Brunei Darussalam		26 Jul 1990 a
Bulgaria		20 Nov 1990 a
Burkina Faso	12 Dec 1985	30 Mar 1989
Burundi		6 Jan 1997 a
Cambodia		27 Jun 2001 a
Cameroon		30 Aug 1989 a
Canada	22 Mar 1985	4 Jun 1986
Cape Verde		31 Jul 2001 a
Central African Republic		29 Mar 1993 a
Chad		18 May 1989 a
Chile	22 Mar 1985	6 Mar 1990
China[2,3]		11 Sep 1989 a
Colombia		16 Jul 1990 a
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 a
Congo		16 Nov 1994 a
Cook Islands		22 Dec 2003 a
Costa Rica		30 Jul 1991 a
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Apr 1993 a
Croatia[1]		21 Sep 1992 d
Cuba		14 Jul 1992 a
Cyprus		28 May 1992 a
Czech Republic[4]		30 Sep 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		24 Jan 1995 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		30 Nov 1994 a
Denmark	22 Mar 1985	29 Sep 1988
Djibouti		30 Jul 1999 a
Dominica		31 Mar 1993 a
Dominican Republic		18 May 1993 a
Ecuador		10 Apr 1990 a
Egypt	22 Mar 1985	9 May 1988
El Salvador		2 Oct 1992 a
Equatorial Guinea		17 Aug 1988 a
Eritrea		10 Mar 2005 a
Estonia		17 Oct 1996 a
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 a
European Community	22 Mar 1985	17 Oct 1988 AA
Fiji		23 Oct 1989 a
Finland	22 Mar 1985	26 Sep 1986
France	22 Mar 1985	4 Dec 1987 AA
Gabon		9 Feb 1994 a
Gambia		25 Jul 1990 a
Georgia		21 Mar 1996 a
Germany[5,6]	22 Mar 1985	30 Sep 1988
Ghana		24 Jul 1989 a
Greece	22 Mar 1985	29 Dec 1988
Grenada		31 Mar 1993 a
Guatemala		11 Sep 1987 a
Guinea		25 Jun 1992 a
Guinea-Bissau		12 Nov 2002 a
Guyana		12 Aug 1993 a
Haiti		29 Mar 2000 a
Honduras		14 Oct 1993 a
Hungary		4 May 1988 a
Iceland		29 Aug 1989 a
India		18 Mar 1991 a
Indonesia		26 Jun 1992 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Oct 1990 a
Ireland		15 Sep 1988 a
Israel		30 Jun 1992 a
Italy	22 Mar 1985	19 Sep 1988
Jamaica		31 Mar 1993 a
Japan		30 Sep 1988 a
Jordan		31 May 1989 a
Kazakhstan		26 Aug 1998 a
Kenya		9 Nov 1988 a
Kiribati		7 Jan 1993 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Kuwait		23 Nov 1992 a
Kyrgyzstan		31 May 2000 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		21 Aug 1998 a
Latvia		28 Apr 1995 a
Lebanon		30 Mar 1993 a
Lesotho		25 Mar 1994 a
Liberia		15 Jan 1996 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		11 Jul 1990 a
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1989 a
Lithuania		18 Jan 1995 a
Luxembourg	17 Apr 1985	17 Oct 1988
Madagascar		7 Nov 1996 a
Malawi		9 Jan 1991 a
Malaysia		29 Aug 1989 a
Maldives		26 Apr 1988 a
Mali		28 Oct 1994 a
Malta		15 Sep 1988 a
Marshall Islands		11 Mar 1993 a
Mauritania		26 May 1994 a
Mauritius		18 Aug 1992 a
Mexico	1 Apr 1985	14 Sep 1987
Micronesia (Federated States of)		3 Aug 1994 a
Moldova		24 Oct 1996 a
Monaco		12 Mar 1993 a
Mongolia		7 Mar 1996 a
Montenegro[7]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	7 Feb 1986	28 Dec 1995
Mozambique		9 Sep 1994 a
Myanmar		24 Nov 1993 a
Namibia		20 Sep 1993 a
Nauru		12 Nov 2001 a
Nepal		6 Jul 1994 a
Netherlands[8]	22 Mar 1985	28 Sep 1988 A
New Zealand[9]	21 Mar 1986	2 Jun 1987
Nicaragua		5 Mar 1993 a
Niger		9 Oct 1992 a
Nigeria		31 Oct 1988 a
Niue		22 Dec 2003 a
Norway	22 Mar 1985	23 Sep 1986
Oman		30 Jun 1999 a
Pakistan		18 Dec 1992 a
Palau		29 May 2001 a
Panama		13 Feb 1989 a
Papua New Guinea		27 Oct 1992 a
Paraguay		3 Dec 1992 a
Peru	22 Mar 1985	7 Apr 1989
Philippines		17 Jul 1991 a
Poland		13 Jul 1990 a
Portugal[3]		17 Oct 1988 a
Qatar		22 Jan 1996 a
Republic of Korea		27 Feb 1992 a
Romania		27 Jan 1993 a
Russian Federation	22 Mar 1985	18 Jun 1986 A
Rwanda		11 Oct 2001 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		10 Aug 1992 a
Saint Lucia		28 Jul 1993 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		2 Dec 1996 a
Samoa		21 Dec 1992 a
Sao Tome and Principe		19 Nov 2001 a
Saudi Arabia		1 Mar 1993 a
Senegal		19 Mar 1993 a
Serbia[1]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		6 Jan 1993 a
Sierra Leone		29 Aug 2001 a
Singapore		5 Jan 1989 a
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[1]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		17 Jun 1993 a
Somalia		1 Aug 2001 a
South Africa		15 Jan 1990 a
Spain		25 Jul 1988 a
Sri Lanka		15 Dec 1989 a
Sudan		29 Jan 1993 a
Suriname		14 Oct 1997 a
Swaziland		10 Nov 1992 a
Sweden	22 Mar 1985	26 Nov 1986
Switzerland	22 Mar 1985	17 Dec 1987
Syrian Arab Republic		12 Dec 1989 a
Tajikistan		6 May 1996 a
Thailand		7 Jul 1989 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[1]		10 Mar 1994 d
Togo		25 Feb 1991 a
Tonga		29 Jul 1998 a
Trinidad and Tobago		28 Aug 1989 a
Tunisia		25 Sep 1989 a
Turkey		20 Sep 1991 a
Turkmenistan		18 Nov 1993 a
Tuvalu		15 Jul 1993 a
Uganda		24 Jun 1988 a
Ukraine	22 Mar 1985	18 Jun 1986 A
United Arab Emirates		22 Dec 1989 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2,10]	20 May 1985	15 May 1987
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Apr 1993 a
United States of America	22 Mar 1985	27 Aug 1986
Uruguay		27 Feb 1989 a
Uzbekistan		18 May 1993 a
Vanuatu		21 Nov 1994 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		1 Sep 1988 a
Viet Nam		26 Jan 1994 a
Yemen		21 Feb 1996 a
Zambia		24 Jan 1990 a
Zimbabwe		3 Nov 1992 a

BAHRAIN[11]

Declaration:

"The accession by the State of Bahrain to the said Convention shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

23 May 1989

"1. On behalf of the European Community, it is hereby declared that the said Community can accept arbitration as a means of dispute settlement within the terms of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer.

It cannot accept submission of any dispute to the International Court of Justice."

"2. According to the customary procedures within the European Community, the Community's financial participation in the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer and in the Montreal Protocol on substances that deplete the Ozone Layer may not involve the Community in expenditure other than administrative costs which may not exceed 2.5% of the total administrative costs."

Declaration by the European Economic Community in conformity with Article 13 (3) of the Vienna Convention for the protection of the ozone layer concerning the extent of its competence with respect to the matters covered by the Convention and by the Montreal Protocol on substances that deplete the ozone layer:

In accordance with the relevant Articles of the EEC Treaty, the Community has competence to take action relating to the preservation, protection and improvement of the quality of the environment.

The Community has exercised its competence in the area covered by the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol in adopting Council Decision 80/372/EEC of 26 March 1980 concerning chlorofluorocarbons in the environment (1), Council Decision 82/795/EEC of 15 November 1982 on the consolidation of precautionary measures concerning chlorofluorocarbons in the environment (2) and Council Regulation (EEC) N° 3322/88 of 14 October 1988 on certain chlorofluorocarbons and halons which deplete the ozone layer. The Community may well exercise its competence in the future by adopting further legislation in this area.

In the field of research in the environment, as referred to by the Convention, the Community has a certain competence by virtue of Council Decision 86/234/EEC of 10 June 1986 adopting multiannual R& D programmes in the field of the environment (1986 to 1990).

(1) OJ N° L 90, 3. 4. 1980, p. 45.
(2) OJ N° L 329, 25. 11. 1982, p. 29.

FINLAND

"With respect to article 11, paragraph 3 of the Convention Finland declares that it accepts both of the said means of dispute settlement as compulsory."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 11, paragraph 3, of the Convention the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 of article 11 of the above-mentioned Convention, both of the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

(a) Arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting;

(b) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

NORWAY

"Norway accepts the means of dispute settlement as described in art. 11, para 3 (*a*) and (*b*) of the Convention as compulsory, that is *a*) arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting, or *b*) submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

SWEDEN

"Sweden accepts the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice [article 11, paragraph 3 (*b*)]

It is, however, the intention of the Swedish Government to accept also the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

Arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting [article 11, paragraph 3 (*a*)].

A declaration in this latter respect will, however, not be given until the procedures for arbitration have been adopted by the Conference of the Parties at its first ordinary meeting."

Notes:

[1] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 16 April 1990. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[3] On 15 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portual a notification to the effect that it shall extend the Convention to Macao. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from the Governments of the Portugal and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[4] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 1 October 1990. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 25 January 1989. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[9] The instrument of ratification indicates that in accordance with the special relationship which exists between New Zealand and the Cook Islands and between New Zealand and Niue, there have been consultations regarding the Convention between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Cook Islands and between the Government of New Zealand and the Government of Niue; that the Government of the Cook Islands, which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in the Cook Islands, has requested that the Convention should extend to the Cook Islands; that the Government of Niue which has exclusive competence to implement treaties in Niue, has requested that the Convention should extend to Niue. The said instrument specifies that accordingly the Convention shall apply also to the Cook Islands and Niue.

In this regard, on 17 March 2004, the Secretary-General received from the Government of New Zealand, the following communcations:

In respect of the Cook Islands:

"... the Government of New Zealand ratified the Convention on 2 June 1987;

... the Government of New Zealand declared, on ratification, that its ratification extended to the Cook Islands;

... the Cook Islands is a self-governing State in a relationship of free association with New Zealand, and possesses in its own right the capacity to enter into treaties and other international agreements with governments and regional and international organisations;

... the Government of the Cook Islands acceded to the Convention in its own right on 22 December 2003;

... the Government of New Zealand declares that, by reason of the accession to the Convention by the Government of the Cook Islands, it regards the Government of Cook Islands as having succeeded to the obligations under the Convention of the Government of New Zealand in respect of the Cook Islands,

... [the Government of New Zealand] declares that, accordingly, as from the date of the accession to the Convention by the Government of the Cook Islands, the Government of New Zealand ceased to have State responsibility for the observance of the obligations under the Convention in respect of the Cook Islands."

In respect of Niue:

"... the Government of New Zealand ratified the Convention on 2 June 1987;

... the Government of New Zealand declared, on ratification, that its ratification extended to Niue;

... Niue is a self-governing State in a relationship of free association with New Zealand, and possesses in its own right the capacity to enter into treaties and other international agreements with governments and regional and international organisations;

... the Government of Niue acceded to the Convention in its own right on 22 December 2003;

... the Government of New Zealand declares that, by reason of the accession to the Convention by the Government of Niue, it regards the Government of Niue as having succeeded to the obligations under the Convention of the Government of New Zealand in respect of Niue,

... [the Government of New Zealand] further declares that, accordingly, as from the date of the accession to the Convention by the Government of Niue, the Government of New Zealand ceased to have State responsibility for the observance of the obligations under the Convention in respect of the territory of Niue."

See also notes 1 under "Cook Islands" and "Niue" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] The instrument of ratification specifies that the said Convention is ratified in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong (see also note 2), Monserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands, and United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the island of Cyprus.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 11 September 1987, from the Government of Argentina the following objection, which was reiterated upon its ratification of the Convention:

The Argentine Republic rejects the ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and reaffirms its sovereignty over those Islands, which form a part of its national territory.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12 and 39/6 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute concerning the question of the Malvinas and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute and to their remaining differences relating to the question, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made. The United Nations General Assembly also adopted resolution 40/21 and 41/40, which again urge the two parties to resume the negotiations.

The Argentine Republic also rejects the ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to what that country calls "British Antarctic Territory".

At the same time, it reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Argentine Antarctic Sector located between longitudes 25° and 74° W and latitude 60° S and the South Pole, including its maritime spaces.

It is appropriate to recall, in this connection, the provisions concerning rights of or claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica contained in article IV of the Antarctic Treaty.

Subsequently, on 1 August 1988, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication concerning the said objection by Argentina:

"The Government of the United Kingdom reject the objection made regarding the application of the Convention by the United Kingdom to the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, and their consequent right to extend treaties to those territories.

With respect to the objection by the Argentine Republic to the application of the Convention to the British Antarctic Territory, the Government of the United Kingdom have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Antarctic Territory, and note the Argentine reference to article IV of the Antarctic Treaty to which both the Government of Argentina and the Government of the United Kingdom are parties."

Upon its ratification of the Convention, the Government of Argentina objected anew to the declaration of territorial applications in question by the Government of the United Kingdom, which in turn reiterated its position in an additional communication received on 6 July 1990.

Subsequently, the Government of Chile, upon ratification, declared the following:

The Government of Chile [. . .] states that it rejects the declarations made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland upon ratification of the Convention and by the Argentine Republic in objecting to that declaration, inasmuch as both declarations affect Chilean Antarctic territory, including the corresponding maritime

jurisdictions. It once again reaffirms its sovereignty over that territory, including its sovereign maritime spaces, in accordance with the definition established by Supreme Decree 1,747, of 6 November 1940.

By a communication received on 30 August 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention and the Protocol shall extend to the Bailiwick of Guernsey for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of Mauritius, upon acceding to the Convention, made the following declaration:

"The Republic of Mauritius rejects the ratification of [the Convention] effected by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 15 May 1987 in respect of the British Indian Ocean Territory namely Chagos Archipelago and reaffirms its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, which form an integral part of its national territory."

Subsequently, on 27 January 1993, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication with respect to the declaration made by the Government of Mauritius:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Indian Ocean Territory and their consequent right to extend the application of the [said] Convention and Protocol to it. Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept or regard as having any legal effect the declarations made by the Government of the Republic of Mauritius.

[11] In this regard, the Government of Israel notified the Secretary-General, on 18 July 1990, of the following:

In the view of the Government of the State of Israel such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Convention and Protocol and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon Bahrain under general international law or under particular conventions.

The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards Bahrain an attitude of complete reciprocity."

2. a) Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Montreal, 16 September 1987

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1989, in accordance with article 16 (1).
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1989, No. 26369.
STATUS: Signatories: 46. Parties: 191.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1522, p. 3; and depositary notifications C.N.285.1988.TREATIES-15 of 20 January 1989 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Spanish text); C.N.181.1989.TREATIES-9 of 28 August 1989 (modification of Annex A); C.N.225.1990.TREATIES-7 of 7 September 1990 (adoption of adjustments); C.N.246.1990.TREATIES-9 of 14 November 1990 (amendment); C.N.133.1991.TREATIES-3/2 of 27 August 1991 (rectification of the Spanish text of the adjustments and amendment); C.N.227.1991.TREATIES-7 of 27 November 1991 (adoption of Annex D.)[1]; C.N.428.1992.TREATIES-12 of 22 March 1993 (adoption of adjustments and amendment of 1993); C.N.200.1993.TREATIES-2 of 17 September 1992 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English text of the 1992 amendment);C.N.484.1995.TREATIES-5 of 5 February 1996 (adoption of adjustments); C.N.468.1997.TREATIES-4/1 of 5 December 1997 (adoption of adjustments); and C.N.1230.1999.TREATIES-7 of 28 January 2000 (adoption of adjustments).

Note: The Protocol was adopted by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Protocol on Chlorofluorocarbons to the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, held in Montreal from14 to 16 September 1987. Open for signature in Montreal on 16 September 1987, in Ottawa from17 September 1987 to 16 January 1988 and at United Nations Headquarters, New York, from 17 January 1988 to 15 September 1988, in accordance with article 15.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan		17 Jun 2004 a
Albania		8 Oct 1999 a
Algeria		20 Oct 1992 a
Angola		17 May 2000 a
Antigua and Barbuda		3 Dec 1992 a
Argentina	29 Jun 1988	18 Sep 1990
Armenia		1 Oct 1999 a
Australia	8 Jun 1988	19 May 1989
Austria	29 Aug 1988	3 May 1989
Azerbaijan		12 Jun 1996 a
Bahamas		4 May 1993 a
Bahrain		27 Apr 1990 a
Bangladesh		2 Aug 1990 a
Barbados		16 Oct 1992 a
Belarus	22 Jan 1988	31 Oct 1988 A
Belgium	16 Sep 1987	30 Dec 1988
Belize		9 Jan 1998 a
Benin		1 Jul 1993 a
Bhutan		23 Aug 2004 a
Bolivia		3 Oct 1994 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina[2]		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		4 Dec 1991 a
Brazil		19 Mar 1990 a
Brunei Darussalam		27 May 1993 a
Bulgaria		20 Nov 1990 a
Burkina Faso	14 Sep 1988	20 Jul 1989
Burundi		6 Jan 1997 a
Cambodia		27 Jun 2001 a
Cameroon		30 Aug 1989 a
Canada	16 Sep 1987	30 Jun 1988
Cape Verde		31 Jul 2001 a
Central African Republic		29 Mar 1993 a
Chad		7 Jun 1994
Chile	14 Jun 1988	26 Mar 1990
China[3,4]		14 Jun 1991 a
Colombia		6 Dec 1993 a
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 a
Congo	15 Sep 1988	16 Nov 1994
Cook Islands		22 Dec 2003 a
Costa Rica		30 Jul 1991 a
Côte d'Ivoire		5 Apr 1993 a
Croatia[2]		21 Sep 1992 d
Cuba		14 Jul 1992 a
Cyprus		28 May 1992 a
Czech Republic[5]		30 Sep 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		24 Jan 1995 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		30 Nov 1994 a
Denmark[6]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988
Djibouti		30 Jul 1999 a
Dominica		31 Mar 1993 a
Dominican Republic		18 May 1993 a
Ecuador		30 Apr 1990 a
Egypt	16 Sep 1987	2 Aug 1988
El Salvador		2 Oct 1992 a
Equatorial Guinea		6 Sep 2006 a
Eritrea		10 Mar 2005 a
Estonia		17 Oct 1996 a
Ethiopia		11 Oct 1994 a
European Community	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988 AA
Fiji		23 Oct 1989 a
Finland	16 Sep 1987	23 Dec 1988 A
France	16 Sep 1987	28 Dec 1988 AA
Gabon		9 Feb 1994 a
Gambia		25 Jul 1990 a
Georgia		21 Mar 1996 a
Germany[7,8]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Ghana	16 Sep 1987	24 Jul 1989
Greece	29 Oct 1987	29 Dec 1988
Grenada		31 Mar 1993 a
Guatemala		7 Nov 1989 a
Guinea		25 Jun 1992 a
Guinea-Bissau		12 Nov 2002 a
Guyana		12 Aug 1993 a
Haiti		29 Mar 2000 a
Honduras		14 Oct 1993 a
Hungary		20 Apr 1989 a
Iceland		29 Aug 1989 a
India		19 Jun 1992 a
Indonesia	21 Jul 1988	26 Jun 1992
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		3 Oct 1990 a
Ireland	15 Sep 1988	16 Dec 1988
Israel	14 Jan 1988	30 Jun 1992
Italy	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988
Jamaica		31 Mar 1993 a
Japan	16 Sep 1987	30 Sep 1988 A
Jordan		31 May 1989 a
Kazakhstan		26 Aug 1998 a
Kenya	16 Sep 1987	9 Nov 1988
Kiribati		7 Jan 1993 a
Kuwait		23 Nov 1992 a
Kyrgyzstan		31 May 2000 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		21 Aug 1998 a
Latvia		28 Apr 1995 a
Lebanon		31 Mar 1993 a
Lesotho		25 Mar 1994 a
Liberia		15 Jan 1996 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		11 Jul 1990 a
Liechtenstein		8 Feb 1989 a
Lithuania		18 Jan 1995 a
Luxembourg	29 Jan 1988	17 Oct 1988
Madagascar		7 Nov 1996 a
Malawi		9 Jan 1991 a
Malaysia		29 Aug 1989 a
Maldives	12 Jul 1988	16 May 1989
Mali		28 Oct 1994 a
Malta	15 Sep 1988	29 Dec 1988
Marshall Islands		11 Mar 1993 a
Mauritania		26 May 1994 a
Mauritius		18 Aug 1992 a
Mexico	16 Sep 1987	31 Mar 1988 A
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Sep 1995 a
Moldova		24 Oct 1996 a
Monaco		12 Mar 1993 a
Mongolia		7 Mar 1996 a
Montenegro[9]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	7 Jan 1988	28 Dec 1995
Mozambique		9 Sep 1994 a
Myanmar		24 Nov 1993 a
Namibia		20 Sep 1993 a
Nauru		12 Nov 2001 a
Nepal		6 Jul 1994 a
Netherlands[10]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988 A
New Zealand[11]	16 Sep 1987	21 Jul 1988
Nicaragua		5 Mar 1993 a
Niger		9 Oct 1992 a
Nigeria		31 Oct 1988 a
Niue		22 Dec 2003 a
Norway	16 Sep 1987	24 Jun 1988
Oman		30 Jun 1999 a
Pakistan		18 Dec 1992 a
Palau		29 May 2001 a
Panama	16 Sep 1987	3 Mar 1989
Papua New Guinea		27 Oct 1992 a
Paraguay		3 Dec 1992 a
Peru		31 Mar 1993 a
Philippines	14 Sep 1988	17 Jul 1991
Poland		13 Jul 1990 a
Portugal[4,12]	16 Sep 1987	17 Oct 1988
Qatar		22 Jan 1996 a
Republic of Korea		27 Feb 1992 a
Romania		27 Jan 1993 a
Russian Federation	29 Dec 1987	10 Nov 1988 A
Rwanda		11 Oct 2001 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		10 Aug 1992 a
Saint Lucia		28 Jul 1993 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		2 Dec 1996 a
Samoa		21 Dec 1992 a
Sao Tome and Principe		19 Nov 2001 a
Saudi Arabia		1 Mar 1993 a
Senegal	16 Sep 1987	6 May 1993
Serbia[2]		12 Mar 2001 d
Seychelles		6 Jan 1993 a
Sierra Leone		29 Aug 2001 a
Singapore		5 Jan 1989 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia[2]		6 Jul 1992 d
Solomon Islands		17 Jun 1993 a
Somalia		1 Aug 2001 a
South Africa		15 Jan 1990 a
Spain	21 Jul 1988	16 Dec 1988
Sri Lanka		15 Dec 1989 a
Sudan		29 Jan 1993 a
Suriname		14 Oct 1997 a
Swaziland		10 Nov 1992 a
Sweden	16 Sep 1987	29 Jun 1988
Switzerland	16 Sep 1987	28 Dec 1988
Syrian Arab Republic		12 Dec 1989 a
Tajikistan		7 Jan 1998 a
Thailand	15 Sep 1988	7 Jul 1989
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[2]		10 Mar 1994 d
Togo	16 Sep 1987	25 Feb 1991
Tonga		29 Jul 1998 a
Trinidad and Tobago		28 Aug 1989 a
Tunisia		25 Sep 1989 a
Turkey		20 Sep 1991 a
Turkmenistan		18 Nov 1993 a
Tuvalu		15 Jul 1993 a
Uganda	15 Sep 1988	15 Sep 1988
Ukraine	18 Feb 1988	20 Sep 1988 A
United Arab Emirates		22 Dec 1989 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3,13]	16 Sep 1987	16 Dec 1988

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
United Republic of Tanzania		16 Apr 1993 a
United States of America	16 Sep 1987	21 Apr 1988
Uruguay		8 Jan 1991 a
Uzbekistan		18 May 1993 a
Vanuatu		21 Nov 1994 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	16 Sep 1987	6 Feb 1989
Viet Nam		26 Jan 1994 a
Yemen		21 Feb 1996 a
Zambia		24 Jan 1990 a
Zimbabwe		3 Nov 1992 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

[See under chapter XXVII.2.]

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

"In the light of article 2.8 of the Protocol, the Community wishes to state that its signature takes place on the assumption that all its member states will take the necessary steps to adhere to the Convention and to conclude the Protocol."

23 May 1989

[See under chapter XXVII.2.]

Notes:

[1] On 27 May 1992, the Government of Singapore notified the Secretary-General, in accordance with article 10 (2) (*b*) of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, of the following:

"Singapore is still in the process of evaluating the feasibility of imposing controls on all the products listed in Annex D. In the interim, Singapore can only approve the intention to ban import of the following:

(a) All products classified under item 2 of Annex D except domestic refrigerators and freezers; and

(b) All products classified under item 3 of Annex D."

Consequently, on the expiry of six months from the date of its circulation, i.e., 27 May 1992, in accordance with the provisions of article 10 (2) (*c*) of the Vienna Convention, Annex D became effective in its entirety for all Parties to the Montreal Protocol, with the exception of Singapore, for which the Annex became effective only with respect of the products described above.

Subsequently, on 20 April 1993, the Government of Singapore informed the Secretary-General that "the Republic of Singapore is now in a position to approve the full list of products under Annex D... with immediate effect."

[2] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Protocol on 3 January 1991. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

Provisions of article 5 of the [said Protocol] will not be applied to the Hong Kong Special Region.

[4] On 19 October 1999, the Secretary-General received from the Government of China, the following communication:

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999. Macau will, from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

In this connection, [the Government of the People's Republic of China informs the Secretary-General of the following:]

The Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited the instrument of accession on 11 September 1989, as well as the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 16 September 1987 and the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 29 June 1990 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention, the Protocol and the Amendment"), will apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999. The Government of the People's Republic of China also wishes to make the following declaration:

Provisions of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 16 September 1987 will not be applied to the Macau Special Administrative Region, and provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 29 June 1990 will not be applied to the Macau Special Administrative Region.

The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention, the Protocol and the Amendment to the Macau Special Administrative Region.

In reference to the communication made on 19 October 1999, the Government of China furthermore informs the Secretary-General of the following:

The above-mentioned declaration is solely to make the provisions of the Protocol that had previously applied to Macau continue to so apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region. The declaration is not purported to modify the obligations previously undertaken by Macau under the Protocol and is fully consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Protocol. In fact, the Chinese Government had made a statement of the same nature in the note of 6 June 1997 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the continuing application of the Protocol to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. The past two years and a half since Hong Kong's return to China saw a clear and full understanding on the part of the Parties to the Protocol of the approach adopted by the Chinese Government.

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 1 October 1990. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The decision, made on 20 December 1991, to reserve the application to Greenland and the Faroe Islands, was lifted by a notification received on 12 February 1997.

[7] The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Protocol on 25 January 1989. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Germany" regarding Berlin (West) in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

[11] Upon ratification the Government of New Zealand specified that the Protocol shall not apply to the Cook Islands and Niue.

[12] On 15 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal a notification to the effect that it shall extend the Protocol to Macau.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 21 October 1999, from the Government of Portugal, the following communication:

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macau."

See also note 4 in this chapter.

[13] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Hong Kong *(see also note 3)*, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands, Turks and Caicos Islands.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

The Argentine Republic rejects the ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to the Malvinas, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and reaffirms its sovereignty over those Islands, which form a part of its national territory.

The United Nations General Assembly has adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12 and 39/6 in which it recognizes the existence of a sovereignty dispute concerning the question of the Malvinas and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute and to their remaining differences relating to the question, through the good offices of the Secretary-General, who is to report to the General Assembly on the progress made. The United Nations General Assembly also adopted resolution 40/21 and 41/40, which again urge the two parties to resume the negotiations.

The Argentine Republic also rejects the ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland with respect to what that country calls "British Antarctic Territory".

At the same time, it reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Argentine Antarctic Sector located between longitudes 25° and 74° W and latitude 60° S and the South Pole, including its maritime spaces.

It is appropriate to recall, in this connection, the provisions concerning rights of or claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica contained in article IV of the Antarctic Treaty.

Further, upon ratification, the Government of Chile declared the following:

[Chile] rejects the declaration made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland upon ratification, as it concerns the Chilean Antarctic Territory, including the corresponding maritime zones: [Chile] reaffirms once more its sovereignty over the said territory including its maritime areas, as defined by Supreme Decree No. 1747 of 6 November 1940.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 August 1990, from the Government of the United Kingdom, the following objection:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Antarctic Territory. In this respect, the Government of the United Kingdom would draw attention to the provisions of Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty of 1 December 1959, to which both Chile and the United Kingdom are parties.

For the above reasons, the Government of the United Kingdom reject the Chilean declaration."

In a communication received on 30 August 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General that the Protocol shall extend to the Bailiwick of Guernsey for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of Mauritius, upon acceding to the Convention, made the following declaration:

"The Republic of Mauritius rejects the ratification of [the Protocol] effected by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on 16 December 1988 in respect of the British Indian Ocean Territory namely Chagos Archipelago and reaffirms its sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, which form an integral part of its national territory."

Subsequently, on 27 January 1993, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication with respect to the declaration made by the Government of Mauritius:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to British sovereignty over the British Indian Ocean Territory and their consequent right to extend the application of the [said] Convention and Protocol to it. Accordingly, the Government of the United Kingdom do not accept or regard as having any legal effect the declarations made by the Government of the Republic of Mauritius.

2. b) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

London, 29 June 1990

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 August 1992, in accordance with article 2 (1).
REGISTRATION: 10 August 1992, No. 26369.
STATUS: Parties: 184.
TEXT: Annex II of the Report of the Second Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.2/3); and depositary notification C.N.133.1991.TREATIES-3/2 of 27 August 1991 (rectification of the Spanish authentic text of the adjustments and amendment).

Note: The amendment was adopted by Decision II/2 of 29 June 1990 at the Second Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, which was held at the Headquarters of the International Maritime Organization, in London, from 27 to 29 June 1990.

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	17 Jun 2004 a
Albania	25 May 2006 a
Algeria	20 Oct 1992 a
Antigua and Barbuda	23 Feb 1993 a
Argentina	4 Dec 1992
Armenia	26 Nov 2003 a
Australia	11 Aug 1992 A
Austria	11 Dec 1992
Azerbaijan	12 Jun 1996 a
Bahamas	4 May 1993 a
Bahrain	23 Dec 1992 A
Bangladesh	18 Mar 1994
Barbados	20 Jul 1994 A
Belarus	10 Jun 1996
Belgium	5 Oct 1993
Belize	9 Jan 1998 a
Benin	21 Jun 2000
Bhutan	23 Aug 2004 a
Bolivia	3 Oct 1994 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11 Aug 2003 a
Botswana	13 May 1997 a
Brazil	1 Oct 1992 A
Bulgaria	28 Apr 1999
Burkina Faso	10 Jun 1994
Burundi	18 Oct 2001 A
Cameroon	8 Jun 1992 A
Canada	5 Jul 1990 A
Cape Verde	31 Jul 2001 a
Chad	30 May 2001
Chile	9 Apr 1992 A
China[1,5]	14 Jun 1991 a
Colombia	6 Dec 1993 a
Comoros	31 Oct 1994 a
Congo	16 Nov 1994
Cook Islands	22 Dec 2003 a
Costa Rica	11 Nov 1998
Côte d'Ivoire	18 May 1994
Croatia	15 Oct 1993
Cuba	19 Oct 1998
Cyprus	11 Oct 1994 A
Czech Republic	18 Dec 1996 a
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	17 Jun 1999 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	30 Nov 1994 a
Denmark[3]	20 Dec 1991 A
Djibouti	30 Jul 1999 a
Dominica	31 Mar 1993 a
Dominican Republic	24 Dec 2001 a
Ecuador	23 Feb 1993
Egypt	13 Jan 1993
El Salvador	8 Dec 2000 a
Eritrea	5 Jul 2005 a
Estonia	12 Apr 1999
European Community	20 Dec 1991 AA
Fiji	9 Dec 1994 a
Finland	20 Dec 1991 A
France	12 Feb 1992 AA
Gabon	4 Dec 2000 a
Gambia	13 Mar 1995
Georgia	12 Jul 2000 a
Germany	27 Dec 1991
Ghana	24 Jul 1992
Greece	11 May 1993
Grenada	7 Dec 1993 a
Guatemala	21 Jan 2002 a
Guinea	25 Jun 1992 a
Guinea-Bissau	12 Nov 2002 a
Guyana	23 Jul 1999 A
Haiti	29 Mar 2000 a
Honduras	24 Jan 2002
Hungary	9 Nov 1993 AA
Iceland	16 Jun 1993
India	19 Jun 1992 a
Indonesia	26 Jun 1992
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Aug 1997 A
Ireland	20 Dec 1991 A
Israel	30 Jun 1992
Italy	21 Feb 1992 AA
Jamaica	31 Mar 1993 a
Japan	4 Sep 1991 A
Jordan	12 Nov 1993
Kazakhstan	26 Jul 2001 a
Kenya	27 Sep 1994
Kiribati	9 Aug 2004 a
Kuwait	22 Jul 1994 a
Kyrgyzstan	13 May 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic	28 Jun 2006 a
Latvia	2 Nov 1998 a
Lebanon	31 Mar 1993 a

Participant	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Liberia	15 Jan 1996 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	12 Jul 2001
Liechtenstein	24 Mar 1994
Lithuania	3 Feb 1998
Luxembourg	20 May 1992
Madagascar	16 Jan 2002 a
Malawi	8 Feb 1994 A
Malaysia	16 Jun 1993 a
Maldives	31 Jul 1991
Mali	28 Oct 1994 a
Malta	4 Feb 1994 A
Marshall Islands	11 Mar 1993 a
Mauritania	22 Jul 2005 A
Mauritius	20 Oct 1992 a
Mexico	11 Oct 1991 A
Micronesia (Federated States of)	27 Nov 2001 a
Moldova	25 Jun 2001 a
Monaco	12 Mar 1993 a
Mongolia	7 Mar 1996 a
Montenegro[6]	23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	28 Dec 1995 a
Mozambique	9 Sep 1994 a
Myanmar	24 Nov 1993 a
Namibia	6 Nov 1997
Nauru	10 Sep 2004 a
Nepal	6 Jul 1994 a
Netherlands[4]	20 Dec 1991 A
New Zealand[5]	1 Oct 1990 A
Nicaragua	13 Dec 1999
Niger	11 Jan 1996 a
Nigeria	27 Sep 2001
Niue	22 Dec 2003 a
Norway	18 Nov 1991
Oman	5 Aug 1999 a
Pakistan	18 Dec 1992 a
Palau	29 May 2001 a
Panama	10 Feb 1994
Papua New Guinea	4 May 1993 a
Paraguay	3 Dec 1992 a
Peru	31 Mar 1993 a
Philippines	9 Aug 1993
Poland	2 Oct 1996 a
Portugal[1,5]	24 Nov 1992
Qatar	22 Jan 1996 a
Republic of Korea	10 Dec 1992 a
Romania	27 Jan 1993 a
Russian Federation	13 Jan 1992 A
Rwanda	7 Jan 2004 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis	8 Jul 1998
Saint Lucia	24 Aug 1999 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2 Dec 1996 a
Samoa	4 Oct 2001 A
Sao Tome and Principe	19 Nov 2001 a
Saudi Arabia	1 Mar 1993 a
Senegal	6 May 1993
Serbia	22 Mar 2005 a
Seychelles	6 Jan 1993 a
Sierra Leone	29 Aug 2001 a
Singapore	2 Mar 1993 a
Slovakia	15 Apr 1994 AA
Slovenia	8 Dec 1992 A
Solomon Islands	17 Aug 1999 a
Somalia	1 Aug 2001 a
South Africa	12 May 1992 A
Spain	19 May 1992 A
Sri Lanka	16 Jun 1993 a
Sudan	2 Jan 2002 a
Suriname	29 Mar 2006 a
Swaziland	16 Dec 2005 a
Sweden	2 Aug 1991
Switzerland	16 Sep 1992
Syrian Arab Republic	30 Nov 1999 a
Tajikistan	7 Jan 1998 a
Thailand	25 Jun 1992
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	9 Nov 1998
Togo	6 Jul 1998 A
Tonga	26 Nov 2003
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Jun 1999
Tunisia	15 Jul 1993 a
Turkey	13 Apr 1995
Turkmenistan	15 Mar 1994 a
Tuvalu	31 Aug 2000 A
Uganda	20 Jan 1994
Ukraine	6 Feb 1997
United Arab Emirates	16 Feb 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[1,7]	20 Dec 1991
United Republic of Tanzania	16 Apr 1993 a
United States of America	18 Dec 1991
Uruguay	16 Nov 1993 a
Uzbekistan	10 Jun 1998 a
Vanuatu	21 Nov 1994 A
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	29 Jul 1993
Viet Nam	26 Jan 1994 a
Yemen	23 Apr 2001 a
Zambia	15 Apr 1994
Zimbabwe	3 Jun 1994

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

BAHRAIN

Declaration:

"The acceptance by the State of Bahrain of the said Amendments shall in no way constitute recognition of Israel or be a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith."

JAPAN

Declaration:

It is hereby declared that the Government of Japan accepts the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, in accordance with the provisions of article 9 of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer.

Notes:

[1] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the reservation made by China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[2] Decision reserved as to the application to the Faroe Islands.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

In a communication received on 16 March 1992, the Government of the Netherlands notified the Secretary-General that "the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts the Amendment . . . for Aruba, and [declares] that the provisions so accepted shall be observed in their entirety."

[4] See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] On 15 February 1994, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Portugal a notification to the effect that it shall extend the Amendment to Macau.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Portugal (21 October 1999):

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macau."

China (19 October 1999):

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999. Macau will, from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

In this connection, [the Government of the People's Republic of China informs the Secretary-General of the following:]

The Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited the instrument of accession on 11 September 1989, as well as the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 16 September 1987 and the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 29 June 1990 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention, the Protocol and the Amendment"), will apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999. The Government of the People's Republic of China also wishes to make the following declaration:

Provisions of Article 5 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 16 September 1987 will not be applied to the Macau Special Administrative Region, and provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 5 of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 29 June 1990 will not be applied to the Macau Special Administrative Region.

In reference to the communication made on 19 October 1999, the Government of China furthermore informs the Secretary-General of the following:

The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention, the Protocol and the Amendment to the Macau Special Administrative Region.

The above-mentioned declaration is solely to make the provisions of the Protocol that had previously applied to Macau continue to so apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region. The declaration is not purported to modify the obligations previously undertaken by Macau under the Protocol and is fully consistent with the objectives and purposes of the Protocol. In fact, the Chinese Government had made a statement of the same nature in the note of 6 June 1997 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations concerning the continuing application of the Protocol to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region. The past two years and a half since Hong Kong's return to China saw a clear and full understanding on the part of the Parties to the Protocol of the approach adopted by the Chinese Government.

[6] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Gibraltar.

Subsequently, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the amendment shall extend to the following territories on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Date of the notification:	***Territorial application:***
	Hong Kong *(see also note 1)*, British Antarctic Territory and the
8 September 1993	Bailiwick of Guernsey
4 January 1995	The Bailiwick of Jersey
30 October 1995	The British Virgin Islands

2. c) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Copenhagen, 25 November 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 14 June 1994, in accordance with article 3 (1) of the amendment.
REGISTRATION: 14 June 1994, No. 26369.
STATUS: Parties: 175.
TEXT: Annex III of the Report of the Fourth Meeting (UNEP/OzL.Pro.4/15); depositary notifications C.N.200.1993.TREATIES-2 of 17 September 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the English authentic text of the amendment); C.N.96.1994.TREATIES-3 of 16 August 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts); and C.N.279.1994.TREATIES-8 of 14 December 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts).

Note: The amendment was adopted by Decision IV/4 (amendment) at the Fourth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer, which was held in Copenhagen from 23 to 25 November 1992.

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	17 Jun 2004 a
Albania	25 May 2006 a
Algeria	31 May 2000
Antigua and Barbuda	19 Jul 1993 a
Argentina	20 Apr 1995 a
Armenia	26 Nov 2003 a
Australia	30 Jun 1994 A
Austria	19 Sep 1996 A
Azerbaijan	12 Jun 1996 a
Bahamas	4 May 1993 a
Bahrain	13 Mar 2001
Bangladesh	27 Nov 2000 A
Barbados	20 Jul 1994 A
Belgium	7 Aug 1997
Belize	9 Jan 1998 a
Benin	21 Jun 2000
Bhutan	23 Aug 2004 a
Bolivia	3 Oct 1994 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11 Aug 2003 a
Botswana	13 May 1997 a
Brazil	25 Jun 1997
Bulgaria	28 Apr 1999
Burkina Faso	12 Dec 1995
Burundi	18 Oct 2001 A
Cameroon	25 Jun 1996 A
Canada	16 Mar 1994
Cape Verde	31 Jul 2001 a
Chad	30 May 2001
Chile	14 Jan 1994
China[1]	22 Apr 2003 a
Colombia	5 Aug 1997 A
Comoros	2 Dec 2002 a
Congo	19 Oct 2001 a
Cook Islands	22 Dec 2003 a
Costa Rica	11 Nov 1998
Côte d'Ivoire	8 Oct 2003
Croatia	11 Feb 1997
Cuba	19 Oct 1998 AA
Cyprus	2 Jun 2003 A
Czech Republic	18 Dec 1996 a
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	17 Jun 1999 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	30 Nov 1994 a
Denmark[2]	21 Dec 1993 A
Djibouti	30 Jul 1999 a
Dominica	7 Mar 2006 a
Dominican Republic	24 Dec 2001 a
Ecuador	24 Nov 1993 A
Egypt	28 Jun 1994
El Salvador	8 Dec 2000 a
Eritrea	5 Jul 2005 a
Estonia	12 Apr 1999
European Community	20 Nov 1995 AA
Fiji	17 May 2000 a
Finland	16 Nov 1993 A
France	3 Jan 1996 AA
Gabon	4 Dec 2000 a
Georgia	12 Jul 2000 a
Germany	28 Dec 1993
Ghana	9 Apr 2001
Greece	30 Jan 1995
Grenada	20 May 1999 a
Guatemala	21 Jan 2002 a
Guinea-Bissau	12 Nov 2002 a
Guyana	23 Jul 1999 A
Haiti	29 Mar 2000 a
Honduras	24 Jan 2002
Hungary	17 May 1994 a
Iceland	15 Mar 1994
India	3 Mar 2003 a
Indonesia	10 Dec 1998 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	4 Aug 1997 A
Ireland	16 Apr 1996 A
Israel	5 Apr 1995
Italy	4 Jan 1995
Jamaica	6 Nov 1997
Japan	20 Dec 1994 A
Jordan	30 Jun 1995
Kenya	27 Sep 1994
Kiribati	9 Aug 2004 a
Kuwait	22 Jul 1994 a
Kyrgyzstan	13 May 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic	28 Jun 2006 a
Latvia	2 Nov 1998 a
Lebanon	31 Jul 2000 a

Participant	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Liberia	15 Jan 1996 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	24 Sep 2004 a
Liechtenstein	22 Nov 1996 a
Lithuania	3 Feb 1998
Luxembourg	9 May 1994
Madagascar	16 Jan 2002 a
Malawi	28 Feb 1994 A
Malaysia	5 Aug 1993 a
Maldives	27 Sep 2001
Mali	7 Mar 2003 A
Malta	22 Dec 2003 A
Marshall Islands	24 May 1993 a
Mauritania	22 Jul 2005 A
Mauritius	30 Nov 1993
Mexico	16 Sep 1994 A
Micronesia (Federated States of)	27 Nov 2001 a
Moldova	25 Jun 2001 a
Monaco	15 Jun 1999 A
Mongolia	7 Mar 1996 a
Montenegro[3]	23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	28 Dec 1995 a
Mozambique	9 Sep 1994 a
Namibia	28 Jul 2003 A
Nauru	10 Sep 2004 a
Netherlands	25 Apr 1994 A
New Zealand[4]	4 Jun 1993
Nicaragua	13 Dec 1999
Niger	8 Oct 1999
Nigeria	27 Sep 2001
Niue	22 Dec 2003 a
Norway	3 Sep 1993
Oman	5 Aug 1999 a
Pakistan	17 Feb 1995
Palau	29 May 2001 a
Panama	4 Oct 1996 a
Papua New Guinea	7 Oct 2003 a
Paraguay	27 Apr 2001
Peru	7 Jun 1999 a
Philippines	15 Jun 2001
Poland	2 Oct 1996 a
Portugal	24 Feb 1998
Qatar	22 Jan 1996 a
Republic of Korea	2 Dec 1994 A
Romania	28 Nov 2000 A
Russian Federation	14 Dec 2005 A
Rwanda	7 Jan 2004 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis	19 May 1994 a
Saint Lucia	24 Aug 1999 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	2 Dec 1996 a
Samoa	4 Oct 2001 A
Sao Tome and Principe	19 Nov 2001 a
Saudi Arabia	1 Mar 1993 a
Senegal	12 Aug 1999 a
Serbia	22 Mar 2005 a
Seychelles	27 May 1993
Sierra Leone	29 Aug 2001 a
Singapore	22 Sep 2000 a
Slovakia	8 Jan 1998 a
Slovenia	13 Nov 1998 A
Solomon Islands	17 Aug 1999 a
Somalia	1 Aug 2001 a
South Africa	13 Mar 2001 a
Spain	5 Jun 1995 A
Sri Lanka	7 Jul 1997 a
Sudan	2 Jan 2002 a
Suriname	29 Mar 2006 a
Swaziland	16 Dec 2005 a
Sweden	9 Aug 1993
Switzerland	16 Sep 1996
Syrian Arab Republic	30 Nov 1999 a
Thailand	1 Dec 1995
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	9 Nov 1998
Togo	6 Jul 1998 A
Tonga	26 Nov 2003
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Jun 1999
Tunisia	2 Feb 1995 a
Turkey	10 Nov 1995
Tuvalu	31 Aug 2000 A
Uganda	22 Nov 1999 a
Ukraine	4 Apr 2002
United Arab Emirates	16 Feb 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	4 Jan 1995
United Republic of Tanzania	6 Dec 2002
United States of America	2 Mar 1994
Uruguay	3 Jul 1997 a
Uzbekistan	10 Jun 1998 a
Vanuatu	21 Nov 1994 A
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	10 Dec 1997
Viet Nam	26 Jan 1994 a
Yemen	23 Apr 2001 a
Zimbabwe	3 Jun 1994

Notes:

[1] Upon accession the Government of China communicated the following:

In accordance with the provision of article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1993, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer adopted in Copenhagen on 25 November 1992 shall apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

The Government of the People's Republic of China also decides that the above-mentioned Amendment will continue to be implemented in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

On that same date, the Government of China declared the following:

The Government of the People's Republic of China would like to restate that the provision of article 5 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer of 16 September 1987 and the provision of paragraph 1, article 5 of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer adopted in London on 29 June 1990 will not apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[2] With reservation of application to the Faroe Islands.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] With extension to Tokelau.

[5] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Guernsey and the Bailiwick of Jersey.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 30 October 1995, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the amendment shall apply to the British Virgin Islands and Hong Kong, for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

2. d) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer adopted by the Ninth Meeting of the Parties

Montreal, 17 September 1997

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 November 1999, in accordance with article 3 (1).
REGISTRATION: 10 November 1999, No. 26369.
STATUS: Parties: 149.
TEXT: UNEP/OzL.Pro.9/12, Annex IV of the Report of the Ninth Meeting of the Parties; C.N.783.TREATIES-21 of 13 October 1999 (proposal for corrections to the original text of the amendment - Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts).[1]

Note: The amendment to the Montreal Protocol as set out in Annexes I to III to the report of the Ninth Meeting of the Parties to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer (Decision IX/4), which was held in Montreal from 15 to 17 September 1997, was adopted in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 9 (4) of the 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer.

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	17 Jun 2004 a
Albania	25 May 2006 a
Antigua and Barbuda	10 Feb 2000
Argentina	15 Feb 2001
Australia	5 Jan 1999 A
Austria	7 Aug 2000
Azerbaijan	28 Sep 2000 AA
Bahamas	16 Mar 2005 A
Bahrain	13 Mar 2001
Bangladesh	27 Jul 2001 A
Barbados	10 Dec 2002 a
Belgium	11 Aug 2004
Bhutan	23 Aug 2004 a
Bolivia	12 Apr 1999 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11 Aug 2003 a
Brazil	30 Jun 2004
Bulgaria	24 Nov 1999
Burkina Faso	11 Nov 2002
Burundi	18 Oct 2001 A
Canada	27 Mar 1998
Cape Verde	31 Jul 2001 a
Chad	30 May 2001
Chile	17 Jun 1998
Colombia	16 Jun 2003 a
Comoros	2 Dec 2002 a
Congo	19 Oct 2001 a
Cook Islands	22 Dec 2003 a
Costa Rica	1 Dec 2005
Croatia	8 Sep 2000
Cuba	12 Sep 2005 A
Cyprus	2 Jun 2003 A
Czech Republic	5 Nov 1999 AA
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	13 Dec 2001 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	23 Mar 2005 a
Denmark[2]	24 Sep 2003 A
Djibouti	30 Jul 1999 a
Dominica	7 Mar 2006 a
Egypt	20 Jul 2000
El Salvador	8 Dec 2000 a
Eritrea	5 Jul 2005 a
Estonia	11 Apr 2003 a
European Community	17 Nov 2000 AA
Finland	18 Jun 2001 A
France	25 Jul 2003 AA
Gabon	4 Dec 2000 a
Georgia	12 Jul 2000 a
Germany	5 Jan 1999
Ghana	8 Aug 2005 a
Greece	27 Jan 2006
Grenada	20 May 1999 a
Guatemala	21 Jan 2002 a
Guinea-Bissau	12 Nov 2002 a
Guyana	23 Jul 1999 A
Haiti	29 Mar 2000 a
Hungary	26 Jul 1999
Iceland	8 Feb 2000
India	3 Mar 2003 a
Indonesia	26 Jan 2006
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	17 Oct 2001 A
Ireland	6 Oct 2005 A
Israel	28 May 2003
Italy	1 May 2001
Jamaica	24 Sep 2003 a
Japan	30 Aug 2002 A
Jordan	3 Feb 1999
Kenya	12 Jul 2000
Kiribati	9 Aug 2004 a
Kuwait	13 Jun 2003 a
Kyrgyzstan	13 May 2003
Lao People's Democratic Republic	28 Jun 2006 a
Latvia	14 Jun 2002 A
Lebanon	31 Jul 2000 a
Liberia	30 Nov 2004 a
Liechtenstein	23 Dec 2003 A
Lithuania	17 Mar 2004 A
Luxembourg	8 Feb 1999
Madagascar	16 Jan 2002 a
Malaysia	26 Oct 2001
Maldives	27 Sep 2001
Mali	7 Mar 2003 A
Malta	22 Dec 2003 A
Marshall Islands	27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania	22 Jul 2005 A
Mauritius	24 Mar 2003 A
Mexico	28 Jul 2006 A
Micronesia (Federated States of)	27 Nov 2001 a

Participant	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Moldova	24 May 2005 a
Monaco	26 Jul 2001 A
Mongolia	28 Mar 2002
Montenegro[3]	23 Oct 2006 d
Nauru	10 Sep 2004 a
Netherlands	21 Feb 2000 A
New Zealand[4]	3 Jun 1999
Niger	8 Oct 1999
Nigeria	27 Sep 2001
Niue	22 Dec 2003 a
Norway	30 Dec 1998
Oman	19 Jan 2005
Pakistan	2 Sep 2005
Palau	29 May 2001 a
Panama	5 Mar 1999
Paraguay	27 Apr 2001
Philippines	23 May 2006
Poland	6 Dec 1999
Portugal	3 Oct 2003
Republic of Korea	19 Aug 1998 A
Romania	21 May 2001 A
Russian Federation	14 Dec 2005 A
Rwanda	7 Jan 2004 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis	25 Feb 1999
Saint Lucia	24 Aug 1999 a
Samoa	4 Oct 2001 A
Sao Tome and Principe	19 Nov 2001 a
Senegal	12 Aug 1999 a
Serbia	22 Mar 2005 a
Seychelles	26 Aug 2002 a
Sierra Leone	29 Aug 2001 a
Singapore	22 Sep 2000 a
Slovakia	3 Nov 1999 AA
Slovenia	15 Nov 1999
Solomon Islands	17 Aug 1999 a
Somalia	1 Aug 2001 a
South Africa	11 Nov 2004 a
Spain	11 May 1999 A
Sri Lanka	20 Aug 1999 a
Sudan	18 May 2004 a
Suriname	29 Mar 2006 a
Swaziland	16 Dec 2005 a
Sweden	12 Jul 1999
Switzerland	28 Aug 2002
Syrian Arab Republic	30 Nov 1999 a
Thailand	23 Jun 2003
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	31 Aug 1999 a
Togo	26 Nov 2001 A
Tonga	26 Nov 2003
Trinidad and Tobago	10 Jun 1999
Tunisia	19 Oct 1999
Turkey	24 Oct 2003
Tuvalu	31 Aug 2000 A
Uganda	23 Nov 1999 a
United Arab Emirates	16 Feb 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	12 Oct 2001
United Republic of Tanzania	6 Dec 2002
United States of America	1 Oct 2003
Uruguay	16 Feb 2000 a
Uzbekistan	31 Oct 2006
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	13 May 2002
Viet Nam	3 Dec 2004
Yemen	23 Apr 2001 a

Notes:

[1] In this regard, the Secretary-General received the following objection:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (20 December 1999):

"With regard to the authentic English text, the Government of the United Kingdom considers the original text of both article 3 (1) and article 3 (3) of the Amendment to be correct. The Government therefore objects to the proposal to correct the text of these two paragraphs by the addition of the words 'or accession'.

The Government of the United Kingdom respectfully draws the attention of the Secretary-General to article 9, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, and to article 14 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer. The effect of these provisions is that amendments to the Protocol are subject to ratification, approval or acceptance. There is no provision for accession to amendments. The Government therefore believes that the addition of the words proposed by the Secretary-General would be inconsistent with the provisions of the Vienna Convention and the Montreal Protocol which apply to the entry into force of amendments to the Protocol.

The Government of the United Kingdom also notes that the existing wording of the authentic English text of article 3 (1) and article 3 (3) of the 1997 Amendment is consistent with the wording used in previous amendments to the Montreal Protocol, namely article 2 of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol adopted at London in 1990 and article 3 of the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol adopted at Copenhagen in 1992.

The Secretary-General's Depositary Notification refers to errors in the first sentence of article 3 (1) (except French version). The Government of the United Kingdom has not seen the authentic French version of article 3 (1), which was not attached to the Depositary Notification, but would respectfully suggest that the Secretary-General may wish to consider whether there are errors in the French version."

[2] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands.

[3] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See also note 1 under "New Zealand" regarding Tokelau in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. e) Amendment to the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer

Beijing, 3 December 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 February 2002, in accordance with article 3 (1) of the amendment.
REGISTRATION: 25 February 2002, No. 26369.
STATUS: Parties: 121.
TEXT: C.N.1231.1999.TREATIES-1 of 28 January 2000; and C.N.13.2004.TREATIES-2 of 8 January 2004 [Procès-verbal of rectification of the original of the amendment (French version)].

Note: At the Eleventh Meeting of the Parties to the Protocol, held in Beijing from 29 November to 3 December 1999, the Parties adopted, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 9, paragraph 4 of the 1985 Vienna Convention for the Protection of the Ozone Layer, the Amendment to the Montreal Protocol as set out in Annex V to the report of the Eleventh Meeting of the Parties (Decision XI/5).

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	17 Jun 2004 a
Albania	25 May 2006 a
Argentina	28 Aug 2006
Australia	17 Aug 2005 A
Austria	23 Sep 2004
Bahamas	16 Mar 2005 A
Barbados	10 Dec 2002 a
Belgium	6 Apr 2006
Bhutan	23 Aug 2004 a
Brazil	30 Jun 2004
Bulgaria	15 Apr 2002 a
Burkina Faso	11 Nov 2002
Burundi	18 Oct 2001 A
Canada	9 Feb 2001 A
Chile	3 May 2000
Colombia	15 Sep 2006 a
Comoros	2 Dec 2002 a
Congo	19 Oct 2001 a
Cook Islands	22 Dec 2003 a
Croatia	25 Apr 2002
Cuba	12 Sep 2005 A
Cyprus	2 Sep 2004
Czech Republic	9 May 2001 A
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	13 Dec 2001 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	23 Mar 2005 a
Denmark[1]	24 Sep 2003 A
Dominica	7 Mar 2006 a
Eritrea	5 Jul 2005 a
Estonia	22 Dec 2003
European Community	25 Mar 2002 AA
Finland	18 Jun 2001 A
France	25 Jul 2003 AA
Gabon	4 Dec 2000 a
Germany	28 Oct 2002
Ghana	8 Aug 2005 a
Greece	27 Jan 2006
Grenada	12 Jan 2004 a
Guatemala	21 Jan 2002 a
Guinea-Bissau	12 Nov 2002 a
Hungary	23 Apr 2002 AA
Iceland	31 Mar 2004
India	3 Mar 2003 a
Indonesia	26 Jan 2006
Ireland	6 Oct 2005 A
Israel	15 Apr 2004
Italy	22 Oct 2004
Jamaica	24 Sep 2003 a
Japan	30 Aug 2002 A
Jordan	1 Feb 2001
Kiribati	9 Aug 2004 a
Kyrgyzstan	5 Oct 2005
Lao People's Democratic Republic	28 Jun 2006 a
Latvia	9 Jul 2004 A
Liberia	30 Nov 2004 a
Liechtenstein	23 Dec 2003 A
Lithuania	17 Mar 2004 A
Luxembourg	22 Jan 2001
Madagascar	16 Jan 2002 a
Malaysia	26 Oct 2001
Maldives	3 Sep 2002 a
Mali	25 Mar 2004 A
Malta	22 Dec 2003 A
Marshall Islands	19 May 2004 a
Mauritius	24 Mar 2003 A
Micronesia (Federated States of)	27 Nov 2001 a
Moldova	5 Dec 2006 a
Monaco	3 Apr 2003 A
Montenegro[2]	23 Oct 2006 d
Nauru	10 Sep 2004 a
Netherlands	13 Nov 2001 A
New Zealand[3]	8 Jun 2001
Niger	25 Aug 2005
Nigeria	24 May 2004
Niue	22 Dec 2003 a
Norway	29 Nov 2001
Oman	19 Jan 2005
Pakistan	2 Sep 2005
Palau	29 May 2001 a
Panama	5 Dec 2001
Paraguay	18 Jul 2006 a
Philippines	23 May 2006
Poland	13 Apr 2006
Portugal	8 May 2006
Republic of Korea	9 Jan 2004 A
Romania	17 Nov 2005 A
Russian Federation	14 Dec 2005 A
Rwanda	7 Jan 2004 a
Saint Lucia	12 Dec 2001

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Samoa	4 Oct 2001 A
Sao Tome and Principe	19 Nov 2001 a
Senegal	8 Oct 2003
Serbia	22 Mar 2005 a
Seychelles	26 Aug 2002 a
Sierra Leone	29 Aug 2001 a
Slovakia	22 May 2002
Slovenia	23 Jan 2003
Somalia	1 Aug 2001 a
South Africa	11 Nov 2004 a
Spain	19 Feb 2002 A
Sri Lanka	27 Nov 2002 A
Sudan	18 May 2004 a
Suriname	29 Mar 2006 a
Swaziland	16 Dec 2005 a
Sweden	28 Mar 2002
Switzerland	28 Aug 2002
Thailand	14 Nov 2006
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	23 May 2002 a
Togo	26 Nov 2001 A
Tonga	26 Nov 2003
Trinidad and Tobago	29 Oct 2003
Tunisia	16 May 2005 a
Turkey	24 Oct 2003
Tuvalu	4 Oct 2004 A
United Arab Emirates	16 Feb 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	12 Oct 2001
United Republic of Tanzania	6 Dec 2002
United States of America	1 Oct 2003
Uruguay	9 Sep 2003 a
Uzbekistan	31 Oct 2006
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	22 Dec 2006
Viet Nam	3 Dec 2004

Notes:

[1] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands.

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] With a territorial application in respect of Tokelau.

3. Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

Basel, 22 March 1989

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 5 May 1992, in accordance with article 25 (1).
REGISTRATION: 5 May 1992, No. 28911.
STATUS: Signatories: 53. Parties: 169.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1673, p. 57; and depositary notifications C.N.302.1992.TREATIES-9 of 25 November 1992 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original English text)[1]; C.N.248.1993.TREATIES-7 of 7 September 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic French text); C.N.144.1994.TREATIES-4 of 27 June 1994 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic, Chinese, English and Spanish texts); C.N.15.1997.TREATIES-1 of 20 Februrary 1997 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Russian text); C.N.77.1998, TREATIES-2 of 6 May 1998 (amendment to annex I and adoption of annexes VIII and IX)[2]; C.N.245.2003.TREATIES-4 of 27 March 2003 [proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (authentic Chinese text)] and C.N.321.2003.TREATIES-5 of 29 April 2003 [Corrections to the original of the Convention (authentic Chinese text)]; C.N.399.2003.TREATIES-9 of 20 May 2003 (Proposal of amendments to Annexes VIII and IX of the Convention) and C.N.1314.2003.TREATIES-12 of 20 November 2003 (Entry into force of amendments to Annexes VIII and IX of the Convention); C.N.119.2005.TREATIES-2 of 23 February 2005 [(Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (authentic Spanish text)] and C.N.406.2005.TREATIES-6 of 25 May 2005 [(Corrections to the original of the Convention (Authentic Spanish text)]; C.N.263.2005.TREATIES-4 of 8 April 2005 (Proposal of amendments to Annexes VIII and IX of the Convention) and C.N.263.2005.TREATIES-4 of (Re-issued) of 13 June 2005 (Proposal of amendments to Annexes VIII and IX of the Convention) and C.N.1044.2005.TREATIES-7 of 10 October 2005 (Entry into force of amendments to Annexes VIII and IX of the Convention).

Note: The Convention, of which the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, was adopted on 22 March 1989 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries which was convened at Basel from 20 to 22 March 1989. In accordance with its article 21, the Convention, which was open for signature at the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland in Berne from 23 March 1989 to 30 June 1989, was open thereafter at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York until 22 March 1990, by all States, Namibia, and by political and/or economic integration organizations[3].

Participant	*Signature*	*Formal confirmation (c), Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	22 Mar 1989	
Albania		29 Jun 1999 a
Algeria		15 Sep 1998 a
Andorra		23 Jul 1999 a
Antigua and Barbuda		5 Apr 1993 a
Argentina	28 Jun 1989	27 Jun 1991
Armenia		1 Oct 1999 a
Australia		5 Feb 1992 a
Austria	19 Mar 1990	12 Jan 1993
Azerbaijan		1 Jun 2001 a
Bahamas		12 Aug 1992 a
Bahrain	22 Mar 1989	15 Oct 1992
Bangladesh		1 Apr 1993 a
Barbados		24 Aug 1995 a
Belarus		10 Dec 1999 a
Belgium	22 Mar 1989	1 Nov 1993
Belize		23 May 1997 a
Benin		4 Dec 1997 a
Bhutan		26 Aug 2002 a
Bolivia	22 Mar 1989	15 Nov 1996
Bosnia and Herzegovina		16 Mar 2001 a
Botswana		20 May 1998 a
Brazil		1 Oct 1992 a
Brunei Darussalam		16 Dec 2002 a
Bulgaria		16 Feb 1996 a
Burkina Faso		4 Nov 1999 a
Burundi		6 Jan 1997 a
Cambodia		2 Mar 2001 a
Cameroon		9 Feb 2001 a
Canada	22 Mar 1989	28 Aug 1992
Cape Verde		2 Jul 1999 a
Central African Republic		24 Feb 2006 a
Chad		10 Mar 2004 a
Chile	31 Jan 1990	11 Aug 1992
China[4]	22 Mar 1990	17 Dec 1991
Colombia	22 Mar 1989	31 Dec 1996
Comoros		31 Oct 1994 a
Cook Islands		29 Jun 2004 a
Costa Rica		7 Mar 1995 a
Côte d'Ivoire		1 Dec 1994 a

Participant	Signature	Formal confirmation (c), Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Croatia		9 May 1994 a
Cuba		3 Oct 1994 a
Cyprus	22 Mar 1989	17 Sep 1992
Czech Republic[5]		30 Sep 1993 d
Democratic Republic of the Congo		6 Oct 1994 a
Denmark	22 Mar 1989	6 Feb 1994 AA
Djibouti		31 May 2002 a
Dominica		5 May 1998 a
Dominican Republic		10 Jul 2000 a
Ecuador	22 Mar 1989	23 Feb 1993
Egypt[6]		8 Jan 1993 a
El Salvador	22 Mar 1990	13 Dec 1991
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Eritrea		10 Mar 2005 a
Estonia		21 Jul 1992 a
Ethiopia		12 Apr 2000 a
European Community	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994 AA
Finland	22 Mar 1989	19 Nov 1991 A
France	22 Mar 1989	7 Jan 1991 AA
Gambia		15 Dec 1997 a
Georgia		20 May 1999 a
Germany[7]	23 Oct 1989	21 Apr 1995
Ghana		30 May 2003 a
Greece	22 Mar 1989	4 Aug 1994
Guatemala	22 Mar 1989	15 May 1995
Guinea		26 Apr 1995 a
Guinea-Bissau		9 Feb 2005 a
Guyana		4 Apr 2001 a
Haiti	22 Mar 1989	
Honduras		27 Dec 1995 a
Hungary	22 Mar 1989	21 May 1990 AA
Iceland		28 Jun 1995 a
India	15 Mar 1990	24 Jun 1992
Indonesia		20 Sep 1993 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		5 Jan 1993 a
Ireland	19 Jan 1990	7 Feb 1994
Israel	22 Mar 1989	14 Dec 1994
Italy	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994
Jamaica		23 Jan 2003 a
Japan		17 Sep 1993 a
Jordan	22 Mar 1989	22 Jun 1989 AA
Kazakhstan		3 Jun 2003 a
Kenya		1 Jun 2000 a
Kiribati		7 Sep 2000 a
Kuwait	22 Mar 1989	11 Oct 1993
Kyrgyzstan		13 Aug 1996 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon	22 Mar 1989	21 Dec 1994
Lesotho		31 May 2000 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		12 Jul 2001 a
Liechtenstein	22 Mar 1989	27 Jan 1992
Lithuania		22 Apr 1999 a
Luxembourg	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994
Madagascar		2 Jun 1999 a
Malawi		21 Apr 1994 a
Malaysia		8 Oct 1993 a
Maldives		28 Apr 1992 a
Mali		5 Dec 2000 a
Malta		19 Jun 2000 a
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		16 Aug 1996 a
Mauritius		24 Nov 1992 a
Mexico	22 Mar 1989	22 Feb 1991
Micronesia (Federated States of)		6 Sep 1995 a
Moldova		2 Jul 1998 a
Monaco		31 Aug 1992 a
Mongolia		15 Apr 1997 a
Montenegro[8]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		28 Dec 1995 a
Mozambique		13 Mar 1997 a
Namibia		15 May 1995 a
Nauru		12 Nov 2001 a
Nepal		15 Oct 1996 a
Netherlands[9]	22 Mar 1989	16 Apr 1993 A
New Zealand[10]	18 Dec 1989	20 Dec 1994
Nicaragua		3 Jun 1997 a
Niger		17 Jun 1998 a
Nigeria	15 Mar 1990	13 Mar 1991
Norway	22 Mar 1989	2 Jul 1990
Oman		8 Feb 1995 a
Pakistan		26 Jul 1994 a
Panama	22 Mar 1989	22 Feb 1991
Papua New Guinea		1 Sep 1995 a
Paraguay		28 Sep 1995 a
Peru		23 Nov 1993 a
Philippines	22 Mar 1989	21 Oct 1993
Poland	22 Mar 1990	20 Mar 1992
Portugal[11]	26 Jun 1989	26 Jan 1994
Qatar		9 Aug 1995 a
Republic of Korea		28 Feb 1994 a
Romania		27 Feb 1991 a
Russian Federation	22 Mar 1990	31 Jan 1995
Rwanda		7 Jan 2004 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		7 Sep 1994 a
Saint Lucia		9 Dec 1993 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		2 Dec 1996 a
Samoa		22 Mar 2002 a
Saudi Arabia	22 Mar 1989	7 Mar 1990
Senegal		10 Nov 1992 a
Serbia[14]		18 Apr 2000 a
Seychelles		11 May 1993 a
Singapore		2 Jan 1996 a
Slovakia[5]		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia		7 Oct 1993 a
South Africa		5 May 1994 a
Spain	22 Mar 1989	7 Feb 1994
Sri Lanka		28 Aug 1992 a
Sudan		9 Jan 2006 a
Swaziland		8 Aug 2005 a
Sweden	22 Mar 1989	2 Aug 1991
Switzerland	22 Mar 1989	31 Jan 1990
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Oct 1989	22 Jan 1992
Thailand	22 Mar 1990	24 Nov 1997
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		16 Jul 1997 a

Participant	Signature	Formal confirmation (c), Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Togo		2 Jul 2004 a
Trinidad and Tobago		18 Feb 1994 a
Tunisia		11 Oct 1995 a
Turkey	22 Mar 1989	22 Jun 1994
Turkmenistan		25 Sep 1996 a
Uganda		11 Mar 1999 a
Ukraine		8 Oct 1999 a
United Arab Emirates	22 Mar 1989	17 Nov 1992
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4,12]	6 Oct 1989	7 Feb 1994
United Republic of Tanzania		7 Apr 1993 a
United States of America[13]	22 Mar 1990	
Uruguay	22 Mar 1989	20 Dec 1991
Uzbekistan		7 Feb 1996 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	22 Mar 1989	3 Mar 1998
Viet Nam		13 Mar 1995 a
Yemen		21 Feb 1996 a
Zambia		15 Nov 1994 a

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon formal confirmation, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

ALGERIA

Declaration:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares, with regard to article 20, paragraph 2 of the [Convention], that in every case, the agreement of the all parties concerned is necessary to submit a dispute to the International Court of Justice or to arbitration.

CHILE

Declaration:

The Government of Chile considers that the provisions of this Convention [. . .] help to consolidate and expand the legal regime that Chile has established through various international instruments on the control of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes and their disposal, whose scope of application covers both the continental territory of the Republic and its area of jurisdiction situated south of latitude 60°S, in accordance with the provisions of article 4, paragraph 6, of the present Convention.

COLOMBIA

Upon signature:

It is the understanding of Colombia that the implementation of the present Convention shall in no case restrict, but rather shall strengthen, the application of the juridical and political principles which, as [was] made clear in the statement [made on 21 March to the Basel Conference], govern the actions taken by the Colombian State in matters covered by the Convention -- in other words, *inter alia*, the latter may in no case be interpreted or applied in a manner inconsistent with the competence of the Colombian State to apply those principles and other norms of its internal rule to its land area (including the subsoil), air space, territorial sea, submarine continental shelf and exclusive economic maritime zone, in accordance with international law.

Upon ratification:

The Government of Colombia, pursuant to article 26, paragraph 2, of the [said Convention], declares, for the purposes of implementing this international instrument, that article 81 of the Political Constitution of Colombia prohibits the bringing of nuclear residues and toxic wastes into the national territory.

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, with regard to article 20 of the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal, that any disputes between Parties as to the interpretation or application of, or compliance with, this Convention or any protocol thereto, shall be settled through negotiation through the diplomatic channel or submitted to arbitration under the conditions set out in Annex VI on arbitration.

DENMARK

Upon signature:

"Denmark's signature of the Global Convention of the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal does not apply to Greenland and the Faroe Islands."

ECUADOR

Upon signature:

The elements contained in the Convention which has been signed may in no way be interpreted in a manner inconsistent with the domestic legal norms of the Ecuadorian State, or with the exercise of its national sovereignty.

GERMANY[7]

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"It is the understanding of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that the provisions in article 4, paragraph 12 of this Convention shall in no way affect the exercise of navigation rights and freedoms as provided for in international law. Accordingly, it is the view of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany that nothing in this Convention shall be deemed to require the giving of notice to or the consent of any State for the passage of hazardous wastes on a vessel under the flag of a party exercising its right of innocent passage through the territorial sea or the freedom of navigation in an exclusive economic zone under international law."

INDONESIA

Declaration:

Mindful of the need to adjust the existing national laws and regulations, the provisions of article 3 (1) of this Convention shall only be implemented by Indonesia after the new revised laws and regulations have been enacted and entered into force.

ITALY

Declaration made on 30 March 1990 and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of Italy declares . . . that it is in favour of the establishment of a global control system for the environmentally sound management of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes.

JAPAN

Declaration:

The Government of Japan declares that nothing in the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movement of Hazardous Wastes and Their Disposal be interpreted as requiring notice to or consent of any State for the mere passage of hazardous wastes or other wastes on a vessel exercising navigational rights and freedoms, as paragraph 12 of article 4 of the said Convention stipulates that nothing in the Convention shall affect in any way the exercise of navigational rights and freedoms as provided for in international law and as reflected in relevant international instruments.

LEBANON

Upon signature:

"[Lebanon] declares that [it] can under no circumstances permit burial of toxic and other wastes in any of the areas subject to its legal authority which they have entered illegally. In 1988, Lebanon announced a total ban on the import of such wastes and adopted Act No. 64/88 of 12 August 1988 to that end. In all such situations, Lebanon will endeavour to co-operate with the States concerned, and with the other States parties, in accordance with the provisions of this treaty."

MEXICO

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

Mexico is signing *ad referendum* the Basel Convention on the Control of the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their disposal because it duly protects its rights as a coastal State in the areas subject to its national jurisdiction, including the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf and, in so far as it is relevant, its airspace, and the exercise in those areas of its legislative and administrative competence in relation to the protection and preservation of the environment, as recognized by international law and, in particular, the law of the sea.

Mexico considers that, by means of this Convention, important progress has been made in protection of the environment through the legal regulation of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes. A framework of general obligations for States parties has been established, fundamentally with a view to reducing to a minimum the generation and transboundary movement of dangerous wastes and ensuring their environmentally rational management, promoting international co-operation for those purposes, establishing co-ordination and follow-up machinery and regulating the implementation of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes.

Mexico further hopes that, as an essential supplement to the standard-setting character of the Convention, a protocol will be adopted as soon as possible, establishing, in accordance with the principles and provisions of international law, appropriate procedures in the matter of responsibility and compensation for damage resulting from the transboundary movement and management of dangerous wastes.

NORWAY

"Norway accepts the binding means of settling disputes set out in Article 20, paragraphs 3 (*a*) and (*b*), of the Convention, by (*a*) submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice and/or (*b*) arbitration in accordance with the procedures set out in Annex VI."

POLAND

Declaration:

With respect to article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Polish Republic declares that it recognizes submission to arbitration in accordance with the procedures and under the conditions set out in Annex VI to the Convention, as compulsory *ipso facto*.

ROMANIA

Declaration:

In conformity with article 26, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Romania declares that the import and the disposal on its national territory of hazardous wastes and other wastes can take place only with the prior approval of the competent Romanian authorities.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Understanding:

The definition of "Territory" in the Cairo Guidelines and Principles for the Environmentally Sound Management of Hazardous Wastes (UNEP Governing Council decision 14/30 of 17 June 1987) to which reference is made in the preamble to the Convention is a special formulation and cannot be used for purposes of interpreting the present Convention or any of its provisions in the light of article 31, paragraph 2, or article 32 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties or on any other basis.

SAINT KITTS AND NEVIS

Declaration:

"With respect to article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Saint Kitts and Nevis declares that it recognizes submission to arbitration in accordance with the procedures and the conditions set out in Annex VI to the Convention, as compulsory *ipso facto*."

SINGAPORE

Declaration:

"The Government of Singapore declares that, in accordance with article 4 (12), the provisions of the Convention do not in any way affect the exercise of navigational rights and freedoms as provided in international law. Accordingly, nothing in this Convention requires notice to or consent of any State for the passage of a vessel under the flag of a party, exercising rights of passage through the territorial sea or freedom of navigation in an exclusive economic zone under international law."

SPAIN

Declaration:

The Spanish Government declares, in accordance with article 26.2 of the Convention, that the criminal characterization of illegal traffic in hazardous wastes or other wastes, established as an obligation of States Parties under article 4.3, will in future take place within the general framework of reform of the substantive criminal legal order.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare that, in accordance with article 4 (12), the provisions of the Convention do not affect in any way the exercise of navigational rights and freedoms as provided for in international law. Accordingly, nothing in this Convention requires notice to or consent of any state for the passage of hazardous wastes on a vessel under the flag of a party, exercising rights of passage through the territorial sea or freedom of navigation in an exclusive economic zone under international law."

URUGUAY

Upon signature:

Uruguay is signing *ad referendum* the Convention on the Control of the Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal because it is duly protecting its rights as a riparian State in the areas subject to its national jurisdiction, including the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf and, as appropriate, the superjacent air space as well as the exercise in such areas of its standard-setting and administrative competence in connection with the protection and preservation of the environment as recognized by international law and, in particular, by the law of the sea.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Upon signature:

Venezuela considers that the Convention [as] adopted properly protects its sovereign rights as a riparian State over the areas under its national jurisdiction, including its territorial sea, exclusive economic zone and continental shelf, and, as appropriate, its air space. The Convention also safeguards the exercise in such areas of its standard-setting and administrative jurisdiction for the purpose of protecting and preserving the environment and its natural resources in accordance with international law, and in particular the law of the sea.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon formal confirmation, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ITALY

The Government of Italy, in expressing its objections *vis-à-vis* the declarations made, upon signature, by the Governments of Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Uruguay and Venezuela, as well as other declarations of similar tenor that might be made in the future, considers that no provision of this Convention should be interpreted as restricting navigational rights recognized by international law. Consequently, a State party is not obliged to notify any other State or obtain authorization from it for simple passage through the territorial sea or the exercise of freedom of navigation in the exclusive economic zone by a vessel showing its flag and carrying a cargo of hazardous wastes.

Notes:

[1] On 16 September 1992, i.e., after the expiry of the 90-day period from the date of its circulation (i.e., 10 June 1992), the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland communicated the following with respect to the corrections proposed by the Government of Japan to article 7 of the Convention:

"The United Kingdom Government has no objection to the first of the . . . suggested amendments since this represents the correction of a typographical error rather than a substantive change. With regard to the second proposed change, however, the UK Government would wish to lodge an objection on the following grounds:

i) Since the Convention was negotiated predominantly through the English language version of the draft Convention, to amend the text of this version to accord with the text of the other language versions would be to align the original version with translations, rather than vice-versa, which would appear to be more appropriate;

ii) Tthere is a general presumption that a legislative provision should be construed, if at all possible, so as to give it meaning and substance. If the amendment proposed by the Japanese Government was to be accepted, article 7 would confirm what is already explicit in article 6.1 of the Convention (as read in conjunction with article 2.13 which defines the term 'the states concerned'). If, however, article 7 remains un-amended, it will continue to add to the scope of article 6.2 and therefore retain a specific meaning;

iii) The United Kingdom is of the view that the Basel Convention should require of Parties the maximum level of prior notification possible. In the case of a proposed movement of a consignment of hazardous waste from the Basel Party to a second Basel Party via a non-Party, we would wish the second Basel Party to send a copy of its final response regarding movement to the non-Party. Article 7, as presently worded, ensures that this takes place. The amendment proposed by the Government of Japan would, however, have the effect of limiting, albeit to a small extent, the amount of prior notification by Parties to the agreement in question.

In view of these objections the government of the United Kingdom agrees to the first of the proposed adjustments of the English text, but not to the second."

On 11 January 1993, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the objection to the second modification proposed by the Government of Japan to article 7 of the Convention.

[2] At the Fourth Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention, held in Kuching, Malaysia, from 23 to 27 February 1998, the Parties proposed an amendment to Annex 1 and adopted two new Annexes (VIII and IX).

In accordance with paragraphs 2 (c) and 3 of article 18, on the expiry of six months from the date of their circulation (on 6 May 1998), the amendment to Annex I and the adoption of Annexes VIII and IX became effective for all Parties to the Convention which had not submitted a notification in accordance with the provisions of article 18, paragraph 2 (b), that is to say on 6 November 1998.

In this connection, the Secretary-General had received from the Governments of the following States, notifications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Austria (30 October 1998):

"Austria is not in a position to accept the amendment and the annexes to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (Basel Convention) which were adopted by decision IV/9 of the fourth meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention.

This objection under Article 18 para. 2 (b) of the said Convention has to be raised on purely technical grounds, due to the necessary parliamentary procedure in Austria, and will be lifted immediately once Parliament has accepted the amendment to Annex I as well as the new annexes VIII and IX.

In this context, due note should be taken of the fact that Austria is legally bound by the "Council Regulation on the supervision and control of shipments of waste within, into and out of the European Community". An amendment to Annex V of this Council Regulation has been decided with the support of Austria on 30 September 1998 in order to take into full consideration those wastes featuring on any lists of wastes characterized as hazardous for the purposes of the Basel Convention."

The amendment to Annex I and the adoption of Annexes VIII and IX took effect for Austria on 26 October 1999, the date of deposit of its instrument of acceptance with the Secretary-General.

Germany (4 November 1998):

At the Fourth Conference of the Parties to the Basel Convention held in Kuching, Malaysia from 23 to 27 February 1998, Germany agreed to the amendments and the new Annexes. However, under the Basic Law for the Federal Republic of Germany formal approval by the legislative bodies is required before the amendments to the Convention enter into force. Unfortunately, it will not be possible to conclude this process within the six-month deadline.

For this reason and in conformity with Article 18 (2) (b) of the Basel Convention, the Federal Republic of Germany declares that it cannot at present accept the amendments to Annex I and the new Annexes VIII and IX to the Basel Convention.

The amendment to Annex I and the adoption of Annexes VIII and IX took effect for Germany on 24 May 2002, the date of deposit of its instrument of acceptance with the Secretary-General.

[3] Such an organization is defined under article 2, paragraph 20, of the said Convention as "an organization constituted by sovereign States to which its member States have transferred competence in respect of matters governed by this Convention and which has been duly authorized, in accordance with its internal procedures, to sign, ratify, accept, approve, formally confirm or accede to it".

[4] On 6 and 10 June 1997, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from the Governments of the United Kingdom and China (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[5] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 24 July 1991. See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] On 31 January 1995, the Government of Egypt informed the Secretary-General that its instrument of accession should have been accompanied by the following declarations:

First declaration: passage of ships carrying hazardous wastes through the Egyptian territorial sea:

The Arab Republic of Egypt, upon acceding to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, which was done on 22 March 1989 and is referred to hereafter as "the Convention", and, in accordance with article 26 of the Convention, declares that:

In accordance with the provisions of the Convention and the rules of international law regarding the sovereign right of the State over its territorial sea and its obligation to protect and preserve the marine environment, since the passage of foreign ships carrying hazardous or other wastes entails many risks which constitute a fundamental threat to human health and the environment; and

In conformity with Egypt's position on the passage of ships carrying inherently dangerous or noxious substances through its territorial sea (United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea, 1983), the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that

1. Foreign ships carrying hazardous or other wastes will be required to obtain prior permission from the Egyptian authorities for passage through its territorial sea.

2. Prior notification must be given of the movement of any hazardous wastes through areas under its national jurisdiction, in accordance with article 2, paragraph 9, of the Convention.

Second declaration: imposition of a complete ban on the import of hazardous wastes:

The Arab Republic of Egypt, upon acceding to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal, which was signed on 22 March 1989 and is referred to below as "the Convention", and

In accordance with article 26 of the Convention, declares that:

In accordance with its sovereign rights and with article 4, paragraph 1(*a*), of the Convention, a complete ban is imposed on the import of all hazardous or other wastes and on their disposal on the territory of the Arab Republic of Egypt. This confirms Egypt's position that the transportation of such wastes constitutes a fundamental threat to the health of people, animals and plants and to the environment.

Third declaration:

The Governments of Bahrain, Belgium, Benin, Côte d'Ivoire, Denmark, Egypt, the Federal Republic of Germany, Finland, France, the German Democratic Republic, Ghana, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Jordan, Kenya, Kuwait, Lebanon, Luxembourg, Malaysia, Malta, Namibia, Netherlands, Niger, Norway, the Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal,Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Sweden, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Arab Emirates and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, as well as the Commission of the European Union, which will sign the Convention and/or the final document referring to the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal (referred to hereinafter as "the Convention"),

Concerned that the transboundary movement of hazardous wastes constitutes a great danger to the health of both humans and the environment,

Considering that the developing countries have a limited ability to manage wastes, especially hazardous wastes, in an environmentally sound manner,

Believing that a reduction in the production of hazardous wastes and their disposal in environmentally sound conditions in the country which exports them must be the goal of waste management policy,

Convinced that the gradual cessation of transboundary movements of hazardous wastes will undoubtedly be a major incentive to the development of appropriate national facilities for the disposal of wastes,

Recognizing the right of every State to ban the import to or export from its territory of hazardous wastes,

Welcoming the signature of the Convention,

Believing it necessary, before applying the provisions of the Convention, to impose immediate and effective control on transboundary movement operations, especially to developing countries, and to reduce them,

Declare the following:

1. The signatories to this Convention affirm their strong determination that wastes should be disposed of in the country of production.

2. The signatories to this Convention request States which accede to the Convention to do so, by making every possible effort to effect a gradual cessation of the import and export of wastes for reasons other than their disposal in facilities which will be set up within the framework of regional cooperation.

3. The signatories to this Convention will not permit wastes to be imported to or exported from countries deficient in the technical, administrative and legal expertise in administering wastes and disposing of them in an environmentally sound manner.

4. The signatories to this Convention affirm the importance of assistance to develop appropriate facilities intended for the final disposal of wastes produced by countries referred to in paragraph 3 above.

5.The signatories to this Convention stress the need to take effective measures within the framework of the Convention to enable wastes to be reduced to the lowest possible level and to be recycled.

Note:

Belgium considers that its declaration does not prejudice the import to its territory of wastes classified as primary or secondary materials.

These declarations were not transmitted to the Secretary-General at the time the instrument of accession. In keeping with the depositary practice followed in similar cases, the Secretary-General proposed to receive the declarations in question for deposit in the absence of any objection on the part of any of the Contracting States, either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date of their circulation (i.e., 17 July 1995).

In this connexion, the Secretary-General received the following objections on the dates indicated hereinafter:

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (9 October 1995):

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot accept the first declaration of Egypt (passage of ships carrying hazardous wastes through the Egyptian territorial sea) [...]. Not only was this declaration out of time, but like all other declarations to similar effect, it is unacceptable in substance. In this connection the United Kingdom Government recalls its own statement upon signature confirmed upon ratification:

[For the text of the statement, see under "Reservations and Declarations".]

Finland (13 October 1995):

... "In the view of the Government of Finland the declarations of Egypt raise certain legal questions. Article 26.1 of the Basel Convention prohibits any reservation or exception to the Convention. However, according to article 26.2 a State can, when acceding to the Convention, make declarations or statements `with a view, *inter alia*, to the harmonization of its laws and regulations with the provisions of this Convention ...'.

Without taking any stand to the content of the declarations, which appear to be reservations in nature, the Government of Finland refers to article 26.2 of the Basel Convention and notes that the declarations of Egypt have been made too late. For this reason the Government of Finland objects to the declarations and considers them devoid of legal effect."

Italy (13 October 1995):

... The Italian Government objects to the deposit of the aforementioned declarations since, in its opinion, they should be considered as reservations to the Basel Convention and the possibility of making reservations is excluded under article 26, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

In any event, article 26, paragraph 2, stipulates that a State may, within certain limits, formulate declarations only "when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving, ... confirming or acceding to this Convention".

For these reasons, the deposit of the aforementioned declarations cannot be allowed, regardless of their content.

Netherlands (13 October 1995):

"While the second and the third declarations do not call for observations by the Kingdom, the first declaration establishing the requirement of prior permission for passage through the Egyptian territorial sea is not acceptable.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the first declaration to be a reservation to the (Basel) Convention. The Convention explicitly prohibits the making of reservations in article 26 par. 1. Moreover, this reservation has been made two years after the accession of Egypt to the (Basel) Convention, and therefore too late.

Consequently the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers the declaration on the requirement of prior permission for passage through the territorial sea made by Egypt a reservation which is null and void."

Sweden (16 October 1995):

"The Government of Sweden cannot accept the declarations made by the Government of Egypt [...].

First, these declarations were made almost two years after the accession by Egypt contrary to the rule laid down in article 26, paragraph 2 of the Basel Convention.

Second, the content of the first of these declarations must be understood to constitute a reservation to the Convention, whereas the Basel Convention explicitly prohibits reservations (article 26, paragraph 1).

Thus, the Government of Sweden considers these declarations null and void."

In view of the above and in keeping with the depositary practice followed in such cases, the Secretary-general has taken the view that he is not in a position to accept these declarations for deposit.

[7] The German Democratic Republic had signed the Convention on 19 March 1989. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[10] With a declaration of non-application to Tokelau "until the date of notification by the Government of New Zealand that the Convention shall so extend to Tokelau".

[11] On 28 June 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General the the Convention would also apply to Macau.

Subsequently, on 9 and 15 December 1999, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macau from the Governments of the Portugal and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention with the will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[12] In respect of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the British Antarctic Territory.

Subsequently, on 30 October 1995, the Government of the the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General that the Convention shall apply to Hong Kong *(see also note 4)*, being a territory for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible.

On 6 July 2001, the Secretary-general received from the Government of Argentina, the following communication:

Following the notification by the Environment Agency of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland of the possible transit of a cargo of hazardous wastes, the Government of Argentina rejected the British attempt to apply the above-mentioned Convention

to the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands, as well as to the surrounding maritime spaces and to the Argentine Antarctic Sector.

The Argentine Republic reaffirms its sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich Islands and the surrounding maritime spaces and rejects any British attempt to apply the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal of 22 March 1989 to the said Territories and maritime spaces.

It also wishes to recall that the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21, 41/40, 42/19 and 43/25, which recognize the existence of a dispute over sovereignty and request the Governments of the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to initiate negotiations with a view to finding the means to resolve peacefully and definitively the pending problems between both countries, including all aspects on the future of the Malvinas Islands, in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations.

Further, on 12 December 2001, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General that "the Convention shall extend to the Isle of Man for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible" (on 27 November 2002: designation of authority: Department of Local Government and the Environment, Murray House, Mount Havelock, Douglas, Isle of Man, IM1 2SF).

On 27 November 2002: on behalf of the Bailiwick of Guernsey. (designation of authority: "Board of Health, David Hughes, Chief Executive, States of Guernsey Board of Health, John Henry House, Le Vauquiedor, St Martin's, Guernsey, GY4 6UU).

On 6 September 2006: in respect of Akrotiri and Dhekelia.

"In accordance with Article 5 paragraph 2 of the Convention, the competent authorities designated by the United Kingdom for the Sovereign Base Areas of Dhekelia and Akrotiri are:

Sovereign Base Areas:

Competent Authority for the Western Sovereign Base Area: Area Officer (Mr Kyprianos Matheou), Area Office, Akrotiri, BFPO 57 (telephone 00357 2527 7290).

Competent Authoriy for Eastern Sovereign Base Area: Area Officer (Mr Christakis Athanasiou), Area Office, Dhekelia, BFPO 58 (telephone 00357 2474 4558).

British Forces Cyprus:

Competent Authority: Defence Estates Support Manager (Mr P Pashas), Block D, Headquarters, British Forces Cyprus, Episkopi, BFPO 53 (telephone 00357 2596 2329).

The Secretary of State for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, United Kingdom, is the focal point for the purposes of Article 5 of the Convention."

[13] On 13 March 1996, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United States of America, the following communication:

"(1) It is the understanding of the United States of America that, as the Convention does not apply to vessels and aircraft that are entitled to sovereign immunity under international law, in particular to any warship, naval auxiliary, and other vessels or aircraft owned or operated by a State and in use on government, non-commercial service, each State shall ensure that such vessels or aircraft act in a manner consistent with this Convention, so far as is practicable and reasonable, by adopting appropriate measures that do not impair the operations or operational capabilities of sovereign immune vessels.

(2) It is the understanding of the United States of America that a State is a `Transit State' within the meaning of the Convention only if wastes are moved, or are planned to be moved, through its inland waterways, inland waters, or land territory.

(3) It is the understanding of the United States of America that an exporting State may decide that it lacks the capacity to dispose of wastes in an `environmentally sound and efficient manner' if disposal in the importing country would be both environmentally sound and economically efficient.

(4) It is the understanding of the United States of America that article 9 (2) does not create obligations for the exporting State with regard to cleanup, beyond taking such wastes back or otherwise disposing of them in accordance with the Convention. Further obligations may be determined by the parties pursuant to article 12.

Further, at the time the United States of America deposits its instrument of ratification of the Basel Convention, the United States will formally object to the declaration of any State which asserts the right to require its prior permission or authorization for the passage of vessels transporting hazardous wastes while exercising, under international law, its right of innocent passage through the territorial sea or freedom of navigation in an exclusive economic zone."

[14] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" and note 1 under "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3. a) Amendment to the Basel Convention on the Control of Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

Geneva, 22 September 1995

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 17 (5) of the Convention which reads as follows: "Instruments of ratification, approval, formal confirmation or acceptance of amendments shall be deposited with the Depositary. Amendments adopted in accordance with paragraphs 3 or 4 [of article 17 of the Convention] shall enter into force between Parties having accepted them on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Depositary of their instrument of ratification, approval, formal confirmation or acceptance by at least three-fourths of the Parties who accepted the amendments to the Protocol concerned, except as may otherwise be provided in such protocol. The amendments shall enter into force for any other Party on the ninetieth day after that Party deposits its instrument of ratification, approval, formal confirmation or acceptance of the amendments.".

STATUS: Parties: 63.

TEXT: Doc. UNEP/CHW.3/35.

Note: By decision III/1, of 22 September 1995, the Third meeting of the Conference of the Contracting Parties to the above Convention, which took place in Geneva from 18 to 22 September 1995, adopted an Amendment to the Convention (including the adoption of Annex VII).

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Succession (d)*
Albania	27 Oct 2005 A
Andorra	23 Jul 1999 A
Austria	17 Oct 1999 A
Bahrain	25 Jul 2005
Belgium	20 Jun 2003
Bolivia	31 Mar 2005
Botswana	17 Jun 2004 A
Brunei Darussalam	16 Dec 2002 A
Bulgaria	15 Feb 2000
China	1 May 2001
Cook Islands	29 Jun 2004
Cyprus	7 Jul 2000 A
Czech Republic	28 Feb 2000 A
Denmark[1]	10 Sep 1997 AA
Ecuador	6 Mar 1998
Egypt	27 Jan 2004
Estonia	2 Aug 2001
Ethiopia	8 Oct 2003
European Community	30 Sep 1997 AA
Finland	5 Sep 1996 A
France	18 Nov 2003 AA
Gambia	7 Mar 2001
Germany	24 May 2002 A
Ghana	9 Jun 2005
Hungary	25 May 2004 AA
Indonesia	24 Oct 2005
Jordan	6 Dec 2004 AA
Kuwait	12 May 2006
Latvia	18 Dec 2003 A
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 A
Liechtenstein	20 May 2003 A
Lithuania	7 Nov 2003 A
Luxembourg	14 Aug 1997
Malaysia	26 Oct 2001
Mauritius	9 Nov 2004
Montenegro[2]	23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	10 Sep 2004 AA
Netherlands	22 Jan 2001 A
Nigeria	24 May 2004
Norway	16 Jul 1997 A
Oman	17 May 2004
Panama	7 Oct 1998
Paraguay	28 Aug 1998
Poland	29 Jan 2003 A
Portugal	30 Oct 2000
Qatar	28 Feb 2002
Romania	17 Jul 2002 A
Saint Lucia	22 Jan 2002
Serbia	22 Nov 2002 A
Slovakia	11 Sep 1998 A
Slovenia	1 Dec 2004
Spain	7 Aug 1997 A
Sri Lanka	29 Jan 1999
Sweden	10 Sep 1997 A
Switzerland	7 Nov 2002 A
Syrian Arab Republic	5 Oct 2004
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	18 Nov 2004
Trinidad and Tobago	12 Jan 2000
Tunisia	26 Oct 1999
Turkey	27 Aug 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[3]	13 Oct 1997
United Republic of Tanzania	26 Aug 2002
Uruguay	10 Mar 1999

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon formal confirmation, ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession. For objections thereto, see hereinafter.)

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

... that the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Amendment and the Protocol shall not under any circumstances whatsoever signify recognition of Israel, nor shall it lead to entry therewith into any dealings that may be governed by the provisions of the said amendment and Protocol.

Notes:

[1] With a reservation for the application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

Subsequently, on 15 April 1998, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General of the following: "....the reservation for the application of the Amendment to Greenland is hereby lifted."

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] On behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the British Antarctic Territory.

Further, on 12 December 2001, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General that "the amendment shall extend to the Isle of Man for whose international relations the Government of the United Kingdom is responsible".

On 27 November 2002: on behalf of the Bailiwick of Guernsey.

On 6 September 2006: on behalf of Akrotiri and Dhekelia.

3. b) Basel Protocol on Liability and Compensation for Damage Resulting from Transboundary Movements of Hazardous Wastes and their Disposal

Basel, 10 December 1999

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 29 which reads as follows: "1. The Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, formal confirmation, approval or accession. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization which ratifies, accepts, approves or formally confirms the Protocol or accedes thereto after the date of the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or accession, it shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or regional economic integration organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or accession. 3. For the purpose of paragraphs 1 and 2 of this Article, any instrument deposited by member States of such organization.".

STATUS: Signatories: 13. Parties: 7.

TEXT: Doc. UNEP/CHW.1/WG/1/9/2; depositary notification C.N.120.2005.TREATIES-12 of 23 February 2005 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Protocol (authentic Spanish text)] and C.N.407.2005.TREATIES-3 of 25 May 2005 [(Corrections to the original of the Protocol (Authentic Spanish text)].

Note: The Protocol will be open for signature by States and by regional economic integration organizations Parties to the Basel Convention in Berne at the Federal Department of Foreign Affairs of Switzerland from 6 to 17 March 2000 and at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 1 April 2000 to 10 December 2000, in accordance with its article 26.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Formal confirmation (c), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Botswana		17 Jun 2004 a
Chile	8 Dec 2000	
Colombia	22 Nov 2000	
Costa Rica	27 Apr 2000	
Democratic Republic of the Congo		23 Mar 2005 a
Denmark	5 Dec 2000	
Ethiopia		8 Oct 2003 a
Finland	6 Dec 2000	
France	8 Dec 2000	
Ghana		9 Jun 2005 a
Hungary	5 Dec 2000	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Luxembourg	28 Aug 2000	
Monaco	17 Mar 2000	
Sweden	1 Dec 2000	
Switzerland	9 Mar 2000	
Syrian Arab Republic		5 Oct 2004 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	3 Apr 2000	
Togo		2 Jul 2004 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	7 Dec 2000	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon formal confirmation, ratification, acceptance, formal confirmation, approval or accession.)

CHILE

Declaration:

Chile understands that aritcle 12 of the Protocol and Annex B thereto do not imply any obstacle for the exporter or the notifier in terms of being able to negotiate with the importer or the disposer the conditions under which the insurance cost involved in the operation shall be defrayed.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

... that the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the Amendment and the Protocol shall not under any circumstances whatsoever signify recognition of Israel, nor shall it lead to entry therewith into any dealings that may be governed by the provisions of the said amendment and Protocol.

4. Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context

Espoo, Finland, 25 February 1991

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 September 1997, in accordance with article 18 (1).
REGISTRATION: 10 September 1997, No. 34028.
STATUS: Signatories: 30. Parties: 41.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1989, p. 309.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Senior Advisers to ECE Governments on Environmental and Water Problems of the Economic Commission for Europe at their fourth session held in Espoo, Finland, from 25 February to 1 March 1991. The Convention was open for signature at Espoo, Finland, during the said period and thereafter at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 2 September 1991.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Albania	26 Feb 1991	4 Oct 1991
Armenia		21 Feb 1997 a
Austria	26 Feb 1991	27 Jul 1994
Azerbaijan		25 Mar 1999 a
Belarus	26 Feb 1991	10 Nov 2005 A
Belgium	26 Feb 1991	2 Jul 1999
Bulgaria	26 Feb 1991	12 May 1995
Canada	26 Feb 1991	13 May 1998
Croatia		8 Jul 1996 a
Cyprus		20 Jul 2000 a
Czech Republic[1]	30 Sep 1993 d	26 Feb 2001
Denmark[2]	26 Feb 1991	14 Mar 1997 AA
Estonia		25 Apr 2001 a
European Community	26 Feb 1991	24 Jun 1997 AA
Finland	26 Feb 1991	10 Aug 1995 A
France[3]	26 Feb 1991	15 Jun 2001 AA
Germany	26 Feb 1991	8 Aug 2002
Greece	26 Feb 1991	24 Feb 1998
Hungary	26 Feb 1991	11 Jul 1997
Iceland	26 Feb 1991	
Ireland	27 Feb 1991	25 Jul 2002
Italy	26 Feb 1991	19 Jan 1995
Kazakhstan		11 Jan 2001 a
Kyrgyzstan		1 May 2001 a
Latvia		31 Aug 1998 a
Liechtenstein		9 Jul 1998 a
Lithuania		11 Jan 2001 a
Luxembourg	26 Feb 1991	29 Aug 1995
Moldova		4 Jan 1994 a
Netherlands[4]	25 Feb 1991	28 Feb 1995 A
Norway	25 Feb 1991	23 Jun 1993
Poland	26 Feb 1991	12 Jun 1997
Portugal	26 Feb 1991	6 Apr 2000
Romania	26 Feb 1991	29 Mar 2001
Russian Federation	6 Jun 1991	
Slovakia[1]	28 May 1993 d	19 Nov 1999
Slovenia		5 Aug 1998 a
Spain	26 Feb 1991	10 Sep 1992
Sweden	26 Feb 1991	24 Jan 1992
Switzerland		16 Sep 1996 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		31 Aug 1999 a
Ukraine	26 Feb 1991	20 Jul 1999
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	26 Feb 1991	10 Oct 1997
United States of America	26 Feb 1991	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

Austria

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 15 paragraph 2 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

Bulgaria

Declaration:

The Republic of Bulgaria declares that for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 15, it accepts both of the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

a) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice;

b) Arbitration in accordance with the procedure set out in Appendix VII.

Canada[6]

Reservation:

"Inasmuch as under the Canadian constitutional system legislative jurisdiction in respect of environmental assessment is divided between the provinces and the federal government, the Government of Canada in ratifying this Convention, makes a

reservation in respect of proposed activities (as defined in this Convention) that fall outside of federal legislative jurisdiction exercised in respect of environmental assessment."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"It is understood, that the Community Member States, in their mutual relations, will apply the Convention in accordance with the Community's internal rules, including those of the EURATOM Treaty, and without prejudice to appropriate amendments being made to those rules.

"The European Community considers that, if the information of the public of the Party of origin takes place when the environmental impact assessment documentation is available, the information of the affected Party by the Party of origin must be implemented simultaneously at the latest.

"The Community considers that the Convention implies that each Party must assure, on its territory, that the public is provided with the environmental impact assessment documentation, that it is informed and that its observations are collected."

Declaration:

Upon approval:

"In the field covered by the Espoo Convention, Council Directive 85/337/EEC of 27 June 1985, annexed to this Declaration, applies. It enables the Community to comply with most of the obligations under the Espoo Convention. Member States are responsible for the performance of those obligations resulting from the Espoo Convention not currently covered by Community law and more specifically by Directive 85/337/EEC. The Community underlines that Directive 85/337/EEC does not cover the application of the Espoo Convention between the Community on the one hand and non-Member States party to the Espoo Convention on the other hand. The Community will inform the depositary of any future amendment to Directive 85/337/EEC.

From this, it follows that the Community, within the limits indicated above, is competent to enter into binding commitments on its own behalf with non-members countries which are Contracting Parties to the Espoo Convention."

FRANCE

Declarations:

.... When approving the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, signed at Espoo on 25 February 1991, the Government of the French Republic declares that it associates itself with the declarations made by the European Commission, both when signing this Convention and when depositing the Community's instrument of ratification, and stresses in particular that:

– In its relations with the member States of the European Union, France will apply the Convention in accordance with the Union's internal rules, including those laid down in the Euratom treaty;

– When the public in the Party of origin is provided with information through the public distribution of the environmental impact assessment documentation, the notification of the affected Party by the Party of origin must be given no later than when the documentation is distributed;

– The Convention implies that it is the responsibility of each Party to ensure the public distribution within its territory of the environmental impact assessment documentation, inform the public and collect its comments, except where different bilateral arrangements apply.

It specifies that, any projects for which a request for authorization or approval is required and has already been submitted to the competent authority at the time when the Convention enters into force in France shall not be subject to the Convention.

Lastly, it specifies that the word 'national' in article 2, paragraph 8, of the Convention shall be understood to refer to national laws, national regulations, national administrative provisions and commonly accepted national legal practices.

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration concerning article 15 (2):

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares in accordance with article 15, paragraph 2, of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 15 of [the said Convention], that it accepts both means of dispute settlement referred to in that paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Upon signature:

"The United Kingdom considers the Convention is incomplete. Annex I of the Convention lists offshore hydrocarbon production. The United Kingdom considers there is no reason to exclude onshore hydrocarbon production from Annex I, and therefore intends to seek an early amendment to the Convention to remedy this omission."

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

SPAIN

26 May 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Canada upon ratification :

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain notes that the said reservation is of a general nature, rendering compliance with the provisions of the Convention dependent on certain norms of Canada's internal legislation.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain believes that this general reservation gives rise to doubts concerning Canada's commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention and recalls that, according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are impermissible.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have decided to become parties should be respected in their entirety by all parties, and that States should be prepared to adapt their internal legislation to comply with their obligations

under those treaties. A general reservation such as that made by the Government of Canada, which does not clearly specify either the provisions of the Convention to which it applies or the scope of the derogation, undermines the foundations of international treaty law.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the aforementioned general reservation made by the Government of Canada to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and Canada..

SWEDEN

26 May 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Canada upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that the general reservation made by the Government of Canada does not clarify to which extent Canada considers itself bound by the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. Furthermore, according to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, and well established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

Sweden does not consider the reservation made by the Government of Canada as admissible unless the Government of Canada, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Sweden therefore, pending clarification of the exact extent of the reservation, objects to the [...] general reservation made by the Government of Canada.

Notes:

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed the Convention on 30 August 1991. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] Upon signature, the Government of Denmark made the following declaration (which was not confirmed upon approval):

Decision reserved as concerns the application of the Convention to the Faeroe Islands and Greenland.

On 12 December 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Denmark a communication declaring that the Convention shall apply to the Faeroe Islands and Greeland as from 14 March 1997."

[3] Upon depositing its instrument of approval, the Government of France declared the following:

The Government of the French Republic declares that the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, signed at Espoo on 25 February 1991, does not apply to the territory of French Polynesia.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] On behalf of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man and Gibraltar.

[6] In this regard, the Secretary-General received from the following States, communications on the dates indicated:

Finland (28 May 1999):

In the view of the Government of Finland the general reservation made by the Government of Canada does not adequately clarify to which extent Canada considers itself bound by the Convention. It is of fundamental importance that States are prepared to undertake legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under their treaties.

Furthermore, according to article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969 as well as customary international law a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

Accordingly, Finland objects to the general reservation of Canada as not compatible with the object and purpose of the [Convention].

Italy (1 June 1999):

The Italian Government notes that the reservation made by the Government of Canada in ratifying the Espoo Convention is of a general nature, since it subordinates the application of the said Convention to certain provisions of Canada's domestic law.

The Italian Government is of the view that this general reservation raises doubts regarding Canada's commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention, and wishes to recall that under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a State may not formulate a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty to which it refers.

It is in the common interest of States to ensure that the treaties to which they are parties are respected in their entirety by all the Contracting Parties, and that the latter are willing to undertake the legislative changes needed to comply with the obligations arising under such treaties.

Reservations of a general nature like the one made by the Government of Canada, which do not clearly specify the scope of the derogations resulting therefrom, undermine the foundations of international treaty law.

Consequently, the Italian Government opposes the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Canada to the [Convention].

France (communicated on 8 June 1999 and confirmed on 15 June 2001)

The Government of the French Republic has considered the reservation made by the Government of Canada with respect to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context.

This reservation, which stresses that legislative jurisdiction with respect to environmental impact assessment is divided between the provinces and the federal government, limits the responsibilities assigned by the Convention to a federal State. However, it is a principle of international law that a State may not invoke its domestic law to justify its failure to fulfil its obligations under a treaty. Moreover, since the reservation is worded in a very general fashion, the Government of the French Republic has been unable to establish to which provisions of the Convention the reservation applies or could apply, or in what way; it believes that application of the reservation could render the provisions of the Convention null and void. It therefore objects to the reservation.

France would be in a position to consider the reservation made by Canada admissible in the light of articles 19 and 21 of the Vienna Convention only if Canada demonstrates, by means of additional statements or through its future practice, that its reservation is in keeping with provisions that are essential for achieving the object and purpose of the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and France.

Norway (28 July 1999):

"It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected as to their object and purpose by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. Furthermore, according to well-established customary international law, a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted. Norway holds the opinion that according to customary international law, reservations of a general character, taken because of division of jurisdictional competence in the national constitution, normally are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention in question. Such a reservation does not sufficiently clarify to which extent the reserving State Party is bound by the provisions of the Convention.

Norway does not consider the reservation made by the Government of Canada as admissible unless the Government of Canada, by providing additional information or through subsequent practice, ensures that the reservation is compatible with the provisions essential for the implementation of the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Norway, therefore, pending clarification of the exact extent of the reservation, objects to the aforesaid general reservation made by the Government of Canada."

Luxembourg (20 August 1999):

The Government of Luxembourg notes that this reservation is of a general nature and makes compliance with the Convention subject to certain provisions of Canada's domestic laws.

This reservation casts doubt on Canada's commitment to the object and purpose of the Convention. Luxembourg wishes to recall that, under the provisions of article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not authorized.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they decide to accede be fully complied with by all parties and that States be prepared to adapt their national legislation to their obligations under such treaties. A general reservation such as the one made by the Government of Canada, which specifies neither the provisions of the Convention to which it applies nor its scope, undermines the basis of the international law of treaties.

The Government of Luxembourg therefore objects to this general reservation made by the Government of Canada with respect to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg and Canada.

On 21 January 2000, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Canada, the following communciation:

"The Government of Canada notes that some States have formulated objections to the reservation of the Government of Canada to the Espoo Convention. The Government of Canada wishes to reaffirm its view that a reservation in respect of proposed activities (as defined in the Convention) that fall outside federal legislative jurisdiction exercised in respect of environmental assessment is compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is thus admissible. In reaffirming its position on this matter, the Government of Canada refers to the negotiating history of the Convention and specifically to the sixth and final meeting of the Working Group to elaborate a draft Convention. At that meeting, the states present agreed to delete a draft article that would have prohibited all reservations to the Convention. It was and remains Canada's understanding that the agreement to delete the prohibition on reservations was linked directly with a further decision not to include a "federal clause" within the Convention.

Canada further wishes to state that Canada's reservation to the Espoo Convention is an integral part of Canada's ratification of the Convention and is not severable therefrom. Canada can only accept treaty relations with other states on the basis of the reservation as formulated and in conformity with Article 21 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

Ireland (25 July 2002):

"The Government of Ireland has noted the reservation made by the Government of Canada when ratifying the Convention. The reservation appears to limit the application of the Convention in respect of Canada, to the proposed activities (as defined by the Convention) only insofar as they fall within the federal legislative jurisdiction exercised by Canada in respect of environmental assessment and therefore to have the effect of excluding the Convention's application to Canada insofar as the proposed activities fall within the jurisdiction of the Canadian provinces.

The reservation is of such a general nature that the Government of Ireland is unable to establish the extent to which Canada considers itself bound by the Convention.

Furthermore, it is a principle of international law that a State may not invoke its domestic law to justify its failure to fulfil its obligations under a treaty. It is, therefore, the view of the Government of Ireland that, without further clarification, it is not possible to determine whether or not the reservation is compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention in question.

Pending further clarification from Canada ensuring that the reservation is compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, the Government of Ireland objects to the reservation made by Canada."

4. a) Amendment to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context

Sofia, 27 February 2001

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 14 (4) of the Convention which reads as follows: "Amendments to [the Convention] adopted in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article shall be sumbitted by the Depositary to all Parties for ratification, approval or acceptance. They shall enter into force for Parties having ratified, approved or accepted them on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Depositary of notification of their ratification, approval or acceptance by at least three fourths of these Parties. Thereafter they shall enter into force for any other Party on the ninetieth day after that Party deposits its instrument of ratification, approval or acceptance of the amendments.".

STATUS: Parties: 7.

TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.44.2002.TREATIES-1 of 25 January 2002.

Note: At the second meeting of the Parties to the Convention of 27 February 2001 on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, held in Sofia, Bulgaria, from 26 to 27 February 2001, the Parties adopted, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 14 (3) of the Convention, the Amendment to the said Convention as set out in Annex XIV to the report of the Second Meeting of the Parties (Decision II/14).

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Albania	12 May 2006 A	Poland	20 Jul 2004 A
Austria	14 Sep 2006	Romania	16 Nov 2006 A
Germany	8 Aug 2002	Sweden	30 Mar 2006
Luxembourg	5 May 2003		

4. b) Protocol on Strategic Environmental Assessment to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context

Kiev, 21 May 2003

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 24 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For the purposes of paragraph 1 above, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization referred to in article 21 shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by States members of such an organization. 3. For each State or regional economic integration organization referred to in article 21 which ratifies, accepts or approves this Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 38. Parties: 4.

TEXT: Doc. ECE/MP.EIA/2003/2.

Note: The above Protocol was adopted on 21 May 2003 by the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Convention of 25 February 1991 on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context held in Kiev, from 21 to 23 May 2003. The Protocol was opened for signature from 21 to 23 May 2003 in Kiev, and will remain open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 31 December 2003 by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Economic Commission for Europe, pursuant to paragraphs 8 and 11 of Economic and Social Council resolution 36 (IV) of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations constituted by sovereign States members of the Economic Commission for Europe to which their member States have transferred competence over matters governed by the Protocol, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of these matters.

Participant	*Succession to signature (d), Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania	21 May 2003	2 Dec 2005
Armenia	21 May 2003	
Austria	21 May 2003	
Belgium	21 May 2003	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	21 May 2003	
Bulgaria	21 May 2003	
Croatia	23 May 2003	
Cyprus	21 May 2003	
Czech Republic	21 May 2003	19 Jul 2005
Denmark	21 May 2003	
Estonia	21 May 2003	
European Community	21 May 2003	
Finland	21 May 2003	18 Apr 2005 A
France	21 May 2003	
Georgia	21 May 2003	
Germany	21 May 2003	
Greece	21 May 2003	
Hungary	21 May 2003	
Ireland	21 May 2003	
Italy	21 May 2003	
Latvia	21 May 2003	
Lithuania	21 May 2003	
Luxembourg	21 May 2003	
Moldova	21 May 2003	
Montenegro[1]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Netherlands	21 May 2003	
Norway	21 May 2003	
Poland	21 May 2003	
Portugal	21 May 2003	
Romania	21 May 2003	
Serbia	21 May 2003	
Slovakia	19 Dec 2003	
Slovenia	22 May 2003	
Spain	21 May 2003	
Sweden	21 May 2003	30 Mar 2006
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	21 May 2003	
Ukraine	21 May 2003	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	21 May 2003	

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

This signature engages also the Waloon region, the Flemish region, and the Brussels-Capital region.

DENMARK

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Both the Faroe Islands and Greeland are self-governing under Home Rule Acts, which implies *inter alia* that environmental affairs in general and the areas covered by the Protocol are governed by the right of self-determination.

Signing by Denmark of the Protocol, therefore does not necessarily mean that Danish ratification will in due course include the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4. c) Amendment to the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context

Cavtat, 4 June 2004

NOT YET IN FORCE: in accordance with annex 14 (4) , which reads as follows: "Amendments to the above Convention adopted in accordance with paragraph 3 of this Article shall be submitted by the Depositary to all Parties for ratification, approval or acceptance. They shall enter into force for Parties having ratified, approved or accepted them on the ninetieth day after the receipt by the Depositary of notification of their ratification, approval or acceptance by at least three fourths of these Parties. Thereafter they shall enter into force for any other Party on the ninetieth day after that Party deposits its instrument of ratification, approval or acceptance of the amendments. ".

STATUS: Parties: 3.

TEXT: : Deppositary Notification C.N.1143.2004.TREATIES-1 of 8 November 2004 (Adoption of Amendment).

Note: At the third meeting of the Parties to the above Convention, held in Cavtat, Croatia, from 1 to 4 June 2004, the Parties adopted, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 14 (3) of the Convention on Environmental Impact Assessment in a Transboundary Context, the second Amendment to the said Convention as set out in Annex VII to the report of the Third Meeting of the Parties (Decision III/7).

Participant	*Ratification, Approval (AA), Acceptance (A)*
Albania	12 May 2006 A
Austria	14 Sep 2006
Sweden	30 Mar 2006

5. Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes

Helsinki, 17 March 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 October 1996, in accordance with article 26 (1).
REGISTRATION: 6 October 1996, No. 33207.
STATUS: Signatories: 26. Parties: 35.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1936, p. 269.

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Senior Advisers to the Economic Commission for Europe Governments on Environmental and Water Problems at their Resumed Fifth Session held at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992. The Convention was opened for signature at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992 and was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 18 September 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Albania	18 Mar 1992	5 Jan 1994
Austria	18 Mar 1992	25 Jul 1996
Azerbaijan		3 Aug 2000 a
Belarus		29 May 2003 a
Belgium	18 Mar 1992	8 Nov 2000
Bulgaria	18 Mar 1992	28 Oct 2003
Croatia		8 Jul 1996 a
Czech Republic		12 Jun 2000 a
Denmark[1]	18 Mar 1992	28 May 1997 AA
Estonia	18 Mar 1992	16 Jun 1995
European Community	18 Mar 1992	14 Sep 1995 AA
Finland	18 Mar 1992	21 Feb 1996 A
France[2]	18 Mar 1992	30 Jun 1998 AA
Germany	18 Mar 1992	30 Jan 1995
Greece	18 Mar 1992	6 Sep 1996
Hungary	18 Mar 1992	2 Sep 1994 AA
Italy	18 Mar 1992	23 May 1996
Kazakhstan		11 Jan 2001 a
Latvia	18 Mar 1992	10 Dec 1996
Liechtenstein		19 Nov 1997 a
Lithuania	18 Mar 1992	28 Apr 2000
Luxembourg	20 May 1992	7 Jun 1994
Moldova		4 Jan 1994 a
Netherlands[3]	18 Mar 1992	14 Mar 1995 A
Norway	18 Sep 1992	1 Apr 1993 AA
Poland	18 Mar 1992	15 Mar 2000
Portugal[4]	9 Jun 1992	9 Dec 1994
Romania	18 Mar 1992	31 May 1995
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1992	2 Nov 1993 A
Slovakia		7 Jul 1999 a
Slovenia		13 Apr 1999 a
Spain	18 Mar 1992	16 Feb 2000
Sweden	18 Mar 1992	5 Aug 1993
Switzerland	18 Mar 1992	23 May 1995
Ukraine		8 Oct 1999 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	18 Mar 1992	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

Austria

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 22 paragraph 2 of the Convention, that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both these means of dispute settlement."

France[4]

3 January 1999

Declaration:

The Government of the French Republic, in approving the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes, declares that reference to the concept of reasonable and equitable use of transboundary waters does not constitute recognition of a principle of customary law, but illustrates a principle of cooperation between Parties to the Convention; the scope of such cooperation is specified in agreements, to which the Convention between States bordering the same transboundary waters - such agreements being concluded on the basis of equality and reciprocity.

Germany

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Federal Republic of Germany, in order to protect information related to personal data according to its national law, reserves the right to supply personal data only under the condition that the part receiving such protected information shall respect the confidentiality of the information received and the conditions under which it is supplied, and shall only use that information for the purposes for which it was supplied".

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

[Same declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, *as the one made under Austria.]*

LITHUANIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Lithuania declares that, for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 22 it accepts the means of dispute settlement provided in paragraph 2 (b) of Article 22 of the said Convention."

NETHERLANDS

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon acceptance:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 22 of the Convention both the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

(*a*) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice;

(*b*) Arbitration in accordance with the procedure set out in annex IV."

SPAIN

Reservation:

In relation to article 3, paragraph 1 (c), the Spanish State takes it that the limits for waste-water discharges stated in permits shall guarantee, in any case, respect for the water-quality criteria of the receiving environment, based on the best available technologies and the technical features of the affected installation, its geographical site and local environmental conditions.

Notes:

[1] With reservation of application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[2] On 14 August 1998, the Government of France made a declaration with respect to the above Convention. The said declaration was communicated to all Contracting States by a depositary notification. Within a period of 90 days from the date of the depositary notification (i.e. 5 October 1998), none of the Contracting States to the Convention notified the Secretary-General of an objection. Consequently, the declaration is deemed to have been accepted for deposit on 3 January 1999.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] On 28 June 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General the the Convention would also apply to Macau.

5. a) Protocol on Water and Health to the 1992 Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes

London, 17 June 1999

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 4 August 2005, in accordance with article 23 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For the purposes of paragraph 1 of this article, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by States members of such an organization. 3. For each State or organization referred to in article 21 which ratifies, accepts or approves this Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 4 August 2005, No. 33207.

STATUS: Signatories: 36. Parties: 20.[1]

TEXT: ECOSOC doc. MP.WAT/AC.1/1999/1 of 24 March 1999.

Note: The Protocol was adopted on 17 June 1999 on the occasion of the Third Ministerial Conference on Environment and Health held at London from 16 to 18 June 1999. The Protocol will be opened for signature in London on 17 June 1999 and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 18 June 2000 by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe, by States members of the Regional Committee for Europe of the World Health Organization, by States having consultative status with the Economic Commission for Europe pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and Social Council resolution 36 (IV) of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations constituted by sovereign States members of the Economic Commission for Europe or members of the Regional Committee for Europe of the World Health Organization to which their member States have transferred competence over matters governed by this Protocol, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of these matters in accordance with its article 21.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Albania	17 Jun 1999	8 Mar 2002
Armenia	17 Jun 1999	
Azerbaijan		9 Jan 2003 a
Belgium	17 Jun 1999	29 Jun 2004
Bulgaria	17 Jun 1999	
Croatia	17 Jun 1999	28 Jul 2006
Cyprus	17 Jun 1999	
Czech Republic	17 Jun 1999	15 Nov 2001
Denmark	17 Jun 1999	
Estonia	17 Jun 1999	9 Sep 2003
Finland	17 Jun 1999	3 Mar 2005 A
France	17 Jun 1999	6 May 2005 AA
Georgia	17 Jun 1999	
Germany	17 Jun 1999	
Greece	17 Jun 1999	
Hungary	17 Jun 1999	7 Dec 2001 AA
Iceland	17 Jun 1999	
Italy	17 Jun 1999	
Latvia	17 Jun 1999	24 Nov 2004
Lithuania	17 Jun 1999	17 Mar 2004
Luxembourg	17 Jun 1999	4 Oct 2001
Malta	17 Jun 1999	
Moldova	10 Mar 2000	16 Sep 2005
Monaco	17 Jun 1999	
Netherlands	17 Jun 1999	
Norway	17 Jun 1999	6 Jan 2004
Poland	17 Jun 1999	
Portugal	17 Jun 1999	6 Sep 2006 AA
Romania	17 Jun 1999	5 Jan 2001
Russian Federation	17 Jun 1999	31 Dec 1999 A
Slovakia	17 Jun 1999	2 Oct 2001
Slovenia	17 Jun 1999	
Spain	17 Jun 1999	
Sweden	17 Jun 1999	
Switzerland	17 Jun 1999	27 Oct 2006
Ukraine	17 Jun 1999	26 Sep 2003
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	17 Jun 1999	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The French, Flemish and German-speaking Communities and the Regions of Wallonia, Flanders and Brussels-Capital are also bound by this singature.

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 23 (2) of the Protocol, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by States members of such an organization.

5. b) Amendments to Articles 25 and 26 of the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes

Geneva, 17 February 2004

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 21(4) of the Convention which reads as follows: "An amendment to the present Convention shall be adopted by consensus of the representatives of the Parties to this Convention present at a meeting of the Parties, and shall enter into force for the Parties to the Convention which have accepted it on the ninetieth day after the date on which two thirds of those Parties have deposited with the Depositary their instruments of acceptance of the amendment. The amendment shall enter into force for any other Party on the ninetieth day after the date on which that Party deposits its instrument of acceptance of the amendment.".

STATUS: Parties: 6.

TEXT: Doc. ECE/MP.WAT/14.

Note: On 28 November 2003, the Parties to the Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes adopted amendments to articles 25 and 26 of the Convention by decision III/1, following a proposal by the Government of Switzerland dated 20 August 2003 (see MP.WAT/2003/4).

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*	*Participant*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Hungary	20 Jun 2005 A	Romania	13 Jun 2006 A
Luxembourg	10 May 2006	Sweden	20 May 2004 A
Netherlands[1]	12 Jan 2006 A		
Poland	31 Jan 2005		

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

6. Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

Helsinki, 17 March 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 19 April 2000, in accordance with article 30 (1).
REGISTRATION: 19 April 2000, No. 36605.
STATUS: Signatories: 27. Parties: 36.[1]
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2105, p. 457..

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Senior Advisers to the Economic Commission for Europe Governments on Environmental and Water Problems at their Resumed Fifth Session held at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992. The Convention was opened for signature at Helsinki from 17 to 18 March 1992 and was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 18 September 1992.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Albania	18 Mar 1992	5 Jan 1994
Armenia		21 Feb 1997 a
Austria	18 Mar 1992	4 Aug 1999
Azerbaijan		16 Jun 2004 a
Belarus		25 Jun 2003 a
Belgium	18 Mar 1992	6 Apr 2006
Bulgaria	18 Mar 1992	12 May 1995
Canada	18 Mar 1992	
Croatia		20 Jan 2000 a
Cyprus		31 Aug 2005 a
Czech Republic		12 Jun 2000 a
Denmark[2]	18 Mar 1992	28 Mar 2001 AA
Estonia	18 Mar 1992	17 May 2000
European Community[1]	18 Mar 1992	24 Apr 1998 AA
Finland	18 Mar 1992	13 Sep 1999 A
France	18 Mar 1992	3 Oct 2003 AA
Germany	18 Mar 1992	9 Sep 1998
Greece	18 Mar 1992	24 Feb 1998
Hungary	18 Mar 1992	2 Jun 1994 AA
Italy	18 Mar 1992	2 Jul 2002
Kazakhstan		11 Jan 2001 a
Latvia	18 Mar 1992	29 Jun 2004
Lithuania	18 Mar 1992	2 Nov 2000
Luxembourg	20 May 1992	8 Aug 1994
Moldova		4 Jan 1994 a
Monaco		28 Aug 2001 a
Netherlands[3]	18 Mar 1992	
Norway	18 Sep 1992	1 Apr 1993 AA
Poland	18 Mar 1992	8 Sep 2003
Portugal	9 Jun 1992	2 Nov 2006
Romania		22 May 2003 a
Russian Federation	18 Mar 1992	1 Feb 1994 A
Slovakia		9 Sep 2003 a
Slovenia		13 May 2002 a
Spain	18 Mar 1992	16 May 1997
Sweden	18 Mar 1992	22 Sep 1999
Switzerland	18 Mar 1992	21 May 1999
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	18 Mar 1992	5 Aug 2002
United States of America	18 Mar 1992	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

Austria

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 21 paragraph 2 of the Convention to accept both of the means of the settlement of disputes mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of settlement of disputes as compulsory."

Azerbaijan

Declarations:

"1. The Republic of Azerbaijan declares that the term 'military installations' appearing in article 2, paragraph 2 (b), of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents is understood to refer to installations serving the interests of national defence and functioning on legal causes.

2. With reference to article 3, paragraph 1, of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that, in relation to any Party, it will cooperate within the framework of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents in accordance with the principles and norms of international law.

3. In accordance with article 21, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Republic of Azerbaijan declares that, for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of article 21, it accepts the arbitration in accordance with the procedure set out in Annex XIII as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of the means of dispute settlement referred to in paragraph 2 of article 21."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY[1]

Reservations:

"The Member States of the European Community, in their mutual relations, will apply the Convention in accordance with the Community's internal rules.

The Community therefore reserves the right:

(i) as concerns the threshold quantities mentioned in Annex I, Part I, No. 3, 4 and 5 of the Convention, to apply threshold quantities of 100 tonnes for bromine (very toxic substance), 5000 tonnes for methanol (toxic substance) and 2000 tonnes for oxygen (oxidizing substance);

(ii) as concerns the threshold quantities mentioned in Annex I, Part I, No. 8 of the Convention to apply threshold quantities of 500 tonnes (risk phrase R50-53 (*): "substances very toxic to aquatic organisms which may cause long term adverse effects in the acquatic environment") and 2000 tonnes (risk phrase R51-53 (*): "substances toxic to aquatic organisms which may cause long term averse effects in the aquatic environment") for substances dangerous for the environment.

Declaration:

"In accordance with the EC Treaty, the objectives and principles of the Community's environmental policy are, in particular, to preserve and protect the quality of the environment and human health through preventive action. In pursuit of those objectives, the Council adopted Council Directive 82/501/EEC of 24 June 1982 on the major-accident hazards of certain industrial activities which has been replaced by Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9 December 1996 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances. These instruments aim at the prevention of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances and the limitations of their consequences for man and the environment and cover matters which are the subject of [the said Convention]. The Community will inform the depositary of any amendment to this Directive and of any further relevant development in the field covered by the Convention.

As regards the application of the Convention, the Community and its Member States are responsible, within their respective spheres of competence."

FRANCE

Declaration and reservation:

1. Interpretative declaration:

The French Government declares that the term "military installations" appearing in article 2, paragraph 2 (b), of the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents is understood to refer to installations serving the interests of national defence and to weapons systems and nuclear-powered vessels of the national navy.

2. Reservation:

At the time of adopting the Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents, signed at Helsinki on 18 March 1992, the French Republic associates itself with the reservations expressed by the European Community at the time of the deposit of its instrument of ratification and states that it will apply the Convention in accordance with its obligations under Directive 96/82 of the Council of the European Union of 9 December 1996 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances.

HUNGARY

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary accepts both means of dispute settlement as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation."

NETHERLANDS

Reservations:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands accepts, for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 of Article 21 of the Convention, both means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the right as concerns the threshold quantities mentioned in Annex I of the Convention, to apply the threshold quantities mentioned in European Council Directive 96/82/EC of 9 December 1996 on the control of major-accident hazards involving dangerous substances."

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 30 (2) of the Convention, any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.

[2] With reservation of application to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

7. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

New York, 9 May 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 March 1994, in accordance with article 23 (1).
REGISTRATION: 21 March 1994, No. 30822.
STATUS: Signatories: 165. Parties: 190.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1771, p. 107; and depositary notifications C.N.148.1993.TREATIES-4 of 12 July 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original texts of the Convention); C.N.436.1993.TREATIES-12 of 15 December 1993 (corrigendum to C.N.148.1993.TREATIES-4 of 12 July 1993); C.N.247.1993.TREATIES-6 of 24 November 1993 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic French text); C.N.462.1993.TREATIES-13 of 30 December 1993 (corrigendum to C.N.247.1993.TREATIES-6 of 24 November 1993); C.N.544.1997.TREATIES-6 of 13 February 1997 (amendment to the list in annex I to the Convention); and C.N.1478.2001.TREATIES-2 of 28 December 2001 (amendment to the list in annex II to the Convention).

Note: The Convention was agreed upon and adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Framework Convention on Climate Change, during its Fifth session, second part, held at New York from 30 April to 9 May 1992. In accordance with its article 20, the Convention was open for signature by States Members of the United Nations or of any of its specialized agencies or that are Parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice and by regional economic integration organizations, at Rio de Janeiro during the United Nations Conference on Environment and Development, from 4 to 14 June 1992, and remained thereafter open at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 19 June 1993.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Afghanistan	12 Jun 1992	19 Sep 2002
Albania		3 Oct 1994 a
Algeria	13 Jun 1992	9 Jun 1993
Angola	14 Jun 1992	17 May 2000
Antigua and Barbuda	4 Jun 1992	2 Feb 1993
Argentina	12 Jun 1992	11 Mar 1994
Armenia	13 Jun 1992	14 May 1993 A
Australia	4 Jun 1992	30 Dec 1992
Austria	8 Jun 1992	28 Feb 1994
Azerbaijan	12 Jun 1992	16 May 1995
Bahamas	12 Jun 1992	29 Mar 1994
Bahrain	8 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994
Bangladesh	9 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1994
Barbados	12 Jun 1992	23 Mar 1994
Belarus	11 Jun 1992	11 May 2000 AA
Belgium	4 Jun 1992	16 Jan 1996
Belize	13 Jun 1992	31 Oct 1994
Benin	13 Jun 1992	30 Jun 1994
Bhutan	11 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Bolivia	10 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1994
Bosnia and Herzegovina		7 Sep 2000 a
Botswana	12 Jun 1992	27 Jan 1994
Brazil	4 Jun 1992	28 Feb 1994
Bulgaria	5 Jun 1992	12 May 1995
Burkina Faso	12 Jun 1992	2 Sep 1993
Burundi	11 Jun 1992	6 Jan 1997
Cambodia		18 Dec 1995 a
Cameroon	14 Jun 1992	19 Oct 1994
Canada	12 Jun 1992	4 Dec 1992
Cape Verde	12 Jun 1992	29 Mar 1995
Central African Republic	13 Jun 1992	10 Mar 1995
Chad	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1994
Chile	13 Jun 1992	22 Dec 1994
China[1]	11 Jun 1992	5 Jan 1993
Colombia	13 Jun 1992	22 Mar 1995
Comoros	11 Jun 1992	31 Oct 1994
Congo	12 Jun 1992	14 Oct 1996
Cook Islands	12 Jun 1992	20 Apr 1993
Costa Rica	13 Jun 1992	26 Aug 1994
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Jun 1992	29 Nov 1994
Croatia	11 Jun 1992	8 Apr 1996 A
Cuba	13 Jun 1992	5 Jan 1994
Cyprus	12 Jun 1992	15 Oct 1997
Czech Republic	18 Jun 1993	7 Oct 1993 AA
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 Jun 1992	5 Dec 1994 AA
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Jun 1992	9 Jan 1995
Denmark	9 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Djibouti	12 Jun 1992	27 Aug 1995
Dominica		21 Jun 1993 a
Dominican Republic	12 Jun 1992	7 Oct 1998
Ecuador	9 Jun 1992	23 Feb 1993
Egypt	9 Jun 1992	5 Dec 1994
El Salvador	13 Jun 1992	4 Dec 1995
Equatorial Guinea		16 Aug 2000 a
Eritrea		24 Apr 1995 a
Estonia	12 Jun 1992	27 Jul 1994
Ethiopia	10 Jun 1992	5 Apr 1994
European Community	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993 AA
Fiji	9 Oct 1992	25 Feb 1993
Finland	4 Jun 1992	3 May 1994 A
France	13 Jun 1992	25 Mar 1994
Gabon	12 Jun 1992	21 Jan 1998
Gambia	12 Jun 1992	10 Jun 1994
Georgia		29 Jul 1994 a
Germany	12 Jun 1992	9 Dec 1993
Ghana	12 Jun 1992	6 Sep 1995
Greece	12 Jun 1992	4 Aug 1994
Grenada	3 Dec 1992	11 Aug 1994
Guatemala	13 Jun 1992	15 Dec 1995
Guinea	12 Jun 1992	7 May 1993

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)
Guinea-Bissau	12 Jun 1992	27 Oct 1995
Guyana	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Haiti	13 Jun 1992	25 Sep 1996
Honduras	13 Jun 1992	19 Oct 1995
Hungary	13 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Iceland	4 Jun 1992	16 Jun 1993
India	10 Jun 1992	1 Nov 1993
Indonesia	5 Jun 1992	23 Aug 1994
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	14 Jun 1992	18 Jul 1996
Ireland	13 Jun 1992	20 Apr 1994
Israel	4 Jun 1992	4 Jun 1996
Italy	5 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1994
Jamaica	12 Jun 1992	6 Jan 1995
Japan	13 Jun 1992	28 May 1993 A
Jordan	11 Jun 1992	12 Nov 1993
Kazakhstan	8 Jun 1992	17 May 1995
Kenya	12 Jun 1992	30 Aug 1994
Kiribati	13 Jun 1992	7 Feb 1995
Kuwait		28 Dec 1994 a
Kyrgyzstan		25 May 2000 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		4 Jan 1995 a
Latvia	11 Jun 1992	23 Mar 1995
Lebanon	12 Jun 1992	15 Dec 1994
Lesotho	11 Jun 1992	7 Feb 1995
Liberia	12 Jun 1992	5 Nov 2002
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	29 Jun 1992	14 Jun 1999
Liechtenstein	4 Jun 1992	22 Jun 1994
Lithuania	11 Jun 1992	24 Mar 1995
Luxembourg	9 Jun 1992	9 May 1994
Madagascar	10 Jun 1992	2 Jun 1999
Malawi	10 Jun 1992	21 Apr 1994
Malaysia	9 Jun 1993	13 Jul 1994
Maldives	12 Jun 1992	9 Nov 1992
Mali	30 Sep 1992	28 Dec 1994
Malta	12 Jun 1992	17 Mar 1994
Marshall Islands	12 Jun 1992	8 Oct 1992
Mauritania	12 Jun 1992	20 Jan 1994
Mauritius	10 Jun 1992	4 Sep 1992
Mexico	13 Jun 1992	11 Mar 1993
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Jun 1992	18 Nov 1993
Moldova	12 Jun 1992	9 Jun 1995
Monaco	11 Jun 1992	20 Nov 1992
Mongolia	12 Jun 1992	30 Sep 1993
Morocco	13 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1995
Mozambique	12 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Myanmar	11 Jun 1992	25 Nov 1994
Namibia	12 Jun 1992	16 May 1995
Nauru	8 Jun 1992	11 Nov 1993
Nepal	12 Jun 1992	2 May 1994
Netherlands[2]	4 Jun 1992	20 Dec 1993 A
New Zealand	4 Jun 1992	16 Sep 1993
Nicaragua	13 Jun 1992	31 Oct 1995
Niger	11 Jun 1992	25 Jul 1995
Nigeria	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Niue		28 Feb 1996 a
Norway	4 Jun 1992	9 Jul 1993
Oman	11 Jun 1992	8 Feb 1995
Pakistan	13 Jun 1992	1 Jun 1994
Palau		10 Dec 1999 a
Panama	18 Mar 1993	23 May 1995
Papua New Guinea	13 Jun 1992	16 Mar 1993
Paraguay	12 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Peru	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1993
Philippines	12 Jun 1992	2 Aug 1994
Poland	5 Jun 1992	28 Jul 1994
Portugal[3]	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Qatar		18 Apr 1996 a
Republic of Korea	13 Jun 1992	14 Dec 1993
Romania	5 Jun 1992	8 Jun 1994
Russian Federation	13 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994
Rwanda	10 Jun 1992	18 Aug 1998
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12 Jun 1992	7 Jan 1993
Saint Lucia	14 Jun 1993	14 Jun 1993
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		2 Dec 1996 a
Samoa	12 Jun 1992	29 Nov 1994
San Marino	10 Jun 1992	28 Oct 1994
Sao Tome and Principe	12 Jun 1992	29 Sep 1999
Saudi Arabia		28 Dec 1994 a
Senegal	13 Jun 1992	17 Oct 1994
Serbia[5]		12 Mar 2001 a
Seychelles	10 Jun 1992	22 Sep 1992
Sierra Leone	11 Feb 1993	22 Jun 1995
Singapore	13 Jun 1992	29 May 1997
Slovakia	19 May 1993	25 Aug 1994 AA
Slovenia	13 Jun 1992	1 Dec 1995
Solomon Islands	13 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994
South Africa	15 Jun 1993	29 Aug 1997
Spain	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Sri Lanka	10 Jun 1992	23 Nov 1993
Sudan	9 Jun 1992	19 Nov 1993
Suriname	13 Jun 1992	14 Oct 1997
Swaziland	12 Jun 1992	7 Oct 1996
Sweden	8 Jun 1992	23 Jun 1993
Switzerland	12 Jun 1992	10 Dec 1993
Syrian Arab Republic		4 Jan 1996 a
Tajikistan		7 Jan 1998 a
Thailand	12 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		28 Jan 1998 a
Timor-Leste		10 Oct 2006 a
Togo	12 Jun 1992	8 Mar 1995 A
Tonga		20 Jul 1998 a
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Jun 1992	24 Jun 1994
Tunisia	13 Jun 1992	15 Jul 1993
Turkey		24 Feb 2004 a
Turkmenistan		5 Jun 1995 a
Tuvalu	8 Jun 1992	26 Oct 1993
Uganda	13 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1993
Ukraine	11 Jun 1992	13 May 1997
United Arab Emirates		29 Dec 1995 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	12 Jun 1992	8 Dec 1993
United Republic of Tanzania	12 Jun 1992	17 Apr 1996
United States of America	12 Jun 1992	15 Oct 1992
Uruguay	4 Jun 1992	18 Aug 1994
Uzbekistan		20 Jun 1993 a
Vanuatu	9 Jun 1992	25 Mar 1993
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	12 Jun 1992	28 Dec 1994

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)	Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)
Viet Nam	11 Jun 1992	16 Nov 1994	Zambia	11 Jun 1992	28 May 1993
Yemen	12 Jun 1992	21 Feb 1996	Zimbabwe	12 Jun 1992	3 Nov 1992

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

BULGARIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Bulgaria declares that in accordance with article 4, paragraph 6, and with respect to paragraph 2 (*b*) of the said article, it accepts as a basis of the anthropogenic emissions in Bulgaria of carbon dioxide and other greenhouse gases not controlled by the Montreal Protocol, the 1988 levels of the said emissions in the country and not their 1990 levels, keeping records of and comparing the emission rates during the subsequent years."

CROATIA[5]

Declaration :

"The Republic of Croatia declares that it intends to be bound by the provisions of the Annex 1, as a country undergoing the process of transition to a market economy."

CUBA

Declaration:

With reference to article 14 of the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change, the Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that, insofar as concerns the Republic of Cuba, any dispute that may arise between the Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall be settled through negotiation through the diplomatic channel.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The European Economic Community and its Member States declare, for the purposes of clarity, that the inclusion of the European Community as well as its Member States in the lists in the Annexes to the Convention is without prejudice to the division of competence and responsibilities between the Community and its Member States, which is to be declared in accordance with article 21 (3) of the Convention."

Upon approval:

Declaration:

"The European Economic Community and its Member States declare that the commitment to limit anthropogenic CO_2 emissions set out in article 4(2) of the Convention will be fulfilled in the Community as a whole through action by the Community and its Member States, within the respective competence of each.

In this perspective, the Community and its Member States reaffirm the objectives set out in the Council conclusions of 29 October 1990, and in particular the objective of stabilization of CO_2 emission by 2000 and 1990 level in the Community as a whole.

The European Economic Community and its Member States are elaborating a coherent strategy in order to attain this objective."

FIJI

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of Fiji declares its understanding that signature of the Convention shall, in no way, constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

HUNGARY

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary attributes great significance to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and it reiterates its position in accordance with the provisions of article 4.6 of the Convention on certain degree of flexibility that the average level of anthropogenic carbon-dioxide emissions for the period of 1985-1987 will be considered as reference level in context of the commitments under article 4.2 of the Convention. This understanding is closely related to the `process of transition' as it is given in article 4.6 of the Convention. The Government of the Republic of Hungary declares that it will do all efforts to contribute to the objective of the Convention."

KIRIBATI

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Kiribati declares its understanding that signature and /or ratification of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

MONACO

Declaration:

In accordance with sub-paragraph g of article 4.2 of the Convention, the Principality of Monaco declares that it intends to be bound by the provisions of sub-paragraphs a and b of said article.

NAURU

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of Nauru declares its understanding that signature of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea declares its understanding that ratification of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under International Law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of Climate Change as derogating from the principles of general International Law."

SOLOMON ISLANDS

Declaration:

"In pursuance of article 14 (2) of the said Convention [the Government of the Solomon Islands] shall recognise as compulsory, arbitration, in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties as soon as practicable, in an annex on arbitration."

TUVALU

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of Tuvalu declares its understanding that signature of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change, and that no provisions in the Convention can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law."

Notifications made in accordance with article 4 (2) (g) [6]

Participant:	*Date of receipt of the notification:*
Czech Republic	27 Nov 1995
Kazakhstan	23 Mar 2000
Monaco	20 Nov 1992
Slovakia	23 Feb 1996
Slovenia	9 Jun 1998

Notes:

[1] By a communication received on 8 April 2003, the Government of the Government of the People's Republic of China notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1990, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change continues to be implemented in the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. The Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change shall not apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China until the Government of China notifies otherwise."

See also note 3 in this chapter.

[2] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[3] On 28 June 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General the the Convention would also apply to Macao.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see note 1 under "Portugal" and note 3 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.) Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[4] In respect of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey and the Isle of Man. On 4 April 2006: in respect of the Bailiwick of Guernsey.

[5] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" and note 1 under "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] States having, in accordance with article 4 (2)(g), notified the Secretary-General of their intention to be bound by article 4 (2)(a) and (b) of the Convention.

7. a) Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change

Kyoto, 11 December 1997

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 February 2005, in accordance with article 25 (1) in accordance with article 25 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date on which not less than 55 Parties to the Convention, incorporating Parties included in Annex I which accounted in total for at least 55 per cent of the total carbon dioxide emissions for 1990 of the Parties included in Annex I, have deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For the purposes of this Article, 'the total carbon dioxide emissions for 1990 of the Parties included in Annex I' means the amount communicated on or before the date of adoption of this Protocol by the Parties included in Annex I in their first national communications submitted in accordance with Article 12 of the Convention. 3. For each State or regional economic integration organization that ratifies, accepts or approves this Protocol or accedes thereto after the conditions set out in paragraph 1 above for entry into force have been fulfilled, this Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit of its instrument of ratification acceptance, approval or accession. 4. For the purposes of this Article, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by States members of the organization. ".

REGISTRATION: 16 February 2005, No. 30822.

STATUS: Signatories: 84. Parties: 169.[1]

TEXT: Decision 1/CP.3 of the Conference of the State Parties to the Convention at its third session; depositary notifications C.N.101.2004.TREATIES-1 of 11 February 2004 [Proposed corrections to the original texts of the Protocol (Arabic and French versions)] and C.N.439.2004.TREATIES-4 of 12 May 2004 [Corrections to the original texts of the Protocol (Arabic and French versions)].

Note: The Protocol was adopted at the third session of the Conference of the Parties to the 1992 United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change ("the Convention"), held at Kyoto (Japan) from 1 to 11 December 1997. The Protocol shall be open for signature by States and regional economic integration organizations which are Parties to the Convention at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 16 March 1998 to 15 March 1999 in accordance with its article 24 (1).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Approval (AA)*
Albania		1 Apr 2005 a
Algeria		16 Feb 2005 a
Antigua and Barbuda	16 Mar 1998	3 Nov 1998
Argentina	16 Mar 1998	28 Sep 2001
Armenia		25 Apr 2003 a
Australia	29 Apr 1998	
Austria	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Azerbaijan		28 Sep 2000 a
Bahamas		9 Apr 1999 a
Bahrain		31 Jan 2006 a
Bangladesh		22 Oct 2001 a
Barbados		7 Aug 2000 a
Belarus		26 Aug 2005 a
Belgium	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Belize		26 Sep 2003 a
Benin		25 Feb 2002 a
Bhutan		26 Aug 2002 a
Bolivia	9 Jul 1998	30 Nov 1999
Botswana		8 Aug 2003 a
Brazil	29 Apr 1998	23 Aug 2002
Bulgaria	18 Sep 1998	15 Aug 2002
Burkina Faso		31 Mar 2005 a
Burundi		18 Oct 2001 a
Cambodia		22 Aug 2002 a
Cameroon		28 Aug 2002 a
Canada	29 Apr 1998	17 Dec 2002
Cape Verde		10 Feb 2006 a
Chile	17 Jun 1998	26 Aug 2002
China[2]	29 May 1998	30 Aug 2002 AA
Colombia		30 Nov 2001 a
Cook Islands	16 Sep 1998	27 Aug 2001
Costa Rica	27 Apr 1998	9 Aug 2002
Croatia	11 Mar 1999	
Cuba	15 Mar 1999	30 Apr 2002
Cyprus		16 Jul 1999 a
Czech Republic	23 Nov 1998	15 Nov 2001 AA
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		27 Apr 2005 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		23 Mar 2005 a
Denmark[3]	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Djibouti		12 Mar 2002 a
Dominica		25 Jan 2005 a
Dominican Republic		12 Feb 2002 a
Ecuador	15 Jan 1999	13 Jan 2000
Egypt	15 Mar 1999	12 Jan 2005
El Salvador	8 Jun 1998	30 Nov 1998
Equatorial Guinea		16 Aug 2000 a
Eritrea		28 Jul 2005 a
Estonia	3 Dec 1998	14 Oct 2002
Ethiopia		14 Apr 2005 a
European Community	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002 AA
Fiji	17 Sep 1998	17 Sep 1998
Finland	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
France	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002 AA
Gabon		12 Dec 2006 a

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Approval (AA)
Gambia		1 Jun 2001 a
Georgia		16 Jun 1999 a
Germany	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Ghana		30 May 2003 a
Greece	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Grenada		6 Aug 2002 a
Guatemala	10 Jul 1998	5 Oct 1999
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Guinea-Bissau		18 Nov 2005 a
Guyana		5 Aug 2003 a
Haiti		6 Jul 2005 a
Honduras	25 Feb 1999	19 Jul 2000
Hungary		21 Aug 2002 a
Iceland		23 May 2002 a
India		26 Aug 2002 a
Indonesia	13 Jul 1998	3 Dec 2004
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		22 Aug 2005 a
Ireland	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Israel	16 Dec 1998	15 Mar 2004
Italy	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Jamaica		28 Jun 1999 a
Japan	28 Apr 1998	4 Jun 2002 A
Jordan		17 Jan 2003 a
Kazakhstan	12 Mar 1999	
Kenya		25 Feb 2005 a
Kiribati		7 Sep 2000 a
Kuwait		11 Mar 2005 a
Kyrgyzstan		13 May 2003 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		6 Feb 2003 a
Latvia	14 Dec 1998	5 Jul 2002
Lebanon		13 Nov 2006 a
Lesotho		6 Sep 2000 a
Liberia		5 Nov 2002 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		24 Aug 2006 a
Liechtenstein	29 Jun 1998	3 Dec 2004
Lithuania	21 Sep 1998	3 Jan 2003
Luxembourg	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Madagascar		24 Sep 2003 a
Malawi		26 Oct 2001 a
Malaysia	12 Mar 1999	4 Sep 2002
Maldives	16 Mar 1998	30 Dec 1998
Mali	27 Jan 1999	28 Mar 2002
Malta	17 Apr 1998	11 Nov 2001
Marshall Islands	17 Mar 1998	11 Aug 2003
Mauritania		22 Jul 2005 a
Mauritius		9 May 2001 a
Mexico	9 Jun 1998	7 Sep 2000
Micronesia (Federated States of)	17 Mar 1998	21 Jun 1999
Moldova		22 Apr 2003 a
Monaco	29 Apr 1998	27 Feb 2006
Mongolia		15 Dec 1999 a
Morocco		25 Jan 2002 a
Mozambique		18 Jan 2005 a
Myanmar		13 Aug 2003 a
Namibia		4 Sep 2003 a
Nauru		16 Aug 2001 a
Nepal		16 Sep 2005 a
Netherlands[4]	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002 A
New Zealand[5]	22 May 1998	19 Dec 2002
Nicaragua	7 Jul 1998	18 Nov 1999
Niger	23 Oct 1998	30 Sep 2004
Nigeria		10 Dec 2004 a
Niue	8 Dec 1998	6 May 1999
Norway	29 Apr 1998	30 May 2002
Oman		19 Jan 2005 a
Pakistan		11 Jan 2005 a
Palau		10 Dec 1999 a
Panama	8 Jun 1998	5 Mar 1999
Papua New Guinea	2 Mar 1999	28 Mar 2002
Paraguay	25 Aug 1998	27 Aug 1999
Peru	13 Nov 1998	12 Sep 2002
Philippines	15 Apr 1998	20 Nov 2003
Poland	15 Jul 1998	13 Dec 2002
Portugal	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002 AA
Qatar		11 Jan 2005 a
Republic of Korea	25 Sep 1998	8 Nov 2002
Romania	5 Jan 1999	19 Mar 2001
Russian Federation	11 Mar 1999	18 Nov 2004
Rwanda		22 Jul 2004 a
Saint Lucia	16 Mar 1998	20 Aug 2003
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	19 Mar 1998	31 Dec 2004
Samoa	16 Mar 1998	27 Nov 2000
Saudi Arabia		31 Jan 2005 a
Senegal		20 Jul 2001 a
Seychelles	20 Mar 1998	22 Jul 2002
Sierra Leone		10 Nov 2006 a
Singapore		12 Apr 2006 a
Slovakia	26 Feb 1999	31 May 2002
Slovenia	21 Oct 1998	2 Aug 2002
Solomon Islands	29 Sep 1998	13 Mar 2003
South Africa		31 Jul 2002 a
Spain	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Sri Lanka		3 Sep 2002 a
Sudan		2 Nov 2004 a
Suriname		25 Sep 2006 a
Swaziland		13 Jan 2006 a
Sweden	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
Switzerland	16 Mar 1998	9 Jul 2003
Syrian Arab Republic		27 Jan 2006 a
Thailand	2 Feb 1999	28 Aug 2002
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		18 Nov 2004 a
Togo		2 Jul 2004 a
Trinidad and Tobago	7 Jan 1999	28 Jan 1999
Tunisia		22 Jan 2003 a
Turkmenistan	28 Sep 1998	11 Jan 1999
Tuvalu	16 Nov 1998	16 Nov 1998
Uganda		25 Mar 2002 a
Ukraine	15 Mar 1999	12 Apr 2004
United Arab Emirates		26 Jan 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[6]	29 Apr 1998	31 May 2002
United Republic of Tanzania		26 Aug 2002 a
United States of America	12 Nov 1998	
Uruguay	29 Jul 1998	5 Feb 2001
Uzbekistan	20 Nov 1998	12 Oct 1999
Vanuatu		17 Jul 2001 a
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		18 Feb 2005 a

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Approval (AA)*
Viet Nam	3 Dec 1998	25 Sep 2002
Yemen		15 Sep 2004 a
Zambia	5 Aug 1998	7 Jul 2006

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

COOK ISLANDS

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Government of the Cook Islands declares its understanding that signature and subsequent ratification of the Kyoto Protocol shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change and that no provision in the Protocol can be interpreted as derogating from principles of general international law.

In this regard, the Government of the Cook Islands further declares that, in light of the best available scientific information and assessment on climate change and its impacts, it considers the emissions reduction obligation in article 3 of the Kyoto Protocol to be inadequate to prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The European Community and its Member States will fulfil their respective commitments under article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol jointly in accordance with the provisions of article 4."

Upon approval:

Declaration by the European Community made in accordance with article 24 (3) of the Kyoto Protocol

"The following States are at present members of the European Community: the Kingdom of Belgium, the Kingdom of Denmark, the Federal Republic of Germany, the Hellenic Republic, the Kingdom of Spain, the French Republic, Ireland, the Italian Republic, the Grand Duchy of Luxembourg, the Kingdom of the Netherlands, the Republic of Austria, the Portuguese Republic, the Republic of Finland, the Kingdom of Sweden, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

The European Community declares that, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular article 175 (1) thereof, it is competent to enter into international agreements, and to implement the obligations resulting therefrom, which contribute to the pursuit of the following objectives:

- preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment;
- protecting human health;
- prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources;
- promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or world wide environmental problems.

The European Community declares that its quantified emission reduction commitment under the Protocol will be fulfilled through action by the Community and its Member States within the respective competence of each and that it has already adopted legal instruments, binding on its Member States, covering matters governed by the Protocol.

The European Community will on a regular basis provide information on relevant Community legal instruments within the framework of the supplementary information incorporated in its national communication submitted under article 12 of the Convention for the purpose of demonstrating compliance with its commitments under the Protocol in accordance with article 7 (2) thereof and the guidelines thereunder."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Interpretative declaration:

The French Republic reserves the right, in ratifying the [said Protocol], to exclude its Overseas Territories from the scope of the Protocol.

Upon approval:

The ratification by the French Republic of the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change of 11 December 1997 should be interpreted in the context of the commitment assumed under article 4 of the Protocol by the European Community, from which it is indissociable. The ratification does not, therefore, apply to the Territories of the French Republic to which the Treaty establishing the European Community is not applicable.

Nonetheless, in accordance with article 4, paragraph 6, of the Protocol, the French Republic shall, in the event of failure to achieve the total combined level of emission reductions, remain individually responsible for its own level of emissions.

IRELAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The European Community and the Member States, including Ireland, will fulfil their respective commitments under article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol in accordance with the provisions of article 4."

KIRIBATI

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Kiribati declares its understanding that accession to the Kyoto Protocol shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of the climate change and that no provision in the Protocol can be interpreted as derogating from principles of general international law."

NAURU

Declarations:

"... The Government of the Republic of Nauru declares its understanding that the ratification of the Kyoto Protocol shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change; ...

... The Government of the Republic of Nauru further declares that, in the light of the best available scientific information and assessment of climate change and impacts, it considers the emissions of reduction obligations in Article 3 of the Kyoto Protocol to be inadequate to prevent the dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system;

... [The Government of the Republic of Nauru declares] that no provisions in the Protocol can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law[.]

NIUE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The Government of Niue declares its understanding that ratification of the Kyoto Protocol shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under international law concerning state responsibility for the adverse effects of climate change and that no provisions in the Protocol can be interpreted as derogating from the principles of general international law.

In this regard, the Government of Niue further declares that, in light of the best available scientific information and assessment of climate change and impacts, it considers the emissions reduction obligations in article 3 of the Kyoto Protocol to be inadequate to prevent dangerous anthropogenic interference with the climate system."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

Statement:

The Russian Federation proceeds from the assumption that the commitments of the Russian Federation under the Protocol will have serious consequences for its social and economic development. Therefore, the decision on ratification was taken following a thorough analysis of all factors, inter alia, the importance of the Protocol for the promotion of international cooperation, and taking into account that the Protocol can enter into force only if the Russian Federation ratifies it.

The Protocol establishes for each of the Parties that have signed it quantified reductions of greenhouse gas emissions to atmosphere for the first commitment period from 2008 to 2012.

The commitments of the Parties to the Protocol on quantified reductions of greenhouse gas emissions to atmosphere for the second and subsequent commitment periods of the Protocol, that is after 2012, will be established through negotiations of the Parties to the Protocol scheduled to start in 2005. On the outcome of these negotiations the Russian Federation will take a decision on its participation in the Protocol in the second and subsequent commitment periods.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Protocol shall in no way imply its recognition of Israel or entail its entry into any dealings with Israel in the matters governed by the provisions thereof.

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 25 (4) of the Protocol, any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.

[2] In a communication received on 30 August 2002, the Government of the People's Republic of China informed the Secretary-General of the following:

In accordance with article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1990 and article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1993, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change shall provisionally not apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

Further, in a communication received on 8 April 2003, the Government of the Government of the People's Republic of China notified the Secretary-General of the following:

"In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China of 1990, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change and the Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

The United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change continues to be implemented in the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China. The Kyoto Protocol to the United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change shall not apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China until the Government of China notifies otherwise."

[3] With a territorial exclusion to the Faroe Islands.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[5] With the following declaration:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

[6] On 4 April 2006, the Government of the United Kingdom informed the Secretary-General that the Protocol shall apply to the Bailiwick of Guernsey and the Isle of Man.

8. CONVENTION ON BIOLOGICAL DIVERSITY

Rio de Janeiro, 5 June 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 December 1993, in accordance with article 36 (1).
REGISTRATION: 29 December 1993, No. 30619.
STATUS: Signatories: 168. Parties: 190.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1760, p. 79; and depositary notification C.N.329.1996.TREATIES-2 of 18 March 1996 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Arabic text).

Note: The Convention was adopted by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for a Convention on Biological Diversity, during its Fifth session, held at Nairobi from 11 to 22 May 1992. The Convention was open for signature at Rio de Janeiro by all States and regional economic integration organizations from 5 June 1992 until 14 June 1992, and remained open at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 4 June 1993.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Succession (d)*
Afghanistan	12 Jun 1992	19 Sep 2002
Albania		5 Jan 1994 a
Algeria	13 Jun 1992	14 Aug 1995
Angola	12 Jun 1992	1 Apr 1998
Antigua and Barbuda	5 Jun 1992	9 Mar 1993
Argentina	12 Jun 1992	22 Nov 1994
Armenia	13 Jun 1992	14 May 1993 A
Australia	5 Jun 1992	18 Jun 1993
Austria	13 Jun 1992	18 Aug 1994
Azerbaijan	12 Jun 1992	3 Aug 2000 AA
Bahamas	12 Jun 1992	2 Sep 1993
Bahrain	9 Jun 1992	30 Aug 1996
Bangladesh	5 Jun 1992	3 May 1994
Barbados	12 Jun 1992	10 Dec 1993
Belarus	11 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1993
Belgium	5 Jun 1992	22 Nov 1996
Belize	13 Jun 1992	30 Dec 1993
Benin	13 Jun 1992	30 Jun 1994
Bhutan	11 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Bolivia	13 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1994
Bosnia and Herzegovina		26 Aug 2002 a
Botswana	8 Jun 1992	12 Oct 1995
Brazil	5 Jun 1992	28 Feb 1994
Bulgaria	12 Jun 1992	17 Apr 1996
Burkina Faso	12 Jun 1992	2 Sep 1993
Burundi	11 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1997
Cambodia		9 Feb 1995 a
Cameroon	14 Jun 1992	19 Oct 1994
Canada	11 Jun 1992	4 Dec 1992
Cape Verde	12 Jun 1992	29 Mar 1995
Central African Republic	13 Jun 1992	15 Mar 1995
Chad	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1994
Chile	13 Jun 1992	9 Sep 1994
China	11 Jun 1992	5 Jan 1993
Colombia	12 Jun 1992	28 Nov 1994
Comoros	11 Jun 1992	29 Sep 1994
Congo	11 Jun 1992	1 Aug 1996
Cook Islands	12 Jun 1992	20 Apr 1993
Costa Rica	13 Jun 1992	26 Aug 1994
Côte d'Ivoire	10 Jun 1992	29 Nov 1994
Croatia	11 Jun 1992	7 Oct 1996
Cuba	12 Jun 1992	8 Mar 1994
Cyprus	12 Jun 1992	10 Jul 1996
Czech Republic	4 Jun 1993	3 Dec 1993 AA
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 Jun 1992	26 Oct 1994 AA
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Jun 1992	3 Dec 1994
Denmark	12 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Djibouti	13 Jun 1992	1 Sep 1994
Dominica		6 Apr 1994 a
Dominican Republic	13 Jun 1992	25 Nov 1996
Ecuador	9 Jun 1992	23 Feb 1993
Egypt	9 Jun 1992	2 Jun 1994
El Salvador	13 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1994
Equatorial Guinea		6 Dec 1994 a
Eritrea		21 Mar 1996 a
Estonia	12 Jun 1992	27 Jul 1994
Ethiopia	10 Jun 1992	5 Apr 1994
European Community	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993 AA
Fiji	9 Oct 1992	25 Feb 1993
Finland	5 Jun 1992	27 Jul 1994 A
France	13 Jun 1992	1 Jul 1994
Gabon	12 Jun 1992	14 Mar 1997
Gambia	12 Jun 1992	10 Jun 1994
Georgia		2 Jun 1994 a
Germany	12 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Ghana	12 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Greece	12 Jun 1992	4 Aug 1994
Grenada	3 Dec 1992	11 Aug 1994
Guatemala	13 Jun 1992	10 Jul 1995
Guinea	12 Jun 1992	7 May 1993
Guinea-Bissau	12 Jun 1992	27 Oct 1995
Guyana	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Haiti	13 Jun 1992	25 Sep 1996
Honduras	13 Jun 1992	31 Jul 1995
Hungary	13 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Iceland	10 Jun 1992	12 Sep 1994
India	5 Jun 1992	18 Feb 1994
Indonesia	5 Jun 1992	23 Aug 1994
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	14 Jun 1992	6 Aug 1996
Ireland	13 Jun 1992	22 Mar 1996
Israel	11 Jun 1992	7 Aug 1995
Italy	5 Jun 1992	15 Apr 1994
Jamaica	11 Jun 1992	6 Jan 1995

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Succession (d)
Japan	13 Jun 1992	28 May 1993 A
Jordan	11 Jun 1992	12 Nov 1993
Kazakhstan	9 Jun 1992	6 Sep 1994
Kenya	11 Jun 1992	26 Jul 1994
Kiribati		16 Aug 1994 a
Kuwait	9 Jun 1992	2 Aug 2002
Kyrgyzstan		6 Aug 1996 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		20 Sep 1996 a
Latvia	11 Jun 1992	14 Dec 1995
Lebanon	12 Jun 1992	15 Dec 1994
Lesotho	11 Jun 1992	10 Jan 1995
Liberia	12 Jun 1992	8 Nov 2000
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	29 Jun 1992	12 Jul 2001
Liechtenstein	5 Jun 1992	19 Nov 1997
Lithuania	11 Jun 1992	1 Feb 1996
Luxembourg	9 Jun 1992	9 May 1994
Madagascar	8 Jun 1992	4 Mar 1996
Malawi	10 Jun 1992	2 Feb 1994
Malaysia	12 Jun 1992	24 Jun 1994
Maldives	12 Jun 1992	9 Nov 1992
Mali	30 Sep 1992	29 Mar 1995
Malta	12 Jun 1992	29 Dec 2000
Marshall Islands	12 Jun 1992	8 Oct 1992
Mauritania	12 Jun 1992	16 Aug 1996
Mauritius	10 Jun 1992	4 Sep 1992
Mexico	13 Jun 1992	11 Mar 1993
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Jun 1992	20 Jun 1994
Moldova	5 Jun 1992	20 Oct 1995
Monaco	11 Jun 1992	20 Nov 1992
Mongolia	12 Jun 1992	30 Sep 1993
Montenegro[1]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	13 Jun 1992	21 Aug 1995
Mozambique	12 Jun 1992	25 Aug 1995
Myanmar	11 Jun 1992	25 Nov 1994
Namibia	12 Jun 1992	16 May 1997
Nauru	5 Jun 1992	11 Nov 1993
Nepal	12 Jun 1992	23 Nov 1993
Netherlands[2]	5 Jun 1992	12 Jul 1994 A
New Zealand	12 Jun 1992	16 Sep 1993
Nicaragua	13 Jun 1992	20 Nov 1995
Niger	11 Jun 1992	25 Jul 1995
Nigeria	13 Jun 1992	29 Aug 1994
Niue		28 Feb 1996 a
Norway	9 Jun 1992	9 Jul 1993
Oman	10 Jun 1992	8 Feb 1995
Pakistan	5 Jun 1992	26 Jul 1994
Palau		6 Jan 1999 a
Panama	13 Jun 1992	17 Jan 1995
Papua New Guinea	13 Jun 1992	16 Mar 1993
Paraguay	12 Jun 1992	24 Feb 1994
Peru	12 Jun 1992	7 Jun 1993
Philippines	12 Jun 1992	8 Oct 1993
Poland	5 Jun 1992	18 Jan 1996
Portugal[3]	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Qatar	11 Jun 1992	21 Aug 1996
Republic of Korea	13 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1994
Romania	5 Jun 1992	17 Aug 1994
Russian Federation	13 Jun 1992	5 Apr 1995
Rwanda	10 Jun 1992	29 May 1996
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12 Jun 1992	7 Jan 1993
Saint Lucia		28 Jul 1993 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		3 Jun 1996 a
Samoa	12 Jun 1992	9 Feb 1994
San Marino	10 Jun 1992	28 Oct 1994
Sao Tome and Principe	12 Jun 1992	29 Sep 1999
Saudi Arabia		3 Oct 2001 a
Senegal	13 Jun 1992	17 Oct 1994
Serbia[5]	8 Jun 1992	1 Mar 2002
Seychelles	10 Jun 1992	22 Sep 1992
Sierra Leone		12 Dec 1994 a
Singapore	10 Mar 1993	21 Dec 1995
Slovakia	19 May 1993	25 Aug 1994 AA
Slovenia	13 Jun 1992	9 Jul 1996
Solomon Islands	13 Jun 1992	3 Oct 1995
South Africa	4 Jun 1993	2 Nov 1995
Spain	13 Jun 1992	21 Dec 1993
Sri Lanka	10 Jun 1992	23 Mar 1994
Sudan	9 Jun 1992	30 Oct 1995
Suriname	13 Jun 1992	12 Jan 1996
Swaziland	12 Jun 1992	9 Nov 1994
Sweden	8 Jun 1992	16 Dec 1993
Switzerland	12 Jun 1992	21 Nov 1994
Syrian Arab Republic	3 May 1993	4 Jan 1996
Tajikistan		29 Oct 1997 a
Thailand	12 Jun 1992	31 Oct 2003
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		2 Dec 1997 a
Timor-Leste		10 Oct 2006 a
Togo	12 Jun 1992	4 Oct 1995 A
Tonga		19 May 1998 a
Trinidad and Tobago	11 Jun 1992	1 Aug 1996
Tunisia	13 Jun 1992	15 Jul 1993
Turkey	11 Jun 1992	14 Feb 1997
Turkmenistan		18 Sep 1996 a
Tuvalu	8 Jun 1992	20 Dec 2002
Uganda	12 Jun 1992	8 Sep 1993
Ukraine	11 Jun 1992	7 Feb 1995
United Arab Emirates	11 Jun 1992	10 Feb 2000
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[4]	12 Jun 1992	3 Jun 1994
United Republic of Tanzania	12 Jun 1992	8 Mar 1996
United States of America	4 Jun 1993	
Uruguay	9 Jun 1992	5 Nov 1993
Uzbekistan		19 Jul 1995 a
Vanuatu	9 Jun 1992	25 Mar 1993
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	12 Jun 1992	13 Sep 1994
Viet Nam	28 May 1993	16 Nov 1994
Yemen	12 Jun 1992	21 Feb 1996
Zambia	11 Jun 1992	28 May 1993
Zimbabwe	12 Jun 1992	11 Nov 1994

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

The Argentine Government considers that this Convention represents a step forward in that it establishes among its objectives the sustainable use of biological diversity. Likewise, the definitions contained in article 2 and other provisions of the Convention indicate that the terms "genetic resources", "biological resources" and "biological material" do not include the human genome. In accordance with the commitments entered into in the Convention, the Argentine Nation will pass legislation on the conditions of access to biological resources and the ownership of future rights and benefits arising from them. The Convention is fully consistent with the principles established in the "Agreement on trade-related aspects of intellectual property rights", including trade in counterfeit goods, contained in the Final Act of the Uruguay Round of GATT.

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 27, paragraph 3 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

CHILE

Declaration:

The Government of Chile, on ratifying the Convention on Biological Diversity of 1992, wishes to place on record that the pine tree and other species that the country exploits as one of its forestry resources are considered exotic and are not taken to fall within the scope of the Convention.

CUBA

Declaration:

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares, with respect to article 27 of the Convention on Biological Diversity, that as far as the Republic of Cuba is concerned, disputes that arise between Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this international legal instrument shall be settled by negotiation through the diplomatic channel or, failing that, by arbitration in accordance with the procedure laid down in Annex II on arbitration of the Convention.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"Within their respective competence, the European Community and its Member States wish to reaffirm the importance they attach to transfers of technology and to biotechnology in order to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The compliance with intellectual property rights constitutes an essential element for the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co-investment.

For the European Community and its member States, transfers of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity, will be carried out in accordance with article 16 of the said Convention and in compliance with the principles and rules of protection of intellectual property, in particular multilateral and bilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting Parties to this Convention.

The European Community and its Member States will encourage the use of the financial mechanism established by the Convention to promote the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights held by European operators, in particular as regards the granting of licences, through normal commercial mechanisms and decisions, while ensuring adequate and effective protection of property rights."

FRANCE

Upon signature:

Declaration:

With reference to article 3, that it interprets that article as a guiding principle to be taken into account in the implementation of the Convention;

With reference to article 21, paragraph 1, that the decision taken periodically by the Conference of the Parties concerns the "amount of resources needed" and that no provision of the Convention authorizes the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature or frequency of the contributions from Parties to the Convention.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

With reference to article 3, that it interprets that article as a guiding principle to be taken into account in the implementation of the Convention;

The French Republic reaffirms its belief in the importance of the transfer of technology and biotechnology in guaranteeing the protection and long-term utilization of biological diversity. Respect for intellectual property rights is an essential element of the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co-investment.

The French Republic affirms that the transfer of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the Convention on Biological Diversity, will be implemented according to article 16 of that Convention and with respect for the principles and rules concerning the protection of intellectual property, including multilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting Parties to the present Convention.

The French Republic will encourage recourse to the financial mechanism established by the Convention for the purpose of promoting the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights under French ownership, *inter alia*, as regards the granting of licences, by traditional commercial decisions and mechanisms while ensuring the appropriate and effective protection of property rights.

With reference to article 21, paragraph 1, the French Republic considers that the decision taken periodically by the Conference of the Parties concerns the "amount of resources needed" and that no provision of the Convention authorizes the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature or frequency of the contributions from Parties to the Convention.

GEORGIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Georgia will use both means for dispute settlement referred to in the Convention:

1. Arbitral consideration in accordance with the procedure given in the enclosure II, Part I.

2. Submitting of disputes to the International Court."

IRELAND

Declaration:

"Ireland wishes to reaffirm the importance it attaches to transfers of technology and to biotechnology in order to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The compliance with intellectual property rights constitutes an essential element for the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co-investment.

For Ireland, transfers of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity and in compliance with the principles and rules of protection of intellectual property, in particular multilateral and bilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the contracting parties to this Convention.

Ireland will encourage the use of the financial mechanism established by the Convention to promote the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights held by Irish operators, in particular as regards the granting of licences, through normal commercial mechanisms and decisions, while ensuring adequate and effective protection of property rights."

ITALY

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The Italian Government [. . .] declares its understanding that the decision to be taken by the Conference of the Parties under article 21.1 of the Convention refers to the 'amount of resources needed' by the financial mechanism, not to the extent or nature and form of the contributions of the Contracting Parties."

LATVIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Latvia declares in accordance with article 27 paragraph 3 of the Convention that it accepts both the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein wishes to reaffirm the importance it attaches to transfers of technology and to biotechnology in order to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity. The compliance with intellectual property rights constitutes an essential element for the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co-investment.

For the Principality of Liechtenstein, transfers of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the text of the [said] Convention, will be carried out in accordance with article 16 of the said Convention and in compliance with the principles and rules of protection of intellectual property, in particular multilateral and bilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting Parties to this Convention.

The Principality of Liechtenstein will encourage the use of the financial mechanism established by the Convention to promote the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights held by Liechtenstein operators, in particular as regards the granting of licenses, through normal commercial mechanisms and decisions, while ensuring adequate and effective protection of property rights."

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

Declaration:

"The Government of the Independent State of Papua New Guinea declares its understanding that ratification of the Convention shall in no way constitute a renunciation of any rights under International Law concerning State responsibility for the adverse effects of Biological Diversity as derogating from the principles of general International Law."

SUDAN

Understanding:

"With respect to the principle stipulated in article 3, the Government of the Sudan agrees with the spirit of the article and interprets it to mean that no state is responsible for acts that take place outside its control even if they fall within its judicial jurisdiction and may cause damage to the environment of other states or of areas beyond the limits of national judicial jurisdiction."

"The Sudan also sees as regards article 14 (2), that the issue of liability and redress for damage to biological diversity should not form a priority to be tackled by the Agreement as there is ambiguity regarding the essence and scope of the studies to be carried out, in accordance with the above-mentioned article. The Sudan further believes that any such studies on liability and redress should shift towards effects of areas such as biotechnology products, environmental impacts, genetically modified organisms and acid rains."

SWITZERLAND

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The Swiss Government wishes to emphasize particularly the progress made in establishing standard terms for cooperation between States in a very important field: research activities and activities for the transfer of technology relevant to resources from third countries.

The important provisions in question create a platform for even closer cooperation with public research bodies or institutions in Switzerland and for the transfer of technologies available to governmental or public bodies, particularly universities and various publicly-funded research and development centres.

It is our understanding that genetic resources acquired under the procedure specified in article 15 and developed by private research institutions will be the subject of programmes of cooperation, joint research and the transfer of technology which will respect the principles and rules for the protection of intellectual property.

These principles and rules are essential for research and private investment, in particular in the latest technologies, such as modern biotechnology which requires substantial financial outlays. On the basis of this interpretation, the Swiss Government wishes to indicate that it is ready, at the opportune time, to take the appropriate general policy measures, particularly under articles 16 and 19, with a view to promoting and encouraging cooperation, on a contractual basis, between Swiss firms and the private firms and governmental bodies of other Contracting Parties.

With regard to financial cooperation, Switzerland interprets the provisions of articles 20 and 21 as follows: the resources to be committed and the management system will have regard, in an equitable manner, to the needs and interests of the developing countries and to the possibilities and interests of the developed countries.

Upon ratification:

Declaration:

Switzerland wishes to reaffirm the importance it attaches to transfers of technology and to biotechnology in order to ensure the conservation and sustainable use of biological diversity The compliance with intellectual property rights constitutes an essential element for the implementation of policies for technology transfer and co-investment.

For Switzerland, transfers of technology and access to biotechnology, as defined in the text of the Convention on Biological Diversity, will be carried out in accordance with article 16 of the said Convention and in compliance with the principles and rules of protection of intellectual property, in particular multilateral and bilateral agreements signed or negotiated by the Contracting Parties to this Convention.

Switzerland will encourage the use of the financial mechanism established by the Convention to promote the voluntary transfer of intellectual property rights held by Swiss operators, in particular as regards the granting of licences, through normal commercial mechanisms and decisions, while ensuring adequate and effective protection of property rights.

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Upon signature:

Declaration:

It is being understood that the signing of this Convention shall not constitute recognition of Israel or leading to any intercourse with it.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare their understanding that article 3 of the Convention sets out a guiding principle to be taken into account in the implementation of the Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland also declare their understanding that the decisions to be taken by the Conference of the Parties under paragraph 1 of article 21 concern "the amount of resources needed" by the financial mechanism, and that nothing in article 20 or 21 authorises the Conference of the Parties to take decisions concerning the amount, nature, frequency or size of the contributions of the Parties under the Convention.

Notes:

[1] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[2] On 4 June 1999: for the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba

[3] On 28 June 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General the the Convention would also apply to Macau.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Portugal (9 December 1999):

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macau."

China (15 December 1999):

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999. Macau will, from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

In this connection, [the Government of the People's Republic of China informs the Secretary-General of the following]:

The Convention on Biological Diversity, done at Nairobi on 5 June 1992 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"), to which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited the instrument of ratification on 5 January 1993, will apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999.

The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to the Macau Special Administrative Region.

[4] In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Bailiwick of Jersey, the British Virgin Islands, the Cayman Islands, Gibraltar, St. Helena and St. Helena Dependencies.

[5] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" and note 1 under "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8. a) Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety to the Convention on Biological Diversity

Montreal, 29 January 2000

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 11 September 2003, in accordance with article 37 (2).
REGISTRATION: 11 September 2003, No. 30619.
STATUS: Signatories: 103. Parties: 137.[1]
TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.251.2000.TREATIES-1 of 27 April 2000; C.N. 1471.2003.TREAITES-41 of 22 December 2003 (Proposal of corrections to the Arabic text of the Protocol) and C.N.291.2004.TREATIES-11 of 26 March 2004 (Rectification of the Arabic text of the Protocol and transmission of the relevant Procès-Verbal) .

Note: The above Protocol was adopted on 29 January 2000 by the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on Biological Diversity at the resumed session of its first extraordinary meeting held in Montreal from 24 to 29 January 2000. The Protocol will be open for signature by States and by regional economic integration organizations in Nairobi at the United Nations Office from 15 to 26 May 2000, and at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 5 June 2000 to 4 June 2001, in accordance with its article 36.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Albania		8 Feb 2005 a
Algeria	25 May 2000	5 Aug 2004
Antigua and Barbuda	24 May 2000	10 Sep 2003
Argentina	24 May 2000	
Armenia		30 Apr 2004 a
Austria	24 May 2000	27 Aug 2002
Azerbaijan		1 Apr 2005 a
Bahamas	24 May 2000	15 Jan 2004
Bangladesh	24 May 2000	5 Feb 2004
Barbados		6 Sep 2002 a
Belarus		26 Aug 2002 a
Belgium	24 May 2000	15 Apr 2004
Belize		12 Feb 2004 a
Benin	24 May 2000	2 Mar 2005
Bhutan		26 Aug 2002 a
Bolivia	24 May 2000	22 Apr 2002
Botswana	1 Jun 2001	11 Jun 2002
Brazil		24 Nov 2003 a
Bulgaria	24 May 2000	13 Oct 2000
Burkina Faso	24 May 2000	4 Aug 2003
Cambodia		17 Sep 2003 a
Cameroon	9 Feb 2001	20 Feb 2003
Canada	19 Apr 2001	
Cape Verde		1 Nov 2005 a
Central African Republic	24 May 2000	
Chad	24 May 2000	1 Nov 2006
Chile	24 May 2000	
China[2]	8 Aug 2000	8 Jun 2005 AA
Colombia	24 May 2000	20 May 2003
Congo	21 Nov 2000	13 Jul 2006
Cook Islands	21 May 2001	
Costa Rica	24 May 2000	
Croatia	8 Sep 2000	29 Aug 2002
Cuba	24 May 2000	17 Sep 2002
Cyprus		5 Dec 2003 a
Czech Republic	24 May 2000	8 Oct 2001
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	20 Apr 2001	29 Jul 2003
Democratic Republic of the Congo		23 Mar 2005 a
Denmark[3]	24 May 2000	27 Aug 2002
Djibouti		8 Apr 2002 a
Dominica		13 Jul 2004 a
Dominican Republic		20 Jun 2006 a
Ecuador	24 May 2000	30 Jan 2003
Egypt	20 Dec 2000	23 Dec 2003
El Salvador	24 May 2000	26 Sep 2003
Eritrea		10 Mar 2005 a
Estonia	6 Sep 2000	24 Mar 2004
Ethiopia	24 May 2000	9 Oct 2003
European Community	24 May 2000	27 Aug 2002 AA
Fiji	2 May 2001	5 Jun 2001
Finland	24 May 2000	9 Jul 2004
France	24 May 2000	7 Apr 2003 AA
Gambia	24 May 2000	9 Jun 2004
Germany	24 May 2000	20 Nov 2003
Ghana		30 May 2003 a
Greece	24 May 2000	21 May 2004
Grenada	24 May 2000	5 Feb 2004
Guatemala		28 Oct 2004 a
Guinea	24 May 2000	
Haiti	24 May 2000	
Honduras	24 May 2000	
Hungary	24 May 2000	13 Jan 2004
Iceland	1 Jun 2001	
India	23 Jan 2001	17 Jan 2003
Indonesia	24 May 2000	3 Dec 2004
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	23 Apr 2001	20 Nov 2003
Ireland	24 May 2000	14 Nov 2003
Italy	24 May 2000	24 Mar 2004
Jamaica	4 Jun 2001	
Japan		21 Nov 2003 a
Jordan	11 Oct 2000	11 Nov 2003
Kenya	15 May 2000	24 Jan 2002
Kiribati	7 Sep 2000	20 Apr 2004
Kyrgyzstan		5 Oct 2005 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		3 Aug 2004 a
Latvia		13 Feb 2004 a
Lesotho		20 Sep 2001 a
Liberia		15 Feb 2002 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		14 Jun 2005 a
Lithuania	24 May 2000	7 Nov 2003

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)
Luxembourg	11 Jul 2000	28 Aug 2002
Madagascar	14 Sep 2000	24 Nov 2003
Malawi	24 May 2000	
Malaysia	24 May 2000	3 Sep 2003
Maldives		3 Sep 2002 a
Mali	4 Apr 2001	28 Aug 2002
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		22 Jul 2005 a
Mauritius		11 Apr 2002 a
Mexico	24 May 2000	27 Aug 2002
Moldova	14 Feb 2001	4 Mar 2003
Monaco	24 May 2000	
Mongolia		22 Jul 2003 a
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco	25 May 2000	
Mozambique	24 May 2000	21 Oct 2002
Myanmar	11 May 2001	
Namibia	24 May 2000	10 Feb 2005
Nauru		12 Nov 2001 a
Nepal	2 Mar 2001	
Netherlands	24 May 2000	8 Jan 2002 A
New Zealand[5]	24 May 2000	24 Feb 2005
Nicaragua	26 May 2000	28 Aug 2002
Niger	24 May 2000	30 Sep 2004
Nigeria	24 May 2000	15 Jul 2003
Niue		8 Jul 2002 a
Norway	24 May 2000	10 May 2001
Oman		11 Apr 2003 a
Pakistan	4 Jun 2001	
Palau	29 May 2001	13 Jun 2003
Panama	11 May 2001	1 May 2002
Papua New Guinea		14 Oct 2005 a
Paraguay	3 May 2001	10 Mar 2004
Peru	24 May 2000	14 Apr 2004
Philippines	24 May 2000	5 Oct 2006
Poland	24 May 2000	10 Dec 2003
Portugal	24 May 2000	30 Sep 2004 A
Republic of Korea	6 Sep 2000	
Romania	11 Oct 2000	30 Jun 2003
Rwanda	24 May 2000	22 Jul 2004
Saint Kitts and Nevis		23 May 2001 a
Saint Lucia		16 Jun 2005 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		27 Aug 2003 a
Samoa	24 May 2000	30 May 2002
Senegal	31 Oct 2000	8 Oct 2003
Serbia		8 Feb 2006 a
Seychelles	23 Jan 2001	13 May 2004
Slovakia	24 May 2000	24 Nov 2003
Slovenia	24 May 2000	20 Nov 2002
Solomon Islands		28 Jul 2004 a
South Africa		14 Aug 2003 a
Spain	24 May 2000	16 Jan 2002
Sri Lanka	24 May 2000	28 Apr 2004
Sudan		13 Jun 2005 a
Swaziland		13 Jan 2006 a
Sweden	24 May 2000	8 Aug 2002
Switzerland	24 May 2000	26 Mar 2002
Syrian Arab Republic		1 Apr 2004 a
Tajikistan		12 Feb 2004 a
Thailand		10 Nov 2005 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	26 Jul 2000	14 Jun 2005
Togo	24 May 2000	2 Jul 2004
Tonga		18 Sep 2003 a
Trinidad and Tobago		5 Oct 2000 a
Tunisia	19 Apr 2001	22 Jan 2003
Turkey	24 May 2000	24 Oct 2003
Uganda	24 May 2000	30 Nov 2001
Ukraine		6 Dec 2002 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	24 May 2000	19 Nov 2003
United Republic of Tanzania		24 Apr 2003 a
Uruguay	1 Jun 2001	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	24 May 2000	13 May 2002
Viet Nam		21 Jan 2004 a
Yemen		1 Dec 2005 a
Zambia		27 Apr 2004 a
Zimbabwe	4 Jun 2001	25 Feb 2005

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession, acceptance or approval.)

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"The European Community declares that, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 175(1) thereof, it is competent for entering into international agreements, and for implementing the obligations resulting therefrom, which contribute to the pursuit of the following objectives:

- preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment;
- protecting human health;
- prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources;
- promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or worldwide environmental problems.

Moreover, the European Community declares that it has already adopted legal instruments, binding on its Member States, covering matters governed by this Protocol, and will submit and update, as appropriate, a list of those legal instruments to the Biosafety Clearing House in accordance with Article 20(3)(a) of the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety.

The European Community is responsible for the performance of those obligations resulting from the Cartagena Protocol on Biosafety which are covered by Community law in force.

The exercise of Community competence is, by its nature, subject to continuous development."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

[The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic] affirms, however, that the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to the said Protocol in no way signifies recognition of Israel nor shall it be conducive to entry into any dealings therewith in respect of matters governed by that Protocol.

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 37 (3) of the Protocol, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by States members of such an organization.

[2] With the following declaration in respect of Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Protocol shall not apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China until the Government of the People's Republic of China notifies otherwise.

[3] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] With the following territorial exclusion:

"... consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

9. Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas

New York, 17 March 1992

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 March 1994, in accordance with article 8 (5).
REGISTRATION: 29 March 1994, No. 30865.
STATUS: Signatories: 6. Parties: 10.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1772, p. 217; and C.N.338.1995.TREATIES-2 of 22 November 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the French authentic text).

Note: The Agreement was approved at Geneva on 13 September 1991, during the Third Meeting of the Conference of the Parties to the Convention on the Conservation of Migratory Species of Wild Animals pursuant to article IV (4) of the said Convention, which was done at Bonn on 23 June 1979 ("Bonn Convention"). The Agreement was open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York on 17 March 1992 and will remain open for signature at United Nations Headquarters until its entry into force.

Participant	*Signature*	*Definitive signature (s), Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Belgium	6 Nov 1992	14 May 1993
Denmark	19 Aug 1992	29 Dec 1993 AA
European Community	7 Oct 1992	
Finland		13 Sep 1999 a
France		3 Oct 2005 a
Germany	9 Apr 1992	6 Oct 1993
Lithuania		27 Jun 2005 a
Netherlands[1]	29 Jul 1992	29 Dec 1992 AA
Poland		18 Jan 1996 a
Sweden		31 Mar 1992 s
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2]	16 Apr 1992	13 Jul 1993

Notes:

[1] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[2] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and the Bailiwick of Guernsey. For the Bailiwick of Jersey (notification received on 26 September 2002).

9. a) Amendment to the Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas

Esbjerg, 22 August 2003

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 6.5.3 of the Convention which reads as follows: "Amendments shall enter into force for those Parties which have accepted them 90 days after the deposit of the fifth instrument of acceptance of the amendment with the Depositary. Thereafter, they shall enter inot force for a Party 30 days after the date of deposit of its instrument of acceptance of the amendment with the Depositary.".

STATUS: Parties: 1.

TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.346.2006.TREATIES-1 of 9 May 2006.

Note: By Resolution No. 4, adopted on 22 August 2003 at the 4th meeting of the Parties to the Agreement on the conservation of small cetaceans of the Baltic and North Seas, held in Esbjerg, Denmark, from 19 to 22 August 2003, the Parties adopted an amendment to the Agreement, in accordance with paragraph 6.5. The Amendment, *inter alia*, changes the name of the Agreement as follows: "Agreement on the Conservation of Small Cetaceans of the Baltic, North East Atlantic, Irish and North Seas".

Participant	*Acceptance (A)*
Denmark	19 Dec 2006 A

10. United Nations Convention to Combat Desertification in those Countries Experiencing Serious Drought and/or Desertification, Particularly in Africa

Paris, 14 October 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 December 1996, in accordance with article 36 (1).
REGISTRATION: 26 December 1996, No. 33480.
STATUS: Signatories: 115. Parties: 191.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1954, p. 3; depositary notification C.N.176.1995.TREATIES-6 of 27 July 1995 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic Chinese text); C.N.513.2000.TREATIES-9 of 19 July 2000 (procès-verbal of rectification of the authentic russian text); C.N.1490.2000.TREATIES-16 of 6 March 2001 (adoption of annex V) and C.N.866.2001.TREATIES-5 of 17 September 2001 (Entry into force of Annex V)[1].

Note: The Convention was adopted on 17 June 1994 by the Intergovernmental Negotiating Committee for the elaboration of an international convention to combat desertification in those countries experiencing serious drought and/or desertification, particularly in Africa (established pursuant to resolution 47/188[2] of the General Assembly dated 22 December 1992), during its Fifth session held at Paris. The Convention was open for signature at Paris by all States and regional economic integration organizations on 14 and 15 October 1994. Thereafter, it remained open for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York until 13 October 1995.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A)*
Afghanistan		1 Nov 1995 a
Albania		27 Apr 2000 a
Algeria	14 Oct 1994	22 May 1996
Andorra		15 Jul 2002 a
Angola	14 Oct 1994	30 Jun 1997
Antigua and Barbuda	4 Apr 1995	6 Jun 1997
Argentina	15 Oct 1994	6 Jan 1997
Armenia	14 Oct 1994	2 Jul 1997
Australia	14 Oct 1994	15 May 2000
Austria		2 Jun 1997 a
Azerbaijan		10 Aug 1998 a
Bahamas		10 Nov 2000 a
Bahrain		14 Jul 1997 a
Bangladesh	14 Oct 1994	26 Jan 1996
Barbados		14 May 1997 a
Belarus		29 Aug 2001 a
Belgium		30 Jun 1997 a
Belize		23 Jul 1998 a
Benin	14 Oct 1994	29 Aug 1996
Bhutan		20 Aug 2003 a
Bolivia	14 Oct 1994	1 Aug 1996
Bosnia and Herzegovina		26 Aug 2002 a
Botswana	12 Oct 1995	11 Sep 1996
Brazil	14 Oct 1994	25 Jun 1997
Brunei Darussalam		4 Dec 2002 a
Bulgaria		21 Feb 2001 a
Burkina Faso	14 Oct 1994	26 Jan 1996
Burundi	14 Oct 1994	6 Jan 1997
Cambodia	15 Oct 1994	18 Aug 1997
Cameroon	14 Oct 1994	29 May 1997
Canada	14 Oct 1994	1 Dec 1995
Cape Verde	14 Oct 1994	8 May 1995
Central African Republic	14 Oct 1994	5 Sep 1996
Chad	14 Oct 1994	27 Sep 1996
Chile	3 Mar 1995	11 Nov 1997
China	14 Oct 1994	18 Feb 1997
Colombia	14 Oct 1994	8 Jun 1999
Comoros	14 Oct 1994	3 Mar 1998
Congo	15 Oct 1994	12 Jul 1999
Cook Islands		21 Aug 1998 a
Costa Rica	15 Oct 1994	5 Jan 1998
Côte d'Ivoire	15 Oct 1994	4 Mar 1997
Croatia	15 Oct 1994	6 Oct 2000 A
Cuba	15 Oct 1994	13 Mar 1997
Cyprus		29 Mar 2000 a
Czech Republic		25 Jan 2000 a
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		29 Dec 2003 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	14 Oct 1994	12 Sep 1997
Denmark	15 Oct 1994	22 Dec 1995
Djibouti	15 Oct 1994	12 Jun 1997
Dominica		8 Dec 1997 a
Dominican Republic		26 Jun 1997 a
Ecuador	19 Jan 1995	6 Sep 1995
Egypt	14 Oct 1994	7 Jul 1995
El Salvador		27 Jun 1997 a
Equatorial Guinea	14 Oct 1994	27 Jun 1997
Eritrea	14 Oct 1994	14 Aug 1996
Ethiopia	15 Oct 1994	27 Jun 1997
European Community	14 Oct 1994	26 Mar 1998
Fiji		26 Aug 1998 a
Finland	15 Oct 1994	20 Sep 1995 A
France	14 Oct 1994	12 Jun 1997
Gabon		6 Sep 1996 a
Gambia	14 Oct 1994	11 Jun 1996
Georgia	15 Oct 1994	23 Jul 1999
Germany	14 Oct 1994	10 Jul 1996
Ghana	15 Oct 1994	27 Dec 1996
Greece	14 Oct 1994	5 May 1997
Grenada		28 May 1997 a
Guatemala		10 Sep 1998 a
Guinea	14 Oct 1994	23 Jun 1997
Guinea-Bissau	15 Oct 1994	27 Oct 1995
Guyana		26 Jun 1997 a
Haiti	15 Oct 1994	25 Sep 1996
Honduras	22 Feb 1995	25 Jun 1997

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A)
Hungary		13 Jul 1999 a
Iceland		3 Jun 1997 a
India	14 Oct 1994	17 Dec 1996
Indonesia	15 Oct 1994	31 Aug 1998
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	14 Oct 1994	29 Apr 1997
Ireland	15 Oct 1994	31 Jul 1997
Israel	14 Oct 1994	26 Mar 1996
Italy	14 Oct 1994	23 Jun 1997
Jamaica		12 Nov 1997 a
Japan	14 Oct 1994	11 Sep 1998 A
Jordan	13 Apr 1995	21 Oct 1996
Kazakhstan	14 Oct 1994	9 Jul 1997
Kenya	14 Oct 1994	24 Jun 1997
Kiribati		8 Sep 1998 a
Kuwait	22 Sep 1995	27 Jun 1997
Kyrgyzstan		19 Sep 1997 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	30 Aug 1995	20 Sep 1996 A
Latvia		21 Oct 2002 a
Lebanon	14 Oct 1994	16 May 1996
Lesotho	15 Oct 1994	12 Sep 1995
Liberia		2 Mar 1998 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	15 Oct 1994	22 Jul 1996
Liechtenstein		29 Dec 1999 a
Lithuania		25 Jul 2003 a
Luxembourg	14 Oct 1994	4 Feb 1997
Madagascar	14 Oct 1994	25 Jun 1997
Malawi	17 Jan 1995	13 Jun 1996
Malaysia	6 Oct 1995	25 Jun 1997
Maldives		3 Sep 2002 a
Mali	15 Oct 1994	31 Oct 1995
Malta	15 Oct 1994	30 Jan 1998
Marshall Islands		2 Jun 1998 a
Mauritania	14 Oct 1994	7 Aug 1996
Mauritius	17 Mar 1995	23 Jan 1996
Mexico	15 Oct 1994	3 Apr 1995
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Dec 1994	25 Mar 1996
Moldova		10 Mar 1999 a
Monaco		5 Mar 1999 a
Mongolia	15 Oct 1994	3 Sep 1996
Morocco	15 Oct 1994	7 Nov 1996
Mozambique	28 Sep 1995	13 Mar 1997
Myanmar		2 Jan 1997 a
Namibia	24 Oct 1994	16 May 1997
Nauru		22 Sep 1998 a
Nepal	12 Oct 1995	15 Oct 1996
Netherlands[3]	15 Oct 1994	27 Jun 1995 A
New Zealand[4]		7 Sep 2000 a
Nicaragua	21 Nov 1994	17 Feb 1998
Niger	14 Oct 1994	19 Jan 1996
Nigeria	31 Oct 1994	8 Jul 1997
Niue		14 Aug 1998 a
Norway	15 Oct 1994	30 Aug 1996
Oman		23 Jul 1996 a
Pakistan	15 Oct 1994	24 Feb 1997
Palau		15 Jun 1999 a
Panama	22 Feb 1995	4 Apr 1996
Papua New Guinea		6 Dec 2000 a
Paraguay	1 Dec 1994	15 Jan 1997
Peru	15 Oct 1994	9 Nov 1995
Philippines	8 Dec 1994	10 Feb 2000
Poland		14 Nov 2001 a
Portugal	14 Oct 1994	1 Apr 1996
Qatar		15 Mar 1999 a
Republic of Korea	14 Oct 1994	17 Aug 1999
Romania		19 Aug 1998 a
Russian Federation		29 May 2003 a
Rwanda	22 Jun 1995	22 Oct 1998
Saint Kitts and Nevis		30 Jun 1997 a
Saint Lucia		2 Jul 1997 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	15 Oct 1994	16 Mar 1998
Samoa		21 Aug 1998 a
San Marino		23 Jul 1999 a
Sao Tome and Principe	4 Oct 1995	8 Jul 1998
Saudi Arabia		25 Jun 1997 a
Senegal	14 Oct 1994	26 Jul 1995
Seychelles	14 Oct 1994	26 Jun 1997
Sierra Leone	11 Nov 1994	25 Sep 1997
Singapore		26 Apr 1999 a
Slovakia		7 Jan 2002 a
Slovenia		28 Jun 2001 a
Solomon Islands		16 Apr 1999 a
Somalia		24 Jul 2002 a
South Africa	9 Jan 1995	30 Sep 1997
Spain	14 Oct 1994	30 Jan 1996
Sri Lanka		9 Dec 1998 a
Sudan	15 Oct 1994	24 Nov 1995
Suriname		1 Jun 2000 a
Swaziland	27 Jul 1995	7 Oct 1996
Sweden	15 Oct 1994	12 Dec 1995
Switzerland	14 Oct 1994	19 Jan 1996
Syrian Arab Republic	15 Oct 1994	10 Jun 1997
Tajikistan		16 Jul 1997 a
Thailand		7 Mar 2001 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		6 Mar 2002 a
Timor-Leste		20 Aug 2003 a
Togo	15 Oct 1994	4 Oct 1995 A
Tonga		25 Sep 1998 a
Trinidad and Tobago		8 Jun 2000 a
Tunisia	14 Oct 1994	11 Oct 1995
Turkey	14 Oct 1994	31 Mar 1998
Turkmenistan	27 Mar 1995	18 Sep 1996
Tuvalu		14 Sep 1998 a
Uganda	21 Nov 1994	25 Jun 1997
Ukraine		27 Aug 2002 a
United Arab Emirates		21 Oct 1998 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[5]	14 Oct 1994	18 Oct 1996
United Republic of Tanzania	14 Oct 1994	19 Jun 1997
United States of America	14 Oct 1994	17 Nov 2000
Uruguay		17 Feb 1999 a
Uzbekistan	7 Dec 1994	31 Oct 1995
Vanuatu	28 Sep 1995	10 Aug 1999
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		29 Jun 1998 a
Viet Nam		25 Aug 1998 a
Yemen		14 Jan 1997 a
Zambia	15 Oct 1994	19 Sep 1996
Zimbabwe	15 Oct 1994	23 Sep 1997

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, accession or acceptance.)

ALGERIA

Declaration:

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 28, paragraph 2, of the [said Convention], to the effect that any dispute must be submitted to the International Court of Justice.

The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that for a dispute submitted to the International Court of Justice, the consent of both parties will be necessary in each case.

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 28 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute in paragraph 2 as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

GUATEMALA

Declaration:

The Republic f Guatemala declares that, in respect of any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, it recognizes arbitration in accordance with procedures adopted by the Conference of the Parties in an annex as soon as practicable as a means of dispute settlement, compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation. This declaration shall remain in force until three months after written notice of its revocation has been deposited with the Depositary.

KUWAIT

Declaration:

With respect to the State of Kuwait, any additional regional implementation annex or any amendment to any regional implementation annex shall enter into force only upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification or accession with respect thereto.

NETHERLANDS

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands declares, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 28 of [the said Convention] that it accepts both means of dispute settlement referred to in that paragraph as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

NEW ZEALAND

Declaration:

"Any additional regional implementation annex or any amendment to any regional implementation annex to the Convention shall enter into force for New Zealand only upon the Government of New Zealand's deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect thereto."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Understandings:

" (1) Foreign assistance.-- The United States understands that, as a "developed country," pursuant to Article 6 of the Convention and its Annexes, it is not obligated to satisfy specific funding requirements or other specific requirements regarding the provision of any resource, including technology, to any "affected country," as defined in Article 1 of the Convention. The United States understands that ratification of the Convention does not alter its domestic legal processes to determine foreign assistance funding or programs.

(2) Financial resources and mechanism.-- The United States understands that neither Article 20 nor Article 21 of the Convention impose obligations to provide specific levels of funding for the Global Environmental Facility, or the Global Mechanism, to carry out the objectives of the Convention, or for any other purpose.

(3) United States land management.-- The United States understands that it is a "developed country party" as defined in Article 1 of the Convention, and that it is not required to prepare a national action program pursuant to Part III, Section 1, of the Convention. The United States also understands that no changes to its existing land management practices and programs will be required to meet its obligations under Articles 4 or 5 of the Convention.

(4) Legal process for amending the Convention.-- In accordance with Article 34 (4), any additional regional implementation annex to the Convention or any amendment to any regional implementation annex to the Convention shall enter into force for the United States only upon the deposit of a corresponding instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.

(5) Dispute settlement.-- The United States declines to accept as compulsory either of the dispute settlement means set out in Article 28(2), and understands that it will not be bound by the outcome, findings, conclusions or recommendations of a conciliation process initiated under Article 28 (6). For any dispute arising from this Convention, the United States does not recognize or accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice."

Notes:

[1] At the fourth session of the Conference of the Parties to the above Convention, held in Bonn, Germany, from 11 to 22 December 2000, the Regional Implementation Annex for Central and Eastern Europe to the above Convention (Annex V) was adopted by decision 7/COP.4 of 22 December 2000 (12th Plenary meeting).

None of the Parties having submitted a notification in accordance with the provisions of article 31 (3) (a) or a declaration in accordance with the provisions of article 31 (3) (b) of the Convention, the adoption of annex V became effective for all Parties to the Convention on the expiry of six months from the date of its notification (6 March 2001) in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 31, i.e. on 6 September 2001.

[2] *Official Records of the General Assembly, Forty-seventh Session, Supplement No. 49* (A/47/49) (Vol.I), p. 137.

[3] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[4] With a declaration to the effect that "consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account its commitment to

the development of self-governemnt through an act of sef-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

[5] For the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland , the British Virgin Islands, St. Helena and Ascension Island. Subsequently, on 24 December 1996, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the Secretary-General that the Convention would apply to Montserrat.

11. Lusaka Agreement on Co-operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora

Lusaka, 8 September 1994

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 10 December 1996, in accordance with article 13 (1).
REGISTRATION: 10 December 1996, No. 33409.
STATUS: Signatories: 7. Parties: 7.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1950, p. 35.

Note: The Agreement was adopted at the Ministerial Meeting for the Adoption of the Agreed Text of the Lusaka Agreement on Co-operative Enforcement Operations Directed at Illegal Trade in Wild Fauna and Flora held at Lusaka on 8-9 September 1994. In accordance with its article 12 (1), the Agreement was open for signature on 9 September 1994 by all African States at Lusaka and thereafter from 12 September 1994 at the Headquarters of the United Nations Environment Programme in Nairobi, and from 13 December 1994 to 13 March 1995 at the United Nations Headquarters in New York.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Congo		14 May 1997 a
Ethiopia	1 Feb 1995	
Kenya	9 Sep 1994	17 Jan 1997
Lesotho		20 Jun 1995 a
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
South Africa	9 Sep 1994	
Swaziland	9 Sep 1994	
Uganda	9 Sep 1994	12 Apr 1996
United Republic of Tanzania	9 Sep 1994	11 Oct 1996
Zambia	9 Sep 1994	9 Nov 1995

12. Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses

New York, 21 May 1997

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 36 which reads as follows: "1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day following the date of deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization that ratifies, accepts or approves the Convention or accedes thereto after the deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the deposit by such State or regional economic integration organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 3. For the purposes of paragraphs 1 and 2, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additonal to those deposited by States.".

STATUS: Signatories: 16. Parties: 14.[1]

TEXT: Doc. A/51/869.

Note: By resolution A/RES/51/229 of 21 May 1997, the General Assembly of the United Nations adopted at its 51st session, the said Convention. In accordance with its article 34, the Convention shall be open for signature at the Headquarters of the United Nations in New York, on 21 May 1997 and will remain open to all States and regional economic integration organizations for signature until 21 May 2000.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Approval (AA)*
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 1998	
Finland	31 Oct 1997	23 Jan 1998 A
Germany	13 Aug 1998	
Hungary	20 Jul 1999	26 Jan 2000 AA
Iraq		9 Jul 2001 a
Jordan	17 Apr 1998	22 Jun 1999
Lebanon		25 May 1999 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		14 Jun 2005 a
Luxembourg	14 Oct 1997	
Namibia	19 May 2000	29 Aug 2001
Netherlands	9 Mar 2000	9 Jan 2001 A
Norway	30 Sep 1998	30 Sep 1998
Paraguay	25 Aug 1998	
Portugal	11 Nov 1997	22 Jun 2005
Qatar		28 Feb 2002 a
South Africa	13 Aug 1997	26 Oct 1998
Sweden		15 Jun 2000 a
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Aug 1997	2 Apr 1998
Tunisia	19 May 2000	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	22 Sep 1997	
Yemen	17 May 2000	

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

Hungary

Declaration:

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary declares itself bound by either of the two means for the settlement of disputes (International Court of Justice, arbitration), reserving its right to agree on the competent body of jurisdiction, as the case may be."

Syrian Arab Republic

Reservation:

The acceptance by the Syrian Arab Republic of this Convention and its ratification by the Government shall not under any circumstances be taken to imply recognition of Israel and shall not lead to its entering into relations therewith that are governed by its provisions.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance approval or accession.)

Israel

15 July 1998

In regard to the reservation made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification:

"In view of the Government of the State of Israel such reservation, which is explicitly of a political nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Syrian Arab Republic under general international treaty law or under particular conventions. The Government of the State of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Syrian Arab Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity."

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 36 (3) of the Convention, any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.

13. Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters

Aarhus, Denmark, 25 June 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 October 2001, in accordance with article 20 (1) and definitively on 30 October 2001, in accordance with article 20 (1).
REGISTRATION: 30 October 2001, No. 37770.
STATUS: Signatories: 40. Parties: 39.
TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2161, p. 447.

Note: Open for signature at Aarhus (Denmark) on 25 June 1998, and thereafter at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 21 December 1998, by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Economic Commission for Europe pursuant to paragraphs 8 and 11 of Economic and Social resolution 36 (IV)[1] of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations constituted by sovereign States members of the Economic Commission for Europe to which their member States have transferred competence over matters governed by this Convention, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of these matters.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Albania	25 Jun 1998	27 Jun 2001
Armenia	25 Jun 1998	1 Aug 2001
Austria	25 Jun 1998	17 Jan 2005
Azerbaijan		23 Mar 2000 a
Belarus	16 Dec 1998	9 Mar 2000 AA
Belgium	25 Jun 1998	21 Jan 2003
Bulgaria	25 Jun 1998	17 Dec 2003
Croatia	25 Jun 1998	
Cyprus	25 Jun 1998	19 Sep 2003
Czech Republic	25 Jun 1998	6 Jul 2004
Denmark[2]	25 Jun 1998	29 Sep 2000 AA
Estonia	25 Jun 1998	2 Aug 2001
European Community	25 Jun 1998	17 Feb 2005 AA
Finland	25 Jun 1998	1 Sep 2004 A
France[3]	25 Jun 1998	8 Jul 2002 AA
Georgia	25 Jun 1998	11 Apr 2000
Germany	21 Dec 1998	
Greece	25 Jun 1998	27 Jan 2006
Hungary	18 Dec 1998	3 Jul 2001
Iceland	25 Jun 1998	
Ireland	25 Jun 1998	
Italy	25 Jun 1998	13 Jun 2001
Kazakhstan	25 Jun 1998	11 Jan 2001
Kyrgyzstan		1 May 2001 a
Latvia	25 Jun 1998	14 Jun 2002
Liechtenstein	25 Jun 1998	
Lithuania	25 Jun 1998	28 Jan 2002
Luxembourg	25 Jun 1998	25 Oct 2005
Malta	18 Dec 1998	23 Apr 2002
Moldova	25 Jun 1998	9 Aug 1999
Monaco	25 Jun 1998	
Netherlands[4]	25 Jun 1998	29 Dec 2004 A
Norway	25 Jun 1998	2 May 2003
Poland	25 Jun 1998	15 Feb 2002
Portugal	25 Jun 1998	9 Jun 2003
Romania	25 Jun 1998	11 Jul 2000
Slovakia		5 Dec 2005 a
Slovenia	25 Jun 1998	29 Jul 2004
Spain	25 Jun 1998	29 Dec 2004
Sweden	25 Jun 1998	20 May 2005
Switzerland	25 Jun 1998	
Tajikistan		17 Jul 2001 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia		22 Jul 1999 a
Turkmenistan		25 Jun 1999 a
Ukraine	25 Jun 1998	18 Nov 1999
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	25 Jun 1998	23 Feb 2005

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

Austria

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with article 16 (2) of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in paragraph 2 as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

Denmark

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Both the Faroe Islands and Greenland are self-governing under Home Rule Acts, which implies *inter alia* that environmental affairs in general and the areas covered by the Convention are governed by the right of self-determination. In both the Faroe and the Greenland Home Rule Governments there is great

political interest in promoting the fundamental ideas and principles embodied in the Convention to the extent possible. However, as the Convention is prepared with a view to European countries with relatively large populations and corresponding administrative and social structures, it is not a matter of course that the Convention is in all respects suitable for the scarcely populated and far less diverse societies of the Faroe Islands and of Greenland. Thus, full implementation of the Convention in these areas may imply needless and inadequate bureaucratization. The authorities of the Faroe Islands and of Greenland will analyse this question thoroughly.

Signing by Denmark of the Convention, therefore, not necessarily means that Danish ratification will in due course include the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"The European Community wishes to express its great satisfaction with the present Convention as an essential step forward in further encouraging and supporting public awareness in the field of environment and better implementation of environmental legislation in the UN/ECE region, in accordance with the principle of sustainable development.

Fully supporting the objectives pursued by the Convention and considering that the European Community itself is being actively involved in the protection of the environment through a comprehensive and evolving set of legislation, it was felt important not only to sign up to the Convention at Community level but also to cover its own institutions, alongside national public authorities.

Within the institutional and legal context of the Community and given also the provisions of the Treaty of Amsterdam with respect to future legislation on transparency, the Community also declares that the Community institutions will apply the Convention within the framework of their existing and future rules on access to documents and other relevant rules of Community law in the field covered by the Convention.

The Community will consider whether any further declarations will be necessary when ratifying the Convention for the purpose of its application to Community institutions."

Upon approval:

Declarations:

"Declaration by the European Community in accordance with Article 19 of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters

"The European Community declares that, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 175 (1) thereof, it is competent for entering into international agreements, and for implementing the obligations resulting there from, which contribute to the pursuit of the following objectives:

preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment;

protecting human health;

prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources;

promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or world-wide environmental problems.

Moreover, the European Community declares that it has already adopted several legal instruments, binding on its Member States, implementing provisions of this Convention and will submit and update as appropriate a list of those legal instruments to the Depositary in accordance with Article 10 (2) and Article 19 (5) of the Convention. In particular, the European Community also declares that the legal instruments in force do not cover fully the implementation of the obligations resulting from Article 9 (3) of the Convention as they relate to administrative and judicial procedures to challenge acts and omissions by private persons and public authorities other than the institutions of the European Community as covered by Article 2 (2)(d) of the Convention, and that, consequently, its Member States are responsible for the performance of these obligations at the time of approval of the Convention by the European Community and will remain so unless and until the Community, in the exercise of its powers under the EC Treaty, adopts provisions of Community law covering the implementation of those obligations.

Finally, the Community reiterates its declaration made upon signing the Convention that the Community institutions will apply the Convention within the framework of their existing and future rules on access to documents and other relevant rules of Community law in the field covered by the Convention.

The European Community is responsible for the performance of those obligations resulting from the Convention which are covered by Community law in force.

The exercise of Community competence is, by its nature, subject to continuous development."

Declaration by the European Community concerning certain specific provisions under directive 2003/4/EC

"In relation to Article 9 of the Aarhus Convention, the European Community invites Parties to the Convention to take note of Article 2 (2) and Article 6 of Directive 2003/4/EC of the European Parliament and of the Council of 28 January 2003 on Public Access to Environmental Information. These provisions give Member States of the European Community the possibility, in exceptional cases and under strictly specified conditions, to exclude certain institutions and bodies from the rules on review procedures in relation to decisions on requests for information.

Therefore the ratification by the European Community of the Aarhus Convention encompasses any reservation by a Member State of the European Community to the extent that such a reservation is compatible with Article 2 (2) and Article 6 of Directive 2003/4/EC."

FINLAND

Declarations

"1. Finland considers that provisions of Article 9, paragraph 2 on access to a review procedure do not require those provisions to be applied at a stage of the decision-making of an activity in which a decision in principle is made by the Government and which then is endorsed or rejected by the national Parliament, provided that provisions of Article 9, paragraph 2 are applicable at a subsequent decision-making stage of the activity.

2. Some activities in Annex I to the Convention may require consecutive decisions by a public authority or public authorities on whether to permit the activity in question. Finland considers that each party shall, within the framework of its national legislation, determine at what stage the substantive and procedural legality of any decision, act or omission subject to the provisions of Article 6 may be challenged pursuant to Article 9, paragraph 2."

FRANCE

Declaration:

Interpretative declaration concerning articles 4, 5 and 6 of the Convention:

The French Government will see to the dissemination of relevant information for the protection of the environment while, at the same time, ensuring protection of industrial and commercial secrets, with reference to established legal practice applicable in France.

GERMANY

Upon signature:

Declaration:

The text of the Convention raises a number of difficult questions regarding its practical implementation in the German legal system which it was not possible to finally resolve during the period provided for the signing of the Convention. These questions require careful consideration, including a consideration of the legislative consequences, before the Convention becomes binding under international law.

The Federal Republic of Germany assumes that implementing the Convention through German administrative enforcement will not lead to developments which counteract efforts towards deregulation and speeding up procedures.

NORWAY

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 16, paragraph 2 a) of the Convention, Norway hereby declares that it will submit the dispute to the International Court of Justice".

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

Declaration made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"The United Kingdom understands the references in article 1 and the seventh preambular paragraph of this Convention to the 'right' of every person 'to live in an environment adequate to his or her health and well-being' to express an aspiration which motivated the negotiation of this Convention and which is shared fully by the United Kingdom. The legal rights which each Party undertakes to guarantee under article 1 are limited to the rights of access to information, public participation in decision-making and access to justice in environmental matters in accordance with the provisions of this Convention."

SWEDEN

Reservations:

Sweden lodges a reservation in relation to Article 9.1 with regard to access to a review procedure before a court of law of decisions taken by the Parliament, the Government and Ministers on issues ~ involving the release of official documents.

A reservation is also lodged in relation to Article 9.2 with regard to access by environmental organisations to a review procedure before a court of law concerning such decisions on local plans that require environmental impact assessments. This also applies to decisions regarding issuing permits that are taken by the Government as the first instance, under, for example the Natural Gas Act (2000:599) and after appeal under Chapter 18 of the Swedish Environmental Code. It is the Government's ambition that Sweden will shortly comply with Article 9.2 in its entirety.

Notes:

[1] *Official Records of the Economic and Social Council* (E/437), p. 36.

[2] Excluding the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[3] Excluding New Caledonia, French Polynesia and Wallis and Futuna.

[4] For the Kingdom in Europe.

13. a) Protocol on Pollutant Release and Transfer Registers

Kiev, 21 May 2003

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 27 which reads as follows: "1. This Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For the purposes of paragraph 1, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by the States members of such an organization. 3. For each State or regional economic integration organization which ratifies, accepts or approves this Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 38. Parties: 2.

TEXT: Doc. MP.PP/2003/1

Note: The above Protocol was adopted on 21 May 2003 by the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Aarhus Convention of 25 June 1998 on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, held in Kiev from 21 to 23 May 2003. The Protocol was opened for signature from 21 to 23 May 2003 in Kiev and will remain open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 31 December 2003 by all States which are members of the United Nations and by regional economic integration organizations constituted by sovereign States members of the United Nations to which their member States have transferred competence over matters governed by the Protocol, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of these matters.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Armenia	21 May 2003	
Austria	21 May 2003	
Belgium	21 May 2003	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	21 May 2003	
Bulgaria	21 May 2003	
Croatia	23 May 2003	
Cyprus	21 May 2003	
Czech Republic	21 May 2003	
Denmark	21 May 2003	
Estonia	21 May 2003	
European Community	21 May 2003	21 Feb 2006 AA
Finland	21 May 2003	
France	21 May 2003	
Georgia	21 May 2003	
Germany	21 May 2003	
Greece	21 May 2003	
Hungary	21 May 2003	
Ireland	21 May 2003	
Italy	21 May 2003	
Latvia	21 May 2003	
Lithuania	21 May 2003	
Luxembourg	21 May 2003	7 Feb 2006
Moldova	21 May 2003	
Montenegro[2]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Netherlands	21 May 2003	
Norway	21 May 2003	
Poland	21 May 2003	
Portugal	21 May 2003	
Romania	21 May 2003	
Serbia	21 May 2003	
Slovenia	22 May 2003	
Spain	21 May 2003	
Sweden	21 May 2003	
Switzerland	21 May 2003	
Tajikistan	21 May 2003	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	21 May 2003	
Ukraine	21 May 2003	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	21 May 2003	

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

BELGIUM

Upon signature:

Declaration:

This signature engages also the Waloon region, the Flemish region, and the Brussels-Capital region.

DENMARK

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"Both the Faroe Islands and Greeland are self-governing under Home Rule Acts, which implies *inter alia* that environmental affairs in general and the areas covered by the Protocol are governed by the right of self-determination.

Signing by Denmark of the Protocol, therefore does not necessarily mean that Danish ratification will in due course include the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

Declaration by the European Community in accordance with article 26(4)

"The European Community declares that, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular article 175 (1) thereof, it is competent for entering into international agreements, and for implementing the obligations resulting therefrom, which contribute to the pursuit of the following objectives:

preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment,

protecting human health,

prudent and rational utilization of natural resources,

promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or worldwide environmental problems.

Pollutant release and transfer registers are appropriate tools for encouraging improvements in environmental performance, for providing public access to information on pollutants released, and for use by competent authorities in tracking trends, demonstrating progress, thereby contributing to the achievement of the abovementioned objectives.

Moreover, the European Community declares that it has already adopted legislation, binding on its Member States, covering matters governed by this Protocol and will submit and update, as appropriate, a list of that legislation in accordance with article 26 (4) of the Protocol.

The European Community is responsible for the performance of those obligations resulting from the Protocol which are covered by Community law in force.

The exercise of Community competence is, by its nature, subject to continuous development."

Notes:

[1] In the course of adopting the Protocol, the Meeting of the Parties to the Convention made an oral modification to the French version of the Protocol to correct some typographical errors, thereby bringing the text in line with the English and Russian versions. The modifications made to the French version were as follows:

- In annex I on Activities, para. 1(c), the text should refer to '50 mégawatts' and not to '500 mégawatts';

- In annex II on Pollutants, in No. 31 the text in the third column should read 'Chloroalcanes, C10-C13)', and in No. 57, third column, '(TRI)' should be deleted;

- In annex II, the column headings '(colonne 1a)', ''(colonne 1b)', '(colonne 1c)' and '(colonne 3)' should be included in the French version as in the English and Russian versions, and the vertical dividing line between column 1c & column 2 should extend to the top of the table (to make it clear that column 2 is not a sub-column of column 1).

[2] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

13. b) Amendment to the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters

Almaty, 27 May 2005

NOT YET IN FORCE: in accordance with article 14 (4) which stipulates: "Amendements to [the] Convention other than those to an annex shall enter into force for Parties having ratified, approved or accepted them on the ninetieth day after receipt by the Depositary of notification of their ratification, approval or acceptance by at least three fourths of these Parties. Thereafter they shall enter into force for any other Party on the ninetieth day after that Party deposits its instrument of ratification, approval or acceptance of the amendments.".

STATUS: Parties: 1.

TEXT: Annex to the Report of the Second Meeting of the Parties (Decision II/1).

Note: At the second meeting of the Parties to the above Convention, held in Almaty, Kazakhstan, from 25-27 May 2005, the Parties adopted, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 14 (4) of the Convention on Access to Information, Public Participation in Decision-Making and Access to Justice in Environmental Matters, the Amendment to the said Convention as set out in the Annex to the Report of the Second Meeting of the Parties (Decision II/1).

Participant	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA)*
Denmark[1]	18 Oct 2006 AA

Notes:

[1] With a territorial exclusion with regard to the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

14. Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade

Rotterdam, 10 September 1998

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 24 February 2004 in accordance with article 26 which reads as follows: "1. The Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization that ratifies, accepts or approves this Convention or accedes thereto after the deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or regional economic integration organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 3. For the purpose of paragraphs 1 and 2, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.".

REGISTRATION: 24 February 2004, No. 39973.

STATUS: Signatories: 73. Parties: 112.[1]

TEXTE: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 2244, p. 337; C.N.846.2002.TREATIES-8 of 20 August 2002 (proposal of corrections to the original English text of the Convention); C.N.1029.2002.TREATIES-18 of 23 September 2002 (correction to the original English text of the Convention); C.N.10.2005.TREATIES-1 of 11 January 2005 (Adoption of Annex VI); C.N.11.2005.TREATIES-2 of 11 January 2005 (Amendments to Annex III).[2,3]

Note: The Convention was adopted on 10 September 1998 by the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Convention in Rotterdam, the Netherlands. In accordance with its article 24, the Convention will be open for signature at Rotterdam by all States and regional economic integration organizations on 11 September 1998, and subsequently at United Nations Headquarters in New York from 12 September 1998 to 10 September 1999.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Angola	11 Sep 1998	
Argentina	11 Sep 1998	11 Jun 2004
Armenia	11 Sep 1998	26 Nov 2003
Australia	6 Jul 1999	20 May 2004
Austria	11 Sep 1998	27 Aug 2002
Barbados	11 Sep 1998	
Belgium	11 Sep 1998	23 Oct 2002
Belize		20 Apr 2005 a
Benin	11 Sep 1998	5 Jan 2004
Bolivia		18 Dec 2003 a
Brazil	11 Sep 1998	16 Jun 2004
Bulgaria		25 Jul 2000 a
Burkina Faso	11 Sep 1998	11 Nov 2002
Burundi		23 Sep 2004 a
Cameroon	11 Sep 1998	20 May 2002
Canada		26 Aug 2002 a
Cape Verde		1 Mar 2006 a
Chad	11 Sep 1998	10 Mar 2004
Chile	11 Sep 1998	20 Jan 2005
China[4]	24 Aug 1999	22 Mar 2005
Colombia	11 Sep 1998	
Congo	11 Sep 1998	13 Jul 2006
Cook Islands		29 Jun 2004 a
Costa Rica	17 Aug 1999	
Côte d'Ivoire	11 Sep 1998	20 Jan 2004
Cuba	11 Sep 1998	
Cyprus	11 Sep 1998	17 Dec 2004
Czech Republic	22 Jun 1999	12 Jun 2000
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		6 Feb 2004 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Sep 1998	23 Mar 2005
Denmark[5]	11 Sep 1998	15 Jan 2004
Djibouti		10 Nov 2004 a
Dominica		30 Dec 2005 a
Dominican Republic		24 Mar 2006 a
Ecuador	11 Sep 1998	4 May 2004
El Salvador	16 Feb 1999	8 Sep 1999
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Eritrea		10 Mar 2005 a
Estonia		13 Jun 2006 a
Ethiopia		9 Jan 2003 a
European Community	11 Sep 1998	20 Dec 2002 AA
Finland	11 Sep 1998	4 Jun 2004 A
France	11 Sep 1998	17 Feb 2004 AA
Gabon		18 Dec 2003 a
Gambia		26 Feb 2002 a
Germany	11 Sep 1998	11 Jan 2001
Ghana	11 Sep 1998	30 May 2003
Greece	11 Sep 1998	23 Dec 2003
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Guinea-Bissau	10 Sep 1999	
Hungary	10 Sep 1999	31 Oct 2000
India		24 May 2005 a
Indonesia	11 Sep 1998	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	17 Feb 1999	26 Aug 2004
Ireland		10 Jun 2005 a
Israel	20 May 1999	
Italy	11 Sep 1998	27 Aug 2002
Jamaica		20 Aug 2002 a
Japan	31 Aug 1999	15 Jun 2004 A
Jordan		22 Jul 2002 a
Kenya	11 Sep 1998	3 Feb 2005

Participant	Signature	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Kuwait	11 Sep 1998	12 May 2006
Kyrgyzstan	11 Aug 1999	25 May 2000
Latvia		23 Apr 2003 a
Lebanon		13 Nov 2006 a
Liberia		22 Sep 2004 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		9 Jul 2002 a
Liechtenstein		18 Jun 2004 a
Lithuania		17 Mar 2004 a
Luxembourg	11 Sep 1998	28 Aug 2002
Madagascar	8 Dec 1998	22 Sep 2004
Malaysia		4 Sep 2002 a
Maldives		17 Oct 2006 a
Mali	11 Sep 1998	5 Jun 2003
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania	1 Sep 1999	22 Jul 2005 A
Mauritius		5 Aug 2005 a
Mexico		4 May 2005 a
Moldova		27 Jan 2005 a
Mongolia	11 Sep 1998	8 Mar 2001
Namibia	11 Sep 1998	24 Jun 2005
Netherlands[6]	11 Sep 1998	20 Apr 2000 A
New Zealand[7]	11 Sep 1998	23 Sep 2003
Niger		16 Feb 2006 a
Nigeria		28 Jun 2001 a
Norway	11 Sep 1998	25 Oct 2001 A
Oman		31 Jan 2000 a
Pakistan	9 Sep 1999	14 Jul 2005
Panama	11 Sep 1998	18 Aug 2000
Paraguay	11 Sep 1998	18 Aug 2003
Peru	11 Sep 1998	14 Sep 2005
Philippines	11 Sep 1998	31 Jul 2006
Poland		14 Sep 2005 a
Portugal	11 Sep 1998	16 Feb 2005 AA
Qatar		10 Dec 2004 a
Republic of Korea	7 Sep 1999	11 Aug 2003
Romania		2 Sep 2003 a
Rwanda		7 Jan 2004 a
Saint Lucia	25 Jan 1999	
Samoa		30 May 2002 a
Saudi Arabia		7 Sep 2000 a
Senegal	11 Sep 1998	20 Jul 2001
Seychelles	11 Sep 1998	
Singapore		24 May 2005 a
Slovenia	11 Sep 1998	17 Nov 1999
South Africa		4 Sep 2002 a
Spain	11 Sep 1998	2 Mar 2004
Sri Lanka		19 Jan 2006 a
Sudan		17 Feb 2005 a
Suriname		30 May 2000 a
Sweden	11 Sep 1998	10 Oct 2003
Switzerland	11 Sep 1998	10 Jan 2002
Syrian Arab Republic	11 Sep 1998	24 Sep 2003
Tajikistan	28 Sep 1998	
Thailand		19 Feb 2002 a
Togo	9 Sep 1999	23 Jun 2004
Tunisia	11 Sep 1998	
Turkey	11 Sep 1998	
Ukraine		6 Dec 2002 a
United Arab Emirates		10 Sep 2002 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Sep 1998	17 Jun 2004
United Republic of Tanzania	11 Sep 1998	26 Aug 2002
United States of America	11 Sep 1998	
Uruguay	11 Sep 1998	4 Mar 2003
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		19 Apr 2005 a
Yemen		4 Feb 2006 a

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the texte of the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with Article 20 (2) of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in Paragraph 2 as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute."

ESTONIA

Declaration:

"With respect to any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, the Republic of Estonia recognizes both of the means of dispute settlement stated in Article 20, paragraph 2 as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation."

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration:

"The European Community declares that, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular Article 175(1) thereof, it is competent to enter into international agreements, and to implement the obligations resulting therefrom, which contribute to the pursuit of the following objectives:

Preserving, Protecting and improving the quality of the environment;

protecting human health;

prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources;

promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or worldwide environmentalproblems.

Moreover, the European Community declares that it has already adopted legal instruments, including a Regulation of the European Parliament and the Council concerning the export and import of dangerous chemicals, binding on its Member States, covering matters governed by this Convention, and will submit

and update, as appropriate, a list of those legal instruments to the Secretariat of the Convention.

The European Community is responsible for the performance of those obligations resulting from the Convention which are covered by Community law in force.

The exercise of Community competence is, by its nature, subject to continuous development."

MOLDOVA

Declaration:

According to article 20 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova declares that [it] accepts both means of dispute settlement, mentioned in paragraph 2 of the article, as compulsory in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation.

NORWAY

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 20 (2), [Norway declares that], with respect to any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, it recognizes (b) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic has reviewed the Rotterdam Convention on the Prior Informed Consent Procedure for Certain Hazardous Chemicals and Pesticides in International Trade, which was signed in 1998. Having given it thorough consideration:

It declares that it has already ratified the above-mentioned Convention by virtue of legislative decree No. 35 of 13 July 2003, and that it will fully comply with and respect all its provisions, while confirming that the ratification of this Convention by the Syrian Arab Republic does not in any way constitute a recognition of Israel, and that the provisions of the Convention do not imply that the Syrian Arab Republic has to deal with that State.

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval, accession or succession.)

ISRAEL

13 January 2004

With regard to the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic upon ratification :

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of ratification of the Syrian Arab Republic to the abovementioned Convention contains a declaration with respect to the State of Israel.

The Government of the State of Israel considers that such declaration, which is explicitly of a political nature, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of the Convention.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic."

Notes :

[1] In accordance with article 26 (3) of the Convention, any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.

[2] By decision RC-1/11 of 24 September 2004, adopted at its first meeting, held in Geneva from 20 to 24 September 2004, the Conference of the Parties to the above Convention adopted Annex VI, setting out the arbitration procedure for purposes of paragraph 2 (a) of article 20 of the Convention and the conciliation procedure for purposes of paragraph 6 of article 20 of the Convention.

In accordance with paragraph 3 (b) of article 22 of the Convention, any Party that is unable to accept an additional annex shall so notify the Depositary, in writing, within one year from the date of communication of the adoption of the additional annex by the Depositary. The Depositary shall without delay notify all Parties of any such notification received. A Party may at any time withdraw a previous notification of non-acceptance in respect of an additional annex and the annex shall thereupon enter into force for that Party subject to paragraph 3 (c) of the same article. In accordance with paragraph 3 (c), on the expiry of one year from the date of the communication by the Depositary of its adoption, Annex VI shall enter into force for all Parties that have not submitted a notification in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 3 (b).

[3] By decision RC-1/3 of 24 September 2004, adopted at its first meeting, held in Geneva from 20 to 24 September 2004, the Conference of the Parties to the above Convention adopted, in accordance with the procedure laid down in article 8 and paragraph 5 of article 22 of the Convention, the amendments to Annex III.

In accordance with paragraph 5 (c) of article 22 of the Convention, the Conference of the Parties, in the same decision, decided that "all the amendments shall enter into force on 1 February 2005, except for the amendments made by subparagraph 1 (a) and (b) of the annex to the ... decision, which shall enter into force on 1 January 2006".

[4] With the following declaration:

In accordance with the provision of article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China; it shall not apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China until the Government of China notifies otherwise.

[5] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

[7] With the following territorial exclusion:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

15. Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants

Stockholm, 22 May 2001

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 17 May 2004, in accordance with article 26 (1) see article 26 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For each State or regional economic integration organization that ratifies, accepts or approves this Convention or accedes thereto after the deposit of the fiftieth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or regional economic integration organization of its instrument of rafification, acceptance, approval or accession. 3. For the purpose of paragraphs 1 and 2, any instrument deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.".

REGISTRATION: 17 May 2004, No. 40214.

STATUS: Signatories: 152. Parties: 136.[1]

TEXT: Depositary notification C.N.531.2001.TREATIES-96 of 19 June 2001; C.N.1204.2002.TREATIES-63 of 19 November 2002 [Proposal of corrections to the original text of the Convention (authentic Spanish text)] and C.N.157.2003.TREATIES-6 of 21 February 2003 [Correction of the original text of the Convention (authentic Spanish text)].

Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 May 2001 at the Conference of Plenipotentiaries on the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, Stockholm, 22-23 May 2001.

In accordance with its article 24, the Convention will be open for signature at Stockholm by all States and by regional economic integration organizations on 23 May 2001 at the Stockholm City Conference Centre/Folkets Hus, and at the United Nations Headquarters in New York from 24 May 2001 to 22 May 2002.

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Albania	5 Dec 2001	4 Oct 2004
Algeria	5 Sep 2001	22 Sep 2006
Angola		23 Oct 2006 a
Antigua and Barbuda	23 May 2001	10 Sep 2003
Argentina	23 May 2001	25 Jan 2005
Armenia	23 May 2001	26 Nov 2003
Australia	23 May 2001	20 May 2004
Austria	23 May 2001	27 Aug 2002
Azerbaijan		13 Jan 2004 a
Bahamas	20 Mar 2002	3 Oct 2005
Bahrain	22 May 2002	31 Jan 2006
Bangladesh	23 May 2001	
Barbados		7 Jun 2004 a
Belarus		3 Feb 2004 a
Belgium	23 May 2001	25 May 2006
Belize	14 May 2002	
Benin	23 May 2001	5 Jan 2004
Bolivia	23 May 2001	3 Jun 2003
Bosnia and Herzegovina	23 May 2001	
Botswana		28 Oct 2002 a
Brazil	23 May 2001	16 Jun 2004
Brunei Darussalam	21 May 2002	
Bulgaria	23 May 2001	20 Dec 2004
Burkina Faso	23 May 2001	31 Dec 2004
Burundi	2 Apr 2002	2 Aug 2005
Cambodia	23 May 2001	25 Aug 2006
Cameroon	5 Oct 2001	
Canada	23 May 2001	23 May 2001
Cape Verde		1 Mar 2006 a
Central African Republic	9 May 2002	
Chad	16 May 2002	10 Mar 2004
Chile	23 May 2001	20 Jan 2005
China[2]	23 May 2001	13 Aug 2004
Colombia	23 May 2001	
Comoros	23 May 2001	
Congo	4 Dec 2001	
Cook Islands		29 Jun 2004 a
Costa Rica	16 Apr 2002	
Côte d'Ivoire	23 May 2001	20 Jan 2004
Croatia	23 May 2001	
Cuba	23 May 2001	
Cyprus		7 Mar 2005 a
Czech Republic	23 May 2001	6 Aug 2002
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		26 Aug 2002 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		23 Mar 2005 a
Denmark[3]	23 May 2001	17 Dec 2003
Djibouti	15 Nov 2001	11 Mar 2004
Dominica		8 Aug 2003 a
Dominican Republic	23 May 2001	
Ecuador	28 Aug 2001	7 Jun 2004
Egypt	17 May 2002	2 May 2003
El Salvador	30 Jul 2001	
Eritrea		10 Mar 2005 a
Ethiopia	17 May 2002	9 Jan 2003
European Community	23 May 2001	16 Nov 2004 AA
Fiji	14 Jun 2001	20 Jun 2001
Finland	23 May 2001	3 Sep 2002 A
France	23 May 2001	17 Feb 2004 AA
Gabon	21 May 2002	
Gambia	23 May 2001	28 Apr 2006
Georgia	23 May 2001	4 Oct 2006
Germany	23 May 2001	25 Apr 2002
Ghana	23 May 2001	30 May 2003
Greece	23 May 2001	3 May 2006

Participant	*Signature, Succession to signature (d)*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Guatemala	29 Jan 2002	
Guinea	23 May 2001	
Guinea-Bissau	24 Apr 2002	
Haiti	23 May 2001	
Honduras	17 May 2002	23 May 2005
Hungary	23 May 2001	
Iceland	23 May 2001	29 May 2002
India	14 May 2002	13 Jan 2006
Indonesia	23 May 2001	
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	23 May 2001	6 Feb 2006
Ireland	23 May 2001	
Israel	30 Jul 2001	
Italy	23 May 2001	
Jamaica	23 May 2001	
Japan		30 Aug 2002 a
Jordan	18 Jan 2002	8 Nov 2004
Kazakhstan	23 May 2001	
Kenya	23 May 2001	24 Sep 2004
Kiribati	4 Apr 2002	7 Sep 2004
Kuwait	23 May 2001	12 Jun 2006
Kyrgyzstan	16 May 2002	12 Dec 2006
Lao People's Democratic Republic	5 Mar 2002	28 Jun 2006
Latvia	23 May 2001	28 Oct 2004
Lebanon	23 May 2001	3 Jan 2003
Lesotho	23 Jan 2002	23 Jan 2002
Liberia		23 May 2002 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		14 Jun 2005 a
Liechtenstein	23 May 2001	3 Dec 2004
Lithuania	17 May 2002	5 Dec 2006
Luxembourg	23 May 2001	7 Feb 2003
Madagascar	24 Sep 2001	18 Nov 2005
Malawi	22 May 2002	
Malaysia	16 May 2002	
Maldives		17 Oct 2006 a
Mali	23 May 2001	5 Sep 2003
Malta	23 May 2001	
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania	8 Aug 2001	22 Jul 2005
Mauritius	23 May 2001	13 Jul 2004
Mexico	23 May 2001	10 Feb 2003
Micronesia (Federated States of)	31 Jul 2001	15 Jul 2005
Moldova	23 May 2001	7 Apr 2004
Monaco	23 May 2001	20 Oct 2004
Mongolia	17 May 2002	30 Apr 2004
Montenegro[4]	23 Oct 2006 d	
Morocco	23 May 2001	15 Jun 2004
Mozambique	23 May 2001	31 Oct 2005
Myanmar		19 Apr 2004 a
Namibia		24 Jun 2005 a
Nauru	9 May 2002	9 May 2002
Nepal	5 Apr 2002	
Netherlands	23 May 2001	28 Jan 2002 A
New Zealand[5]	23 May 2001	24 Sep 2004
Nicaragua	23 May 2001	1 Dec 2005
Niger	12 Oct 2001	12 Apr 2006
Nigeria	23 May 2001	24 May 2004
Niue	12 Mar 2002	2 Sep 2005
Norway	23 May 2001	11 Jul 2002
Oman	4 Mar 2002	19 Jan 2005
Pakistan	6 Dec 2001	
Palau	28 Mar 2002	
Panama	23 May 2001	5 Mar 2003
Papua New Guinea	23 May 2001	7 Oct 2003
Paraguay	12 Oct 2001	1 Apr 2004
Peru	23 May 2001	14 Sep 2005
Philippines	23 May 2001	27 Feb 2004
Poland	23 May 2001	
Portugal	23 May 2001	15 Jul 2004 A
Qatar		10 Dec 2004 a
Republic of Korea	4 Oct 2001	
Romania	23 May 2001	28 Oct 2004
Russian Federation	22 May 2002	
Rwanda		5 Jun 2002 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		21 May 2004 a
Saint Lucia		4 Oct 2002 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		15 Sep 2005 a
Samoa	23 May 2001	4 Feb 2002
Sao Tome and Principe	3 Apr 2002	12 Apr 2006
Saudi Arabia	14 Mar 2002	
Senegal	23 May 2001	8 Oct 2003
Serbia	2 May 2002	
Seychelles	25 Mar 2002	
Sierra Leone		26 Sep 2003 a
Singapore	23 May 2001	24 May 2005
Slovakia	23 May 2001	5 Aug 2002
Slovenia	23 May 2001	4 May 2004
Solomon Islands		28 Jul 2004 a
South Africa	23 May 2001	4 Sep 2002
Spain	23 May 2001	28 May 2004
Sri Lanka	5 Sep 2001	22 Dec 2005
Sudan	23 May 2001	29 Aug 2006
Suriname	22 May 2002	
Swaziland		13 Jan 2006 a
Sweden	23 May 2001	8 May 2002
Switzerland	23 May 2001	30 Jul 2003
Syrian Arab Republic	15 Feb 2002	5 Aug 2005
Tajikistan	21 May 2002	
Thailand	22 May 2002	31 Jan 2005
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	23 May 2001	27 May 2004
Togo	23 May 2001	22 Jul 2004
Tonga	21 May 2002	
Trinidad and Tobago		13 Dec 2002 a
Tunisia	23 May 2001	17 Jun 2004
Turkey	23 May 2001	
Tuvalu		19 Jan 2004 a
Uganda		20 Jul 2004 a
Ukraine	23 May 2001	
United Arab Emirates	23 May 2001	11 Jul 2002
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	11 Dec 2001	17 Jan 2005
United Republic of Tanzania	23 May 2001	30 Apr 2004
United States of America	23 May 2001	
Uruguay	23 May 2001	9 Feb 2004
Vanuatu	21 May 2002	16 Sep 2005
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	23 May 2001	19 Apr 2005
Viet Nam	23 May 2001	22 Jul 2002
Yemen	5 Dec 2001	9 Jan 2004

Participant	Signature, Succession to signature (d)	Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)
Zambia	23 May 2001	7 Jul 2006
Zimbabwe	23 May 2001	

Declarations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ARGENTINA

Declaration:

In accordance with article 25, paragraph 4 of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Republic of Argentina declares that any amendment to Annex A, B, or C shall enter into force for Argentina only after it has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect thereto.

AUSTRALIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 25 (4) [of the Convention], the Government of Australia declares that any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force only upon the deposit of Australia's instrument of ratification with respect thereto."

AUSTRIA

Declaration:

"The Republic of Austria declares in accordance with Article 18 paragraph 2 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in paragraph 2 as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

BAHRAIN

Declarations:

1. Arbitration according to the procedures adopted by the Conference of States Parties is the only binding procedure for the Government of the Kingdom of Bahrain regarding resolving any dispute on the interpretation or implementation of the Convention.

2. Any amendment to the Convention annexes A, B and C will not be binding to the Kingdom of Bahrain unless it is ratified according to the constitutional rules.

BELGIUM

Declaration made upon signature:

"This signature engages also the Waloon region, the Flemish region, and the Brussels-Capital region."

BOTSWANA

Declaration:

"... the Republic of Botswana declares pursuant to article 25 (4) that, with respect to it, any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force for it only after it has deposited an instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect to such amendment."

CANADA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 4, of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, Canada hereby declares that any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force for Canada only upon the deposit by Canada of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval with respect thereto."

CHINA

Declaration:

In accordance with the provisions of article 25, paragraph 4 of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, with respect to the People's Republic of China, any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force only upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect thereto.

EUROPEAN COMMUNITY

Declaration in accordance with article 25 (3):

"The Community declares that, in accordance with the Treaty establishing the European Community, and in particular article 175 thereof, it is competent for entering into international environmental agreements, and for implementing the obligations resulting therefrom, which contribute to the pursuit of the following objectives:

- Preserving, protecting and improving the quality of the environment,
- Protecting human health,
- Prudent and rational utilisation of natural resources,
- Promoting measures at international level to deal with regional or worldwide environmental problems.

Moreover, the Community declares that it has already adopted legal instruments, binding on its Member States, covering matters governed by this Convention, and will submit and update, as appropriate, a list of those legal instruments to the Conference of the Parties in accordance with article 15 (1) of the Convention.

The Community is responsible for the performance of those obligations resulting from the Convention which are covered by Community law in force.

The exercise of Community competence is, by its nature, subject to continuous development."

INDIA

28 March 2006

Declaration:

"Any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force only upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect thereto."

LIECHTENSTEIN

Declaration:

"The Principality of Liechtenstein declares in accordance with Article 18 paragraph 2 of the Convention that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement."

MAURITIUS

Declaration:

"Pursuant to Article 25, paragraph 4, of the Stockholm Convention on Persistant Organic Pollutants, the Republic of Mauritius declares that any amendments to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force for the Republic of Mauritius only upon the deposit by the Republic of Mauritius of its instrument of Ratification, Acceptance, Approval or Accession with respect thereto."

MOLDOVA

Declaration:

In accordance with article 18, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Moldova accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any party that accepts the same obligation.

Pursuant to article 25, paragraph 4, of the Convention, any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force for the Republic of Moldova only upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification, acceptance or approval with respect thereto.

MICRONESIA (FEDERATED STATES OF)

Declaration:

1.The Federated States of Micronesia declares in accordance with the provisions of article 25, paragraph 4 of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, that any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force only upon the deposit of the Federated States of Micronesia's instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession thereto.

2.The Federated States of Micronesia declares in accordance with Article 18, paragraph 2 of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants that it accepts both of the means of dispute settlement mentioned in this paragraph as compulsory in relation to any party accepting an obligation concerning one or both of these means of dispute settlement.

SLOVAKIA

Declaration:

"Pursuant to article 25, paragraph 4, of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Slovak Republic hereby declares that any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force for the Slovak Republic only upon the deposit by the Slovak Republic of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect thereto."

SLOVENIA

Declaration:

"In accordance with article 25, paragraph 4 of the Convention, the Republic of Slovenia herewith declares, that any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall enter into force only upon the deposit of its instrument of ratification with respect thereto."

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC

Declaration:

The ratification of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention shall in no way signify the recognition of Israel or entail entry into any dealings with Israel in the context of the provisions of this Convention.

VANUATU

Declaration:

"That in relation to paragraph 4 of Article 25 of the Convention, any amendment to Annex A, B or C shall bind the Republic of Vanuatu only upon its deposit of an instrument of ratification or accession with respect to such amendments."

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Declaration:

In accordance with article 25, paragraph 4 of the Stockholm Convention on Persistent Organic Pollutants, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela declares that any amendment to Annex A, B, or C shall enter into force for the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela only after it has deposited its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with respect thereto.

Notes:

[1] In accordance with article 26 (3) of the Convention, any instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession deposited by a regional economic integration organization shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by member States of that organization.

[2] With the following :

In accordance with the provisions of article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the Convention shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and the Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

[3] With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[4] See note 1 under "Montenegro" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] With the following territorial exclusion:

".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this ratification shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultation with that territory."

16. Protocol on Civil Liability and Compensation for Damage Caused by the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents on Transboundary Waters to the 1992 Convention on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes and to the 1992 Convention on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents

Kiev, 21 May 2003

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 29 which reads as follows: "1. The Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. Article 2, paragraph 2(e)(iii), shall take effect when thresholds, limits of liability and minimum limits of financial securities for pipelines are set in annexes I and II in accordance with article 24, paragraphs 8 and 9. 3. For the purposes of paragraph 1, any instrument deposited by an organization referred to in article 27 shall not be counted as additional to those deposited by States members of such an organization. 4. For each State or organization referred to in article 27 which ratifies, accepts or approves the Protocol or accedes thereto after the deposit of the sixteenth instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Protocol shall enter into force on the ninetieth day after the date of deposit by such State or organization of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

STATUS: Signatories: 24. Parties: 1.

TEXT: Doc. ECE/MP.WAT/11-ECE/CP.TEIA/9.

Note: The above Protocol was adopted on 21 May 2003 by the Extraordinary Meeting of the Parties to the Convention of 17 March 1992 on the Protection and Use of Transboundary Watercourses and International Lakes and the Convention of 17 March 1992 on the Transboundary Effects of Industrial Accidents held in Kiev from 21 to 23 May 2003. The Protocol was opened for signature from 21 to 23 May 2003 in Kiev, and will remain open for signature at United Nations Headquarters in New York until 31 December 2003 by States members of the Economic Commission for Europe as well as States having consultative status with the Economic Commission for Europe, pursuant to paragraph 8 of Economic and Social Council resolution 36 (IV) of 28 March 1947, and by regional economic integration organizations constituted by sovereign States members of the Economic Commission for Europe to which their member States have transferred competence in respect of matters governed by the Protocol, including the competence to enter into treaties in respect of these matters.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)*
Armenia	21 May 2003	
Austria	30 Dec 2003	
Belgium	21 May 2003	
Bosnia and Herzegovina	21 May 2003	
Bulgaria	21 May 2003	
Cyprus	21 May 2003	
Denmark	21 May 2003	
Estonia	21 May 2003	
Finland	21 May 2003	
Georgia	21 May 2003	
Greece	21 May 2003	
Hungary	21 May 2003	25 Jun 2004
Latvia	21 May 2003	
Lithuania	21 May 2003	
Luxembourg	21 May 2003	
Moldova	21 May 2003	
Monaco	21 May 2003	
Norway	21 May 2003	
Poland	13 Jun 2003	
Portugal	21 May 2003	
Romania	21 May 2003	
Sweden	21 May 2003	
Ukraine	21 May 2003	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	21 May 2003	

Declarations

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations were made upon ratification,acceptance, approval or accession.)

Belgium

Declaration made upon signature:

This signature engages also the Waloon region, the Flemish region, and the Brussels-Capital region.

Denmark

Declaration made upon signature:

"Both the Faroe Islands and Greeland are self-governing under Home Rule Acts, which implies *inter alia* that environmental affairs in general and the areas covered by the Protocol are governed by the right of self-determination.

Signing by Denmark of the Protocol, therefore does not necessarily mean that Danish ratification will in due course include the Faroe Islands and Greenland."

CHAPTER XXVIII

FISCAL MATTERS

1. a) Multilateral Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties

Madrid, 13 December 1979

NOT YET IN FORCE: see article 13 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force three months after the deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, or acceding to this convention after the deposit of the tenth instrument of ratification, acceptance or accession, this Convention shall enter into force three months after the deposit of its instrument.".

STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 8.

TEXT: Doc. of UNESCO and WIPO.

Note: The Convention (a), and the Additional Protocol (b) were established by the International Conference of States on the Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties Remitted from One Country to Another, held in Madrid from 26 November to 13 December 1979. The Conference was convened jointly by the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the World Intellectual Property Organization (WIPO), in accordance with resolution 5/9.2/1, section II, adopted by the General Conference of UNESCO at its twentieth session, and with the decisions taken by the General Assembly of WIPO and by the Assembly and the Conference of Representatives of the International Union for the Protection of Literary and Artistic Works (Berne Union) during their ordinary sessions held in September 1978.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Cameroon	13 Dec 1979	
Czech Republic		30 Sep 1993 d
Ecuador		26 Oct 1994 a
Egypt		11 Feb 1982 a
Holy See	13 Dec 1979	
India		31 Jan 1983 a
Iraq		15 Jul 1981 a
Israel	13 Dec 1979	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Peru		15 Apr 1988 a
Slovakia		28 May 1993 d

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, accession or succession.)

CZECH REPUBLIC[1]

SLOVAKIA[1]

INDIA

Reservation :

The Government of India does not consider itself bound by articles 1 to 4 and 17 of the Convention.

Notes :

[1] Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 October 1980 and 24 September 1981, respectively, with the following reservation:

- "The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 17, paragraph 1, according to which all disputes between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or in the matter of application of this Convention, not settled by negotiation, shall, unless the States concerned agree on some other method of settlement, be brought before the International Court of Justice for determination by it, and it declares that in every case an agreement of all the parties to the dispute is needed for bringing that dispute before the International Court of Justice."

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

1. b) Additional Protocol to the Multilateral Convention for the Avoidance of Double Taxation of Copyright Royalties

Madrid, 13 December 1979

NOT YET IN FORCE: see paragraph 2 which reads as follows: "(a) This Protocol shall be signed and shall be subject to ratification, acceptance or accession by the signatory States, or may be acceded to, in accordance with the provisions of Article 11 of the Convention. (c) Any Contracting State may denounce this Protocol in accordance with provisions of Article 14 of the Convention, it being understood, however, that a Contracting State denouncing the Convention must at the same time also denounce this Protocol. (d) The provisions of Article 16 of the Convention shall apply to this Protocol.".

STATUS: Signatories: 3. Parties: 3.

TEXT: Doc. of UNESCO and WIPO.

Note: See "Note" at the beginning of chapter XXVIII.1 (a).

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification, Acceptance (A), Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Cameroon	13 Dec 1979	
Czech Republic[1]		30 Sep 1993 d
Holy See	13 Dec 1979	
Israel	13 Dec 1979	
Liberia		16 Sep 2005 a
Slovakia[1]		28 May 1993 d

Notes :

[1] Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Protocol on 24 September 1981. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

CHAPTER XXIX

MISCELLANEOUS

1. AGREEMENT ON SUCCESSION ISSUES

Vienna, 29 June 2001

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 June 2004, in accordance with article 12 (1) which reads as follows: "(1) This Agreement shall enter into force thirty days after the deposit of the fifth instrument of ratification. The Depositary shall notify the successor States, and the Office of the High Representative, of the date of entry into force. (2) Notwithstanding paragraph (1) of this Article, Article 4 (3) of the Agreement, Article 5 of Annex A, Articles 1 and 5-6 of Annex B, and Article 6 of, and the Appendix to, Annex C, shall be provisionally applied after the date of signature of this Agreement, in accordance with their terms.".

REGISTRATION: 2 June 2004, No. 40296.

STATUS: **TEXT:** For the text of the Agreement (English only), see http://untreaty.un.org under *Texts of Recently Deposited Multilateral Treaties*.

Note: The Agreement was adopted at the Conference on Succession Issues held at the Hofburg Palace, Heldenplatz, Vienna on 29 June 2001. The text of the Agreement was done in seven originals in the English language, one retained by each successor State, one by the Office of the High Representative and one deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Participant	*Signature*	*Ratification*
Bosnia and Herzegovina	29 Jun 2001	15 May 2002
Croatia	29 Jun 2001	3 May 2004
Serbia	29 Jun 2001	10 Oct 2002
Slovenia	29 Jun 2001	21 Aug 2002
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	29 Jun 2001	6 Mar 2002

Part II

LEAGUE OF NATIONS MULTILATERAL TREATIES

1. International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace

Geneva, 23 September 1936

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 2 April 1938, in accordance with article 11.
REGISTRATION: 2 April 1938, No. 4319[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (February 11th, 1938)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2] (August 18th, 1937)
Burma (October 13th, 1937 a)
Southern Rhodesia (November 1st, 1937 a)
Aden Colony, Bahamas, Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong Kong, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher and Nevis, Virgin Islands), Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei], Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroon under British Mandate], North Borneo (State of), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena and Ascension, Sarawak, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland Protectorate, Straits Settlements, Swaziland, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trans-Jordan, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar Protectorate (July 14th, 1939 a)
Australia (June 25th, 1937 a)
Including the Territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the Mandated Territories of *New Guinea and Nauru*.
New Zealand (January 27th, 1938)
Union of South Africa (February 1st, 1938 a)
Including the Mandated Territory of *South West Africa*.
India (August 11th, 1937)
Ireland (May 25th, 1938 a)
Chile (February 20th, 1940)
Denmark (October 11th, 1937)
Egypt (July 29th, 1938)
Estonia (August 18th, 1938)
Finland (November 29th, 1938 a)
France (March 8th, 1938)
French Colonies and Protectorates and Territories under French Mandate (January 14th, 1939 a)
Guatemala (November 18th, 1938 a)
Latvia (April 25th, 1939 a)
Luxembourg (February 8th, 1938)
Netherlands[3] (February 15th, 1939)
Including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*.
New Hebrides (July 14th, 1939 a)
Norway (May 5th, 1938)
Salvador (August 18th, 1938 a)
Sweden (June 22nd, 1938 a)
Switzerland (December 30th, 1938)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
Argentina
Austria
Belgium
Under reservation of the declarations mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.[4]
Colombia
Dominican Republic
Greece
Lithuania
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Under reservation of the declaration mentioned in the *procès-verbal* of the final meeting of the Conference.[5]
Turkey
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[6,7]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Afghanistan[8]	8 Feb 1985 a	
Australia		17 May 1985
Bulgaria[9]	17 May 1972 a	
Cameroon	19 Jun 1967 d	
France[10]		13 Apr 1984
Holy See	5 Jan 1967 a	
Hungary[11]	20 Sep 1984 a	
Lao People's Democratic Republic	23 Mar 1966 a	
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a	
Malta	1 Aug 1966 d	
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d	

Participant[6,7]	Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)	Denunciation
Mongolia[12]	10 Jul 1985 a	
Netherlands[13]		10 Oct 1982
Russian Federation[14]	3 Feb 1983	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[15]		24 Jul 1985
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d	

Notes:

[1] See League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 186, p. 301; vol. 197, p. 394, and vol. 200, p. 557.

[2] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] These declarations are worded as follows:

"The Delegation of Belgium declares its opinion that the right of a country to jam by its own means improper transmissions emanating from another country, in so far as such a right exists in conformity with the general provisions of international law and with the Conventions in force, is in no way affected by the Convention."

[5] This declaration is worded as follows:

"The Spanish Delegation declares that its Government reserves the right to put a stop by all possible means to propaganda liable adversely to affect internal order in Spain and involving a breach of the Convention, in the event of the procedure proposed by the Convention not permitting of immediate steps to put a stop to such breach."

[6] The instrument of accession had been received on 30 August 1984 from the Government of the German Democratic Republic, with the following reservation and declaration:

Reservation:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 7 of the Convention, according to which disputes regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention in the absence of a settlement by way of negotiation shall be submitted, at the request of one of the Parties to the dispute, to arbitration or to judicial settlement. The German Democratic Republic holds the view that in every single case the consent of all Parties to the dispute shall be necessary to refer a particular dispute to arbitration or to judicial settlement.

Declaration:

The position of the German Democratic Republic on Article 14 of the International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace of 23 September 1936, as far as the application of the Convention to colonial and other dependent territories is concerned, is governed by the provisions of the United Nations Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples (Resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960) proclaiming the necessity of bringing to a speedy and unconditional end colonialism in all its forms and manifestations. The German Democratic Republic expresses its conviction that the purpose of the Convention would be served if all member States of the United Nations Organization were granted the possibility to become parties to the Convention. The German Democratic Republic declares that it reserves itself the right to take measures to protect its interests in the case that other States would not comply with the provisions of the Convention or in the case of other activities which affect the interests of the German Democratic Republic.

Since the Convention concerned is one of those in respect of which the Secretary-General, under resolution 24 (I) of the United Nations General Assembly, exercises the functions previously carried out by the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and taking into account the practice followed by the latter in the case of reservations made in respect of multilateral treaties which do not contain provision in that regard, the Secretary-General had requested the States concerned, by circular letter dated 19 September 1984, to notify him within 90 days of any objection to the reservation quoted above.

In this regard, the Secretary-General had received on 5 December 1984 from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following objection:

"1.[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] do not accept the reservation to article 7 of the Convention contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"2.[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] do not accept the declaration concerning article 14 contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"3.[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland] do not consider either of the foregoing state ments as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for the German Democratic Republic."

This above-quoted objection being the only one received by the Secretary-General within the 90 day period, and it not precluding the entry into force of the Convention for the German Democratic Republic, the Secretary-General proceeded with the deposit of the instrument (19 December 1984) with reservation and declaration.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The instrument of ratification was received on 18 September 1984 from the Government of Czechoslovakia accompanied with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

"Having seen and considered the International Convention aforesaid and knowing that the Federal Assembly of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic agrees to it, we approve and confirm it in accordance with its article 9, while stipulating that the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not feel to be bound by the provisions of its article 7 concerning the submission of disputes over the interpretation or implementation of the Convention to arbitration or judicial settlement."

Declarations:

"The provision of article 14 is in contradiction to the Declar ation on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples which was adopted at the XVth Session of the General Assembly of the United Nations in 1960 and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic regards it therefore as superseded".

"The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic retains the right to adopt any measures in protection of its interests, both in case of failure by other States to comply with the Convention and in case of other actions harmful to its interests".

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 5 in this chapter), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and declarations on 30 October 1984 and, in the absence of objection within the period of 90 days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of ratification with reservation and declarations.

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to with draw the reservation to article 7 made upon ratification.

See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The instrument of accession was received on 31 July 1984 from the Government of Afghanistan, with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

(i)The Democratic Republic of Afghanistan, by acceding to the International Convention concerning the Use of Broadcasting in the Cause of Peace, does not bound herself to the provision of article 7 of the said Convention, because, in accordance with this article, in the case of dispute arising between two or several High Contract ing Parties regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, only at the request of one of the concerned parties, the case can be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice for judgement.

Therefore, concerning this matter, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares that in the case of dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention, the case should be submitted to the Permanent Court of International Justice with the agreement of all concerned parties.

Interpretative declaration:

(ii)Likewise, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan declares that the provision of article 14 of this Convention runs counter to the Declaration, adopted in the year 1960, on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, the interpreta tion of which indirectly confirms the continuation of the existence of the colonies and protectorates.

Therefore, the Democratic Republic of Afghanistan does not deem necessary the existence of article 14 in the said Convention and does not bound herself to it.

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 5 in this chapter), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and interpretative declaration on 9 November 1984 and, in the absence of objection within the period of 90 days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of accession with reservation and interpretative declaration.

[9] The instrument of accession was received on 4 November 1971, from the Government of Bulgaria, and accompanied with the following reservation:

1. The People's Republic of Bulgaria will not consider itself bound by the provisions of the section of article 7 of the Convention which provided for consideration of disputes between Parties by the International Court of Justice at the request of one of the Parties. Any decision by the Court concerning a dispute between the People's Republic of Bulgaria and another Party to the Convention rendered on a basis of a request made to the Court without the consent of the People's Republic of Bulgaria will be considered null and void.

2. The People's Republic of Bulgaria will apply the principles of the Convention in respect of all States Parties to the Convention on the basis of reciprocity. However, the Convention will not be deemed to create formal commitments between countries which do not maintain diplomatic relations.

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note [6]), the Secretary-General had requested the States concerned, by circular letter dated 17 February 1972, to notify him within 90 days of any objection to the reservation quoted above.

In a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 May 1972 with respect to the above reservation, the Permanent Representa tive of the United Kingdom to the United Nations stated the following:

"The United Kingdom Government wish to put on record that they are unable to accept the reservation contained in paragraph 1 of this statement. They are also unable to accept the reservation contained in the second sentence of paragraph 2 because, in their view, treaties create rights and obligations between contracting States irrespective of whether those States maintain diplomatic relations. They do not, however, consider these objections as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for Bulgaria."

This above-quoted objection being the only one received by the Secretary-General within the 90 day period, and it not precluding the entry into force of the Convention for Bulgaria, the Secretary-General proceeded with the deposit of the instrument with reservation and declaration.

[10] The notification specifies that the denunciation is being effected since the French broadcasting régime resulting from the Law of 29 July 1982 on audio-visual communications does not appear to be compatible with the provisions of the Convention.

[11] The instrument of accession was received on 17 May 1984 from the Government of Hungary, with the following declaration and reservation:

Declaration:

"The Hungarian People's Republic declares [. . .] that the provisions of article 14 of the Convention are at variance with United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960 on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and as such have lost their topicality."

Reservation:

"The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 7 of the Convention that should a dispute arise between the Parties regarding the interpretation or application of the present Convention for which it has been found impossible to arrive at a satisfactory settlement through the diplomatic channel, it shall, at the request of one of the Parties, be submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement, and declares that submission of any such dispute to arbitration or to judicial settlement shall be subject to the common consent of the Parties."

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note [6]), the Secretary-General had requested by circular letter dated 21 June 1984, to notify him within 90 days of any objection to the reserva tion quoted above.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 24 September 1984, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the following objection:

[The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland]:

"1.do not accept the reservation to article 7 of the Convention contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"2.do not accept the declaration concerning article 14 contained in the note accompanying the instrument.

"3.do not consider either of the foregoing statements as preclud ing the entry into force of the Convention for Hungary."

[12] The instrument of accession was received on 10 July 1985 from the Government of Mongolia and accompanied with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:

The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 7 of the Convention under which disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Conven tion and which has not been settled by means of negotiations shall be submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement at the request of one of the Parties to the dispute. The Mongolian People's Republic considers that for the submission of a dispute to any judicial settlement, the consent of all Parties to the dispute shall be essential in every individual case.

Declarations:

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that it retains the right to take any measures to preserve its interests both in the event of failure by other states to observe the provisions of the Convention and in the event of encroachment on the interests of the Mongolian People's Republic;

The Mongolian People's Republic declares that the provisions of article 14 of this Convention are obsolete and contradict the Declaration on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly resolution 1514/XV of 14 December 1960.

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 5 in this chapter), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and declarations on 6 September 1985 and, in the absence of objection within the period of ninety days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of accession with the said reservation and declaration.

Subsequently, on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification with respect to article 7.

[13] With effect from 11 October 1983.

[14] The signature was effected on 23 September 1936 under the reservation of the declarations mentioned in the procès-verbal of the final meeting to the Conference (for the text of the declarations, see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. CLXXXVI, p. 317. The instrument of ratification, received by the depositary on 28 October 1982, was accompanied by the following reservation and declaration, which supersede those made upon signature:

[1.] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 7 of the Convention under which any dispute that may arise regarding the interpretation or application of the Convention which has not been settled by means of negotiations shall be submitted to arbitration or to judicial settlement at the request of one of the Parties, and declares that, for the submission of such a dispute to arbitration or to judicial settlement,the agreement of all Parties to the dispute shall be essential in every separate case;

[2.] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it retains the right to take any measures to preserve its interests both in the event of failure by other States to observe the provisions of the Convention and in the event of any other actions that encroach on the interests of the USSR;

[3.] The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that the provisions of article 14 of the Convention are obsolete and contradict the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples adopted by the United Nations General Assembly (resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960).

Since the Convention concerned is one which was formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, and in accordance with established procedure (see note 5 in this chapter), the Secretary-General circulated the said reservation and declarations on 5 November 1982 and, in the absence of objection within the period of 90 days as from that date, proceeded with the deposit of the instrument of ratification with reservation and declarations.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 9 December 1983 from the Government of the United Kingdom and Northern Ireland, the following communication:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wish to place on record the following:

"1. They do not accept the reservation to article 7 of the Convention reproduced under (1) of [the reservation and declarations made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics].

"2. They note [the Secretary-General's] understanding that the declaration reproduced under (2) of [the said reservation and declarations] does not purport to modify the legal effect of any provision of the Convention. If, contrary to this understanding, the declaration were intended to modify the legal effect of any provision of the Convention, they would consider it incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, particularly when taken together with the purported reservation to article 7.

"3. They do not accept the declaration concerning article 14 reproduced under (3) of [the said reservation and declarations].

"4. They do not consider any of the foregoing statements as precluding the entry into force of the Convention for the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics."

[15] The notification specifies that the denunciation shall apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and those dependent territories to which the Convention was applied and for whose international relations the United Kingdom is still responsible.

2. SPECIAL PROTOCOL CONCERNING STATELESSNESS

The Hague, 12 April 1930[1]

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 15 March 2004, in accordance with articles 9 and 10.
REGISTRATION: 1 April 2004, No. 40153[2].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (April 4th, 1939)
With the reservation that the application of this Protocol will not be extended to the Colony of the Belgian Congo or to the Territories under mandate.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 a)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations*[3]. (January 14th, 1932)

Burma[4]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.

Australia (July 8th, 1935 a)
Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.

Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under His suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China[5] [(February 14th, 1935)]

Salvador (October 14th, 1935)
The Republic of Salvador does not assume the obligation laid down by the Protocol where the Salvadorian nationality possessed by the person and ultimately lost by him was acquired by naturalisation.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Canada
Colombia
Cuba
Egypt
Greece
Ireland
Luxembourg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[5]	*Succession (d)*
Fiji	25 May 1973 d
Pakistan[6]	29 Jul 1953 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] See document C.27.M.16.1931.V.

[2] This treaty, formerly deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, was transferred to the custody of the United Nations by virtue of General Assembly resolution 24 (I) of 12 February 1946, and of a League of Nations Assembly resolution of 18 April 1946 (League of Nations, *Official Journal*, Special Supplement No. 194, p. 57). It was registered, *ex officio*, with the Secretariat on 1 April 2004 pursuant to Article 102 of the United Nations Charter.

[3] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

On 12 September 1973, the Secretary-General received a communication from the Government of China to the effect that it had decided not to recognize as binding on China the Special Protocol concerning Statelessness of April 12th, 1930, signed and ratified by the defunct Government of China. That notification was treated as a withdrawal of the instrument.

[6] In a communication received on 29 July 1953, the Government of Pakistan notified the Secretary-General that by reason of Article 4 of the Schedule to the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947, the rights and obligations under the Special Protocol devolve upon Pakistan, and that the Government of Pakistan, "therefore, considers itself a party to that Protocol".

3. PROTOCOL RELATING TO A CERTAIN CASE OF STATELESSNESS

The Hague, 12 April 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1937 in accordance with articles 9 and 10.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1937, No. 4138[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 a)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations.*[2] (January 14th, 1932)

Burma[3]

His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.

Australia (July 8th, 1935)

(Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru.*)

Union of South Africa (April 9th, 1936)

India (September 28th, 1932)

In accordance with the provisions of Article 13 of this Protocol, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under his suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

Chile (March 20th, 1935)

China[4] (February 14th, 1935)

Netherlands[5] (April 2nd, 1937)

Including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curacao.*

Poland (June 15th, 1934)

Salvador (October 14th, 1935 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Belgium

Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.

Canada
Colombia
Cuba
Czechoslovakia[6]
Denmark
Egypt
Estonia
France
Greece
Ireland
Japan
Latvia
Luxembourg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Cyprus	3 Apr 1978 d
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Jamaica	12 Jun 1968 a
Kiribati	29 Nov 1983 d
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974 d
Malawi[7]	11 Jul 1967 a
Malta[8]	16 Aug 1966 d
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Niger	18 Jul 1968 a
Pakistan	29 Jul 1953 d
Serbia[9]	12 Mar 2001 d
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[9]	18 Jan 1994 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.179, p.115.

[2] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The instrument of accession contains the following reservation made in accordance with article 4 of the Protocol:

"Article 1 shall only be binding upon the Government of Malawi in cases where the mother of a person referred to therein is both a citizen of Malawi and of African race. However, no such person who is denied citizenship of Malawi because his mother is not of African race shall be precluded from applying for citizenship of Malawi on the grounds of close connection with Malawi, birth in Malawi being regarded as a close connection for this purpose."

[8] The notification of succession contains the following declaration:

"In accordance with article 4 of the Protocol, the Government of Malta declares that:

"(i)article 1 shall apply unconditionally to any person born in Malta on or after the 21st September 1964;

"(ii)in regard to a person born in Malta before the 21st September 1964, article 1 shall only apply, where such person was on 20 September 1964, a citizen of the United Kingdom and Colonies and one of his parents was born in Malta."

[9] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Protocol on 15 December 1959. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4. Convention on Certain Questions Relating to the Conflict of Nationality Laws

The Hague, 12 April 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 July 1937 in accordance with articles 25 and 26.
REGISTRATION: 1 July 1937, No. 4137[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (April 4th, 1939)
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.
Excluding Article 16 of the Convention.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 a)
With reservations as regards Articles 5, 6, 7, 16 and 17, which Brazil will not adopt owing to difficulties with which it has to contend in connection with principles forming the basis of its internal legislation.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate members of the League of Nations.*[2] (April 6th, 1934)

Burma[3]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.

Canada (April 6th, 1934)

Australia (November 10th, 1937)
Including the territories of *Papua and Norfolk Island.*

India (October 7th, 1935)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 29, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under his suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

China[4] (February 14th, 1935)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.

Monaco (April 27th, 1931 a)

Netherlands[5] (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao.*
Excluding the provisions of Articles 8, 9 and 10 of the Convention.

Norway (March 16th, 1931 a)

Poland (June 15th, 1934)

Sweden (July 6th, 1933)
The Swedish Government declares that it does not accept to be bound by the provisions of the second sentence of Article 11, in the case where the wife referred to in the article, after recovering the nationality of her country of origin, fails to establish her ordinary residence in that country.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Union of South Africa
China
Colombia
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
Cuba
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 9 10 and 11.
Czechoslovakia
Denmark
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 5 and 11.
Egypt
Estonia
France
Germany
Greece
Hungary
Iceland
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Subject to reservation as regards Articles 4 and 10 and as regards the words "according to its law" of Article 13.
Latvia
Luxembourg
Mexico
Subject to reservation as regards paragraph 2 of Article 1.
Peru
Subject to reservation as regards Article 4.
Portugal
Salvador
Spain
Switzerland
Subject to reservation as regards Article 10.
Uruguay
Yugoslavia (former)[6]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Canada		15 May 1996
Cyprus	27 Mar 1970 d	
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d	
Kiribati	29 Nov 1983 d	
Lesotho[7]		
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a	
Malta[8]	16 Aug 1966 d	
Mauritius[9]	18 Jul 1969 d	
Pakistan	29 Jul 1953 d	
Swaziland	18 Sep 1970 a	
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d	

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 179, p. 89.

[2] See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[5] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The notification of succession contains the following reservation:

"In accordance with article 20 of the Convention, the Government of the Kingdom of Lesotho declares that the second paragraph of article 6 of the Convention shall not apply so as to give effect to a declaration of renunciation of the citizenship of Lesotho if such declaration is made during any war in which Lesotho is engaged, or if the Government of Lesotho considers such declaration otherwise not conducive to the public good."

The above reservation not having been originally formulated by the Government of the United Kingdom in respect of Basutoland, it has become effective for Lesotho on the date on which it would have done so under the provisions of article 26 of the Convention, had it been formulated upon accession, that is to say, on 2 February 1975.

[8] The notification of succession contains the following declaration:

"In accordance with article 20 of the Convention, the Government of Malta declares that:

" (a) The second paragraph of article 6 of the Convention shall not apply in Malta so as to give immediate effect to a declaration of renunciation of citizenship of Malta, if such declaration is made during any war in which Malta may be engaged or if in the opinion of the Government of Malta such declaration is otherwise contrary to the public policy;

"(b) Article 16 of the Convention shall not apply to an illegitimate child born outside Malta."

[9] The notification of succession contains the following reservation:

"In accordance with article 20 of the Convention the Government of Mauritius declares that the second paragraph of article 6 of the Convention shall not apply in Mauritius so as to give effect to a declaration of renunciation of the citizenship of Mauritius, if such declaration is made during any war in which Mauritius is engaged."

5. Protocol relating to Military Obligations in Certain Cases of Double Nationality

The Hague, 12 April 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 May 1937 in accordance with articles 11 and 12.
REGISTRATION: 25 May 1937, No. 4117[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

United States of America (August 3rd, 1932)

Belgium (April 4th, 1939)
Subject to accession later for the Colony of the Congo and the Mandated Territories.

Brazil (September 19th, 1931 a)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and *all parts of the British Empire which are not separate Members of the League of Nations*[2] (January 14th, 1932)

Burma[3]
His Majesty the King does not assume any obligation in respect of the Karenni States, which are under His Majesty's suzerainty, or the population of the said States.

Australia (July 8th, 1935 a)
Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.

Union of South Africa (October 9th, 1935 a)
Subject to reservation as regards Article 2.

India (September 28th, 1932)
In accordance with the provisions of Article 15, His Britannic Majesty does not assume any obligation in respect of the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under his suzerainty or the population of the said territories.

Colombia (February 24th, 1937)

Cuba (October 22nd, 1936)
The Government of Cuba declares that it does not accept the obligation imposed by Article 2 of the Protocol when the minor referred to in that Article, although he has the right, on attaining his majority, to renounce or decline Cuban nationality, habitually resides in the territory of the State and is in fact more closely connected with the latter than with any other State whose nationality he may also possess.

Netherlands[4] (April 2nd, 1937)
Including the *Netherlands Indies*, *Surinam* and *Curacao*.

Salvador (October 14th, 1935)

Sweden (July 6th, 1933)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Canada
Chile
Denmark
Egypt
France
Germany
Greece
Ireland
Luxembourg
Mexico
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	28 Jul 1958
Cyprus	27 Mar 1970 d
Fiji	12 Jun 1972 d
Kiribati	29 Nov 1983 d
Lesotho	4 Nov 1974 d
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Malawi	13 Oct 1966 a
Malta	16 Aug 1966 d
Mauritania	2 Mar 1966 a
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Niger	25 Jul 1966 a
Nigeria	17 Mar 1967 a
Swaziland	18 Sep 1970 a
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 178, p. 227.

2 See note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3 See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4 See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6. PROTOCOL ON ARBITRATION CLAUSES

Geneva, 24 September 1923

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 28 July 1924, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 28 July 1924, No. 678[1].

Ratifications

Albania (August 29th, 1924)
Austria (January 25th, 1928)
Belgium (September 23rd, 1924)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Brazil (February 5th, 1932)
Subject to the condition that the arbitral agreement or the arbitration clause mentioned in Article 1 of this Protocol should be limited to contracts which are considered as commercial by the Brazilian legislation.
British Empire (September 27th, 1924)
Applies only to Great Britain and Northern Ireland, and consequently does not include any of the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates under His Britannic Majesty's sovereignty or authority or any territory in respect of which His Majesty's Government exercises a mandate.
Southern Rhodesia (December 18th, 1924 a)
Newfoundland (June 22nd, 1925 a)
British Guiana, British Honduras, Ceylon, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gold Coast (including Ashanti and the Northern Territories of the Gold Coast and Togoland), Gibraltar, Jamaica (Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Northern Rhodesia, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Trans-Jordan, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar (March 12th, 1926 a)
Tanganyika (June 17th, 1926 a)
St. Helena (July 29th, 1926 a)
Uganda (June 28th, 1929 a)
Bahamas (January 23rd, 1931 a)
Burma[2] *(excluding the Karenni States under His Majesty's suzerainty)* (October 19th, 1938 a)
His Majesty reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under the law of Burma.
New Zealand (June 9th, 1926)
India (October 23rd, 1937)
Is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Protocol upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.
India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Czechoslovakia[3] (September 18th, 1931)
The Czechoslovak Republic will regard itself as being bound only in relation to States which will have ratified the Convention of September 26th, 1927, on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, and the Czechoslovak Republic does not intend by this signature to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it which regulate the questions referred to in the present Protocol by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Protocol.
Denmark (April 6th, 1925)
Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary courts of law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.
Estonia (May 16th, 1929)
Limits, in accordance with Article 1, paragraph 2 of this Protocol, the obligation mentioned in paragraph 1 of the said article to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Finland (July 10th, 1924)
France (June 7th, 1928)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law. Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Protectorates or Territories in respect of which France exercises a mandate.
Germany (November 5th, 1924)
Greece (May 26th, 1926)
Iraq (March 12th, 1926 a)
Italy(excluding Colonies)
(July 28th, 1924)
Japan (June 4th, 1928)
Chosen, Taiwan, Karafuto, the leased territory of Kwantung, and the territories in respect of which Japan exercises a mandate.
(February 26th, 1929 a)
Luxembourg (September 15th, 1930)
Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Monaco (February 8th, 1927)
Reserves the right to limit its obligation to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.
Netherlands
(including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*)[4]
(August 6th, 1925)
The Government of the Netherlands declares its opinion that the recognition in principle of the validity of arbitration clauses in no way affects either the restrictive provisions at present existing under Netherlands law or the right to introduce other restrictions in the future.
Norway (September 2nd, 1927)
Poland (June 26th, 1931)

Under reservation that, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 1, the undertaking contemplated in the said Article will apply only to contracts which are declared as commercial in accordance with national Polish law.

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)

(1) In accordance with the second paragraph of Article 1, the Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

(2) According to the terms of the first paragraph of Article 8, the Portuguese Government declares that its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include its Colonies.

Romania (March 12th, 1925)

Subject to the reservation that the Royal Government may in all circumstances limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Spain (July 29th, 1926)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1, paragraph 2, to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Its acceptance of the present Protocol does not include the Spanish Possessions in Africa, or the territories of the Spanish Protectorate in Morocco.

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (May 14th, 1928)

Thailand (September 3rd, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratifications

Bolivia

Chile

Latvia

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in paragraph 2 of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Liechtenstein[5]

Subject to the following reservation:

Agreements which are the subject of a special contract, or of clauses embodied in other contracts, attributing competence to a foreign tribunal, if they are concluded between nationals and foreigners or between nationals in the country, shall henceforth be valid only when they have been drawn up in due legal form.

This provision shall apply also to stipulations in articles of association, deeds of partnership and similar instruments and also to agreements for the submission of a dispute to an arbitral tribunal sitting in a foreign country.

Any agreement which submits to a foreign tribunal or to an arbitral tribunal a dispute relating to insurance contracts shall be null and void if the person insured is domiciled in the country or if the interest insured is situated in the country.

It shall be the duty of the tribunal to ensure as a matter of routine that this provision is observed even during procedure for distraint or during bankruptcy proceedings.

Lithuania

Nicaragua

Panama

Paraguay

Peru

Salvador

Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[6,7]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda		25 Oct 1988 d
Bahamas		16 Feb 1977 d
Bangladesh	27 Jun 1979	27 Jun 1979
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 d
Czech Republic[3]		9 Feb 1996 d
Ireland	29 Nov 1956	11 Mar 1957
Israel	24 Oct 1951	13 Dec 1951
Malta		16 Aug 1966 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Republic of Korea	4 Mar 1968	
Serbia[8]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[3]		28 May 1993 d
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[8]		10 Mar 1994 d
Uganda	5 May 1965	
Zimbabwe		1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 27, p. 157.

[2] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] Further, when signing and ratifying, the Netherlands Government made a reservation which it withdrew, in respect of the Kingdom of Europe, on February 22nd, 1938 (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 185, p. 372) and, as regards the Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao, on April 16th, 1940 (see ibid., vol. 200, p. 500). See also note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Nethelrands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] This reservation has been submitted to the States parties to the Protocol for acceptance.

[6] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Protocol as from 4 April 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the applica tion as from 4 April 1958, of the Protocol of 24 September 1923 on Arbitration Clauses, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of the reapplication of the Protocol on Arbitration Clauses of 24 September 1923 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland acceded on behalf of Hong Kong on 10 February 1965. See also note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Nothern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Protocol on 13 March 1959. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7. Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards

Geneva, 26 September 1927

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 25 July 1929, in accordance with article 8.
REGISTRATION: 25 July 1929, No. 2096[1].

Ratifications

Austria (July 18th, 1930)

Belgium (April 27th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Belgian Congo, Territory of Ruanda-Urundi (June 5th, 1930 a)

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[2] (July 2nd, 1930)

Newfoundland (January 7th, 1931 a)

Bahamas, British Guiana, British Honduras, Falkland Islands, Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Tanganyika Territory, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent), Zanzibar (May 26th, 1931 a)

Mauritius (July 13th, 1931 a)

Northern Rhodesia (July 13th, 1931 a)

Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis, Virgin Islands) (March 9th, 1932 a)

Malta (October 11th, 1934 a)

Burma[3] *(excluding the Karenni States under His Majesty's suzerainty)* (October 19th, 1938 a)

His Majesty reserves the right to limit the obligations mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered commercial under the law of Burma.

New Zealand (Western Samoa included) (April 9th, 1929)

India (October 23rd, 1937)

Is not binding as regards the enforcement of the provisions of this Convention upon the territories in India of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

India reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in the first paragraph of Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Czechoslovakia[4] (September 18th, 1931)

The Czechoslovak Republic does not intend to invalidate in any way the bilateral treaties concluded by it with various States, which regulate the questions referred to in the present Convention by provisions going beyond the provisions of the Convention.

Denmark (April 25th, 1929)

Under Danish law, arbitral awards made by an Arbitral Tribunal do not immediately become operative; it is necessary in each case, in order to make an award operative, to apply to the ordinary Courts of Law. In the course of the proceedings, however, the arbitral award will generally be accepted by such courts without further examination as a basis of the final judgments in the affair.

Estonia (May 16th, 1929)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Finland (July 30th, 1931)

France (May 13th, 1931)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Germany (September 1st, 1930)

Greece (January 15th, 1932)

The Hellenic Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Italy (November 12th, 1930)

Luxembourg (September 15th, 1930)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)[5] (August 12th, 1931)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curaçao (January 28th, 1933 a)

Portugal (December 10th, 1930)

(1) The Portuguese Government reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

(2) The Portuguese Government declares, according to the terms of Article 10, that the present Convention does not apply to its Colonies.

Romania (June 22nd, 1931)

Reserves the right to limit the obligation mentioned in Article 1 to contracts which are considered as commercial under its national law.

Spain (January 15th, 1930)

Sweden (August 8th, 1929)

Switzerland (September 25th, 1930)

Thailand (July 7th, 1931)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia
Nicaragua
Peru

Participant[6,7]	*Signature*	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda.		25 Oct 1988 d
Bahamas		16 Feb 1977 d
Bangladesh	27 Jun 1979	27 Jun 1979
Croatia		26 Jul 1993 d
Czech Republic[4]		9 Feb 1996 d
Ireland	29 Nov 1956	10 Jun 1957
Israel	24 Oct 1951	27 Feb 1952
Japan	4 Feb 1952	11 Jul 1952
Malta		16 Aug 1966 d
Mauritius		18 Jul 1969 d
Republic of Korea	4 Mar 1968	
Serbia[8]		12 Mar 2001 d
Slovakia[4]		28 May 1993 d
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia[8]		10 Mar 1994 d
Uganda	5 May 1965	

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.92, p.301.

2 In a notification received on 16 December 1985, the Government of the United Kingdom recalled the following:

At the time of accession, Anguilla was part of the territory of St.Christopher and Nevis. By 1978, Anguilla had a separate constitutional status, as part of the St. Christopher and Nevis/Anguilla group.St.Christopher and Nevis became independent on 19 September 1983 and Anguilla then reverted to being a dependant territory of the United Kingdom. Therefore, the Convention continues to apply to Anguilla.

3 See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4 See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5 See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6 In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 22January 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the applica tion, as from 22 January 1958, of the Convention of 26 September 1927 on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroac tive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention on the Execution of Foreign Arbitral Awards of 26 September 1927 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7 The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland acceded on behalf of Hong Kong on 10 February 1965. See also note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8 The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 13 March 1959. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", "Slovenia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8. Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes

Geneva, 7 June 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1934, in accordance with article 16.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1934, No. 3314[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(August 31st, 1932)
Belgium	(August 31st, 1932)
Brazil	(August 26th, 1942 a)
Denmark	(July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	
Finland	(August 31st, 1932)
France	(April 27th, 1936 a)
Germany[2]	(October 3rd, 1933)
Greece	(August 31st, 1931)
Italy	(August 31st, 1932)
Japan	(August 31st, 1932)
Monaco	(January 25th, 1934 a)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)[3]	(August 20th, 1932)
Netherlands Indies and Curacao	(July 16th, 1935 a)
Surinam	(August 7th, 1936 a)
Norway	(July 27th, 1932)
Poland	(December 19th, 1936 a)
Portugal[2,4]	(June 8th, 1934)
Sweden	(July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[5]	(August 26th, 1932)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(November 25th, 1936 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Colombia
Czechoslovakia[6]
Ecuador
Peru
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia (former)[7]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (See also note 4)

Participant[4,8]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Belarus	4 Feb 1998 d
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 a
Kazakhstan	20 Nov 1995 a
Lithuania	28 Apr 2000 a
Luxembourg	5 Mar 1963
Ukraine	8 Oct 1999 a

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.143, p.317.

2 All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3 See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4 The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 319). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of that reservation.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 29 September 1999 and 19 October 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume. Upon resuming the excercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention and Protocol will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

5 According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect for Switzerland, as from that date.

[6] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the applica tion, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 7 June 1930 for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 7 June 1930 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 regarding "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

9. CONVENTION FOR THE SETTLEMENT OF CERTAIN CONFLICTS OF LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES

Geneva, 19 March 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1934, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1934, No. 3317[1].

Ratifications or définitive accessions

Brazil	(August 26th, 1942 a)
Denmark	(July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.	
Finland	(August 31st, 1932)
France	(April 27th, 1936 a)
Germany[2]	(October 3rd, 1933)
Greece[2]	(June 1st, 1934)
Italy	(August 31st, 1933)
Japan	(August 25th, 1933)
Monaco	(February 9th, 1933)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)[2,3]	(April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao	(September 30th, 1935 a)
Surinam	(August 7th, 1936 a)
Nicaragua	(March 16th, 1932 a)
Norway	(July 27th, 1932)
Poland	(December 19th, 1936 a)
Portugal[2,4]	(June 8th, 1934)
Sweden	(July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[5]	(August 26th, 1932)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Czechoslovakia[6]
Ecuador
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia (former)[7]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (See also note 3)

Participant[8]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	1 Dec 1958
Belgium[9]	18 Dec 1961
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 a
Indonesia	9 Mar 1959 d
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania	28 Apr 2000 a
Luxembourg	1 Aug 1968 a

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p.407.

[2] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[3] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p. 409). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 29 September 1999 and 19 October 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portugal and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume. Upon resuming the excercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention and Protocol will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[5] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect for Switzerland, as from that date.

[6] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 19 March 1931 for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in connection with cheques, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the Declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 18 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention for the Settlement of Certain Conflicts of Laws in Connection with Cheques of 19 March 1931 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] With a declaration that, in accordance with article 18 of the Convention, the Government of Belgium does not intend to assume any obligations in respect of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

10. Convention providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes

Geneva, 7 June 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1934, in accordance with article VII.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1934, No. 3313[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria[2] (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Article 6, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

Belgium (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the utilization of the rights provided in Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention. As regards the Belgian Congo and Ruanda-Urundi, the Belgian Government intends to reserve all the rights provided in the Annex in question, with the exception of the right mentioned in Article 21 of that Annex.

Brazil (August 26th, 1942 a)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

Denmark[3] (July 27th, 1932)

The undertaking by the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 10, 14, 15, 17, 18 and 20 of Annex II to the said Convention.

The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

Finland[4] (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention, and Finland has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

France[5] (April 27th, 1936 a)

Declares that Articles 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 10, 11, 13, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 22 and 23 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

Germany[6] (October 3rd, 1933)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 10 , 1 3, 14, 15, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

Greece (August 31st, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations with regard to Annex II:

Article 8: Paragraphs 1 and 3.

Article 9: As regards bills payable at a fixed date, or at a fixed period after date or after sight.

Article 13.

Article 15: (a) Proceedings against a drawer or endorser who has made an inequitable gain; (b) Same proceedings against an acceptor who has made an inequitable gain. "These proceedings shall be taken within a period of five years counting from the date of the bill of exchange."

Article 17: The provisions of Greek law relating to short-term limitations shall apply.

Article 20: The above-mentioned reservations apply equally to promissory notes.

Italy (August 31st, 1932)

The Italian Government reserves the right to avail itself of the right granted in Articles 2, 8, 10, 13, 15, 16, 17, 19 and 20 of Annex II to this Convention.

Japan (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the right referred to in the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention, in virtue of Article 1, paragraph 2.

Monaco (January 25th, 1934 a)

Netherlands(for the Kingdom in Europe) [7] (August 20th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservation mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 a)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 a)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Norway[8] (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15, 17 and 18 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Poland (December 19th, 1936 a)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 21, paragraph 2, and 22 of Annex II to the Convention.

Portugal[6,9] (June 8th, 1934)

Sweden[10] (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 14 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 10, 15 and 17 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Switzerland[11] (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 6, 14 , 1 5, 16, 17, 18 and 19 of Annex II.

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 a)

Subject to the reservation mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Colombia
Czechoslovakia[12]
Ecuador
Peru
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia (former)[13]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (see also notes 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10)

Participant[14]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Azerbaijan	30 Aug 2000 a
Belarus	4 Feb 1998 d
Hungary[15]	28 Oct 1964 a
Kazakhstan	20 Nov 1995 a
Kyrgyzstan	1 Aug 2003 a
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997 a
Luxembourg[16]	5 Mar 1963
Ukraine	8 Oct 1999 a

Declarations and Reservations

(Unless otherwise idicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

KYRGYZSTAN

Reservations:

"Article 1. Individuals and legal entities of the Kyrgyz Republic shall have the right to undertake obligations arising from bills of exchange and promissory notes.

Organs of the executive power structure may assume obligations under bills of exchange in the cases and under the procedure envisaged in the legislation of the Kyrgyz Republic.

Article 2. A bill of exchange may be drawn up only on paper (paper product).

Article 3. The clearing-houses referred to in Annex I, article 38, second paragraph of the Convention shall mean financial and credit institutions in possession of a licence from the National Bank of the Kyrgyz Republic to conduct operations for servicing bank accounts.

Article 4. Pursuant to Annex II, article 7 of the Convention, and by derogation from the obligation envisaged in Annex I, article 41, third paragraph of the Convention, a bill of exchange may be issued and payable in foreign currency if in the place of payment indicated in the bill of exchange, payment of the bill of exchange is possible in the currency indicated therein in accordance with the legislation in force in the State in which the payment is to be made.

Article 5. By derogation from Annex I, articles 48 and 49 of the Convention, and pursuant to Annex II, articles 13 and 14 of the Convention, as regards a bill of exchange which is issued and payable in the territory of the Kyrgyz Republic, the interest must be paid at the rate established by the National Bank of the Kyrgyz Republic, unless otherwise stipulated by an international treaty concluded and ratified under the procedure established by law.

Article 6. On the basis of Annex II, article 16 of the Convention, the drawer of a bill of exchange must provide the necessary cover for possible extinction of the obligation under the bill of exchange at maturity.

Article 7. Pursuant to annex II, article 17 of the Convention, with regard to determining the causes of interruption or suspension of limitation in the case of actions on bills of exchange, the provisions of the first part of the Civil Code of the Kyrgyz Republic shall apply.

Article 8. In accordance with Annex II, article 19 of the Convention, the denomination of a promissory note must include the words "promissory note".

Article 9. All the reservations envisaged in this act shall apply also to promissory notes."

UKRAINE

Reservations:

"This accession is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention."

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.143, p.257.

[2] In a communication received on 13 May 1963, the Government of Austria notified the Secretary-General that, in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention, it "has decided to make reservations referred to in article 18 of Annex II to the Convention, to the effect that certain business days shall be assimilated to legal holidays as regards presentment for acceptance of payment and all other acts relating to bills of exchange".

In a communication received on 26 November 1968, the Government of Austria, with reference to the above-mentioned reservations, notified the Secretary-General that "according to Austrian Law in force since July 26, 1967, no payment, acceptance or other acts may be demanded in respect of bills of exchange and promissory notes on the following legal holidays or days assimilated to such holidays: 1 January (New Year's Day), 6 January (Epiphany), Good Friday, Easter Monday, 1 May (Legal Holiday), Ascension, Whit-Monday, Corpus Christi, 15 August (Assumption), 26 October (National Day), 1 November (All Saints' Day), 8 December (Immaculate Conception), 25 December and 26 December (Christmas), Saturdays and Sundays".

[3] In a communication received on 31 January 1966, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General of the following: "As from December 1, 1965, the Danish laws giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the Convention were amended to provide that Saturdays shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication

should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention."

In the same communication, the Government of Denmark also notified the Secretary-General that the declaration made on its behalf under article X, paragraph 1, of the Convention upon its ratification to the effect that it "does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland", should be considered as withdrawn as from 1 July 1965.

[4] In a communication received on 29 July, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of the following: "As from 1 June 1966, the First of May an Saturdays of Jue, July and August shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention."

In a communication received on 6 June 1977, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"As from 1 April 1968, the Finnish laws giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the two Conventions were amended to provide that Staturdays throughout the year shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I [of the Convention]."

[5] The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic informed the Secretary-General by a communication received at the Secretariat on October 20th, 1937, that, in consequence of certain changes introduced into French legislation regarding the maturity of commercial bills by the Decree-Law of August 31st, 1937, the holder of a bill of exchange may, in accordance with Article 38 of the Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (Annex I to the Convention), present it, not only on the day on which it is payable, but either on that day or on one of the two following business days.

Consequently, the reservation made in this respect by France, on her accession to the Convention, concerning Article 5 of Annex II to the said instrument ceases to apply.

[6] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[7] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a communication received on 15 April 1970, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General that as from 1 June 1970, legislation would be promulgated in Norway assimilating Saturdays and the first day of the month of May to legal holidays.

[9] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*,vol.143, p.261). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation. See also note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[10] In a communication received on 16 May 1961, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General that the Swedish Government, after having obtained the approval of the Parliament, promulgated on 7 April 1961 the law under which Saturdays from 1 June to 30 September of each year shall be assimilated to legal holidays for the purposes including the presentation for acceptance or payment and all other acts relating to bills of exchange. The Government of Sweden further requested that this communication be considered as a notification of reservations made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention.

In a communication received on 18 June 1965, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General of the following: on 26 May 1965, the Swedish Government, with the approval of the Parliament, promulgated legal provisions under which the Swedish law giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the Convention was amended to provide that Saturdays shall be assimilated to legal holidays, as is already the case with the Saturdays of April, May, June, July, August and September. These provisions will enter into force on 1 October 1965.

[11] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[12] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 7 June 1930 providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention Providing a Uniform Law for Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 7 June 1930 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] In a communication received on 5 January 1966, the Government of Hungary, with reference to the third paragraph of article I of the Convention and article 18 of Annex II thereof, notified the Secretary-General of the following: "In respect of bills of exchange and promissory notes, no payment may be demanded in Hungary on legal holidays, namely: 1 January (New Year's Day), 4 April (Liberation Day), 1 May (Labour Day), 20 August (Constitution Day), 7 November (Anniversary of the October Socialist Revolution), 25 December (Christmas Day), 26 December (Boxing Day), Easter Monday, and weekly rest days (usually Sundays)."

Subsequently, on 25 March 1985, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Hungary the following notification:

"In the circulation of bills of exchange between inlanders the protest may be replaced by a dated statement, written on the bill of exchange itself and signed by the drawee and the third person making the payment /Article 8,/ Annex 2, respectively, unless an authentic protest is required by the drawer in the wording of the bill of exchange.

In the case mentioned in the above paragraph it is deemed that an undated negotiation of bill is dated as before the date of the protest."

In a further communication received on 21 June 1985, the Government of Hungary provided the following additional comments with respect to the above-mentioned notification:

"1/As regards conformity with Article 8 of Annex II, the wording "signed by the drawee and the third person making the payment, respectively" is intended by the competent Hungarian financial organs to express that the statement of the person to whom the bill of exchange is payable is required. If the bill of exchange is not domiciled with a named person for payment, the drawee's statement is required. In the

case of an instrument domiciled with a named person payment, the statement signed by that named person is required.

2/The wording in regard to bills of exchange domiciled with a named person for payment had to be expanded for two reasons:

/a/As the third person named for payment can be consid ered as the drawee's "cashier", it is logical to authorize him to make the statement in case of non-payment. /b/A domiciled bill of exchange is to be presented for payment at maturity at the domicile. If the statement of the third person named for payment could not be accepted in lieu of protest and the statement of the drawee should therefore be obtained, it would often cause practically insurmountable difficultics in reaching the drawee within two and a half business days of frustrated payment.

Attention is called in this respect to the fact that the same solution is adopted by Art. 56, para. /3/, of the Draft Convention on International Bills of Exchange and International Promissory Notes /A/CN9/211/ prepared by the Working Group on International Negotiable Instruments."

[16] The instrument of ratification stipulates that the Government of Luxembourg, in accordance with article 1 of the Convention, avails itself of all the reservations provided in articles 1, 4, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19 and 20 of Annex II to the Convention.

11. CONVENTION PROVIDING A UNIFORM LAW FOR CHEQUES

Geneva, 19 March 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1934, in accordance with article VI.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1934, No. 3316[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (August 26th, 1942 a)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

Denmark[2] (July 27th, 1932)

The undertaking of the Government of the King to introduce in Denmark the Uniform Law forming Annex I to this Convention is subject to the reservations referred to in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, para. 1, 16 (a), 18, 25, 26, 27 and 29 of Annex II to the said Convention.

The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

Finland[3] (August 31st, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (a), 18 and 27 of Annex II to this Convention, and has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

France[4,5] (April 27th, 1936 a)

Declares that Articles 1, 2, 4, 5, 6, 9, 11, 12, 13, 15, 16, 18, 19, 21, 22, 23, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30 and 31 of Annex II to this Convention are being applied.

Germany[6] (October 3rd, 1933)

This ratification is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 6, 14, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26 and 29 of Annex II to the Convention.

Greece[6] (June 1st, 1934)

Subject to the following conditions:

A. The Hellenic Government does not avail itself of the res ervations provided in Articles 1, 2, 5-8, 10-14, 16, para graph 1 (a) and (b), 18, paragraph 1, 19-22, 24 and 26, paragraph 2, of Annex II.

B. The Hellenic Government avails itself of the following reservations provided in Annex II:

(1) The reservation in Article 3, paragraph 3 of Article 2 of the Uniform Law being replaced by the words: "A cheque which does not specify the place of payment shall be regarded as payable at the place where it was drawn".

(2) The reservation in Article 4, the following paragraph being added to Article 3: "A cheque issued and payable in Greece shall not be valid as a cheque unless it is drawn on a banking Company or Greek legal person having the status of an institution of public law, engaging in banking business".

(3) The reservation in Article 9, the following provision being added to paragraph 3 of Article 6 of the Uniform Law: "But in such exceptional case the issue of the cheque to bearer is prohibited."

(4) The reservation in Article 15, the following paragraph being added to Article 31 of the Uniform Law: "By presidential decree, promulgated at the instance of the Ministers of Justice and National Economy, it may be decided what institutions in Greece are to be regarded as clearing-houses."

(5) The reservation in the second paragraph of Article 16, it being laid down that "provisions with regard to the loss or theft of cheques shall be embodied in Greek law".

(6) The reservation in Article 17, the following paragraph being added at the end of Article 35: "In exceptional circumstances connected with the rate of exchange of Greek currency, the effects of the stipulation contained in paragraph 3 of the present Article may be abrogated in each case by special legislation as regards cheques payable in Greece. The above provision may also be applied as regards cheques issued in Greece."

(7) The reservation in Article 23, the following being added to No. 2 in Article 45 of the Uniform Law: "which, however, in the case of cheques issued and payable in Greece, shall be calculated in each case at the legal rate of interest in force in Greece". Similarly, the following is added to No. 2 of Article 46 of the Uniform Law: "except in the special case dealt with in No. 2 of the preceding Article".

(8) The reservation in Article 25, the following Article being added to the National Law: "In the event of forfeiture of the bearer's rights or limitation of the right of action, proceedings may be taken against the drawer or endorser on the ground of his having made an inequitable gain. The right to take such proceedings lapses after three years from the date of the issue of the cheque."

(9) The reservation in the first paragraph of Article 26, a provision being enacted to the following effect: "The causes of interruption or suspension of limitation of actions enacted in the present law shall be governed by the rules regarding limitation and short-term limitation of actions."

(10)The reservation in Article 27, a separate Article being appended in the following terms: "Legal holidays within the meaning of the present law shall be all Sundays and all full days of rest observed by public offices."

(11)The reservation in Article 28 and the reservation in Article 29.

(12)The reservation in Article 30.

Italy (August 31st, 1933)

In accordance with Article 1 of this Convention, the Royal Italian Government intends to avail itself of the rights provided in Articles 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 9, 10, 14, 16, para. 2, 19, 20, 21, para. 2, 23, 25, 26, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

In connection with Article 15 of Annex II to this Convention, the institutions referred to in the said article are, in Italy, solely the "Stanze di compensazione".

Japan (August 25th, 1933)

By application of Article I, paragraph 2, of the Convention, this ratification is subject to the benefit of the provisions mentioned in Annex II to this Convention.

Monaco (February 9th, 1933)

The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)[6,7] (April 2nd, 1934)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (September 30th, 1935 a)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Surinam (August 7th, 1936 a)

Subject to the reservations mentioned in Annex II to the Convention.

Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 a)

Norway[8] (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (a) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Norwegian Government reserves the right, at the same time, to avail itself of the right granted to each of the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26, 27 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Poland (December 19th, 1936 a)

This accession is given subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 15, 16, paragraph 1 (a), 16, paragraph 2, 17, 23, 24, 25, 26, 28, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

Portugal[6,9] (June 8th, 1934)

Sweden[10] (July 27th, 1932)

This ratification is subject to the reservations mentioned in Articles 4, 6, 9, 14, paragraph 1, 16 (a) and 18 of Annex II to the Convention, and the Royal Swedish Government has availed itself of the right granted to the High Contracting Parties by Articles 25, 26 and 29 of the said Annex to legislate on the matters referred to therein.

Switzerland[11] (August 26th, 1932)

This ratification is given subject to the reservationsmentioned in Articles 2, 4, 8, 15, 16, paragraph 2, 19, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29 and 30 of Annex II.

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Czechoslovakia[12]
Ecuador
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia (former)[13]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (See also notes 2, 3, 4, 8, 9 and 10)

Participant[14]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria[15]	1 Dec 1958
Azerbaijan	30 Aug 2000 a
Belgium[16]	18 Dec 1961
Hungary[17]	28 Oct 1964 a
Indonesia	9 Mar 1959 d
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania	10 Feb 1997 a
Luxembourg	1 Aug 1968 a
Malawi[18]	[3 Nov 1965 a]

Notes:

[1] Registered No.3316. League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.143, p.355.

[2] In a communication received on 31 January 1966, the Government of Denmark notified the Secretary-General of the following: "As from December 1, 1965, the Danish laws giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the Convention were amended to provide that Saturdays shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article 1 of the Convention."

In the same communication, the Government of Denmark also notified the Secretary-General that the declaration made on its behalf under article X, paragraph 1, of the Convention upon its ratification to the effect that it "does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland", should be considered as withdrawn as from 1 July 1965.

[3] In a communication received on 29 July, the Government of Finland notified the Secretary-General of the following: "As from 1 June 1966, the First of May an Saturdays of Jue, July and August shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention."

In a communication received on 6 June 1977, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"As from 1 April 1968, the Finnish laws giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the two Conventions were amended to provide that Staturdays throughout the year shall be assimilated to legal holidays. This communication should be considered as a notification made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I [of the Convention]."

[4] The Secretary-General received, on 7 February 1979, from the Government of France the following communication:

The French Government is at present conducting a campaign against tax fraud. To this end, it has, inter alia, taken measures to impose restrictions on the endorsing of cheques; these measures are embodied in the French Finance Act of 1979.

These measures may well be deemed to conflict with the Convention of 19 March 1931 providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, for which the United Nations has assumed depositary functions. France has been a party to that Convention since 27 April 1936.

Accordingly, in order to avoid any conflict between French domestic legislation and the provisions of the Convention, the French Government intends to make, with respect to articles 5 and 14 of annex I, the reservation provided for in annex II, article 7, of the Convention of 19 March 1931.

Since no objections by the Contracting States were received within 90 days from the date of circulation of this communication by the Secretary-General (effected on 10 February 1979), the reservation was deemed accepted and took effect on 11 May 1979.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 20 February 1980, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has taken note of the communication of the French Government on the Convention of 19 March 1931 providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, which was received by the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 7 February 1979 and distributed with circular note C.N.29.1979.Treaties-1 of 10 February 1979 of the Acting Director of the General Legal Division and which informed about the modification of France's membership of the Convention effected by the said communication, and raises no objections thereto."

[5] The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic informed the Secretariat on October 20th, 1937, that, in consequence of certain changes introduced into French legislation regarding the maturity of commercial bills by the Decree-Law of August 31st, 1937, and in application of Article 27 of Annex II to the Convention and Article II of the Final Act of the Conference by which it was adopted, no payment whatsoever, in respect of a bill, draft cheque, current account, deposit of funds or securities or otherwise, may be demanded and no protest may be drawn up on Saturdays or Mondays, which for these purposes only, are assimilated to legal holidays.

[6] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[7] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a communication received on 15 April 1970, the Government of Norway notified the Secretary-General that as from 1 June 1970, legislation would be promulgated in Norway assimilating Saturdays and the first day of the month of May to legal holidays.

[9] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.143, p.361). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 29 September and 19 October 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portgual and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[10] In a communication received on 16 May 1961, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General that the Swedish Government, after having obtained the approval of the Parliament, promulgated on 7 April 1961 the law under which Saturdays from 1 June to 30September of each year shall be assimilated to legal holidays for the purposes including the presentation for acceptance or payment and all other acts relating to bills of exchange. The Government of Sweden further requested that this communication be considered as a notification of reservations made in accordance with the third paragraph of article I of the Convention.

In a communication received on 18 June 1965, the Government of Sweden notified the Secretary-General of the following: on 26 May 1965, the Swedish Government, with the approval of the Parliament, promulgated legal provisions under which the Swedish law giving effect to the uniform legislation introduced by the Convention was amended to provide that Saturdays shall be assimilated to legal holidays, as is already the case with the Saturdays of April, May, June, July, August and September. These provisions will enter into force on 1 October 1965.

[11] According to the declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[12] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[13] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[14] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the applica tion, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 19 March 1931 providing a Uniform Law for Cheques, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention providing a Uniform Law for cheques of 19 March 1931 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[15] The ratification by the Government of Austria is made subject to the reservations contained in articles 6, 14, 15, 16 (paragraph 2), 17, 18, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29 and 30 of Annex II to the Convention.

In a communication received on 26 November 1968, the Government of Austria, with reference to the reservations provided for in article 27 of Annex II to the Convention, specified legal holidays or days assimilated to such holidays as regards the limit of time for presentment and all acts relating to cheques. For the list of holidays, see the second paragraph of note 2 in Part II.10 in the League of Nations Treaties.

[16] With a declaration that, in accordance with article X of the Convention, the Government of Belgium does not intend to assume any obligations in respect of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi. Moreover the Government of Belgium reserves its right to avail itself of all the provisions of Annex II to the Convention.

[17] The instrument of accession contains the following reservation:

"In accordance with article 30 of Annex II to the Convention, the Hungarian People's Republic declares that the Uniform Law for Cheques shall not be applicable to the special kinds of cheques used in inland trade between Socialist economic organizations."

In a communication received on 5 January 1966, the Government of Hungary, with reference to the third paragraph of article I of the Convention and article 27 of Annex II to the Convention, notified the Secretary-General that "in respect of cheques, no payment may be demanded in Hungary on legal holidays". The list of holidays is as follows: 1 January (New Year's Day), 6 January (Epiphany), Good Friday, Easter Monday, 1 May (Legal Holiday), Ascension, Whit-Monday, Corpus Christi, 15 August (Assumption), 26 October (National Day), 1 November (All Saints' Day), 8 December (Immaculate Conception), 25 December and 26 December (Christmas), Saturdays and Sundays"..

[18] In a communication received on 30 July 1968, the Government of Malawi informed the Secretary-General that it denounced the Convention under the procedure provided in the third paragraph of article 8 of the Convention, which read as follows:

"In urgent cases a High Contracting Party which denounces the Convention shall immediately notify direct all other High Contracting Parties, and the denunciation shall take effect two days after the receipt of such notification by the said High Contracting Parties. A High Contracting Party denouncing the Convention in these circumstances shall also inform the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its decision."

And that, in accordance with the above-mentioned provisions, the denunciation took effect on 5 October 1967 in respect of France; on 8 October 1967 in respect of Austria, Denmark, Italy and Norway; on 9 October 1968 in respect of Portugal and Sweden; on 13 october 1967 in respect of Finland; on 14 October 1967 in respect of Poland; on 15 October 1967 in respect of Brazil, Greece, Hungary, Indonesia and Monaco; on 18 October 1967 in respect of Belgium and Switzerland; and on 24 April 1968 in respect of Japan.

The Government of Malawi further informed the Secretary-General that it no longer considered itself bound by the Convention in respect of Nicaragua, the Government of that State having not acknowledged, inspite of several requests, the notification of denunciation addressed to it by the Government of Malawi, and that it had so notified the Government of Nicaragua. Subsequently, in a communication addressed to the Secretary-General on 19 March 1969, the Government of Malawi informed him that the latter notification had been received by the Government of Nicaragua on 17 January 1969.

12. Convention on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes

Geneva, 7 June 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 January 1934, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 1 January 1934, No. 3315[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (August 31st, 1932)
Belgium (August 31st, 1932)
Brazil (August 26th, 1942 a)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (April 18th, 1934 a)

His Majesty does not assume any obligations in respect of any of his Colonies or Protectorates or any territories under mandate exercised by his Government in the United Kingdom.

Newfoundland (May 7th, 1934 a)

Subject to the provision D.I. in the Protocol of the Convention

Barbados (with limitation)[2], Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda (with limitation), British Guiana (with limitation), British Honduras, Ceylon (with limita tion), Cyprus (with limitation), Fiji (with limitation), Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar (with limitation), Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Kenya (Colony and Protectorate) (with limitation), Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei (with limitation)],Malta, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate) (with limita tion), Straits Settlements (with limitation), Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago (with limitation), Uganda Protectorate (with limitation), Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent) (with limitation) (July 18th, 1936 a)

Bahamas (with limitation), British Solomon Islands Protectorate (with limitation), Falkland Islands and Dependencies (with limitation), Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony (with limitation), Mauritius, Saint Helena and Ascension (with limitation), Tanganyika Territory (with limitation), Tonga (with limitation), Trans-Jordan (with limitation), Zanzibar (with limitation) (September 7th, 1938 a)

Jamaica, including the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands (with limitation), Somaliland Protector ate (with limitation)(August 3rd, 1939 a)

Australia[3] (September 3rd, 1939 a)

Including the territories of *Papua* and *Norfolk Island* and the mandated territories of *New Guinea* and *Nauru*.

It is agreed that, insofar as concerns the Commonwealth of Australia, the only instruments to which the provisions of this Convention shall apply are bills of exchange presented for acceptance or accepted or payable elsewhere than in the Commonwealth of Australia.

A similar limitation shall apply in the case of Territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territories of New Guinea and Nauru.

Ireland[4] (July 10th, 1936 a)
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)

The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Con vention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.

Finland (August 31st, 1932)
France (April 27th, 1936 a)
Germany[5] (October 3rd, 1933)
Italy (August 31st, 1932)
Japan (August 31st, 1932)
Monaco (January 25th, 1934 a)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)[6] (August 20th, 1932)
Netherlands Indies and Curaçao (July 16th, 1935 a)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 a)
New Hebrides (with limitation) (March 16th, 1939 a)
Norway (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936 a)
Portugal[5,7] (June 8th, 1934)
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[8] (August 26th, 1932)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (November 25th, 1936 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Colombia
Czechoslovakia[9]
Ecuador
Peru
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia (forme)[13]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7,10]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Bahamas[11]	19 May 1976 d
Belarus	4 Feb 1998 d
Cyprus[12]	5 Mar 1968 d
Fiji[12]	25 Mar 1971 d
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 a
Kazakhstan	20 Nov 1995 a
Luxembourg	5 Mar 1963
Malaysia	14 Jan 1960 d
Malta	6 Dec 1966 d
Papua New Guinea	12 Feb 1981 a
Tonga[12]	2 Feb 1972 d
Uganda	15 Apr 1965 a
Ukraine	8 Oct 1999 a

PAPUA NEW GUINEA

"It is agreed that, insofar as concerns Papua New Guinea, the only instruments to which the provisions of the Convention shall apply are bills of exchange presented for acceptance or accepted or payable elsewhere than in Papua New Guinea."

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.143, p.337.

[2] The words "with limitation" placed after the names of certain territories indicate that the limitation contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention applies to these territories.

[3] This limitation was accepted by the States parties to the Convention, which were consulted in accordance with Section D, paragraph 4, of the Protocol of the said Convention.

[4] The Government of Ireland having informed the Secretary-General of the League of Nations of its desire to be allowed the limitation specified in paragraph 1 of Section D of the Protocol to this Convention, the Secretary-General has transmitted this desire to the interested States in application of paragraph 4 of the above-mentioned Section. No objection having been raised on the part of the said States, this limitation should be considered as accepted.

[5] All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

[6] See note 8 in chapter I.1.

[7] The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Portugal (see League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.143, p.339). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Portugal (29 September 1999):

"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Macau signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macau until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macau."

China (19 October 1999):

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999. Macau will, from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

It is provided both in Section VIII of Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Macau, which is Annex I to the Joint Declaration, and Article 138 of the Basic Law of the Macau Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 31 March 1993 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not yet a party but which are implemented in Macau may continue to be implemented in the Macau Special Administrative Region.

In accordance with the above provisions, [the Government of the People's Republic of China informs the Secretary-General of the following:]

The Convention on the Stamp Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes (and Protocol), done at Geneva on 7 June 1930 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention and the Protocol"), which applies to Macau at present, will continue to apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999.

Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Convention and the Protocol.

[8] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[9] See note 11 in chapter I.2.

[10] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the applica tion, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 7 June 1930 on the Stamp Laws in connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention on the Stamp Laws in Connection with Bills of Exchange and Promissory Notes of 7 June 1930 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See note 14 in chapter I.2.

[11] Maintaining the limitations contained in Section D of the Protocol to the Convention, subject to which the Convention was made applicable to its territory.

[12] Maintaining the limitations contained in Section D of the Protocol of the Convention subject to which the Convention was made applicable to its territory before the attainment of independence.

[13] See notes 1 regarding "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

13. CONVENTION ON THE STAMP LAWS IN CONNECTION WITH CHEQUES

Geneva, 19 March 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 29 November 1933, in accordance with article 5.
REGISTRATION: 29 November 1933, No. 3301[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Brazil (August 26th, 1942 a)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland (January 13th, 1932)
This ratification does not include any British Colony or Protectorate or any mandated territory in respect of which the mandate is exercised by His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom.
Barbados, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana , British Honduras, Ceylon, Cyprus, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu, and Brunei], Malta, Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland Protectorate, Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Straits Settlements, Swaziland, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent) (July 18th, 1936 a)
Bahamas, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Mauritius, Saint Helena and Ascencion, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trans-Jordan, Zanzibar (September 7th, 1938 a)
Jamaica, including the Turks and Caicos Islands and the Cayman Islands (August 3rd, 1939 a)
Somaliland Protectorate (August 3rd, 1939 a)
Australia (September 3rd, 1938 a)
Including the territories of Papua and Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of New Guinea and Nauru
Ireland (July 10th, 1936 a)
Denmark (July 27th, 1932)
The Government of the King, by its acceptance of this Convention, does not intend to assume any obligations as regards Greenland.
Finland (August 31st, 1932)
France (April 27, 1936 a)
Germany[2,8] (October 3rd, 1933)
Greece[2] (June 1st, 1934)
Italy (August 31st, 1933)
Japan (August 25th, 1933)
Monaco (February 9th, 1933)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)[2,3] (April 2nd, 1934)
Netherlands Indies and Curacao (September 30th, 1935 a)
Surinam (August 7th, 1936 a)
New Hebrides (March 16th, 1939 a)
Nicaragua (March 16th, 1932 a)
Norway (July 27th, 1932)
Poland (December 19th, 1936 a)
Portugal[2,4] (June 8th, 1934)
Sweden (July 27th, 1932)
Switzerland[5] (August 26th, 1932)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Czechoslovakia[6]
Ecuador
Mexico
Romania
Spain
Turkey
Yugoslavia (former)[7]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[8]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Austria	1 Dec 1958
Bahamas	19 May 1976 d
Belgium[9]	18 Dec 1961
Cyprus	5 Mar 1968 d
Fiji	25 Mar 1971 d
Hungary	28 Oct 1964 a
Indonesia	9 Mar 1959 d
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Luxembourg	1 Aug 1968 a
Malaysia	14 Jan 1960 d
Malta	6 Dec 1966 d
Papua New Guinea	12 Feb 1981 a
Tonga	2 Feb 1972 d

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 143, p.7.

2 All the parties to this Convention have agreed to consider the instrument of ratification deposited by this country, after the date stipulated in the Convention, as valid. The Japanese Government, however, is of opinion that this ratification has the character of an accession.

3 See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4 The ratification was made subject to the reservation that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to the colonial territory of Por-

tugal (see ibid., vol. 143, p. 9). In a communication received on 18 August 1953, the Government of Portugal notificid the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of this reservation. Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 29 September and 19 October 1999, communications concerning the status of Macao from Portgual and China (see also note 3 under "China" and note 1 under "Portugal" regarding Macao in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region.

[5] According to a declaration made by the Swiss Government when depositing the instrument of ratification of this Convention, the latter was to take effect, in respect of Switzerland, only after the adoption of a law revising Sections XXIV to XXXIII of the Federal Code of Obligations or, if necessary, of a special law regarding bills of exchange, promissory notes and cheques. The law above referred to having entered into force on July 1st, 1937, the Convention took effect, for Switzerland, as from that date.

[6] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 13 January 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the applica tion, as from 6 June 1958, of the Convention of 19 March 1931 on the Stamp Laws in connection with Cheques, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 28 April 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention on the Stamp Laws in Connection with Cheques of 19 March 1931 to which it acceded on the basis of the succession of States."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] With a declaration that, in accordance with article 9 of the Convention, the Government of Belgium does not intend to assume any obligations in respect of the Trust Territory of Ruanda-Urundi.

14. a) International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency

Geneva, 20 April 1929

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 February 1931, in accordance with article 25.
REGISTRATION: 22 February 1931, No. 2623[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (June 25th, 1931)
Belgium (June 6th, 1932)
Brazil (July 1st, 1938 a)
Bulgaria (May 22nd, 1930)
Colombia (May 9th, 1932)
Cuba (June 13th, 1933)
Czechoslovakia[2] (September 12th, 1931)
Denmark[3] (February 19th, 1931)
Ecuador (September 25th, 1937 a)
Estonia (August 30th, 1930 a)
Finland (September 25th, 1936 a)
Germany[8] (October 3rd, 1933)
Greece (May 19th, 1931)
Hungary (June 14th, 1933)
Ireland (July 24th, 1934 a)
Italy (December 27th, 1935)
Latvia (July 22nd, 1939 a)
Mexico (March 30th, 1936 a)
Monaco (October 21st, 1931)
The Netherlands (April 30th, 1932)
Norway[4] (March 16th, 1931)

In view of the provisions of Article 176, paragraph 2, of the Norwegian Ordinary Criminal Code and Article 2 of the Norwegian Law on the Extradition of Criminals, the extradition provided for in Article 10 of the present Convention may not be granted for the offence referred to in Article 3, No. 2, where the person uttering the counterfeit currency himself accepted it bona fide as genuine.

Poland (June 15th, 1934)
Portugal (September 18th, 1930)
Romania (March 7th, 1939)
Spain (April 28th, 1930)
Turkey (January 21st, 1937 a)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics[5] (July 13th, 1931)
Yugoslavia (former)[6] (November 24th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
United States of America
India

As provided in Article 24 of the Convention, this signature does not include the territories of any Prince or Chief under the suzerainty of His Majesty.

China[7]
Japan
Luxembourg
Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[8,9]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Algeria[10]	17 Mar 1965 a
Australia	5 Jan 1982 a
Bahamas	9 Jul 1975 d
Belarus	23 Aug 2001 d
Benin	17 Mar 1966 a
Burkina Faso	8 Dec 1964 a
Côte d'Ivoire	25 May 1964 a
Croatia	30 Dec 2003 d
Cyprus	10 Jun 1965 a
Czech Republic	9 Feb 1996 d
Egypt	15 Jul 1957 a
Fiji	25 Mar 1971 d
France	28 Mar 1958
Gabon	11 Aug 1964 a
Georgia	20 Jul 2000 a
Ghana	9 Jul 1964 a
Holy See	1 Mar 1965 a
Indonesia[11]	3 Aug 1982 a
Iraq	14 May 1965 a
Israel	10 Feb 1965 a
Kenya	10 Nov 1977 a
Kuwait	9 Dec 1968 a
Lebanon	6 Oct 1966 a
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania	2 Apr 2004 a
Luxembourg	14 Mar 2002
Malawi	18 Nov 1965 a
Malaysia[12]	4 Jul 1972 a
Mali	6 Jan 1970 a
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Morocco[13]	4 May 1976 a
Niger	5 May 1969 a
Peru	11 May 1970 a
Philippines[14]	5 May 1971 a
San Marino	18 Oct 1967 a
Senegal	25 Aug 1965 a

Participant[8,9]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Singapore	12 Feb 1979 d
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 d
Slovenia	9 May 2006 d
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa	28 Aug 1967 a
Sri Lanka	2 Jun 1967 a
Sweden	15 Mar 2001 a
Switzerland	30 Dec 1948
Syrian Arab Republic[15]	14 Aug 1964
Thailand	6 Jun 1963 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	7 Mar 2005 d
Togo	3 Oct 1978 a
Uganda	15 Apr 1965 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	28 Jul 1959
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

BELARUS

Declaration:

The Republic of Belarus is not to be bound by the reservation on Article 20 of the Convention concerning the special order of transmitting the instrument of ratification to the Depositary and the declaration on Article 19 of the Convention concerning the non-recognition of jurisdiction of the Permanent Court of International Justice and of a Court of Arbitration as the means of the Settlement of Disputes between States, made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republic on signing the Convention.

LUXEMBOURG

Declaration:

The public prosecutor is designated to act as the central office in the meaning of article 12 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency signed at Geneva on 20 April 1929.

The designation of the public prosecutor as central office shall not prejudice the execution of the mission specified in articles 12 to 16 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency or in the community legislative acts relating to the protection of the euro against counterfeiting by the authorities or legally authorized national organs, subject to the procedure to be determined, if necessary, by the public prosecutor in his capacity as central office.

Notifications made under article 12 and 15 of the Convention
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

AUSTRIA

CYPRUS

CZECH REPUBLIC

DENMARK

ESTONIA

FINLAND

FRANCE

GERMANY

GREECE

IRELAND

ITALY

LATVIA

LUXEMBOURG

NETHERLANDS

POLAND

PORTUGAL

SPAIN

12 June 2006

[Same notifications as the ones made by Belgium.]

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

9 February 2006

[Same notifications as the one made under Belgium.]

BELGIUM

2 mars 2006

Belgium, a Member State of the European Union, has given the European Police Office (hereinafter referred to as Europol) a mandate to combat euro counterfeiting.

In order for the Geneva Convention of 1929 to function more effectively, Belgium shall in future fulfil its obligations as follows:

1. With regard to euro counterfeiting, Europol shall perform - in the framework of its objective according to the Council Act of 26 July 1995 on the establishment of a European Police Office (Europol Convention) [OJ C 316, 27.11.1995, p. 1] - the following central office functions within the meaning of Articles 12 to 15 of the Geneva Convention of 1929.

1.1.Europol shall centralise and process, in accordance with the Europol Convention, all information of a nature to facilitate the investigation, prevention and combating of euro counterfeiting and shall forward this information without delay to the national central offices of the Member States.

1.2.In accordance with the Europol Convention, in particular in accordance with Article 18 thereof and the Council Act of 12 March 1999 adopting the rules governing the transmission of personal data by Europol to third States and third bodies [OJ C 88, 30.3.1999 p. 1. Council Act as amended by Council Act of 28 February 2002 (OJ C 76, 27.3.2002, p. 1)], Europol shall correspond directly with the central offices of third countries to fulfil the tasks set down in points 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 of this Declaration.

1.3.Europol shall, insofar as it considers it expedient, forward to the central offices of third countries a set of specimens of actual euro.

1 .4.Europol shall regularly notify the central offices of third countries, giving all necessary particulars, of new currency issued and the withdrawal of currency from circulation.

1.5.Except in cases of purely local interest, Europol shall, insofar as it considers it expedient, notify the central offices of third countries of:

any discovery of counterfeit or falsified Euro currency. Notification of the counterfeit or falsification shall be accompanied by a technical description of the counterfeit, to be provided solely by the institution whose notes have been counterfeited. A photographic reproduction or, if possible, a specimen counterfeited note should be transmitted. In urgent cases, a notification and a brief description made by the police authorities may be discreetly communicated to the central offices interested, without prejudice to the notification and technical description mentioned above;

details of discoveries of counterfeiting, stating whether it has been possible to seize all the counterfeit currency put into circulation.

1.6.As central office for the Member States, Europol shall participate in conferences dealing with euro counterfeiting within the meaning of Article 15 of the Geneva Convention.

1.7.Where Europol is unable to carry out the tasks specified in points 1.1. to 1.6. in accordance with the Europol Convention, the national central offices of the Member States shall retain competence.

2. With regard to the counterfeiting of all other currencies and for central office functions not delegated to Europol in accordance with point 1, the existing competencies of the national central offices shall remain in effect.

LATVIA

9 June 2005

"Central authority:
Economic Police Department of theCentral Criminal
Police Department of theState Police
Stabu iela 89,
Rïga, LV-1009
Latvia
Phone: +371 7208 663
Fax: +371 7208 706
e-mail: epb@vp.gov.lv"

LITHUANIA

"... in accordance with Article 12 of the said Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania designates the Police Department under the Ministry of the Interior of the Republic of Lithuania as a Central Authority to discharge the duties imposed by the Convention;

... it is provided in Article 16, paragraph 4, of the Convention, the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that requests under Article 16 shall be communicated to its authorities only through its Central Authority."

SLOVAKIA

25 July 2006

"Slovak Republic, a Member State of the European Union, has given the European Police Office (hereinafter referred to as "Europol") a mandate to combat euro counterfeiting.

In order for the Geneva Convention of 1929 to function more effectively, Slovak Republic shall in future fulfil its obligations as follows:

1. With regard to euro counterfeiting, Europol shall perform - in the framework of its objective according to the Council Act of 26 July 1995 on the establishment of a European Police Office (Europol Convention) [OJ C 316, 27.11.1995, p. 1]

- the following central office functions within the meaning of Articles 12 to 15 of the Geneva Convention of 1929.

1. 1. Europol shall centralise and process, in accordance with the Europol Convention, all information of a nature to facilitate the investigation, prevention and combating of euro counterfeiting and shall forward this information without delay to the national central offices of the Member States.

1. 2. In accordance with the Europol Convention, in particular in accordance with Article 18 thereof and the Council Act of 12 March 1999 adopting the rulesgoverning the transmission of personal data by Europol to third States and third bodies [OJ C 88, 30.3.1999 p. 1. Council Act as amended by Council Act of 28 February 2002 (OJ C 76, 27.3.2002, p. 1)], Europol shall correspond directly with the central offices of third countries to fulfil the tasks set down in points 1.3, 1.4 and 1.5 of this Declaration.

1. 3. Europol shall, insofar as it considers it expedient, forward to the central offices of third countries a set of specimens of actual euro.

1. 4. Europol shall regularly notify the central offices of third countries, giving all necessary particulars, of new currency issued and the withdrawal of currency from circulation.

1. 5. Except in cases of purely local interest, Europol shall, insofar as it considers it expedient, notify the central offices of third countries of:

any discovery of counterfeit or falsified Euro currency. Notification of the counterfeit or falsification shall be accompanied by a technical description of the counterfeit, to be provided solely by the institution whose notes have been counterfeited. A photographic reproduction or, if possible, a specimen counterfeited note should be transmitted. In urgent cases, a notification and a brief description made by the police authorities may be discreetly communicated to the central offices interested, without prejudice to the notification and technical description mentioned above;

details of discoverics of counterfeiting, stating whether it has been possible to seize all the counterfeit currency put into circulation.

1. 6. As central office for the Member States, Europol shall participate in conferences dealing with euro counterfeiting within the meaning of Article 15 of the Geneva Convention.

1. 7. Where Europol is unable to carry out the tasks specified in points 1.1. to 1.6. in accordance with the Europol Convention, the national central offices of the Member States shall retain competence.

2. With regard to the counterfeiting of all other currencies and for central office functions not delegated to Europol in accordance with point 1, the existing competencies of the national central offices shall remain in effect".

Accessions in respect of territories

Participant:	*Territory:*	*Date of notification:*
Netherlands[16]	22 Mar 1954	Netherlands Antilles and Surinam
United Kingdom[17]	13 Oct 1960	Antigua, Bahamas, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Falkland Island, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Montserrat, North Borneo, St. Christopher-Nevis and Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Sarawak, Sierra Leone, State of Singapore, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Trinidad, Uganda, Zanzibar
	7 Mar 1963	Barbados and its dependencies

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.112, p.371.

[2] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

[4] The reservation by Norway has not given rise to any objection on the part of the States to which it was communicated in accordance with Article 22, it may be considered as accepted.

[5] Instrument deposited in Berlin.

[6] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[7] See note concerning signatures, ratifications and accession made on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[8] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the International Convention of 20April 1929 for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroac tive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, April 20th, 1929 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[9] The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention and the Protocol on 3 December 1964. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[10] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article 19 of the Convention, which confers upon the International Court of Justice jurisdiction with respect to any disputes concerning the Convention.

The jurisdiction of international tribunals may be accepted, by way of exception, in cases with respect to which the Algerian Government shall have expressly given its consent.

[11] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19 of this Convention but takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice for decision, only with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

[12] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"The Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19 of the Convention."

[13] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention: The Kingdom of Morocco does not consider itself bound by article 19 of the Convention which provides that any disputes which might arise relating to the said Convention shall be settled by the Permanent Court of International Justice.

However, it may accept the jurisdiction of the International Court, by way of exception, in cases where the Moroccan Government expressly states that it accepts such jurisdiction.

[14] With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"Articles 5 and 8 of the Convention shall be inoperative with respect to the Philippines unless and until Article 163 of the Revised Penal Code and Section 14 (a), Rule 110, of the Rules of the Court in the Philippines, shall have been amended to conform to the said provisions of the Convention."

[15] In a communication received on 14 August 1964, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, referring to Presidential decrec No.1147 of 20 June 1959, pursuant to which the application of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency and Protocol, done at Geneva on 30 April 1929, was extended to the Syrian Province of the United Arab Republic, and to décret-loi No.25 promulgated on 13 June 1962 by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic (see also note 1 under "United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria)" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume) has informed the Secretary-General that the Syrian Arab Republic considers itself a party to the said Convention and Protocol as from 20 June 1959. See also note 1 under "United Arab Republic (Egypt and Syria)" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[16] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[17] See note 1 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

14. b) Protocol to the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency

Geneva, 20 April 1929

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 February 1931.
REGISTRATION: 22 February 1931, No. 2623[1].

Note: The Protocol came into force at the same time as the Convention, of which it forms an integral part, and was registered under the same number.

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(June 25th, 1931)	Ireland	(July 24th, 1934 a)
Belgium	(June 6th, 1932)	Italy	(December 27th, 1935)
Brazil	(July 1st, 1938 a)	Latvia	(July 22nd, 1939 a)
Bulgaria	(May 22nd, 1930)	Mexico	(March 30th, 1936 a)
Colombia	(May 9th, 1932)	Monaco	(October 21st, 1931)
Cuba	(June 13th, 1933)	The Netherlands	(April 30th, 1932)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 12th, 1931)	Norway	(March 16th, 1931)
Denmark[3]	(February 19th, 1931)	Poland	(June 15th, 1934)
Ecuador	(September 25th, 1937 a)	Portugal	(September 18th, 1930)
Estonia	(August 30th, 1930 a)	Romania	(March 7th, 1939)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 a)	Spain	(April 28th, 1930)
Germany[7]	(October 3rd, 1933)	Turkey	(January 21st, 1937 a)
Greece	(May 19th, 1931)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics[4]	(July 13th, 1931)
Hungary	(June 14th, 1933)	Yugoslavia (former)[5]	(November 24th, 1930)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Albania
United States of America
China[6]
Japan
India
Luxembourg
Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7,8]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Algeria[9]	17 Mar 1965 a
Australia	5 Jan 1982 a
Bahamas	9 Jul 1975 a
Belarus	23 Aug 2001 d
Benin	17 Mar 1966 a
Burkina Faso	8 Dec 1964 a
Côte d'Ivoire	25 May 1964 a
Cyprus	10 Jun 1965 a
Egypt	15 Jul 1957 a
Fiji	25 Mar 1971 d
France	28 Mar 1958
Gabon	11 Aug 1964 a
Georgia	20 Jul 2000 a
Ghana	9 Jul 1964 a
Holy See	1 Mar 1965 a
Indonesia[10]	3 Aug 1982 a
Iraq	14 May 1965 a
Israel	10 Feb 1965 a
Kuwait	9 Dec 1968 a
Lebanon	6 Oct 1966 a
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Lithuania	2 Apr 2004 a
Luxembourg	14 Mar 2002
Malawi	18 Nov 1965 a
Malaysia[11]	4 Jul 1972 a
Mali	6 Jan 1970 a
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Niger	5 May 1969 a
Peru	11 May 1970 a
Philippines[12]	5 May 1971 a
San Marino	18 Oct 1967 a
Senegal	25 Aug 1965 a
Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 d
Slovenia	9 May 2006 d
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 d
South Africa	29 Aug 1967 a
Sri Lanka	2 Jun 1967 a
Sweden	15 Mar 2001 a
Switzerland	30 Dec 1958
Syrian Arab Republic[13]	14 Aug 1964
Thailand	6 Jun 1963 a
Togo	3 Oct 1978 a
Uganda	15 Apr 1965 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	28 Jul 1959

Participant:	*Territory:*	*Date of notification:*
Netherlands[14]	22 Mar 1954	Netherlands Antilles and Surinam
United Kingdom[15]	13 Oct 1960	Antigua, Bahamas, Basutoland, Bechuanaland Protectorate, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands, British Virgin Islands, Dominica, Falkland Island, Federation of Rhodesia and Nyasaland, Fiji, Gambia, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Grenada, Jamaica, Kenya, Mauritius, Montserrat, North Borneo, St.Christopher-Nevis and Anguilla, St.Lucia, St.Vincent, Sarawak, Sierra Leone, State of Singapore, Swaziland, Tanganyika, Trinidad, Uganda, Zanzibar
	7 Mar 1963	Barbados and its dependencies

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.112, p.371.

2 See notes 1 under "Czech Republic" and "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3 According to a Declaration made by the Danish Government when ratifying the Convention, the latter was to take effect in respect of Denmark only upon the coming into force of the Danish Penal Code of April 15th, 1930. This Code having entered into force on January 1st, 1933, the Convention has become effective for Denmark from the same date.

4 Instrument deposited in Berlin.

5 See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6 See note concerning signatures, ratifications and accession made on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

7 In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 2 March 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the applica tion, as from 6 June 1958, of the International Convention of 20April 1929 for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroac tive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the International Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency, April 20th, 1929 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

8 The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Convention and the Protocol on 3 December 1964. See also note 1 under "Viet Nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volument.

9 With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

The Democratic and Popular Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by article 19 of the Convention, which confers upon the International Court of Justice jurisdiction with respect to any disputes concerning the Convention.

The jurisdiction of international tribunals may be accepted, by way of exception, in cases with respect to which the Algerian Government shall have expressly given its consent.

10 With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19 of this Convention but takes the position that any dispute relating to the interpreta tion or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice for decision, only with the agreement of all the parties to the dispute.

11 With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"The Government of Malaysia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 19 of the Convention.".

12 With the following reservation, which is deemed to have been accepted by the other Contracting Parties in accordance with article 22 of the Convention:

"Articles 5 and 8 of the Convention shall be inoperative with respect to the Philippines unless and until Article 163 of the Revised Penal Code and Section 14 (a), Rule 110, of the Rules of the Court in the Philippines, shall have been amended to conform to the said provisions of the Convention."

13 In a communication received on 14 August 1964, the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, referring to Presidential decree No.1147 of 20 June 1959, pursuant to which the application of the Convention for the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency and Protocol, done at Geneva on 30 April 1929, was extended to the Syrian Province of the United Arab Republic, and to décret-loi No.25 promulgated on 13 June 1962 by the President of the Syrian Arab Republic (see also note 1 under "United Arab Republic"(Egypt/Syria)" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume) has informed the Secretary-General that the Syrian Arab Republic considers itself a party to the said Convention and Protocol as from 20 June 1959. See also note 1 under "United ARab Republic (Egypt and Syria)" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

14 See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volumen

15 See note 1 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

15. Optional Protocol regarding the Suppression of Counterfeiting Currency

Geneva, 20 April 1929

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 30 August 1930.
REGISTRATION: 22 February 1931, No. 2624[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria	(June 25th, 1931)	Greece	(May 19th, 1931)
Brazil	(July 1st, 1938 a)	Latvia	(July 22nd, 1939 a)
Bulgaria	(May 22nd, 1930)	Poland	(June 15th, 1934)
Colombia	(May 9th, 1932)	Portugal	(September 18th, 1930)
Cuba	(June 13th, 1933)	Romania	(November 10th, 1930)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 12th, 1931)	Spain	(April 28th, 1930)
Estonia	(August 30th, 1930 a)	Yugoslavia (former)[3]	(November 24th, 1930)
Finland	(September 25th, 1936 a)		

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Panama

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Participant*[4]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Algeria	17 Mar 1965 a	Lithuania	2 Apr 2004 a
Burkina Faso	8 Dec 1964 a	Malawi	18 Nov 1965 a
Côte d'Ivoire	25 May 1964 a	Niger	5 May 1969 a
Cyprus	10 Jun 1965 a	Senegal	25 Aug 1965 a
Czech Republic[2]	9 Feb 1996 d	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 d
Gabon	11 Aug 1964 a	Slovenia	9 May 2006 d
Ghana	9 Jul 1964 a	Sri Lanka	2 Jun 1967 a
Iraq	14 May 1965 a	Sweden	15 Mar 2001 a
Israel	10 Feb 1965 a		
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a		

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 112, p. 395.

2 See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3 See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

4 The Republic of Viet-Nam had acceded to the Protocol on 3 December 1964. See also note 1 under "Viet nam" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

16. Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit

Barcelona, 20 April 1921

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 31 October 1922, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 8 October 1921, No. 171[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
Austria (November 15th, 1923)
Belgium (May 16th, 1927)
British Empire[2], including Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès-verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 a)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 a)
Palestine (January 28th, 1924 a)
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
India (August 2nd, 1922)
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia[3] (October 29th, 1923)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Estonia (June 6th, 1925)
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (September 19th, 1924)
Syria and Lebanon (February 7th, 1929 a)
Germany (April 9th, 1924 a)
Greece (February 18th, 1924)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 a)
Iran (January 29th, 1931)
Iraq (March 1st, 1930 a)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Japan (February 20th, 1924)
Latvia (September 29th, 1923)
Luxembourg (March 19th, 1930)
The Netherlands[4] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curacao*) (April 17th, 1924)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Poland (October 8th, 1924)
Romania (September 5th, 1923)
Spain (December 17th, 1929)
Sweden (January 19th, 1925)
Switzerland (July 14th, 1924)
Thailand (November 29, 1922 a)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 a)
Yugoslavia (former)[5] (May 7th, 1930)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia
China[6]
Ethiopia (a)
Guatemala
Lithuania
Panama
Peru (a)
Portugal
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2,7]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 d
Bosnia and Herzegovina	1 Sep 1993 d
Cambodia	12 Apr 1971 d
Croatia	3 Aug 1992 d
Czech Republic[3]	9 Feb 1996 d
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 d
Georgia	2 Jun 1999 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic	24 Nov 1956 d
Lesotho	23 Oct 1973 d
Liberia	16 Sep 2005 a
Malta	13 May 1966 d
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d
Nepal	22 Aug 1966 a
Nigeria	3 Nov 1967 a
Rwanda	10 Feb 1965 d
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5 Sep 2001 d
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 d
Slovenia	6 Jul 1992 d
Swaziland	24 Nov 1969 a
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.7, p.11.

[2] Subsequently, the Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

The notification made by the Government of China also contained the following reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that it has reservation to Article 13 of the [said Convention and Statute].

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[4] See note 1 under "Netherlands" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" and in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "China" and in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 3 September 1968, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, done at Barcelona on 20 April 1921, stated the following:

"As I mentioned in my previous letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Government regards all multilateral treaties validly applied to the former Nyasaland, including this Convention and Statute, as remaining in force on a reciprocal basis as between Malawi and any other party to the treaty, pending our notification to the depositary of the treaty confirming Malawi's succession, acceding in her own right, or terminating all legal connection therewith.

"On behalf of the Government of Malawi, I would now inform you, as depositary for this Convention and Statute, that my Government considers that as from this date any legal obligations and rights which may have devolved upon Malawi from the previous ratification by the United Kingdom are terminated. Accordingly, Malawi considers herself to have no further legal connection with the Convention and Statute on Freedom of Transit, signed at Barcelona on 20th April 1921. The Government of Malawi wishes, however, to reserve the right to accede to this Convention and Statute at a later date should this become necessary."

17. Convention and Statute on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern

Barcelona, 20 April 1921

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 31 October 1922, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 8 October 1921, No. 172[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
Austria (November 15th, 1923)
British Empire[2], including Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
Subject to the declaration inserted in the Procès- verbal of the meeting of April 19th, 1921, as to the British Dominions which have not been represented at the Barcelona Conference.
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 a)
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 a)
Palestine (January 28th, 1924 a)
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
India[3] [August 2nd, 1922]
Bulgaria (July 11th, 1922)
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Czechoslovakia[4] (September 8th, 1924)
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
France (December 31st, 1926)
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 a)
Italy (August 5th, 1922)
Luxembourg (March 19th, 1930)
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Romania (May 9th, 1924 a)
In so far as its provisions are not in conflict with the principles of the new Danube Statute drawn up by the International Commission which was appointed in accordance with Articles 349 of the Treaty of Versailles, 304 of the Treaty of Saint-Germain, 232 of the Treaty of Neuilly and 288 of the Treaty of Trianon.
Sweden (September 15th, 1927)
Thailand (November 29th, 1922 a)
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 a)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Belgium
Bolivia
China[5]
Colombia (a)
Estonia
Guatemala
Lithuania
Panama
Peru (a)
Poland
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2,6]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 d	
Cambodia	12 Apr 1971 d	
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 d	
India[3]		26 Mar 1956
Malta	13 May 1966 d	
Morocco	10 Oct 1972 a	
Nigeria	3 Nov 1967 a	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5 Sep 2001 d	
Slovakia[4]	28 May 1993 d	
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 d	
Swaziland	16 Oct 1970 a	
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d	

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 35.

2 The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kindom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

The notification made by the Government of China also contained the following reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that it has reservation to Article 22 of the [said Convention and Statute].

[3] With effect from 26 March 1957.

[4] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note regarding signatures, ratifications, accessions etc., on behalf of China (note1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[6] In a letter addressed to the Secretary-General on 21 March 1969, the President of the Republic of Malawi, referring to the Convention and Statute on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, done at Barcelona on 20 April 1921, stated the following:

"In my letter to you of the 24th November 1964, concerning the disposition of Malawi's inherited treaty obligations, my Goverrment declared that with respect to any multilateral treaty which was applied or extended to the former Nyasaland Protectorate, any Party to such a treaty could on the basis of reciprocity rely as against Malawi on the terms of that treaty until Malawi notified its depositary of what action it wished to take by way of confirmation of termination, confirmation of succession, or accession.

"I am to inform you as depositary of this Convention that the Government of Malawi now wishes to terminate any connection with this Convention which it might have inherited. The Government of Malawi considers that any legal relationship with the aforementioned Convention and Statute on the Régime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern, Barcelona, 1921 which might have devolved upon it by way of succession from the ratification of the United Kingdom, is terminated as of this date."

18. Additional Protocol to the Convention on the Regime of Navigable Waterways of International Concern

Barcelona, 20 April 1921

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 31 October 1922.
REGISTRATION: 8 October 1921, No. 173[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (October 8th, 1921)
Austria (November 15th, 1923 a)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (a) of the Protocol.
British Empire (August 2nd, 1922)
In respect of the United Kingdom only accepting paragraph (a).
Newfoundland (August 2nd, 1922)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (a).
Nyasaland Protectorate and Tanganyika Territory (August 2nd, 1922)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (b).*Bahamas, Barbados, British Guiana, British Solomon Islands, Ceylon, Cyprus, Fiji, Gambia Colony and Protectorate, Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands Colony, Gold Coast (Ashanti and Northern Territories), Hong-Kong, Jamaica (including Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya Colony and Protectorate, Leeward Islands, Malta, Mauritius, Nigeria Colony and Protectorate, Seychelles, Sierra Leone Colony and Protectorate, St. Helena, Straits Settlements, Tonga Islands, Trinidad and Tobago, Uganda Protectorate, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia and St. Vincent), Zanzibar* (August 2nd, 1922 a)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (a).
Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang (August 22nd, 1923 a)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (a).
Non-Federated Malay States: Brunei, Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan and Trengganu (August 22nd, 1923 a)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (a).
Palestine (January 28th, 1924 a)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a) of the Protocol.
Bermuda (December 27th, 1928 a)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a).
New Zealand (August 2nd, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (a).
India [August 2nd, 1922]
In respect of India only accepting paragraph (a).
Chile (March 19th, 1928)
Accepting paragraph (b).
Czechoslovakia[2] (September 8th, 1924)
Accepting paragraph (b).
Denmark (November 13th, 1922)
Accepting paragraph (a).
Finland (January 29th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (b).
Greece (January 3rd, 1928)
Hungary (May 18th, 1928 a)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a).
Luxembourg (March 19th, 1930)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a).
Norway (September 4th, 1923)
Accepting paragraph (a).
Romania (May 9th, 1924 a)
Is unable to accept any restriction of her liberty in administrative matters on the waterways which are not of interna tional concern, that is to say, on purely national rivers, while at the same time accepting the principles of liberty in accordance with the laws of the country.
Sweden (September 15th, 1927 a)
Accepting paragraph (b).
Thailand (November 29th, 1922 a)
To the full extent indicated under paragraph (a).
Turkey (June 27th, 1933 a)
To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a).

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Belgium
Accepting paragraph (a)
Peru (a)
Portugal
Spain
Accepting paragraph (a)

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Antigua and Barbuda[2]	25 Oct 1988 d	
Fiji[2]	15 Mar 1972 d	
India[5]		26 Mar 1956
Malta[2]	13 May 1966 d	
Morocco[3]	10 Oct 1972 a	
Nigeria[4]	3 Nov 1967 a	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5 Sep 2001 d	
Slovakia[6]	28 May 1993 d	
Solomon Islands[2]	3 Sep 1981 d	

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 65.

[2] To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a).

[3] With effect from 26 March 1957.

[4] To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a) "on all navigable waterways".

[5] To the full extent indicated in paragraph (a), namely, on condition of reciprocity on all navigable waterways.

[6] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

19. DECLARATION RECOGNISING THE RIGHT TO A FLAG OF STATES HAVING NO SEA-COAST

Barcelona, 20 April 1921

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 20 April 1921.
REGISTRATION: 8 October 1921, No. 174[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania	(October 8th, 1921)	Hungary	(May 18th, 1928 a)
Austria	(July 10th, 1924)	Iraq	(April 17th, 1935 a)
Belgium	(May 16th, 1927)	Italy[3]	
British Empire[6], including Newfoundland	(October 9th, 1922)	Japan	(February 20th, 1924)
Canada	(October 31st, 1922 a)	Latvia	(February 12th, 1924)
Australia	(October 31st, 1922 a)	Mexico	(October 17th, 1935 a)
New Zealand	(October 9th, 1922)	The Netherlands[3,4] (including Netherlands Indies, Surinam and	
Union of South Africa	(October 31st, 1922 a)	Curaçao)	(November 28th, 1921)
India	(October 9th, 1922)	Norway	(September 4th, 1923)
Bulgaria	(July 11th, 1922)	Poland	(December 20th, 1924)
Chile	(March 19th 1928)	Romania	(February 22nd, 1923 a)
Czechoslovakia[2]	(September 8th, 1924)	Spain	(July 1st, 1929)
Denmark	(November 13th, 1922)	Sweden	(January 19th, 1925)
Estonia[3]		Switzerland[3]	
Finland	(September 22nd, 1922 a)	Thailand	(November 29th, 1922 a)
France[3]		Turkey	(June 27th, 1933 a)
Germany[7]	(November 10th, 1931 a)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(May 16th, 1935 a)
Greece	(January 3rd, 1928)	Yugoslavia (former)[5]	(May 7th, 1930)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Bolivia	Panama
China[6]	Peru (a)
Guatemala	Portugal
Iran	Uruguay
Lithuania	

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[7,8]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Participant*[7,8]	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Antigua and Barbuda	25 Oct 1988 d	Mongolia	15 Oct 1976 a
Croatia	3 Aug 1992 d	Rwanda	10 Feb 1965 d
Czech Republic[2]	9 Feb 1996 d	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5 Sep 2001 d
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 d	Slovakia[2]	28 May 1993 d
Lesotho	23 Oct 1973 d	Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 d
Malawi	11 Jun 1969 d	Swaziland	16 Oct 1970 a
Malta	21 Sep 1966 d	Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d		

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 7, p. 73.

[2] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] Accepts Declaration as binding without ratification.

[4] See note 1 under "Suriname" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions etc, on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[7] In a notification received on 31 January 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 4 June 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 23 February 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974, concerning the application, as from 4June 1958, of the Declaration of 20 April 1921 recognizing the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Declaration recognizing the Right to a Flag of States having no Sea-coast, April 20th, 1921 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[8] The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

20. Convention and Statute on the International Régime of Maritime Ports

Geneva, 9 December 1923

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 26 July 1926, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 2 December 1926, No. 1379[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (January 20th, 1927 a)

Belgium (May 16th, 1927)

Does not apply to the Belgian Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.

With regard to Article 12 of the Statute, the Belgian Government declares that legislation exists in Belgium on the transport of emigrants, and that this legislation, whilst it does not distinguish between flags and consequently does not affect the principle of equality of treatment of flags, imposes special obligations on all vessels engaged in the transport of emigrants.

British Empire[2] (August 29th, 1924)

This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and that, in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or Territories.

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 a)

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 a)

Bahamas, Barbados, Bermuda, British Guiana, British Honduras, British Solomon Islands Protectorate, Brunei, Ceylon, Cyprus, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Fiji, Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gibraltar, Gilbert and Ellice Islands, Gold Coast, Grenada, Hong-Kong, Jamaica (excluding Turks and Caicos Islands and Cayman Islands), Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Leeward Islands (Antigua, Dominica, Montserrat, St. Christopher-Nevis, Virgin Islands), Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan and Pahang; (b) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu], Mauritius, Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan), St. Helena, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Seychelles, Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Somaliland, Straits Settlements, Tanganyika Territory, Tonga, Trans-Jordan, Trinidad and Tobago, Zanzibar
(September 22nd, 1925 a)

Malta (November 7th, 1925 a)

Australia (June 29th, 1925 a)

Does not apply in the case of Papua, Norfolk Island and the mandated territories of Nauru and New Guinea.

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)

Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Czechoslovakia[3] (July 10th, 1931)

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)

Excluding Greenland, the maritime ports of which are subject to a separate regime.

Estonia (November 4th, 1931)

The Estonian Government reserves the right regarding emigration provided for in Article 12 of the Statute.

France (August 2nd, 1932)

Shall have the power, in conformity with Article 8 of the Stat ute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of Article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.

Does not include any of the Protectorates, Colonies, Overseas Possessions or Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany (May 1st, 1928)

In conformity with Article 12 of the Statute on the International Regime of Maritime Ports, the German Government declares that it reserves the right of limiting the transport of emigrants, in accordance with the provisions of its own legislation, to vessels which have been granted special authorization as fulfilling the requirements of the said legislation.

In exercising this right, the German Government will continue to be guided as far as possible by the principles of this Statute.

Greece (January 24th, 1927)

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Hungary (March 21st, 1929)

With reservation as to the right regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

Iraq (May 1st, 1929 a)

With reservation as to the rights regarding emigration provided in Article 12 of the Statute.

Italy (October 16th, 1933)

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.

This ratification cannot be interpreted as implying the admission or the recognition of any reservation or declaration made with a view to limiting in any way the rights granted by Article 12 of the Statute to the High Contracting Parties.

Japan (September 30th, 1926)

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Mexico (March 5th, 1934 a)

The Netherlands[4] (February 22nd, 1928)

Netherlands Indies, Surinam and Curacao
(February 22nd, 1928 a)

The Netherlands Government reserves the right mentioned in Article 12, paragraph 1, of the Statute annexed to the Convention, it being understood that no discrimination shall be made against the flag of any contracting State which in regard to the transport of emigrants does not discriminate against the Netherlands flag.

Norway (June 21st, 1928)

Sweden (September 15th, 1927)

Switzerland (October 23rd, 1926)

Thailand (January 9th, 1925)

Yugoslavia (former)[5] (November 20th, 1931)

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrants mentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil

Bulgaria

Chile

Lithuania

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrantsmentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute

Panama (a)

El Salvador

Spain

With reservation as to the right relating to emigrantsmentioned in Article twelve (12) of the Statute.

Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Antigua and Barbuda	27 Feb 1989 d	
Burkina Faso	18 Jul 1966 a	
Côte d'Ivoire	22 Jun 1966 a	
Croatia	3 Aug 1992 d	
Cyprus	9 Nov 1964 d	
Czech Republic[3]	9 Feb 1996 d	
Fiji	15 Mar 1972 d	
Madagascar[6]	4 Oct 1967 a	
Malaysia	31 Aug 1966 a	
Malta	18 Apr 1966 d	
Marshall Islands	2 Feb 1994 a	
Mauritius	18 Jul 1969 d	
Monaco	20 Feb 1976 a	
Morocco	19 Oct 1972 a	
Nigeria	3 Nov 1967 a	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	5 Sep 2001 d	
Slovakia[3]	28 May 1993 d	
Thailand		2 Oct 1973
Trinidad and Tobago	14 Jun 1966 a	
Vanuatu	8 May 1991 a	
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d	

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 58, p. 285.

[2] The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

[3] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "Netherlands" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] The Government of Madagascar shall have the power, in conformity with article 8 of the Statute, of suspending the benefit of equality of treatment as regards the mercantile marine of a State which, under the provisions of article 12, paragraph 1, has itself departed from equality of treatment in favour of its own marine.

21. Convention on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles

Geneva, 30 March 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 9 May 1933, in accordance with article 14.
REGISTRATION: 9 May 1933, No. 3185[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (November 9th, 1932)
Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.

Great Britain and Northern Ireland [April 20th, 1932]
Does not include any colonies, protectorates or overseas territories or territories under suzerainty or mandate.

Southern Rhodesia (August 6th, 1932 a)
Newfoundland (January 9th, 1933 a)
Ceylon, Cyprus, Gold Coast [(a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate], Hong-Kong, Jamaica, Malta, Windward Islands (Grenada, St. Lucia, St. Vincent) (January 3rd, 1935 a)
Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], Sierra Leone (Colony under Protectorate) (March 11th, 1936 a)
Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (April 29th, 1936 a)
Malay States [(a) Federated Malay States: Negri Sembilan, Pahang, Perak, Selangor; (b) Unfederated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Kelantan, Perlis, Trengganu], Straits Settlements (November 6th, 1937 a) Kenya (Colony and Protectorate), Northern Rhodesia, Nyasaland, Tanganyika Territory, Uganda, Zanzibar (May 3rd, 1938 a)
Trinidad (May 21st, 1940 a)

Ireland [November 27th, 1933 a]
Bulgaria (March 5th, 1932 a)
Denmark (December 4th, 1931)
Egypt (May 20th, 1939 a)
Finland [May 23rd, 1934 a]
Greece (June 6th, 1939 a)
Iraq (September 20th, 1938 a)
Italy (September 25th, 1933)
Latvia (January 10th, 1939 a)
Luxembourg [March 31st, 1933]
The Netherlands[2] (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (January 16th, 1934)
Poland (June 15th, 1934)
Portugal (January 23rd, 1932)
Does not assume any obligation as regards its Colonies.
Romania [June 19th, 1935 a]
Spain (June 3rd, 1933)
Sweden (November 9th, 1933)
Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)
Turkey (September 25th, 1936)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 a)
Yugoslavia (former)[3] (May 9th, 1933 a)

Signature not yet perfected by ratification

Czecho-Slovakia

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations[4]

Participant[5,6]	*Denunciation, Succession (d)*
Denmark	7 Mar 1968
Finland[7]	10 Sep 1956
Ireland	18 Mar 1963
Luxembourg	2 Jun 1965
Poland	26 May 1971
Romania	10 Jul 1967
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	14 Jan 1963
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 138, p. 149.

2 See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3 See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4 A new convention on the subject of the taxation of foreign motor vehicles was drawn up within the framework of the Inland Transport Committee of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe and opened for signature at Geneva on 18 May 1956, namely, the Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic. Its article 4 provides as follows:

"As soon as a country which is a Contracting Party to the Convention of 30 March 1931 on the Taxation of Foreign Motor Vehicles becomes a Contracting Party to the present Convention, it shall take the measures laid down in article 17 of the 1931 Conven tion to denounce that Convention."

For the list of signatures, ratifications and accessions to the Convention of 18 May 1956, see chapter XI.B-10.

[5] In accordance with article 17, denunciation takes effect one year after date of its receipt by the Secretary-General.

[6] In a communication received on 1 March 1960, the Government of the Netherlands has informed the Secretary-General that it "will no longer consider itself bound, for the Realm as a whole, by the provisions of the 1931 Convention in its relations with those Parties to the said Convention for whom the Convention of 1956 [on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic] has come into force, this as from the date on which the Convention of 1956 enters into force between those States and the Kingdom of the Netherlands but not before one year after the day on which you will have received this declaration".

[7] In a communication of 31 July 1957, the Government of Finland, with reference to its notification of denunciation, has informed the Secretary-General that the said notification has been intended to take effect in respect of Finland on 10 September 1957, i.e., one year after the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General, only "if the Convention on the Taxation of Road Vehicles for Private Use in International Traffic of 18 May 1956, to which Finland is a party, has entered into force by that date. If the Convention has not entered into force on 10 September 1957, it is the intention of the Government of Finland that the denunciation should take effect on such date thereafter as the Convention shall enter into force."

22. International Convention relating to the Simplification of Customs Formalities

Geneva, 3 November 1923

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 November 1924, in accordance with article 26.
REGISTRATION: 27 November 1924, No. 775[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (September 11th, 1924)
Belgium (October 4th, 1924)
Brazil (July 10th, 1929)
British Empire[2] (August 29th, 1924)

It is stated in the instrument of ratification that this ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia (or any territory under its authority) or the Irish Free State or in the case of India, and that in pursuance of the power reserved in Article XXIX of the Convention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Island of Newfoundland or of the territories of Iraq and Nauru, in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate. It does not apply to the Sudan.

Burma[3]

Australia (March 13th, 1925)

Excluding Papua, Norfolk Island and the Mandated Territory of New Guinea

New Zealand (August 29th, 1924)

Includes the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

Union of South Africa (August 29th, 1924)
India (March 13th, 1925)
Bulgaria (December 10th, 1926)
China[2,4] (February 23rd, 1926)
Czechoslovakia[5] (February 10th, 1927)
Denmark (May 17th, 1924)
Egypt (March 23rd, 1925)
Estonia (February 28th, 1930 a)
Finland (May 23rd, 1928)
France (September 13th, 1926)

Does not apply to the Colonies under its sovereignty.

Morocco (French Protectorate) (November 8th, 1926)
Tunis (November 8th, 1926)
Syria and Lebanon (March 9th, 1933 a)

Germany[7] (August 1st, 1925)
Greece (July 6th, 1927)
Hungary (February 23rd, 1926)
Iran (May 8th, 1925 a)
Iraq (May 3rd, 1934 a)
Italy (June 13th, 1924)
Latvia (September 28th, 1931 a)
Luxembourg (June 10th, 1927)
The Netherlands (including the *Netherlands Indies, Surinam* and *Curaçao*) (May 30th, 1925)
Norway (September 7th, 1926)
Poland (September 4th, 1931)
Romania (December 23rd, 1925)

Under the same reservations as those formulated by the other Governments and inserted in Article 6 of the Protocol, the Royal Government understands that Article 22 of the Convention confers the right to have recourse to the procedure provided for in this Article for questions of a general nature solely on the High Contracting Parties, private persons being only entitled to appeal to their own judicial authorities in case any dispute arises with the authorities of the Kingdom.

Sweden (February 12th, 1926)
Switzerland (January 3rd, 1927)
Thailand (May 19th, 1925)
Yugoslavia (former)[6] (May 2nd, 1929)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Chile
Lithuania
Paraguay
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2,7]	*Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)*	*Denunciation*
Cyprus	6 May 1964 d	
Czech Republic[5]	9 Feb 1996 d	
Fiji	31 Oct 1972 d	31 Oct 1972
Israel	29 Aug 1966 a	
Japan	29 Jul 1952	
Lesotho	12 Jan 1970 a	
Malawi	16 Feb 1967 a	
Niger	14 Mar 1966 a	
Nigeria	14 Sep 1964 d	
Pakistan	27 Jan 1951 d	
Singapore	22 Dec 1967 a	
Slovakia[5]	28 May 1993 d	
Solomon Islands	3 Sep 1981 d	
Tonga	11 Nov 1977 d	
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d	

Notifications under article 10 (8)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon the date of ratification, accession or succession.)

SWITZERLAND

24 March 2003

..... the following authorities are authorized to issue the international identity card for commercial travellers in the sense of the Convention:

1. For commercial travellers whose enterprises appear on the trade register of the Swiss Confederation:

Secrétariat d'Etat à l'économie (SECO) (State Secretariat for Economic Affairs)
CH-3003 Berne

2. For commercial travellers whose enterprises appear on the trade register of the Principality of Liechtenstein, the territory of which is united with and an integral part of the territory of Switzerland for customs purposes (pursuant to the Treaty of 29 March 1923 between the two countries):

Regierungskanzlei (government record office)
FL-9490 Vaduz

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 30, p.371. The Convention and Protocol came into force on the same day.

[2] The Secretary-General received, on 6 and 10 June 1999, communications concerning the status of Hong Kong from China and the United Kingdom (see also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume). Upon resuming the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong, China notified the Secretary-General that the Convention will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

The notification made by the Govenrment of China also contained the following reservation:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that it has reservation to paragraph 3 of Article 22 of the [said Convention].

[3] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 6June1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 10 June 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that the notification by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the German Democratic Republic of 31 January 1974 concerning the application, as from 6 June 1958, of the International Convention of 3 November 1923 relating to the Simplification of Custom Formalities cannot, either for the past or for the future by itself have the effect of establishing contractual relations between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic.

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

23. International Convention for the Campaign against Contagious Diseases of Animals

Geneva, 20 February 1935

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 March 1938 , in accordance with articles 13 and 14.
REGISTRATION: 23 March 1938, No. 4310[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (July 21st, 1937)
The Belgian Government does not regard the mere fact that in Belgium the inspection of meat, while carried out by Government veterinary surgeons or by veterinary surgeons approved by the Government, is placed under the supervision of the Minister of the Interior (Inspection of Foodstuffs), as being contrary to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 5, of the present Convention; particularly since all the requirements of the said Article are observed in Belgium.

Bulgaria (August 28th, 1936)
Iraq (December 24th, 1937 a)
Latvia (May 4th, 1937)
Poland (January 3rd, 1939)
Romania (December 23rd, 1937)
Turkey (March 19th, 1941)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Chile (a)
Czechoslovakia[2]
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Spain
Switzerland

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Serbia[3]	12 Mar 2001 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 186, p. 173.

[2] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had acceded to the Convention on 8 February 1967. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

24. International Convention concerning the Transit of Animals, Meat and Other Products of Animal Origin

Geneva, 20 February 1935

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 December 1938 , in accordance with articles 20 and 21.
REGISTRATION: 6 December 1938, No. 4486[1].

Ratifications

Belgium	(July 21st, 1937)	Romania	(December 23rd, 1937)
Bulgaria	(September 7th, 1938)	Turkey	(March 19th, 1941)
Latvia	(May 4th, 1937)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Chile (a)
Czechoslovakia[2]

The Czechoslovak Government does not consider that it can waive the right to make the transit of animals across its territory subject to a previous authorization. It intends, in practice, to exercise the right so reserved in as liberal a spirit as possible, in conformity with the principles which are at the basis of the present Convention, the object of which is to facilitate the transit of animals and of animal products.

France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Spain
Switzerland

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Serbia[3]	12 Mar 2001 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 37.

[2] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Convention on 8 February 1967. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

25. International Convention concerning the Export and Import of Animal Products (other than Meat, Meat Preparations, Fresh Animal Products, Milk and Milk Products)

Geneva, 20 February 1935

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 6 December 1938 , in accordance with articles 14 and 15.
REGISTRATION: 6 December 1938, No. 4487[1].

Ratifications

Belgium	(July 21st, 1937)	Romania	(December 23rd, 1937)
Bulgaria	(September 7th, 1938)	Turkey	(March 19th, 1941)
Latvia	(May 4th, 1937)	Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(September 20th, 1937)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Austria
Chile (a)
Czechoslovakia[2]
France
Greece
Italy
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe)
Poland
Spain
Switzerland

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Accession (a), Succession (d)*
Serbia[3]	12 Mar 2001 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 193, p. 59.

[2] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia had acceeded to the Convention on 8 February 1967. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovnia", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonica" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

26. Convention establishing an International Relief Union

Geneva, 12 July 1927

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 27 December 1932, in accordance with article 18.
REGISTRATION: 27 December 1932, No. 3115[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Albania (August 31st, 1929)
Belgium (May 9th, 1929)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland [January 9th, 1929 a]
Does not include any of His Britannic Majesty's Colonies, Protectorates or territories under suzerainty or mandate.
Burma[2]
New Zealand [December 22nd, 1928 a]
On the understanding that no contribution to the initial fund of the Union will fall due by New Zealand before the commencement of the next financial year in that country, viz., April 1st, 1929.
India [April 2nd, 1929]
Bulgaria (May 22nd, 1931)
China[3] (May 29th, 1935 a)
Cuba [June 18th, 1934]
Czechoslovakia[4,5] (August 20th, 1931)
Ecuador (July 30th, 1928)
Egypt [August 7th, 1928]
Subject to later acceptance by the Egyptian Government of the decisions of the Executive Committee fixing its contribution.
Finland (April 10th, 1929)
France (April 27th, 1932)
Germany (July 22nd, 1929)
Greece [January 16th, 1931]
Hungary[5] (April 17th, 1929)
It being understood that "the most extensive immunities, facilities and exemptions" mentioned in Article 10 of the present Convention shall not include exterritoriality or the other rights and immunities enjoyed in Hungary by duly accredited diplomatic agents.
Iran (September 28th, 1932 a)
Iraq[5] (June 12th, 1934 a)
Italy (August 2nd, 1928)
Applies also to the Italian Colonies.
Luxembourg [June 27th, 1929 a]
Monaco (May 21st, 1929)
Poland (July 11th, 1930)
Romania [September 11th, 1928]
San Marino (August 12th, 1929)
Sudan (May 11th, 1928 a)
Switzerland (January 2nd, 1930 a)
Turkey (March 10th, 1932)
Venezuela (June 19th, 1929)
Yugoslavia (former)[6] [August 28th, 1931 a]

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil
Colombia
Guatemala
Latvia
Nicaragua
Peru
Portugal
Spain
Uruguay

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[4,5,7]	*Notification of withdrawal from the International Relief Union*
Cuba	8 Oct 1956
Egypt	1 Aug 1955
France	20 Feb 1973
Greece	6 Nov 1963
Hungary[5]	
India	9 Nov 1950
Iraq[5]	
Luxembourg	20 Apr 1964
Myanmar	1 Oct 1951
New Zealand	2 Aug 1950
Romania[8]	24 Dec 1963
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	4 May 1948

Notes:

1 League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.135, p.247.

2 See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

3 See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions etc, made on behalf of China1 (note 1"China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

4 See note 4 in this chapter and note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

5 In a letter of 6 December 1968, the Executive Secretary of the International Relief Union informed the Secretary-General that the Governments of the following States had withdrawn from the said Union by notifying it directly of their withdrawal on the dates indicated:

Participant:	***Date of notification:***
Czechoslovakia*	30 June 1951
Hungary	13 November 1951
Iraq	10 April 1961

Voir note 4 in this chapter.

6 See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

7 In accordance with article 19, the provisions of the Convention cease to be applicable to the territory of the withdrawing Member one year after the receipt of the notice of withdrawal by the Secretary-General

8 The notice of withdrawal contains the following statement:

The Romanian People's Republic hereby gives notice of its decision [of withdrawal] and accordingly considers itself free from any obligations deriving from the Convention establishing an International Relief Union.

As regards the question of dealing with the consequences of national disasters the Government of the Romanian People's Republic will continue as heretofore to give assistance to countries which suffer such disasters in the manner it considers appropriate.

27. CONVENTION ON THE INTERNATIONAL RÉGIME OF RAILWAYS

Geneva, 9 December 1923

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 March 1926, in accordance with article 6.
REGISTRATION: 23 March 1926, No. 1129[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Austria (January 20th, 1927)

Belgium (May 16th, 1927)

Does not apply to the Belgium Congo or to the territory of Ruanda-Urundi under Belgian mandate, without prejudice to the right of ratification at a subsequent date on behalf of either or both of these territories.

British Empire (August 29th, 1924)

This ratification shall not be deemed to apply in the case of the Dominion of Canada, the Commonwealth of Australia, the Dominion of New Zealand, the Union of South Africa or the Irish Free State (or any territories under their authority) or in the case of India, and in pursuance of the power reserved in Article 9 of this Con vention, it shall not be deemed to apply in the case of any of the Colonies, Possessions or Protectorates or of the territories in respect of which His Britannic Majesty has accepted a mandate; without prejudice, however, to the right of subsequent ratification or accession on behalf of any or all of those Dominions, Colonies, Possessions, Protectorates or territories.

Southern Rhodesia (April 23rd, 1925 a)

Newfoundland (April 23rd, 1925 a)

British Guiana, British Honduras, Brunei (September 22nd, 1925 a)

Federated Malay States [(a) Perak, Selangor, Negri Sembilan, Pahang; (b) Non-Federated Malay States: Johore, Kedah, Perlis, Kelantan, Trengganu] (September 22nd, 1925 a)

Gambia (Colony and Protectorate), Gold Coast (a) Colony, (b) Ashanti, (c) Northern Territories, (d) Togoland under British Mandate] (September 22nd, 1925 a)

Hong-Kong[2] (September 22nd, 1925 a)

Nigeria [(a) Colony, (b) Protectorate, (c) Cameroons under British Mandate], Northern Rhodesia,Nyasaland (September 22nd, 1925 a)

Palestine (excluding Trans-Jordan) (September 22nd, 1925 a)

Sierra Leone (Colony and Protectorate), Straits Settlements September 22nd, 1925 a) Tanganyika Territory, Trans-Jordan (September 22nd, 1925 a)

New Zealand (April 1st, 1925)

Including the mandated territory of Western Samoa.

India (April 1st, 1925)

Denmark (April 27th, 1926)

Estonia (September 21st, 1929)

Ethiopia (September 20th, 1928 a)

Finland (February 11th, 1937)

France (August 28th, 1935)

Subject to the reservation contained in Article 9 of the present Convention to the effect that its provisions do not apply to the various Protectorates, Colonies, Possessions or Overseas Territories under the sovereignty or authority of the French Republic.

Germany[6] (December 5th, 1927)

Greece (March 6th, 1929)

Hungary (March 21st, 1929)

Italy (December 10th, 1934)

This ratification does not apply to the Italian colonies or possessions.

Japan (September 30th, 1926)

Latvia (October 8th, 1934)

The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (February 22nd, 1928)

Norway (February 24th, 1926)

Poland (January 7th, 1928)

Romania (December 23rd, 1925)

Spain (January 15th, 1930)

Sweden (September 15th, 1927)

Switzerland (October 23rd, 1926)

Thailand (January 9th, 1925)

Yugoslavia (former)[3] (May 7th, 1930)

Signatures or accessions not yet perfected by ratification

Brazil
Bulgaria
Chile
China (a)[4]

The Chinese Government, subject to the declarations made in its name by the delegates whom it instructed to take part in the discussions on this Convention, confirms the said declarations regarding:

(1)The whole of Part III: "Relations between the rail way and its users", Articles 14, 15, 16 and 17; (2)In Part VI: "General Regulations", Article 37, re lating to the conclusion of special agreements for the purpose of putting the provisions of the Statute into force in cases where existing agreements are not adequate for this purpose.

Colombia (a)
Czechoslovakia[5]
Lithuania
Panama (a)
Portugal
El Salvador
Uruguay

Participant[6]	*Succession (d)*
Malawi	7 Jan 1969 d
Zimbabwe	1 Dec 1998 d

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 47, p. 55.

[2] See also note 2 under "China" and note 2 under "United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland" regarding Hong Kong in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accession, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume).

[5] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[6] In a communication received on 4 October 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic had declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 26 September 1958.

In this connection, the Secretary-General received, on 24 February 1976, the following communication from the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany:

With reference to the communication by the German Democratic Republic of 30 September 1974, concerning the application, as from 26 September 1958, of the Convention and Statute of 9 December 1923 on the International Régime of Railways, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that in the relation between the Federal Republic of Germany and the German Democratic Republic the declaration of application has no retroactive effect beyond 21 June 1973.

Subsequently, in a communication received on 17 June 1976, the Government of the German Democratic Republic declared:

"The Government of the German Democratic Republic takes the view that in accordance with the applicable rules of international law and the international practice of States the regulations on the reapplication of agreements concluded under international law are an internal affair of the successor State concerned. Accordingly, the German Democratic Republic was entitled to determine the date of reapplication of the Convention and Statute on the International Régime of Railways, December 9th, 1923 to which it established its status as a party by way of succession."

See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

28. CONVENTION REGARDING THE MEASUREMENT OF VESSELS EMPLOYED IN INLAND NAVIGATION

Paris, 27 November 1925

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 October 1927, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 1 October 1927, No. 1539[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium (July 2nd, 1927)
Albania
British Empire (for Great Britain and Northern Ireland) (July 14th, 1927)
Denmark
Estonia
Bulgaria (July 2nd, 1927)
Iran
Czechoslovakia[2] (January 17th, 1929)
Ireland
France (July 2nd, 1927)

It being understood on behalf of the French Government, and as provided for in Article 6 of the Protocol of Signature, that in the event of a re-measurement of a vessel original ly measured by its own officials the original indelible marks, when they are not intended solely to indicate that the vessel has been measured, shall have added to them an indelible cross having arms of equal length, and that this addition shall be regarded as equivalent to the removal described in Article 10 of the Annex to the Convention; that the old measurement plates shall be marked with a cross instead of being withdrawn; and that, if new plates are affixed, the old plates shall be placed at the same level and near to the new ones. In the case provided for above, the notification provided for in the third paragraph of Article 5 and in Article 6 of the Convention shall also be addressed to the original office of inscription.

Germany[4] (July 2nd, 1927)
Greece (February 6th, 1931)
Hungary (January 3rd, 1928)
Italy (September 27th, 1932)
The Netherlands (for the Kingdom in Europe) (July 2nd, 1927)
Poland (June 16th, 1930)
Romania (May 18th, 1928)
Spain (July 11th, 1927)
Switzerland (July 2nd, 1927)
Yugoslavia (former)[3] (May 7th, 1930)

Under Clause IV of the Protocol of Signature.

Open to accession by:

Albania
Denmark
Estonia
Iran
Ireland
Latvia
Lithuania
Luxembourg
Norway
Portugal
Sweden
Turkey

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Finland
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant[2,3]	*Denunciation*
Belgium	9 Mar 1972
Bulgaria	4 Mar 1980
France	13 Jun 1975
Germany[4]	14 Feb 1975
Hungary	5 Jan 1978
Netherlands	14 Aug 1978
Romania	24 May 1976
Switzerland	7 Feb 1975

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol.67, p.63.

[2] Czechoslovakia had notified its denunciation on 19 April 1974. See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] The former Yugoslavia deposited its instrument of denunciation to the Convention on 28 July 1975. In a communication received on 24 November 1975, the Government of Yugoslavia informed the Secretary-General that the denunciation should be considered, for the purpose of article 14 of the Convention of 1925, as having taken effect on 19 April 1975, the date when the Convention of 15 February 1966 on the same subject entered into force in respect of Yugoslavia. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina, "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia" , "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", "Slovenia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[4] In a notification received on 21 February 1974, the Government of the German Democratic Republic stated that the German Democratic Republic has declared the reapplication of the Convention as of 21August 1958. See also note 2 under "Germany" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

29. General Act of Arbitration (Pacific Settlement of International Disputes)

Geneva, 26 September 1928

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 August 1929, in accordance with article 44.
REGISTRATION: 16 August 1929, No. 2123[1].
FIVE-YEAR PERIODS OF OBLIGATION (Article 45).
1st period: August 16th, 1929–August 15th, 1934–Expired.
2nd period: August 16th, 1934–August 15th, 1939–Expired.
3rd period: August 16th, 1934–August 15th, 1939–Expired.
4th period: August 16th, 1944–August 15th, 1949–Period next following
etc . . .
Under the system established by the General Act (Article 45), States cannot be released from their obligation before the expiration of a five-year period.
In order to obtain release for the ensuing period, they must notify their denunciation six months before the expiration of the current period.

---

1. Accessions: 22

A (20 accessions)

All the provisions of the Act

Belgium (May 18th, 1929)

Subject to the reservation provided in Article 39 (2) (a), with the effect of excluding from the procedures described in this Act disputes arising out of facts prior to the accession of Belgium or prior to the accession of any other Party with whom Belgium may have a dispute.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (i) That, in the case of a dispute not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

His Majesty's Secretary of State for Foreign Affairs, by a communication which was received at the Secretariat on February 15th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom will continue, after the 16th August 1939, to participate in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes subject to the reservation that, as from that date, the participation of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the General Act will not, should they unfortunately find themselves involved in hostilities, cover disputes arising out of events occurring during the war. This reservation applies also to the procedure of conciliation."

The participation of His Majesty's Government in the United Kingdom in the General Act, after the 16th August 1939, will continue, as heretofore, to be subject to the reservations set forth in their instrument of accession."

Canada (July 1st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession in respect of Canada to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in Canada and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and (v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty in respect of Canada reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (i) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

By a letter of December 7th, 1939, which the Secretary-General was asked to communicate to the Governments concerned,[2] *the Permanent Delegate of Canada to the League of Nations notified the Secretary-General that, in view of the considerations set out in the letter:*

The Canadian Government will not regard their acceptance of the General Act as covering disputes arising out of events occurring during the present war.

Australia (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (i) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

By a telegram of September 7th, 1939, which the Secretary-General was asked to communicate to the Governments concerned,[3] *the Prime Minister of the Commonwealth of Australia notified the Secretary-General that, in view ofthe considerations set out in the telegram:*

His Majesty's Government in the Commonwealth of Australia will not regard its accession to the General Act as covering or relating to any disputes arising out of events occurring during the present crisis.

New Zealand (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between His Majesty's Government in New Zealand and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (i) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

The High Commissioner for New Zealand in London, by a communication which, was received at the Secretariat on February 15th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"His Majesty's Government in the Dominion of New Zealand will continue, after the 16th August 1939, to participate in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes subject to the reservation that, as from that date, the participation of the New Zealand Government will not, should it unfortunately find itself involved in hostilities, cover disputes arising out of events occurring dur ing the war. This reservation applies also to the procedures of conciliation.

"The participation of the New Zealand Government in the General Act, after the 16th August 1939, will continue, as heretofore, to be subject to the reservations set forth in its instrument of accession."

Ireland (September 26th, 1931)

India (May 21st, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

1. That the following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation:

(i) Disputes arising prior to the accession of His Majesty to the said General Act or relating to situations or facts prior to the said accession;

(ii) Disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(iii) Disputes between the Government of India and the Government of any other Member of the League which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such a manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;

(iv) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States; and

(v) Disputes with any Party to the General Act who is not a Member of the League of Nations.

2. That His Majesty reserves the right in relation to the disputes mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act to require that the procedure prescribed in Chapter II of the said Act shall be suspended in respect of any dispute which has been submitted to and is under consideration by the Council of the League of Nations, provided that notice to suspend is given after the dispute has been submitted to the Council and is given within ten days of the notification of the initiation of the procedure, and provided also that such suspension shall be limited to a period of twelve months or such longer period as may be agreed by the parties to the dispute or determined by a decision of all the Members of the Council other than the parties to the dispute.

3. (i) That, in the case of a dispute, not being a dispute mentioned in Article 17 of the General Act, which is brought before the Council of the League of Nations in accordance with the provisions of the Covenant, the procedure prescribed in Chapter I of the General Act shall not be applied, and, if already commenced, shall be suspended, unless the Council determines that the said procedure shall be adopted.

(ii) That, in the case of such a dispute, the procedure described in Chapter III of the General Act shall not be applied unless the Council has failed to effect a settlement of the dispute within twelve months from the date on which it was first submitted to the Council, or, in a case where the procedure prescribed in Chapter I has been adopted without producing an agreement between the parties, within six months from the termination of the work of the Conciliation Commission. The Council may extend either of the above periods by a decision of all its Members other than the parties to the dispute.

His Majesty's Secretary of State for India, by a communication which was received at the Secretary on February 15th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"India will continue, after the 16th August 1939, to participate in the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes subject to the reservation that, as from that date, the participation of India will not, should she unfortunately find herself involved in hostilities, cover dis putes arising out of events occurring during the war. This reservation applies also to the procedure of conciliation.

"The participation of India in the General Act, after the 16th August 1939, will continue, as heretofore, to be subject to the reservations set forth in the instrument of accession in respect of India."

Denmark (April 14th, 1930)

Estonia (September 3rd, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions: The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of con ciliation:

(a) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the acces sion of Estonia or to the accession of another Party with whom Estonia might have a dispute;

(b) Disputes concerning questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States.

Ethiopia (March 15th, 1935)

Finland (September 6th, 1930)

France (May 21st, 1931)

The said accession concerning all disputes that may arise after the said accession with regard to situations or facts subse quent thereto, other than those which the Permanent Court of International Justice may recognize as bearing on a question left by international law to the exclusive competence of the State, it being understood that in application of Article 39 of the said Act the disputes which the parties or one of them may have referred to the Council of the League of Nations will not be submitted to the procedures described in this Act unless the Council has been unable to pronounce a decision under the conditions laid down in Article 15, paragraph 6, of the Covenant.

Furthermore, in accordance with the resolution adopted by the Assembly of the League of Nations "on the submission and recommendations of the General Act", Article 28 of this Act is interpreted by the French Govern ment as meaning in particular that "respect for rights established by treaty or resulting from international law" is obligatory upon arbitral tribunals constituted in application of Chapter III of the said General Act.

The Minister for Foreign Affairs of the French Republic, by a communication which was received at the Secretariat on February 14th, 1939, made the following declaration:

"The Government of the French Republic declares that it adds to the instrument of accession to the General Act of Arbitration deposited in its name on May 21st, 1931, the reservation that in future that accession shall not extend to disputes relating to any events that may occur in the course of a war in which the French Government is involved."

Greece (September 14th, 1931)

Subject to the following conditions:

The following disputes are excluded from the procedures described in the General Act, including the procedure of conciliation referred to in Chapter I:

(a) Disputes resulting from facts prior either to the accession of Greece or to the accession of another Party with whom Greece might have a dispute;

(b) Disputes concerning questions which by interna tional law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States and in particular disputes relating to the territorial status of Greece, including disputes relating to its rights of sovereignty over its ports and lines of communication.

Italy (September 7th, 1931)

Subject to the following reservations:

I. The following disputes shall be excluded from the procedure described in the said Act:

(a) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(b) Disputes relating to questions which international law leaves to the sole jurisdiction of States;

(c) Disputes affecting the relations between Italy and any third Power.

II. It is understood that, in conformity with Article 29 of the said Act, disputes for the solution of which a special procedure is provided by other conventions shall be settled in accordance with the provisions of those conventions; and that, in particular, disputes which may be submitted to the Council or Assembly of the League of Nations in virtue of one of the provisions of the Covenant shall be settled in accord ance with those provisions.

III. It is further understood that the present accession in no way affects Italy's accession to the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and to the clause in that Statute concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court.

Latvia (September 17th, 1935)

Luxembourg (September 15th, 1930)

Norway[4] (June 11th, 1930)

Peru (November 21st, 1931)

Subject to reservation (b) provided for in Article 39, para graph 2.

Spain[5] : Denunciation(April 8th, 1939)

Switzerland (December 7th, 1934)

Turkey (June 26th, 1934)

Subject to the following reservations: The following disputes are excluded from the procedure described in the Act:

(a) Disputes arising out of facts or situations prior to the present accession;

(b) Disputes relating to questions which by international law are solely within the domestic jurisdiction of States;

(c) Disputes affecting the relations between Turkey and any third Power.

B (2 Accessions)

Provisions relating to concilation and judicial settlement (Chapters I and II) and general provisions dealing with these procedures (Chapter IV), Provisions relating to concilation (chapter I) and general provisions concerning that procedure (Chapter IV)

The Netherlands (including Netherlands Indies, Surinamn and Curacao) (August 8th, 1930)

Sweden (May 13th, 1929)

2. Open to accession by: (1) The Members of the League of Nations which have not acceded:

United States of America
Brazil
Chile
Costa Rica
Germany
Guatemala
Honduras

Hungary
Japan
Nicaragua
Paraguay
Salvador
Spain
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics
Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the date upon which the Secretary-General of the Organization of the United Nations assumed the functions of depositary

Australia[7]
Dominica[8]
France[9]
India[10]
Pakistan[11]
Turkey[12]
United Kingdom[13]

Notes:

[1] League of Nations, *TreatySeries*, vol. 93, p. 343.

[2] The letter was received by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on December 8th, 1939. For the text, see *Official Journal of the League of Nations,* Nos. 1-3, January, February, March 1940.

[3] The telegram was received by the Secretariat of the League of Nations on September 8th, 1939. For the text, see *Official Journal of the League of Nations*, Nos. 9-10, September-October 1939.

[4] On June 11th, 1929, Norway acceded to Chapters I, II and IV. On June 11th, 1930, it extended its accession to the whole of the Act.

[5] Spain acceded on September 16th, 1930.

By a letter dated April 1st, 1939, and received by the Secretariat on April 8th, the Spanish National Government denounced the accession of Spain, pursuant to the terms of Article 45 of the General Act.

Under Article 45, this denunciation should have been effected six months before the expiration of the current five-year period, that is to say, in this case, before February 16th, 1939.

In regard to this point, the National Government states in its letter that, as the Secretary-General and almost all the States which are parties to the General Act have "in the past . . . refused to receive any communi cations from the National Government, this Government could not have acted earlier in pursuance of the right which it now exercises in virtue of Article 45 of the Act".

The Secretary-General brought this communication to the knowledge of the Governments concerned.

[6] See note 1 under "Netherlands" regarding Aruba/Netherlands Antilles in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[7] On 17 March 1975, the Secretary-General received a declaration to the effect that the Government of Australia, in accordance with article 40, of the above-mentioned Act, abandons all the conditions to which its acceptance is subject (instrument of accession deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on 21 May 1931) with the exception of the condition relating to disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement.

[8] In a notification received on 24 November 1987, the Government of Dominica declared the following:

"The Government of the Commonwealth of Dominica has now examined the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes signed in Geneva on 26th September 1928 and is of the opinion that the provisions of the Act ceased to apply to the Commonwealth of Dominica after 8th February 1974 when the United Kingdom formally denounced it and in any case the Commonwealth of Dominica does not regard itself bound by that Act after its Independence."

[9] In a notification received on 10 January 1974, the Government of France declared the following:

In a case dealt with by the International Court of Justice the Government of the French Republic noted that it was contended that the 1928 General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes could, in the present circumstances, justify the exercise of jurisdiction by the Court.

On that occasion the French Government specified the reasons why it considered that view to be unfounded.

While reaffirming that position, and, accordingly, without prejudice to it, the French Government requests you, with a view to avoiding any new controversy, to take cognizance of the fact that, with respect to any State or any institution that might contend that the General Act is still in force, the present letter constitutes denunciation of that Act in conformity with Article 45 thereof.

[10] In a notification received on 18 September 1974, the Minister of External Affairs of India declared the following:

"I have the honour to refer to the General Act of 26th September 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes, which was accepted for British India by the then His Majesty's Secretary of State for India by a communication addressed to the Secretariat of the League of Nations dated 21st May 1931, and which was later revised on 15th February 1939.

"The Government of India never regarded themselves as bound by the General Act of 1928 since her Independence in 1947, whether by succession or otherwise. Accordingly, India has never been and is not a party to the General Act of 1928 ever since her Indepen dence. I write this to make our position absolutely clear on this point so that there is no doubt in any quarter."

[11] On 30 May 1974, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Pakistan, a notification of succession to the Gneral Act. The notification specified that the Government of Pakistan does not maintain the reservations formulated by British India upon accession to the General Act of Arbitration.

The notification also contains the following declaration:

When Pakistan became a Member of the United Nations in October 1947, the delegation of India communicated to the Secretary-General the text of the Constitutional arrangements made at the time when India and Pakistan became independent (Document A/C.6/161 of 7 October 1947), with reference to the devolution upon them, as successor States of the former British India, of British India's international rights and obligations.

Among the rights and obligations of former British India were those of the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes done at Geneva on 26th September 1928, which was acceded to by British India on 21st May 1931. The Government of Pakistan regards the Act as continuing in force as between parties to the Act as established on 26th September 1928 and all successor States. Article 17 of the said Act is given efficacy by Article 37 of the Statute of International Court of Justice, as between Members of the United Nations or parties to the Statute of the Court.

As a result of the arrangements mentioned in paragraph 1, Pakistan has been a separate party to the General Act of 1928 from the date of her independence, i.e. the 14th August 1947, since in accordance with Section 4 of the Indian Independence (Interna tional Arrangements), Order, 1947 (Document No. A/C.6/161 of 7October 1946), Pakistan succeeded to the rights and obligations of British India under all multilateral treaties binding upon her before her partition into the two successor States. By virtue of these arrangements, the Government of Pakistan did not need to take any steps to indicate its consent de novo to acceding to multilateral conventions by which British India had been bound. Nevertheless, the Secretary-General of the United Nations was made aware of the situation through the communication referred above.

However, in order to dispel all doubts in this connection and without prejudice to Pakistan's rights as a successor State to British India, the Government of Pakistan have decided to notify Your Excellency, in your capacity as depositary of the General Act of 1928, that the Government of Pakistan continues to be bound by the accession of British India of the General Act of 1928. The Government of Pakistan does not, however, affirm the reservations made by British India.

In this regard, the Secretary-General received on 18 September 1974 a communication from the Minister of External Affairs of India stating inter alia:

. . .

2. In the aforementioned communication, the Prime Minister of Pakistan has stated, inter alia, that as a result of the constitutional arrangements made at the time when India and Pakistan became independent, Pakistan has been a separate party to the General Act of 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes from the date of her independence, i.e. 14th August 1947, since in accordance with Section 4 of the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order 1947, Pakistan succeeded to the rights and obligations of British India under all multilateral treaties binding upon her before her partition into the two successor States.

The Prime Minister of Pakistan has further stated that accordingly, the Government of Pakistan did not need to take any steps to communicate its consent de novo to acceding to multilateral conventions by which British India had been bound. However, in order to dispel all doubts in this connection, the Government of Pakistan have stated that they continue to be bound by the accession of British India to the General Act of 1928. The communication further adds that 'the Government of Pakistan does not, however, affirm the reservations made by British India'.

3. In this connection, the Government of India has the follow ing observations to make:

(1) The General Act of 1928 for the Pacific Settlement of Interna tional Disputes was a political agreement and was an integral part of the League of Nations system. Its efficacy was impaired by the fact that the organs of the League of Nations to which it refers have now disappeared. It is for these reasons that the General Assembly of the United Nations on 28 April 1949 adopted the Revised General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes. (2)Whereas British India did accede to the General Act of 1928, by a communication of 21 May 1931, revised on 15 February 1939, neither India nor Pakistan, into which British India was divided in 1947, succeeded to the General Act of 1928, either under general international law or in accordance with the provisions of the Indian Independence (International Arrange ments) Order, 1947. (3)India and Pakistan have not yet acceded to the Revised General Act of 1949. (4)Neither India nor Pakistan have regarded themselves as being party to or bound by the provisions of the General Act of 1928. This is clear from the following: (a)In 1947, a list of treaties to which the Indian Indepen dence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947 was to apply was prepared by 'Expert Committee No. 9 on Foreign Rela tions'. Their report is contained in Partition Proceedings, Volume III, pages 217-276. The list comprises 627 treaties in force in 1947. The 1928 General Act is not included in that list. The report was signed by the representatives of India and Pakistan. India should not therefore have been listed in any record as a party to the General Act of 1928 since 15 August 1947. (b)In several differences or disputes since 1947, such as those relating to the uses of river waters or the settlement of the boundary in the Rann of Kutch area, the 1928 General Act was not relied upon or cited either by India or by Pakistan. (c)In a case decided in 1961, the Supreme Court of Pakistan while referring to the Indian Independence (Interna tional Arrangements) Order, 1947 held that this Order `did not and, indeed, could not provide for the devolution of treaty rights and obligations which were not capable of being succeeded to by a part of a country, which is severed from the parent State and established as an independent sovereign power, according to the practice of States'. Such treaties would include treaties of alliance, arbitration or commerce. The Court held that `an examination of the provision of the said Order of 1947 also reveals no intention to depart from this principle'. (d)Statements on the existing international law of succession clearly establish that political treaties like the 1928 General Act are not transmissible by succession or by devolution agreements. Professor O'Connell states as follows: `Clearly not all these treaties are transmissible; no State has yet acknowledged its succession to the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes' (1928). (State Succession in Municipal Law and International Law, vol. II, 1967, page 213.) See also Sir Humphrey Waldock's Second Report (article 3) and Third Report (articles 6 and 7) on State Succession submitted to the International Law Commission in 1969 and 1970, respectively; Succession of States and Governments, Doc. A/CN.4/149-Add.1 and A/CN.4/150–Memorandums prepared by UN Secretariat on 3 December 1962 and 10 December 1962, respectively; and Oscar Schachter, `The Development of International Law through Legal Opinions of the United Nations Secretariat', British Yearbook of International Law (1948) pages 91, 106-107. (e)The Government of Pakistan had attempted to establish the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in the Trial of Prisoners of War case in May 1973 and in that connection, as an alternative pleading, for the first time cited the provisions of the General Act of 1928 in support of the Court's jurisdiction to deal with the matter. Although the Government of India did not appear in these proceedings on the ground that their consent, required under the relevant treaty, had not been obtained before instituting these proceedings, their views regarding the non-application of the General Act of 1928 to India-Pakistan were made clear to the Court by a communica tion dated 4 June 1973 from the Indian Ambassador at TheHague.

4. To sum up the 1928 General Act, being an integral part of the League of Nations system, ceased to be a treaty in force upon the disappearance of the organs of the League of Nations. Being a political agreement it could not be transmissible under the law of succession. Neither India nor Pakistan have regarded themselves as bound by the General Act of 1928 since 1947. The General Act of 1928 was not listed in the list of 627 agreements to which the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947 related and India and Pakistan could therefore not have been listed in any record as parties to the 1928 General Act. Nor have Pakistan or India yet acceded to the Revised General Act of 1949.

5. The Government of Pakistan, by their communication dated 30 May 1974, have now expressed their intention to be bound by the General Act of 1928, without the reservations made by British India. This new act of Pakistan may or may not amount to accession to the General Act of 1928 depending upon their wishes as a sovereign State and the position in international law of the treaty in question. In view of what has been stated above, the Government of India consider that Pakistan cannot, however, become a party to the General Act of 1928 by way of succession under the Indian Independence (International Arrangements) Order, 1947, as stated by Pakistan.

[12] In a notification received on 18 December 1978 the Government of Turkey declared the following:

"In a case being dealt with by the International Court of Justice, it has been alleged that the General Act for the Pacific Settlement of International Disputes of 26 September 1928 provides a basis of jurisdiction for the Court to entertain a unilateral application. In that connection, the Government of Turkey has made clear its position that the General Act is no longer in force. The Government of Turkey reaffirms this position.

"Nevertheless, without prejudice to that position, and for the removal of any possibility of doubt that might arise as a result of any state or any institution considering that the afore-mentioned General Act continues to have any force or validity, the Government of Turkey hereby gives notice of denunciation of the General Act and requests that this notice be treated as a formal notification of denunciation under

Article 45 thereof in so far as the General Act might be regarded as still in force."

"Article 45 of the General Act provides as follows:

" `1. The present General Act shall be concluded for a period of five years, dating from its entry into force.

" `2. It shall remain in force for further successive periods of five years in the case of Contracting Parties which do not denounce it at least six months before the expiration of the current period.

" `3. Denunciation shall be effected by a written notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the League of Nations, who shall inform all the Members of the League and the non-member States referred to in Article 43.

" `4. A denunciation may be partial only, or may consist in notification of reservations not previously made.

" `5. Notwithstanding denunciation by one of the Contracting Parties concerned in a dispute, all proceedings pending at the expiration of the current period of the General Act shall be duly completed.' "

[13] In a notification received on 8 February 1974, the Government of the United Kingdom declared *inter alia* the following:

"In the light of events since then [the accession of the United Kingdom to the General Act] doubts have been raised as to the continued legal force of the General Act. Without prejudice to the views of the United Kingdom as to the continued force of the General Act,

(i) insofar as the General Act may be regarded as still in force, the United Kingdom hereby gives notice of its denunciation of the General Act in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of Article 45 thereof;

(ii) insofar as the General Act may be regarded as no longer in force, this notice serves to place beyond doubt the position of the United Kingdom in this matter."

In a notification received on 1 March 1974, the Government of the United Kingdom subsequently indicated that the notification received on 8 February 1974 was to be treated as a formal notification of denunciation under Article 45 of the General Act in so far as the latter might be regarded as still in force.

30. CONVENTION CONCERNING THE UNIFICATION OF ROAD SIGNALS

Geneva, 30 March 1931

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 16 July 1934, in accordance with article 11[1].
REGISTRATION: 16 July 1934, No. 3459[2].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Egypt (June 10th, 1940 a)

France (October 11th, 1934)

Does not assume any obligation in regard to Algeria, col onies, protectorates and territories under its mandate.

Algeria (July 22nd, 1935 a)

Hungary (January 8th, 1937)

Italy (September 25th, 1933)

Latvia (January 10th, 1939 a)

Luxembourg (April 9th, 1936)

Monaco (January 19th, 1932 a)

The Netherlands[3] (for the Kingdomin Europe)

Surinam and Curacao (January 16th, 1934 a)

Netherlands Indies (January 29th, 1940 a)

In view of the special character of the roads in the Netherlands Indies, the Netherlands Government reserves the right to place upon them the danger signals referred to in paragraph I, subparagraph (2), of the Annex to the Convention, at a distance from the obstacle which shall not be less than 60 metres, without making special arrangements.

Poland (April 5th, 1934)

Portugal (April 18th, 1932 a)

Does not include the Portuguese Colonies.

Romania (June 19th, 1935 a)

Spain (July 18th, 1933)

Sweden (February 25th, 1938 a)

Switzerland (October 19th, 1934)

Turkey (October 15th, 1936)

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (July 23rd, 1935 a)

Signatures subject to ratification:

Belgium

Subject to subsequent accession for the colonies and territories under mandate.

Czechoslovakia[4]

Denmark

Germany

Yugoslavia (former)[5]

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Denunciation*
Austria	2 May 1956
France	19 Oct 1954
Hungary	30 Jul 1962
Italy	29 May 1953
Luxembourg	30 Nov 1954
Monaco	18 May 1953
Netherlands[6]	26 Dec 1952
Poland	29 Oct 1958
Portugal	6 Jun 1957
Romania	26 May 1961
Russian Federation	26 Apr 1961
Spain	28 Feb 1958
Sweden	31 Mar 1952

Notes:

[1] The Convention ceased to have effect on 30 July 1963, the number of States bound by its provisions having been reduced to less than five as the result of successive denunciations.

[2] League of Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 150, p. 247.

[3] This reservation has been submitted to the States Parties to the Convention for acceptance.

[4] See note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[5] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume

[6] Denunciation for the Kingdom in Europe only: The Netherlands wishes to remain a party to the Convention in respect of the Netherlands Antilles, Surinam and Netherlands New Guinea until the Protocol of 19 September 1949 has become applicable to those territories (see chapter XI.B-2).

31. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MARITIME SIGNALS

Lisbon, 23 October 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 22 November 1931, in accordance with article 12.
REGISTRATION: 22 November 1931, No. 2849[1].

Definitive signatures or accessions and Ratifications

Belgium (February 10th, 1932)

Belgium cannot undertake, for the present, to apply the provisions relating to "Warning of gale expected to affect the locality" which form the first chapter of the Regulations of this Agreement.

Further, the ratification by Belgium of the provisions which are the object of Chapter II (Tide and depth signals), and Chapter III (Signals concerning the movement of vessels at the entrances of harbours or important channels), will only take effect when Germany, Denmark, France, Great Britain, the Netherlands and Norway shall have them selves notified their effective ratifications of the provi sions contained in these two chapters.

The ratification by Belgium does not apply to the Belgian Congo.

Brazil (November 21st, 1932 a)
China (May 29th 1935)
Free City of Danzig (through the intermediaryof Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
Finland (June 12th, 1936)
France (July 13th, 1931)
Morocco (September 3rd, 1931)
Tunis (October 27th, 1931)
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:
Cameroon (October 28th, 1983 a)
French Cost of Somaliland "
French Equatorial Africa "
French Settlements in India "
French West Africa "
Guadeloupe, Guyana "
Indo-China "
Madagascar, Martinique "
New Caledonia "
Oceania "
Reunion "
St. Pierre and Miquelon "
Togoland "
Greece (September 14th, 1932)
Latvia (September 17th, 1935 a)
Monaco (November 3rd, 1933)
The Netherlands (August 24th, 1931 s)
(Including the Netherlands Indies.)
Poland (October 2nd, 1933)
Portugal (October 23rd, 1930 s)
Romania (June 1st, 1931 s)
Spain (November 3rd, 1933)
Turkey (June 27th, 1936 a)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (April 27th, 1931 s)
Yugoslavia (former)[2] (December 11th, 1937)

Signatures subject to ratification:

Union of South Africa
Cuba
Estonia
Germany
Sweden

Open to accession by:

Albania
Argentine Republic
Australia
Bulgaria
Canada
Chile
Colombia
Costa Rica
Denmark
Dominican Republic
Ecuador
Egypt
Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Guatemala
Haiti
Honduras
Iceland
India
Iran
Iraq
Ireland
Italy
Japan
Liberia
Lithuania
Mexico
New Zealand
Nicaragua
Norway
Panama
Peru
Salvador
Tangier
Thailand
United States of America
Uruguay
Venezuela

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Denunciation*
Belgium	1 Oct 1985
France	11 Jul 1983
Greece	24 Jul 1986
Netherlands	29 Dec 1992

Notes:

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, vol. 125, p. 95. Ratifications and accessions subsequent to registration: vol. 138, p. 453; vol. 142, p. 379; vol. 156, p. 241; vol. 160, p. 393; vol. 164, p. 390 and vol. 181, p. 395.

[2] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

32. CONVENTION RELATING TO THE NON-FORTIFICATION AND NEUTRALISATION OF THE AALAND ISLANDS

Geneva, 20 October 1921

IN FORCE for each signatory or acceding Power immediately on the deposit of such Power's ratification or instrument of accesion (Article 10)[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

British Empire	(April 6th, 1922)	Germany	(April 6th, 1922)
Denmark	(April 6th, 1922)	Italy	(May 11th, 1922)
Estonia	(April 3rd, 1923)	Latvia	(September 9th, 1922)
Finland	(April 6th, 1922)	Poland	(June 29th, 1922)
France	(April 6th, 1922)	Sweden	(April 6th, 1922)

Notifications received by the Secretary-General of the Organization of the United Nations after he assumed the functions of depositary

Estonia[2]
Latvia[3]

Notes:

[1] Registered No. 255. See *Treaty Series*, League of Nations, vol. 9. p. 211.

[2] In a notification received on 21 July 1992, the Government of Estonia declared the following:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia [notifies] the declaration of continuity by Estonia regarding the [said] Convention."

[3] In a notification received on 14 April 1992, the Government of Latvia declared the following:

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs declares, in conformity with article 8 and article 10 of the Convention [. . .] that the said Convention is still binding for the Republic of Latvia and the provisions so accepted shall be observed in their entirety."

33. AGREEMENT CONCERNING MANNED LIGHTSHIPS NOT ON THEIR STATIONS

Lisbon, 23 October 1930

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 21 January 1931, in accordance with article 4.
REGISTRATION: 21 January 1931, No. 2603[1].

Ratifications or definitive accessions

Belgium	(February 10th, 1923)
This ratification does not apply to the Belgian Congo.	
Brazil	(November 21st, 1932 a)
Great Britain and Northern Ireland	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
Does not include any Colonies, Protectorates or Territories under suzerainty or mandate of His Britannic Majesty.	
Burma[2]	
India	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
Does not include any of the Indian States under British suzerainty.	
China	(May 29th, 1935)
Free City of Danzig	(through the intermediary of Poland) (October 2nd, 1933)
Denmark	(April 29th, 1931 s)
Estonia	(September 16th, 1936)
Finland	(May 23rd, 1934)
France	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
Morocco	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
Tunis	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
French Colonies and Mandated Territories as follows:	
Cameroons	(October 28th, 1933 a)
French Coast of Somaliland	(October 28th, 1933 a)
French Equatorial Africa	(October 28th, 1933 a)
French Settlements in India	(October 28th, 1933 a)
French West Africa	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Guadeloupe, Guiana	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Indo-China	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Madagascar, Martinique	(October 28th, 1933 a)
New Caledonia	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Oceania	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Reunion	(October 28th, 1933 a)
St. Pierre and Miquelon	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Togoland	(October 28th, 1933 a)
Greece	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
Iraq	(October 15th, 1935 a)
Latvia	(September 17th, 1935 a)
Monaco	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
The Netherlands[3]	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
(Including the Netherlands Indies.)	
Poland	(October 2nd, 1933)
Portugal	(October 23rd, 1930 s)
Romania	(June 1st, 1931 s)
Spain	(November 3rd, 1933)
Sweden	(February 3rd, 1933)
Union of Soviet Socialist Republics	(April 27th, 1931 s)
Turkey	(June 27th, 1936 a)
Yugoslavia (former)[4]	(January 16th, 1934)

Signatures not yet perfected by ratification

Cuba
Germany

Actions subsequent to the assumption of depositary functions by the Secretary-General of the United Nations

Participant	*Denunciation*
Netherlands[3]	29 Dec 1992

Notes:

[1] See *Treaty Series* of the League of Nations, vol. 112, p. 21.

[2] See note 1 under "Myanmar" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

[3] For the Kingdom of Europe. With effect from 29 December 1993.

[4] See note 1 under "former Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

(REFERENCE NUMBERS CORRESPOND TO CHAPTERS AND THEIR SUBDIVISIONS - SEE "TABLE OF CONTENTS" AND FOOTER AT THE BOTTOM OF EACH PAGE)

A

B

C

D

E

F

G

H

I

R

S

T

U

V

W

كيفية الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة

يمكن الحصول على منشورات الأمم المتحدة من المكتبات ودور التوزيع في جميع أنحاء العالم . استعلم عنها من المكتبة التي تتعامل معها أو اكتب إلى : الأمم المتحدة . قسم البيع في نيويورك أو في جنيف .

如何购取联合国出版物

联合国出版物在全世界各地的书店和经售处均有发售。请向书店询问或写信到纽约或日内瓦的联合国销售组。

HOW TO OBTAIN UNITED NATIONS PUBLICATIONS

United Nations publications may be obtained from bookstores and distributors throughout the world. Consult your bookstore or write to: United Nations, Sales Section, New York or Geneva.

COMMENT SE PROCURER LES PUBLICATIONS DES NATIONS UNIES

Les publications des Nations Unies sont en vente dans les librairies et les agences dépositaires du monde entier. Informez-vous auprès de votre libraire ou adressez-vous à : Nations Unies, Section des ventes, New York ou Genève.

КАК ПОЛУЧИТЬ ИЗДАНИЯ ОРГАНИЗАЦИИ ОБЪЕДИНЕННЫХ НАЦИЙ

Издания Организации Объединенных Наций можно купить в книжных магазинах и агентствах во всех районах мира. Наводите справки об изданиях в вашем книжном магазине или пишите по адресу: Организация Объединенных Наций, Секция по продаже изданий, Нью-Йорк или Женева.

COMO CONSEGUIR PUBLICACIONES DE LAS NACIONES UNIDAS

Las publicaciones de las Naciones Unidas están en venta en librerías y casas distribuidoras en todas partes del mundo. Consulte a su librero o diríjase a: Naciones Unidas, Sección de Ventas, Nueva York o Ginebra.

ISBN 978-92-1-133757-0

9 789211 337570

Litho in United Nations, New York
22703 February 2007 – 370

United Nations publication
Sales No. E.07.V.3
ST/LEG/SER.E/25 (Vol. II)