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: 190.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2178, p. 197; 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*	*Approval(AA), Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania	18 Dec 2001	10 Apr 2002
Algeria	18 Jan 2000	8 Nov 2001
Andorra	11 Nov 2001	22 Oct 2008
Angola		9 Jun 2011 a
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 (The)	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[1]	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 (Plurinational State of)	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	
Cabo Verde	13 Nov 2001	10 May 2002
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	12 Dec 2005
Cameroon		6 Feb 2006 a
Canada	10 Feb 2000	19 Feb 2002
Central African Republic	19 Dec 2001	19 Feb 2008
Chile	2 May 2001	10 Nov 2001

Participant	Signature		Approval(AA), Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification	
China[2]	13 Nov	2001	19 Apr	2006
Colombia	30 Oct	2001	14 Sep	2004
Comoros	14 Jan	2000	25 Sep	2003
Congo	14 Nov	2001	20 Apr	2007
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	25 Jul	2013
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Nov	2001	28 Oct	2005
Denmark[3]	25 Sep	2001	27 Aug	2002
Djibouti	15 Nov	2001	13 Mar	2006
Dominica			24 Sep	2004 a
Dominican Republic	15 Nov	2001	4 Sep	2008
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
Eswatini			4 Apr	2003 a
Ethiopia			20 Mar	2012 a
Fiji			15 May	2008 a
Finland	10 Jan	2000	28 Jun	2002 A
France	10 Jan	2000	7 Jan	2002
Gabon	8 Sep	2000	10 Mar	2005
Gambia			8 Jul	2015 a
Georgia	23 Jun	2000	27 Sep	2002
Germany	20 Jul	2000	17 Jun	2004
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	19 Sep	2008
Guyana			12 Sep	2007 a
Haiti			13 Jan	2010 a
Holy See			25 Jan	2012 a
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
Iraq			16 Nov	2012 a
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
Kuwait[4]			11 Jul	2013 a
Kyrgyzstan			2 Oct	2003 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic			29 Sep	2008 a
Latvia	18 Dec	2001	14 Nov	2002
Lebanon			29 Aug	2019 a
Lesotho	6 Sep	2000	12 Nov	2001
Liberia			5 Mar	2003 a
Libya	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
Malaysia			29 May	2007 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
Monaco	10 Nov	2001	10 Nov	2001
Mongolia	12 Nov	2001	25 Feb	2004
Montenegro[5]			23 Oct	2006 d
Morocco	12 Oct	2001	19 Sep	2002

Participant	*Signature*	*Approval(AA), Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
Mozambique	11 Nov 2001	14 Jan 2003
Myanmar	12 Nov 2001	16 Aug 2006
Namibia	10 Nov 2001	18 Oct 2012
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	24 May 2005
Nepal		23 Dec 2011 a
Netherlands (Kingdom of the)[6]	10 Jan 2000	7 Feb 2002 A
New Zealand[7]	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
Niue		22 Jun 2009 a
North Macedonia	31 Jan 2000	30 Aug 2004
Norway	1 Oct 2001	15 Jul 2002
Oman		10 Nov 2011 a
Pakistan		17 Jun 2009 a
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
Qatar		27 Jul 2008 a
Republic of Korea	9 Oct 2001	17 Feb 2004
Republic of Moldova	16 Nov 2001	10 Oct 2002
Romania	26 Sep 2000	9 Jan 2003
Russian Federation	3 Apr 2000	27 Nov 2002
Rwanda	4 Dec 2001	13 May 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	23 Aug 2007
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
Solomon Islands		24 Sep 2009 a
Somalia	19 Dec 2001	
South Africa	10 Nov 2001	1 May 2003
South Sudan		20 Oct 2023 a
Spain	8 Jan 2001	9 Apr 2002
Sri Lanka	10 Jan 2000	8 Sep 2000
St. Kitts and Nevis	12 Nov 2001	16 Nov 2001
St. Lucia		18 Nov 2011 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines	3 Dec 2001	28 Mar 2002
Sudan	29 Feb 2000	5 May 2003
Suriname		19 Jul 2013 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
Timor-Leste		27 May 2014 a
Togo	15 Nov 2001	10 Mar 2003
Tonga		9 Dec 2002 a
Trinidad and Tobago		23 Sep 2009 a
Tunisia	2 Nov 2001	10 Jun 2003
Türkiye	27 Sep 2001	28 Jun 2002
Turkmenistan		7 Jan 2005 a
Uganda	13 Nov 2001	5 Nov 2003
Ukraine[8,9]	8 Jun 2000	6 Dec 2002
United Arab Emirates		23 Sep 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[10]	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
Yemen		3 Mar 2010 a
Zambia		7 Apr 2017 a
Zimbabwe		30 Jan 2013 a

Declarations and Reservations
(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ALGERIA

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.

ANDORRA

The Principality of Andorra does not consider itself bound by article 24, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The Government of the Principality of Andorra hereby declares that, for a dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties shall in every case be required.

ARGENTINA

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 (THE)

"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

The Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention.

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.
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

"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."

"[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[1,11]

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).

[.....]

BRAZIL[12]

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

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

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

"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

"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

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[13]

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.

Reservations:

1. The reservation relating to Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) of the Convention shall be amended to read as 'The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the treaties to which it is not a party among the treaties listed in the Annex of the Convention.'

2. The reservation relating to Article 14 of the Convention shall be withdrawn.

3. The reservation relating to Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention shall remain valid.

EGYPT[14]

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.

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

(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[15]

ETHIOPIA

"Ethiopia does not consider itself to be bound by the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice as per Article 24 (2) of the Convention."

"Pursuant to Article 2 (2) (a) of the Convention, the Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Materials which has been adopted in Vienna on 3 March 1980 and annexed to the [International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism], shall not apply in Ethiopia."

FRANCE

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

"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

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.

[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.

HOLY SEE

"Pursuant to article 24.2 of the Convention, the Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 24.1 of the Convention. The Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, specifically reserves the right to agree in a particular case, on an ad hoc basis, to any convenient means to settle any dispute arising out of this Convention."

"By acceding to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, intends to contribute and to give its moral support to the global prevention, repression and prosecution of terrorism and to the protection of victims of such crimes.

In conformity with its own nature, its mission, and the particular character of Vatican City State, the Holy See upholds the values of brotherhood, justice and peace between persons and peoples, whose protection and strengthening require the primacy of the rule of law and respect for human rights, and it reaffirms that instruments of criminal and judicial cooperation constitute effective safeguards in the face of criminal activities that jeopardize human dignity and peace.

The Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of the Vatican City State, declares that its accession to the Convention does not constitute consent to be bound by or to become a party to any of the treaties listed in the Annex to the Convention. Considering that, at the date of its accession to the Convention, the Holy See is not a party to any of the treaties listed in the Annex, for the purposes of article 2.2(a) of the Convention, none of them should be deemed to beincluded within the scope of the Convention pursuant to its article 2.1(a). In the future, should the Holy See ratify or acceded to any of those treaties, once it has come into force for the Holy See, the treaty in question shall be deemed to be included within the scope of the Convention pursuant to its article 2.1(a).

In respect to article 5 of the Convention, the Holy See notes that, due to the particular nature of the Holy See and of Vatican City State, the concept of criminal liability of legal persons is not embodied in their domestic legal principles.

Pursuant to article 11.2 of the Convention, the Holy See declares that it takes the Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other Parties to the Convention, subject to the limitations to the extradition of persons provided for by its domestic law.

With regard to article 15 of the Convention, the Holy See declares that the terms 'prosecuting or punishing a person on account of that person's race, religion, nationality, ethnic origin or political opinion' and 'prejudice to that person's position' shall be interpreted in light of its legal doctrine and the sources of its law (Vatican City State Law LXXI, 1 October 2008)."

"Pursuant to the last sentence of article 2.2(a) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, of 9 December 1999, the Holy See, acting also in the name and on behalf of Vatican City State, declares that, from the moment the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, enters into force for the Holy See, it shall be deemed to be included within the scope of the Convention

for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism pursuant to its article 2.1(a).”

INDONESIA

"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. "

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 wit the consent of all the Parties to the dispute."

ISRAEL[16]

"... 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."

JAPAN

“The Government of Japan has carefully examined the declaration described as a reservation, relating to Article 14 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, opened for signature at the United Nations Headquarters in New York on 10 January 2000 (hereinafter referred to as “the Convention”), made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan when acceding to the Convention.

The Government of Japan considers that, if the Islamic Republic of Pakistan purported to exclude or to limit the legal effect of the provision of the said Article in its application to the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and thereby not to implement the obligation of the country under the said Article, the aforesaid declaration would amount to a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of Japan recalls that such reservation shall not be permitted under established rules of international law.

The Government of Japan thus considers the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to have no effect on the application of the Convention, including Article 14, between the two countries.”

JORDAN[17]

“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.”

KAZAKHSTAN[18]

The Republic of Kazakhstan 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.

KUWAIT[4]

Availing itself of article 24, paragraph 2, the State of Kuwait shall not be bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1.

LATVIA

"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."

"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 oferrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

LEBANON

… with a reservation regarding the definition of terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of that Convention and an endorsement of the definition of terrorism set forth in articles 1 and 2 of the Arab counter-Terrorism Convention signed in Cairo on 22 April 1984.

LITHUANIA[19]

"...

...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

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

"(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."

MOZAMBIQUE

"... 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[20]

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)."

Reservations:

"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."

NAMIBIA

"That a struggle waged by people in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces, shall not be considered as terrorist acts."

NEPAL

"Nepal hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provision of paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism."

"[The] Government of Nepal declares that as Nepal is not a party to the following Conventions referred to in Annex to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of such conventions until Nepal becomes a party:

1. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.
2. 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.

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."

"Nepal has acceded to the 'International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, 1999' on 24 June 2011 according to the National Law. While presenting the proposal for accession to the said Convention in the Legislature Parliament, the Government of Nepal clarified the meaning of the word 'Terrorism' as mentioned in the 'International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, 1999' that 'any acts which are related to political activities will not be considered as the acts of Terrorism'."

NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

"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."

"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."

".....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 Teorism 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."

"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."

"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 tothe 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."

"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 Republicto 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."

"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."

NEW ZEALAND

"... 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

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.

NORTH MACEDONIA

"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."

OMAN

“In accordance with the provisions of article 24, paragraph 2, the Sultanate of Oman 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.”

PAKISTAN

“Article 11

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that pursuant to Article 11 paragraph 2, of the Convention, it does not take this Convention as the legal basis for cooperation on extradition with other States Parties.

Article 14

Extradition to other countries shall be subject to the domestic laws of Pakistan.

Article 24

The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan does not consider itself bound by Article 24, Paragraph 1 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The Government of Islamic Republic of Pakistan hereby declares that, for a dispute to be referred to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties shall in every case be required.”

PHILIPPINES

"... , 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."

".....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).

QATAR

Reservation:

… with reservation regarding paragraph 1 of Article (24) concerning the submission of disputes to International Arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

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.

ROMANIA

“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

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.

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.

SAUDI ARABIA

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself bound by article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention relating to the submission to arbitration of any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, or their referral to the International Court of Justice should settlement by arbitration be impossible.

The Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material is not deemed by the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to be included in the annex referred to in article 2, paragraph 1 (a) of the Convention.

SINGAPORE

"... 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."

“... [S]ubject to the following 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.”

ST. LUCIA

“In accordance with Article 2, paragraph 2, subparagraph (a) of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of Saint Lucia declares that in the application of this Convention to Saint Lucia, the following treaties shall be deemed not to be included in the Annex referred to in Article 2,

paragraph 1 (a) of the Convention, as Saint Lucia is not a party to these treaties:

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. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997."

"In accordance with Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Saint Lucia does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention, and takes the position that any dispute may only be referred to the International Court of Justice with the consent of all the parties to the dispute."

ST. VINCENT AND THE GRENADINES

"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."

SURINAME

"[I]n the application of the aforementioned Convention the following treaties listed in the Annex referred to in Article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph a, shall be deemed not to be included:

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 on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980;

Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, done at Rome 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;

International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997".

SYRIAN ARAB REPUBLIC[21]

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

"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.".

TRINIDAD AND TOBAGO

"… pursuant to paragraph 2 of Article 24 the Government of the Republic of Trinidad and Tobago declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention."

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 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.

TÜRKIYE

"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

.....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

"(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."

"(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)

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[22]

"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:

- Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980;
"

YEMEN[23]

[The Government of the Republic of Yemen has ratified the Convention] … subject to reservations to the following articles:

(a) Article 2, paragraph 1(b);

(b) Article 24, paragraph 1.

The accession of the Republic of Yemen to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with it.

ZIMBABWE

“The Government of the Republic of Zimbabwe hereby declares in terms of Article 24 (2) that it enters a reservation to Article 24 (1) which provides that where Parties fail to resolve their dispute through arbitration any Party may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice.”

Objections
(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

AUSTRALIA

“The Permanent Mission of Australia to the United Nations […] advise[s] that it has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to Article 2 (1) (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism 1999 upon ratifying this Convention.

The Government of Australia considers that the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, that is, the suppression of the financing of terrorism acts. The norm of customary international law embodied in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties 1961 provides that a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Australia therefore objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to Article 2

(1) (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism 1999.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Australia and Yemen."

AUSTRIA

"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."

"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."

"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 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 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."

"The Government of Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of Yemen to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism upon accession.

Austria finds that the reservation to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), seeks to limit the scope of application of the Convention in a way that is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts.

Austria would like to recall that, according to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Article 19, sub-paragraph c), 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.

For these reasons, the Government of Austria objects to the aforementioned reservations made by the Government of Yemen to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This position however does not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention between the Republic of Yemen and Austria."

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the reservation made by Namibia upon the ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of Austria considers that this reservation limits 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 reservation 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 Namibia 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 Namibia."

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the interpretative declaration made by Kuwait upon the ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of Austria is of the view that the declaration amounts to a reservation as it unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention. The Government of Austria further 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 carried out.

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 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 Kuwait to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing ofTerrorism.

However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Austria and Kuwait."

"The Government of Austria has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism on 29 August 2019.

Austria considers the statement to amount to a reservation as well, because it aims at subjecting the application of the Convention for the Lebanese Republic to its own, narrower definition of terrorism.

By excluding the definition of terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention and applying a different definition, Lebanon seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. Austria considers these reservations to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorism acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

Furthermore, the reservations are 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'.

Austria would like to recall that, according to customary law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Article 19, sub-paragraph (c)), 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.

Austria therefore objects to the aforementioned reservations. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Austria and the Lebanese Republic in its entirety. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without Lebanon benefitting from the aforementioned reservations."

BELGIUM

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.

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 above-mentioned 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.

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has examined the reservation formulated by the Government of the Republic of Namibia to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, stating that an armed struggle waged by people... "for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces, shall not be considered as terrorist acts" by the Government of Namibia. The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium considers that this reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is contrary to the object and purpose thereof, 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 the Kingdom of Belgium recalls that, according to article 19, paragraph (c), of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention are not permitted.

The Government of Belgium therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of Namibia 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 Namibia.

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has examined the interpretative declaration formulated by the Government of the State of Kuwait upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999).

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium considers that this interpretative declaration in fact constitutes a reservation the aim of which is to restrict the scope of the Convention by making the implementation of the Convention subject to the domestic legislation in force in Kuwait.

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium considers that the aim of this reservation is to limit the scope of the Convention unilaterally and that it is contrary to the purpose and objective of the Convention, which is to suppress the financing of terrorism, wherever and by whomever committed.

Moreover, this declaration contravenes article 6 of the Convention, which states 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 Kingdom of Belgium recalls that, under article 19, paragraph (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, no reservation can be made that is incompatible with the object and purpose of this Convention.

The Belgian Government therefore opposes the aforementioned reservation made by the Kuwaiti 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 Kuwait.

The Kingdom of Belgium has carefully examined the reservation formulated by the Lebanese Republic upon its accession, on 29 August 2019, to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999).

The Kingdom of Belgium considers that the aim of this reservation is to limit the scope of the Convention unilaterally and that it is contrary to the purpose and objective of the Convention, which is to suppress the financing of terrorism, wherever and by whomever committed.

Moreover, this declaration contravenes article 6 of the Convention, which states 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 Kingdom of Belgium recalls that, under article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a State may not formulate a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty.

The Kingdom of Belgium therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Lebanese 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 Lebanon.

CANADA

"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."

"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."

"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."

"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 Reservaion 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."

"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 afoesaid 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."

“The Permanent Mission informs the United Nations that the Government of Canada objects to the reservation put forward by the Republic of Namibia. The Government of Canada has examined the Reservation made by the Republic of Namibia 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 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.

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 Republic of Namibia 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 Namibia."

Canada's Permanent Mission to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the Secretary General's note C.N.467.2013.TREATIES-XVIII.11 (Depositary Notification) dated July 11, 2013, which communicated that the Secretary-General has received from the State of Kuwait an instrument of accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism 1999 "the Convention", with a proposed interpretive declaration submitted in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

The Permanent Mission informs the United Nations that the Government of Canada objects to the interpretive declaration put forward by the State of Kuwait. The Government of Canada has examined the declaration made by the State of Kuwait at the time of its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and considers that the interpretive declaration (which Canada considers amounts to a 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 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 Canada notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty 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 declaration made by the State of Kuwait 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 Kuwait.

CROATIA

"The Republic of Croatia has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Republic of Croatia considers that the reservation made by the Lebanese Republic in relation to Article 2 paragraph 1 (b) of the said Convention unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The Republic of Croatia would like 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 reservation 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.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have decided to become Parties are respected in relation to their object and purpose. The Republic of Croatia therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Lebanese 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 Croatia and the Lebanese Republic in its entirety. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without the Lebanese Republic benefiting from the aforementioned reservation."

CZECH REPUBLIC

"The Czech Republic has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen on March 3, 2010, upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of December 9, 1999, according to which the Republic of Yemen excludes the application of the provisions of Article 2, Paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention.

This reservation purports to exclude the suppression of the financing of acts of terrorism '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'. The Czech Republic is of the view that the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of all terrorist acts.

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 Czech Republic, therefore, objects to the above-stated reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Czech Republic and the Republic of Yemen. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the Czech Republic and the Republic of Yemen without the Republic of Yemen benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Namibia upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of

Terrorism (hereinafter as the 'Convention'), according to which the Government of the Republic of Namibia does not consider the armed struggle waged by people against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces for the purpose of liberation or self-determination to be terrorist acts.

The Government of the Czech Republic considers this reservation to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, including the acts defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention and directed against civilians or any other persons not taking an active part in the hostilities in a situation of armed conflict. Such acts cannot be justified with reference to the struggle for liberation or self-determination or to any other purpose and must be prosecuted irrespective of the circumstances or context in which 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,areservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted and that such a reservation is null and void, and therefore devoid of any legal effect.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Namibia 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 Namibia and the Czech Republic. The Convention enters into force between Namibia and the Czech Republic without the Republic of Namibia benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the interpretative declaration formulated by the State of Kuwait upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, in which the State of Kuwait declares that the commitment of the State of Kuwait to the Convention is without prejudice to its Arab and Islamic obligations in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation.

The Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that the interpretative declaration in fact constitutes a reservation, as the declaration purports to exclude or to modify the legal effect of certain provisions of the Convention in their application to the State of Kuwait. The Government of the Czech Republic considers that the reservation is of general and vague nature, since it does not specify the content of the Arab and Islamic obligations of the State of Kuwait in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation. Therefore, the character and scope of the reservation cannot be properly assessed. The Government of the Czech Republic wishes to recall that reservations may not be general or vague, since such reservations, without indicating in precise terms their scope, make it impossible to assess whether or not they are compatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

In addition, the reservation formulated by the State of Kuwait leaves open the question whether it is compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely to what extent the State ofKuwait commits itself to the binding definition of terrorist acts, including the acts which are defined in paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention and are directed against civilians or any other persons not taking an active part in the hostilities in a situation of armed conflict. Such acts cannot be justified with reference to the legitimate national struggle against occupation or with reference to any other purpose and must be prosecuted irrespective of the circumstances or context in which they take place and who carries them out. Thus, the reservation raises serious doubts as to the commitment of the State of Kuwait to the object and purpose of the Convention.

Therefore, the Government of the Czech Republic objects to the aforesaid reservation formulated by the State of Kuwait. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the State of Kuwait and the Czech Republic, without the State of Kuwait benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Czech Republic has examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of December 9, 1999, (hereinafter as the 'Convention'), according to which the Government of the Lebanese Republic purports to exclude the application of the provisions of Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention.

The Czech Republic considers that the statement also constitutes a reservation, as its aim is to subject the application of the Convention for the Lebanese Republic to a different, narrower definition of terrorism.

By excluding the definition of terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention and applying a different definition, Lebanon seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis.

The Government of the Czech Republic considers these reservations to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

In addition, the Government of the Czech Republic is of the view that the reservations are 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 and that such a reservation is null and void, and therefore devoid of any legal effect.

The Government of the Czech Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Lebanese Republic to the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Lebanese Republic and the Czech Republic. The Convention enters into force between Lebanon and the Czech Republic without the Lebanese Republic benefiting from its reservations."

DENMARK

".....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."

"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 ofthe 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". "

"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 Ab 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".

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark has carefully examined the interpretative declaration made by Kuwait upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of Denmark considers that the interpretative declaration made by Kuwait in substance constitutes a reservation limiting the scope of the Convention.

The Government of Denmark finds that with this reservation the application of the Convention is made subject to national legislation in force in Kuwait.

The Government of Denmark considers that with this reservation Kuwait unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention, contrary to its object and purpose of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

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 which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the reservation of Kuwait 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 Denmark and Kuwait."

ESTONIA

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the reservation relating to Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (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."

"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, acceding 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 theaw 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 afore-mentioned 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."

"The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the reservation made on 3 March 2010 by the Government of Yemen to Article 2 (1) (b) of the Convention.

The Government of Estonia wishes to recall that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to suppress the financing of all terrorist acts. The reservation purports to exclude the suppression of the financing of acts of terrorism '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' and thus is contrary 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 the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Estonia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Yemen to the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention as between the Republic of Estonia and the Republic of Yemen."

"Estonia has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made at the time of its accession to the Convention. Estonia considers that as the reservation and statement seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral [basis], the reservation and statement is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. Estonia wishes to recall that by acceding to the Convention, a State commits itself to suppress the financing of all terrorist acts as [foreseen] by the Convention.

Furthermore, Estonia considers the reservation and statement to be also contrary to the terms of Article 6 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.'

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.

Estonia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic to the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force in its entirety of the Convention as between the Republic of Estonia and the Lebanese Republic."

FINLAND

"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 above-mentioned 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."

"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 above-mentioned 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."

"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 above-mentioned 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."

“The Government of Finland has carefully examined the content of the reservation relating to subparagraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Republic of Yemen upon accession.

The reservation seeks to exclude from the scope of the Convention acts of terrorism defined in subparagraph 1 (b) of Article 2. 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 Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and customary international law, a reservation contrary to 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 Finland therefore objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen in respect of subparagraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Yemen and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Republic of Yemen benefiting from its reservation.”

“The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of this reservation. In view of the Government of Finland, it is 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 reservation 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 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 Finland wishes to recall that, according to customary international !aw as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty is not 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.

Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by Namibia to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Finland and Namibia. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Namibia benefitting from its reservation.”

The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait.

The Government of Finland is of the view that the declaration amounts to a reservation as it unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention. The Government of Finland further 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 carried out.

Moreover, 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 other similar nature.

The Government of Finland 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 the treaty is not 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.

Therefore, the Government of Finland objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the State of Kuwait to the Convention. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Finland and Kuwait. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Kuwait benefitting from its reservation.

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the reservation and statement relating to subparagraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Lebanese Republic upon accession.

The Government of the Lebanese Republic has made a general reservation to sub paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2, which is central in defining offences within the meaning of the Convention. Furthermore, the Government apparently seeks to subject the application of the Convention for the Lebanese Republic to its own definition of terrorism. If this is the intention of the Government of the Lebanese Republic, the Government of Finland considers that the statement part of the Lebanese submission constitutes a reservation as well. It seems clear that the Government of the Lebanese Republic seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis.

The Government of Finland considers that reservations of this kind are in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention, which is the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be carried out.

Furthermore, according to Article 6 of the Convention State Parties commit themselves to adopt 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 Finland 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 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 Lebanese 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 Finland and the Lebanese Republic. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Lebanese Republic benefiting from its reservation."

FRANCE

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.

The Government of the French Republic hasexamined 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. Ithat 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.

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.

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.

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation made by Yemen upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, of 9 December 1999, according to which Yemen excludes the application of the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention. This reservation purports to exclude the suppression of the financing of acts of terrorism "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". The Government of the French Republic is of the view that the reservation made by Yemen is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing the financing of all terrorist acts. It therefore objects thereto, without however precluding the entry into force of the Convention as between Yemen and France.

… the Government of the French Republic has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by Lebanon upon accession to the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999.

The Government of the French Republic considers this statement and this reservation to amount, by their effect, to a reservation, the purpose of which is to limit, on a unilateral basis, the scope of the obligations set out in the Convention.

Since it relates to an essential provision of the Convention, namely the definition of terrorism, this reservation has a general scope that could affect all the obligations contained in the Convention.

Moreover, the Government of the French Republic considers that this reservation is contrary to Article 6 of the Convention, which states 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 points out that, according to customary international law codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the French Republic therefore objects to the reservation and statement made by the Government of Lebanon upon accession to the Convention. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the French Republic and Lebanon.

GERMANY

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.

"The Government ofthe 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."

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.

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.

"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 shallnot 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."

“The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism with respect to Article 2, paragraph 1 b). The Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the reservation of the Government of the Republic of Yemen seeks to limit the scope of application in a way that is contrary to the objective and purpose of the Convention, which aims at suppressing the financing of all terrorist acts.

According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969, reservations that are not compatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism. The objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Yemen.”

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia upon its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999.

It is the object and purpose of the Convention, to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those, defined in article 2 paragraph 1 (b). It follows from article 6 of the Convention that such acts may not be justified by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore considers that the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is hence to be deemed impermissible.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to that reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Namibia.

“The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait upon its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999.

By means of this interpretative declaration the State of Kuwait makes the application of the Convention subject to its national legislation and thereby seeks to limit the legal effects of the Convention unilaterally in its application to the State of Kuwait. Therefore, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait to constitute in substance a reservation within the meaning of article 2 paragraph 1 (d) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Moreover, it is the object and purpose of the Convention to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in article 2 paragraph 1 (b). It follows from article 6 of the Convention that such acts may not be justified by considerations of a political,

philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is therefore of the opinion that the reservation made by the State of Kuwait is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is hence to be considered impermissible.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to this reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the State of Kuwait."

"… the Federal Government has carefully examined the reservation made by the Lebanese Republic upon accession to the Convention on August 29, 2019 to Article 2(l)(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 Federal Government 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 Federal Government therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation by the Lebanese 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 Federal Republic of Germany and the Lebanese Republic in its entirety. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without the Lebanese Republic benefitting from the aforementioned reservation."

GREECE

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic has examined the reservation formulated by Namibia upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic considers that this reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention in a way which is incompatible with its object and purpose, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

Furthermore, this reservation is considered 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 Hellenic Republic 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 a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic therefore objects to the above reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Greece and Namibia."

"The Government of the Hellenic Republic has examined the reservation and statement made by Lebanon upon accession, on 29 August 2019, to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

Lebanon, through the above reservation and statement, excludes the definition of terrorism, set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the aforementioned Convention and endorses a different definition, thus seeking to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic considers that the said reservation and statement amount, by their effect, to a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic also notes that such a reservation, to the extent that it is formulated in relation to an essential provision of the Convention, namely the definition of terrorism, is of a general scope that could affect the implementation of all the obligations set out in the Convention.

Furthermore, this reservation is considered 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 Hellenic Republic recalls that, according to customary international law, as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Hellenic Republic, therefore, objects to the above reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Hellenic Republic and Lebanon."

HUNGARY

"... 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."

"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."

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the explanatory declaration relating to paragra 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."

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary has examined the Reservations 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 Republic of Yemen at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary considers that the Reservations made by the Government of the Republic of Yemen 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.

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 Republic of Yemen 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 Republic of Yemen."

"Hungary has examined the reservation and statement relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1999) made by the Lebanese Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention.

Hungary considers that the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic constitute 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.

Furthermore, 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.'

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.

Hungary therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation and statement made by the Government of the Lebanese 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 Hungary and the Lebanese Republic."

IRELAND

"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 Statese 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 Republic of Egypt, without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of Ireland has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Yemen upon accession to Article 2 (1) (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of Ireland considers that the reservation entered by the Republic of Yemen seeks to exclude the suppression of the financing of terrorism 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.' The Government of Ireland is of the view that such a reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention as a whole, the purpose of which is to suppress the financing of terrorism in all circumstances.

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 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. 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 of that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to Article 2 (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 Ireland and the Republic of Yemen. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Republic of Yemen, without the Republic of Yemen benefiting from its reservation."

1. The Government of Ireland has examined the reservation contained in the instrument of ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, made by Namibia on 18 October 2012.

2. The Government of Ireland is 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.

3. The Government of Ireland considers that 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.

4. The Government of Ireland 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.

5. The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Namibia to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

6. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and Namibia.

1. The Government of Ireland has examined the interpretative declaration made by Kuwait upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Government of Kuwait declares that the commitment of the State of Kuwait to the Convention is without prejudice to its Arab and Islamic obligations in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation.

2. The Government of Ireland is of the view that this interpretative declaration amounts to a reservation, as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland is 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.

3. In the view of the Government of Ireland, a reservation should clearly define for the other States Parties to the Convention the extent to which the reserving State has accepted the obligations of the Convention. Reservations which consist of a general reference to a system of obligations without specifying their contents do not do so.

4. The Government of Ireland considers that 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.

5. The Government of Ireland 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.

6. The Government of Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Kuwait to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

7. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and Kuwait.

“Ireland welcomes the accession of Lebanon to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism on 29 August 2019.

Ireland has examined the reservation and statement made by Lebanon to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism at the time of its accession to the Convention on 29 August 2019.

Ireland is of the view that the reservation and statement of Lebanon, regarding the definition for terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention, in substance constitutes a reservation, which seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis.

Ireland considers the reservation to be contrary to 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”.

Ireland considers that the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out. Ireland recalls that under international treaty law a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

Ireland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Lebanon 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 Lebanon.”

ITALY

"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."

"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 ofaly 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."

"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 jusfied 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."

"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 paragraph1 (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."

"The Government of Italy considers the reservation to be a unilateral limit on the scope of the Convention and thus in contradiction with 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 reservation also contradicts 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 Yemen 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 Yemen."

The Government of Italy has examined the interpretative declaration formulated by the State of Kuwait upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (9 December 1999) according to which the Government of Kuwait declares that the commitment of the State of Kuwait to the Convention is without prejudice to its Arab and Islamic obligations in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation.

The Government of Italy considers that this interpretative declaration amounts to a reservation which limits the scope of the Convention. The Government of Italy is also of the view that this reservation is in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention.

Moreover, 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 other similar nature.

The Government of Italy 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.

For these reasons the Government of Italy objects to the abovementioned interpretative declaration formulated by the State of Kuwait.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and the State of Kuwait.

JAPAN

"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 theConvention 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

"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."

"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."

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully exaned 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 theFinancing of Terrorism will become operative without People's Republic of Bangladesh benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to the International Convention upon accession regarding Article 2, paragraph 1(b).

The Government of the Republic of Latvia believes that the main aim of the International Convention is to prevent the commission of the terrorist attacks around the world. Taking into due account that the terrorist attack cannot be performed without sufficient funding, the International Community has elaborated this International Convention.

However, the International Community could not agree on one comprehensive definition of terrorism. Therefore, the approach defining the acts of terrorism in a manner set forth by Article 2, paragraph 1 has been applied. The so called 13 Universal Anti-Terrorism Conventions cover only the main offences for financing of which the penalty should be established under Article 4 of the International Convention. Also being aware, that the acts of terrorism may occur in different manners and forms of manifestation, the definition of terrorism given by this International Convention has been supplemented with paragraph (b), putting stress on the intention of the offender.

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the reservation to Article 2, paragraph 1(b) of the International Convention could not be considered to be in line with the aim and purpose of the International Convention.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that the customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), set out that the reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

Consequently, the Government of the Republic of Latvia objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to the Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of 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 between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Yemen. Thus, the International Convention will become operative without the Republic of Yemen benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Republic of Latvia has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers that the aim of the said International Convention is to prevent and suppress the financing of terrorism by whomsoever it might be committed. Therefore, the legitimate rights of self-determination of people and rights to fight against the foreign occupation, as they are recognized by the principles of the international law, cannot be subject of the International Convention.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia holds the opinion that the reservation conflicts with the terms of Article 6 of the International 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 International Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls that customary international law as codified by the 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.

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Latvia objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic

of Namibia 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 between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Namibia. Thus, the International Convention will become operative without the Republic of Namibia benefiting from its reservation."

The Government of the Republic of Latvia has examined the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait upon accession to the International Convention of the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia considers this unilateral statement, submitted by the State of Kuwait and named an interpretative declaration, modifies the legal effect on obligations arising from the International Convention for the State Parties.

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Latvia consider[s] the interpretative declaration made by State of Kuwait a reservation as stipulated by Article 2(1)(d) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

Moreover, the Government of the Republic of Latvia holds the opinion that this reservation conflicts with the terms of Article 6 of the International 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 International Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature.

Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia recalls the customary international law as codified by the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), setting out that reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permissible.

Consequently, the Government of the Republic of Latvia objects to the aforesaid reservation named as an interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait 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 between the Republic of Latvia and the State of Kuwait. Thus, the International Convention will become operative without the State of Kuwait benefiting from its reservation.

LITHUANIA

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania has carefully examined the reservation with a statement made by the Lebanese Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the

Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism on 29 August 2019.

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania considers that [the] Lebanese reservation with statement regarding the definition of terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of the financing of terrorism.

Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania considers the reservation with statement to be incompatible with Article 6 of the Convention, according to which [a] 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.

Therefore, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania objects to the aforesaid reservation with statement. This objection, however, shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Lithuania and the Lebanese Republic.

NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

"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."

".....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 Teorism 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."

"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."

"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 tothe 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."

"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 Republicto 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."

"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."

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the reservation with respect to Article 14 of the Convention would give precedence to domestic law in force in the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that a reservation which consists of a general reference to national law, without specifying its contents, does not clearly define to other States Parties to the Convention to what extent the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers itself bound by the obligations of the Convention and raises concerns as to the commitment of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that reservations of this kind must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and would recall that, according to customary

international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Convention.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation of the Republic of Yemen upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, of 9 December 1999, in respect of Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention.

The reservation of the Republic of Yemen excludes the financing of terrorist acts defined in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), from the scope of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, which aims to suppress the financing of all terrorist acts. According to customary international law, as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to the Convention.

This objection does not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Republic of Yemen."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation made by Namibia upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation Namibia unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention, contrary to its object and purpose of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands 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 the Kingdom of the Netherlands 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 the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation of Namibia 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 Namibia."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the interpretative declaration made by Kuwait upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the interpretative declaration made by Kuwait in substance constitutes a reservation limiting the scope of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation the application of the Convention is made subject to national legislation in force in Kuwait.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation Kuwait unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention, contrary to its object and purpose of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands 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 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.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation of Kuwait 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 Kuwait."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by Lebanon upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism on 29 August 2019, relating to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), thereof.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that with this reservation Lebanon unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention, contrary to its object and purpose of suppressing the financing of terrorist acts wherever and by whomever they may be committed.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands 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 the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to customary international law as codified in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are not permissible.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the reservation and statement of Lebanon 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 Lebanon."

NORWAY

"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."

"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 contrarto 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."

"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 above-mentioned 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."

"The Government of Norway has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (hereinafter the 'Convention'). According to the reservation, Namibia does not consider the armed struggle waged by people against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces for the purposes of liberation or self-determination to be terrorist acts.

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 Norway further considers the reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, according to which State 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 Norway 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 Norway therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Namibia 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 Norway and the Republic of Namibia."

POLAND

"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."

"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 thSuppression 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."

"The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen is incompatible with the purpose and object of the Convention, which are to provide effective and comprehensive manners of the suppression of the financing of international terrorism. The reservation is incompatible with the main purpose of the Convention, as it purports to exclude the application of the Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention, which defines the act of the financing of terrorism.

Therefore the Government of the Republic of Poland wishes to recall that according to Article 19 letter c of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, done at Vienna on 23 May 1969 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 to the Convention made by the Republic of Yemen.

However, that objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism done at New York on 9 December 1999 between the Republic of Poland and the Republic of Yemen."

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Namibia 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 Republic of Namibia unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and it is, therefore, contrary to the object and to the purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Poland 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 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 the 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 Republic of Namibia 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 Republic of Namibia."

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1999.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait in substance constitutes a reservation and it unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and it is, therefore, contrary to the object and to the purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Poland 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 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 the purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration, which in substance constitutes a reservation, made by the State of Kuwait to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1999. However this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and the State of Kuwait."

"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservation made by the Lebanese Republic regarding the definition of terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 9, 1999.

The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the reservation made by the Lebanese Republic unilaterally limits the scope of the Convention and it is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, which are to provide effective and comprehensive manners of the suppression of the financing of international terrorism. The reservation is incompatible with the main purpose of the convention, as it purports to exclude the application of the Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the Convention, which defines the act of the financing terrorism.

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, reservations 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 Lebanese 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 Poland and the Lebanese Republic."

PORTUGAL

".....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."

"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."

"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."

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Yemen to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, on 3 March 2010, upon its ratification.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that the reservation made by the Government of Republic of Yemen is a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on an 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 reservation is furthermore contrary to the terms of 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 the Portuguese Republic 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 the Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Republic of Yemen to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of 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 Portuguese Republic and the Republic of Yemen."

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, on 18 October 2012, upon its ratification;

The Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that the reservation made by the Government of Namibia seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on an 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 reservation is furthermore contrary to the terms of 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 the Portuguese Republic 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 the Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Namibia to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of 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 Portuguese Republic and Namibia."

"The Government of the Portuguese Republic has examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism and considers that it amounts to a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the [Convention] on a unilateral basis.

Furthermore, the Government of the Portuguese Republic considers that reservations by which a State limits its responsibilities under the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism by not recognizing the definition of terrorism established therein and binding itself to a different definition raises doubts as to the commitment of the reserving State to the object and purpose of the Convention, as the reservation is likely to deprive the provisions of the Convention of their effect and [is] contrary to the object and purpose thereof.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic 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.

Thus, the Government of the Portuguese Republic objects to this reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and the Lebanese Republic."

ROMANIA

"The Government of Romania has examined the interpretative declaration made by the Government of Kuwait to the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism and appreciates that a declaration with reference to the provisions of Islamic law is of unlimited scope and undefined character.

Moreover, this interpretative declaration is contrary to the terms 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'.

Consequently, the Government of Romania considers that the declaration is in fact a disguised reservation, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention (which consists in the suppression of financing of terrorism in whatever form is committed) and without effect under international law.

The objection shall not otherwise affect the entry into force of the Convention between Romania and Kuwait. Thus, the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism will become operative without the Government of Kuwait benefitting from its reservation."

"The Government of Romania has examined the reservation and statement relating to paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999) made by the Government of the Lebanese Republic at the time of its accession to this Convention.

The Government of Romania considers that the aforementioned reservation and statement constitute 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 reservation is furthermore contrary to 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 Romania 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 Romania therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Government of the Lebanese 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 Romania and the Lebanese Republic."

SLOVAKIA

"The Slovak Republic has examined the reservation made by Yemen upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, of 9 December 1999, according to which Yemen excludes the application of the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention.

The Slovak Republic considers that this reservation contradicts mainly the terms of:

1. Article 4 of the Convention according to which 'Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary:

(a) To establish as criminal offences under its domestic law the offences set forth in article 2;

(b) To make those offences punishable by appropriate penalties which take into account the grave nature of the offences.'

2. 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'.

3. Article 7 paragraph 1 of the Convention according to which 'Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 when:

(a) The offence is committed in the territory of that State;

(b) The offence is committed on board a vessel flying the flag of that State or an aircraft registered under the laws of that State at the time the offence is committed;

(c) The offence is committed by a national of that State'.

and it is incompatible with the object and purpose of theConvention.

The Slovak Republic recalls that the customary international law as codified by Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties, and in particular Article 19 (c), set out that the reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty is not permitted.

The Slovak Republic, therefore, objects to the aforesaid reservation made by Yemen to the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Slovak Republic and Yemen, without Yemen benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Slovak Republic has carefully examined the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia upon its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (1999). This reservation concerns the right of people to self-determination and according to the Republic of Namibia 'a struggle waged by people in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces, shall not be considered as terrorist acts.'

The Government of the Slovak Republic is of the view that the right of people to selfdetermination can never justify any act of terrorism in any form. The crimes falling within the scope of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism are defined under Article 2, paragraph 1 of this Convention. Firstly, it expressis verbis applies to any act which constitutes an offence within the scope of and as defined in one of the specific international treaties aimed at combatting terrorism. Moreover, the Convention also covers any other act 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 to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act. The latter is aimed at protection of civilians and other persons during any armed conflict including struggle for liberation or self-determination. In that regard, any terrorist act cannot be exculpated through the exercise of the right of people to self-determination.

Furthermore, the reservation of the Republic of Namibia is contrary to Article 6 of the Convention, as any criminal act within the scope of the Convention is under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

Therefore, the Government of the Slovak Republic finds this reservation incompatible with the object and the purpose of the Convention and inadmissible under article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Subsequently, it shall not be permitted, in accordance with Article 24, paragraph 2 of the international Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

For these reasons, the Government of the Slovak Republic objects to the above mentioned reservation made by the Republic of Namibia upon its ratification to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism between the Slovak Republic and the Republic of Namibia. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the Slovak Republic and the Republic of Namibia, without the Republic of Namibia benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of the Slovak Republic has carefully examined the reservation made by Lebanon upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

By seeking to exclude the application of Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of that Convention, the reservation purports to alter the definition of terrorism set forth in the aforementioned provision, and endorses, instead, a different definition stemming from a regional instrument.

The Slovak Republic recalls that it is the object and purpose of the Convention to suppress the financing of terrorist acts, including those defined in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b). Therefore, limiting the scope of the Convention by means of excluding certain acts from its application contravenes the object and purpose of the Convention and is deemed impermissible.

The Slovak Republic therefore considers the reservation formulated by Lebanon incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and hereby objects to it. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Slovak Republic and Lebanon, without Lebanon benefiting from its reservation."

SLOVENIA

"The Republic of Slovenia has carefully examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted in New York on 9 December 1999.

The Republic of Slovenia considers that this reservation regarding the exclusion of the application of Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the aforementioned Convention and of the definition of terrorism as an offence within the meaning of this Convention therein, seeks to limit the scope of the Convention. This is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty and therefore not permissible under Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Furthermore, the option of reservations to paragraph 1 of the Article 2 of the Convention is not provided for in the Convention.

Therefore, the Republic of Slovenia objects to the reservation made by the Lebanese Republic to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of the aforementioned Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Slovenia and the Lebanese Republic in its entirety. The Convention shall thus become operative between the two States without the Lebanese Republic benefitting from this reservation."

SPAIN

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.

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 articleof 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.

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.

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.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999) upon ratifying the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that the reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and contravenes 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, according to customary law enshrined in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (article 19 (c)), reservations that are contrary to the object and purpose of international treaties shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Yemen to article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Government of the Kingdom of Spain and the Republic of Yemen.

The Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia at the time of expression of consent to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999).

The Kingdom of Spain considers the aforesaid reservation to be contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, and also contrary to article 6 thereof, 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 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 an international treaty are not permitted.

The Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the reservation formulated by Namibia. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and Namibia.

The Kingdom of Spain has examined the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait at the time of its consent to be bound by the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999).

The Kingdom of Spain considers that the aforesaid interpretative declaration constitutes a reservation that limits the application of the Convention, and that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, and also contrary to article 6 thereof, 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 Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under the rule of customary law 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 an international treaty are not permitted.

The Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the reservation formulated by Kuwait. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and Kuwait.

The Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (New York, 9 December 1999). The reservation is to article 2 (1) (b) of the Convention. The statement, which intends to limit the application of the Convention, also constitutes a reservation.

The Kingdom of Spain considers that the aforementioned reservations are contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention and also violate article 6 thereof, according to which States Parties undertake to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, the adoption of 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 Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under the rule of customary law enshrined in article 19 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are contrary to the object and purpose of international treaties shall not be permitted.

The Kingdom of Spain therefore objects to the reservation and statement made by the Lebanese Republic.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Lebanese Republic.

SWEDEN

"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."

"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 Adtionals 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."

"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."

"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 Arb 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."

"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 respecteds 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."

"…the Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Yemen upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Republic of Yemen excludes the application of the provisions of paragraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the Convention.

The Government of Sweden considers that the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of all terrorist acts.

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 Republic of Yemen 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 Yemen and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between the Republic of Yemen and Sweden, without the Republic of Yemen benefiting from its reservation."

"[…] The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by the Government of Namibia upon ratification of the Convention, according to which the Government of Namibia does not consider armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces for the purpose of liberation or self determination to be acts of terrorism.

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 State 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 tothe reservation made by Namibia 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 Namibia and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between Namibia and Sweden without Namibia benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of Sweden has examined the interpretative declaration made by the Government of Kuwait upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism, according to which the Government of Kuwait declares that the commitment of the State of Kuwait to the Convention is without prejudice to its Arab and Islamic obligations in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation.

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 interpretative declaration made by Kuwait 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 State 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 Kuwait to the International Convention for the Suppression of Financing of Terrorism. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Kuwait and Sweden. The Convention enters into force between Kuwait and Sweden without Kuwait benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of Sweden has examined the content of the reservation and statement relating to subparagraph 1 (b) of Article 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Government of the Lebanese Republic upon accession.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that the statement of Lebanon in substance constitutes a reservation, as it seeks to limit the scope of the Convention and to subject the application of the Convention for the Lebanese Republic to a different definition of terrorism.

The Government of Sweden considers that the reservations are incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

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 reservations made by the Republic of Lebanon 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 Lebanon and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the Republic of Lebanon and Sweden, without the Republic of Lebanon benefiting from its reservations."

SWITZERLAND

The Swiss Federal Council has examined the reservation formulated by the Republic of Namibia upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999, stating that a struggle waged by people in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces, shall not be considered as terrorist acts.

The Federal Council considers that this reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention by limiting the definition of terrorist acts under the Convention. The Federal Council is of the view that such acts are under no circumstances justifiable on the basis of the right of peoples to selfdetermination. The reservation is therefore incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that instruments to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States should be prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under such instruments. The Swiss Federal Council considers that a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention is invalid and has no legal effect.

The Swiss Federal Council objects to the reservation made by the Republic of Namibia. This objection shall not preclude the entry the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Switzerland and the Republic of Namibia.

The Swiss Federal Council has examined the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999 stating that "the commitment of the State of Kuwait to the Convention is without prejudice to its Arab and Islamic obligations in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation".

The Federal Council considers that the interpretative declaration made by the State of Kuwait seeks to narrow the scope of the Convention by limiting the definition of acts of terrorism under the Convention. The interpretative declaration therefore in substance constitutes a reservation, despite its designation. The Federal Council is of the view that such acts are under no circumstances justifiable on the basis of legitimate national struggle against occupation. The reservation is therefore

incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that instruments to which they have chosen to become parties should be respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States should be prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under such instruments. The Swiss Federal Council considers that a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention is invalid and has no legal effect.

The Swiss Federal Council objects to the reservation of the State of Kuwait. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety betweenSwitzerland and the State of Kuwait.

The Swiss Federal Council has examined the reservation and statement made by Lebanon upon its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism of 9 December 1999, which read as follows: "… with a reservation regarding the definition of terrorism set forth in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b) of that Convention and an endorsement of the definition of terrorism set forth in articles 1 and 2 of the Arab counter-Terrorism Convention signed in Cairo on 22 April 1984".

The Federal Council considers that the reservation made by Lebanon has the effect of excluding from the scope of application of the Convention the financing of terrorist acts of "struggle … against foreign occupation and aggression for liberation and self-determination...". Such an exception could legitimize the financing of attacks against civilians and other persons not taking part in the hostilities and, thus, restricts the scope of application of the Convention. Consequently, the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

It is in the common interest of States that instruments 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 to comply with their treaty obligations.

The Swiss Federal Council henceforth objects to the reservation by Lebanon. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention, in its entirety, between Switzerland and Lebanon.

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"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."

"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 incompatiith 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."

"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."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has examined the reservation 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 Syrian Arab Republic at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom objects to the aforesaid reservation."

"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."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the 'understaing' 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."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has examined the said reservation. The reservation provides that, 'Extradition to other countries shall be subject to the domestic laws of Pakistan'. Reservations that leave it uncertain to what extent a State consents to be bound by its obligations are in the opinion of the Government of the United Kingdom to be treated as general reservations, which are not compatible with the object and purpose of a Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers that the above reservation is of that character and therefore objects to it. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Pakistan."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland has examined the said reservation and considers that it is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of the financing of all terrorist acts. The Government of the United Kingdom recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1961, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Yemen."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the Reservation made by the Government of Namibia, 'That a struggle waged by people in accordance with the principles of international law for their liberation or self-determination, including armed struggle against colonialism, occupation, aggression and domination by foreign forces, shall not be considered as terrorist acts.'

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland consider that the Reservation is not in compliance with Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties in that it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

The purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of all terrorist acts, including those defined in paragraph 1 of Article 2 of the Convention. Furthermore, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland consider the Reservation made by the Government of Namibia to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, under which States Parties are committed 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 of Great Britain and Northern Ireland 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 the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland therefore object to the Reservation made by Namibia 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 Namibia and the United Kingdom."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland consider that the Interpretative Declaration constitutes a Reservation limiting the scope of the Convention and that the Reservation is not in compliance with Article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties in that it is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The purpose of the Convention is to suppress the financing of all terrorist acts. The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland consider the Reservation made by the State of Kuwait to be contrary to the terms of Article 6 of the Convention, under which States Parties are committed 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 the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland 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 the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland therefore object to the Interpretative Declaration made by the State of Kuwait to the Convention . This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Kuwait and the United Kingdom."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"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."

"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."

"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."

"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."

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the 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 and who carries them out.

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 reservation made by the Government of Namibia upon ratification of the Convention. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Namibia."

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the declaration made by Kuwait to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The reservation 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 carries them out.

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 reservation made by the Government of Kuwait upon ratification of the Convention. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Kuwait."

"… [T]he Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers Lebanon's reservation and statement to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The reservation 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 carries them out.

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 of America 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 reservation and statement made by the Government of Lebanon upon accession to the Convention. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Lebanon."

Notifications made under article 7 (3)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ANDORRA

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Principality of Andorra declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

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

".... 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

".....in accordance with Article 7, paragraph 3, of the above-mentioned 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 (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)

... 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

"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

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.”

KUWAIT

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, the State of Kuwait establishes its full jurisdiction over all of the offences set out in article 7, paragraph 2, items a, b, c, d and e.

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

.....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)).

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

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.

REPUBLIC OF 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."

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.

SAUDI ARABIA

The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia has decided to establish its jurisdiction over all offences provided for in article 7, paragraph 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 international 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

"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.

TÜRKIYE

".....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

"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] On 28 January 2008, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General of its intention to withdraw the reservation in respect of article 14 made upon ratification. The text of the reservation reads as follows:

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.

[2] 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.

[3] With a territorial exclusion with respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.

[4] On 26 August 2024, the State of Kuwait notified the Secretary-General of its withdrawal of the following interpretative declaration made upon accession: “The commitment of the State of Kuwait to the Convention is without prejudice to its Arab and Islamic obligations in respect of the definition of terrorism and the distinction between terrorism and legitimate national struggle against occupation.”

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

[6] For the Kingdom in Europe.

Subsequently, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General on 23 March 2005 and 22 March 2010 that the Convention will apply to Aruba and to the Netherland Antilles, respectively, 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."

[7] 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."

[8] On 20 October 2015, the Government of Ukraine made a communication. The text can be found here: C.N.609.2015.TREATIES-XVIII.11of 20 October 2015.

[9] On 4 March 2022, the Government of Ukraine made a communication. The text can be found here: C.N.71.2022.TREATIES-XVIII.11 of 8 March 2022.

[10] In a communication received on 25 September 2008, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

“… the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wishes the United Kingdom’s ratification of the Convention to be extended to the following territories for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible:

Bailiwick of Guernsey

Isle of Man

Jersey

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the Convention to the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man, and Jersey to take effect from the date of deposit of this notification … .”

In a communication received on 17 May 2012, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

“… The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wishes the United Kingdom’s ratification of the [Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism] to be extended to the following territory for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible:

British Virgin Islands

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the aforesaid Convention to the British Virgin Islands to enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit of this notification [i.e. on 16 June 2012].”

In a communication received on 3 October 2014, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"… the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wishes the United Kingdom's Ratification of the Convention be extended to the territory of Bermuda for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the Convention to the territory of Bermuda to enter into force on the day of receipt of this notification by you for deposit…"

In a communication received on 20 April 2015, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wishes the United Kingdom's Ratification of the Convention [to] be extended to the territory of Anguilla for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the Convention to Anguilla to enter into force from the day of deposit of this notification ..."

In a communication received on 23 March 2020, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland hereby extends the application of the United Kingdom's ratification of the Convention to Gibraltar, for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the Convention to Gibraltar to take effect on the date of deposit of this notification..."

In a communication received on 12 August 2021, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland hereby extends the application of the United Kingdom's ratification of the Convention to the territory of the Cayman Islands, for the international relations of which the United Kingdom is responsible.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland considers the extension of the Convention to the territory of the Cayman Islands to take effect on the date of deposit of this notification…"

[11] 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 objeives, 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.

[12] Within a period of one year from the date of the depositary notification transmitting the declaration (C.N.916.2009.TREATIES-3 of 29 December 2009), 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 declaration in question was accepted for deposit upon the above-stipulated one year period, that is on 29 December 2010.

[13] 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 Goverhe 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.

[14] 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 Republicishes 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."

[15] 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;"....

[16] 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.

[17] 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 andseriousness 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),nd 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."

[18] By 23 July 2009, i.e., within a period of one year from the date of depositary notification C.N.526.2008.TREATIES-5 of 23 July 2008, 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.

[19] On 19 December 2024, the Government of Lithuania notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation it made upon accession in respect of paragraph 1 of Article 24 of the Convention, which reads as follows:

"...it is provided in paragraph 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."

[20] In a communication received in 17 September 2012, the Government of the Union of Myanmar notified the Secretary-General of the withdrawal of the following reservation made upon ratification of the Convention:

"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.

[21] 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."

[22] The Secretary-General received on 14 February 2014 the following notification from the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam under article 2, paragraph 2 (a) regarding the declaration made upon accession that the provisions of the Convention shall not be applied with regard to the offences set forth in the following treaties:

"… from 8 February 2014, the declaration made by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in accordance with Article 2.2(a) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 9 December 1999, shall cease to have effect in respect of the following Conventions:

- International Convention against the Taking of Hostages, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 17 December 1979, and

- International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997…"

[23] The Secretary-General received a communication relating to the reservation made by Yemen upon accession from the following Government on the date indicated hereinafter :

Belgium (25 March 2011)

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has examined the reservation formulated by the Republic of Yemen upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, in particular the part of the reservation in which the Republic of Yemen excludes the application of "article 2, paragraph 1 (b)" of the Convention. This reservation purports to exclude suppression of the financing of terrorist 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".

The Government of Belgium considers that this reservation seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis that is contrary to its object and purpose, namely, suppression of the financing of terrorist acts, wherever and by whomsoever committed.

Moreover, this reservation 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 that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention may not be formulated.

The Government of Belgium therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation to the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism made by the Republic of Yemen. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention as between Belgium and Yemen.