9. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings

New York, 15 December 1997

ENTRY INTO FORCE: 23 May 2001, in accordance with article 22 which reads as follows: "1. This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession. 2. For each State ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the twenty-second instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.".

REGISTRATION: 23 May 2001, No. 37517.

STATUS: Signatories: 58. Parties: 170.

TEXT: United Nations, *Treaty Series* , vol. 2149, p. 256; depositary notification C.N.801.2001.TREATIES-9 of 12 October 2001 [proposal for corrections to the original of the Convention (authentic Chinese text)] and C.N.16.2002.TREATIES-1 of 10 January 2002 [rectification of the original text of the Convention (Chinese authentic text)]; C.N.310.2002.TREATIES-14 of 4 April 2002 [proposal of a correction to the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)] and C.N.416.2002.TREATIES-16 of 3 May 2002 [rectification of the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)]; C.N.1161.2005.TREATIES-15 of 15 Novemberl 2005 [proposal of a correction to the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)].

Note: The Convention was adopted by resolution A/RES/52/164 of the General Assembly on 15 December 1997. In accordance with its article 21(1), the Convention will be open for signature by all States on 12 January 1998 until 31 December 1999 at United Nations Headquarters.

Participant	*Signature*	*Approval(AA), Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification*
Afghanistan		24 Sep 2003 a
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria	17 Dec 1998	8 Nov 2001
Andorra		23 Sep 2004 a
Antigua and Barbuda		24 Sep 2009 a
Argentina	2 Sep 1998	25 Sep 2003
Armenia		16 Mar 2004 a
Australia		9 Aug 2002 a
Austria	9 Feb 1998	6 Sep 2000
Azerbaijan		2 Apr 2001 a
Bahamas (The)		5 May 2008 a
Bahrain		21 Sep 2004 a
Bangladesh		20 May 2005 a
Barbados		18 Sep 2002 a
Belarus	20 Sep 1999	1 Oct 2001
Belgium[1]	12 Jan 1998	20 May 2005
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Benin		31 Jul 2003 a
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)		22 Jan 2002 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina		11 Aug 2003 a
Botswana		8 Sep 2000 a
Brazil	12 Mar 1999	23 Aug 2002
Brunei Darussalam		14 Mar 2002 a
Bulgaria		12 Feb 2002 a
Burkina Faso		1 Oct 2003 a
Burundi	4 Mar 1998	
Cabo Verde		10 May 2002 a
Cambodia		31 Jul 2006 a
Cameroon		21 Mar 2005 a
Canada	12 Jan 1998	3 Apr 2002
Central African Republic		19 Feb 2008 a

Participant	Signature	Approval(AA), Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification
Chile		10 Nov 2001 a
China[2]		13 Nov 2001 a
Colombia		14 Sep 2004 a
Comoros	1 Oct 1998	25 Sep 2003
Costa Rica	16 Jan 1998	20 Sep 2001
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 1998	13 Mar 2002
Croatia		2 Jun 2005 a
Cuba		15 Nov 2001 a
Cyprus	26 Mar 1998	24 Jan 2001
Czech Republic	29 Jul 1998	6 Sep 2000
Democratic Republic of the Congo		27 Jun 2008 a
Denmark[3]	23 Dec 1999	31 Aug 2001
Djibouti		1 Jun 2004 a
Dominica		24 Sep 2004 a
Dominican Republic		21 Oct 2008 a
Egypt	14 Dec 1999	9 Aug 2005
El Salvador		15 May 2003 a
Equatorial Guinea		7 Feb 2003 a
Estonia	27 Dec 1999	10 Apr 2002
Eswatini		4 Apr 2003 a
Ethiopia		16 Apr 2003 a
Fiji		15 May 2008 a
Finland	23 Jan 1998	28 May 2002 A
France	12 Jan 1998	19 Aug 1999
Gabon		10 Mar 2005 a
Georgia		18 Feb 2004 a
Germany	26 Jan 1998	23 Apr 2003
Ghana		6 Sep 2002 a
Greece	2 Feb 1998	27 May 2003
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala		12 Feb 2002 a
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Guinea-Bissau		6 Aug 2008 a
Guyana		12 Sep 2007 a
Honduras		25 Mar 2003 a
Hungary	21 Dec 1999	13 Nov 2001
Iceland	28 Sep 1998	15 Apr 2002
India	17 Sep 1999	22 Sep 1999
Indonesia		29 Jun 2006 a
Iraq		30 Jul 2013 a
Ireland	29 May 1998	30 Jun 2005
Israel	29 Jan 1999	10 Feb 2003
Italy	4 Mar 1998	16 Apr 2003
Jamaica		9 Aug 2005 a
Japan	17 Apr 1998	16 Nov 2001 A
Kazakhstan		6 Nov 2002 a
Kenya		16 Nov 2001 a
Kiribati		15 Sep 2005 a
Kuwait		19 Apr 2004 a
Kyrgyzstan		1 May 2001 a
Lao People's Democratic Republic		22 Aug 2002 a
Latvia		25 Nov 2002 a
Lesotho		12 Nov 2001 a
Liberia		5 Mar 2003 a
Libya		22 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein		26 Nov 2002 a
Lithuania	8 Jun 1998	17 Mar 2004
Luxembourg	6 Feb 1998	6 Feb 2004
Madagascar	1 Oct 1999	24 Sep 2003
Malawi		11 Aug 2003 a
Malaysia		24 Sep 2003 a
Maldives		7 Sep 2000 a
Mali		28 Mar 2002 a
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Marshall Islands		27 Jan 2003 a
Mauritania		30 Apr 2003 a
Mauritius		24 Jan 2003 a
Mexico		20 Jan 2003 a
Micronesia (Federated States of)		23 Sep 2002 a
Monaco	25 Nov 1998	6 Sep 2001
Mongolia		7 Sep 2000 a
Montenegro[4]		23 Oct 2006 d
Morocco		9 May 2007 a
Mozambique		14 Jan 2003 a
Myanmar		12 Nov 2001 a
Namibia		2 Sep 2016 a
Nauru		2 Aug 2005 a
Nepal	24 Sep 1999	
Netherlands (Kingdom of the)[5]	12 Mar 1998	7 Feb 2002 A
New Zealand[6]		4 Nov 2002 a
Nicaragua		17 Jan 2003 a

Participant	Signature	Approval(AA), Acceptance(A), Accession(a), Succession(d), Ratification
Niger		26 Oct 2004 a
Nigeria		24 Sep 2013 a
Niue		22 Jun 2009 a
North Macedonia	16 Dec 1998	30 Aug 2004
Norway	31 Jul 1998	20 Sep 1999
Pakistan		13 Aug 2002 a
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	3 Sep 1998	5 Mar 1999
Papua New Guinea		30 Sep 2003 a
Paraguay		22 Sep 2004 a
Peru		10 Nov 2001 a
Philippines	23 Sep 1998	7 Jan 2004
Poland	14 Jun 1999	3 Feb 2004
Portugal	30 Dec 1999	10 Nov 2001
Qatar		27 Jun 2008 a
Republic of Korea	3 Dec 1999	17 Feb 2004
Republic of Moldova		10 Oct 2002 a
Romania	30 Apr 1998	29 Jul 2004
Russian Federation	12 Jan 1998	8 May 2001
Rwanda		13 May 2002 a
San Marino		12 Mar 2002 a
Sao Tome and Principe		12 Apr 2006 a
Saudi Arabia		31 Oct 2007 a
Senegal		27 Oct 2003 a
Serbia		31 Jul 2003 a
Seychelles		22 Aug 2003 a
Sierra Leone		26 Sep 2003 a
Singapore		31 Dec 2007 a
Slovakia	28 Jul 1998	8 Dec 2000
Slovenia	30 Oct 1998	25 Sep 2003
Solomon Islands		24 Sep 2009 a
South Africa	21 Dec 1999	1 May 2003
Spain	1 May 1998	30 Apr 1999
Sri Lanka	12 Jan 1998	23 Mar 1999
St. Kitts and Nevis		16 Nov 2001 a
St. Lucia		17 Oct 2012 a
St. Vincent and the Grenadines		15 Sep 2005 a
Sudan	7 Oct 1999	8 Sep 2000
Sweden	12 Feb 1998	6 Sep 2001
Switzerland		23 Sep 2003 a
Tajikistan		29 Jul 2002 a
Thailand		12 Jun 2007 a
Togo	21 Aug 1998	10 Mar 2003
Tonga		9 Dec 2002 a
Trinidad and Tobago		2 Apr 2001 a
Tunisia		22 Apr 2005 a
Türkiye	20 May 1999	30 May 2002
Turkmenistan	18 Feb 1999	25 Jun 1999
Uganda	11 Jun 1999	5 Nov 2003
Ukraine[7,8]		26 Mar 2002 a
United Arab Emirates		23 Sep 2005 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland[9]	12 Jan 1998	7 Mar 2001
United Republic of Tanzania		22 Jan 2003 a
United States of America	12 Jan 1998	26 Jun 2002
Uruguay	23 Nov 1998	10 Nov 2001
Uzbekistan	23 Feb 1998	30 Nov 1998
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	23 Sep 1998	23 Sep 2003
Viet Nam		9 Jan 2014 a
Yemen		23 Apr 2001 a
Zambia		7 Apr 2017 a

Declarations and Reservations

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

ALGERIA

Reservation of Algeria

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that in order for a dispute to be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties to the dispute shall be required in each case.

BAHAMAS (THE)

"In accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 20, the Commonwealth of The Bahamas does not consider itself bound by any of the arbitration procedures established under paragraph 1 of Article 20 on the basis that referral of a dispute concerning the application or interpretation of the provisions of the Convention to arbitration or to the International Court must be by the consent of all of the parties to the dispute."

BAHRAIN

The Kingdom of Bahrain does not consider itself bound by Paragraph 1 of Article 20 of the Convention.

BELGIUM[1]

BRAZIL

".....the Federative Republic of Brazil declares, pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted in New York on the 15th December 1997, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1, of the said Convention.

CANADA

"Canada declares that it considers the application of article 2 (3) (c) of the Terrorist Bombing Convention to be limited to acts committed in furthering a conspiracy of two or more persons to commit a specific criminal offence contemplated in paragraph 1 or 2 of article 2 of that Convention."

CHINA

"... China accedes to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombing, done at New York on 15 December 1997, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 20 of the Convention."

COLOMBIA

By virtue of article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Colombia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article.

Furthermore, by virtue of article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Colombia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in relation to paragraph 2 of the same article.

CUBA

Reservation

The Republic of Cuba declares, pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article, concerning the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, inasmuch as it considers that such disputes must be settled through amicable negotiation. In consequence, it declares that it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

Declaration

The Republic of Cuba declares that none of the provisions contained in article 19, paragraph 2, shall constitute an encouragement or condonation of the threat or use of force in international relations, which must under all circumstances be governed strictly by the principles of international law and the purposes and principles enshrined in the Charter of the United Nations.

Cuba also considers that relations between States must be based strictly on the provisions contained in resolution 2625 (XXV) of the United Nations General Assembly.

In addition, the exercise of State terrorism has historically been a fundamental concern for Cuba, which considers that the complete eradication thereof through mutual respect, friendship and cooperation between States, full respect for sovereignty and territorial integrity, self-determination and non-interference in internal affairs must constitute a priority of the international community.

Cuba is therefore firmly of the opinion that the undue use of the armed forces of one State for the purpose of aggression against another cannot be condoned under the present Convention, whose purpose is precisely to combat, in accordance with the principles of the international law, one of the most noxious forms of crime faced by the modern world.

To condone acts of aggression would amount, in fact, to condoning violations of international law and of the Charter and provoking conflicts with unforeseeable consequences that would undermine thecessary cohesion of the international community in the fight against the scourges that truly afflict it.

The Republic of Cuba also interprets the provisions of the present Convention as applying with full rigour to activities carried out by armed forces of one State against another State in cases in which no armed conflict exists between the two.

EGYPT[10]

"1. Article 6, paragraph 5:

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it is bound by Article 6, paragraph 5, of the Convention insofar as the domestic laws of States Parties do not contradict the relevant rules and principles of international law.

2. Article 19, paragraph 2 :

The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it is bound by Article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention insofar as the military forces of the State, in the exercise of their duties do not violate the rules and principles of international law."

1. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 6, paragraph 5, of the Convention to the extent that the national legislation of States Parties is not incompatible with the relevant norms and principles of international law.

2. The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention to the extent that the armed forces of a State, in the exercise of their duties, do not violate the norms and principles of international law.

EL SALVADOR

... with regard to article 20, paragraph 2, the Republic of El Salvador declares that it does not consider itsel f bound by paragraph 1 of the said article because it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

ETHIOPIA

"The Government of the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia does not consider itself bound by the aforementioned provision of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention would be submitted to arbitration or to the Court only with the prior consent of all the parties concerned."

GERMANY

The Federal Republic of Germany understands article 1 para. 4 of [the said Convention] in the sense that the term "military forces of a state" includes their national contingents operating as part of the United Nations forces. Furthermore, the Federal Republic of Germany also understands that, for the purposes of this Convention, the term "military forces of a state" also covers police forces.

INDIA

“In accordance with Article 20 (2), the Government of the Republic of India hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 20 (1) of the Convention.”.

INDONESIA

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia declares that the provisions of Article 6 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings will have to be implemented in strict compliance with the principles of the sovereignty and territorial integrity of States."

"The Government of the Republic of Indonesia does not consider itself bound by the provision of Article 20 and takes the position that dispute relating to the interpretation and application on the Convention which cannot be settled through the channel provided for in Paragraph (1) of the said Article, may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the Parties to the dispute."

ISRAEL

" ... with the following declarations:

The Government of the State of Israel understands Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, in the sense that the term "military forces of a State" includes police and security forces operating pursuant to the internal law of the State of Israel.

...

The Government of the State of Israel understands that the term "international humanitarian law"referred to in Article 19, of the Convention has the same substantive meaning as the term "the laws of war"("jus in bello"). This body of laws does not include the provisions of the protocols additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1977 to which the State of Israel is not a Party.

The Government of the State of Israel understands that under Article 1 paragraph 4 and Article 19 the Convention does not apply to civilians who direct or organize the official activities of military forces of a state.

Pursuant to Article 20, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the State of Israel does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

KUWAIT

".....the reservation to its paragraph (a) of article (20) and the declaration of non-compliance to its provisions."

LAO PEOPLE'S DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

"In accordance with paragraph 2, Article 20 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Lao People's Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1, article 20 of the present Convention. The Lao People's Democratic Republic declares that to refer a dispute relating to interpretation and application of the present Convention to arbitration or International Court of Justice, the agreement of all parties concerned in the dispute is necessary."

MALAYSIA

“1. The Government of Malaysia understands the phrase “Military forces of a State” in Article 1 (4) of the Convention to include the national contingents of Malaysia operating as part of United Nations forces.

2. .....

3. The Government of Malaysia understands Article 8 (1) of the Convention to include the right of the competent authorities to decide not to submit any particular case for prosecution before the judicial authorities if the alleged offender is dealt with under national security and preventive detention laws.

4. (a) Pursuant to Article 20 (2) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 20 (1) of the Convention; and

(b) the Government of Malaysia reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the arbitration procedure set forth in Article 20 (1) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration.”

MOZAMBIQUE

“... with the following declaration in accordance with its article 20, paragraph 2:

“The Republic of Mozambique does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20 paragraph 1 of the Convention.

In this connection, the Republic of Mozambique states that, in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice”.

Furthermore, the Republic of Mozambique declare that:

“The Republic of Mozambique, in accordance with its Constitution and domestic laws, may not and will not extradite Mozambique citizens.

Therefore, Mozambique citizens will be tried and sentenced in national courts”.

MYANMAR

“The Government of the Union of Myanmar, having considered the Convention aforesaid, hereby declares that it accedes to the same with reservation on Article 20 (1) and does not consider itself bound by the provision set forth in the said Article.”

NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

PAKISTAN[11]

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination, in accordance with the rules of international law. This interpretation is consistent with Article 53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969 which provides that an agreement or treaty concluded in conflict with an existing jus cogen or preemptory norm of international

law is void and, the right of self-determination is universally recognized as *a jus cogen* ."

PORTUGAL

"For the purposes of article 8, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Portugal declares that the extradiction of Portuguese nationals from its territory will be authorized only if the following conditions, as stated in the Constitution of the Portuguese Republic, are met:

a) In case of terrorism and organised criminality; and

b) For purposes of criminal proceedings and, being so, subject to a guarantee given by the state seeking the extradition that the concerned person will be surrended to Portugal to serve the sentence or mesure imposed on him or her, unless such person does not consent thereto by means of expressed declaration.

For purposes of enforcement of a sentence in Portugal, the procedures referred to in the declaration made by Portugal to the European Convention on the transfer of sentenced persons shall be complied with."

QATAR

Reservation:

… with reservation regarding paragraph 1 of Article (20) concerning the submission of disputes to international arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

... with the following declarations and reservation

1. .....

2. The Republic of Moldova declares its understanding that the provisions of article 12 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings should be implemented in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offenses falling within the scope of the Convention, without prejudice to the effectiveness of the international cooperation on the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

3. Pursuant to article 20, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Moldova declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

RUSSIAN FEDERATION

The position of the Russian Federation is that the provisions of article 12 of the Convention should be implemented in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offences falling within the scope of the Convention, without detriment to the effectiveness of international cooperation on the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

.....

2) "The position of the Russian Federation is that the provisions of article 12 of the Convention should be implemented in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for the commission of offenses falling within the scope of the Convention, without detriment to the effectiveness of international cooperation on the questions of extradition and legal assistance".

SAUDI ARABIA

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia decides to establish its full jurisdiction in accordance with paragraph (2) of article 6 of the Convention.

2. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 20 of the Convention concerning the submission of disputes arising from the interpretation or application of this Convention or referring such dispute to the International Court of Justice.

SINGAPORE

"(1) Pursuant to Article 20, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Republic of Singapore declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 20, paragraph 1 of the Convention."

"(1) The Republic of Singapore understands Article 8, paragraph 1, of the Convention to include the right of competent authorities to decide not to submit any particular case for prosecution before the judicial authorities if the alleged offender is dealt with under national security and preventive detention laws.

(2) The Republic of Singapore understands that the term 'armed conflict' in Article19, paragraph 2, of the Convention does not include internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence, and other acts of a similar nature.

(3) The Republic of Singapore understands that, under Article 19 and Article 1, paragraph 4, the Convention does not apply to:

(a) the military forces of a state in the exercise of their official duties;

(b) civilians who direct or organize the official activities of military forces of a state; or

(c) civilians acting in support of the official activities of the military forces of a state, if the

civilians are under the formal command, control, and responsibility of those forces."

SPAIN

According to article 23 of the Organization of Justice Act 6/1985 of 1 July, terrorism is a crime that is universally prosecutable and over which the Spanish courts have international jurisdiction under any circumstances; accordingly, article 6, paragraph 2 of the Convention is deemed to have been satisfied and there is no need to establish a special jurisdiction upon ratification of the Convention.

ST. LUCIA

"1. In accordance with Article 10 of paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Government of Saint Lucia does not consider itself bound by the arbitration procedures established under Article 20 paragraph 1, of the Convention.

2. That the explicit expressed consent of the Government of Saint Lucia would be necessary for any submission of any dispute to arbitration [or] to the International Court of Justice."

SUDAN

This paragraph shall not create any additional obligation to the Government of the Republic of the Sudan. It does not affect and does not diminish the responsibility of the Government of the Republic of the Sudan to maintain by all legitimate means order and law or re-establish it in the country or to defend its national unity or territorial integrity.

This paragraph does not affect the principle of non-interference in internal affairs of states, directly or indirectly, as it is set out in the United Nations Charter and relative provisions of international law.

The Republic of the Sudan does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 20, in pursuance to paragraph 2 of the same article.

TUNISIA

By agreeing to accede to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December

1997, [the Republic of Tunisia] declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 20 (1) and affirms that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the said Convention may only be submitted to the International Court of Justice with its prior consent."

TÜRKIYE

"The Republic of Turkey declares that articles 9 and 12 should not be interpreted in such a way that offenders of these crimes are neither tried nor prosecuted. Furthermore mutual legal assistance and extradition are two different concepts and the conditions for rejecting a request for extradition should not be valid for mutual legal assistance.

The Republic of Turkey declares its understanding that the term international humanitarian law referred to in article 19 of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings shall be interpreted as comprising the relevant international rules excluding the provisions of additional Protocols to Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, to which Turkey is not a Party. The first part of the second paragraph of the said article should not be interpreted as giving a different status to the armed forces and groups other than the armed forces of a state as currently understood and applied in international law and thereby as creating new obligations for Turkey.

Pursuant to paragraph 2 of article (20) of the [Convention] the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article (20) of the said Convention."

"[W]ith the stated reservations...[:]

1) The Republic of Turkey declares that Articles (9) and (12) should not be interpreted in such a way that offenders of these crimes are neither tried nor prosecuted.

2) The Republic of Turkey declares its understanding that the term international humanitarian law referred to in Article (19) of the Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings shall be interpreted as comprising the relevant international rules excluding the provisions of Additional Protocols to Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, to which Turkey is not a Party. The first part of the second paragraph of the said article should not be interpreted as giving a different status to the armed forces and groups other than the armed forces of a state as currently understood and applied in international law and thereby as creating new obligations for Turkey.

3) Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Article (20) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Paragraph 1 of Article (20) of the said Convention."

UKRAINE

The provisions of article 19, paragraph 2, do not preclude Ukraine from exercising its jurisdiction over the members of military forces of a state and their prosecution, should their actions be illegal. The Convention will be applied to the extent that such activities are not governed by other rules of international law.

UNITED ARAB EMIRATES

....subject to a reservation with respect to paragraph 1 of article 20 thereof, which relates to the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, in consequence of which the United Arab Emirates does not consider itself bound by that paragraph concerning arbitration.

Moreover, the Government of the United Arab Emirates will determine its jurisdiction over the offences in the cases provided for in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention and will notify the Secretary-General of the United Nations to that effect in accordance with paragraph 3 of that article.

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"(a) pursuant to article 20 (2) of the Convention, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 20 (1) of the Convention; and

(b) the United States of America reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the procedure in Article 20 (1) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

"(1) EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF TERM "ARMED CONFLICT". The United States of America understands that the term "armed conflict"in Article 19 (2) of the Convention does not include internal disturbances and tensions, such as riots, isolated and sporadic acts of violence, and other acts of a similar nature.

(2) MEANING OF TERM "INTERNATIONAL HUMANITARIAN LAW". The United States of America understands that the term "international humanitarian law"in Article 19 of the Convention has the same substantive meaning as the law of war.

(3) EXCLUSION FROM COVERAGE OF ACTIVITIES BY MILITARY FORCES. The United States understands that, under Article 19 and Article 1 (4), the Convention does not apply to:

(A) the military fores of a state in the exercise of their official duties;

(B) civilians who direct or organize the official activities of military forces of a state; or

(C) civilians acting in support of the official activities of the military forces of a state, if the civilians are under the formal command, control, and responsibility of those forces. "

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

The Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, pursuant to the provisions of article 20, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, formulates an express reservation regarding the stipulation in paragraph 1 of that article. Accordingly, it does not consider itself bound to resort to arbitration as a means of dispute settlement, and does not recognize the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

VIET NAM

“[T]he Socialist Republic of Viet Nam does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of Article 20 of this Convention.”

“1. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam declares that the provisions of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings are non-self-executing in Viet Nam. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shall duly implement the provisions of the Convention through multilateral and bilateral mechanisms, specific provisions in its domestic laws and regulations and on the basis of the principle of reciprocity.

2. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, pursuant to Article 9 of this Convention, declares that it shaII not take this Convention as the direct legal basis for extradition. The Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shaII carry out extradition in accordance with the provisions of its domestic laws and regulations, on the basis of treaties on extradition and the principle of reciprocity.”

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

AUSTRALIA

"The Government of Australia has examined the Declaration made by the Government of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997. The Government of Australia considers the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Government of Australia further considers the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention ... are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of Australia recalls that, according to Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Australia objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Australia and Pakistan."

AUSTRIA

"The Government of Austria has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

The Government of Austria considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstance justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Austria recalls that according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Austria therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Austria ans the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. "

CANADA

"The Government of Canada has examined the Declaration made by Pakistan at the time of its accession to the Convention and considers that the Declaration is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of Canada considers the Declaration to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of Canada considers that the above Declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of Canada recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and Pakistan".

"The Government of Canada considers the Reservation to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to ".....adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature."

The Government of Canada therefore objects to the Reservation relating to Article 2 made by the Government of Belgium upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings which it considers as contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Canada and Belgium.

The Government of Canada notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as

reflected in Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted."

DENMARK

"The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark recalls that, according to Article 19 C of the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that all parties respect treaties to which they have chosen to become party, as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of Denmark and Pakistan."

FINLAND

"The Government of Finland has carefully examined the contents of the interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of Finland is of the view that the declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Finland further considers the declaration to be in contradiction with the object and purpose of the Convention, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings wherever and by whomever carried out.

The declaration is, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Finland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of states that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose and that states are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to the above-mentioned interpretative declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two states without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its declaration."

FRANCE

"The Government of the French Republic has considered the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, in ratifying the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings of 15 December 1997, that 'nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination, in accordance with international law'. The aim of the Convention is to suppress all terrorist bombings, and article 5 states that 'each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary (...) to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature'. The Government of the French Republic considers that the above declaration constitutes a reservation, to which it objects".

The Government of the French Republic has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon its ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings of 15 December 1997. Pursuant to that reservation, the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it is bound by article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention only insofar as the military forces of the State, in the exercise of their duties, do not violate the rules and principles of international law. However, the relevant portion of article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention states that: "the activities undertaken by military forces of a State in the exercise of their official duties, inasmuch as they are governed by other rules of international law, are not governed by this Convention".

The Government of the French Republic considers that the effect of the reservation made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is to bring within the scope of the Convention activities undertaken by a State's armed forces which do not belong there because they are covered by other provisions of international law. As a result, the reservation substantially alters the meaning and scope of article 19, paragraph 2 of the Convention. The Government of the French Republic objects to the reservation, which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and Egypt.

The Government of the French Republic has examined the declaration formulated by Viet Nam upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

In this declaration, Viet Nam states, inter alia, that “the provisions of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings are non-self-executing in Viet Nam,” and that “the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam shall duly implement the provisions of the Convention through multilateral and bilateral mechanisms, specific provisions in its domestic laws and regulations and on the basis of the principle of reciprocity.”

The French Government notes that the declaration formulated by Viet Nam has the legal effect of restricting the scope of certain stipulations of the Convention and must therefore be considered as a reservation.

The French Government also notes that Viet Nam intends, by means of this declaration, to make the application of the provisions of the Convention subordinate to the principle of reciprocity. However, as specified in the preambular paragraphs, the purpose of the Convention is to meet "the urgent need to enhance international cooperation between States in devising and adopting effective and practical measures for the prevention of such acts of terrorism, and for the prosecution and punishment of their perpetrators". In this regard, the reservation formulated by Viet Nam appears to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the French Republic therefore objects to the declaration formulated by Viet Nam. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between France and Viet Nam.

GERMANY

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the "declaration" to the International Convention of the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature."

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Pakistan."

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the declaration relating to the Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 8 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia introduces a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to clearly identify in which way the Government of Malaysia intends to change the obligations arising from the Convention.

Therefore the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany hereby objects to this declaration which is considered to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and Malaysia."

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings with respect to its Article 11. With this reservation, the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium expresses that it reserves the right to refuse extradition or mutual legal assistance in respect of any offence which it considers to be politically motivated. In the opinion of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, this reservation seeks to limit the Convention's scope of application in a way that is incompatible withthe objective and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to the above-mentioned reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Kingdom of Belgium."

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

In this declaration the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt expresses the opinion that the activities of the armed forces of a State in the exercise of their duties, inasmuch as they are not consistent with the rules and principles of international humanitarian law, are governed by the Convention. However, according to article 19, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the activities of armed forces during an armed conflict, as those terms are understood under international humanitarian law, which are governed by that law, as well as the activities undertaken by military forces of a State in the exercise of their official duties, inasmuch as they are governed by other rules of international law, are not governed by this Convention, so that the declaration by the Arab Republic of Egypt aims to broaden the scope of the Convention.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the opinion that the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt is only entitled to make such a declaration unilaterally for its own armed forces, and it interprets the declaration as having binding effect only on armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt. In the view of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, such a unilateral declaration cannot apply to the armed forces of other States Parties without their express consent. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore declares that it does not consent to the Egyptian declaration as so interpreted with regard to any armed forces other than those of the Arab Republic of Egypt, and in particular does not recognize any applicability of the Convention to the armed forces of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany also emphasizes that the declaration by the Arab Republic of Egypt has no effect whatsoever on the Federal Republic of Germany's obligations as State Party to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, or on the Convention's applicability to armed forces of the Federal Republic of Germany.

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany regards the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings as entering into force between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Arab Republic of Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, which relates exclusively to the obligations of the Arab Republic of Egypt and to the armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt."

INDIA

"The Government of the Republic of India have examined the Declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997.

The Government of the Republic of India consider that the Declaration made by Pakistan is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and it is, therefore, incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of India consider the Declaration to be, furthermore, contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention ... are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of their political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of India consider that the above Declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of India recall that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of India therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between India and Pakistan."

IRELAND

"The Government of Ireland have examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings according to which the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggles, for the realisation of the right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland are also of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing terrorist bombings, wherever and by whomever carried out.

The Government of Ireland further consider the declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

ISRAEL

"The Permanent Mission of the State of Israel to the United Nations presents its compliments to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and has the honour to refer to the declaration of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, 1997.

"The Government of the State of Israel considers that declaration to be, in fact, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, as expressed in Article 5 thereof.

The Government of the State of Israel recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the State of Israel therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan."

ITALY

"The Government of Italy has examined the "declaration" to the International Convention of the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of Italy considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its objective and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the term of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Italy and Pakistan."

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservation to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of Belgium upon the accession to that Convention. The Government of Italy considers the reservation by Belgium as intended to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis, which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where it takes place and of who carries it out. The Government of Italy recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of the Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. The Government of Italy therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Belgium and Italy. The Convention enters into force between Belgium and Italy without the Government of Belgium benefiting from its reservation. "

"The Government of Italy has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorism Bombings, according to which 1) The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 6, paragraph 5, of the Convention to the extent that national legislation of States Parties is not incompatible with relevant norms and principles of international law. 2) The Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt declares that it shall be bound by article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention to the extent that the armed forces of a State, in article 19, paragraph 2, of the Convention to the extent that the armed forces of a State, in the exercise of their duties, do not violate the norms and principles of international law.

The Government of Italy considers the reservations to be contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which the States Parties are under an obligation to adopt such measures as maybe necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature.

The Government of Italy wishes to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Italy therefore objects to the reservations made by the Arab Republic of Egypt to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Italy. The Convention enters into force between the Arab Republic of Egypt and Italy without the Arab Republic of Egypt benefiting from its reservations."

JAPAN

".....[The Permanent Mission of Japan] has the honour to make the following declaration on behalf of the Government of Japan.

When depositing its Instrument of Accession, the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan made a declaration which reads as follows:

"The Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan declares that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination, in accordance with the rules of international law. This interpretation is consistent with Article53 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969 which provides that an agreement or treaty concluded in conflict with an existing jus cogen or preemptory norm of international law is void and, the right of self-determination is universally recognized as a jus cogen."

In this connection, the Government of Japan draws attention to the provisions of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Japan considers that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan seeks to exclude struggles, including armed struggle, for the realization of right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination from the application of the Convention and that such declaration constitutes a reservation which is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of Japan therefore objects to the aforementioned reservation made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

NETHERLANDS (KINGDOM OF THE)

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the declaration made by Pakistan is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, which is the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) the Vienna Convention on the law of treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Pakistan."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to the International Convention for the suppression of terrorist bombings made by the Government of Malaysia at the time of its accession to the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that in making the interpretation and application of Article 8 of the Convention subject to the national legislation of Malaysia, the Government of Malaysia is formulating a general and indefinite reservation that makes it impossible to identify the changes to the obligations arising from the Convention that it is intended to introduce. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore considers that a reservation formulated in this way is likely to contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law.

For these reasons, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby objects to this declaration which it

considers to be a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Malaysia."

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the declaration relating to article 19, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

In the view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands this declaration made by the Government of Egypt seeks to extend the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis to include the armed forces of a State to the extent that they fail to meet the test that they 'do not violate the rules and principles of international law'. Otherwise such activities would be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the Government of Egypt is entitled to make such a declaration, only to the extent that Egypt will apply the terms of the Convention in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention to their own armed forces. The declaration of the Government of Egypt will have no effect in respect of the obligations of the Kingdom of the Netherlands under the Convention or in respect to the application of the Convention to the armed forces of the Kingdom of the Netherlands.

This statement shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Arab Republic of Egypt."

NEW ZEALAND

"The Government f New Zealand has carefully examined the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997.

The Government of New Zealand considers the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of New Zealand further considers the declaration to be contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention...are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious, or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of New Zealand recalls that, according to article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of New Zealand therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between New Zealand and Pakistan."

NORWAY

"The Government of Norway has examined the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

The Government of Norway considers the declaration to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention according to which State Parties commit themselves to adopt measures as may be necessary to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent wit their grave nature.

The Government of Norway recalls that, according to customary international law, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Norway therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of Pakistan to the Convention between the Kingdom of Norway and Pakistan."

SPAIN

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has considered the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in respect of the International Convention for the Prevention of Terrorist Bombings (New York, 15 December 1997) at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers this declaration to constitute a de facto reservation the aim of which is to limit unilaterally the scope of the Convention. This is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, which is the repression of terrorist bombings, by whomever and wherever they may be carried out.

In particular, the declaration by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan is incompatible with the spirit of article 5 of the Convention, which establishes the obligation for all States Parties to adopt "such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention [...] are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature."

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain wishes to point out that, under customary international law, as codified in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of treaties are not permitted.

Consequently, the Government of Spain objects to the aforementioned declaration by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Prevention of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the aforementioned Convention between the Kingdom of Spain and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to article 11 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings upon ratifying that Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that this reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers, in particular, that the reservation by Belgium is incompatible with article 5 of the Convention, whereby States parties undertake to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of the Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by

considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or others of similar nature.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain recalls that, under the customary-law provision enshrined in article 19 (c) of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty concerned are not permitted.

Accordingly, the Government of the Kingdom of Spain objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Kingdom of Belgium to article 11 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

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

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain has examined the reservation to article 19, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings presented by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain considers that Egypt's reservation relates to an essential component of the Convention, having an impactnot only on article 19, paragraph 2, but also on the clause establishing the scope of the Convention's implementation, because its effect is to alter the law applicable to actions of a State's armed forces which violate international law. As a result, this is a reservation which runs counter to the interests safeguarded by the Convention, and to the Convention's object and purpose.

The Government of the Kingdom of Spain wishes to recall that, according to the provision of international law codified in the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty are prohibited.

Consequently, the Kingdom of Spain objects to Egypt's reservation to article 19, paragraph 2, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

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

SWEDEN

"The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Turkey to article 19 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, whereby Turkey intends to exclude the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions from the term international humanitarian law. It is the view of the Government of Sweden that the majority of the provisions of those Additional Protocols constitute customary international law, by which Turkey is bound.

In the absence of further clarification, Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by Turkey to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Turkey and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Turkey benefiting from its reservation."

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon acceding to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (the Convention).

The Government of Sweden recalls that the name assigned to a statement, whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified,, does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by Pakistan to the Convention in substance constitutes a reservation.

The Government of Sweden notes that the Convention is being made subject to a general reservation. This reservation does not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the Convention and it raises serious doubts as to the commitment of Pakistan to the object and purpose of the Convention.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of Sweden would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Pakistan and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation".

"The Government of Sweden has examined the declaration made by Israel regarding article 19 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, whereby Israel intends to exclude the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions from the term international humanitarian law.

The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the declaration made by Israel in substance constitutes a reservation.

It is the view of the Government of Sweden that the majority of the provisions of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions constitute customary international law, by which Israel is bound. In the absence of further clarification, Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation by Israel to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Israel and Sweden. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Israel benefiting from this reservation."

UNITED KINGDOM OF GREAT BRITAIN AND NORTHERN IRELAND

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the Declaration made by the Government of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom consider the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose,

namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Government of the United Kingdom further consider the Declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention...are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, hnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the United Kingdom recall that, according to Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom and Pakistan."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the reservation relating to Article 11 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of Belgium at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The Government of the United Kingdom note that the effect of the said reservation is to disapply the provisions of Article 11 in "exceptional circumstances". In light of the grave nature of the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention, the Government of the United Kingdom consider that the provisions of Article 11 should apply in all circumstances.

The Government of the United Kingdom therefore objects to the reservation made by the Government of Belgium to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. However, this objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United Kingdom and Belgium."

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The declaration appears to purport to extend the scope of application of the Convention to include the armed forces of a State to the extent that they fail to meet the test that they ‘do not violate the rules and principles of international law'. Such activities would otherwise be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2. It is the opinion of the United Kingdom that the Government of Egypt is entitled to make such a declaration only insofar as the declaration constitutes a unilateral declaration by the Government of Egypt that Egypt will apply the terms of the Convention in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention toheir own armed forces on a unilateral basis. The United Kingdom consider this to be the effect of the declaration made by Egypt.

However, in the view of the United Kingdom, Egypt cannot by a unilateral declaration extend the obligations of the United Kingdom under the Convention beyond those set out in the Convention without the express consent of the United Kingdom. For the avoidance of any doubt, the United Kingdom wish to make clear that it does not so consent. Moreover, the United Kingdom do not consider the declaration made by the Government of Egypt to have any effect in respect of the obligations of the United Kingdom under the Convention or in respect of the application of the Convention to the armed forces of the United Kingdom.

The United Kingdom thus regard the Convention as entering into force between the United Kingdom and Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of Egypt, which applies only to the obligations of Egypt under the Convention and only in respect of the armed forces of Egypt."

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the declaration made by Pakistan to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The declaration is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely, the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and who carries them out.

The Government of the United States also considers the declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, which provides: "Each State Party shall adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention ... are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature."

The Government of the United States notes that, under established principles of international treaty law, as reflected in Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the United States therefore objects to the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection does not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Pakistan."

"The Government of the United States of America, after careful review, considers the Declaration made by Belgium to Article 11 of the Convention, to be a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis. The Government of the United States understands that the intent of the Government of Belgium may have been narrower than apparent from its Declaration in that the Government of Belgium would expect its Declaration to apply only in exceptional circumstances where it believes that, because of the political nature of the offense, an alleged offender may not receive a fair trial. The United States believes the Declaration is unnecessary because of the safeguards already provided for under Articles 12, 14, and 19 (2) of the Convention. However, given the broad wording of the Declaration and because the Government of the United States considers Article 11 to be a critical provision in the Convention, the United States is constrained to file this objection. This objection does not preclude entry into force of the Convention between the United States and Belgium."

"The Government of the United States of America has examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The declaration appears to purport to extend the scope of application of the Convention to include the armed forces of a State, to the extent that those forces fail to meet the test that they ‘do not violate the rules and principles of international law'. Such activities would otherwise be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2. It is the opinion of the United States that the Government of Egypt is entitled to make such a declaration only insofar

as the declaration constitutes a unilateral declaration by the Government of Egypt that Egypt will apply the terms of the Convention in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention tos own armed forces on a unilateral basis. The United States considers this to be the effect of the declaration made by Egypt. However, in the view of the United States, Egypt cannot by a unilateral declaration extend the obligations of the United States or any country other than Egypt under the Convention beyond those obligations set out in the Convention without the express consent of the United States or other countries. To avoid any doubt, the United States wishes to make clear that it does not consent to Egypt's declaration. Moreover, the United States does not consider the declaration made by the Government of Egypt to have any effect in respect of the obligations of the United States under the Convention or in respect of the application of the Convention to the armed forces of the United States. The United States thus regards the Convention as entering into force between the United States and Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of Egypt, which applies only to the obligations of Egypt under the Convention and only in respect of the armed forces of Egypt."

Notifications made under article 6 (3)
(Unless otherwise indicated, the notifications were made upon ratification, acceptance, approval or accession.)

ANDORRA

In accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Andorra establishes its competence regarding the offences described in article 2, for all the cases covered by article 6, paragraph 2, b), c) and d).

AUSTRALIA

"... in accordance with article 6 (3) of the Convention, Australia has chosen to establish jurisdiction in all the circumstances provided for by Article 6 (2), and has provided for such jurisdiction in domestic legislation which took effect on 8 September 2002."

BOLIVIA (PLURINATIONAL STATE OF)

... by virtue of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Bolivia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in respect of offences committed in the situations and conditions provided for under article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

BRAZIL

... the Federative Republic of Brazil declares that, in accordance with the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the said Convention, it will exercise jurisdiction over the offences within the meaning of article 2, in the cases set forth in article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraphs (a), (b) and (e) of the Convention."

CHILE

In accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Government of Chile declares that, in accordance with article 6, paragraph 8, of the Courts Organization Code of the Republic of Chile, crimes and ordinary offences committed outside the territory of the Republic which are covered in treaties concluded with other Powers remain under Chilean jurisdiction.

CYPRUS

“In accordance with article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Cyprus establishes its jurisdiction over the offences specified in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4.

DENMARK

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Denmark provides the following information on Danish criminal jurisdiction:

Rules on Danish criminal jurisdiction are laid down in Section 6 to 12 in the Danish Criminal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Section 6

Acts committed

1) within the territory of the Danish state; or

2) on board a Danish ship or aircraft, being outside the territory recognized by international law as belonging to any state; or

3) on board a Danish ship or aircraft, being within the territory recognized by international law as belonging to a foreign state, if committed by persons employed on the ship or aircraft or by passengers travelling on board the ship or aircraft, shall be subject to Danish criminal jurisdiction.

Section 7

(1) Acts committed outside the territory of the Danish state by a Danish national or by a person resident in the Danish state shall also be subject to Danish criminal jurisdiction in the following circumstances, namely;

1) where the act was committed outside the territory recognized by international law as belonging to any state, provided acts of the kind in question are punishable with a sentence more severe than imprisonment for four months; or

2) where the act was committed within the territory of a foreign state, provided that it is also punishable under the law in force in that territory.

(2) The provisions in Subsection (1) above shall similarly apply to acts committed by a person who is a national of, or who is resident in Finland, Iceland, Norway or Sweden, and who is present in Denmark.

Section 8

The following acts committed outside the territory of the Danish state, shall also come within Danish criminal jurisdiction, irrespective of the nationality of the perpetrator.

1) where the act violates the independence, security, Constitution of public authorities of the Danish state, official duties toward the state or such interests, the legal protection of which depends on a personal connection with the Danish state; or

2) where the act violates an obligation which the perpetrator is required by law to observe abroad or prejudices the performance of an official duty incumbent on him with regard to a Danish ship or aircraft; or

3) where an act committed outside the territory recognized by international law as belonging to any state violates a Danish national or a person resident in the

Danish state, provided acts of the kind in question are punishable with a sentence more severe than imprisonment for four months; or

4) where the act comes within the provisions of Section 183 a of this Act. The prosecution may also include breaches of Sections 237 and 244-248 of this Act, when committed in conjunction with the breach of Section 183 a; or

5) where the act is covered by an international convention in pursuance of which Denmark is under an obligation to start legal proceedings; or

6) where transfer of the accused for legal proceedings in another country is rejected, and the act, provided it is committed within the territory recognized by international law as belonging to a foreign state, is punishable according to the law of this state, and provided that according to Danish law the act is punishable with a sentence more severe than one year of imprisonment.

Section 9

Where the punishable nature of an act depends on or is influenced by an actual or intended consequence, the act shall also be deemed to have been committed where the consequence has taken effect or has been intended to take effect.

Section 10

(1) Where prosecution takes place in this country under the foregoing provisions, the decision concerning the punishment or other legal consequences of the act shall be made under Danish law.

(2) In the circumstances referred to in Section 7 of this Act, if the act was committed within the territory recognized by international law as belonging to a foreign state, the punishment may not be more severe than that provided for by the law of that state.

Section 10 a

(1) A person who has been convicted by a criminal court in the state where the act was committed or who has received a sentence which is covered by the European Convention on the International Validity of Criminal Judgments, or by the Act governing the Transfer of Legal Proceedings to another country, shall not be prosecuted in this country for the same act, if,

1) he is finally acquitted; or

2) the penalty imposed has been served, is being served or has been remitted according to the law of the state in which the court is situated; or

3) he is convicted, but no penalty is imposed.

(2) The provisions contained in Subsection (1) above shall not apply to

a) acts which fall within Section 6 (1) of this Act; or

b) the acts referred to in Section 8 (1) 1) above, unless the prosecution in the state in which the court was situated was at the request of the Danish Prosecuting Authority.

Section 10 b

Where any person is prosecuted and punishment has already been imposed on him for the same act in another country, the penalty imposed in this country shall be reduced according to the extent to which the foreign punishment has been served.

Section 11

If a Danish national or a person resident in the Danish state has been punished in a foreign country for an act which under Danish law may entail loss or forfeiture of an office or profession or of any other right, such a deprivation may be sought in a public action in this country.

Section 12

The application of the provisions of Section 6-8 of this Act shall be subject to the applicable rules of international law."

EL SALVADOR

With regard to article 6, paragraph 3, the Government of the Republic of El Salvador, gives notification that it has established its jurisdiction under its domestic law in respect of the offences committed in the situations and under the conditions mentioned in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention;...

ESTONIA

".....pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Estonia declares that in its domestic law it shall apply the jurisdiction set forth in article 6 paragraph 2 over offences set forth in article 2."

FINLAND

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Finland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1, 2 and 4."

HUNGARY

"The Government of the Republic of Hungary declares that, in relation to Article 6, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Hungary, pursuant to its Criminal Code, has jurisdiction over the crimes set out in Article 2 of the Convention in the cases provided for in Article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2 of the Convention."

ICELAND

"Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Iceland declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

ISRAEL

Pursuant to Article 6 paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Government of the State of Israel hereby notifies the Secretary-General of the United Nations that it has established jurisdiction over the offences referred to in Article 2 in all the cases detailed in Article 6 paragraph 2.

JAMAICA

".....Jamaica has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2, with respect to the jurisdiction stated in Article 6 (2) (d) which states:

'A State Party may establish jurisdiction over any such offence when:

...(d) The offence is committed in an attempt to compel that State to do or abstain from doing any act;'..."

LATVIA

"In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, opened for signature at New York on the 12th day of January 1998, the Republic of Latvia declares that it has established jurisdiction in all cases listed in Article 6, paragraph 2."

LITHUANIA

".....the Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania declares that the Republic of Lithuania establishes the jurisdiction for the offences provided in Article 2 of the Convention in all cases described in paragraph 2 of Article 6 of the said Convention."

MALAYSIA

"In accordance with Article 6 (3) of the Convention, the Government of Malaysia declares that it has established jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic laws over the offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in Article 6 (1) and 6 (2)."

MEXICO

.....in accordance with article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, Mexico exercises jurisdiction over the offences defined in the Convention where:

(a) They are committed against Mexicans in the territory of another State party, provided that the accused is in Mexico and has not been tried in the country in which the offence was committed. Where it is a question of offences defined in the Convention but committed in the territory of a non-party State, the offence shall also be defined as such in the place where it was committed (art. 6, para. 2 (a));

(b) They are committed in Mexican embassies and on diplomatic or consular premises (art. 6, para. 2 (b));

(c) They are committed abroad but produce effects or are claimed to produce effects in the national territory (art. 6, para. (d)).

MONACO

The Principality declares that, in accordance with the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, it establishes its jurisdiction over the acts recognized as offences within the meaning of article 2 of the Convention, in the cases set forth in article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, of the Convention.

PARAGUAY

..., by virtue of the provisions of article 6, paragraph 3, of the aforementioned Convention, the Republic of Paraguay has established its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic legislation, under article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

PORTUGAL

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Portugal declares that in accordance with article 5 (1) (a) of the Penal Code, Portuguese courts will have jurisdiction against the crimes of terrorism and of terrorist organisations, set forth respectively in article 300 and 301 of the same Code, wherever the place they have been committed, thus covering, in connection with the said crimes, the cases set forth in article 6 (2) of the Convention."

REPUBLIC OF KOREA

Pursuant to Article 6, Paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings,

The Republic of Korea provides the following information on its criminal jurisdiction. Principles on the criminal jurisdiction are set out in the Chapter I of Part I of the Korean Penal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Article 2 (Domestic Crimes) This Code shall apply to anyone, whether Korean or alien, who commits a crime within the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 3 (Crimes by Koreans outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to a Korean national who commits a crime outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 4 (Crimes by Aliens on board Korean Vessel, etc., outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits a crime on board a Korean vessel or a Korean aircraft outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea.

Article 5 (Crimes by Aliens outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits any of the following crimes outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea:

1. Crimes concerning insurrection;
2. Crimes concerning treason;
3. Crimes concerning the national flag;
4. Crimes concerning currency;
5. Crimes concerning securities, postage and revenue stamps;
6. Crimes specified in Articles 225 through 230 among crimes concerning documents; and
7. Crimes specified in Article 238 among crimes concerning seal.

Article 6 (Foreign Crimes against the Republic of Korea and Koreans outside Korea)

This Code shall apply to an alien who commits a crime, other than those specified in the preceding Article, against the Republic of Korea or its national outside the territorial boundary of the Republic of Korea, unless such act does not constitute a crime, or it is exempt from prosecution or execution of punishment under the lex loci delictus.

Article 8 (Application of General Provisions)

The provisions of the preceding Articles shall also apply to such crimes as are provided by other statutes unless provided otherwise by such statutes.

REPUBLIC OF MOLDOVA

Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, the Republic of Moldova establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in cases provided for in article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2.

ROMANIA

"In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, Romania declares that it has established its jurisdiction for the offenses set forth in Article 2, in all cases stipulated by Article 6, paragraphs 1 and 2, in conformity with relevant provisions of its domestic law."

RUSSIAN FEDERATION[10]

"The Russian Federation declares that in accordance with paragraph 3 of article 6 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (hereinafter - the Convention) it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases envisaged in paragraphs 1 and 2 of article 6 of the Convention."

SINGAPORE

"In accordance with Article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Singapore declares that it has established jurisdiction over offences set forth in Article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in Article 6, paragraph 1, and Article 6, paragraph 2."

SUDAN

The Republic of the Sudan declares hereby that it has established its jurisdiction over crimes set out in article 2 of the Convention in accordance with situations and conditions as stipulated in article 6, paragraph 2.

SWEDEN

"Pursuant to article 6 (3) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Sweden provides the following information on Swedish criminal jurisdiction. Rules on Swedish criminal jurisdiction are laid down in Chapter 2 Section 1-5 in the Swedish Penal Code. The provisions have the following wording:

Section 1

Crimes committed in this Realm shall be adjudged in accordance with Swedish law and by a Swedish court. The same applies when it is uncertain where the crime was committed but grounds exist for assuming that it was committed within the Realm.

Section 2

Crimes committed outside the Realm shall be adjudged according to Swedish law and by a Swedish court when the crime has been committed:

1. By a Swedish citizen or an alien domiciled in Sweden,
2. By an alien not domiciled in Sweden who, after having committed the crime, has become a Swedish citizen or has acquired domicile in the Realm or who is a Danish, Finnish, Icelandic or Norwegian citizen and is present in the Realm, or
3. By any other alien, who is present in the Realm, and the crime under Swedish law can result in imprisonment for more than six months.

The first paragraph shall not apply if the act is not subject to criminal responsibility under the law of the place where it was committed or if it was committed within an area not belonging to any state and, under Swedish law, the punishment for the act cannot be more severe than a fine.

In cases mentioned in this Section, a sanction may not be imposed which is more severe than the most severe punishment provided for the crime under the law in the place where it was committed.

Section 3

Even in cases other than those listed in Section 2, crimes committed outside the Realm shall be adjudged according to Swedish law and by a Swedish court:

1. if the crime was committed on board a Swedish vessel or aircraft, or was committed in the course of duty by the officer in charge or by a member of its crew,
2. if the crime was committed by a member of the armed force in an area in which a detachment of the armed forces was present, or if it was committed by some other person in such an area and the detachment was present for a purpose other than exercise,
3. if the crime was committed in the course of duty outside the Realm by a person employed in a foreign contingent of the Swedish armed forces,

3a. if the crime was committed in the course of duty outside the Realm by a policeman, custom officer or official employed at the coast guard, who performs boundless assignments according to an international agreement that Sweden has ratified,

4. if the crime committed was a crime against the Swedish nation, a Swedish municipal uthority or other assembly, or against a Swedish public institution,
5. If the crime was committed in an area not belonging to any state and was directed against a Swedish citizen, a Swedish association or private institution, or against an alien domiciled in Sweden,
6. if the crime is hijacking, maritime or aircraft sabotage, airport sabotage, counterfeiting currency, an attempt to commit such crimes, a crime against international law, unlawful dealings with chemical weapons, unlawful dealings with mines or false or careless statement before an international court, or
7. if the least severe punishment prescribed for the crime in Swedish law is imprisonment for four years or more.

Section 3 a

Besides the cases described in Sections 1-3, crimes shall be adjudged according to Swedish law by a Swedish court in accordance with the provisions of the Act on International Collaboration concerning Proceedings in Criminal matters.

Section 4

A crime is deemed to have been committed where the criminal act was perpetrated and also where the crime was completed or in the case of an attempt, where the intended crime would have been completed.

Section 5

Prosecution for a crime committed within the Realm on a foreign vessel or aircraft by an alien, who was the officer in charge or member of its crew or otherwise travelled in it, against another alien or a foreign interest shall not be instituted without the authority of the Government or a person designated by the Government.

1. on a Swedish vessel or aircraft or by the officer in charge or some member of its crew in the course of duty,
2. by a member of the armed forces in an area in which a detachment of the armed forces was present,
3. in the course of duty outside the Realm by a person employed by a foreign contingent of the Swedish armed forces,
4. In the course of duty outside the Realm by a policeman, custom officer or official employed at the coast guard, who performs boundless assignments according to an international agreement that Sweden has ratified,
5. In Denmark, Finland, Iceland or Norway or on a vessel or aircraft in regular commerce between places situated in Sweden or one of the said states, or
6. By a Swedish, Danish, Finnish, Icelandic or Norwegian citizen against a Swedish interest."

SWITZERLAND

Pursuant to article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, Switzerland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 6, paragraph 2.

UKRAINE

“Ukraine excercises its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases provided for in paragraph 2 article 6 of the Convention.”

URUGUAY

Notifies, by virtue of article 6, paragraph 3, of the Convention, that the authorities of the Eastern Republic of Uruguay exercise jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2, to which reference is made in article 6, paragraph 2. With regard to article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraphs (a) and (b), that jurisdiction is established in article 10 of the Penal Code (Act 9.155 of 4 December 1933) and, with regard to article 6, paragraph 2, subparagraph (e), in article 4 of the Aeronautical Code (Decree-Law 14.305 of 29 November 1974).

UZBEKISTAN

The Republic of Uzbekistan has established its jurisdiction over the crimes set out in article 2 under all the conditions stipulated in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

VENEZUELA (BOLIVARIAN REPUBLIC OF)

Moreover, the Bolivarian Republic of Venezuela, having regard for article 6, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, declares that it has established jurisdiction under its domestic law over the offences committed in the

situations and under the conditions envisaged in article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Notes:

[1] On 28 January 2008, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General of his withdrawal of the reservation in respect of article 11 made upon ratification. The text of the reservation read 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] On 13 November 2001, the Government of China notified the Secretary-General of the following:

In accordance with the provisions of Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and Article 138 of the Basic Law of Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, the Government of the People's Republic of China decides that the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings shall apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region and Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China.

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

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

[5] For the Kingdom in Europe.

Subsequently, the Government of the Netherlands informed the Secretary-General on 23 March 2005 and on 22 March 2010 that the Convention will apply to Aruba and to the Nertherlands Antilles, respectively, with the following declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 8, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

[6] With a territorial exclusion with resepct to Tokelau to the effect that: ".....consistent with the constitutional status of Tokelau and taking into account the commitment of the Government of New Zealand to the development of self-government for Tokelau through an act of self-determination under the Charter of the United Nations, this accession shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a Declaration to this effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the Depositary on the basis of appropriate consultations with that territory."

[7] On 20 October 2015, the Government of Ukraine made a communication. The text can be found here: C.N.610.2015.TREATIES-XVIII.9 of 20 October 2015.

[8] On 4 March 2022, the Government of Ukraine made a communication. The text can be found here: C.N.73.2022.TREATIES-XVIII.9 of 8 March 2022.

[9] On 1 June 2012, the Secretary-General received the following communication:

"… the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland wishes the United Kingdom's Ratification of the of the [United Nations Convention Against Transnational Organized Crime] to be extended to the territory of the Isle of Man 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 aforesaid Convention to the Isle of Man to enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit of this notification..."

Furthermore, on 16 April 2013, 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 Terrorist Bombings] to be extended to the territory of The Bailiwick of Jersey 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 aforesaid Convention to The Bailiwick of Jersey to enter into force on the thirtieth day after the deposit of this notification…"

[10] The Secretary-General received a communciation with regard to the declaration made by the Government of Egypt upon ratification from the following Government on the date indicated hereinafter:

Canada (14 September 2006) :

"The Government of Canada has examined the declaration, described as a reservation, relating to article 19, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt at the time of its ratification of the Convention.

The declaration appears to extend the scope of the application of the Convention to include the armed forces of a State, in the exercise of their duties, to the extent that those armed forces violate the rules and principles of international law. Such activities would otherwise be excluded from the application of the Convention by virtue of article 19, paragraph 2.

The Government of Canada considers the effect of the declaration to be a unilateral extension of the terms of the Convention by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to apply only to the armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt in circumstances going beyond those required by the Convention. The Arab Republic of Egypt cannot by unilateral declaration extend the obligations of Canada under the Convention beyond those set out in the Convention. Canada does not consider the declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt to have any effect in respect of the obligations of Canada under the Convention or in respect of the application of the Convention to the armed forces of Canada.

The Government of Canada thus regards the Convention as entering into force between Canada and the Arab Republic of Egypt subject to a unilateral declaration made by the Government of the Arab Republic of Egypt, which applies only to the obligations of the Arab Republic of Egypt under the Convention and only in respect of the armed forces of the Arab Republic of Egypt."

Russian Federation (14 November 2006):

The Russian Side has considered the reservation to Article 19 (2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings made by the Arab Republic of Egypt upon ratification of the Convention.

The objective of this reservation is to extend the scope of application of the Convention and to cover armed forces of the States Parties, if they violate "norms and principles of international law"in the exercise of their official duties.

The Russian side regards this reservation of Egypt as unilateral obligation of Egypt to apply the Convention to its own armed forces if they in the exercise of their official duties go beyond the scope of the norms and principles of international law.

The Russian side proceeds from the understanding that Egypt does not have right to unilaterally impose additional obligations on other Parties to the Convention without their explicit consent through formulating its reservation.

The Russian side does not recognize the extension of the Convention to include activities of armed forces of the States Parties except for Egypt, which according to Article 19 (2) are explicitly excluded from the scope of application of the Convention. Thus the Convention applies in relations between the Russian Federation and the Arab Republic of Egypt with the reservation of Egypt, which stipulates only obligations of Egypt and is applicable to its armed forces.

[11] The Secretary-General received communciations with regard to the declaration made by the Government of Pakistan upon accession, from the following Governments on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Republic of Moldova (6 october 2003):

"The Government of the Republic of Moldova has examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings 1997.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova considers that the declaration is, in fact, a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and is therefore contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The declaration is furthermore contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to "adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention...are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature".

The Government of the Republic of Moldova recalls that, according to Article 19 (c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become parties are respected as to their object and purpose, by all parties, and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties.

The Government of the Republic of Moldova therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Moldova and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Convention enters into force in its entirety between the two States, without Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."

Russian Federation (22 September 2003):

The Russian Federation has considered the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, of 1997.

The Russian Federation takes the position that every State which has agreed to the binding nature of the provisions of the Convention must adopt such measures as may be necessary, pursuant to article 5, to ensure that criminal acts which, in accordance with article 2, are within the scope of the Convention, in particular where they are intended or calculated to provoke a state of terror in the general public or in a group of persons or particular persons, are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Russian Federation notes that the realization of the right of peoples to self- determination must not conflict with other fundamental principles of international law, such as the principle of the settlement of international disputes by peaceful means, the principle of the territorial integrity of States, and the principle of respect for human rights and fundamental freedoms.

The Russian Federation believes that the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings is incompatible with the object and purpose of the

Convention. In the view of the Russian Federation, the declaration made by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan may jeopardize the fulfilment of the provisions of the Convention in relations between the Islamic Republic of Pakistan and other States Parties and thereby impede cooperation in combating acts of terrorist bombing. It is in the common interest of States to develop and strengthen cooperation in formulating and adopting effective practical measures to prevent terrorist acts and punish the perpetrators.

The Russian Federation, once again declaring its unequivocal condemnation of all acts, methods and practices of terrorism as criminal and unjustified, regardless of their motives and in all their forms and manifestations, wherever and by whomever they are perpetrated, calls upon the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to reconsider its position and withdraw the declaration.

Poland (3 February 2004):

"The Government of the Republic of Poland considers that the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan at the time of its accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings of 15 December 1997 is in fact a reservation that seeks to limit the scope of the Convention on a unilateral basis and which is contrary to its object and purpose, namely the suppression of terrorist bombings, irrespective of where they take place and of who carries them out.

The Government of the Republic of Poland further considers the declaration to be contrary to the terms of article 5 of the Convention, according to which each State Party commits itself to 'adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention (...) are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or other similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature'.

The Government of the Republic of Poland wishes to recall that, according to the customary international law as cified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty shall not be permitted.

The Government of the Republic of Poland therefore objects to the aforesaid declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

This objection shall not, however, preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Republic of Poland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan."

Ireland (23 June 2006):

"The Government of Ireland have examined the declaration made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan upon accession to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings according to which the Islamic Republic of Pakistan considers that nothing in this Convention shall be applicable to struggles, including armed struggles, for the realisation of the right of self-determination launched against any alien or foreign occupation or domination.

The Government of Ireland are of the view that this declaration amounts to a reservation as its purpose is to unilaterally limit the scope of the Convention. The Government of Ireland are also of the view that this reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the Convention, namely suppressing terrorist bombings, wherever and by whomever carried out.

The Government of Ireland further consider the declaration to be contrary to the terms of Article 5 of the Convention, according to which States Parties commit themselves to adopt such measures as may be necessary, including, where appropriate, domestic legislation, to ensure that criminal acts within the scope of this Convention are under no circumstances justifiable by considerations of a political, philosophical, ideological, racial, ethnic, religious or similar nature and are punished by penalties consistent with their grave nature.

The Government of Ireland recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, reservations that are incompatible with the object and purpose of a convention are not permissible. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become party are respected as to their object and purpose and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under these treaties.

The Government of Ireland therefore object to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan to the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan. The Convention enters into force between Ireland and the Islamic Republic of Pakistan, without the Islamic Republic of Pakistan benefiting from its reservation."