



COUNCIL OF EUROPE    CONSEIL DE L'EUROPE

Strasbourg, 29/07/02

CAHDI (2002) 11  
*Anglais seulement*

**COMMITTEE OF LEGAL ADVISERS  
ON PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW  
(CAHDI)**

**24th meeting  
Bratislava, 9-10 September 2002**

**EUROPEAN OBSERVATORY OF RESERVATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL TREATIES :**  
**CONSIDERATIONS OF RESERVATIONS AND DECLARATIONS TO INTERNATIONAL  
TREATIES APPLICABLE TO THE FIGHT AGAINST TERRORISM**

Document prepared by the  
Secretariat Directorate General of legal affairs

**Foreword**

At its 23<sup>rd</sup> meeting (Strasbourg, 4-5 March 2002) the CAHDI took note of the decisions taken by the Committee of Ministers at Ministers' Deputies level at the 765 bis meeting (Strasbourg, 21 September 2001) on the Council of Europe's activities in the fight against terrorism instructing the CAHDI, in conjunction with its Observatory on Reservations to International Treaties, to consider the question of reservations to regional and universal conventions relating to terrorism and to hold exchanges of views – with the involvement of observers – on conventions currently being drafted in the United Nations with a view to co-ordinating the positions taken by member states.

As a result thereof, the CAHDI agreed to place on the agenda of its forthcoming meetings an item on developments in the fight against terrorism to enable it to be kept informed of the activities underway in the various international organisations and the measures taken at national level and decided to extend the scope of its Observatory on Reservations to International Treaties to include treaties relating to the fight against terrorism in order to provide input to the Council of Europe's activities to counter terrorism (see draft report of the 23<sup>rd</sup> CAHDI meeting, document CAHDI (2002) 8, Paras. 17-18 & 102-104).

The Secretariat was asked to prepare a document compiling the state of signatures and ratifications as well as reservations and declarations to most significant anti-terrorist conventions. Sources: Websites of the Treaty Offices of the organisations concerned. Unless otherwise indicated, the state of signature and ratification of the conventions included hereafter is as of the date of the document. References to Council of Europe member States are highlighted.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF AIRCRAFT, THE HAGUE, 16 DECEMBER 1970 .....	4
CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY OF CIVIL AVIATION, MONTREAL, 23 SEPTEMBER 1971 .....	12
CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF CRIMES AGAINST INTERNATIONALLY PROTECTED PERSONS, INCLUDING DIPLOMATIC AGENTS, NEW YORK , 14 DECEMBER 1973.....	21
INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES, NEW YORK, 17 DECEMBER 1979.....	39
PROTOCOL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS OF VIOLENCE AT AIRPORTS SERVING INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION, SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY OF CIVIL AVIATION, DONE AT MONTREAL ON 23 SEPTEMBER 1971, MONTREAL, 24 FEBRUARY 1988 .....	53
CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY OF MARITIME NAVIGATION, 1988, ROME, 10 MARCH 1988, ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 MARCH 1992.....	62
PROTOCOL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY OF FIXED PLATFORMS LOCATED ON THE CONTINENTAL SHELF, 1988, ROME, 10 MARCH 1988, ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 MARCH 1992 .....	68
INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF TERRORIST BOMBINGS, NEW YORK, 15 DECEMBER 1997.....	74
INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE FINANCING OF TERRORISM, NEW YORK, 9 DECEMBER 1999 .....	87

**CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL SEIZURE OF AIRCRAFT, THE  
HAGUE, 16 DECEMBER 1970**

**Entry into force:** The Convention entered into force on 14 October 1971.

**Status:** 175 Parties.

This list is based on information received from the depositaries, the Governments of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of signature</b>	<b>Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification, Accession or Succession</b>
Afghanistan	16 December 1970	29 August 1979
Albania		21 October 1997
Algeria (1)		6 October 1995
Angola		12 March 1998
Antigua and Barbuda		22 July 1985
Argentina (2)	16 December 1970	11 September 1972
Australia	15 June 1971	9 November 1972
Austria	28 April 1971	11 February 1974
Azerbaijan		3 March 2000
Bahamas		13 August 1976
Bahrain (3)		20 February 1984
Bangladesh		28 June 1978
Barbados	16 December 1970	2 April 1973
Belarus (3)	16 December 1970	30 December 1971
Belgium	16 December 1970	24 August 1973
Belize		10 June 1998
Benin	5 May 1971	13 March 1972
Bhutan		28 December 1988
Bolivia		18 July 1979
Bosnia and Herzegovina (4)		15 August 1994
Botswana		28 December 1978
Brazil (3)	16 December 1970	14 January 1972
Brunei Darussalam		16 April 1986
Bulgaria (5)	16 December 1970	19 May 1971
Burkina Faso		19 October 1987
Burundi	17 February 1971	
Cambodia	16 December 1970	8 November 1996
Cameroon		14 April 1988
Canada	16 December	20 June 1972

	1970	
Cape Verde		20 October 1977
Central African Republic		1 July 1991
Chad	27 September 1971	12 July 1972
Chile	4 June 1971	2 February 1972
China (3)(6)		10 September 1980
Colombia	16 December 1970	3 July 1973
Comoros		1 August 1991
Congo		24 November 1989
Costa Rica	16 December 1970	9 July 1971
Côte d'Ivoire		9 January 1973
Croatia (7)		8 June 1993
Cuba(3)		27 November 2001
Cyprus		5 July 1972
Czech Republic (8)		14 November 1994
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		28 April 1983
Democratic Republic of the Congo		6 July 1977
Denmark (9)	16 December 1970	17 October 1972
Djibouti		24 November 1992
Dominican Republic	29 June 1971	22 June 1978
Ecuador	19 March 1971	14 June 1971
Egypt (3)		28 February 1975
El Salvador	16 December 1970	16 January 1973
Equatorial Guinea	4 June 1971	2 January 1991
Estonia		22 December 1993
Ethiopia	16 December 1970	26 March 1979
Fiji	5 October 1971	27 July 1972
Finland	8 January 1971	15 December 1971
France	16 December 1970	18 September 1972
Gabon	16 December 1970	14 July 1971
Gambia	18 May 1971	28 November 1978
Georgia		20 April 1994
Germany (10)	16 December 1970	11 October 1974
Ghana	16 December	12 December 1973

	1970	
Greece	16 December 1970	20 September 1973
Grenada		10 August 1978
Guatemala (3)	16 December 1970	16 May 1979
Guinea		2 May 1984
Guinea-Bissau		20 August 1976
Guyana		21 December 1972
Haiti		9 May 1984
Honduras		13 April 1987
Hungary (11)	16 December 1970	13 August 1971
Iceland		29 June 1973
India (3)	14 July 1971	12 November 1982
Indonesia (3)	16 December 1970	27 August 1976
Iran, Islamic Republic of	16 December 1970	25 January 1972
Iraq	22 February 1971	3 December 1971
Ireland		24 November 1975
Israel	16 December 1970	16 August 1971
Italy	16 December 1970	19 February 1974
Jamaica	16 December 1970	15 September 1983
Japan	16 December 1970	19 April 1971
Jordan	9 June 1971	18 November 1971
Kazakhstan		4 April 1995
Kenya		11 January 1977
Kuwait (12)	21 July 1971	25 May 1979
Kyrgyzstan		25 February 2000
Lao People's Democratic Republic	16 February 1971	6 April 1989
Latvia		23 October 1998
Lebanon		10 August 1973
Lesotho		27 July 1978
Liberia		1 February 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya (13)		4 October 1978
Liechtenstein	24 August 1971	23 February 2001
Lithuania		4 December 1996
Luxembourg	16 December 1970	22 November 1978

Madagascar		18 November 1986
Malawi (3)		21 December 1972
Malaysia	16 December 1970	4 May 1985
Maldives		1 September 1987
Mali		29 September 1971
Malta		14 June 1991
Marshall Islands		31 May 1989
Mauritania		1 November 1978
Mauritius		25 April 1983
Mexico	16 December 1970	19 July 1972
Monaco		3 June 1983
Mongolia	18 January 1971	8 October 1971
Morocco (14)		24 October 1975
Myanmar		22 May 1996
Nauru		17 May 1984
Nepal		11 January 1979
Netherlands (15)	16 December 1970	27 August 1973
New Zealand	15 September 1971	12 February 1974
Nicaragua		6 November 1973
Niger	19 February 1971	15 October 1971
Nigeria		3 July 1973
Norway	9 March 1971	23 August 1971
Oman (3)(16)		2 February 1977
Pakistan	12 August 1971	28 November 1973
Palau		3 August 1995
Panama	16 December 1970	10 March 1972
Papua New Guinea (3)		15 December 1975
Paraguay	30 July 1971	4 February 1972
Peru (3)		28 April 1978
Philippines	16 December 1970	26 March 1973
Poland (3)	16 December 1970	21 March 1972
Portugal (25)(26)	16 December 1970	27 November 1972
Qatar (3)		26 August 1981
Republic of Korea (17)		18 January 1973
Republic of Moldova		21 May 1997

Romania (3)	13 October 1971	10 July 1972
Russian Federation(3)	16 December 1970	24 September 1971
Rwanda	16 December 1970	3 November 1987
Saint Lucia		8 November 1983
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 November 1991
Samoa		9 July 1998
Saudi Arabia (3)(18)		14 June 1974
Senegal	10 May 1971	3 February 1978
Seychelles		29 December 1978
Sierra Leone	19 July 1971	13 November 1974
Singapore	8 September 1971	12 April 1978
Slovakia (19)		13 December 1995
Slovenia (20)		27 May 1992
South Africa (3)	16 December 1970	30 May 1972
Spain	16 March 1971	30 October 1972
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978
Sudan		18 January 1979
Suriname (21)		27 October 1978
Swaziland		27 December 1999
Sweden	16 December 1970	7 July 1971
Switzerland	16 December 1970	14 September 1971
Syrian Arab Republic (3)		10 July 1980
Tajikistan		29 February 1996
Thailand	16 December 1970	16 May 1978
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (22)		7 January 1998
Togo		9 February 1979
Tonga		21 February 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	16 December 1970	31 January 1972
Tunisia (3)		16 November 1981
Turkey	16 December 1970	17 April 1973
Turkmenistan		25 May 1999
Uganda		27 March 1972
Ukraine (3)	16 December 1970	21 February 1972
United Arab Emirates (23)		10 April 1981



United Kingdom (24)	16 December 1970	22 December 1971
United Republic of Tanzania		9 August 1983
United States	16 December 1970	14 September 1971
Uruguay		12 January 1977
Uzbekistan		7 February 1994
Vanuatu		22 February 1989
Venezuela	16 December 1970	7 July 1983
Viet Nam (3)		17 September 1979
Yemen		29 September 1986
Yugoslavia, F.R. of (27)		23 July 2001
Zambia		3 March 1987
Zimbabwe		6 February 1989

### NOTES

(1) Reservation: "The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of articles 24.1, 12.1 and 14.1 respectively of the Tokyo, The Hague and Montreal Conventions, which provide for the mandatory referral of any dispute to the International Court of Justice. The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria states that in each case the prior consent of all the parties concerned shall be required in order to refer a dispute to the International Court of Justice."

(2) The instrument of ratification by Argentina contains a declaration which, in translation, reads: "The application of this Convention to territories the sovereignty of which may be disputed among two or more States, whether Parties to the Convention or not, may not be interpreted as alteration, renunciation or waiver of the position upheld by each up to the present time".

(3) Reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the Convention

(4) An instrument of succession by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 15 August 1994, with effect from 6 March 1992.

(5) On 9 May 1994, a Note was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of Bulgaria whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 9 May 1994.

(6) The instrument of accession by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains the following declaration: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China".

(7) An instrument of succession by the Government of Croatia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 8 June 1993.

(8) An instrument of succession by the Government of the Czech Republic to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the Russian Federation on 14 November 1994, with effect from 1 January 1993.

(9) Until later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

Note: A notification was received by the Government of the United Kingdom from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark whereby the latter withdraws, with effect from 1 June 1980, the reservation made at the time of ratification that this Convention should not apply to Greenland.

(10) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Convention on 3 June 1971, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(11) On 10 January 1990, instruments were deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 12 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 10 January 1990.

(12) Ratification by Kuwait was accompanied by an Understanding stating that ratification of the Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(13) The instrument of accession deposited by the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya contains a disclaimer regarding recognition of Israel.

(14) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned."

(15) The Convention cannot enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until thirty days after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands shall have notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures to give effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles.

Note 1: On 11 June 1974, a declaration was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles and, consequently, the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this declaration.

Note 2: By a Note dated 9 January 1986 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the Government of the United States that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention is applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(16) Accession to the said Convention by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(17) The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not, in any way, mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government.

(18) Approval by Saudi Arabia does not mean and could not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(19) Notification of succession by the Government of Slovakia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 13 December 1995, with effect from 1 January 1993.

(20) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovenia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 27 May 1992.

(21) Notification of succession to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 27 October 1978, by virtue of the extension of the Convention to Suriname by the Kingdom of the Netherlands prior to independence. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975.

(22) Notification of succession by the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 7 January 1998, with effect from 17 November 1991.

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

(24) The Convention is ratified "in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate".

(25) By a Note dated 9 August 1999, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the International Civil Aviation Organization of the wish of the Government of Portugal to extend the Convention to the Territory of Macao, the extension taking effect on 19 July 1999.

(26) By a Note dated 27 October 1999, the Government of Portugal advised the Government of the United Kingdom as follows:

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

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

(27) By a note dated 17 July 2001, deposited on 23 July 2001, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia declared itself bound, as a successor State to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, this Convention, with effect from 27 April 1992, the date of State succession. (The former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 16 December 1970 and ratified it on 2 October 1972.)

**CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY  
OF CIVIL AVIATION, MONTREAL, 23 SEPTEMBER 1971**

**Entry into force:** The Convention entered into force on 26 January 1973.

**Status:** 176 Parties.

This list is based on information received from the depositaries, the Governments of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of signature</b>	<b>Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification, Accession or Succession</b>
Afghanistan(1)		26 September 1984
Albania		21 October 1997
Algeria(2)		6 October 1995
Angola		12 March 1998
Antigua and Barbuda		22 July 1985
Argentina	23 September 1971	26 November 1973
Australia	12 October 1972	12 July 1973
Austria	13 November 1972	11 February 1974
Azerbaijan		15 March 2000
Bahamas		27 December 1984
Bahrain(1)		20 February 1984
Bangladesh		28 June 1978
Barbados	23 September 1971	6 August 1976
Belarus(1)	23 September 1971	31 January 1973
Belgium	23 September 1971	13 August 1976
Belize		10 June 1998
Bhutan		28 December 1988
Bolivia		18 July 1979
Bosnia and Herzegovina(3)		15 August 1994
Botswana	12 October 1972	28 December 1978
Brazil(1)	23 September 1971	24 July 1972
Brunei Darussalam		16 April 1986
Bulgaria(4)	23 September 1971	28 March 1973
Burkina Faso		19 October 1987
Burundi	6 March 1972	11 February 1999
Cambodia		8 November 1996
Cameroon(5)		11 July 1973
Canada	23 September 1971	19 June 1972

Cape Verde		20 October 1977
Central African Republic		1 July 1991
Chad	23 September 1971	12 July 1972
Chile		28 February 1974
China(1)(6)		10 September 1980
Colombia		4 December 1974
Comoros		1 August 1991
Congo	23 September 1971	19 March 1987
Costa Rica	23 September 1971	21 September 1973
Côte d'Ivoire		9 January 1973
Croatia(7)		8 June 1993
Cuba(1)		31 October 2001
Cyprus	28 November 1972	27 July 1973
Czech Republic(8)		14 November 1994
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		13 August 1980
Democratic Republic of the Congo		6 July 1977
Denmark(9)	17 October 1972	17 January 1973
Djibouti		24 November 1992
Dominican Republic	31 May 1972	28 November 1973
Ecuador		12 January 1977
Egypt(1)	24 November 1972	20 May 1975
El Salvador		25 September 1979
Equatorial Guinea		2 January 1991
Estonia		22 December 1993
Ethiopia(1)	23 September 1971	26 March 1979
Fiji	21 August 1972	5 March 1973
Finland		13 July 1973
France(1)		30 June 1976
Gabon	24 November 1971	29 June 1976
Gambia		28 November 1978
Georgia		20 April 1994
Germany(10)	23 September 1971	3 February 1978
Ghana		12 December 1973
Greece	9 February 1972	15 January 1974

Grenada		10 August 1978
Guatemala(1)	9 May 1972	19 October 1978
Guinea		2 May 1984
Guinea-Bissau		20 August 1976
Guyana		21 December 1972
Haiti	6 January 1972	9 May 1984
Honduras		13 April 1987
Hungary(11)	23 September 1971	27 December 1972
Iceland		29 June 1973
India	11 December 1972	12 November 1982
Indonesia(1)		27 August 1976
Iran, Islamic Republic of		10 July 1973
Iraq		10 September 1974
Ireland		12 October 1976
Israel	23 September 1971	30 June 1972
Italy	23 September 1971	19 February 1974
Jamaica	23 September 1971	15 September 1983
Japan		12 June 1974
Jordan	2 May 1972	13 February 1973
Kazakhstan		4 April 1995
Kenya		11 January 1977
Kuwait(12)		23 November 1979
Kyrgyzstan		25 February 2000
Lao People's Democratic Republic	1 November 1972	6 April 1989
Latvia		13 April 1997
Lebanon		23 December 1977
Lesotho		27 July 1978
Liberia		1 February 1982
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		19 February 1974
Liechtenstein		23 February 2001
Lithuania		4 December 1996
Luxembourg	29 November 1971	18 May 1982
Madagascar		18 November 1986
Malawi(1)		21 December 1972
Malaysia		4 May 1985
Maldives		1 September 1987
Mali		24 August 1972
Malta		14 June 1991

Marshall Islands		31 May 1989
Mauritania		1 November 1978
Mauritius		25 April 1983
Mexico	25 January 1973	12 September 1974
Monaco		3 June 1983
Mongolia(1)	18 February 1972	14 September 1972
Morocco(13)		24 October 1975
Myanmar		22 May 1996
Nauru		17 May 1984
Nepal		11 January 1979
Netherlands(14)	23 September 1971	27 August 1973
New Zealand	26 September 1972	12 February 1974
Nicaragua	22 December 1972	6 November 1973
Niger	6 March 1972	1 September 1972
Nigeria		3 July 1973
Norway		1 August 1973
Oman(1)(15)		2 February 1977
Pakistan		24 January 1974
Palau		3 August 1995
Panama	18 January 1972	24 April 1972
Papua New Guinea(1)		15 December 1975
Paraguay	23 January 1973	5 March 1974
Peru(1)		28 April 1978
Philippines	23 September 1971	26 March 1973
Poland(1)	23 September 1971	28 January 1975
Portugal(26)(27)	23 September 1971	15 January 1973
Qatar(1)		26 August 1981
Republic of Korea(16)		2 August 1973
Republic of Moldova		21 May 1997
Romania(1)	10 July 1972	15 August 1975
Russian Federation(1)	23 September 1971	19 February 1973
Rwanda	26 June 1972	3 November 1987
Saint Lucia		8 November 1983
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		29 November 1991

Samoa		9 July 1998
Saudi Arabia(1)(17)		14 June 1974
Senegal	23 September 1971	3 February 1978
Seychelles		29 December 1978
Sierra Leone		20 September 1979
Singapore	21 November 1972	12 April 1978
Slovakia(18)		6 March 1995
Slovenia(19)		27 May 1992
Solomon Islands(20)		13 April 1982
South Africa(1)	23 September 1971	30 May 1972
Spain	15 February 1972	30 October 1972
Sri Lanka		30 May 1978
Sudan		18 January 1979
Suriname(21)		27 October 1978
Swaziland		27 December 1999
Sweden		10 July 1973
Switzerland	23 September 1971	17 January 1978
Syrian Arab Republic(1)		10 July 1980
Tajikistan		29 February 1996
Thailand		16 May 1978
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia(22)		4 January 1995
Togo		9 February 1979
Tonga		21 February 1977
Trinidad and Tobago	9 February 1972	9 February 1972
Tunisia(1)		16 November 1981
Turkey	5 July 1972	23 December 1975
Turkmenistan		25 May 1999
Uganda		19 July 1982
Ukraine(1)	23 September 1971	26 January 1973
United Arab Emirates(23)		10 April 1981
United Kingdom(24)	23 September 1971	25 October 1973
United Republic of Tanzania		9 August 1983
United States	23 September 1971	1 November 1972
Uruguay		12 January 1977
Uzbekistan		7 February 1994
Vanuatu		6 November 1989



Venezuela(25)	23 September 1971	21 November 1983
Viet Nam		17 September 1979
Yemen	23 October 1972	29 September 1986
Yugoslavia, F.R. of(28)		23 July 2001
Zambia		3 March 1987
Zimbabwe		6 February 1989

### NOTES

(1) Reservation made with respect to paragraph 1 of Article 14 of the Convention.

(2) Reservation: "The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of articles 24.1, 12.1 and 14.1 respectively of the Tokyo, The Hague and Montreal Conventions, which provide for the mandatory referral of any dispute to the International Court of Justice. The People's Democratic Republic of Algeria states that in each case the prior consent of all the parties concerned shall be required in order to refer a dispute to the International Court of Justice."

(3) Notification of succession by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 15 August 1994, with effect from 6 March 1992.

(4) On 9 May 1994, a Note was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of Bulgaria whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 14 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 9 May 1994.

(5) "In accordance with the provisions of the Convention of 23 September 1971, for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts directed against the Security of Civil Aviation, the Government of the United Republic of Cameroon declares that in view of the fact that it does not have any relations with South Africa and Portugal, it has no obligation toward these two countries with regard to the implementation of the stipulations of the Convention."

(6) The instrument of accession by the Government of the People's Republic of China contains the following declaration: "The Chinese Government declares illegal and null and void the signature and ratification of the above-mentioned Convention by the Taiwan authorities in the name of China".

(7) An instrument of succession by the Government of Croatia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 8 June 1993, with effect from 8 October 1991.

(8) An instrument of succession by the Government of the Czech Republic to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the Russian Federation on 14 November 1994, with effect from 1 January 1993.

(9) Until later decision, the Convention will not be applied to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

Note 1: A notification was received by the Government of the United Kingdom from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark whereby the latter withdraws, with effect from 1 June 1980, the reservation made at the time of ratification that this Convention should not apply to Greenland.

Note 2: The Government of the United Kingdom subsequently received, on 21 September 1994, a notification from the Government of the Kingdom of Denmark whereby the latter withdraws, with effect from 1 October 1994, the reservation made at the time of ratification that this Convention should not apply to the Faroe Islands.

(10) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Convention on 9 June 1972, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(11) On 10 January 1990, instruments were deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the United States by the Government of Hungary whereby that Government withdraws the reservation made at the time of ratification with regard to paragraph 1 of Article 14 of the Convention. The withdrawal of the reservation took effect on 10 January 1990.

(12) It is understood that accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Civil Aviation, done at Montreal, 1971, does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relation will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(13) "In case of a dispute, all recourse must be made to the International Court of Justice on the basis of the unanimous consent of the parties concerned".

(14) The Convention cannot enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles until thirty days after the date on which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands shall have notified the depositary Governments that the necessary measures to give effect to the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles.

Note 1: On 11 June 1974, a declaration was deposited with the Government of the United States by the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands stating that in the interim the measures required to implement the provisions of the Convention have been taken in the Netherlands Antilles and, consequently, the Convention will enter into force for the Netherlands Antilles on the thirtieth day after the date of deposit of this declaration.

Note 2: By a Note dated 9 January 1986 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the Government of the United States that as of 1 January 1986 the Convention is applicable to the Netherlands Antilles (without Aruba) and to Aruba.

(15) Accession to the said Convention by the Government of the Sultanate of Oman does not mean or imply, and shall not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(16) The accession by the Government of the Republic of Korea to the present Convention does not in any way mean or imply the recognition of any territory or regime which has not been recognized by the Government of the Republic of Korea as a State or Government.

(17) Approval by Saudi Arabia does not mean and could not be interpreted as recognition of Israel generally or in the context of this Convention.

(18) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovakia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 6 March 1995, with effect from 1 January 1993.

(19) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovenia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 27 May 1992.

(20) An instrument of succession by the Government of Solomon Islands to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 13 April 1982. Solomon Islands attained independence on 7 July 1978.

(21) Notification of succession to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 27 October 1978, by virtue of the extension of the Convention to Suriname by the Kingdom of the Netherlands prior to independence. The Republic of Suriname attained independence on 25 November 1975.

(22) An instrument of succession by the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Convention was deposited with the Government of the United States on 4 January 1995.

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

(24) The Convention is ratified "in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Territories under territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom as well as the British Solomon Islands Protectorate".

Note: By a Note dated 20 November 1990, the Government of the United Kingdom declared that Anguilla has been included under the ratification of the Convention by that Government with effect from 7 November 1990.

(25) The instrument of ratification by the Government of Venezuela contains the following reservation regarding Articles 4, 7 and 8 of the Convention:

"Venezuela will take into consideration clearly political motives and the circumstances under which offences described in Article 1 of this Convention are committed, in refusing to extradite or prosecute an offender, unless financial extortion or injury to the crew, passengers, or other persons has occurred".

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland made the following declaration in a Note dated 6 August 1985 to the Department of State of the Government of the United States:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela insofar as it purports to limit the obligation under Article 7 of the Convention to submit the case against an offender to the competent authorities of the State for the purpose of prosecution".

With reference to the above declaration by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Government of Venezuela, in a Note dated 21 November 1985, informed the Department of State of the Government of the United States of the following:

"The reserve made by the Government of Venezuela to Articles 4, 7 and 8 of the Convention is based on the fact that the principle of asylum is contemplated in Article 116 of the Constitution of the Republic of Venezuela. Article 116 reads:

'The Republic grants asylum to any person subject to persecution or which finds itself in danger, for political reasons, within the conditions and requirements established by the laws and norms of international law.'

It is for this reason that the Government of Venezuela considers that in order to protect this right, which would be diminished by the application without limits of the said articles, it was necessary to request the formulation of the declaration contemplated in Art. 2 of the Law approving the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Security (sic) of Civil Aviation".

The Government of Italy made the following declaration in a Note dated 21 November 1985 to the Department of State of the Government of the United States:

"The Government of Italy does not consider as valid the reservation formulated by the Government of the Republic of Venezuela due to the fact that it may be considered as aiming to limit the obligation under Article 7 of the Convention to submit the case against an offender to the competent authorities of the State for the purpose of prosecution".

(26) By a Note dated 9 August 1999, the Government of the United Kingdom notified the International Civil Aviation Organization of the wish of the Government of Portugal to extend the Convention to the Territory of Macao, the extension taking effect on 19 July 1999.

(27) By a Note dated 27 October 1999, the Government of Portugal advised the Government of the United Kingdom as follows:

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

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

(28) By a note dated 17 July 2001, deposited on 23 July 2001, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia declared itself bound, as a successor State to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, this Convention, with effect from 27 April 1992, the date of State succession. (The former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had signed the Convention on 23 September 1971 and ratified it on 2 October 1972.)

**CONVENTION ON THE PREVENTION AND PUNISHMENT OF CRIMES AGAINST  
INTERNATIONALLY PROTECTED PERSONS, INCLUDING DIPLOMATIC AGENTS, NEW  
YORK , 14 DECEMBER 1973**

**Entry into force:** 20 February 1977, in accordance with article 17 (1).  
**Registration:** 20 February 1977, No. 15410.  
**Status:** Signatories: 25 ,Parties: 119.  
**Text:** United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1035, p. 167.

**Note:** The Convention was opened for signature at New York on 14 December 1973 until 31 December 1974.

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)</b>
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria		7 Nov 2000 a
Antigua and Barbuda		19 Jul 1993 a
Argentina		18 Mar 1982 a
Armenia		18 May 1994 a
Australia	30 Dec 1974	20 Jun 1977
Austria		3 Aug 1977 a
Azerbaijan		2 Apr 2001 a
Bahamas		22 Jul 1986 a
Barbados		26 Oct 1979 a
Belarus	11 Jun 1974	5 Feb 1976
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Bhutan		16 Jan 1989 a
Bolivia		22 Jan 2002 a
Bosnia and Herzegovina <sup>1</sup>		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		25 Oct 2000 a
Brazil		7 Jun 1999 a
Brunei Darussalam		13 Nov 1997 a
Bulgaria	27 Jun 1974	18 Jul 1974
Burundi		17 Dec 1980 a
Cameroon		8 Jun 1992 a
Canada	26 Jun 1974	4 Aug 1976
Chile		21 Jan 1977 a
China <sup>2</sup>		5 Aug 1987 a
Colombia		16 Jan 1996 a
Costa Rica		2 Nov 1977 a
Côte d'Ivoire		13 Mar 2002 a
Croatia <sup>1</sup>		12 Oct 1992 d

Cuba		10 Jun 1998 a
Cyprus		24 Dec 1975 a
Czech Republic <sup>3</sup>		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		1 Dec 1982 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo		25 Jul 1977 a
Denmark <sup>4</sup>	10 May 1974	1 Jul 1975
Dominican Republic		8 Jul 1977 a
Ecuador	27 Aug 1974	12 Mar 1975
Egypt		25 Jun 1986 a
El Salvador		8 Aug 1980 a
Estonia		21 Oct 1991 a
Finland	10 May 1974	31 Oct 1978
Gabon		14 Oct 1981 a
Germany <sup>5,6</sup>	15 Aug 1974	25 Jan 1977
Ghana		25 Apr 1975 a
Greece		3 Jul 1984 a
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala	12 Dec 1974	18 Jan 1983
Haiti		25 Aug 1980 a
Hungary	6 Nov 1974	26 Mar 1975
Iceland	10 May 1974	2 Aug 1977
India		11 Apr 1978 a
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		12 Jul 1978 a
Iraq		28 Feb 1978 a
Israel		31 Jul 1980 a
Italy	30 Dec 1974	30 Aug 1985
Jamaica		21 Sep 1978 a
Japan		8 Jun 1987 a
Jordan		18 Dec 1984 a
Kazakhstan		21 Feb 1996 a
Kenya		16 Nov 2001 a
Kuwait		1 Mar 1989 a
Latvia		14 Apr 1992 a
Lebanon		3 Jun 1997 a
Liberia		30 Sep 1975 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		25 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein		28 Nov 1994 a
Malawi		14 Mar 1977 a

Maldives		21 Aug 1990 a
Mali		12 Apr 2002 a
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Mauritania		9 Feb 1998 a
Mexico		22 Apr 1980 a
Mongolia	23 Aug 1974	8 Aug 1975
Morocco		9 Jan 2002 a
Nepal		9 Mar 1990 a
Netherlands <sup>7</sup>		6 Dec 1988 a
New Zealand <sup>8</sup>		12 Nov 1985 a
Nicaragua	29 Oct 1974	10 Mar 1975
Niger		17 Jun 1985 a
Norway	10 May 1974	28 Apr 1980
Oman		22 Mar 1988 a
Pakistan		29 Mar 1976 a
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama		17 Jun 1980 a
Paraguay	25 Oct 1974	24 Nov 1975
Peru		25 Apr 1978 a
Philippines		26 Nov 1976 a
Poland	7 Jun 1974	14 Dec 1982
Portugal <sup>9</sup>		11 Sep 1995 a
Qatar		3 Mar 1997 a
Republic of Korea		25 May 1983 a
Republic of Moldova		8 Sep 1997 a
Romania	27 Dec 1974	15 Aug 1978
Russian Federation	7 Jun 1974	15 Jan 1976
Rwanda	15 Oct 1974	29 Nov 1977
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		12 Sep 2000 a
Seychelles		29 May 1980 a
Slovakia <sup>3</sup>		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia <sup>1</sup>		6 Jul 1992 d
Spain		8 Aug 1985 a
Sri Lanka		27 Feb 1991 a
Sudan		10 Oct 1994 a
Sweden	10 May 1974	1 Jul 1975
Switzerland		5 Mar 1985 a
Syrian Arab Republic		25 Apr 1988 a

Tajikistan		19 Oct 2001 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <sup>1</sup>		12 Mar 1998 d
Togo		30 Dec 1980 a
Trinidad and Tobago		15 Jun 1979 a
Tunisia	15 May 1974	21 Jan 1977
Turkey		11 Jun 1981 a
Turkmenistan		25 Jun 1999 a
Ukraine	18 Jun 1974	20 Jan 1976
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	13 Dec 1974	2 May 1979
United States of America	28 Dec 1973	26 Oct 1976
Uruguay		13 Jun 1978 a
Uzbekistan		19 Jan 1998 a
Viet Nam		2 May 2002 a
Yemen <sup>10</sup>		9 Feb 1987 a
Yugoslavia <sup>1</sup>		12 Mar 2001 d

### **DECLARATIONS AND RESERVATIONS**

(Unless otherwise indicated, the declarations and reservations were made upon ratification, accession or succession. For objections thereto see hereinafter.)

#### **Algeria**

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria states that in each individual case, a dispute may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute.

#### **Argentina**

In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, the Argentine Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

#### **Belarus**

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice,



and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

### **Brazil**

Reservation:

With the reservation provided for in paragraph 2 of article 13.

<b>Bulgaria</b> <sup>11.</sup>
--------------------------------

### **Burundi**

In respect of cases where the alleged offenders belong to a national liberation movement recognized by Burundi or by an international organization of which Burundi is a member, and their actions are part of their struggle for liberation, the Government of the Republic of Burundi reserves the right not to apply to them the provisions of article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1.

### **China**

[The People's Republic of China] declares that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of article 13 of the Convention, the People's Republic of China has reservations on paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of the said paragraph.

### **Colombia**

Reservations:

1. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the Convention, and particularly to article 8(1), (2), (3) and (4) thereof, which are inconsistent with article 35 of the Basic Law in force which states that: Native-born Colombians may not be extradited. Aliens will not be extradited for political crimes or for their opinions. Any Colombian who has committed, abroad, crimes that are considered as such under national legislation, shall be tried and sentenced in Colombia.

2. Colombia enters a reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, inasmuch as it is contrary to the provisions of article 35 of its Political Constitution.

3. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the Convention, which are contrary to the guiding principles of the Colombian Penal Code and to article 29 of the Political Constitution of Colombia, the fourth paragraph of which states that:

Everyone shall be presumed innocent until proven guilty according to law. Anyone who is charged with an offence shall be entitled to defence and the assistance of counsel of his own choosing, or one appointed by the court, during the investigation and trial; to be tried properly, in public without undue delay; to present evidence and to refute evidence brought against him; to contest the sentence; and not to be tried twice for the same act.

Consequently, the expression "Alleged offender" shall be taken to mean "the accused".

### **Cuba**

Declaration:

In accordance with article 13, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Cuba declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

<b>Czech Republic<sup>3</sup></b>
-----------------------------------

**Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

Reservation:

The Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, recognizing that any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention should not, without consent of both parties, be submitted to international arbitration and to the International Court of Justice.

**Democratic Republic of the Congo**

The Republic of Zaire does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice. In the light of its policy based on respect for the sovereignty of States, the Republic of Zaire is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration and hopes that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice not at the request of one of the parties but with the consent of all the interested parties.

**Ecuador**

Upon signature:

Ecuador wishes to avail itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, of the Convention, declaring that it does not consider itself bound to refer disputes concerning the application of the Convention to the International Court of Justice.

**El Salvador**

The State of El Salvador does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention.

<b>Finland</b>
----------------

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

"Finland reserves the right to apply the provision of article 8, paragraph 3, in such a way that extradition shall be restricted to offences which, under Finnish Law, are punishable by a penalty more severe than imprisonment for one year and, provided also that other conditions in the Finnish Legislation for extradition are fulfilled."

Declaration made upon signature:

"Finland also reserves the right to make such other reservations as it may deem appropriate if and when ratifying this Convention."

<b>Germany<sup>6</sup></b>
----------------------------

Upon signature:

"The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying this Convention, to state its views on the explanations of vote and declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention."

**Ghana<sup>12</sup>.**

"(i) Paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention provides that disputes may be submitted to arbitration, failing which any of the parties to the dispute may refer it to the International Court of Justice by request. Since Ghana is opposed to any form of compulsory arbitration, she wishes to exercise her option under article 13 (2) to make a reservation on article 13 (1). It is noted that such a reservation can be withdrawn later under article 13 (3)."

**Hungary<sup>13</sup>.**

**India**

"The Government of the Republic of India does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention."

**Iraq<sup>14</sup>.**

(1) The resolution of the United Nations General Assembly with which the above-mentioned Convention is enclosed shall be considered to be an integral part of the above-mentioned Convention.

(2) Sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention shall cover the representatives of the national liberation movements recognized by the League of Arab States or the Organization of African Unity.

(3) The Republic of Iraq shall not bind itself by paragraph (1) of article 13 of the Convention.

(4) The accession of the Government of the Republic of Iraq to the Convention shall in no way constitute a recognition of Israel or a cause for the establishment of any relations of any kind therewith.

**Israel<sup>15</sup>.**

**Declarations:**

"The Government of the State of Israel declares that its accession to the Convention does not constitute acceptance by it as binding of the provisions of any other international instrument, or acceptance by it of any other international instrument as being an instrument related to the Convention.

The Government of Israel reaffirms the contents of its communication of 11 May 1979 to the Secretary-General of the United Nations."

**Reservation:**

"The State of Israel does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

**Jamaica**

"Jamaica avails itself of the provisions of article 13, para- graph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of this article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

#### **Jordan<sup>14</sup>.**

Reservation:

The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan de- clares that its accession [. . .] cannot give rise to relations with "Israel".

#### **Kuwait<sup>14</sup>.**

Declaration:

[The Government of Kuwait] wishes to reiterate Kuwait's complete reservation on paragraph 1 of article 13 in the Convention, for its accession to it does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and does not engage them into any treaty relations as a result.

#### **Liechtenstein**

Interpretative declaration:

The Principality of Liechtenstein construes articles 4 and 5, paragraph 1 of the Convention, to mean that the Principality of Liechtenstein undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein under the conditions laid down in its domestic legislation.

#### **Malawi**

"The Government of the Republic of Malawi [declares], in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of article 13, that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

#### **Mongolia**

Declaration made upon signature and renewed upon ratification:

"The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

#### **Netherlands**

Declaration:

"In view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands article 12 of the Convention, and in particular the second sentence of that Article, in no way affects the applicability of article 33 of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees".

Reservation:

"In cases where the judicial authorities of either the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles or Aruba cannot exercise jurisdiction pursuant to one of the principles mentioned in article 3, para. 1, the Kingdom accepts the aforesaid obligation [laid down in article 7] subject to the condition that it has received and rejected a request for extradition from another State party to the Convention."

### **New Zealand**

Reservation:

The Government of New Zealand reserves the right not to apply the provisions of the Convention to Tokelau pending the enactment of the necessary implementing legislation in Tokelau law.

### **Pakistan**

"Pakistan shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention".

### **Peru**

With reservation as to article 13 (1).

### **Poland<sup>16</sup>**

### **Portugal**

Reservation:

Portugal does not extradite anyone for crimes which carry the death penalty or life imprisonment under the law of the requesting State nor does it extradite anyone for violations which carry security measure for life.

### **Romania**

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Socialist Republic of Romania declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention which is not settled by negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice.

The Socialist Republic of Romania considers that such disputes may be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

### **Russian Federation**

Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

### **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**

**Declaration:**

"Saint Vincent and the Grenadines avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2 of the aforesaid Convention and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

<b>Slovakia</b> <sup>3.</sup>
-------------------------------

<b>Switzerland</b>
--------------------

**Declaration:**

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 and article 5, paragraph 1, of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

### **Syrian Arab Republic**<sup>14.</sup>

**Declaration:**

1. The Syrian Arab Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, concerning arbitration and the results thereof.

2. Accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention in no way implies recognition of Israel or entry into any relations with Israel concerning any question regulated by this Convention.

### **Trinidad and Tobago**

"The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago avails itself of the provisions of article 13, paragraph 2, and declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or referred to the International Court of Justice, and states that in each individual case, the consent of all Parties to such a dispute is necessary for the submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice."

### **Tunisia**

**Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:**

No dispute may be brought before the International Court of Justice unless by agreement between all parties to the dispute.

<b>Ukraine</b>
----------------

**Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:**

The Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider it self bound by the provisions of article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, under which any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice,

and states that, in each individual case, the consent of all parties to such a dispute is necessary for submission of the dispute to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice.

### **Viet Nam**

Reservation:

"Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam makes its reservation to paragraph 1 of article 13 of the Convention."

### **Yemen**<sup>10,14.</sup>

Reservation:

In acceding to this Convention, the People's Democratic Republic of Yemen does not consider itself bound by article 13, paragraph 1, of the Convention, which states that disputes between States parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention may, at the request of anyone of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice. It declares that the competence of the International Court of Justice with respect to disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention shall in each case be subject to the express consent of all parties to the dispute.

Declaration

The People's Democratic Republic of Yemen declares that its accession to this Convention shall in no way signify recognition of Israel or serve as grounds for the establishment of relations of any sort with Israel.

## **OBJECTIONS**

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)

### **Germany**<sup>6.</sup>

30 November 1979

The statement by the Republic of Iraq on sub-paragraph (b) of paragraph (1) of article 1 of the Convention does not have any legal effects for the Federal Republic of Germany.

25 March 1981

The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers the reservation made by the Government of Burundi concerning article 2, paragraph 2, and article 6, paragraph 1, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, to be incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

### **Israel**

"The Government of the State of Israel does not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

28 June 1982

"The Government of the State of Israel regards the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and is unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn.

"In the view of the Government of Israel, the purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven."

### Italy

(a) The Italian Government does not consider as valid the reservation made by Iraq on 28 February 1978 with regard to article 1, paragraph 1(b), of the said Convention;

(b) With regard to the reservation expressed by Burundi on 17 December 1980, [the Italian Government considers that] the purpose of the Convention is to ensure the punishment, world-wide, of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny a safe haven to the perpetrators of such crimes. Considering therefore that the reservation expressed by the Government of Burundi is incompatible with the aim and purpose of the Convention, the Italian Government can not consider Burundi's accession to the Convention as valid as long as it does not withdraw that reservation.

### United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland do not regard as valid the reservation made by Iraq in respect of paragraph (1) (b) of article 1 of the said Convention."

15 January 1982

"The purpose of this Convention was to secure the world-wide repression of crimes against internationally protected persons, including diplomatic agents, and to deny the perpetrators of such crimes a safe haven. Accordingly the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland regard the reservation entered by the Government of Burundi as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention, and are unable to consider Burundi as having validly acceded to the Convention until such time as the reservation is withdrawn."

## TERRITORIAL APPLICATION

Participant	Date of receipt of the notification	Territories
United Kingdom <sup>2,17,18,19</sup>	2 May 1979	Bailiwick of Jersey, Bailiwick of Guernsey, Isle of Man, Belize, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands and Dependencies, Gibraltar, Gilbert Islands, Hong Kong, Montserrat, the Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena and Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Kingdom Sovereign Base Areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the Island of Cyprus.
	16 Nov 1989	Anguilla

## NOTES



1. The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 17 December 1974 and 29 December 1976, respectively. See also notes 1 regarding "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

2. On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, the Governments of China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:

[Same notifications as those made under note 5 in chapter IV.1.]

In addition, the notification made by the Government of China contained the following declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that the reservation to paragraph 1, article 13 of the [said Convention] made by the Government of the People's Republic of China will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

3. Czechoslovakia had signed and ratified the Convention on 11 October 1974 and 30 June 1975, respectively, with a reservation. Subsequently, by a notification received on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1035, p. 234. See also note 12 in chapter I.2.

4. In a notification received on 12 March 1980, the Government of Denmark informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon ratification of the Convention, which specified that until further decision, the Convention would not apply to the Faeroe Islands or to Greenland. The notification indicates 1 April 1980 as the effective date of withdrawal.

5. The German Democratic Republic had signed and ratified the Convention, with reservation, on 23 May 1974 and 30 November 1976, respectively. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1035, p. 230. See also note 15 in chapter I.2.

6. In a communication accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared as follows:

With effect from the day on which the Convention enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany it will also apply to Berlin (West) subject to the rights and responsibilities of the Allied authorities.

With respect to the above declaration, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

Union of Soviet Socialist Republics (21 July 1977):

The declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany when it deposited the instrument of ratification concerning the application of the Convention to Berlin (West) is incompatible with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971 and can therefore have no legal force. The Quadripartite Agreement, as is well known, does not allow the Federal Republic of Germany to represent the interests of Berlin in matters of status and security in the international arena. The above-mentioned Convention directly affects matters of status and security. It therefore follows that the Federal Republic of Germany cannot assume the rights and obligations of ensuring the observance of the provisions of this Convention in Berlin (West).

Since under the Quadripartite Agreement the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States retain their rights and responsibility with respect to the representation

abroad of interests of Berlin (West) and its permanent residents, including rights and responsibility concerning matters of security and status, both in international organizations and in relations with other countries, the Soviet Union will, in any matters which may arise in connexion with the application and implementation of the Convention in Berlin (West), address itself to the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States.

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (7 December 1977-in relation to the declaration made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics received on 21 July 1977):

"We have the honour to refer to the Note from the Director of the General Legal Division in charge of the Office of Legal Affairs [...] dated 10 August 1977 concerning the ratification by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany with declaration, of the Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes Against Internationally Protected Persons, Including Diplomatic Agents, and in particular to refer to paragraph 2 of that note which reported a communication made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics relating to the application of that Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin.

"In a communication to the Government of the USSR which is an integral part (Annex IV A) of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, the Governments of France, the US and the UK confirmed that, provided matters of security and status are not affected and provided that extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the USSR, in a communication to the Government of France, the UK and the US, which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such an extension.

"The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed inter alia to afford the authorities of France, the UK and the US the opportunity to ensure that international agreements concluded by the FRG which are to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status remain unaffected. The extension of the aforesaid Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin received the authorization, under these established procedures, of the authorities of France, the United Kingdom and the United States who took the necessary steps to ensure that matters of security and status would not be affected thereby.

Consequently, pursuant to the declaration on Berlin made by the FRG, this Convention has been validly extended to the WSB. Accordingly, the application of this Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect."

Federal Republic of Germany (13 February 1978):

"By their Note of 3 December 1977, disseminated [on] 19 January 1978, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication [of 21 July 1977] referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the Note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that, subject to the rights and responsibilities of the Three Powers, the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned instrument extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

German Democratic Republic (22 December 1978):

Concerning the application of the Convention to Berlin (West), the German Democratic Republic states, in conformity with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, that Berlin (West) is not a constituent part of the Federal Republic of Germany and is not to be governed by it. The statement of the Federal Republic of Germany, according to which this Convention is to be extended to Berlin (West), is inconsistent with the Quadripartite Agreement which stipulates that agreements concerning matters of security and the status of Berlin (West) must not be extended by the Federal Republic of Germany to Berlin (West). Accordingly, the statement made by the Federal Republic of Germany can have no legal effects.

Czechoslovakia (25 April 1979):

"According to the Quadripartite Agreement of September 3, 1971, the Federal Republic of Germany cannot extend international conventions to Berlin (West) if the conventions in question relate to matters of security and the status of Berlin (West). Since the above-mentioned multilateral international Convention leaves no doubt as to its direct relation to the matters of security and the status of Berlin (West) there is no legal ground for its extension to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany.

"In view of all these facts the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic cannot accept the extension of the said Convention to Berlin (West) by the Federal Republic of Germany, is not in a position to regard the extension as legally valid and cannot attach to it any legal effects."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (21 August 1979-relating to the communications from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia received on 22 December 1978 and 25 April 1979, respectively):

"With regard to the communications referred to above, our Governments reaffirm that States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement are not competent to comment authoritatively on its provisions.

"The three Governments do not consider it necessary, nor do they intend to respond to any further communications on this subject from States which are not parties to the Quadripartite Agreement. This should not be taken to imply any change of the position of the three Governments in this matter."

Federal Republic of Germany (18 October 1979-relating to the communications from the German Democratic Republic and Czechoslovakia received on 22 December 1978 and 25 April 1979, respectively):

"By their Note of 20 August 1979, disseminated [on] 21 August 1979, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States rejected the assertions made in the communications referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

Hungary (27 November 1979):

[Communication identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, to the one of 25 April 1979 by Czechoslovakia.]

Czechoslovakia (25 January 1980):

"The Czechoslovak side continues to hold the view that also States that are not signatories of the Four-Power Agreement of 3 September 1971 must proceed from the criteria set forth by the Four-Power Agreement, since no other criteria exist. We furthermore believe that it is the inalienable right of every State to adjudge its treaty relations from its own will. The exercise of such a right even by a non-signatory State cannot be hindered by third State parties."

France, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and United States of America (18 February 1982-relating to the declaration made by Czechoslovakia on 25 January 1980):  
 "With regard to the communication of the Government of Czechoslovakia referred to above, our Governments reaffirm their position as stated in their note of 21 August 1979 to the Secretary-General in connexion with this Convention. The Quadripartite Agreement is an international treaty concluded between the four contracting parties and not open to participation by any other State. In concluding this Agreement, the four powers acted on the basis of their quadripartite rights and responsibilities, and of the corresponding war-time and post-war agreements and decisions of the four powers, which are not affected. The Quadripartite Agreement is a part of conventional, not customary international law. Accordingly, Czechoslovakia, as a third State not a party to the Quadripartite Agreement, has no right whatsoever to comment authoritatively on it."

Federal Republic of Germany (2 April 1982-relating to the declaration made by Czechoslovakia on 25 January 1980):

"By their note of 18 February 1982, disseminated [on] 12 March 1982, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertion made in the communication referred to in depositary notification [. . .] of 27 February 1980. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of 18 February 1982, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under the established procedure continues in full force and effect.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

Subsequently, in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 3 October 1990, the Government of Hungary indicated that, the German State having achieved its unity on this day [3 October 1990], it had decided to withdraw, as from that date, the declaration it had made with respect to the notification of extension by the Federal Republic of Germany to Land Berlin.

See also note 5.

7. For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

8. The instrument of accession specifies that the Convention will also apply to the Cook Islands and Niue.

9. On 11 August 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention will apply to Macau.

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

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

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

10. The formality was effected by Democratic Yemen. See also note 35 in chapter I.2.

11. On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, made upon signature and renewed upon ratification. For the text of the declaration, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1035, p. 228.

12. In a notification received on 18 November 1976, the Government of Ghana informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation contained in its instrument of accession, concerning article 3 (1)(c) of the Convention. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1035, p. 235.

13. In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation in respect to article 13 (1) of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation, see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1035, p. 235.

14. The Secretary-General received on 11 May 1979 from the Government of Israel the following communication:

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

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

Identical communications, in essence, *mutatis mutandis* have been received by the Secretary-General from the Government of Israel on 11 March 1985 in respect of the reservation made by Jordan; on 21 August 1987 in respect of the declaration by Democratic Yemen; on 26 July 1988 in respect of the declaration made by the Syrian Arab Republic; and on 17 May 1989 in respect of the declaration made by Kuwait.

15. The communication of 11 May 1979 refers to the reservation made by Iraq upon accession to the Convention. See note 12.

16. On 16 October 1997, the Government of Poland notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with regard to article 13, paragraph 1 of the Convention made upon ratification. For the text of the reservation see United Nations, Treaty Series, vol. 1295, p. 394.

17. The Secretary-General received, on 25 May 1979 from the Government of Guatemala, the following communication:

The Government of Guatemala [does] not accept [the extension by the United Kingdom of the Convention to the Territory of Belize] in view of the fact the said Territory is a territory concerning which a dispute exists and to which [Guatemala] maintains a claim that is the subject, by mutual agreement, of procedures for the peaceful settlement of disputes between the two Governments concerned.

In this respect, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in a communication received by the Secretary-General on 12 November 1979, stated the following:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to their sovereignty over Belize and do not accept the reservation submitted by the Government of Guatemala."

18. On 3 October 1983, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Argentina the following objection:

[The Government of Argentina makes a] formal objection to the [declaration] of territorial extension issued by the United Kingdom with regard to the Malvinas Islands [and dependencies], which that country is illegally occupying and refers to as the "Falkland Islands".

The Argentine Republic rejects and considers null and void the [said declaration] of territorial extension.

With reference to the above-mentioned objection, the Secretary-General received, on 28 February 1985, from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following declaration:

[For the text of the declaration see note 25 in chapter IV.1.]

19. The Government of the United Kingdom specified that the application of the Convention had been extended to Anguilla as from 26 March 1987.

20. On 1 March 2002, the Government of Colombia informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the following reservations made upon accession:

*1. Colombia enters a reservation to those provisions of the Convention, and particularly to article 8 (1), (2), (3) and (4) thereof, which are inconsistent with article 35 of the Basic Law in force which states that: Native-born Colombians may not be extradited. Aliens will not be extradited for political crimes or for their opinions. Any Colombian who has committed, abroad, crimes that are considered as such under national legislation, shall be tried and sentenced in Colombia.*

*2. Colombia enters a reservation to article 13 (1) of the Convention, inasmuch as it is contrary to the provisions of article 35 of its Political Constitution.*

**INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION AGAINST THE TAKING OF HOSTAGES, NEW YORK,  
17 DECEMBER 1979**

**Entry into force:** 3 June 1983, in accordance with article 18(1).  
**Registration:** 3 June 1983, No. 21931.  
**Status:** Signatories: 39 ,Parties: 108.  
 United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1316, p. 205; and depositary notifications C.N.209.1987.TREATIES-6 of 8 October 1987 and C.N.324.1987.TREATIES-9 of 1 February 1988 (procès-verbal of rectification of the original Russian text).  
**Text:**

**Note:** The Convention was adopted by resolution 34/146<sup>1</sup> of the General Assembly of the United Nations dated 17 December 1979. It was opened for signature from 18 December 1979 to 31 December 1980.

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Ratification, Accession (a), Succession (d)</b>
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria		18 Dec 1996 a
Antigua and Barbuda		6 Aug 1986 a
Argentina		18 Sep 1991 a
Australia		21 May 1990 a
Austria	3 Oct 1980	22 Aug 1986
Azerbaijan		29 Feb 2000 a
Bahamas		4 Jun 1981 a
Barbados		9 Mar 1981 a
Belarus		1 Jul 1987 a
Belgium	3 Jan 1980	16 Apr 1999
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Bhutan		31 Aug 1981 a
Bolivia	25 Mar 1980	7 Jan 2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina <sup>2</sup>		1 Sep 1993 d
Botswana		8 Sep 2000 a
Brazil		8 Mar 2000 a
Brunei Darussalam		18 Oct 1988 a
Bulgaria		10 Mar 1988 a
Cameroon		9 Mar 1988 a
Canada	18 Feb 1980	4 Dec 1985
Chile	3 Jan 1980	12 Nov 1981
China <sup>2</sup>		26 Jan 1993 a
Côte d'Ivoire		22 Aug 1989 a
Cuba		15 Nov 2001 a
Cyprus		13 Sep 1991 a

Czech Republic <sup>3</sup>		22 Feb 1993 d
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		12 Nov 2001 a
Democratic Republic of the Congo	2 Jul 1980	
Denmark		11 Aug 1987 a
Dominica		9 Sep 1986 a
Dominican Republic	12 Aug 1980	
Ecuador		2 May 1988 a
Egypt	18 Dec 1980	2 Oct 1981
El Salvador	10 Jun 1980	12 Feb 1981
Estonia		8 Mar 2002 a
Finland	29 Oct 1980	14 Apr 1983
France		9 Jun 2000 a
Gabon	29 Feb 1980	
Germany <sup>4,5</sup>	18 Dec 1979	15 Dec 1980
Ghana		10 Nov 1987 a
Greece	18 Mar 1980	18 Jun 1987
Grenada		10 Dec 1990 a
Guatemala	30 Apr 1980	11 Mar 1983
Haiti	21 Apr 1980	17 May 1989
Honduras	11 Jun 1980	1 Jun 1981
Hungary		2 Sep 1987 a
Iceland		6 Jul 1981 a
India		7 Sep 1994 a
Iraq	14 Oct 1980	
Israel	19 Nov 1980	
Italy	18 Apr 1980	20 Mar 1986
Jamaica	27 Feb 1980	
Japan	22 Dec 1980	8 Jun 1987
Jordan		19 Feb 1986 a
Kazakhstan		21 Feb 1996 a
Kenya		8 Dec 1981 a
Kuwait		6 Feb 1989 a



Lebanon		4 Dec 1997 a
Lesotho	17 Apr 1980	5 Nov 1980
Liberia	30 Jan 1980	
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		25 Sep 2000 a
Liechtenstein		28 Nov 1994 a
Lithuania		2 Feb 2001 a
Luxembourg	18 Dec 1979	29 Apr 1991
Malawi		17 Mar 1986 a
Mali		8 Feb 1990 a
Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Mauritania		13 Mar 1998 a
Mauritius	18 Jun 1980	17 Oct 1980
Mexico		28 Apr 1987 a
Monaco		16 Oct 2001 a
Mongolia		9 Jun 1992 a
Nepal		9 Mar 1990 a
Netherlands <sup>6</sup>	18 Dec 1980	6 Dec 1988
New Zealand <sup>Z</sup>	24 Dec 1980	12 Nov 1985
Norway	18 Dec 1980	2 Jul 1981
Oman		22 Jul 1988 a
Pakistan		8 Sep 2000 a
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	24 Jan 1980	19 Aug 1982
Peru		6 Jul 2001 a
Philippines	2 May 1980	14 Oct 1980
Poland		25 May 2000 a
Portugal <sup>8</sup>	16 Jun 1980	6 Jul 1984
Republic of Korea		4 May 1983 a
Romania		17 May 1990 a
Russian Federation		11 Jun 1987 a
Rwanda		13 May 2002 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		17 Jan 1991 a
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		12 Sep 2000 a
Saudi Arabia		8 Jan 1991 a
Senegal	2 Jun 1980	10 Mar 1987
Slovakia <sup>3</sup>		28 May 1993 d
Slovenia <sup>2</sup>		6 Jul 1992 d

Spain		26 Mar 1984 a
Sri Lanka		8 Sep 2000 a
Sudan		19 Jun 1990 a
Suriname	30 Jul 1980	5 Nov 1981
Sweden	25 Feb 1980	15 Jan 1981
Switzerland	18 Jul 1980	5 Mar 1985
Tajikistan		6 May 2002 a
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia <sup>2</sup>		12 Mar 1998 d
Togo	8 Jul 1980	25 Jul 1986
Trinidad and Tobago		1 Apr 1981 a
Tunisia		18 Jun 1997 a
Turkey		15 Aug 1989 a
Turkmenistan		25 Jun 1999 a
Uganda	10 Nov 1980	
Ukraine		19 Jun 1987 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland <sup>9,10</sup>	18 Dec 1979	22 Dec 1982
United States of America	21 Dec 1979	7 Dec 1984
Uzbekistan		19 Jan 1998 a
Venezuela		13 Dec 1988 a
Yemen		14 Jul 2000 a
Yugoslavia <sup>2</sup>		12 Mar 2001 d

## **DECLARATIONS AND RESERVATIONS**

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

### **Algeria**

Reservation:

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the [said Convention]. These provisions are not in accordance with the view of the Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria that the submission of a dispute to the International Court of Justice requires the prior agreement of all the parties concerned in each case.

### **Belarus**

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1, of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that, in order for any dispute between parties to the Convention concerning the interpretation or application thereof to be referred to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the consent of all parties to the dispute must be secured in each individual case.

The Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic condemns international terrorism, which takes the lives of innocent people, constitutes a threat to their freedom and personal inviolability and destabilizes the international situation, whatever the motives used to explain terrorist actions. Accordingly, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic considers that article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention should be applied in a manner consistent with the stated aims of the Convention, which include the development of international co-operation in adopting effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking as manifestations of international terrorism through, inter alia, the extradition of alleged offenders.

### **Brazil**

Reservation:

With the reservation provided under article 16 (2).

### **Bulgaria<sup>11</sup>**

Declaration on article 9, paragraph 1:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria condemns all acts of international terrorism, whose victims are not only governmental and public officials but also many innocent people, including mothers, children, old-aged, and which exerts an increasingly destabilizing impact on international relations, complicates considerably the political solution of crisis situations, irrespective of the reasons invoked to explain terrorist acts. The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers that article 9, paragraph 1 of the Convention should be applied in a manner consistent with the stated aims of the Convention, which include the development of international co-operation in adopting effective measures for the prevention, prosecution and punishment of all acts of hostage-taking as manifestations of international terrorism, including extradition of alleged offenders.

### **Chile**

The Government of the Republic [of Chile], having approved this Convention, states that such approval is given on the understanding that the aforesaid Convention prohibits the taking of hostages in any circumstances, even those referred to in article 12.

### **China**

Reservation:

The People's Republic of China makes its reservation to article 16, paragraph 1, and does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

### **Cuba**

Reservation:

The Republic of Cuba declares, pursuant to article 16, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article, concerning the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, inasmuch as it considers that such disputes must be settled through amicable negotiation. In consequence, it reiterates that it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

<b>Czech Republic<sup>3</sup></b>
-----------------------------------

### **Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

Reservations:

... with the following reservations:

1. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.
2. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 5, paragraph 3 of the Convention.

### **Dominica**

Understanding:

"The aforesaid Convention prohibits the taking of hostages in any circumstances, even those referred to in article 12."

### **El Salvador**

Upon signature:

With the reservation permitted under article 16 (2) of the said Convention.

Upon ratification:

Reservation with respect to the application of the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

<b>France</b>
---------------

Declarations:

1. France considers that the act of hostage-taking is prohibited in all circumstances.
2. With regard to the application of article 6, France, in accordance with the principles of its penal procedure, does not intend to take an alleged offender into custody or to take any

other coercive measures prior to the institution of criminal proceedings, except in cases where pre-trial detention has been requested.

3. With regard to the application of article 9, extradition will not be granted if the person whose extradition is requested was a French national at the time of the events or, in the case of a foreign national, if the offence is punishable by the death penalty under the laws of the requesting State, unless that State gives what are deemed to be adequate assurances that the death penalty will not be imposed or, if a death sentence is passed, that it will not be carried out.

## **Hungary<sup>12</sup>**

### **India**

Reservation:

"The Government of the Republic of India declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 which establishes compulsory arbitration or adjudication by the International Court of Justice concerning disputes between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention at the request of one of them."

### **Israel**

Upon signature:

"1. It is the understanding of Israel that the Convention implements the principle that hostage taking is prohibited in all circumstances and that any person committing such an act shall be either prosecuted or extradited pursuant to article 8 of this Convention or the relevant provisions of the Geneva Conventions of 1949 or their additional Protocols, without any exception whatsoever.

"2) The Government of Israel declares that it reserves the right, when depositing the instrument of ratification, to make reservations and additional declarations and understandings."

## **Italy**

Upon signature:

The Italian Government declares that, because of the differing interpretations to which certain formulations in the text lend themselves, Italy reserves the right, when depositing the instrument of ratification, to invoke article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 23 May 1969 in conformity with the general principles of international law.

### **Jordan**

"The Government of the Hashemite Kingdom of Jordan declares that their accession to the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages can in no way be construed as constituting recognition of, or entering into treaty relations with the 'state of Israel'.

### **Kenya**

"The Government of the Republic of Kenya does not consider herself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the article 16 of the Convention."

## **Kuwait<sup>13</sup>**

**Declaration:**

It is understood that the accession to this Convention does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait.  
Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

**Lebanon****Declaration:**

1. The accession of the Lebanese Republic to the Convention shall not constitute recognition of Israel, just as the application of the Convention shall not give rise to relations or cooperation of any kind with it.

2. The provisions of the Convention, and in particular those of its article 13, shall not affect the Lebanese Republic's stance of supporting the right of States and peoples to oppose and resist foreign occupation of their territories.

**Liechtenstein****Interpretative declaration:**

The Principality of Liechtenstein construes article 4 of the Convention to mean that the Principality of Liechtenstein undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein under the conditions laid down in its domestic legislation.

**Malawi**

"While the Government of the Republic of Malawi accepts the principles in article 16, this acceptance would nonetheless be read in conjunction with [the] declaration [made by the President and the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Malawi] of 12 December, 1966 upon recognition as compulsory, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under article 36, paragraph 2, of the State of the Court."

**Mexico**

In relation to article 16, the United Mexican States adhere to the scope and limitations established by the Government of Mexico on 7 November 1945, at the time when it ratified the Charter of the United Nations and the Statute of the International Court of Justice.  
6 August 1987

The Government of Mexico subsequently specified that the said declaration should be understood to mean that, in so far as article 16 is concerned, the United Mexican States accede subject to the limits and restrictions laid down by the Mexican Government when recognizing, on 23 October 1947, the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in accordance with article 36, paragraph 2, of the State of the Court.

**Netherlands**

## Reservation:

"In cases where the judicial authorities of either the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles or Aruba cannot exercise jurisdiction pursuant to one of the principles mentioned in article 5, paragraph 1, the Kingdom accepts the aforesaid obligation [laid down in article 8] subject to the condition that it has received and rejected a request for extradition from another State party to the Convention."

## Declaration:

"In the view of the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands article 15 of the Convention, and in particular the second sentence of that article, in no way affects the applicability of article 33 of the Convention of 28 July 1951 relating to the Status of Refugees."

**Russian Federation**

*[Same reservation and declaration identical in substance, mutatis mutandis, as those made by Belarus.]*

**Saudi Arabia<sup>13</sup>**

## Reservation:

1. The Kingdom of Saudi Arabia does not consider itself obligated with the provision of paragraph 1, of article 16, of the Convention concerning arbitration.

## Declaration:

2. The accession of the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia to this Convention does not constitute a recognition of Israel and does not lead to entering into any transactions or the establishment of any relations based on this Convention.

**Slovakia<sup>3</sup>****Switzerland**

## Declaration:

The Swiss Federal Council interprets article 4 of the Convention to mean that Switzerland undertakes to fulfil the obligations contained therein in the conditions specified by its domestic legislation.

**Tunisia**

## Reservation:

[The Government of the Republic of Tunisia] declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 16 and states that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention can only be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice with the prior consent of all the Parties concerned.

**Turkey**

## Reservation:

In acceding to the Convention the Government of the Republic of Turkey, under article 16 (2) of the Convention declares that it doesn't consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the said article.

**Ukraine**

[Same reservation and declaration identical in substance, mutatis mutandis, as those made by Belarus.]

**Venezuela**

Declaration:

The Republic of Venezuela declares that it is not bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.

**Yugoslavia<sup>2</sup>**

Confirmed upon succession:

Declaration:

"The [Government of Yugoslavia] herewith states that the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention should be interpreted and applied in practice in the way which would not bring into question the goals of the Convention, i.e. undertaking of efficient measures for the prevention of all acts of the taking of hostages as a phenomenon of international terrorism, as well as the prosecution, punishment and extradition of persons considered to have perpetrated this criminal offence."

**OBJECTIONS**

(Unless otherwise indicated, the objections were received upon ratification, accession, acceptance, approval, formal confirmation or succession.)

**Israel**

9 September 1998

With regard to declarations made by Lebanon upon accession:

"... The Government of Israel refers in particular to the political declaration "[see *declaration "1" made under "Lebanon"*] made by the Lebanese Republic on acceding to the [said] Convention.

"In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making declarations of a political character. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter adopt towards the Lebanese Republic an attitude of complete reciprocity.

"Moreover, in view of the Government of Israel, the Lebanese understanding of certain of the Convention's provisions [see *declaration "2" made under "Lebanon"*] is incompatible with and contradictory to the object and purpose of the Convention and in effect defeats that object and purpose."

Communications made under article 7 of the Convention

**Saudi Arabia**

11 December 2001

[For the text of the communication see depositary notification C.N.1500.2001.TREATIES- of 8 January 2002]



## NOTES

1. Official Records of the General Assembly, Thirty-fourth Session, Supplement No. 46 (A/34/46), p. 245.

2. The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 29 December 1980 and 19 April 1985, respectively, with the following reservation (made upon signature) and declaration (made upon ratification):

"With the reservation with regard to article 9, subject to subsequent approval pursuant to the constitutional provisions in force in Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia".

Declaration:

"The Government of the Yugoslavia herewith states that the provisions of Article 9 of the Convention should be interpreted and applied in practice in the way which would not bring into question the goals of the Convention, i.e. undertaking of efficient measures for the prevention of all acts of the taking of hostages as a phenomenon of international terrorism, as well as the prosecution, punishment and extradition of persons considered to have perpetrated this criminal offence."

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

3. Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 27 January 1988, with the following reservation to article 16 (1):

The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provision of its article 16, paragraph 1, and states that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to a conciliation procedure or to the International Court of Justice the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.

Subsequently, on 26 April 1991, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the said reservation.

See also note 12 in chapter I.2.

4. The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 2 May 1988 with the following reservation and declaration:

Reservation regarding article 16, paragraph 1:

The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that in every single case the consent of all parties in the dispute is necessary to submit to arbitration or refer to the International Court of Justice any dispute between the States Parties to the Convention concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention.

Declaration regarding article 9, paragraph 1:

The German Democratic Republic decisively condemns any act of international terrorism. Therefore, the German Democratic Republic holds the opinion that article 9, paragraph 1, of the Convention shall be applied in such a way as to be in correspondence with the declared aims of the Convention which embrace the taking of effective measures for the prevention,

prosecution and punishment of all acts of international terrorism, including the taking of hostages.

See also note 15 in chapter I.2.

5. In a communication accompanying the instrument of ratification, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declared that the said Convention shall also apply to Berlin (West) with effect from the date on which it enters into force for the Federal Republic of Germany, subject to the Allied rights, responsibilities and legislation.

With regard to the above declaration, the Secretary-General received, on 9 November 1981, from the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics the following communication:

The declaration made by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany when depositing the instrument of ratification, to the effect that the said Convention shall extend to Berlin (West), is incompatible with the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971. That Agreement, as is generally known, does not grant the Federal Republic of Germany the right to extend to West Berlin international agreements which affect matters of security and status. The above-mentioned Convention belongs precisely to that category of agreement. The 1979 Convention contains provisions on the establishment of criminal jurisdiction over hostage-taking offences committed in the territories of States parties or on board a ship or aircraft registered in those States, as well as provisions relating to extradition of and court proceedings against offenders. Thus, the Convention concerns sovereign rights and obligations which cannot be exercised by a State in a territory which does not come under its jurisdiction.

In view of the foregoing, the Soviet Union considers the declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany on extending the application of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages to Berlin (West) to be illegal and to have no legal force.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications:

France, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the United States of America (4 June 1982):

"In a communication to the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, which is an integral part (annex IV A), of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States confirmed that, provided that matters of security and status are not affected and provided that the extension is specified in each case, international agreements and arrangements entered by the Federal Republic of Germany may be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin in accordance with established procedures. For its part, the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, in a communication to the Governments of the Three Powers, which is similarly an integral part (Annex IV B) of the Quadripartite Agreement of 3 September 1971, affirmed that it would raise no objection to such extension.

"The established procedures referred to above, which were endorsed in the Quadripartite Agreement, are designed *inter alia* to afford the authorities of the Three Powers the opportunity to ensure that international agreements and arrangements entered into by the Federal Republic of Germany which are to be extended to the Western Sectors of Berlin are extended in such a way that matters of security and status are not affected.

"When authorizing the extension of the above-mentioned Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin, the authorities of the Three Powers took such steps as were necessary to ensure that matters of security and status were not affected. Accordingly, the validity of the Berlin

declaration made by the Federal Republic of Germany in accordance with established procedures is unaffected and the application of the Convention to the Western Sectors of Berlin continues in full force and effect, subject to Allied rights, responsibilities and legislation."

Federal Republic of Germany (12 August 1982):

"By their note of 28 May 1982 [ . . . ] the Governments of France, the United Kingdom and the United States answered the assertions made in the communication referred to above. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany, on the basis of the legal situation set out in the note of the Three Powers, wishes to confirm that the application in Berlin (West) of the above-mentioned Convention extended by it under the established procedures continues in full force and effect, subject to Allied rights, responsibilities and legislation.

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany wishes to point out that the absence of a response to further communications of a similar nature should not be taken to imply any change of its position in this matter."

See also note 4.

6. For the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.

7. For New Zealand (except Tokelau), Cook Islands and Niue.

8. On 28 June 1999, the Government of Portugal informed the Secretary-General that the Convention would also apply to Macau.

Subsequently, the Secretary-General received the following communications on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Portugal (27 October 1999):

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

China (3 December 1999):

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macau (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration), the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macau with effect from 20 December 1999. Macau will, from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defense affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

[In accordance with the above provisions, the Government of the People's Republic of China informs the Secretary-General of the following:]

The International Convention Against the Taking of Hostages, adopted at New York on 17 December 1979 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"), to which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited the instrument of accession on 26 January 1993, will apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999.

The Government of the People's Republic of China also wishes to make the following declaration:

The reservation made by the Government of the People's Republic of China to paragraph 1 of Article 20 of the Convention will also apply to the Macau Special Administrative Region. The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to the Macau Special Administrative Region.

9. On 6 and 10 June 1997, respectively, the Governments of China and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland notified the Secretary-General of the following:  
[Same notifications as those made under note 5 in chapter IV.1.]

In addition, the notification made by China contained the following declaration:

The Government of the People's Republic of China also declares that the reservation to paragraph 1, article 16 of the [said Convention] will also apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

10. In respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom. (See also note 9.)

11. On 24 June 1992, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation to article 16 (1) of the Convention, made upon accession which reads as follows:

The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the International Convention against the Taking of Hostages and declares that submission of any dispute concerning interpretation and application of the Convention between parties to the Convention to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice requires the consent of all parties to the dispute in each individual case.

12. In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its reservation with respect to article 16 made upon accession which reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the dispute settlement procedures provided for in article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention, since in its opinion, the jurisdiction of any arbitral tribunal or of the International Court of Justice can be founded only on the voluntary prior acceptance of such jurisdiction by all the Parties concerned.

13. On 17 May 1989, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel the following communication:

"The Government of the State of Israel has noted that the instrument of accession by the Government of Kuwait to the above-mentioned Convention contains a declaration in respect to Israel. In the view of the Government of the State of Israel, such declaration, which is explicitly of a political character, is incompatible with the purposes and objectives of this Convention and cannot in any way affect whatever obligations are binding upon the Government of Kuwait under general international law or under particular Conventions.

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

On 22 May 1991, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Israel a communication, identical in essence, *mutatis mutandis*, with regard to the declaration made by Saudi Arabia upon accession.

**PROTOCOL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS OF VIOLENCE AT AIRPORTS SERVING INTERNATIONAL CIVIL AVIATION, SUPPLEMENTARY TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY OF CIVIL AVIATION, DONE AT MONTREAL ON 23 SEPTEMBER 1971, MONTREAL, 24 FEBRUARY 1988**

**Entry into force:** The Protocol entered into force on 6 August 1989.

**Status:** 121 Parties.

This list is based on information received by ICAO or as communicated by the other depositaries, the Governments of the Russian Federation, the United Kingdom and the United States.

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of signature</b>	<b>Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification, Accession or Succession</b>	<b>Effective date</b>
Albania		29 April 2002	29 May 2002
Algeria		6 October 1995	5 November 1995
Argentina	24 February 1988	12 February 1992	13 March 1992
Australia		23 October 1990	22 November 1990
Austria	4 July 1989	28 December 1989	27 January 1990
Azerbaijan		23 March 2000	22 April 2000
Bahrain		12 February 1996	13 March 1996
Belarus	24 February 1988	1 May 1989	6 August 1989
Belgium	15 March 1989	20 April 1999	20 May 1999
Belize		10 June 1998	10 July 1998
Bolivia		1 February 2002	3 March 2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina(1)		15 August 1994	6 March 1992
Botswana		30 October 2000	29 November 2000
Brazil	24 February 1988	9 May 1997	8 June 1997
Brunei Darussalam		20 December 2000	19 January 2001
Bulgaria	24 February 1988	26 March 1991	25 April 1991
Burkina Faso		8 December 1998	7 January 1999
Cambodia		8 November 1996	8 December 1996
Cameroon	23 November 1988		
Canada	24 February	2 August 1993	1 September

	1988		1993
Central African Republic		1 July 1991	31 July 1991
Chile	24 February 1988	15 August 1989	14 September 1989
China(2)	24 February 1988	5 March 1999	4 April 1999
Congo	13 April 1989		
Costa Rica	24 February 1988		
Côte d'Ivoire	21 March 1988		
Croatia(3)		8 June 1993	8 October 1991
Cuba		31 October 2001	30 November 2001
Cyprus		23 April 2002	23 May 2002
Czech Republic(4)		25 March 1993	1 January 1993
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	11 April 1989	19 July 1995	18 August 1995
Democratic Republic of the Congo	24 February 1988		
Denmark(5)	24 February 1988	23 November 1989	23 December 1989
Egypt	24 February 1988	25 July 2000	24 August 2000
El Salvador		8 April 1998	8 May 1998
Estonia		22 December 1993	21 January 1994
Ethiopia	24 February 1988	15 December 1999	14 January 2000
Fiji		21 September 1992	21 October 1992
Finland	16 November 1988	3 April 1998	3 May 1998
France(6)	29 March 1988	6 September 1989	6 October 1989
Gabon	20 September 1988		
Gambia		16 June 2000	16 July 2000
Georgia		15 February 1999	17 March 1999
Germany(7)	24 February 1988	25 April 1994	25 May 1994
Ghana	24 February 1988	15 July 1997	14 August 1997
Greece	18 April 1988	25 April 1991	25 May 1991
Grenada		15 January 2002	14 February 2002
Guatemala		11 October 1994	10 November 1994

Guinea		1 October 1998	31 October 1998
Guyana		19 June 2002	19 July 2002
Hungary	24 February 1988	7 September 1988	6 August 1989
Iceland	24 February 1988	9 May 1990	8 June 1990
India		22 March 1995	21 April 1995
Indonesia	24 February 1988		
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		14 February 2002	16 March 2002
Iraq		31 January 1990	2 March 1990
Ireland	29 July 1988	26 July 1991	25 August 1991
Israel	24 February 1988	2 April 1993	2 May 1993
Italy	24 February 1988	13 March 1990	12 April 1990
Jamaica	24 February 1988		
Japan		24 April 1998	24 May 1998
Jordan	30 September 1988	18 September 1992	18 October 1992
Kazakhstan		18 May 1995	17 June 1995
Kenya		5 October 1995	4 November 1995
Kuwait(8)	24 February 1988	8 March 1989	6 August 1989
Kyrgyzstan		28 February 2000	29 March 2000
Latvia		13 April 1997	13 May 1997
Lebanon	24 February 1988	27 May 1996	26 June 1996
Liberia	24 February 1988		
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		26 July 1996	25 August 1996
Liechtenstein		26 February 2001	28 March 2001
Lithuania		4 December 1996	3 January 1997
Luxembourg	18 May 1989		
Madagascar		30 March 1998	29 April 1998
Malawi	24 February 1988		
Malaysia	24 February 1988		
Maldives		22 March 1999	21 April 1999
Mali		31 October 1990	30 November 1990
Malta		14 June 1991	14 July 1991
Marshall Islands	23 June 1988	30 May 1989	6 August 1989

Mauritius	28 June 1989	17 August 1989	16 September 1989
Mexico	24 February 1988	11 October 1990	10 November 1990
Monaco		22 December 1993	21 January 1994
Mongolia		22 September 1999	22 October 1999
Morocco	8 July 1988	15 February 2002	17 March 2002
Myanmar		22 May 1996	21 June 1996
Netherlands(9)	13 April 1988	11 July 1995	10 August 1995
New Zealand	11 April 1989	2 August 1999	1 September 1999
Nicaragua		25 April 2002	25 May 2002
Niger	24 February 1988		
Norway	24 February 1988	29 May 1990	28 June 1990
Oman		27 November 1992	27 December 1992
Pakistan	24 February 1988	26 September 2000	26 October 2000
Palau		12 October 1995	11 November 1995
Panama		10 April 1996	10 May 1996
Papua New Guinea		11 July 2002	10 August 2002
Paraguay		23 July 2002	22 August 2002
Peru	24 February 1988	7 June 1989	6 August 1989
Philippines	25 January 1989		
Poland	24 February 1988		
Portugal	24 February 1988	18 December 2001	17 January 2002
Republic of Korea	24 February 1988	27 June 1990	27 July 1990
Republic of Moldova		20 June 1997	20 July 1997
Romania	24 February 1988	3 September 1998	3 October 1998
Russian Federation	24 February 1988	31 March 1989	6 August 1989
Rwanda		16 May 2002	15 June 2002
Saint Lucia		11 June 1990	11 July 1990
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	1 December 1988	29 November 1991	29 December 1991
Samoa		9 July 1998	8 August 1998
Saudi Arabia	24 February	21 February 1989	6 August 1989



	1988		
Senegal	24 February 1988		
Singapore		22 November 1996	22 December 1996
Slovakia(10)		20 March 1995	1 January 1993
Slovenia(11)		27 May 1992	-
South Africa		21 September 1998	21 October 1998
Spain	2 March 1989	8 May 1991	7 June 1991
Sri Lanka	28 October 1988	11 February 1997	13 March 1997
Sudan		15 May 2000	14 June 2000
Sweden	24 February 1988	26 July 1990	25 August 1990
Switzerland	24 February 1988	9 October 1990	8 November 1990
Tajikistan		29 February 1996	30 March 1996
Thailand		14 May 1996	13 June 1996
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia(12)		4 January 1995	-
Togo	24 October 1988	9 February 1990	11 March 1990
Trinidad and Tobago		3 April 2001	3 May 2001
Tunisia		7 June 1994	7 July 1994
Turkey	24 February 1988	7 July 1989	6 August 1989
Turkmenistan		25 May 1999	24 June 1999
Uganda		17 March 1994	16 April 1994
Ukraine	24 February 1988	3 January 1990	2 February 1990
United Arab Emirates	24 February 1988	9 March 1989	6 August 1989
United Kingdom(13)(14)(15)	26 October 1988	15 November 1990	15 December 1990
United States	24 February 1988	19 October 1994	18 November 1994
Uruguay		3 December 1998	2 January 1999
Uzbekistan		7 February 1994	9 March 1994
Venezuela	24 February 1988		
Viet Nam		25 August 1999	24 September 1999
Yugoslavia (F.R. of)(16)		6 September 2001	27 April 1992

#### NOTES

(1) An instrument of succession by the Government of Bosnia and Herzegovina to the Protocol was deposited with the Government of the United States on 15 August 1994.

(2) Notification issued by the Government of the People's Republic of China dated 12 June 1997:

"It is provided both in Section XI of Annex 1 to the Joint Declaration, 'Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Hong Kong', and Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, ..., that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not a party but which are implemented in Hong Kong may continue to be implemented in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In accordance with the above provisions, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to make the following notification: The Protocol..., which applies to Hong Kong at present, will continue to apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997.

Within the above ambit, responsibility for the international rights and obligations of a party to the Protocol will be assumed by the Government of the People's Republic of China."

The Government of the People's Republic of China made the following reservation at the time of ratification of the Protocol: "the reservation made by the People's Republic of China, when it adhered to the Convention, on paragraph 1 of Article 14 of the 'Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation' done at Montreal on 23 September 1971 is also applicable to this Protocol."

(3) An instrument of succession by the Government of Croatia to the Protocol was deposited with the Government of the United States on 8 June 1993.

(4) By a Note dated 8 March 1993, received on 25 March 1993, the Government of the Czech Republic informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that, as a successor State created as a result of the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, it considered itself bound by the Protocol with effect from 1 January 1993.

(5) The Government of Denmark made the following reservation at the time of ratification of the Protocol: "Until later decision, the Protocol will not be applied to the Faroe Islands."

Note: On 27 September 1994, a declaration dated 22 September 1994 was deposited with the International Civil Aviation Organization by the Government of Denmark whereby that Government withdraws the above reservation, with effect from 1 October 1994.

(6) The Government of France made the following declaration at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The French Republic recalls the declaration made at the time of its accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971, when it stated that: 'In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2, the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that Article under which any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation, shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.'

The above declaration is applicable to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971." In addition, the following declaration was made by that Government at the time of ratification: "In depositing its instrument of ratification of the Protocol of 24 February 1988 for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation done at Montreal on 23 September 1971, the French Republic recalls and confirms the declaration made at the time of its accession to the said Convention, when it stated that: 'In accordance with Article 14, paragraph 2, the French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of that Article under which any dispute between two or more Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation, shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.'

The above declaration is applicable to the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts of Violence at Airports Serving International Civil Aviation, Supplementary to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation of 23 September 1971."

(7) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Protocol on 31 January 1989, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.

(8) It is understood that the ratification of this Protocol does not mean in any way a recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait. Furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

(9) The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands made the following interpretative statement at the time of signature of the Protocol:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that, in the light of the preamble, it understands the provisions laid down in Articles II and III of the Protocol to signify the following:

- only those acts which, in view of the nature of the weapons used and the place where they are committed, cause or are likely to cause incidental loss of life or serious injury among the general public or users of international civil aviation in particular, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 *bis* (a), as contained in Article II of the Protocol;

- only those acts which, in view of the damage which they cause to buildings or aircraft at the airport or their disruption of the services provided by the airport, endanger or are likely to endanger the safe operation of the airport in relation to international civil aviation, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 *bis* (b), as contained in Article II of the Protocol."

On depositing its instrument of ratification, the Kingdom of the Netherlands made the following declaration:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands hereby declares that, in the light of the preamble, it understands the provisions laid down in Article II and III of the Protocol to signify the following:

- only those acts which, in the view of the nature of the weapons used and the place where they are committed, cause or are likely to cause incidental loss of life or serious injury among the general public or users of international civil aviation in particular, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 bis (a), as contained in Article II of the Protocol;

- only those acts which, in view of the damage which they cause to buildings or aircraft at the airport or their disruption of the services provided by the airport, endanger or are likely to endanger the safe operation of the airport in relation to international civil aviation, shall be classed as acts of violence within the meaning of the new paragraph 1 bis (b), as contained in Article II of the Protocol."

(10) By a Note dated 16 February 1995, received on 20 March 1995, the Government of Slovakia informed the International Civil Aviation Organization that, as a successor State, born from the dissolution of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, it considered itself bound by the Protocol with effect from 1 January 1993.

(11) An instrument of succession by the Government of Slovenia to the Protocol was deposited with the Government of the United Kingdom on 27 May 1992.

(12) An instrument of succession by the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia to the Protocol was deposited with the Government of the United States on 4 January 1995.

(13) The Government of the United Kingdom made the following declaration at the time of ratification of the Protocol: "... the United Kingdom declares that until consultations with various territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom are completed, the Protocol will apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland only. Consultations with the territories are in hand and are expected to be completed by the end of 1991."

(14) Declaration made at the time of ratification by the Isle of Man: "...subsequent to the deposit of the United Kingdom's Instrument of Ratification in the Treaty Archives on 15 November 1990 The Isle of Man, for whose international relations the United Kingdom is responsible and whose Government has informed the Government of the United Kingdom that they wish to participate in the Protocol, has been included under the United Kingdom's ratification of the Protocol...to take effect from 14 February 1997."

(15) Statement issued by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, dated 18 June 1997:

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

(16) By a Note dated 17 July 2001, deposited on 6 September 2001 with ICAO, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia declared itself bound, as a successor State to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, this Protocol, with effect from 27 April 1992, the date of State succession. (The former Socialist

Federal Republic of Yugoslavia had signed the Protocol on 24 February 1988 and ratified it on 21 December 1989.)

**CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY  
OF MARITIME NAVIGATION, 1988, ROME, 10 MARCH 1988, ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1  
MARCH 1992**

**Contracting States as at 27 July 2002**

<b>States</b>	<b>Date of deposit of instrument</b>	<b>Date of entry into force</b>
Albania	19 June 2002	17 September 2002
Algeria (accession) <sup>1</sup>	11 February 1998	12 May 1998
Argentina (ratification) <sup>1</sup>	17 August 1993	15 November 1993
Australia (accession)	19 February 1993	20 May 1993
Austria (ratification)	28 December 1989	1 March 1992
Barbados (accession)	6 May 1994	4 August 1994
Bolivia (accession)	13 February 2002	14 May 2002
Botswana (accession)	14 September 2000	13 December 2000
Bulgaria (ratification)	8 July 1999	6 October 1999
Canada (ratification) <sup>2</sup>	18 June 1993	16 September 1993
Chile (ratification)	22 April 1994	21 July 1994
China (ratification) <sup>1</sup>	20 August 1991	1 March 1992
Cuba (accession) <sup>2</sup>	20 November 2001	18 February 2002
Cyprus (accession)	2 February 2000	2 May 2000
Denmark (ratification) <sup>1</sup>	25 August 1995	23 November 1995
Dominica (accession)	31 August 2001	29 November 2001
Egypt (ratification) <sup>1</sup>	8 January 1993	8 April 1993
El Salvador (accession)	7 December 2000	7 March 2001
Estonia (accession)	15 February 2002	16 May 2002
Finland (ratification)	12 November 1998	10 February 1999
France (approval) <sup>1</sup>	2 December 1991	1 March 1992
Gambia (accession)	1 November 1991	1 March 1992
Germany <sup>3</sup> (accession)	6 November 1990	1 March 1992
Greece (ratification)	11 June 1993	9 September 1993
Grenada (accession)	9 January 2002	9 April 2002
Hungary (ratification)	9 November 1989	1 March 1992
Iceland (accession)	28 May 2002	26 August 2002
India (accession) <sup>1</sup>	15 October 1999	13 January 2000
Italy (ratification)	26 January 1990	1 March 1992
Japan (accession)	24 April 1998	23 July 1998

Kenya (accession)	21 January 2002	21 April 2002
Lebanon (accession)	16 December 1994	16 March 1995
Liberia (ratification)	5 October 1995	3 January 1996
Mali (accession)	29 April 2002	28 July 2002
Malta (accession)	20 November 2001	18 February 2002
Marshall Islands (accession)	29 November 1994	27 February 1995
Mexico (accession) <sup>1</sup>	13 May 1994	11 August 1994
Monaco (accession)	25 January 2002	25 April 2002
Morocco (ratification)	8 January 2002	8 April 2002
Netherlands (acceptance)	5 March 1992	3 June 1992
New Zealand (ratification)	10 June 1999	8 September 1999
Norway (ratification)	18 April 1991	1 March 1992
Oman (accession)	24 September 1990	1 March 1992
Pakistan (accession)	20 September 2000	19 September 2000
Palau (accession)	4 December 2001	4 March 2002
Panama (accession)	3 July 2002	1 October 2002
Peru (accession)	19 July 2001	17 October 2001
Poland (ratification)	25 June 1991	1 March 1992
Portugal (accession) <sup>1</sup>	5 January 1996	4 April 1996
Romania (accession)	2 June 1993	31 August 1993
Russian Federation (ratification)	4 May 2001	2 August 2001
St. Kitts and Nevis (accession)	17 January 2002	17 April 2002
St. Vincent and the Grenadines (accession)	9 October 2001	7 January 2002
Seychelles (ratification)	24 January 1989	1 March 1992
Slovakia (accession)	8 December 2000	8 March 2001
Spain (ratification)	7 July 1989	1 March 1992
Sri Lanka (accession)	4 September 2000	3 December 2000
Sudan (accession)	22 May 2000	20 August 2000
Sweden (ratification)	13 September 1990	1 March 1992
Switzerland (ratification)	12 March 1993	10 June 1993
Trinidad and Tobago (accession)	27 July 1989	1 March 1992
Tunisia (accession) <sup>1</sup>	6 March 1998	4 June 1998
Turkey (ratification) <sup>1</sup>	6 March 1998	4 June 1998
Turkmenistan (accession)	8 June 1999	6 September 1999
Ukraine (ratification)	21 April 1994	20 July 1994
United Kingdom (ratification) <sup>1,4</sup>	3 May 1991	1 March 1992
United States (ratification)	6 December 1994	6 March 1995

Uruguay (accession)	10 August 2001	8 November 2001
Uzbekistan (accession)	25 September 2000	24 December 2000
Vanuatu (accession)	18 February 1999	19 May 1999
Viet Nam (accession)	12 July 2002	10 October 2002
Yemen (accession)	30 June 2000	28 September 2000

Number of Contracting States: 72

## NOTES

1. With a reservation, declaration or statement.
2. With a notification under article 6.
3. On 3 October 1990 the German Democratic Republic acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Democratic Republic had acceded\* to the Convention on 14 April 1989. (\*) With a reservation.
4. The United Kingdom declared its ratification to be effective also in respect of the Isle of Man (notification received 8 February 1999).

## DECLARATIONS, RESERVATIONS AND STATEMENTS

### Algeria

The instrument of accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria was accompanied by the following reservation:

*[Translation]*

"The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation concluded in Rome on 10 March 1988. The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria declares that for a dispute to be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice, the agreement of all the parties involved shall be necessary in each case."

### Argentina

The instrument of ratification of the Argentine Republic contained the following reservation:

*[Translation]*

"The Argentine Republic declares, in accordance with the provisions of article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that it shall not be bound by any of the provisions of paragraph 1 of that article."

### Chile

The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

*[Translation]*

"In connection with the provisions of article 4 of the present Convention, the Government of Chile shall not apply the provisions thereof to incidents that occur in its internal waters and in the waters of Magellan Strait."



## China

The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Convention:

*[Translation]*

"The People's Republic of China shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 of the said Convention." This statement was reaffirmed in the instrument of ratification of the People's Republic of China.

## Denmark

The instrument of ratification of the Kingdom of Denmark contained the following reservation:  
*(Translation)*

"... with the qualification, however, that the Convention as well as the Protocol will not apply to the Faroes nor to Greenland, pending a further decision."

## Egypt

The instrument of ratification of the Arab Republic of Egypt was accompanied by the following reservations:

*[Translation]*

"1. A reservation is made to article 16 on the peaceful settlement of disputes because it provides for the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and also with regard to the application of the Convention to seagoing ships in internal waters which are scheduled to navigate beyond territorial waters.

2. A reservation is made to article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention and article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol because those articles permit the optional jurisdiction of blackmailed States (which are asked by the perpetrator of an act of terrorism to do or abstain from doing any act). This is in compliance with the provision of paragraph 4 of each of the two articles."

## France

The instrument of approval of the French Republic contained the following declarations:

*[Translation]*

"1. As far as article 3, paragraph 2, is concerned the French Republic understands by "tentative", "incitation", "complicité" and "menace", la tentative, l'incitation, la complicité and la menace as defined in the conditions envisaged by French criminal law.

2. The French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, according to which: "Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation within a reasonable time shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If, within six months from the date of the request for arbitration, the parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration any one of those parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court".

## German Democratic Republic

The instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic was accompanied by the following reservation in the German language:

*[Translation]*

"In accordance with article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention the German Democratic Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention."

### **India**

The instrument of accession of the Republic of India contained the following reservation:  
 "In accordance with article 16(2) of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, 1988, the Government of the Republic of India hereby declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 16(1)."

### **Iraq**

The following reservation was made at the time of signature of the convention:

*[Translation]*

"This signature does not in any way imply recognition of Israel or entry into any relationship with it."

### **Mexico**

The instrument of accession of the United Mexican States contained the following reservation:

*[Translation]*

"Mexico's accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, 1988, and to its Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, 1988, is on the understanding that in matters relating to extradition, both article 11 of the Convention and article 3 of the Protocol will be applied in the Republic of Mexico subject to the modalities and procedures laid down in the applicable provisions of national law."

### **Portugal**

The instrument of accession of the Portuguese Republic contained the following declaration:

*[Translation]*

"In face of its internal law Portugal considers that the handing over of the suspect mentioned in article 8 of the Convention can only be based on strong suspicions that he committed any of the crimes mentioned in article 3, and will always depend on a court decision. Furthermore it will not be admitted in the event that the crime ascribed entails death sentence."

### **Tunisia**

The instrument of accession of the Republic of Tunisia was accompanied by the following declaration:

*[Translation]*

"The Republic of Tunisia, in agreeing to accede to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation concluded in Rome on 10 March 1988, declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph 1 of article 16 of the Convention and maintains that disputes concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention may be submitted to arbitration or to the International Court of Justice only with the prior agreement of all the parties involved."

### **Turkey**

The instrument of ratification of the Republic of Turkey was accompanied by the following reservation:

"In signing the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation and the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, the Government of the Republic of Turkey, under the article 16(2) of the said Convention declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the article 16 of the said Convention."

#### **United Kingdom**

The instrument of ratification of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was accompanied by the following declaration:

"... that until consultations with various territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom are completed, the Convention and Protocol will apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland only. Consultations with the territories are in hand and are expected to be completed by the end of 1991."

### **NOTIFICATIONS ARTICLE 6**

#### **Canada**

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 6, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Secretary-General has been informed that Canada has established jurisdiction over offences in all of the cases cited in Article 6, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

**PROTOCOL FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF UNLAWFUL ACTS AGAINST THE SAFETY  
OF FIXED PLATFORMS LOCATED ON THE CONTINENTAL SHELF, 1988, ROME, 10  
MARCH 1988, ENTRY INTO FORCE: 1 MARCH 1992**

**Contracting States as at 27 July 2002**

<b>State</b>	<b>Date of deposit of instrument</b>	<b>Date of entry into force</b>
Albania (accession)	19 June 2002	17 September 2002
Australia (accession)	19 February 1993	20 May 1993
Austria (accession)	28 December 1989	1 March 1992
Barbados (accession)	6 May 1994	4 August 1994
Bolivia (accession)	13 February 2002	14 May 2002
Botswana (accession)	14 September 2000	13 December 2000
Bulgaria (ratification)	8 July 1999	6 October 1999
Canada (ratification) <sup>1</sup>	18 June 1993	16 September 1993
Chile (ratification)	22 April 1994	21 July 1994
China (ratification) <sup>2</sup>	20 August 1991	1 March 1992
Cuba (accession) <sup>2</sup>	20 November 2001	18 February 2002
Cyprus (accession)	2 February 2000	2 May 2000
Denmark (ratification) <sup>2</sup>	25 August 1995	23 November 1995
Egypt (ratification) <sup>2</sup>	8 January 1993	8 April 1993
El Salvador (accession)	7 December 2000	7 March 2001
Finland (accession)	28 April 2000	27 July 2000
France (approval) <sup>2</sup>	2 December 1991	1 March 1992
Germany <sup>3</sup> (accession)	6 November 1990	1 March 1992
Greece (ratification)	11 June 1993	9 September 1993
Grenada (accession)	9 January 2002	9 April 2002
Hungary (ratification)	9 November 1989	1 March 1992
Iceland (accession)	28 May 2002	26 August 2002
India (accession) <sup>2</sup>	15 October 1999	13 January 2000

Italy (ratification)	26 January 1990	1 March 1992
Japan (accession)	24 April 1998	23 July 1998
Kenya (accession)	21 January 2002	21 April 2002
Lebanon (accession)	16 December 1994	16 March 1995
Liberia (ratification)	5 October 1995	3 January 1996
Mali (accession)	29 April 2002	28 July 2002
Malta (accession)	20 November 2001	18 February 2002
Marshall Islands (accession)	16 October 1995	14 January 1996
Mexico (accession) <sup>1</sup>	13 May 1994	11 August 1994
Monaco (accession)	25 January 2002	25 April 2002
Morocco (ratification)	8 January 2002	8 April 2002
Netherlands (acceptance) <sup>2</sup>	5 March 1992	3 June 1992
New Zealand (ratification)	10 June 1999	8 September 1999
Norway (ratification)	18 April 1991	1 March 1992
Oman (accession)	24 September 1990	1 March 1992
Pakistan (accession)	20 September 2000	10 December 2000
Palau (accession)	4 December 2001	4 March 2002
Panama (accession)	3 July 2002	1 October 2002
Peru (accession)	19 July 2001	17 October 2001
Poland (ratification)	25 June 1991	1 March 1992
Portugal (accession)	5 January 1996	4 April 1996
Romania (accession)	2 June 1993	31 August 1993
Russian Federation (ratification)	4 May 2001	2 August 2001
St. Vincent and the Grenadines (accession)	9 October 2001	7 January 2002
Seychelles (ratification)	24 January 1989	1 March 1992
Slovakia (accession)	8 December 2000	8 March 2001
Spain (ratification)	7 July 1989	1 March 1992
Sudan (accession)	22 May 2000	20 August 2000

Sweden (ratification)	13 September 1990	1 March 1992
Switzerland (ratification)	12 March 1993	10 June 1993
Trinidad and Tobago (accession)	27 July 1989	1 March 1992
Tunisia (accession)	6 March 1998	4 June 1998
Turkey (ratification) <sup>2</sup>	6 March 1998	4 June 1998
Turkmenistan (accession)	8 June 1999	6 September 1999
Ukraine (ratification)	21 April 1994	20 July 1994
United Kingdom (ratification) <sup>2, 4</sup>	3 May 1991	1 March 1992
United States (ratification)	6 December 1994	6 March 1995
Uruguay (accession)	10 August 2001	8 November 2001
Uzbekistan (accession)	25 September 2000	24 December 2000
Vanuatu (accession)	18 February 1999	19 May 1999
Viet Nam (accession)	12 July 2002	10 October 2002
Yemen (accession)	30 June 2000	28 September 2000

Number of Contracting States: 65

## NOTES

<sup>1</sup>With a notification under article 3.

<sup>2</sup>With a reservation, declaration or statement.

<sup>3</sup>On 3 October 1990 the German Democratic Republic acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany. The German Democratic Republic had acceded\* to the Convention on 14 April 1989.(\*) With a reservation.

<sup>4</sup>The United Kingdom declared its ratification to be effective also in respect of the Isle of Man (notification received 8 February 1999).

## DECLARATIONS, RESERVATIONS AND STATEMENTS

### China

The following statement was made at the time of signature of the Protocol:

*[Translation]*

"The People's Republic of China shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of article 16 of the said Convention<sup>1</sup>."

This statement was reaffirmed in the instrument of ratification of the People's Republic of China.

**Denmark**

The instrument of ratification of the Kingdom of Denmark contained the following reservation:

*[Translation]*

"... with the qualification, however, that the Convention as well as the Protocol will not apply to the Faroes nor to Greenland, pending a further decision."

**Egypt**

The instrument of ratification of the Arab Republic of Egypt was accompanied by the following reservations:

*[Translation]*

"1 A reservation is made to article 16 on the peaceful settlement of disputes because it provides for the binding jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, and also with regard to the application of the Convention to seagoing ships in internal waters which are scheduled to navigate beyond territorial waters.

2 A reservation is made to article 6, paragraph 2, of the Convention and article 3, paragraph 2, of the Protocol because those articles permit the optional jurisdiction of blackmailed States (which are asked by the perpetrator of an act of terrorism to do or abstain from doing any act).

This is in compliance with the provision of paragraph 4 of each of the two articles."

**France**

The instrument of approval of the French Republic contained the following declarations:

*[Translation]*

"1. As far as article 2, paragraph 2, is concerned the French Republic understands by "tentative", "incitation", "complicité" and "menace", la tentative, l'incitation, la complicité and la menace as defined in the conditions envisaged by French criminal law.

2. The French Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 1, paragraph 1, to the extent that reference is made to the provisions of article 16, paragraph 1, according to which: "Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation within a reasonable time shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If, within six months from the date of the request for arbitration, the parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration any one of those parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court".

**German Democratic Republic**

The instrument of accession of the German Democratic Republic was accompanied by the following reservation in the German language:

*[Translation]*

"In accordance with article 16, paragraph 2, of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, the provisions of which shall also apply *mutatis mutandis* to the Protocol according to article 1, paragraph 1, of the Protocol, the German Democratic Republic declares that it does not consider itself bound by article 16, paragraph 1 of the Convention as regards the Protocol."

**Iraq**

The following reservation was made at the time of signature of the Protocol:

*[Translation]*

"This signature does not in any way imply recognition of Israel or entry into any relationship with it."

**Mexico**

The instrument of accession of the United Mexican States contained the following reservation:

*[Translation]*

"Mexico's accession to the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, 1988, and to its Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, 1988, is on the understanding that in matters relating to extradition, both article 11 of the Convention and article 3 of the Protocol will be applied in the Republic of Mexico subject to the modalities and procedures laid down in the applicable provisions of national law."

**Netherlands**

The instrument of acceptance of the Kingdom of the Netherlands contained the following reservation:

"With regard to the obligation laid down in article 1 of the Protocol in conjunction with article 10 of the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation to exercise jurisdiction in cases where the judicial authorities of the Netherlands cannot exercise jurisdiction on any of the grounds referred to in article 3, paragraph 1, of the Protocol, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands reserves the right to be bound to exercise such jurisdiction only after the Kingdom has received and rejected a request for extradition from a State Party".

**Turkey**

The instrument of ratification of the Republic of Turkey was accompanied by the following reservation:

*[Translation]*

"In signing "the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation" and "the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf", the Government of the Republic of Turkey, under the article 16(2) of the said Convention declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of paragraph (1) of the article 16 of the said Convention."

**United Kingdom**

The instrument of ratification of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland was accompanied by the following declaration:

"... that until consultations with various territories under the territorial sovereignty of the United Kingdom are completed, the Convention and Protocol will apply in respect of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland only. Consultations with the territories are in hand and are expected to be completed by the end of 1991."



**NOTIFICATIONS ARTICLE 3****Canada**

Pursuant to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Protocol, the Secretary-General has been informed that Canada has established jurisdiction over offences in all of the cases cited in Article 3, paragraph 2 of the Protocol.

**INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF TERRORIST  
BOMBINGS, NEW YORK, 15 DECEMBER 1997**

**Entry into force:** 23 May 2001, in accordance with article 22 (1).  
**Registration:** 23 May 2001, No. 37517.  
**Status:** Signatories: 58 ,Parties: 64.  
 Doc. A/RES/52/164; 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)];  
**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)].

**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.

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)</b>
Albania		22 Jan 2002 a
Algeria	17 Dec 1998	8 Nov 2001
Argentina	2 Sep 1998	
Austria	9 Feb 1998	6 Sep 2000
Azerbaijan		2 Apr 2001 a
Belarus	20 Sep 1999	1 Oct 2001
Belgium	12 Jan 1998	
Belize		14 Nov 2001 a
Bolivia		22 Jan 2002 a
Botswana		8 Sep 2000 a
Brazil	12 Mar 1999	
Brunei Darussalam		14 Mar 2002 a
Bulgaria		12 Feb 2002 a
Burundi	4 Mar 1998	
Canada	12 Jan 1998	3 Apr 2002
Cape Verde		10 May 2002 a
Chile		10 Nov 2001 a
China <sup>3</sup>		13 Nov 2001 a

Comoros	1 Oct 1998	
Costa Rica	16 Jan 1998	20 Sep 2001
Côte d'Ivoire	25 Sep 1998	13 Mar 2002
Cuba		15 Nov 2001 a
Cyprus	26 Mar 1998	24 Jan 2001
Czech Republic	29 Jul 1998	6 Sep 2000
Denmark <sup>2</sup>	23 Dec 1999	31 Aug 2001
Egypt	14 Dec 1999	
Estonia	27 Dec 1999	10 Apr 2002
Finland	23 Jan 1998	28 May 2002 A
France	12 Jan 1998	19 Aug 1999
Germany	26 Jan 1998	
Greece	2 Feb 1998	
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala		12 Feb 2002 a
Guinea		7 Sep 2000 a
Hungary	21 Dec 1999	13 Nov 2001
Iceland	28 Sep 1998	15 Apr 2002
India	17 Sep 1999	22 Sep 1999
Ireland	29 May 1998	
Israel	29 Jan 1999	
Italy	4 Mar 1998	
Japan	17 Apr 1998	16 Nov 2001 A
Kenya		16 Nov 2001 a
Kyrgyzstan		1 May 2001 a
Lesotho		12 Nov 2001 a
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya		22 Sep 2000 a
Lithuania	8 Jun 1998	
Luxembourg	6 Feb 1998	
Madagascar	1 Oct 1999	
Maldives		7 Sep 2000 a
Mali		28 Mar 2002 a

Malta		11 Nov 2001 a
Monaco	25 Nov 1998	6 Sep 2001
Mongolia		7 Sep 2000 a
Myanmar		12 Nov 2001 a
Nepal	24 Sep 1999	
Netherlands2	12 Mar 1998	7 Feb 2002 A
Norway	31 Jul 1998	20 Sep 1999
Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	3 Sep 1998	5 Mar 1999
Peru		10 Nov 2001 a
Philippines	23 Sep 1998	
Poland	14 Jun 1999	
Portugal	30 Dec 1999	10 Nov 2001
Republic of Korea	3 Dec 1999	
Romania	30 Apr 1998	
Russian Federation	12 Jan 1998	8 May 2001
Rwanda		13 May 2002 a
Saint Kitts and Nevis		16 Nov 2001 a
San Marino		12 Mar 2002 a
Slovakia	28 Jul 1998	8 Dec 2000
Slovenia	30 Oct 1998	
South Africa	21 Dec 1999	
Spain	1 May 1998	30 Apr 1999
Sri Lanka	12 Jan 1998	23 Mar 1999
Sudan	7 Oct 1999	8 Sep 2000
Sweden	12 Feb 1998	6 Sep 2001
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	16 Dec 1998	
Togo	21 Aug 1998	
Trinidad and Tobago		2 Apr 2001 a
Turkey	20 May 1999	30 May 2002
Turkmenistan	18 Feb 1999	25 Jun 1999

Uganda	11 Jun 1999	
Ukraine		26 Mar 2002 a
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	12 Jan 1998	7 Mar 2001
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	23 Sep 1998	
Yemen		23 Apr 2001 a

### **DECLARATIONS AND RESERVATIONS**

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

#### **Algeria**

Reservation:  
Reservation of Algeria

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

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

#### **Canada**

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

## China

Reservation:

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

## Cuba

Reservation and declaration:

Reservation

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

Declaration

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

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

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

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

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

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

## Egypt

Upon signature:

Reservations:

"1. Article 6, paragraph 5:

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

*2. Article 19, paragraph 2:*

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

**Estonia**

Declaration:

"....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."

**Germany**

Upon signature:

Declaration:

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

**India**

Reservation:

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

**Myanmar**

Reservation:

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

**Netherlands**

Declaration:

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

**Portugal**

Upon signature:

Declaration:

"For the purposes of article 8, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Portugal declares that the extradition 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 surrendered to Portugal to serve the sentence or measure imposed on him or her, unless such person does not consent thereto by means of expressed declaration.

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

**Russian Federation**

Upon signature:

Declaration:

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

Upon ratification:

Declarations:

.....

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

**Spain**

29 February 2000

Declaration:

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

**Sudan**

Declaration concerning article 19, paragraph 2:



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

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

Reservation to article 20, paragraph 1:

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

### **Turkey**

Upon signature:

Declarations:

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

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

Reservation:

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

Upon ratification:

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

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

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

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

### **Ukraine**

#### Reservation:

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

### **United States of America**

#### Reservation:

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

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

#### Understandings:

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

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

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

- (A) the military 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. "

### **NOTIFICATIONS UNDER ARTICLE 6 (3)**

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

### **Bolivia**

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

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."

### **Finland**

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

### **Hungary**

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

### **Iceland**

Declaration:

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

### **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.

### **Portugal**

16 January 2002

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

**Russian Federation**

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

**Sudan**

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

**Ukraine**

21 May 2002

"Ukraine exercises its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in cases provided for in paragraph 2 article 6 of the Convention."

Uruguay

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

**Uzbekistan**

15 May 2000

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

**NOTES**

1. With a territorial exclusion in respect of the Faroe Islands and Greenland.
2. For the Kingdom in Europe.
- 3 . 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.

**INTERNATIONAL CONVENTION FOR THE SUPPRESSION OF THE FINANCING OF  
TERRORISM, NEW YORK, 9 DECEMBER 1999**

**Entry into force:** 10 April 2002, in accordance with article 26 (1).  
**Registration:** 10 April 2002, No. 38349.  
**Status:** Signatories: 132 ,Parties: 42.  
 Resolution A/RES/54/109; depositary notifications  
 C.N.327.2000.TREATIES-12 of 30 May 2000 (rectification of the  
 original text of the Convention); and C.N.3.2002.TREATIES-1 of 2  
 January 2002 [proposal for corrections to the original text of the  
 Convention (Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish  
 authentic texts)] and C.N.86.2002.TREATIES-4 of 1 February 2002  
**Text:** [Rectification of the original of the Convention (Arabic, Chinese,  
 English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts)];  
 C.N.312.2002.TREATIES-14 of 4 April 2002 [proposal of a  
 correction to the original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)]  
 and C.N.420.2002.TREATIES-20 of 3 May 2002 [rectification of the  
 original of the Convention (Spanish authentic text)].<sup>1</sup>

**Note:** The Convention was adopted by Resolution 54/109 of 9 December 1999 at the fourth session of the General Assembly of the United Nations. In accordance with its article 25 (1), the Convention will be open for signature by all States at United Nations Headquarters from 10 January 2000 to 31 December 2001.

**PARTICIPANTS**

<b>Participant</b>	<b>Signature</b>	<b>Ratification, Acceptance (A), Approval (AA), Accession (a)</b>
Albania	18 Dec 2001	10 Apr 2002
Algeria	18 Jan 2000	8 Nov 2001
Andorra	11 Nov 2001	
Antigua and Barbuda		11 Mar 2002 a
Argentina	28 Mar 2001	
Armenia	15 Nov 2001	
Australia	15 Oct 2001	
Austria	24 Sep 2001	15 Apr 2002
Azerbaijan	4 Oct 2001	26 Oct 2001
Bahamas	2 Oct 2001	
Bahrain	14 Nov	

	2001	
Barbados	13 Nov 2001	
Belarus	12 Nov 2001	
Belgium	27 Sep 2001	
Belize	14 Nov 2001	
Benin	16 Nov 2001	
Bhutan	14 Nov 2001	
Bolivia	10 Nov 2001	7 Jan 2002
Bosnia and Herzegovina	11 Nov 2001	
Botswana	8 Sep 2000	8 Sep 2000
Brazil	10 Nov 2001	
Bulgaria	19 Mar 2001	15 Apr 2002
Burundi	13 Nov 2001	
Cambodia	11 Nov 2001	
Canada	10 Feb 2000	19 Feb 2002
Cape Verde	13 Nov 2001	10 May 2002
Central African Republic	19 Dec 2001	
Chile	2 May 2001	10 Nov 2001
China	13 Nov 2001	
Colombia	30 Oct 2001	
Comoros	14 Jan 2000	
Congo	14 Nov 2001	
Cook Islands	24 Dec 2001	
Costa Rica	14 Jun 2000	
Côte d'Ivoire		13 Mar 2002 a
Croatia	11 Nov	



	2001	
Cuba	19 Oct 2001	15 Nov 2001
Cyprus	1 Mar 2001	30 Nov 2001
Czech Republic	6 Sep 2000	
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	12 Nov 2001	
Democratic Republic of the Congo	11 Nov 2001	
Denmark	25 Sep 2001	
Djibouti	15 Nov 2001	
Dominican Republic	15 Nov 2001	
Ecuador	6 Sep 2000	
Egypt	6 Sep 2000	
Estonia	6 Sep 2000	22 May 2002
Finland	10 Jan 2000	28 Jun 2002 A
France	10 Jan 2000	7 Jan 2002
Gabon	8 Sep 2000	
Georgia	23 Jun 2000	
Germany	20 Jul 2000	
Ghana	12 Nov 2001	
Greece	8 Mar 2000	
Grenada		13 Dec 2001 a
Guatemala	23 Oct 2001	12 Feb 2002
Guinea	16 Nov 2001	
Guinea-Bissau	14 Nov 2001	
Honduras	11 Nov 2001	
Hungary	30 Nov 2001	
Iceland	1 Oct 2001	15 Apr 2002
India	8 Sep 2000	
Indonesia	24 Sep 2001	
Ireland	15 Oct 2001	
Israel	11 Jul 2000	

Italy	13 Jan 2000	
Jamaica	10 Nov 2001	
Japan	30 Oct 2001	11 Jun 2002 A
Jordan	24 Sep 2001	
Kenya	4 Dec 2001	
Latvia	18 Dec 2001	
Lesotho	6 Sep 2000	12 Nov 2001
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya	13 Nov 2001	9 Jul 2002
Liechtenstein	2 Oct 2001	
Luxembourg	20 Sep 2001	
Madagascar	1 Oct 2001	
Mali	11 Nov 2001	28 Mar 2002
Malta	10 Jan 2000	11 Nov 2001
Mauritius	11 Nov 2001	
Mexico	7 Sep 2000	
Micronesia (Federated States of)	12 Nov 2001	
Monaco	10 Nov 2001	10 Nov 2001
Mongolia	12 Nov 2001	
Morocco	12 Oct 2001	
Mozambique	11 Nov 2001	
Myanmar	12 Nov 2001	
Namibia	10 Nov 2001	
Nauru	12 Nov 2001	
Netherlands <sup>2</sup>	10 Jan 2000	7 Feb 2002 A
New Zealand	7 Sep 2000	
Nicaragua	17 Oct 2001	
Nigeria	1 Jun 2000	
Norway	1 Oct 2001	15 Jul 2002

Palau		14 Nov 2001 a
Panama	12 Nov 2001	3 Jul 2002
Paraguay	12 Oct 2001	
Peru	14 Sep 2000	10 Nov 2001
Philippines	16 Nov 2001	
Poland	4 Oct 2001	
Portugal	16 Feb 2000	
Republic of Korea	9 Oct 2001	
Republic of Moldova	16 Nov 2001	
Romania	26 Sep 2000	
Russian Federation	3 Apr 2000	
Rwanda	4 Dec 2001	13 May 2002
Saint Kitts and Nevis	12 Nov 2001	16 Nov 2001
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	3 Dec 2001	28 Mar 2002
Samoa	13 Nov 2001	
San Marino	26 Sep 2000	12 Mar 2002
Saudi Arabia	29 Nov 2001	
Seychelles	15 Nov 2001	
Sierra Leone	27 Nov 2001	
Singapore	18 Dec 2001	
Slovakia	26 Jan 2001	
Slovenia	10 Nov 2001	
Somalia	19 Dec 2001	
South Africa	10 Nov 2001	
Spain	8 Jan 2001	9 Apr 2002
Sri Lanka	10 Jan 2000	8 Sep 2000
Sudan	29 Feb 2000	
Sweden	15 Oct	6 Jun 2002

	2001	
Switzerland	13 Jun 2001	
Tajikistan	6 Nov 2001	
Thailand	18 Dec 2001	
The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia	31 Jan 2000	
Togo	15 Nov 2001	
Tunisia	2 Nov 2001	
Turkey	27 Sep 2001	28 Jun 2002
Uganda	13 Nov 2001	
Ukraine	8 Jun 2000	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	10 Jan 2000	7 Mar 2001
United States of America	10 Jan 2000	26 Jun 2002
Uruguay	25 Oct 2001	
Uzbekistan	13 Dec 2000	9 Jul 2001
Venezuela	16 Nov 2001	
Yugoslavia	12 Nov 2001	

## **DECLARATIONS AND RESERVATIONS**

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

### **Algeria**

Reservation:

Reservation of Algeria

The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism.

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

### **Brazil**

Upon signature:

I

interpretative declarations:

"Interpretative Declarations to be made by the Federal Republic of Brazil on the occasion of signing of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism:

1. As concerns Article 2 of the said Convention, three of the legal instruments listed in the Annex to the Convention have not come into force in Brazil. These are the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation; Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf; and the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings.

2. As concerns Article 24, paragraph 2 of the said Convention, Brazil does not consider itself obligated by paragraph 1 of the said Article, given that it has not recognized the mandatory jurisdiction clause of the International Court of Justice."

### **Cuba**

Reservation:

The Republic of Cuba declares, pursuant to article 24, paragraph 2, that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the said article, concerning the settlement of disputes arising between States Parties, inasmuch as it considers that such disputes must be settled through amicable negotiation. In consequence, it declares that it does not recognize the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice.

### **Democratic People's Republic of Korea**

Upon signature:

Reservations:

Reservations

1. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraph (a) of the Convention.

2. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 14 of the Convention.

3. The Democratic People's Republic of Korea does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 24, paragraph 1 of the Convention.

### **Estonia**

Declaration:

"[With] the following Declaration[s]:

1) pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 of the Convention, the Republic of Estonia declares, that she does not consider itself bound by the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome, on 10 March 1988, annexed to the Convention;"....

### **France**

Declarations:

Declaration pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a)

In accordance with article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of this Convention, France declares that in the application of the Convention to France, the Convention of 14 December 1973 on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, shall be deemed not to be included in the annex referred to in article 2, paragraph 1, subparagraph (a), since France is not a party thereto.

Declaration under article 7, paragraph 3:

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, of the Convention, France states that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all cases referred to in article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2.

### **Guatemala**

6 June 2002

Declaration under article 2 (2) (A):

[The Government of Guatemala notifies,]...pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, that on 14 March 2002<sup>3</sup>, the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings entered into force for the Republic of Guatemala. Accordingly, the declaration made by the Republic of Guatemala at the time of depositing its instrument of ratification that the latter Convention was deemed not to be included in the annex to the International Convention for the

Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism has ceased to have effect.

Article 2. Pursuant to article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention referred to in the preceding article, the State of Guatemala, in ratifying the Convention, makes the following declaration: "In the application of this Convention, Guatemala deems the following treaties not to be included in the annex: the Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Maritime Navigation, signed at Rome on 10 March 1988; the Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms located on the Continental Shelf, done at Rome on 10 March 1988 and the International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations

on 15 December 1997. The declaration shall cease to have effect, for each of the treaties indicated, as soon as the treaty enters into force for the State of Guatemala, which shall notify the depositary of this fact.

### **Myanmar**

Upon signature:

Reservation:

"The Government of the Union of Myanmar declares in pursuance of Article 24, paragraph

(2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Article 24, Paragraph (1)."

### **Netherlands**

Declaration:

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands understands Article 10, paragraph 1, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism to include the right of the competent judicial authorities to decide not to prosecute a person alleged to have committed such an offence, if, in the opinion of the competent judicial authorities grave considerations of procedural law indicate that effective prosecution will be impossible."

### **Russian Federation**

Upon signature:

Declaration:

It is the position of the Russian Federation that the provisions of article 15 of the Convention must be applied in such a way as to ensure the inevitability of responsibility for perpetrating the crimes falling within the purview of the Convention, without prejudice to the effectiveness of international cooperation with regard to the questions of extradition and legal assistance.

### **Saint Vincent and the Grenadines**

Declaration and Reservation:

"In accordance with Article 2 paragraph 2 a) of the said Convention, however, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declares that in the application of this Convention to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines the following treaties shall be deemed not to be included in the Annex referred to in its Article 2 paragraph 1(a):

1. Convention on the Physical Protection of Nuclear Material, adopted at Vienna on 3 March 1980.
2. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 15 December 1997.

Further, in accordance with Article 24 paragraph 2 of the said Convention, the Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declares that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of Article 24. The Government of Saint Vincent and the Grenadines considers that any dispute may be referred to the International Court of Justice only with the consent of all the parties to the dispute."

## Singapore

Reservation:

Upon signature:

"... the Government of the Republic of Singapore makes the following reservations in relation to Article 2 and Article 24 of the 1999 International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism:

i) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of Article 2, paragraph 2 (a) of the Convention that in the application of this Convention, the treaty shall be deemed not to include the treaties listed in the annex of this Convention which the Republic of Singapore is not a party to.

ii) The Republic of Singapore declares, in pursuance of Article 24, paragraph 2 of the Convention that it will not be bound by the provisions of Article 24 paragraph 1 of the Convention."

## Turkey

Declaration:

"1. The Republic of Turkey declares that the application of Paragraph 1(b) of Article (2) of the Convention does not necessarily indicate the existence of an armed conflict and the term "armed conflict", whether it is organized or not, describes a situation different from the commitment of acts that constitute the crime of terrorism within the scope of criminal law.

2. The Republic of Turkey declares its understanding that Paragraph 1(b) of Article (2) of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, as stated in Article (21) of the said Convention, shall not prejudice the obligations of states under international law including the Charter of the United Nations, in particular the obligation of not providing financial support to terrorist and armed groups acting in the territory of other states.

3. Pursuant to Paragraph 2 of Article 24 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Turkey declares that it does not consider itself bound by the provisions of Paragraph 1 of Article (24) of the said Convention."

## United States of America

Reservation:

"(a) pursuant to Article 24 (2) of the Convention, the United States of America declares that it does not consider itself bound by Article 24 (1) of the Convention; and

(b) the United States of America reserves the right specifically to agree in a particular case to follow the arbitration procedure set forth in Article 24 (1) of the Convention or any other procedure for arbitration."

Understandings:

"(1) EXCLUSION OF LEGITIMATE ACTIVITIES AGAINST LAWFUL TARGETS. The United States of America understands that nothing in the Convention precludes any State Party to the Convention from conducting any legitimate activity against any lawful target in accordance with the law of armed conflict.



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

### **OBJECTIONS**

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

#### **Netherlands**

1 May 2002

With regard to the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea upon signature:

"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph 1 (a), and article 14 of the International Convention for the suppression of the financing of terrorism made at the time of its signature of the said Convention.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations made by the Democratic People's Republic of Korea regarding article 2, paragraph 1 (a), and article 14 of the Convention are reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention.

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

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

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of the Democratic People's Republic of Korea to the International Convention for the suppression of the financing of terrorism.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Democratic People's Republic of Korea."

### **NOTIFICATIONS MADE UNDER ARTICLE 7 (3)**

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

#### **Bolivia**

13 février 2002

... by virtue of the provisions of article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Bolivia states that it establishes its jurisdiction in accordance with its domestic law in respect of offences committed in the situations and conditions provided for under article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

#### **Chile**

In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Government of Chile declares that, in accordance with article 6, paragraph 8, of the Courts Organization Code of the Republic of Chile, crimes and ordinary offenses committed outside the territory of the Republic which are covered in treaties concluded with other Powers remain under Chilean jurisdiction.

### **Cyprus**

27 December 2001

In accordance with paragraph 3 of Article 7, the Republic of Cyprus declares that by section 7.1 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism (Ratification and other Provisions) Law No. 29 (III) of 2001, it has established jurisdiction over the offences set forth in Article 2 in all circumstances described in paragraph 2 of Article 7."

### **Estonia**

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, the Republic of Estonia declares that in its domestic law it shall apply the jurisdiction set forth in article 7 paragraph 2 over offences set forth in article 2."

### **Finland**

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3 of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, the Republic of Finland establishes its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 in all the cases provided for in article 7, paragraphs 1 and 2."

### **Iceland**

"Pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism, Iceland declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2 of the Convention in all the cases provided for in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

### **Monaco**

The Principality of Monaco reports, pursuant to article 7, paragraph 3, of the International Convention for the Suppression of the Financing of Terrorism adopted in New York on 9 December 1999, that it exercises very broad jurisdiction over the offences referred to in that Convention.

The jurisdiction of the Principality is thus established pursuant to article 7, paragraph 1, over:  
(a) Offences committed in its territory: this is the case in Monaco in application of the general principle of territoriality of the law;

(b) Offences committed on board a vessel flying the Monegasque flag: this is the case in Monaco in application of article L.633-1 et seq. of the Maritime Code;  
Offences committed on board an aircraft registered under Monegasque law: the Tokyo Convention of 14 September 1963, rendered enforceable in Monaco by Sovereign Order No. 7.963 of 24 April 1984, specifies that the courts and tribunals of the State of registration of the aircraft are competent to exercise jurisdiction over offences and acts committed on board it;

(c) Offences committed by a Monegasque national: the Code of Criminal Procedure states in articles 5 and 6 that any Monegasque committing abroad an act qualified as a crime or offence by the law in force in the Principality may be charged and brought to trial there. The jurisdiction of the Principality is also established pursuant to article 7, paragraph 2 when:

(a) The offence was directed towards or resulted in the carrying out of a terrorist offence in its territory or against one of its nationals: articles 42 to 43 of the Criminal Code permit the Monegasque courts, in general terms, to punish accomplices of a perpetrator charged in Monaco with offences referred to in article 2 of the Convention;

(b) The offence was directed towards or resulted in the carrying out of a terrorist offence against a State or government facility, including diplomatic or consular premises: attacks aimed at bringing about devastation, massacres and pillage in Monegasque territory are punishable under article 65 of the Criminal Code; in addition, article 7 of the Code of Criminal Procedure provides for the charging and trial in Monaco of foreigners who, outside the territory of the Principality, have committed a crime prejudicial to the security of the State or a crime or offence against Monegasque diplomatic or consular agents or premises;

(c) The offence was directed towards or resulted in a terrorist offence committed in an attempt to compel the State to do or abstain from doing any act: the crimes and offences in question normally correspond to one of those referred to above, directly or through complicity;

(d) The offence was committed by a stateless person who had his or her habitual residence in Monegasque territory: application of the general principle of territoriality of the law permits the charging of stateless persons having their habitual residence in Monaco;

(e) The offence was committed on board an aircraft operated by the Monegasque Government: if the Monegasque Government directly operated an aircraft or an airline, its aircraft would have to be registered in Monaco, and the Tokyo Convention of 14 September 1963 referred to above would then apply

#### **Norway**

"Declaration: In accordance with article 7, paragraph 3 of the Convention, Norway hereby declares that it has established its jurisdiction over the offences set forth in article 2, of the Convention in all cases provided for in article 7, paragraph 2, of the Convention."

#### **Spain**

"In accordance with the provisions of article 7, paragraph 3, the Kingdom of Spain gives notification that its courts have international jurisdiction over the offences referred to in paragraphs 1 and 2, pursuant to article 23 of the Organization of Justice Act No. 6/1985 of 1 July 1985."

#### **Uzbekistan**

5 February 2002

"Republic of Uzbekistan establishes its jurisdiction over offences referred to in article 2 of the Convention in all cases stipulated in article 7, paragraph 2 of the Convention."

**NOTES**

1. In accordance with the established depositary practice, and unless there is an objection to effecting a particular correction from a signatory State or a contracting State, the Secretary-General proposes to effect in article 9, paragraph 5 of the Arabic, Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish authentic texts of the original of the Convention the proposed corrections. Any objections should be communicated to the Secretary-General no later than Friday, 1 February 2002, i.e., within 30 days from the date of the present notification.

2. For the Kingdom in Europe.