

Strasbourg, 12/09/12

CAHDI (2012) 13 rev

COMMITTEE OF LEGAL ADVISERS ON PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW (CAHDI)

**International Court of Justice's jurisdiction under selected
international treaties and agreements,**

**Situation concerning member, participant and observer States to
the CAHDI, which are parties to these agreements and treaties**

44th meeting
Paris, 19-20 September 2012

Public International Law Division,
Directorate of Legal Advice and Public International Law, DLAPIL

cahdi@coe.int - fax +33 (0)3 90 21 51 31 - www.coe.int/cahdi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|-----------|
| FOREWORD | 3 |
| INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS | 3 |
| 1. ICJ COMPULSORY JURISDICTION (ARTICLE 36 OF THE STATUTE OF THE ICJ)..... | 3 |
| 2. HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES..... | 4 |
| 3. TREATIES AGAINST TERRORISM | 7 |
| 4. TREATIES OF CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW | 10 |
| 5. MISCELLANEOUS – TREATIES FORESEEING THE JURISDICTION OF ICJ | 13 |
| APPENDICES | 15 |
| APPENDIX 1. DECLARATIONS RECOGNISING ICJ JURISDICTION AS COMPULSORY | 15 |
| APPENDIX 2. SUMMARY TABLE OF THE ICJ'S JURISDICTION..... | 32 |

FOREWORD

At its 31st meeting (Strasbourg, 23-24 March 2006), the CAHDI considered the International Court of Justice's (hereafter "ICJ") jurisdiction under selected international treaties and agreements and in particular the situation concerning the Council of Europe's member and observer States on the basis of document CAHDI (2006) 4. Since its 32nd meeting (Athens, 13-14 September 2006), the CAHDI pursued its consideration of this matter on the basis of a revised version of the aforementioned document.

For each meeting, the Secretariat revises the document in the light of developments published on <http://treaties.un.org/>, <http://conventions.coe.int/> and contributions from delegations. The present document sets out the current state of play.

The analysis focuses now on the States mentioned in the terms of reference of the CAHDI, namely the 47 member States of the Council of Europe, the States with observer status with the Council of Europe (Canada, Holy See, Japan, Mexico and United States of America) and the observer States to the CAHDI (Australia, Israel and New Zealand).

* * *

INTERNATIONAL TREATIES AND AGREEMENTS

1. ICJ COMPULSORY JURISDICTION (ARTICLE 36 OF THE STATUTE OF THE ICJ)¹

Of the 47 Council of Europe member States (hereafter "**member States**"), the following 24 member States have recognised the ICJ compulsory jurisdiction: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom. Out of 8 other States represented in the CAHDI² (hereafter "**other States**"), 5 have recognised the ICJ compulsory jurisdiction: Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand.

Article 36

"1. The jurisdiction of the Court comprises all cases which the parties refer to it and all matters specially provided for in the Charter of the United Nations or in treaties and conventions in force.

2. The states parties to the present Statute may at any time declare that they recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes concerning:

- a. the interpretation of a treaty;*
- b. any question of international law;*
- c. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;*
- d. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.*

3. The declarations referred to above may be made unconditionally or on condition of reciprocity on the part of several or certain states, or for a certain time.

4. Such declarations shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the parties to the Statute and to the Registrar of the Court.

5. Declarations made under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and which are still in force shall be deemed, as between the parties to the present Statute, to be acceptances of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice for the period which they still have to run and in accordance with their terms.

6. In the event of a dispute as to whether the Court has jurisdiction, the matter shall be settled by the decision of the Court."

¹ The declarations recognising the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory appear in the appendix to the present document.

² These other States are: Australia, Canada, Holy See, Israel, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand and United States of America (USA).

2. HUMAN RIGHTS TREATIES

A. The International Covenant on Economic, Social and Cultural Rights (1966)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (Andorra being the exception). Of the **other States**, 6 are parties: Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand. No provision on ICJ Jurisdiction.

B. The International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)

All **member States** are parties. Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the Holy See being the exception). No provision on ICJ Jurisdiction.

- Optional Protocol to the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights (1966)

Of the **member States**, 44 are parties, namely: Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Turkey and Ukraine. Of the **other States**, 4 are parties, namely: Australia, Canada, Mexico and New Zealand.

C. The International Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Racial Discrimination, monitored by the Committee on the Elimination of Racial Discrimination (1966)

All **member States** are parties. All **other States** are parties. Turkey, Israel and USA are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 22.

Article 22

"Any dispute between two or more States Parties with respect to the interpretation or application of this Convention, which is not settled by negotiation or by the procedures expressly provided for in this Convention, shall, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision, unless the disputants agree to another mode of settlement."

D. The Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discriminations against Women, monitored by the Committee on the Elimination of Discrimination against Women (1979)

All **member States** are parties. Of the **other States**, 6 are parties: Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand. France, Israel, Monaco and Turkey are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 29.

Article 29

"Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention which is not settled by 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."

- Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Elimination of all forms of Discriminations against Women (1999)

Of the **member States** 43 are parties, namely: Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 4 are parties: Australia, Canada, Mexico and New Zealand.

E. The Convention against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, monitored by the Committee against Torture (1984)

All **member States** are parties. All **other States** are parties. France, Monaco, Poland, Turkey, Israel and USA are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 30.

Article 30

“Any dispute between two or more States Parties 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.”

F. The Convention on the Rights of the Child, monitored by the Committee on the Rights of Children (1989)

The Convention does not have any provision on the jurisdiction of the ICJ, or that on the peaceful settlement of disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the Convention. All **member States** are parties. Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the USA being the exception).

G. The International Convention on the Protection of the Rights of All Migrant Workers and Members of their Families (1990)

Of the **member States**, 4 are parties: Albania, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Turkey. Of the **other States**, one is a party: Mexico. No State has made a **reservation** to its Article 92.

Article 92

“1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the present Convention that is not settled by 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.

2. Each State Party may at the time of signature or ratification of the present Convention or accession thereto declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the present article. The other States Parties shall not be bound by that paragraph with respect to any State Party that has made such a declaration.

3. Any State Party that has made a declaration in accordance with paragraph 2 of the present article may at any time withdraw that declaration by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.”

H. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of the Crime of Genocide (1948)

Of the **member States**, 45 are parties (Malta and San Marino being the exceptions). Of the **other States**, 6 are parties: Australia, Canada, Israel, Mexico, New Zealand and USA. Montenegro, Serbia and USA are maintaining **reservations** to its Article IX.

Article IX

“Disputes between the Contracting Parties relating to the interpretation, application or fulfilment of the present Convention, including those relating to the responsibility of a State for genocide or for any of the other acts enumerated in article III, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any of the parties to the dispute.”

I. Convention relating to the Status of Refugees (1951)

Of the **member States**, 45 are parties (Andorra and San Marino being the exceptions). Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (USA being the exception). No State has made a **reservation** to its Article 38.

Article 38

“Any dispute between Parties to this Convention relating to its interpretation or application, which cannot be settled by other means, shall be referred to the International Court of Justice at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute.”

J. Convention on the Reduction of Statelessness (1961)

Of the **member States**, 23 are parties: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Ireland, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Norway, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Sweden, and United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 3 are parties: Australia, Canada and New Zealand. No State has made a **reservation** to its Article 14.

Article 14

“Any dispute between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled by other means shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice at the request of any one of the parties to the dispute.”

K. International Convention against the Taking of Hostages (1979)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (San Marino being the exception). Of the **other States**, 6 are parties: Australia, Canada, Japan, Mexico, New Zealand and USA. The Republic of Moldova, Turkey and Ukraine are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 16.

Article 16

*“1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which is not settled by 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.
2. Each State may at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article. The other States Parties shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of this article with respect to any State Party which has made such a reservation.
3. Any State Party which has made a reservation in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article may at any time withdraw that reservation by notification to the Secretary-General in the United Nations”*

L. International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance (2006)

Of the **member States**, 11 are parties: Albania, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, France, Germany, Montenegro, Netherlands, Serbia and Spain. Of the **other States**, 2 are parties: Japan and Mexico. No State has made a **reservation** to its Article 42.

Article 42

*“1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation or by the procedures expressly provided for in this Convention 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.
2. A State may, at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article. The other States Parties shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of this article with respect to any State Party having made such a declaration.
3. Any State Party having made a declaration in accordance with the provisions of paragraph 2 of this article may at any time withdraw this declaration by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.”*

3. TREATIES AGAINST TERRORISM

A. International Convention for the Suppression of Terrorist Bombings (1997)

All **member States** are parties. Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the Holy See being the exception). The Republic of Moldova, Turkey, Israel and USA are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 20.

Article 20

“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 application, in conformity with the Statute of the Court”

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

All the **member States** are parties. All **other States** are parties. Andorra, Lithuania, the Republic of Moldova, Turkey, the Holy See, Israel and USA are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 24.

Article 24

“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 application, in conformity with the Statute of the Court.”

C. International Convention for the Suppression of Acts of Nuclear Terrorism, 2005

Of the **member States**, 29 are parties, namely: Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Ukraine and the United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 3 are parties: Australia, Japan and Mexico. Azerbaijan, Georgia and Turkey are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 23.

Article 23

“1. 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 of 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 application, in conformity with the Statute of the Court.

2. Each State may, at the time of signature, ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of the present article. The other States Parties shall not be bound by paragraph 1 with respect to any State Party which has made such a reservation.

3. Any State which has made a reservation in accordance with paragraph 2 of the present article may at any time withdraw that reservation by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.”

D. European Convention on the Suppression of Terrorism (1977)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (Andorra being the exception). None of the **other States** is a party. No Parties have made a **reservation** to its Article 10.

Article 10

“Any dispute between Contracting States concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, which has not been settled in the framework of Article 9, paragraph 2, shall, at the request of any Party to the dispute, be referred to arbitration. Each Party shall nominate an arbitrator and the two arbitrators shall nominate a referee. If any Party has not nominated its arbitrator within the three months following the request for arbitration, he shall be nominated at the request

of the other Party by the President of the European Court of Human Rights. If the latter should be a national of one of the Parties to the dispute, this duty shall be carried out by the Vice-President of the Court or if the Vice-President is a national of one of the Parties to the dispute, by the most senior judge of the Court not being a national of one of the Parties to the dispute. The same procedure shall be observed if the arbitrators cannot agree on the choice of referee."

E. Council of Europe Convention on Laundering, Search, Seizure and Confiscation of the Proceeds from Crime and on Financing Terrorism (2005)

Of the **member States**, 22 are parties: Albania, Armenia, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Hungary, Latvia, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, San Marino, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and Ukraine, and 12 other States have signed it. The European Union is also a signatory. However, none of the **other States** is a party. No State has made a **reservation** to its Article 48.4.

Article 48.4

"In case of a dispute between Parties as to the interpretation or application of the Convention, they shall seek a settlement of the dispute through negotiation or any other peaceful means of their choice, including submission of the dispute to the COP, to an arbitral tribunal whose decisions shall be binding upon the Parties, or to the International Court of Justice, as agreed upon by the Parties concerned."

F. Council of Europe Convention on the Prevention of Terrorism (2005)

Of the **member States**, 29 are parties: Albania, Andorra, Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovak Republic, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Turkey and Ukraine, and 15 have signed it. None of the **other States** is a party. No Parties have made a **reservation** to its Article 29.

Article 29

"In the event of a dispute between Parties as to the interpretation or application of this Convention, they shall seek a settlement of the dispute through negotiation or any other peaceful means of their choice, including submission of the dispute to an arbitral tribunal whose decisions shall be binding upon the Parties to the dispute, or to the International Court of Justice, as agreed upon by the Parties concerned."

G. Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling, and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction (1992)

All **member States** are parties. Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (Israel being the exception). No State has made a **reservation** to its Article XIV 2).

Article XIV 2)

"When a dispute arises between two or more States Parties, or between one or more States Parties and the Organization, relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention, the parties concerned shall consult together with a view to the expeditious settlement of the dispute by negotiation or by other peaceful means of the parties' choice, including recourse to appropriate organs of this Convention and, by mutual consent, referral to the International Court of Justice in conformity with the Statute of the Court. The States Parties involved shall keep the Executive Council informed of actions being taken."

H. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Seizure of Aircraft, 1970

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (San Marino being the exception). Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the Holy See being the exception). Ukraine is maintaining a **reservation** to its Article 12.

Article 12

"1. 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.

2. Each State may at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not consider itself bound by the preceding paragraph. The other Contracting States shall not be bound by the preceding paragraph with respect to any Contracting State having made such a reservation.

3. Any Contracting State having made a reservation in accordance with the preceding paragraph may at any time withdraw this reservation by notification to the Depositary Governments.”

I. Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Civil Aviation (1971)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (San Marino being the exception). Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the Holy See being the exception). France and Ukraine are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 14.

Article 14

“1. 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.

2. Each State may at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not consider itself bound by the preceding paragraph. The other Contracting States shall not be bound by the preceding paragraph with respect to any Contracting State having made such a reservation.

3. Any Contracting State having made a reservation in accordance with the preceding paragraph may at any time withdraw this reservation by notification to the Depositary Governments.”

J. Convention on Cluster Munitions (2008)

Of the **member States**, 28 are parties: Albania, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Ireland, Italy, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, San Marino, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia” and the United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 4 are parties: Holy See, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand. No State has made a **reservation** to its Article 10.

Article 10

“1. When a dispute arises between two or more States Parties relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention, the States Parties concerned shall consult together with a view to the expeditious settlement of the dispute by negotiation or by other peaceful means of their choice, including recourse to the Meeting of States Parties and referral to the International Court of Justice in conformity with the Statute of the Court. 2. The Meeting of States Parties may contribute to the settlement of the dispute by whatever means it deems appropriate, including offering its good offices, calling upon the States Parties concerned to start the settlement procedure of their choice and recommending a time-limit for any agreed procedure.

4. TREATIES OF CODIFICATION OF INTERNATIONAL LAW

A. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations (1961)

All **member States** and **other States** are parties.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, concerning Acquisition of Nationality (1961)

Of the **member States**, 15 are parties: Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Serbia, Sweden, Switzerland, and "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia". Of the **other States**, one is a party: New Zealand.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations, concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes (1961)

Of the **member States**, 27 are parties: Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 4 are parties: Australia, Japan, New Zealand and USA.

B. Vienna Convention on Consular Relations (1963)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (San Marino being the exception). Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (Israel being the exception).

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, concerning Acquisition of Nationality (1963)

Of the **member States**, 12 are parties: Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Iceland, Italy, Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, and Switzerland. Of the **other States**, one is a party: New Zealand.

- Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations, concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes (1963)

Of the **member States**, 21 are parties: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Iceland, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 4 are parties: Australia, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand.

C. Convention on Special Missions (1969)

Of the **member States**, 19 are parties: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Montenegro, Poland, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Ukraine. Of the **other States**, one is a party: Mexico.

- Optional Protocol to the Convention on Special Missions concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes (1969)

Of the **member States**, 10 are parties: Austria, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Cyprus, Estonia, Liechtenstein, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, and Switzerland. None of the **other States** is a party.

D. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (1969)

Of the **member States**, 38 are parties: Albania, Andorra, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", Ukraine, United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 6 are parties: Australia, Canada, Holy See, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand. No provision on ICJ jurisdiction.

E. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents (1973)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties (San Marino being the exception). Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the Holy See being the exception). Lithuania, Ukraine and Israel are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 13.

Article 13

“Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which is not settled by 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.”

F. Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties (1978)

Of the **member States**, 12 are parties: Bosnia and Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Republic of Moldova, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Ukraine. None of the **other States** is a party. No State is maintaining a **reservation** to its Articles 41 to 44.

Article 41

“If a dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the present Convention arises between two or more Parties to the Convention, they shall, upon the request of any of them, seek to resolve it by a process of consultation and negotiation.”

Article 42

“If the dispute is not resolved within six months of the date on which the request referred to in article 41 has been made, any party to the dispute may submit it to the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the present Convention by submitting a request to that effect to the Secretary-General of the United Nations and informing the other party or parties to the dispute of the request.”

Article 43

“Any State at the time of signature or ratification of the present Convention or accession thereto or at any time thereafter, may, by notification to the depositary, declare that, where a dispute has not been resolved by the application of the procedures referred to in articles 41 and 42, that dispute may be submitted for a decision to the International Court of Justice by a written application of any party to the dispute, or in the alternative to arbitration, provided that the other party to the dispute has made a like declaration.”

Article 44

“Notwithstanding articles 41, 42 and 43, if a dispute regarding the interpretation or application of the present Convention arises between two or more Parties to the Convention, they may by common consent agree to submit it to the International Court of Justice, or to arbitration, or to any other appropriate procedure for the settlement of disputes.”

G. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations (1986)

Of the **member States**, 20 are parties, namely: Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Italy, Liechtenstein, Netherlands, Republic of Moldova, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. Of the **other States**, 2 are parties: Australia and Mexico. No State is maintaining a **reservation** to its Article 66.2.

Article 66.2

“With respect to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64:

(a) if a State is a party to the dispute with one or more States, it may, by a written application, submit the dispute to the International Court of Justice for a decision;

(b) if a State is a party to the dispute to which one or more international organizations are parties, the State may, through a Member State of the United Nations if necessary, request the General Assembly or the Security Council or, where appropriate, the competent organ of an international organization which is a party to the dispute and is authorized in accordance with Article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations, to request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 65 of the Statute of the Court;

(c) if the United Nations or an international organization that is authorized in accordance with Article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations is a party to the dispute, it may request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 65 of the Statute of the Court;

(d) if an international organization other than those referred to in subparagraph (c) is a party to the dispute, it may,

through a Member State of the United Nations, follow the procedure specified in subparagraph (b);

(e) the advisory opinion given pursuant to subparagraph (b), (c) or (d) shall be accepted as decisive by all the parties to the dispute concerned;

(f) if the request under subparagraph (b), (c) or (d) for an advisory opinion of the Court is not granted, any one of the parties to the dispute may, by written notification to the other party or parties, submit it to arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the Annex to the present Convention.”

5. MISCELLANEOUS – TREATIES FORESEEING THE JURISDICTION OF ICJ

A. European Convention for the Peaceful Settlement of Disputes (1957)

Of the **member States**, 14 are parties: Austria, Belgium, Denmark, Germany, Italy, Liechtenstein, Luxembourg, Malta, Netherlands, Norway, Slovakia, Sweden, Switzerland, and United Kingdom. None of the **other States** is a party.

B. Revised General Act for the Pacific Settlement of Disputes (1949)

Of the **member States**, 7 are parties: Belgium, Denmark, Estonia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway and Sweden. None of the **other States** is a party. No State is maintaining a **reservation** to its Article 41.

Article 41

“Disputes relating to the interpretation or application of the present General Act, including those concerning the classification of disputes and the scope of reservations, shall be submitted to the International Court of Justice.”

C. Single Convention on Narcotic drugs (1961)

Of the **member States**, 39 are parties: Austria, Azerbaijan, Belgium, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Iceland, Ireland, Italy, Latvia, Liechtenstein, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Republic of Moldova, Romania, Russian Federation, San Marino, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Sweden, Switzerland, “the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia”, Turkey, Ukraine, United Kingdom. All **other States** are parties. No State has entered a **reservation** to its Article 48.

Article 48

“If there should arise between two or more Parties a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention, the said Parties shall consult together with a view to the settlement of the dispute by negotiation, investigation, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, recourse to regional bodies, judicial process or other peaceful means of their own choice.

Any such dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed shall be referred to the International Court of Justice for decision.”

D. United Nations Convention against Illicit Traffic in Narcotic Drugs and Psychotropic Substances (1988)

All **member States** are parties. All **other States** are parties. Andorra, France, Lithuania, Turkey, the Holy See, Israel and USA are maintaining **reservations** to its Article 32.

Article 32

“1. If there should arise between two or more Parties a dispute relating to the interpretation or application of this Convention, the Parties shall consult together with a view to the settlement of the dispute by negotiation, enquiry, mediation, conciliation, arbitration, recourse to regional bodies, judicial process or other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. Any such dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of this article shall be referred, at the request of any one of the States Parties to the dispute, to the International Court of Justice for decision.

3. If a regional economic integration organization referred to in article 26, subparagraph c) is a Party to a dispute which cannot be settled in the manner prescribed in paragraph 1 of this article, it may, through a State Member of the United Nations, request the Council to request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 65 of the Statute of the Court, which opinion shall be regarded as decisive.

4. Each State, at the time of signature or ratification, acceptance or approval of this Convention or accession thereto, or each regional economic integration organization, at the time of signature or deposit of an act of formal confirmation or accession, may declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 of this article. The other Parties shall not be bound by paragraphs 2 and 3 with respect to any Party having made such a declaration.

5. Any Party having made a declaration in accordance with paragraph 4 of this article may at any time withdraw the declaration by notification to the Secretary-General.”

E. United Nations Framework Convention on Climate Change (1992)

All **member States** are parties. Of the **other States**, 7 are parties (the Holy See being the exception). The Netherlands have made such a **declaration**.

Article 14

"1. In the event of a dispute between any two or more Parties concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, the Parties concerned shall seek a settlement of the dispute through negotiation or any other peaceful means of their own choice.

2. When ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to the Convention, or at any time thereafter, a Party which is not a regional economic integration organization may declare in a written instrument submitted to the Depositary that, in respect of any dispute concerning the interpretation or application of the Convention, it recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any Party accepting the same obligation:

(a) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice, and/or

(b) Arbitration in accordance with procedures to be adopted by the Conference of the Parties as soon as practicable, in an annex on arbitration.

A Party which is a regional economic integration organization may make a declaration with like effect in relation to arbitration in accordance with the procedures referred to in subparagraph (b) above.

3. A declaration made under paragraph 2 above shall remain in force until it expires in accordance with its terms or until three months after written notice of its revocation has been deposited with the Depositary.

4. A new declaration, a notice of revocation or the expiry of a declaration shall not in any way affect proceedings pending before the International Court of Justice or the arbitral tribunal, unless the parties to the dispute otherwise agree.

5. Subject to the operation of paragraph 2 above, if after twelve months following notification by one Party to another that a dispute exists between them, the Parties concerned have not been able to settle their dispute through the means mentioned in paragraph 1 above, the dispute shall be submitted, at the request of any of the parties to the dispute, to conciliation."

F. Convention on Biological Diversity (1992)

Of the **member States**, 46 are parties, (Andorra being the exception). Of the **other States**, 6 are parties: Australia, Canada, Israel, Japan, Mexico and New Zealand. Austria, Georgia and Latvia have made a **declaration** in pursuance of the terms of Article 27 paragraph 3 (b).

Article 27

" 1. In the event of a dispute between Contracting Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention, the parties concerned shall seek solution by negotiation.

2. If the parties concerned cannot reach agreement by negotiation, they may jointly seek the good offices of, or request mediation by, a third party.

3. When ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to this Convention, or at any time thereafter, a State or regional economic integration organization may declare in writing to the Depositary that for a dispute not resolved in accordance with paragraph 1 or paragraph 2 above, it accepts one or both of the following means of dispute settlement as compulsory:

(a) Arbitration in accordance with the procedure laid down in Part 1 of Annex II;

(b) Submission of the dispute to the International Court of Justice.

4. If the parties to the dispute have not, in accordance with paragraph 3 above, accepted the same or any procedure, the dispute shall be submitted to conciliation in accordance with Part 2 of Annex II unless the parties otherwise agree.

5. The provisions of this Article shall apply with respect to any protocol except as otherwise provided in the protocol concerned."

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1. DECLARATIONS RECOGNISING ICJ JURISDICTION AS COMPULSORY

AUSTRIA

19 May 1971

I hereby declare that the Republic of Austria recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State which accepts or has accepted the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

This Declaration does not apply to any dispute in respect of which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to other means of peaceful settlement for its final and binding decision.

This Declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until it will be terminated or modified by a written declaration.

Done at Vienna on 28 April 1971.

(Signed) Franz JONAS,
The Federal President.

In witness whereof the present declaration has been countersigned by the Federal Chancellor and the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the national seal of the Republic of Austria has been affixed thereto.

(Signed) Bruno KREISKY,
The Federal Chancellor.

(Signed) Rudolf KIRCHSCHLAEGER,
The Federal Minister for Foreign Affairs.

BELGIUM

17 June 1958

[Translation from the French]

I declare on behalf of the Belgian Government that I recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, in legal disputes arising after 13 July 1948 concerning situations or facts subsequent to that date, except those in regard to which the parties have agreed or may agree to have recourse to another method of pacific settlement.

This declaration is made subject to ratification. It shall take effect on the day of deposit of the instrument of ratification for a period of five years. Upon the expiry of that period, it shall continue to have effect until notice of its termination is given.

Brussels, 3 April 1958.

(Signed) V. LAROCK,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

BULGARIA

24 June 1992

[Translation from the Bulgarian]

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria, I have the honour to declare that in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice the Republic of Bulgaria recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes arising out of facts and situations subsequent to or continuing to exist after the entry into force of the present Declaration, concerning:

1. the interpretation of a treaty;
2. any question of international law;
3. the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
4. the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation,

except for disputes with any State which has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute less than twelve months prior to filing an application bringing the dispute before the Court or where such acceptance has been made only for the purpose of a particular dispute.

The Republic of Bulgaria also reserves the right at any time to modify the present Declaration, the modifications taking effect six months after the deposit of the notification thereof.

The present Declaration shall be in force for a period of five years from the date of its deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. It shall continue in force thereafter until six months after a notice of its denunciation is given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Sofia, 26 May 1992.

(Signed) S. GANEV,
Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Bulgaria.

CYPRUS

3 September 2002

1. I have the honour on behalf of the Government of the Republic of Cyprus to declare, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, that the Republic of Cyprus accepts as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the Jurisdiction of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, over all legal disputes concerning:

(a) the interpretation of any treaty

I. to which the Republic of Cyprus became a party on or after 16 August 1960 or

II. which the Republic of Cyprus recognizes as binding on it by succession;

(b) any question of international law;

(c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation.

(d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

Provided that this declaration shall not apply :

i. To disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute ; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

ii. To disputes relating to questions which fall within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Cyprus.

2. The Government of the Republic of Cyprus also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw this Declaration or any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

Nicosia, 3 September 2002.

(Signed) Ioannis KASOULIDES,
Minister of Foreign Affairs.

DENMARK

10 December 1956

[Translation from the French]

In conformity with the Royal Decree of 3 December 1956, I have the honour, on behalf of the Danish Government, to make the following declaration:

Pursuant to Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Kingdom of Denmark recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement the jurisdiction of the Court in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, for a period of five years from 10 December 1956 and thereafter for further periods of five years, if this declaration is not denounced by notice of not less than six months before the expiration of any five-year period.

New York, 10 December 1956.

(Signed) Karl I. ESKELUND,
Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary,
Permanent Representative
to the United Nations.

ESTONIA

21 October 1991

I, Arnold Ruutel, Chairman of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia, declare on behalf of the Republic of Estonia and in accordance with the Resolution of September 26, 1991 of the Supreme Council of the Republic of Estonia, that the Republic of Estonia recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, provided that this declaration shall not apply to disputes, the solution of which the parties shall entrust to other tribunals by virtue of agreements already in existence or which may be concluded in the future.

Tallinn, 10 October 1991.

(Signed) A. RUUTEL,
Chairman of the Supreme Council.

FINLAND

25 June 1958

[Translation from the French]

On behalf of the Finnish Government, I hereby declare that I recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years from 25 June 1958. This declaration shall be renewed by tacit agreement for further periods of the same duration, unless it is denounced not later than six months before the expiry of any such period. This declaration shall apply only to disputes arising in regard to situations or facts subsequent to 25 June 1958.

New York, 25 June 1958.

(Signed) G. A. GRIPENBERG,
Permanent Representative of Finland
to the United Nations.

GEORGIA

20 June 1995

I have the honour on behalf of the Republic of Georgia to declare that, in accordance with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Republic of Georgia recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the Court in all legal disputes referred to in paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice.

Tbilisi, 16 June 1995.

(Signed) Alexander CHIKVAIDZE,
Minister of Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Georgia.

GERMANY

1st May 2008

[Translation from the German]

With reference to Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice I have the honour to formulate on behalf of the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany the following declaration:

1. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany declares that it recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations withdrawing the declaration and with effect as from the moment of such notification, over all disputes arising after the present declaration, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this date other than:

(i) any dispute which the Parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement or which is subject to another method of peaceful settlement chosen by all the Parties.

(ii) any dispute which

(a) relates to, arises from or is connected with the deployment of armed forces abroad, involvement in such deployments or decisions thereon,

or

(b) relates to, arises from or is connected with the use for military purposes of the territory of the Federal Republic of Germany, including its airspace, as well as maritime areas subject to German sovereign rights and jurisdiction;

(iii) any dispute in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

2. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

Berlin, 30 April 2008
(Signed)
Frank-Walter Steinmeier
Minister for Foreign Affairs

GREECE

10 January 1994

[Translation from the French]

I declare, on behalf of the Greek Government, that I recognize as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes referred to in Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court. However, the Greek Government excludes from the competence of the Court any dispute relating to defensive military action taken by the Hellenic Republic for reasons of national defence.

This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years. Upon the expiry of that period, it shall continue to have effect until notice of its termination is given.

Athens, 20 December 1993.

(Signed) Karolos PAPOULIAS,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

HUNGARY

22 October 1992

The Republic of Hungary hereby recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court in all disputes which may arise in respect of facts or situations subsequent to this declaration, other than:

- a) disputes in regard to which the parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
- b) disputes in regard to matters which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Hungary;
- c) disputes relating to, or connected with, facts or situations of hostilities, war, armed conflicts, individual or collective actions taken in self-defence or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any resolution or recommendation of the United Nations, and other similar or related acts, measures or situations in which the Republic of Hungary is, has been or may in the future be involved;
- d) disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purpose of such dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of the Republic of Hungary reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect of six months of such notification to amend, add to or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

This declaration shall remain in force until the expiration of six months after notification has been given of its termination.

Budapest, 7 October 1992.

(Signed) Dr. GEZA JESZENSZKY,
Minister for Foreign Affairs
of the Republic of Hungary.

IRELAND

15 December 2011

Ireland hereby declares that it recognises as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other state accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes as specified in Article 36, paragraph 2, with the exception of any legal dispute with the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in regard to Northern Ireland.

The present Declaration shall take effect from the date of its receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

The Government of Ireland reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to Secretary-General of the United Nations and with effect from the date of such notification, either to amend or withdraw the present Declaration; or to add to, amend or withdraw the foregoing reservation or any other reservations which may subsequently be made.

Dublin, 8 December 2011.

(Signed) Eamon Gilmore, T.D.

Tánaiste and Minister for Foreign Affairs and Trade of Ireland

LIECHTENSTEIN

29 March 1950

[Translation from the French]

The Government of the Principality of Liechtenstein, duly authorized by His Serene Highness, the Reigning Prince François Joseph II, in accordance with the Order of the Diet of the Principality of Liechtenstein dated 9 March 1950, which came into force on 10 March 1950, declares by these presents that the Principality of Liechtenstein recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

- (a) the interpretation of a treaty;
- (b) any question of international law;
- (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

The present declaration, which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall take effect from the date on which the Principality becomes a party to the Statute and shall have effect as long as the declaration has not been revoked subject to one year's notice.

Done at Vaduz, 10 March 1950.

On behalf of the Government of
the Principality of Liechtenstein,
(Signed) A. FRICK,
The Head of Government.

LUXEMBOURG

15 September 1930

[Translation from the French]

The Government of the Grand-Duchy of Luxembourg recognizes as compulsory, ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is to say on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the Court in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute, in any disputes arising after the signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this signature, except in cases where the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to another procedure or to another method of pacific settlement. The present declaration is made for a period of five years. Unless it is denounced six months before the expiration of that period, it shall be considered as renewed for a further period of five years and similarly thereafter.

Geneva, 15 September 1930.

(Signed) BECH.

MALTA

6 December 1966

I have the honour to declare, on behalf of the Government of Malta, that Malta accepts as compulsory ipso facto and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes other than:

- (i) disputes in regard to which the Parties to the dispute have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
- (ii) disputes with the government of any other country which is a Member of the British Commonwealth of Nations, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;
- (iii) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Malta;
- (iv) disputes concerning any question relating to or arising out of belligerent or military occupation or the discharge of any functions pursuant to any recommendation or decision of an organ of the United Nations, in accordance with which the Government of Malta have accepted obligations;
- (v) disputes arising under multilateral treaty, unless (1) all Parties to the treaty affected by the decision are also Parties to the case before the Court, or (2) the Government of Malta specially agrees to jurisdiction;
- (vi) disputes relating to any matter excluded from compulsory adjudication or arbitration under any treaty, convention or other international agreement or instrument to which Malta is a party;
- (vii) disputes in respect of which arbitral or judicial proceedings are taking, or have taken place with any State which, at the date of the commencement of the proceedings, had not itself accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice; and
- (viii) disputes in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

The Government of Malta also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

Valletta, 29 November 1966.

(Signed) G. FELICE
Acting Minister of Commonwealth
and Foreign Affairs.

2 September 1983.

I have the honour to refer to the declaration made by the Government of Malta on 29 November 1966, and notified on 6 December 1966, concerning the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice and to give notice that, with effect from the moment this notification is received by Your Excellency, the acceptance of the Government of Malta of the jurisdiction of the Court shall be limited to all disputes with Malta other than

(1) the disputes mentioned in paragraphs (i) to (viii) both inclusive, of the said declaration, and
(2) the following categories of disputes, that is to say: Disputes with Malta concerning or relating to:

- (a) its territory, including the territorial sea, and the status thereof,
- (b) the continental shelf or any other zone of maritime jurisdiction, and the resources thereof,
- (c) the determination or delimitation of any of the above,
- (d) the prevention or control of pollution or contamination of the marine environment in marine areas adjacent to the coast of Malta.

The Government of Malta also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added.

(Signed) Alex SCEBERAS TRIGON,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

NETHERLANDS

1 August 1956

[Translation from the French]

I hereby declare that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands recognizes, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, with effect from 6 August 1956, as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of said Court in all disputes arising or which may arise after 5 August 1921, with the exception of disputes in respect of which the parties, excluding the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, may have agreed to have recourse to some other method of pacific settlement.

The aforesaid obligation is accepted for a period of five years and will be renewed by tacit agreement for additional periods of five years, unless notice is given, not less than six months before the expiry of any such period, that the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands does not wish to renew it.

The acceptance of the jurisdiction of the Court founded on the declaration of 5 August 1946 is terminated with effect from 6 August 1956.

New York, 1 August 1956.

(Signed) E. L. C. SCHIFF,
Acting Permanent Representative of the
Kingdom of the Netherlands to the United Nations.

NORWAY

24 June 1996

I hereby declare on behalf of the Royal Norwegian Government that Norway recognises as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, for a period of five years as from 3 October 1976. This declaration shall thereafter be tacitly renewed for additional periods of five years, unless notice of termination is given

not less than six months before the expiration of the current period; provided, however, that the limitations and exceptions relating to the settlement of disputes pursuant to the provisions of, and the Norwegian declarations applicable at any given time to, the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 and the Agreement of 4 December 1995 for the Implementation of the Provisions of the United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982 relating to the Conservation and Management of Straddling Fish Stocks and Highly Migratory Fish Stocks, shall apply to all disputes concerning the law of the sea.

It is requested that this notification be communicated to the governments of all the States that have accepted the Optional clause and to the Registrar of the International Court of Justice.

New York, 24 June 1996.

(Signed) Hans Jacob BIORN LIAN,
Permanent Representative of
Norway to the United Nations.

POLAND

25 March 1996

On behalf of the Government of the Republic of Poland I hereby declare that the Republic of Poland withdraws its consent to the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice communicated on 25 September 1990 in light of Article 36, par. 2 of the Statute of the Court. At the same time, I hereby declare that the Republic of Poland shall recognize with the effect as of 25 September 1996, in accordance with the provisions of the aforementioned article, as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation and subject to the sole condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes other than:

- a) disputes prior to 25 September 1990 or disputes arisen out of facts or situations prior to the same date,
- b) disputes with regard to the territory and State boundaries,
- c) disputes with regard to environmental protection,
- d) disputes with regard to foreign liabilities or debts,
- e) disputes with regard to any State which has made a declaration accepting the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court,
- f) disputes in respect whereof the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to other method of peaceful settlement,
- g) disputes relating to matters which, by international law, fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Republic of Poland.

The Government of the Republic of Poland reserves its right to withdraw or modify the present Declaration at any time and by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, taking effect after six months from the moment whereof.

25 March 1996.

(Signed) Dariusz ROSATI,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

PORTUGAL

25 February 2005

On behalf of the Portuguese Republic, I declare and give notice that Portugal, continuing to accept the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, amends its declaration made on 19 December 1955, replacing its terms by the following:

1. Under Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, the Portuguese Republic recognizes the jurisdiction of the Court as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation (and to the extent it accepts it), until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, in all legal disputes other than:

(i) any dispute which Portugal has agreed or shall agree with the other party or parties thereto to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement;

(ii) any dispute with any State that has deposited or ratified the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction or an amendment thereto so that the dispute became included in its scope less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;

(iii) any dispute, unless it refers to territorial titles or rights or to sovereign rights or jurisdiction, arising before 26 April 1974 or concerning situations or facts prior to that date;

(iv) any dispute with a party or parties to a treaty regarding which the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice has, under the applicable rules, been explicitly excluded, irrespective of whether the scope of the dispute refers to the interpretation and application of the treaty provisions or to other sources of international law.

2. The Portuguese Republic also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added,"

Lisbon, 18 February 2005.

(Signed) Antonio Victor Martins MONTEIRO,
Minister For Foreign Affairs.

SLOVAKIA

28 May 2004

On behalf of the Slovak Republic I have the honour to declare that the Slovak Republic recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court over all legal disputes arising after the date of signature of the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date.

This declaration does not apply to disputes:

(1) Which the parties have agreed to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement;

(2) in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or when the declaration recognizing the jurisdiction of the Court on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited less than twelve months prior to the filing of the unilateral application bringing the dispute before the Court;

(3) with regard to the protection of environment;

(4) with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the domestic jurisdiction of the Slovak Republic.

The Slovak republic reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the date of a receipt of such notification, to amend or withdraw this declaration.

Done at Bratislava on 11 May 2004.

(Signed) Rudolf SCHUSTER
President of the Slovak Republic.

SPAIN

29 October 1990

[Translation from the Spanish]

1. On behalf of the Spanish Government, I have the honour to declare that the Kingdom of Spain accepts as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, on condition of reciprocity, in legal disputes not included among the following situations and exceptions:

- (a) Disputes in regard to which the Kingdom of Spain and the other party or parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement of the dispute;
- (b) Disputes in regard to which the other party or parties have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purposes of the dispute in question;
- (c) Disputes in regard to which the other party or parties have accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;
- (d) Disputes arising prior to the date on which this Declaration was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations or relating to events or situations which occurred prior to that date, even if such events or situations may continue to occur or to have effects thereafter.

2. The Kingdom of Spain may at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, add to, amend or withdraw, in whole or in part, the foregoing reservations or any that may hereafter be added. These amendments shall become effective on the date of their receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

3. The present Declaration, which is deposited with the Secretary General of the United Nations in conformity with Article 36, paragraph 4, of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall remain in force until such time as it has been withdrawn by the Spanish Government or superseded by another declaration by the latter.

The withdrawal of the Declaration shall become effective after a period of six months has elapsed from the date of receipt by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the relevant notification by the Spanish Government. However, in respect of States which have established a period of less than six months between notification of the withdrawal of their Declaration and its becoming effective, the withdrawal of the Spanish Declaration shall become effective after such shorter period has elapsed.

Madrid, 15 October 1990.

(Signed) Francisco FERNANDEZ ORDONEZ,
Minister for Foreign Affairs.

SWEDEN

6 April 1957

[Translation from the French]

On behalf of the Royal Swedish Government, I declare that it accepts as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the said Court, for a period of five years as from 6 April 1957. This obligation shall be renewed by tacit agreement for further periods of the same duration unless notice of abrogation is made at least six months before the expiration of any such period. The above-mentioned obligation is accepted only in respect of disputes which may arise with regard to situations or facts subsequent to 6 April 1947.

New York, 6 April 1957.

(Signed) Claes CARBONNIER,
Permanent Representative a.i.
of Sweden to the United Nations.

SWITZERLAND

28 July 1948

[Translation from the French]

The Swiss Federal Council, duly authorized for that purpose by a Federal decree which was adopted on 12 March 1948 by the Federal Assembly of the Swiss Confederation and became operative on 17 June 1948, Hereby declares that the Swiss Confederation recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in all legal disputes concerning:

- (a) the interpretation of a treaty;
- (b) any question of international law;
- (c) the existence of any fact which, if established, would constitute a breach of an international obligation;
- (d) the nature or extent of the reparation to be made for the breach of an international obligation.

This declaration, which is made under Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, shall take effect from the date on which the Swiss Confederation becomes a party to that Statute and shall have effect as long as it has not been abrogated subject to one year's notice.

Done at Berne, 6 July 1948.

On behalf of the Swiss Federal Council:
(Signed) CELIO,
The President of the Confederation.

(Signed) LEIMGRUBER,
The Chancellor of the Confederation.

UNITED KINGDOM

5 July 2004

1. The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland accept as compulsory ipso facto and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after 1 January 1974, with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date, other than:

- (i) any dispute which the United Kingdom has agreed with the other Party or Parties thereto to settle by some other method of peaceful settlement;
- (ii) any dispute with the government of any other country which is or has been a Member of the Commonwealth;
- (iii) any dispute in respect of which any other Party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other Party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

2. The Government of the United Kingdom also reserve the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

New York, 5 July 2004.

(Signed) Emyr JONES PARRY
Permanent Representative
of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
to The United Nations.

* * *

AUSTRALIA

22 March 2002

WHEREAS on the first day of November one thousand nine hundred and forty-five Australia ratified the Charter of the United Nations, of which the Statute of the International Court of Justice is an integral part; and

WHEREAS the Government of Australia deposited for and on behalf of Australia on the first day of November one thousand nine hundred and forty-five its instrument of ratification to the Statute of the International Court of Justice done at San Francisco on the twenty-sixth day of June, one thousand nine hundred and forty-five; and

WHEREAS Australia made a declaration under paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the said Statute on the thirteenth day of March one thousand nine hundred and seventy-five effective until such time as notice may be given to withdraw that declaration;

THE GOVERNMENT OF AUSTRALIA, having considered the said declaration, hereby gives notice effective immediately of the WITHDRAWAL of that declaration and REPLACES the same with the following declaration:

The Government of Australia declares that it recognises as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to the Secretary-General of the United Nations withdrawing this declaration. This declaration is effective immediately.

This declaration does not apply to:

(a) any dispute in regard to which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;

(b) any dispute concerning or relating to the delimitation of maritime zones, including the territorial sea, the exclusive economic zone and the continental shelf, or arising out of, concerning, or relating to the exploitation of any disputed area of or adjacent to any such maritime zone pending its delimitation;

(c) any dispute in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the Court only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited less than 12 months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I, ALEXANDER JOHN GOSSE DOWNER, Minister for Foreign Affairs, have hereunto set my hand and affixed my seal.

DONE at Canberra this 21st day of March, two thousand and two.

(Signed) A.J.G. DOWNER,
Minister for Foreign Affairs of Australia.

CANADA

10 May 1994

On behalf of the Government of Canada,

(1) I give notice that I hereby terminate the acceptance by Canada of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice hitherto effective by virtue of the declaration made on 10 September 1985 in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court.

(2) I declare that the Government of Canada accepts as compulsory ipso facto and without special convention, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the Court, until such time as notice may be given to terminate the acceptance, over all disputes arising after the present declaration with regard to situations or facts subsequent to this declaration, other than:

- (a) disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
- (b) disputes with the government of any other country which is a member of the Commonwealth, all of which disputes shall be settled in such manner as the parties have agreed or shall agree;
- (c) disputes with regard to questions which by international law fall exclusively within the jurisdiction of Canada; and
- (d) disputes arising out of or concerning conservation and management measures taken by Canada with respect to vessels fishing in the NAFO Regulatory Area, as defined in the Convention on Future Multilateral Co-operation in the Northwest Atlantic Fisheries, 1978, and the enforcement of such measures.

(3) The Government of Canada also reserves the right at any time, by means of a notification addressed to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and with effect as from the moment of such notification, either to add to, amend or withdraw any of the foregoing reservations, or any that may hereafter be added.

It is requested that this notification be communicated to the governments of all the States that have accepted the Optional Clause and to the Registrar of the International Court of Justice.

New York, 10 May 1994.

(Signed) Louise FRECHETTE,
Ambassador and
Permanent Representative.

JAPAN

9 July 2007

I have the honour, by direction of the Minister for Foreign Affairs, to declare on behalf of the Government of Japan that, in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Statute of the International Court of Justice, Japan recognizes as compulsory ipso facto and without special agreement, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation and on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, over all disputes arising on and after 15 september 1958 with regard to situations or facts subsequent to the same date and being not settled by other means of peaceful settlement.

This declaration does not apply to disputes which the parties thereto have agreed or shall agree to refer for final and binding decision to arbitration or judicial settlement.

This declaration does not apply to any dispute in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute; or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited or notified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court.

This declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years and thereafter until it may be terminated by a written notice.

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

9 July 2007.

(Signed) Kenzo Oshima
Permanent Representative of Japan
to the United Nations.

MEXICO

28 October 1947

[Translation from the Spanish]

In regard to any legal dispute that may in future arise between the United States of Mexico and any other State out of events subsequent to the date of this Declaration, the Mexican Government recognizes as compulsory ipso facto, and without any special agreement being required therefore, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in accordance with Article 36, paragraph 2, of the Statute of the said Court, in relation to any other State accepting the same obligation, that is, on condition of strict reciprocity. This Declaration, which does not apply to disputes arising from matters that, in the opinion of the Mexican Government, are within the domestic jurisdiction of the United States of Mexico, shall be binding for a period of five years as from 1 March 1947 and after that date shall continue in force until six months after the Mexican Government gives notice of denunciation.

Mexico, D.F., 23 October 1947.

(Signed) Jaime TORRES BODET,
Secretary of State for External Relations.

NEW ZEALAND

22 September 1977

I have the honour, by direction of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of New Zealand, to declare on behalf of the Government of New Zealand:

(I) The acceptance by the Government of New Zealand of the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice by virtue of the Declaration made on 1 April 1940 under Article 36 of the Statute of the Permanent Court of International Justice and made applicable to the International Court of Justice by paragraph 5 of Article 36 of the Statute of that Court, is hereby terminated.

(II) The Government of New Zealand accept as compulsory, ipso facto, and without special agreement, on condition of reciprocity, the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice in conformity with paragraph 2 of Article 36 of the Court over all disputes other than:

- (1) Disputes in regard to which the parties have agreed or shall agree to have recourse to some other method of peaceful settlement;
- (2) Disputes in respect of which any other party to the dispute has accepted the compulsory jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice only in relation to or for the purpose of the dispute: or where the acceptance of the Court's compulsory jurisdiction on behalf of any other party to the dispute was deposited or ratified less than twelve months prior to the filing of the application bringing the dispute before the Court;
- (3) Disputes arising out of, or concerning the jurisdiction or rights claimed or exercised by New Zealand in respect of the exploration, exploitation, conservation or management of the living resources in marine areas beyond and adjacent to the territorial sea of New Zealand but within 200 nautical miles from the baselines from which the breadth of the territorial sea is measured.

This Declaration shall remain in force for a period of five years from 22 September 1977 and thereafter until the expiration of six months after notice has been given of the termination of this Declaration provided that the Government of New Zealand reserves the right at any time to amend this Declaration in the light of the results of the Third United Nations Conference on the Law of the Sea in respect of the settlement of disputes.

New York, 22 September 1977.

(Signed) M. J. C. TEMPLETON,
Permanent Representative of
New Zealand to the United Nations.

| | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| San Marino | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ○ | ● | | | | ● | ● | | | | | | | | | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | | |
| Serbia | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ® | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| Slovak Republic | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| Slovenia | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| Spain | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | |
| Sweden | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ○ | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | |
| Switzerland | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | |
| "The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | |
| Turkey | | ● | ● | ● | ® | ® | ● | ® | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ® | ® | ® | ● | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ® | | ● | | | | ● | | | | | | | ○ | ● | ® | ● | ● | ● | | |
| Ukraine | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ® | ® | ® | | ● | | | ● | | | | ● | ® | ● | | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | | |
| United Kingdom | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ○ | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | |
| Australia | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | |
| Canada | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | ○ | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | |
| Holy See | | | | ● | | | ● | ● | | | ● | | | ® | | | | | ● | | | ● | ● | | | | | ● | | | | ○ | | | | | ● | ® | | | | | |
| Israel | | ● | ● | | ® | ® | | ® | ● | | ● | ● | | ® | ® | ○ | | | ○ | ● | ● | ○ | ○ | ● | | ○ | ○ | | ○ | | | | ® | | | | ● | ® | ● | ● | | | |
| Japan | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ○ | | | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | |
| Mexico | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | |
| New Zealand | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● | ● |
| USA | | ○ | ● | | ® | ○ | | ® | ○ | | ® | | | ® | ® | ○ | | | ● | ● | ● | ● | | ● | ● | | | | | ○ | ● | | ○ | | | ● | ® | ● | ○ | | ○ | | |

APPENDIX 2. SUMMARY TABLE OF THE ICJ'S JURISDICTION

● Party to the Treaty ○ Signed ® Party has made a reservation regarding the ICJ's compulsory jurisdiction ■: Party has made a declaration accepting the ICJ's compulsory jurisdiction

