(a) the treaty provides for such consent to be expressed by means of ratification;

(b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States were agreed that ratification should be required;

(c) the representative of the State has signed the treaty subject to ratification; or

(d) the intention of the State to sign the treaty subject to ratification appears from the full powers of its representative or was expressed during the negotiation.

2. The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty is expressed by acceptance or approval under conditions similar to those which apply to ratification.

**Article 15**

*Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by accession*

The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty is expressed by accession when:

(a) the treaty provides that such consent may be expressed by that State by means of accession;

(b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States were agreed that such consent may be expressed by that State by means of accession; or

(c) all the parties have subsequently agreed that such consent may be expressed by that State by means of accession.

**Article 16**

*Exchange or deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession*

Unless the treaty otherwise provides, instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession establish the consent of a State to be bound by a treaty upon:

(a) their exchange between the contracting States;

(b) their deposit with the depositary; or

(c) their notification to the contracting States or to the depositary, if so agreed.

**Article 17**

*Consent to be bound by part of a treaty and choice of differing provisions*

1. Without prejudice to articles 19 to 23, the consent of a State to be bound by part of a treaty is effective only if the treaty so permits or the other contracting States so agree.
2. The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty which permits a choice between differing provisions is effective only if it is made clear to which of the provisions the consent relates.

Article 18
Obligation not to defeat the object and purpose of a treaty prior to its entry into force

A State is obliged to refrain from acts which would defeat the object and purpose of a treaty when:

(a) it has signed the treaty or has exchanged instruments constituting the treaty subject to ratification, acceptance or approval, until it shall have made its intention clear not to become a party to the treaty; or

(b) it has expressed its consent to be bound by the treaty, pending the entry into force of the treaty and provided that such entry into force is not unduly delayed.

SECTION 2. RESERVATIONS

Article 19
Formulation of reservations

A State may, when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty, formulate a reservation unless:

(a) the reservation is prohibited by the treaty;

(b) the treaty provides that only specified reservations, which do not include the reservation in question, may be made; or

(c) in cases not failing under subparagraphs (a) and (b), the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

Article 20
Acceptance of and objection to reservations

1. A reservation expressly authorized by a treaty does not require any subsequent acceptance by the other contracting States unless the treaty so provides.

2. When it appears from the limited number of the negotiating States and the object and purpose of a treaty that the application of the treaty in its entirety between all the parties is an essential condition of the consent of each one to be bound by the treaty, a reservation requires acceptance by all the parties.

3. When a treaty is a constituent instrument of an international organization and unless it otherwise provides, a reservation requires the acceptance of the competent organ of that organization.

4. In cases not falling under the preceding paragraphs and unless the treaty otherwise provides:
(a) acceptance by another contracting State of a reservation constitutes the reserving State a party to the treaty in relation to that other State if or when the treaty is in force for those States;

(b) an objection by another contracting State to a reservation does not preclude the entry into force of the treaty as between the objecting and reserving States unless a contrary intention is definitely expressed by the objecting State;

(c) an act expressing a State’s consent to be bound by the treaty and containing a reservation is effective as soon as at least one other contracting State has accepted the reservation.

5. For the purposes of paragraphs 2 and 4 and unless the treaty otherwise provides, a reservation is considered to have been accepted by a State if it shall have raised no objection to the reservation by the end of a period of twelve months after it was notified of the reservation or by the date on which it expressed its consent to be bound by the treaty, whichever is later.

Article 21
Legal effects of reservations and of objections to reservations

1. A reservation established with regard to another party in accordance with articles 19, 20 and 23:

(a) modifies for the reserving State in its relations with that other party the provisions of the treaty to which the reservation relates to the extent of the reservation; and

(b) modifies those provisions to the same extent for that other party in its relations with the reserving State.

2. The reservation does not modify the provisions of the treaty for the other parties to the treaty inter se.

3. When a State objecting to a reservation has not opposed the entry into force of the treaty between itself and the reserving State, the provisions to which the reservation relates do not apply as between the two States to the extent of the reservation.

Article 22
Withdrawal of reservations and of objections to reservations

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, a reservation may be withdrawn at any time and the consent of a State which has accepted the reservation is not required for its withdrawal.

2. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, an objection to a reservation may be withdrawn at any time.

3. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, or it is otherwise agreed:
(a) the withdrawal of a reservation becomes operative in relation to another contracting State only when notice of it has been received by that State;

(b) the withdrawal of an objection to a reservation becomes operative only when notice of it has been received by the State which formulated the reservation.

Article 23
Procedure regarding reservations

1. A reservation, an express acceptance of a reservation and an objection to a reservation must be formulated in writing and communicated to the contracting States and other States entitled to become parties to the treaty.

2. If formulated when signing the treaty subject to ratification, acceptance or approval, a reservation must be formally confirmed by the reserving State when expressing its consent to be bound by the treaty. In such a case the reservation shall be considered as having been made on the date of its confirmation.

3. An express acceptance of, or an objection to, a reservation made previously to confirmation of the reservation does not itself require confirmation.

4. The withdrawal of a reservation or of an objection to a reservation must be formulated in writing.

SECTION 3. ENTRY INTO FORCE AND PROVISIONAL, APPLICATION OF TREATIES

Article 24
Entry into force

1. A treaty enters into force in such manner and upon such date as it may provide or as the negotiating States may agree.

2. Failing any such provision or agreement, a treaty enters into force as soon as consent to be bound by the treaty has been established for all the negotiating States.

3. When the consent of a State to be bound by a treaty is established on a date after the treaty has come into force, the treaty enters into force for that State on that date, unless the treaty otherwise provides.

4. The provisions of a treaty regulating the authentication of its text, the establishment of the consent of States to be bound by the treaty, the manner or date of its entry into force, reservations, the functions of the depositary and other matters arising necessarily before the entry into force of the treaty apply from the time of the adoption of its text.
Article 25
Provisional application

1. A treaty or a part of a treaty is applied provisionally pending its entry into force if:

(a) the treaty itself so provides; or

(b) the negotiating States have in some other manner so agreed.

2. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or the negotiating States have otherwise agreed, the provisional application of a treaty or a part of a treaty with respect to a State shall be terminated if that State notifies the other States between which the treaty is being applied provisionally of its intention not to become a party to the treaty.

PART III.
OBSERVANCE, APPLICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES

SECTION 1. OBSERVANCE OF TREATIES

Article 26
"Pacta sunt servanda"

Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith.

Article 27
Internal law and observance of treaties

A party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty. This rule is without prejudice to article 46.

SECTION 2. APPLICATION OF TREATIES

Article 28
Non-retroactivity of treaties

Unless a different intention appears from the treaty or is otherwise established, its provisions do not bind a party in relation to any act or fact which took place or any situation which ceased to exist before the date of the entry into force of the treaty with respect to that party.

Article 29
Territorial scope of treaties

Unless a different intention appears from the treaty or is otherwise established, a treaty is binding upon each party in respect of its entire territory.
Article 30

Application of successive treaties relating to
the same subject matter

1. Subject to Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, the rights and obligations of States Parties to successive treaties relating to the same subject matter shall be determined in accordance with the following paragraphs.

2. When a treaty specifies that it is subject to, or that it is not to be considered as incompatible with, an earlier or later treaty, the provisions of that other treaty prevail.

3. When all the parties to the earlier treaty are parties also to the later treaty but the earlier treaty is not terminated or suspended in operation under article 59, the earlier treaty applies only to the extent that its provisions are compatible with those of the later treaty.

4. When the parties to the later treaty do not include all the parties to the earlier one:

(a) as between States Parties to both treaties the same rule applies as in paragraph 3;

(b) as between a State party to both treaties and a State party to only one of the treaties, the treaty to which both States are parties governs their mutual rights and obligations.

5. Paragraph 4 is without prejudice to article 41, or to any question of the termination or suspension of the operation of a treaty under article 60 or to any question of responsibility which may arise for a State from the conclusion or application of a treaty the provisions of which are incompatible with its obligations towards another State under another treaty.

SECTION 3.  INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES

Article 31

General rule of interpretation

1. A treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in the light of its object and purpose.

2. The context for the purpose of the interpretation of a treaty shall comprise, in addition to the text, including its preamble and annexes:

(a) any agreement relating to the treaty which was made between all the parties in connection with the conclusion of the treaty;

(b) any instrument which was made by one or more parties in connection with the conclusion of the treaty and accepted by the other parties as an instrument related to the treaty.

3. There shall be taken into account, together with the context:
(a) any subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or the application of its provisions;

(b) any subsequent practice in the application of the treaty which establishes the agreement of the parties regarding its interpretation;

(c) any relevant rules of international law applicable in the relations between the parties.

4. A special meaning shall be given to a term if it is established that the parties so intended.

Article 32
Supplementary means of interpretation

Recourse may be had to supplementary means of interpretation, including the preparatory work of the treaty and the circumstances of its conclusion, in order to confirm the meaning resulting from the application of article 31, or to determine the meaning when the interpretation according to article 31:

(a) leaves the meaning ambiguous or obscure; or

(b) leads to a result which is manifestly absurd or unreasonable.

Article 33
Interpretation of treaties authenticated in two or more languages

1. When a treaty has been authenticated in two or more languages, the text is equally authoritative in each language, unless the treaty provides or the parties agree that, in case of divergence, a particular text shall prevail.

2. A version of the treaty in a language other than one of those in which the text was authenticated shall be considered an authentic text only if the treaty so provides or the parties so agree.

3. The terms of the treaty are presumed to have the same meaning in each authentic text.

4. Except where a particular text prevails in accordance with paragraph 1, when a comparison of the authentic texts discloses a difference of meaning which the application of articles 31 and 32 does not remove, the meaning which best reconciles the texts, having regard to the object and purpose of the treaty, shall be adopted.

SECTION 4. TREATIES AND THIRD STATES

Article 34
General rule regarding third States

A treaty does not create either obligations or rights for a third State without its consent.
**Article 35**  
*Treaties providing for obligations for third States*

An obligation arises for a third State from a provision of a treaty if the parties to the treaty intend the provision to be the means of establishing the obligation and the third State expressly accepts that obligation in writing.

**Article 36**  
*Treaties providing for rights for third States*

1. A right arises for a third State from a provision of a treaty if the parties to the treaty intend the provision to accord that right either to the third State, or to a group of States to which it belongs, or to all States, and the third State assents thereto. Its assent shall be presumed so long as the contrary is not indicated, unless the treaty otherwise provides.

2. A State exercising a right in accordance with paragraph 1 shall comply with the conditions for its exercise provided for in the treaty or established in conformity with the treaty.

**Article 37**  
*Revocation or modification of obligations or rights of third States*

1. When an obligation has arisen for a third State in conformity with article 35, the obligation may be revoked or modified only with the consent of the parties to the treaty and of the third State, unless it is established that they had otherwise agreed.

2. When a right has arisen for a third State in conformity with article 36, the right may not be revoked or modified by the parties if it is established that the right was intended not to be revocable or subject to modification without the consent of the third State.

**Article 38**  
*Rules in a treaty becoming binding on third States through international custom*

Nothing in articles 34 to 37 precludes a rule set forth in a treaty from becoming binding upon a third State as a customary rule of international law, recognized as such.

**PART IV.**  
**AMENDMENT AND MODIFICATION OF TREATIES**

**Article 39**  
*General rule regarding the amendment of treaties*

A treaty may be amended by agreement between the parties. The rules laid down in Part II apply to such an agreement except insofar as the treaty may otherwise provide.
Article 40
Amendment of multilateral treaties

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, the amendment of multilateral treaties shall be governed by the following paragraphs.

2. Any proposal to amend a multilateral treaty as between all the parties must be notified to all the contracting States, each one of which shall have the right to take part in:

(a) the decision as to the action to be taken in regard to such proposal;

(b) the negotiation and conclusion of any agreement for the amendment of the treaty.

3. Every State entitled to become a party to the treaty shall also be entitled to become a party to the treaty as amended.

4. The amending agreement does not bind any State already a party to the treaty which does not become a party to the amending agreement; article 30, paragraph 4 (b), applies in relation to such State.

5. Any State which becomes a party to the treaty after the entry into force of the amending agreement shall, failing an expression of a different intention by that State:

(a) be considered as a party to the treaty as amended; and

(b) be considered as a party to the unamended treaty in relation to any party to the treaty not bound by the amending agreement.

Article 41
Agreements to modify multilateral treaties between certain of the parties only

1. Two or more of the parties to a multilateral treaty may conclude an agreement to modify the treaty as between themselves alone if:

(a) the possibility of such a modification is provided for by the treaty; or

(b) the modification in question is not prohibited by the treaty and:

(i) does not affect the enjoyment by the other parties of their rights under the treaty or the performance of their obligations;

(ii) does not relate to a provision, derogation from which is incompatible with the effective execution of the object and purpose of the treaty as a whole.

2. Unless in a case falling under paragraph 1 (a) the treaty otherwise provides, the parties in question shall notify the other parties of their intention to conclude the agreement and of the modification to the treaty for which it provides.
PART V.
INVALIDITY, TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF TREATIES
SECTION 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 42
Validity and continuance in force of treaties

1. The validity of a treaty or of the consent of a State to be bound by a treaty may be impeached only through the application of the present Convention.

2. The termination of a treaty, its denunciation or the withdrawal of a party, may take place only as a result of the application of the provisions of the treaty or of the present Convention. The same rule applies to suspension of the operation of a treaty.

Article 43
Obligations imposed by international law independently of a treaty

The invalidity, termination or denunciation of a treaty, the withdrawal of a party from it, or the suspension of its operation, as a result of the application of the present Convention or of the provisions of the treaty, shall not in any way impair the duty of any State to fulfil any obligation embodied in the treaty to which it would be subject under international law independently of the treaty.

Article 44
Separability of treaty provisions

1. A right of a party, provided for in a treaty or arising under article 56, to denounce, withdraw from or suspend the operation of the treaty may be exercised only with respect to the whole treaty unless the treaty otherwise provides or the parties otherwise agree.

2. A ground for invalidating, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty recognized in the present Convention may be invoked only with respect to the whole treaty except as provided in the following paragraphs or in article 60.

3. If the ground relates solely to particular clauses, it may be invoked only with respect to those clauses where:

(a) the said clauses are separable from the remainder of the treaty with regard to their application;

(b) it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that acceptance of those clauses was not an essential basis of the consent of the other party or parties to be bound by the treaty as a whole; and

(c) continued performance of the remainder of the treaty would not be unjust.

4. In cases falling under articles 49 and 50, the State entitled to invoke the fraud or corruption may do so with respect either to the whole treaty or, subject to paragraph 3, to the particular clauses alone.
5. In cases falling under articles 51, 52 and 53, no separation of the provisions of the treaty is permitted.

Article 45

Loss of a right to invoke a ground for invalidating, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty

A State may no longer invoke a ground for invalidating, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty under articles 46 to 50 or articles 60 and 62 if, after becoming aware of the facts:

(a) it shall have expressly agreed that the treaty is valid or remains in force or continues in operation, as the case may be; or

(b) it must by reason of its conduct be considered as having acquiesced in the validity of the treaty or in its maintenance in force or in operation, as the case may be.

SECTION 2. INVALIDITY OF TREATIES

Article 46

Provisions of internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties

1. A State may not invoke the fact that its consent to be bound by a treaty has been expressed in violation of a provision of its internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties as invalidating its consent unless that violation was manifest and concerned a rule of its internal law of fundamental importance.

2. A violation is manifest if it would be objectively evident to any State conducting itself in the matter in accordance with normal practice and in good faith.

Article 47

Specific restrictions on authority to express the consent of a State

If the authority of a representative to express the consent of a State to be bound by a particular treaty has been made subject to a specific restriction, his omission to observe that restriction may not be invoked as invalidating the consent expressed by him unless the restriction was notified to the other negotiating States prior to his expressing such consent.

Article 48

Error

1. A State may invoke an error in a treaty as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty if the error relates to a fact or situation which was assumed by that State to exist at the time when the treaty was concluded and formed an essential basis of its consent to be bound by the treaty.
2. Paragraph 1 shall not apply if the State in question contributed by its own conduct to the error or if the circumstances were such as to put that State on notice of a possible error.

3. An error relating only to the wording of the text of a treaty does not affect its validity; article 79 then applies.

*Article 49*

*Fraud*

If a State has been induced to conclude a treaty by the fraudulent conduct of another negotiating State, the State may invoke the fraud as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty.

*Article 50*

*Corruption of a representative of a State*

If the expression of a State’s consent to be bound by a treaty has been procured through the corruption of its representative directly or indirectly by another negotiating State, the State may invoke such corruption as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty.

*Article 51*

*Coercion of a representative of a State*

The expression of a State’s consent to be bound by a treaty which has been procured by the coercion of its representative through acts or threats directed against him shall be without any legal effect.

*Article 52*

*Coercion of a State by the threat or use of force*

A treaty is void if its conclusion has been procured by the threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

*Article 53*

*Treaties conflicting with a peremptory norm of general international law (“jus cogens”)*

A treaty is void if, at the time of its conclusion, it conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law. For the purposes of the present Convention, a peremptory norm of general international law is a norm accepted and recognized by the international community of States as a whole as a norm from which no derogation is permitted and which can be modified only by a subsequent norm of general international law having the same character.
SECTION 3. TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION
OF THE OPERATION OF TREATIES

Article 54
Termination of or withdrawal from a treaty under its provisions or by consent of the parties

The termination of a treaty or the withdrawal of a party may take place:

(a) in conformity with the provisions of the treaty; or

(b) at any time by consent of all the parties after consultation with the other contracting States.

Article 55
Reduction of the parties to a multilateral treaty below the number necessary for its entry into force

Unless the treaty otherwise provides, a multilateral treaty does not terminate by reason only of the fact that the number of the parties falls below the number necessary for its entry into force.

Article 56
Denunciation of or withdrawal from a treaty containing no provision regarding termination, denunciation or withdrawal

1. A treaty which contains no provision regarding its termination and which does not provide for denunciation or withdrawal is not subject to denunciation or withdrawal unless:

(a) it is established that the parties intended to admit the possibility of denunciation or withdrawal; or

(b) a right of denunciation or withdrawal may be implied by the nature of the treaty.

2. A party shall give not less than twelve months’ notice of its intention to denounce or withdraw from a treaty under paragraph 1.

Article 57
Suspension of the operation of a treaty under its provisions or by consent of the parties

The operation of a treaty in regard to all the parties or to a particular party may be suspended:

(a) in conformity with the provisions of the treaty; or

(b) at any time by consent of all the parties after consultation with the other contracting States.
Article 58
Suspension of the operation of a multilateral treaty by agreement between certain of the parties only

1. Two or more parties to a multilateral treaty may conclude an agreement to suspend the operation of provisions of the treaty, temporarily and as between themselves alone, if:

(a) the possibility of such a suspension is provided for by the treaty; or

(b) the suspension in question is not prohibited by the treaty and:

(i) does not affect the enjoyment by the other parties of their rights under the treaty or the performance of their obligations;

(ii) is not incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

2. Unless in a case falling under paragraph 1 (a) the treaty otherwise provides, the parties in question shall notify the other parties of their intention to conclude the agreement and of those provisions of the treaty the operation of which they intend to suspend.

Article 59
Termination or suspension of the operation of a treaty implied by conclusion of a later treaty

1. A treaty shall be considered as terminated if all the parties to it conclude a later treaty relating to the same subject matter and:

(a) it appears from the later treaty or is otherwise established that the parties intended that the matter should be governed by that treaty; or

(b) the provisions of the later treaty are so far incompatible with those of the earlier one that the two treaties are not capable of being applied at the same time.

2. The earlier treaty shall be considered as only suspended in operation if it appears from the later treaty or is otherwise established that such was the intention of the parties.

Article 60
Termination or suspension of the operation of a treaty as a consequence of its breach

1. A material breach of a bilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles the other to invoke the breach as a ground for terminating the treaty or suspending its operation in whole or in part.

2. A material breach of a multilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles:

(a) the other parties by unanimous agreement to suspend the operation of the treaty in whole or in part or to terminate it either:
(i) in the relations between themselves and the defaulting State; or
(ii) as between all the parties;

(b) a party specially affected by the breach to invoke it as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty in whole or in part in the relations between itself and the defaulting State;

(c) any party other than the defaulting State to invoke the breach as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty in whole or in part with respect to itself if the treaty is of such a character that a material breach of its provisions by one party radically changes the position of every party with respect to the further performance of its obligations under the treaty.

3. A material breach of a treaty, for the purposes of this article, consists in:

(a) a repudiation of the treaty not sanctioned by the present Convention; or

(b) the violation of a provision essential to the accomplishment of the object or purpose of the treaty.

4. The foregoing paragraphs are without prejudice to any provision in the treaty applicable in the event of a breach.

5. Paragraphs 1 to 3 do not apply to provisions relating to the protection of the human person contained in treaties of a humanitarian character, in particular to provisions prohibiting any form of reprisals against persons protected by such treaties.

Article 61
Supervening impossibility of performance

1. A party may invoke the impossibility of performing a treaty as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from it if the impossibility results from the permanent disappearance or destruction of an object indispensable for the execution of the treaty. If the impossibility is temporary, it may be invoked only as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty.

2. Impossibility of performance may not be invoked by a party as a ground for terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty if the impossibility is the result of a breach by that party either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.

Article 62
Fundamental change of circumstances

1. A fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty unless:

(a) the existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty; and
the effect of the change is radically to transform the extent of obligations still to be performed under the treaty.

2. A fundamental change of circumstances may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty:

(a) if the treaty establishes a boundary; or

(b) if the fundamental change is the result of a breach by the party invoking it either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.

3. If, under the foregoing paragraphs, a party may invoke a fundamental change of circumstances as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty it may also invoke the change as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty.

*Article 63*

Severance of diplomatic or consular relations

The severance of diplomatic or consular relations between parties to a treaty does not affect the legal relations established between them by the treaty except insofar as the existence of diplomatic or consular relations is indispensable for the application of the treaty.

*Article 64*

Emergence of a new peremptory norm of general international law ("jus cogens")

If a new peremptory norm of general international law emerges, any existing treaty which is in conflict with that norm becomes void and terminates.

SECTION 4. PROCEDURE

*Article 65*

Procedure to be followed with respect to invalidity, termination, withdrawal from or suspension of the operation of a treaty

1. A party which, under the provisions of the present Convention, invokes either a defect in its consent to be bound by a treaty or a ground for impeaching the validity of a treaty, terminating it, withdrawing from it or suspending its operation, must notify the other parties of its claim. The notification shall indicate the measure proposed to be taken with respect to the treaty and the reasons therefor.

2. If, after the expiry of a period which, except in cases of special urgency, shall not be less than three months after the receipt of the notification, no party has raised any objection, the party making the notification may carry out in the manner provided in article 67 the measure which it has proposed.
3. If, however, objection has been raised by any other party, the parties shall seek a solution through the means indicated in Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

4. Nothing in the foregoing paragraphs shall affect the rights or obligations of the parties under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes.

5. Without prejudice to article 45, the fact that a State has not previously made the notification prescribed in paragraph 1 shall not prevent it from making such notification in answer to another party claiming performance of the treaty or alleging its violation.

Article 66
Procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation

If, under paragraph 3 of article 65, no solution has been reached within a period of 12 months following the date on which the objection was raised, the following procedures shall be followed:

(a) any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 may, by a written application, submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision unless the parties by common consent agree to submit the dispute to arbitration;

(b) any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the present Convention may set in motion the procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention by submitting a request to that effect to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 67
Instruments for declaring invalid, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty

1. The notification provided for under article 65, paragraph 1, must be made in writing.

2. Any act of declaring invalid, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty pursuant to the provisions of the treaty or of paragraphs 2 or 3 of article 65 shall be carried out through an instrument communicated to the other parties. If the instrument is not signed by the Head of State, Head of Government or Minister for Foreign Affairs, the representative of the State communicating it may be called upon to produce full powers.

Article 68
Revocation of notifications and instruments provided for in articles 65 and 67

A notification or instrument provided for in article 65 or 67 may be revoked at any time before it takes effect.
SECTION 5. CONSEQUENCES OF THE INVALIDITY, TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF A TREATY

Article 69
Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty

1. A treaty the invalidity of which is established under the present Convention is void. The provisions of a void treaty have no legal force.

2. If acts have nevertheless been performed in reliance on such a treaty:

(a) each party may require any other party to establish as far as possible in their mutual relations the position that would have existed if the acts had not been performed;

(b) acts performed in good faith before the invalidity was invoked are not rendered unlawful by reason only of the invalidity of the treaty.

3. In cases falling under article 49, 50, 51 or 52, paragraph 2 does not apply with respect to the party to which the fraud, the act of corruption or the coercion is imputable.

4. In the case of the invalidity of a particular State’s consent to be bound by a multilateral treaty, the foregoing rules apply in the relations between that State and the parties to the treaty.

Article 70
Consequences of the termination of a treaty

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or the parties otherwise agree, the termination of a treaty under its provisions or in accordance with the present Convention:

(a) releases the parties from any obligation further to perform the treaty;

(b) does not affect any right, obligation or legal situation of the parties created through the execution of the treaty prior to its termination.

2. If a State denounces or withdraws from a multilateral treaty, paragraph 1 applies in the relations between that State and each of the other parties to the treaty from the date when such denunciation or withdrawal takes effect.

Article 71
Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty which conflicts with a peremptory norm of general international law

1. In the case of a treaty which is void under article 53 the parties shall:

(a) eliminate as far as possible the consequences of any act performed in reliance on any provision which conflicts with the peremptory norm of general international law; and
(b) bring their mutual relations into conformity with the peremptory norm of general international law.

2. In the case of a treaty which becomes void and terminates under article 64, the termination of the treaty:

(a) releases the parties from any obligation further to perform the treaty;

(b) does not affect any right, obligation or legal situation of the parties created through the execution of the treaty prior to its termination, provided that those rights, obligations or situations may thereafter be maintained only to the extent that their maintenance is not in itself in conflict with the new peremptory norm of general international law.

Article 72
Consequences of the suspension of the operation of a treaty

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or the parties otherwise agree, the suspension of the operation of a treaty under its provisions or in accordance with the present Convention:

(a) releases the parties between which the operation of the treaty is suspended from the obligation to perform the treaty in their mutual relations during the period of the suspension;

(b) does not otherwise affect the legal relations between the parties established by the treaty.

2. During the period of the suspension the parties shall refrain from acts tending to obstruct the resumption of the operation of the treaty.

PART VI.
MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 73
Cases of State succession, State responsibility and outbreak of hostilities

The provisions of the present Convention shall not prejudge any question that may arise in regard to a treaty from a succession of States or from the international responsibility of a State or from the outbreak of hostilities between States.

Article 74
Diplomatic and consular relations and the conclusion of treaties

The severance or absence of diplomatic or consular relations between two or more States does not prevent the conclusion of treaties between those States. The conclusion of a treaty does not in itself affect the situation in regard to diplomatic or consular relations.
Article 75
Case of an aggressor State

The provisions of the present Convention are without prejudice to any obligation in relation to a treaty which may arise for an aggressor State in consequence of measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations with reference to that State’s aggression.

PART VII.
DEPOSITARIES, NOTIFICATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND REGISTRATION

Article 76
Depositaries of treaties

1. The designation of the depositary of a treaty may be made by the negotiating States, either in the treaty itself or in some other manner. The depositary may be one or more States, an international organization or the chief administrative officer of the organization.

2. The functions of the depositary of a treaty are international in character and the depositary is under an obligation to act impartially in their performance. In particular, the fact that a treaty has not entered into force between certain of the parties or that a difference has appeared between a State and a depositary with regard to the performance of the latter’s functions shall not affect that obligation.

Article 77
Functions of depositaries

1. The functions of a depositary, unless otherwise provided in the treaty or agreed by the contracting States, comprise in particular:

(a) keeping custody of the original text of the treaty and of any full powers delivered to the depositary;

(b) preparing certified copies of the original text and preparing any further text of the treaty in such additional languages as may be required by the treaty and transmitting them to the parties and to the States entitled to become parties to the treaty;

(c) receiving any signatures to the treaty and receiving and keeping custody of any instruments, notifications and communications relating to it;

(d) examining whether the signature or any instrument, notification or communication relating to the treaty is in due and proper form and, if need be, bringing the matter to the attention of the State in question;

(e) informing the parties and the States entitled to become parties to the treaty of acts, notifications and communications relating to the treaty;
(f) informing the States entitled to become parties to the treaty when the number of signatures or of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession required for the entry into force of the treaty has been received or deposited;

(g) registering the treaty with the Secretariat of the United Nations;

(h) performing the functions specified in other provisions of the present Convention.

2. In the event of any difference appearing between a State and the depositary as to the performance of the latter’s functions, the depositary shall bring the question to the attention of the signatory States and the contracting States or, where appropriate, of the competent organ of the international organization concerned.

Article 78
Notifications and communications

Except as the treaty or the present Convention otherwise provide, any notification or communication to be made by any State under the present Convention shall:

(a) if there is no depositary, be transmitted direct to the States for which it is intended, or if there is a depositary, to the latter;

(b) be considered as having been made by the State in question only upon its receipt by the State to which it was transmitted or, as the case may be, upon its receipt by the depositary;

(c) if transmitted to a depositary, be considered as received by the State for which it was intended only when the latter State has been informed by the depositary in accordance with article 77, paragraph 1 (e).

Article 79
Correction of errors in texts or in certified copies of treaties

1. Where, after the authentication of the text of a treaty, the signatory States and the contracting States are agreed that it contains an error, the error shall, unless they decide upon some other means of correction, be corrected:

(a) by having the appropriate correction made in the text and causing the correction to be initialled by duly authorized representatives;

(b) by executing or exchanging an instrument or instruments setting out the correction which it has been agreed to make; or

(c) by executing a corrected text of the whole treaty by the same procedure as in the case of the original text.
2. Where the treaty is one for which there is a depositary, the latter shall notify the signatory States and the contracting States of the error and of the proposal to correct it and shall specify an appropriate time-limit within which objection to the proposed correction may be raised. If, on the expiry of the time-limit:

(a) no objection has been raised, the depositary shall make and initial the correction in the text and shall execute a procès-verbal of the rectification of the text and communicate a copy of it to the parties and to the States entitled to become parties to the treaty;

(b) an objection has been raised, the depositary shall communicate the objection to the signatory States and to the contracting States.

3. The rules in paragraphs 1 and 2 apply also where the text has been authenticated in two or more languages and it appears that there is a lack of concordance which the signatory States and the contracting States agree should be corrected.

4. The corrected text replaces the defective text ab initio, unless the signatory States and the contracting States otherwise decide.

5. The correction of the text of a treaty that has been registered shall be notified to the Secretariat of the United Nations.

6. Where an error is discovered in a certified copy of a treaty, the depositary shall execute a procès-verbal specifying the rectification and communicate a copy of it to the signatory States and to the contracting States.

Article 80
Registration and publication of treaties

1. Treaties shall, after their entry into force, be transmitted to the Secretariat of the United Nations for registration or filing and recording, as the case may be, and for publication.

2. The designation of a depositary shall constitute authorization for it to perform the acts specified in the preceding paragraph.

PART VIII.
FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 81
Signature

The present Convention shall be open for signature by all States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and by any other State invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a party to the Convention, as follows: until 30 November 1969, at the

Article 82
Ratification

The present Convention is subject to ratification. The instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 83
Accession

The present Convention shall remain open for accession by any State belonging to any of the categories mentioned in article 81. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 84
Entry into force

1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession.

2. For each State ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State of its instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 85
Authentic texts

The original of the present Convention, of which the Chinese, English, French, Russian and Spanish texts are equally authentic, shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized thereto by their respective Governments, have signed the present Convention.

DONE at Vienna this twenty-third day of May, one thousand nine hundred and sixty-nine.

ANNEX

1. A list of conciliators consisting of qualified jurists shall be drawn up and maintained by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. To this end, every State which is a Member of the United Nations or a party to the present Convention shall be invited to nominate two conciliators, and the names of the persons so nominated shall constitute the list. The term of a conciliator, including that of any conciliator nominated to fill a casual vacancy, shall be five years and may be renewed. A conciliator whose term expires shall continue to fulfil any function for which he shall have been chosen under the following paragraph.
2. When a request has been made to the Secretary-General under article 66, the Secretary-General shall bring the dispute before a conciliation commission constituted as follows:

The State or States constituting one of the parties to the dispute shall appoint:

(a) one conciliator of the nationality of that State or of one of those States, who may or may not be chosen from the list referred to in paragraph 1; and

(b) one conciliator not of the nationality of that State or of any of those States, who shall be chosen from the list.

The State or States constituting the other party to the dispute shall appoint two conciliators in the same way. The four conciliators chosen by the parties shall be appointed within sixty days following the date on which the Secretary-General receives the request.

The four conciliators shall, within sixty days following the date of the last of their own appointments, appoint a fifth conciliator chosen from the list, who shall be chairman.

If the appointment of the chairman or of any of the other conciliators has not been made within the period prescribed above for such appointment, it shall be made by the Secretary-General within sixty days following the expiry of that period. The appointment of the chairman may be made by the Secretary-General either from the list or from the membership of the International Law Commission. Any of the periods within which appointments must be made may be extended by agreement between the parties to the dispute.

Any vacancy shall be filled in the manner prescribed for the initial appointment.

3. The Conciliation Commission shall decide its own procedure. The Commission, with the consent of the parties to the dispute, may invite any party to the treaty to submit to it its views orally or in writing. Decisions and recommendations of the Commission shall be made by a majority vote of the five members.

4. The Commission may draw the attention of the parties to the dispute to any measures which might facilitate an amicable settlement.

5. The Commission shall hear the parties, examine the claims and objections, and make proposals to the parties with a view to reaching an amicable settlement of the dispute.

6. The Commission shall report within twelve months of its constitution. Its report shall be deposited with the Secretary-General and transmitted to the parties to the dispute. The report of the Commission, including any conclusions stated therein regarding the facts or questions of law, shall not be binding upon the parties and it shall have no other character than that of recommendations submitted for the consideration of the parties in order to facilitate an amicable settlement of the dispute.
7. The Secretary-General shall provide the Commission with such assistance and facilities as it may require. The expenses of the Commission shall be borne by the United Nations.
ANNEX 7
CHAPTER XXIII

LAW OF TREATIES

   Vienna, 23 May 1969

Entry into force: 27 January 1980, in accordance with article 84(1).

Registration: 27 January 1980, No. 18232

Status: Signatories: 45. Parties: 114


Note: The Convention was adopted on 22 May 1969 and opened for signature on 23 May 1969 by the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2166 (XXI)1 of 5 December 1966 and 2287 (XXII)2 of 6 December 1967. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 26 March to 24 May 1968 and the second session from 9 April to 22 May 1969. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain declarations and resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria. The text of the Final Act is included in document A/CONF.39/11/Add.2.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of Deposit</th>
<th>Date of Accession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bolivia (Plurinational State of)</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>1 Sep 1993 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bosnia and Herzegovina ²</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>1 Sep 1993 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>25 Sep 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulgaria</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>21 Apr 1987 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burkina Faso</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>25 May 2006 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambodia</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>23 Oct 1991 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cameroon</td>
<td></td>
<td>23 Oct 1991 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td></td>
<td>14 Oct 1970 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central African Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>10 Dec 1971 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>9 Apr 1981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>China ⁴</td>
<td></td>
<td>3 Sep 1997 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colombia</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>10 Apr 1985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Congo</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>12 Apr 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costa Rica</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>22 Nov 1996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Côte d'Ivoire</td>
<td>23 Jul 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Croatia ²</td>
<td></td>
<td>12 Oct 1992 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuba</td>
<td></td>
<td>9 Sep 1998 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td></td>
<td>28 Dec 1976 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Czech Republic ⁵</td>
<td></td>
<td>22 Feb 1993 d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic Republic of the Congo</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Jul 1977 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>18 Apr 1970</td>
<td>1 Jun 1976</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominican Republic</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 Apr 2010 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ecuador</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>11 Feb 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>11 Feb 1982 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>16 Feb 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estonia</td>
<td></td>
<td>21 Oct 1991 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethiopia</td>
<td>30 Apr 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>19 Aug 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gabon</td>
<td></td>
<td>5 Nov 2004 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td></td>
<td>8 Jun 1995 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany ⁶, ²</td>
<td>30 Apr 1970</td>
<td>21 Jul 1987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghana</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td></td>
<td>30 Oct 1974 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>21 Jul 1997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guinea</td>
<td></td>
<td>16 Sep 2005 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guyana</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>15 Sep 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haiti</td>
<td></td>
<td>25 Aug 1980 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holy See</td>
<td>30 Sep 1969</td>
<td>25 Feb 1977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honduras</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>20 Sep 1979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hungary</td>
<td></td>
<td>19 Jun 1987 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td></td>
<td>7 Aug 2006 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>22 Apr 1970</td>
<td>25 Jul 1974</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jamaica</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>28 Jul 1970</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td>2 Jul 1981 a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Country</td>
<td>Date</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kazakhstan</td>
<td>5 Jan 1994 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiribati</td>
<td>15 Sep 2005 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kuwait</td>
<td>11 Nov 1975 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kyrgyzstan</td>
<td>11 May 1999 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lao People's Democratic Republic</td>
<td>31 Mar 1998 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Latvia</td>
<td>4 May 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lesotho</td>
<td>3 Mar 1972 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liberia</td>
<td>23 May 1969 29 Aug 1985</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libya</td>
<td>22 Dec 2008 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liechtenstein</td>
<td>8 Feb 1990 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lithuania</td>
<td>15 Jan 1992 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Luxembourg</td>
<td>4 Sep 1969 23 May 2003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madagascar</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malawi</td>
<td>23 Aug 1983 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malaysia</td>
<td>27 Jul 1994 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maldives</td>
<td>14 Sep 2005 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mali</td>
<td>31 Aug 1998 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Malta</td>
<td>26 Sep 2012 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mauritius</td>
<td>18 Jan 1973 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>23 May 1969 25 Sep 1974</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mongolia</td>
<td>16 May 1988 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montenegro</td>
<td>23 Oct 2006 d</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
<td>23 May 1969 26 Sep 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mozambique</td>
<td>8 May 2001 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myanmar</td>
<td>16 Sep 1998 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nauru</td>
<td>5 May 1978 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nepal</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>9 Apr 1985 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>29 Apr 1970 4 Aug 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niger</td>
<td>27 Oct 1971 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nigeria</td>
<td>23 May 1969 31 Jul 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oman</td>
<td>18 Oct 1990 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>29 Apr 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Panama</td>
<td>28 Jul 1980 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paraguay</td>
<td>3 Feb 1972 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>23 May 1969 14 Sep 2000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>23 May 1969 15 Nov 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poland</td>
<td>2 Jul 1990 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>6 Feb 2004 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Korea</td>
<td>27 Nov 1969 27 Apr 1977</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Republic of Moldova</td>
<td>26 Jan 1993 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Russian Federation</td>
<td>29 Apr 1986 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rwanda</td>
<td>3 Jan 1980 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saudi Arabia</td>
<td>14 Apr 2003 a</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date of Ratification</th>
<th>Date of Accession</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senegal</td>
<td>11 Apr 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Serbia</td>
<td>12 Mar 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovakia</td>
<td>28 May 1993</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slovenia</td>
<td>6 Jul 1992</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solomon Islands</td>
<td>9 Aug 1989</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>16 May 1972</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>St. Vincent and the Grenadines</td>
<td>27 Apr 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State of Palestine</td>
<td>2 Apr 2014</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sudan</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>18 Apr 1990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suriname</td>
<td>31 Jan 1991</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>23 Apr 1970</td>
<td>4 Feb 1975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>7 May 1990</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Syrian Arab Republic</td>
<td>2 Oct 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tajikistan</td>
<td>6 May 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia</td>
<td>8 Jul 1999</td>
<td>12 Apr 1999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timor-Leste</td>
<td>8 Jan 2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Togo</td>
<td>28 Dec 1979</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinidad and Tobago</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tunisia</td>
<td>23 Jun 1971</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkmenistan</td>
<td>4 Jan 1996</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ukraine</td>
<td>14 May 1986</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Republic of Tanzania</td>
<td>12 Apr 1976</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States of America</td>
<td>24 Apr 1970</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uruguay</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td>5 Mar 1982</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Uzbekistan</td>
<td>12 Jul 1995</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Viet Nam</td>
<td>10 Oct 2001</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zambia</td>
<td>23 May 1969</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Declarations and Reservations**

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

**Afghanistan**

**Upon signature:**

"Afghanistan's understanding of article 62 (fundamental change of circumstances) is as follows:

"Sub-paragraph 2 (a) of this article does not cover unequal and illegal treaties, or any treaties which were contrary to the principle of self-determination. This view was also supported by the Expert Consultant in his statement of 11 May 1968 in the Committee of the Whole and on 14 May 1969 (doc. A/CONF.39/L.40) to the Conference."

**Algeria**

**Declaration:**

The accession of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria to the present Convention does not in any way mean recognition of Israel.

This accession shall not be interpreted as involving the establishment of relations of any kind whatever with Israel.
Reservation:

The Government of the People’s Democratic Republic of Algeria considers that the competence of the International Court of Justice cannot be exercised with respect to a dispute such as that envisaged in article 66 (a) at the request of one of the parties alone.

It declares that, in each case, the prior agreement of all the parties concerned is necessary for the dispute to be submitted to the said Court.

Argentina

(a) The Argentine Republic does not regard the rule contained in article 45 (b) as applicable to it inasmuch as the rule in question provides for the renunciation of rights in advance.

(b) The Argentine Republic does not accept the idea that a fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty; moreover, it objects to the reservations made by Afghanistan, Morocco and Syria with respect to article 62, paragraph 2 (a), and to any reservations to the same effect as those of the States referred to which may be made in the future with respect to article 62.

The application of this Convention to territories whose sovereignty is a subject of dispute between two or more States, whether or not they are parties to it, cannot be deemed to imply a modification, renunciation or abandonment of the position heretofore maintained by each of them.

Armenia

13 July 2006

Reservation

“The Republic of Armenia does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the application or the interpretation of any article of part V of the Convention to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to the Conciliation Commission for consideration the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.”

Belarus

[Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Russian Federation.]

Belgium

21 June 1993

Reservation:

The Belgian State will not be bound by articles 53 and 64 of the Convention with regard to any party which, in formulating a reservation concerning article 66 (a), objects to the settlement procedure established by this article.

Bolivia (Plurinational State of)

Upon signature:

1. The shortcomings of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties are such as to postpone the realization of the aspirations of mankind.

2. Nevertheless, the rules endorsed by the Convention do represent significant advances, based on the principles of international justice which Bolivia has traditionally supported.
### Brazil

**Reservation:**

... with a reservation to articles 25 and 66.

### Bulgaria

**Declaration:**

The People's Republic of Bulgaria considers it necessary to underline that articles 81 and 83 of the Convention, which preclude a number of States from becoming parties to it, are of an unjustifiably restrictive character. These provisions are incompatible with the very nature of the Convention, which is of a universal character and should be open for accession by all States.

### Canada

"In acceding to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of Canada declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relation to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of Canada declares that it does not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing 'some other method of peaceful settlement' within the meaning of paragraph 2 (a) of the declaration of the Government of Canada accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on April 7, 1970."

### Chile

**Reservation:**

The Republic of Chile declares its adherence to the general principle of the immutability of treaties, without prejudice to the right of States to stipulate, in particular, rules which modify this principle, and for this reason formulates a reservation relating to the provisions of article 62, paragraphs 1 and 3, of the Convention, which it considers inapplicable to Chile.

### China

**Reservation:**

1. The People's Republic of China makes its reservation to article 66 of the said Convention.

**Declaration:**

2. The signature to the said Convention by the Taiwan authorities on 27 April 1970 in the name of "China" is illegal and therefore null and void.

### Colombia

**Reservation:**

With regard to article 25, Colombia formulates the reservation that the Political Constitution of Colombia does not recognize the provisional application of treaties; it is the responsibility of the National Congress to approve or disapprove any treaties and conventions which the Government concludes with other States or with international legal entities.

### Costa Rica

**Reservations and declarations made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:**

1. With regard to articles 11 and 12, the delegation of Costa Rica wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Costa Rican system of constitutional law does not authorize any form of consent which is not subject to ratification by the Legislative Assembly.

2. With regard to article 25, it wishes to make a reservation to the effect that the Political Constitution of Costa...
Rica does not permit the provisional application of treaties, either.

3. With regard to article 27, it interprets this article as referring to secondary law and not to the provisions of the Political Constitution.

4. With regard to article 38, its interpretation is that no customary rule of general international law shall take precedence over any rule of the Inter-American System to which, in its view, this Convention is supplementary.

**Cuba**

*Reservation:*

The Government of the Republic of Cuba enters an explicit reservation to the procedure established under article 66 of the Convention, since it believes that any dispute should be settled by any means adopted by agreement between the parties to the dispute; the Republic of Cuba therefore cannot accept solutions which provide means for one of the parties, without the consent of the other to submit the dispute to procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation.

*Declaration:*

The Government of the Republic of Cuba declares that the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties essentially codified and systematized the norms that had been established by custom and other sources of international law concerning negotiation, signature, ratification, entry into force, termination and other stipulations relating to international treaties; hence, those provisions, owing to their compulsory character, by virtue of having been established by universally recognized sources of international law, particularly those relating to invalidity, termination and suspension of the application of treaties, are applicable to any treaty negotiated by the Republic of Cuba prior to the aforesaid convention, essentially, treaties, covenants and concessions negotiated under conditions of inequality or which disregard or diminish its sovereignty and territorial integrity.

**Czech Republic**

**Denmark**

As between itself and any State which formulates, wholly or in part, a reservation relating to the provisions of article 66 of the Convention concerning the compulsory settlement of certain disputes, Denmark will not consider itself bound by those provisions of part V of the Convention, according to which the procedures for settlement set forth in article 66 are not to apply in the event of reservations formulated by other States.

**Ecuador**

Upon signature:

In signing this Convention, Ecuador has not considered it necessary to make any reservation in regard to article 4 of the Convention because it understands that the rules referred to in the first part of article 4 include the principle of the peaceful settlement of disputes, which is set forth in Article 2, paragraph 3 of the Charter of the United Nations and which, as *jus cogens*, has universal and mandatory force.

Ecuador also considers that the first part of article 4 is applicable to existing treaties.

It wishes to place on record, in this form, its view that the said article 4 incorporates the indisputable principle that, in cases where the Convention codifies rules of *lex lata*, these rules, as pre-existing rules, may be invoked and applied to treaties signed before the entry into force of this Convention, which is the instrument codifying the rules.

Upon ratification:

In ratifying this Convention, Ecuador wishes to place on record its adherence to the principles, norms and methods of peaceful settlement of disputes provided for in the Charter of the United Nations and in other international instruments on the subject, which have been expressly included in the Ecuadorian legal system in article 4, paragraph 3, of the Political Constitution of the Republic.

**Finland**
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“Finland also declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, Finland will consider itself bound neither by those procedural provisions nor by the substantive provisions of part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation.”

**Germany**

**Upon signature:**

“The Federal Republic of Germany reserves the right, upon ratifying the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to state its views on the declarations made by other States upon signing or ratifying or acceding to that Convention and to make reservations regarding certain provisions of the said Convention.”

**Upon ratification:**

2. The Federal Republic of Germany assumes that the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice brought about by consent of States outside the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties cannot be excluded by invoking the provisions of article 66 (b) of the Convention.


**Guatemala**

**Upon signature:**

Reservations:

I. Guatemala cannot accept any provision of this Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the Territory of Belize.

II. Guatemala will not apply articles [...], 25 and 66 in so far as they are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic.

III. Guatemala will apply the provision contained in article 38 only in cases where it considers that it is in the national interest to do so.

**Upon ratification:**

Reservations:

(a) The Republic of Guatemala formally confirms reservations I and III which it formulated upon signing the [said Convention], to the effect, respectively, that Guatemala could not accept any provision of the Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the territory of Belize and that it would apply the provision contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so;

(b) With respect to reservation II, which was formulated on the same occasion and which indicated that the Republic of Guatemala would not apply articles [...], 25 and 66 of the [said Convention] insofar as they were contrary to the Constitution, Guatemala states:

(b) (I) That it confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 25 and 66 of the Convention, insofar as both are incompatible with provisions of the Political Constitution currently in force;

(b) (II) [...]

Guatemala’s consent to be bound by a treaty is subject to compliance with the requirements and procedures established in its Political Constitution. For Guatemala, the signature or initialling of a treaty by its representative is always understood to be *ad referendum* and subject, in either case, to confirmation by its Government.

(c) A reservation is hereby formulated with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of its secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

**Hungary**

---
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**Kuwait**

The participation of Kuwait in this Convention does not mean in any way recognition of Israel by the Government of the State of Kuwait and that furthermore, no treaty relations will arise between the State of Kuwait and Israel.

**Mongolia**

*Declarations:*

1. The Mongolian People's Republic declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the case of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic deems it appropriate to draw attention to the discriminatory nature of article 81 and 83 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that the Convention should be open for accession by all States.

**Morocco**

*Reservation made upon signature and confirmed upon ratification:*

1. Morocco interprets paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 (Fundamental change of circumstances) as not applying to unlawful or inequitable treaties, or to any treaty contrary to the principle of self-determination. Morocco’s views on paragraph 2 (a) were supported by the Expert Consultant in his statements in the Committee of the Whole on 11 May 1968 and before the Conference in plenary on 14 May 1969 (see Document A/CONF.39/L.40).

2. It shall be understood that Morocco’s signature of this Convention does not in any way imply that it recognized Israel. Furthermore, no treaty relationships will be established between Morocco and Israel.

**Netherlands**

*Declaration:*

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands does not regard the provisions of Article 66 (b) of the Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of the declaration of the Kingdom of the Netherlands accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on 1 August 1956."

**New Zealand**

*Declaration:*

The Government of New Zealand declares its understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to exclude the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under the provisions of any treaty in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In relations to states parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of New Zealand declares that it will not regard the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of this phrase where it appears in the declaration of the Government of New Zealand accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the League of Nations on 8 April 1940."

**Oman**

*Declaration:*

According to the understanding of the Government of the Sultanate of Oman the implementation of paragraph (2) of article (62) of the said Convention does not include those Treaties which are contrary to the right to self-determination.

**Peru**


**Reservation:**
For the Government of Peru, the application of articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention must be understood in accordance with, and subject to, the process of treaty signature, approval, ratification, accession and entry into force stipulated by its constitutional provisions.

**Portugal**

*Declaration:*
"Article 66" of the Vienna of the Convention is inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which it relates. Therefore, Portugal declares that as to its relation with any State which has made or makes a reservation to the effect that this State will not be bound by some or all of the provisions of article 66, it will consider itself bound neither by those procedural norms nor by the substantive norms of Part V of the Convention to which the procedures provided for in Article 66 do not apply as a result of the said reservation. However, Portugal does not object to the entry into force of the remaining of the Convention between the Portuguese Republic and such a State and considers that the absence of treaty relations between itself and that State with regard to all or certain norms of Part V will not in any way impair the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law in dependently of the Convention”.

**Russian Federation**

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that, in order for any dispute among the Contracting Parties concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision or for any dispute concerning the application or interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to be submitted for consideration by the Conciliation Commission, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the Conciliation Commission may only be persons appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics will consider that it is not obligated by the provisions of article 20, paragraph 3 or of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

*Declaration:*
The Union of Soviet Socialist Republics declares that it reserves the right to take any measures to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

**Saudi Arabia**

*Reservation:*
"... with a reservation regarding Article 66 so that the recourse to judgement or to arbitration should be preceded by agreement between the two countries concerned.”

**Slovakia**

**Syrian Arab Republic**

A–Acceptance of this Convention by the Syrian Arab Republic and ratification of it by its Government shall in no way signify recognition of Israel and cannot have as a result the establishment with the latter of any contact governed by the provisions of this Convention.

B–The Syrian Arab Republic considers that article 81 is not in conformity with the aims and purposes of the Convention in that it does not allow all States, without distinction or discrimination, to become parties to it.

C–The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic does not in any case accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, referred to in article 62, paragraph 2 (a), inasmuch as it regards this as a flagrant violation of an obligatory norm which forms part of general international law and which recognizes the right of peoples to self-determination.

D–The Government of the Syrian Arab Republic interprets the provisions in article 52 as follows:
The expression "the threat or use of force" used in this article extends also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests.

E–The accession of the Syrian Arab Republic to this Convention and the ratification of it by its Government shall not apply to the Annex to the Convention, which concerns obligatory conciliation.

Tunisia

The dispute referred to in article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision.

Ukraine

[Same reservations and declaration, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, as the one made by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics.]

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

Upon signature:

"In signing the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland declare their understanding that nothing in article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice, the Government of the United Kingdom declare that they will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of article 66 of the Vienna Convention as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom accepting as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

"The Government of the United Kingdom, while reserving their position for the time being with regard to other declarations and reservations made by various States on signing the Convention, consider it necessary to state that the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim in respect of the territory of British Honduras."

Upon ratification:

It is [the United Kingdom's] understanding that nothing in Article 66 of the Convention is intended to oust the jurisdiction of the International Court of Justice where such jurisdiction exists under any provisions in force binding the parties with regard to the settlement of disputes. In particular, and in relation to States parties to the Vienna Convention which accept as compulsory the jurisdiction of the International Court, the United Kingdom will not regard the provisions of sub-paragraph (b) of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as providing "some other method of peaceful settlement" within the meaning of sub-paragraph (i) (a) of the Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom which was deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations on the 1st of January 1969.

United Republic of Tanzania

"Article 66 of the Convention shall not be applied to the United Republic of Tanzania by any State which enters a reservation on any provision of part V or the whole of that part of the Convention."

Viet Nam

Reservation:

“Acceding to this Convention, the Socialist Republic of Vietnam makes its reservation to article 66 of the said Convention.”

Objections

(Unless otherwise indicated the objections were made upon ratification, accession or succession.)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Text</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Algeria</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Government of the People's Democratic Republic of Algeria, dedicated to the principle of the inviolability of the frontiers inherited on accession to independence, expresses an objection to the reservation entered by the Kingdom of Morocco with regard to paragraph 2 (a) of article 62 of the Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>16 September 1998</td>
<td>With respect to the reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“Austria is of the view that the Guatemalan reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of [the said Convention] many of which are solidly based on international customary law. The reservations could call into question well-established and universally accepted norms. Austria is of the view that the reservations also raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the [said Convention]. Austria therefore objects to these reservations. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the [said Convention] between Austria and Guatemala.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>22 October 1971</td>
<td>“. . . Canada does not consider itself in treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic in respect of those provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties to which the compulsory conciliation procedures set out in the annex to that Convention are applicable.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Republic of Chile formulates an objection to the reservations which have been made or may be made in the future relating to article 62, paragraph 2, of the Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td></td>
<td>With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>“These reservations refer to general rules of [the said Convention], many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservation - if accepted - could call to question well established and universally accepted norms. It is the opinion of the Government of Denmark that the reservations are not compatible with the object and purpose of [said Convention]. It is in the common interest of States that treaties to which they have chosen to become Parties are respected, as to their object and purpose, by all Parties and that States are prepared to undertake any legislative changes necessary to comply with their obligations under the treaties. The Government of Denmark therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to [the said Convention]. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of [the said Convention] between Guatemala and Denmark and will thus enter into force between Guatemala and Denmark without Guatemala benefitting from these reservations.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egypt</td>
<td></td>
<td>The Arab Republic of Egypt does not consider itself bound by part V of the Convention vis-à-vis States which formulate reservations concerning the procedures for judicial settlement and compulsory arbitration set forth in article 66 and in the annex to the Convention, and it rejects reservations made to the provisions of part V of the Convention.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>16 September 1998</td>
<td>With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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These reservations which consist of general references to national law and which do not clearly specify the extent of the derogation from the provisions of the Convention, may create serious doubts about the commitment of the reserving State as to the object and purpose of the Convention and may contribute to undermining the basis of international treaty law. In addition, the Government of Finland considers the reservation to article 27 of the Convention particularly problematic as it is a well-established rule of customary international law. The Government of Finland would like to recall that according to article 19 c of the [said] Convention, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention shall not be permitted.

The Government of Finland therefore objects to these reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to the [said] Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Guatemala and Finland. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Guatemala benefiting from these reservations.”

Germany

1. The Federal Republic of Germany rejects the reservations made by Tunisia, the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic and with regard to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties as incompatible with the object and purpose of the said Convention. In this connection it wishes to point out that, as stressed on numerous other occasions, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers articles 53 and 64 to be inextricably linked to article 66 (a).

Objections, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, were also formulated by the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 27 January 1988: in respect of reservations formulated by Bulgaria, the Hungarian People’s Republic and the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic.
(ii) 21 September 1988: in respect of the reservation made by Mongolia;
(iii) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

12 June 2002

With respect to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has examined the reservation to article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam at the time of its accession to the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany considers that the dispute settlement procedure provided for by article 66 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V of the Convention and was indeed the basis on which the Vienna Conference accepted elements of Part V. The dispute settlement set forth in article 66 therefore is an essential part of the Convention.

The Government of the Republic of Germany is thus of the view that the reservation excluding that procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation to be followed in case of a dispute, raises doubts as to the full commitment of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam to the object and purpose of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.


This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam”.

Israel

16 March 1970

"The Government of Israel has noted the political character of paragraph 2 in the declaration made by the Government of Morocco on that occasion. In the view of the Government of Israel, this Convention is not the proper place for making such political pronouncements. Moreover, that declaration cannot in any way affect the obligations of Morocco already existing under general international law or under particular treaties. The Government of Israel will, in so far as concerns the substance of the matter, adopt towards the Government of Morocco an attitude of complete reciprocity.”

16 November 1970

[With respect of declaration "A" made by the Syrian Arab Republic, same declaration, in essence, as the one above.]
Japan

1. "The Government of Japan objects to any reservation in tended to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the pro-visions of article 66 and the Annex concerning the obligatory procedures for settlement of disputes and does not consider Japan to be in treaty relations with any State which has formulated or will formulate such reservation, in respect of those provisions of Part V of the Convention regarding which the application of the obligatory procedures mentioned above are to be excluded as a result of the said reservation. Accordingly, the treaty relations between Japan and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and the treaty relations between Japan and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan does not accept the interpre-tation of article 52 put forward by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic, since that interpretation does not correctly reflect the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion."

3 April 1987

"[In view of its declaration made upon accession] . . . . the Government of Japan objects to the reservations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 66 and the Annex of the Convention and reaffirms the position of Japan that [it] will not be in treaty relations with the above States in respect of the provisions of Part V of the Convention.

2. The Government of Japan objects to the reservation made by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics to article 20, paragraph 3.

3. The Government of Japan objects to the declarations made by the Governments of the German Democratic Republic and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics reserving their right to take any measures to safeguard their interests in the event of the non-observance by other States of the provisions of the Conven tion."

Netherlands

"The Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the opinion that the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66 of the Convention, are an important part of the Con- vention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers it necessary to object to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State, the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that their treaty relations will not include the provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of the procedures regarding the settlement of disputes, as laid down in Article 66, wholly or in part is excluded.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the absence of treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and such a State with regard to all or certain provisions of Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Convention.

For the reasons set out above, the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the submission to the International Court of Justice of a dispute referred to in Article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties there to. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Syrian Arab Republic and the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Tunisia will not include Article 53 and 64 of the Convention."

Objections, identical in essence, mutatis mutandis, were also formulated by the Government of the Netherlands in regard to reservations made by various states, as follows:

(i) 25 September 1987: in respect of reservations formulated by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the Byelorussian Soviet Socialist Republic, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic and the German Democratic Republic;

(ii) 14 July 1988: in respect of reservations made by the Government of Bulgaria, Czechoslovakia and Hungary;

(iii) 28 July 1988: in respect of one of the reservations made by Mongolia;

(iv) 30 January 1989: in respect of the reservation made by Algeria.

(v) 14 September 1998: in respect of the reservation to article 66 made by Guatemala.

15 November 1999
In regard to the reservation made by Cuba upon accession:

“In conformity with the terms of the objections the Kingdom of the Netherlands must be deemed to have objected to the reservation, excluding wholly or in part the procedures for the settlement of disputes, contained in article 66 of the Convention, as formulated by Cuba. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Cuba under the Convention do not include any of the provisions contained in Part V of the Convention. The Kingdom of the Netherlands reiterates that the absence of treaty relations between itself and Cuba in respect of Part V of the Convention will not in any way impair the duty of Cuba to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independent of the Convention.”

11 October 2001

In regard to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation made by the Government of Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands notes that the articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Peru.

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru as to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

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

The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands therefore objects to the aforesaid reservation made by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

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

4 December 2001

In regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

“The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has examined the reservation with regard to article 66 made by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam at the time of its accession to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, concluded on 23 May 1969, and refers to the objections formulated by the Kingdom of the Netherlands upon its accession to the above-mentioned Convention on 9 April 1985.

In conformity with the terms of the objections the Kingdom of the Netherlands must be deemed to have objected to the reservation formulated by the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam, excluding wholly the procedures for the settlement of disputes contained in article 66 of the Convention. Accordingly, the treaty relations between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam under the Convention do not include any of the provisions contained in Part V of the Convention.

The Kingdom of the Netherlands stresses that the absence of treaty relations between itself and the Socialist Republic of Viet Nam in respect of Part V of the Convention will not in any way impair the duty of Viet Nam to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions, to which it is bound under international law, independent of the Convention.”

4 December 2001

New Zealand

14 October 1971

“...The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria to the obligatory conciliation procedures contained in the Annex to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between New Zealand and Syria.”

10 August 1972

“...The New Zealand Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 (a) of the Convention and does not consider New Zealand to be in treaty relations with Tunisia in respect of those provisions of the Convention to which the dispute settlement procedure provided for in Article 66 (a) is applicable.”

10 August 1972
Sweden

4 February 1975

"Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called *jus cogens*, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion.

"The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.

"For the reasons set out above, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which its accession to the Convention shall not include the Annex, and to the reservation of Tunisia, according to which the dispute referred to in article 66 (a) requires the consent of all parties thereto in order to be submitted to the International Court of Justice for a decision. In view of these reservations, the Swedish Government considers, firstly, that the treaty relations between Sweden and the Syrian Arab Republic will not include those provisions of Part V of the Convention to which the conciliation procedure in the Annex applies and, secondly, that the treaty relations between Sweden and Tunisia will not include articles 53 and 64 of the Convention.

"The Swedish Government has also taken note of the declaration of the Syrian Arab Republic, according to which it interprets the expression "the threat or use of force" as used in article 52 of the Convention so as to extend also to the employment of economic, political, military and psychological coercion and to all types of coercion constraining a State to conclude a treaty against its wishes or its interests. On this point, the Swedish Government observes that since article 52 refers to threat or use of force in violation of the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, it should be interpreted in the light of the practice which has developed or will develop on the basis of the Charter."

16 September 1998

With regard to reservations made by Guatemala upon ratification:

"The Government of Sweden is of the view that these reservations raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservations could call into question well established and universally accepted norms.

The Government of Sweden notes in particular that the Government of Guatemala has entered a reservation that it would apply the provisions contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so; and furthermore a reservation with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

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

The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Government of Guatemala to the [said] Convention.

This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Guatemala and Sweden. The Convention will thus become operative between the two States without Guatemala benefiting from this reservation."

17 November 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Cuba upon accession:
“The Government of Sweden wishes to recall its statements of the 4th of February 1975, made in connection with its ratification of the Convention, relating to the accession of the Syrian Arab Republic and the Republic of Tunisia respectively, which reads as follows: ‘Article 66 of the Convention contains certain provisions regarding procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation. According to these provisions a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64, which deal with the so called jus cogens, may be submitted to the International Court of Justice. If the dispute concerns the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the Convention, the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention may be set in motion. The Swedish Government considers that these provisions regarding the settlement of disputes are an important part of the Convention and that they cannot be separated from the substantive rules with which they are connected. Consequently, the Swedish Government considers it necessary to raise objections to any reservation which is made by another State and whose aim is to exclude the application, wholly or in part, of the provisions regarding the settlement of disputes. While not objecting to the entry into force of the Convention between Sweden and such a State, the Swedish Government considers that their treaty relations will not include either the procedural provision in respect of which a reservation has been made or the substantive provisions to which that procedural provision relates.’ For the reasons set out above, which also apply to the reservation made by the Republic of Cuba, the Swedish Government objects to the reservation entered by the Government of the Republic of Cuba to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.”

25 July 2001

With regard to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification:

“The Government of Sweden has examined the reservation made by Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

The Government of Sweden notes that articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention are being made subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing legislation in Peru.

The Government of Sweden is of the view that, in the absence of further clarification, this reservation raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru to the object and purpose of the Convention and would like to recall that, according to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted.

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


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

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

“The United Kingdom does not accept that the interpretation of Article 52 put forward by the Government of Syria correctly reflects the conclusions reached at the Conference of Vienna on the subject of coercion; the Conference dealt with this matter by adopting a Declaration on this subject which forms part of the Final Act;

“The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Syria in respect of Article 66 of the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Syria;

“With reference to a reservation in relation to the territory of British Honduras made by Guatemala on signing the Convention, the United Kingdom does not accept that Guatemala has any rights or any valid claim with respect to that territory; “The United Kingdom fully reserves its position in other respects with regard to the declarations made by various States on signature, to some of which the United Kingdom would object, if they were to be confirmed on ratification.”

22 June 1972

“... The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by the Government of Tunisia in respect of Article 66 (a) of the Convention and does not accept the entry into force of the Convention as between the United Kingdom and Tunisia.”

7 December 1977

“The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland note that the instrument of ratification of the Government of Finland, which was deposited with the Secretary-General on 19 August 1977,
contains a declaration relating to paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention. The Government of the United
Kingdom wish to inform the Secretary-General that they do not regard that declaration as in any way
affecting the interpretation or application of article 7."

5 June 1987

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation
entered by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics by which it rejects the application of article
66 of the Convention. Article 66 provides in certain circumstances for the compulsory settlement of disputes by
the International Court of Justice (in the case of disputes concerning the application or interpretation of articles
53 or 64) or by a conciliation procedure (in the case of the rest of Part V of the Convention). These provisions are
inextricably linked with the provisions of Part V to which they relate. Their inclusion was the basis on which those
parts of Part V which represent progressive development of international law were accepted by the Vienna
Conference. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the Soviet
Union include Part V of the Convention.

With respect to any other reservation the intention of which is to exclude the application, in whole or in part,
of the provisions of article 66, to which the United Kingdom has already objected or which is made after the
reservation by the Government of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the United Kingdom will not consider
its treaty relations with the State which has formulated or will formulate such a reservation as including those
provisions of Part V of the Convention with regard to which the application of article 66 is rejected by the
reservation.

The instrument of accession deposited by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics included also a declaration
that it reserves the right to take "any measures" to safeguard its interests in the event of the non-observance by
other States of the provisions of the Convention. The purpose and scope of this statement is unclear; but, given
that the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics has rejected the application of article 66 of the Convention, it would
seem to apply rather to acts by Parties to the Convention in respect of treaties where such acts are in breach of the
Convention. In such circumstances a State would not be limited in its response to the measures in article 60:
under customary international law it would be entitled to take other measures, provided always that they are
reasonable and in proportion to the breach."

11 October 1989

With regard to the reservation made by Algeria upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom wish in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 [in
respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] which in accordance with its terms applies to
the reservations mentioned above, and will similarly apply to any like reservations which any other State may
formulate."

19 November 1999

With regard to the reservation made by Cuba upon accession:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland objects to the reservation [...].
The Government of the United Kingdom wishes in this context to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 [in
respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics] which in accordance with its terms applies to
the reservation mentioned above, and will apply similarly to any like reservation which any other State may
formulate. Accordingly the United Kingdom does not consider that the treaty relations between it and the
Republic of Cuba include Part V of the Convention."

22 July 2002

With regard to the reservation made by Viet Nam upon accession:

"The instrument of accession deposited by the Government of the Socialist Republic of Vietnam contains a
reservation in respect of article 66 of the Convention. The United Kingdom objects to the reservation entered by
the Socialist Republic of Vietnam in respect of article 66 and does not accept the entry into force of the
Convention as between the United Kingdom and the Socialist Republic of Vietnam."

United States of America

26 May 1971
The Government of the United States of America objects to reservation E of the Syrian instrument of accession:

"In the view of the United States Government that reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Convention and undermines the principle of impartial settlement of disputes concerning the invalidity, termination, and suspension of the operation of treaties, which was the subject of extensive negotiation at the Vienna Conference.

"The United States Government intends, at such time as it may become a party to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, to reaffirm its objection to the foregoing reservation and to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V of the Convention with regard to which the Syrian Arab Republic has rejected the obligatory conciliation procedures set forth in the Annex to the Convention.

"The United States Government is also concerned about Syrian reservation C declaring that the Syrian Arab Republic does not accept the non-applicability of the principle of a fundamental change of circumstances with regard to treaties establishing boundaries, as stated in Article 62, 2 (a), and Syrian reservation D concerning its interpretation of the expression ‘the threat or use of force’ in Article 52. However, in view of the United States Government’s intention to reject treaty relations with the Syrian Arab Republic under all provisions in Part V to which reservations C and D relate, we do not consider it necessary at this time to object formally to those reservations.

"The United States Government will consider that the absence of treaty relations between the United States of America and the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to certain provisions in Part V will not in any way impair the duty of the latter to fulfil any obligation embodied in those provisions to which it is subject under international law independently of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

29 September 1972

". . . The United States of America objects to the reservation by Tunisia to paragraph (a) of Article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties regarding a dispute as to the interpretation or application of Article 53 or 64. The right of a party to invoke the provisions of Article 53 or 64 is inextricably linked with the provisions of Article 42 regarding impeachment of the validity of a treaty and paragraph (a) of Article 66 regarding the right of any party to submit to the International Court of Justice for decision any dispute concerning the application or interpretation of Article 53 or 64.

"Accordingly, the United States Government intends, at such time as it becomes a party to the Convention, to reaffirm its objection to the Tunisian reservation and declare that it will not consider that Article 53 or 64 of the Convention is in force between the United States of America and Tunisia."-

Notifications made under the Annex (paragraphs 1 and 2) (List of conciliators nominated for the purpose of constituting a conciliation commission) (For the list of conciliators whose nomination was not renewed, see note 21 hereinafter). HI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Nominations:</th>
<th>Date of deposit of notification with the Secretary-General:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Austria 22 | Ambassador Helmut Türk 8 Jan 2001
| Austria 22 | Professor Karl Zemanek 8 Jan 2001
| Croatia | Dr. Stanko Nick 14 Dec 1992
| Croatia | Professor Dr. Budislav Vukas 14 Dec 1992
| Denmark 22 | Prof. Isi Foighel 7 Mar 1995
| Denmark 22 | Ambassador Skjold Gustav Mellhin 7 Mar 1995
| Germany | Prof. Dr. Wolff Heintschel von Heinegg 12 Mar 2001
| Germany | Dr. Andreas Zimmermann 12 March 2001
| Paraguay | Dr. Luis María Ramírez Boettner 22 Sep 1994
| Paraguay | Dr. Jerónimo Irisa Burgos 22 Sept 1994
Portugal

Professor Wladimir Brito  5 Oct 2011

Portugal

Professor Francisco Ferreira de Almelda  5 Oct 2011

Slovakia

Dr. Igor Grexa, Director-General for Legal and Consular Affairs, Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Slovakia  9 Jul 2004

Spain

Sr. D. José Antonio Pastor Ridruejo  3 Jan 2001

Spain

Sr. D. Aurelio Pérez Giralda  3 Jan 2001

Sweden

Mr. Hans Danelius  17 Feb 1994

Sweden

Mr. Love Gustav-Adolf Kellberg  17 Feb 1994

Switzerland

Mr. Lucius Caflisch, Judge at the European Court of Human Rights  6 March 2008

Switzerland

Mr. Walter Kälin, Professor of Public Law and International Law at the University of Berne  6 March 2008

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Mrs. Elena Andreevska, Director of the Directorate on International Law  3 Mar 1999

The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia

Mr. Goran Stecevski, Director of the Directorate on International Law  27 April 2011

End Note


3. The former Yugoslavia had signed and ratified the Convention on 23 May 1969 and 27 August 1970, respectively. See also note 1 under "Bosnia and Herzegovina", "Croatia", "former Yugoslavia", "Slovenia", "The Former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia" and "Yugoslavia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

4. Signed on behalf of the Republic of China on 27 April 1970. See note concerning signatures, ratifications, accessions, etc., on behalf of China (note 1 under "China" in the "Historical Information" secton in the front matter of this volume).

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics stated that the said signature was irregular since the so-called "Government of China" represented no one and had no right to speak on behalf of China, there being only one Chinese State in the world—the People's Republic of China.

The Permanent Mission of Bulgaria to the United Nations later addressed to the Secretary-General a similar communication.

In two letters addressed to the Secretary-General in regard to the above-mentioned communications, the Permanent Representative of China to the United Nations stated that the Republic of China, a sovereign State and Member of the United Nations, had attended the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties in 1968 and 1969, contributed to the formulation of the Convention concerned and signed it, and that "any statements or reservations to the said Convention that are incompatible with or derogatory to the legitimate position of the Government of the Republic of China shall in no way affect the rights and obligations of the Republic of China as a signatory of the said Convention".

5. Czechoslovakia had acceded to the Convention on 29 July 1987, with a reservation. By a communication received on 19 October 1990, the Government of Czechoslovakia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with respect to article 66 of the Convention, which reads as follows: The Czechoslovak Socialist Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention and declares that, in accordance with the principle of sovereign equality of States, for any dispute to be submitted to the International Court of Justice or to a conciliation procedure, the consent of all the parties to the dispute is required in each separate case.
See also note 1 under "Czech Republic" and note 1 under "Slovakia" in the "Historical Information" section in the front matter of this volume.

6. The German Democratic Republic had acceded to the Convention on 20 October 1986 with the following reservation and declarations:

Reservation:
The German Democratic Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention. In order to submit a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or to submit a dispute on the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles of Part V of the Convention to the Conciliation Commission for consideration it shall be necessary in every single case to have the consent of all Parties to the dispute. The members of the Conciliation commission shall be appointed jointly by the Parties to the dispute.

Declarations:
The German Democratic Republic declares that it reserves itself the right to take measures to protect its interests in the case that other States would not comply with the provisions of the Convention.
The German Democratic Republic holds the view that the provisions of articles 81 and 83 of the Convention are in contradiction to the principle according to which any State, the policy of which is guided by the purposes and principles of the United Nations Charter, has the right to become a Party to Conventions affecting the interests of all States.

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

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

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

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

10. With reference to this signature, communications have been addressed to the Secretary-General by the Permanent Missions to the United Nations of Bulgaria, Mongolia and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, stating that the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not under any circumstances speak on behalf of Korea.

In a communication addressed to the Secretary-General the Permanent Observer of the Republic of Korea to the United Nations declared that the above-mentioned statement by the Permanent Mission of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics was without legal foundation and therefore neither affected the legitimate act of signing the Convention by the Government of the Republic of Korea nor prejudiced the rights and obligations of the Republic of Korea under it. He further stated that "in this connexion, it should be noted that the General Assembly of the United Nations declared at its third session and has continuously reaffirmed thereafter that the Government of the Republic of Korea is the only lawful Government in Korea".

Subsequently, in a communication received on 24 October 2002, the Government of Bulgaria informed the Secretary-General of the following:

"... upon signature of the above Convention by the Republic of Korea, in 1971, the Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria[,] in [a] communication addressed to the Secretary-General with reference to the above-mentioned signature, ... stated that its Government considered the said signature was illegal inasmuch as the South Korean authorities could not speak on behalf of Korea.

Now therefore [the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria declares] that the Government of the Republic of Bulgaria, having reviewed the said declaration, hereby withdraws the same."

11. Within a period of one year from the date of the depositary notification transmitting the reservation (i.e. 13 July 2005), none of the Contracting Parties to the said Convention had notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged. Consequently, the reservation in question was accepted for deposit upon the above-stipulated one year period, that is on 13 July 2006.

12. On 18 February 1993, the Government of Belgium notified the Secretary-General that its instrument of accession should have specified that the said accession was made subject to the said reservation. None of the Contracting Parties to the Agreement having notified the Secretary-General of an objection either to the deposit itself or to the procedure envisaged, within a period of 90 days from the date its circulation (23 March 1993), the reservation is deemed to have been accepted.

13. In a notification received on 6 May 1994, the Government of Bulgaria notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw the reservation made upon accession with regard to article 66 (a), which read as follows: The People's Republic of Bulgaria does not consider itself bound by the provision of article 66, paragraph a) of the Convention, according to which any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation
of article 53 or 64 may, by a written application, submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision unless the parties by common consent agree to submit the dispute to arbitration. The Government of the People's Republic of Bulgaria states that for the submission of such a dispute to the International Court of Justice for a decision, the preliminary consent of all parties to the dispute is needed.

14. In this regard, on 13 October 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland the following communication: "The Government of the United Kingdom object to the reservation entered by Costa Rica in respect of article 27 and reiterate their observation in respect of the similar reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala."

15. On 20 April 2001, the Government of Finland informed the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw its declaration in respect of article 7 (2) made upon ratification. The text of the declaration reads as follows:
"Finland declares its understanding that nothing in paragraph 2 of article 7 of the Convention is intended to modify any provisions of internal law in force in any Contracting State concerning competence to conclude treaties. Under the Constitution of Finland the competence to conclude treaties is given to the President of the Republic, who also decides on the issuance of full powers to the Head of Government and the Minister for Foreign Affairs.

16. On 15 March 2007, the Government of Guatemala informed the Secretary-General of that it had decided the following:
"Withdraw in their entirety the reservations formulated by the Republic of Guatemala on 23 May 1969 and confirmed upon 14 May 1997 to Articles 11 and 12 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties."

The text of the reservations made upon signature and ratification read as follows:

Upon signature:
Reservations:
I. Guatemala cannot accept any provision of this Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the Territory of Belize.
II. Guatemala will not apply articles 11, 12, 25 and 66 in so far as they are contrary to the provisions of the Constitution of the Republic.
III. Guatemala will apply the provision contained in article 38 only in cases where it considers that it is in the national interest to do so.

Upon ratification:
Reservations:
(a) The Republic of Guatemala formally confirms reservations I and III which it formulated upon signing the [said Convention], to the effect, respectively, that Guatemala could not accept any provision of the Convention which would prejudice its rights and its claim to the territory of Belize and that it would apply the provision contained in article 38 of the Convention only in cases where it considered that it was in the national interest to do so; (b) With respect to reservation II, which was formulated on the same occasion and which indicated that the Republic of Guatemala would not apply articles 25 and 66 of the [said Convention] insofar as both are incompatible with provisions of the Political Constitution currently in force; (b) (II) That it also confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 25 and 66 of the Convention, insofar as both are incompatible with provisions of the Political Constitution currently in force; (b) (II) That it also confirms the reservation with respect to the non-application of articles 11 and 12 of the Convention.

Guatemala's consent to be bound by a treaty is subject to compliance with the requirements and procedures established in its Political Constitution. For Guatemala, the signature or initialling of a treaty by its representative is always understood to be ad referendum and subject, in either case, to confirmation by its Government.

(c) A reservation is hereby formulated with respect to article 27 of the Convention, to the effect that the article is understood to refer to the provisions of the secondary legislation of Guatemala and not to those of its Political Constitution, which take precedence over any law or treaty.

In will be recalled that the Secretary-General received communications in regard to the said reservations from the various States on the dates indicated hereinafter:

Germany (21 September 1998):

These reservations refer almost exclusively to general rules of the Convention many of which are solidly based on customary international law. The reservations could call into question well-established and universally-accepted norms of international law, especially insofar as the reservations concern articles 27 and 38 of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany is of the view that the reservations also raise doubts as to their compatibility with the object and purpose of the Convention. The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany therefore objects to these reservations. This objection does not preclude the entry into force of the Convention between Germany and Guatemala.

Belgium (30 September 1998):

The reservations entered by Guatemala essentially concern general rules laid down in the [said Convention], many of which form part of customary international law. These reservations could call into question firmly established...
and universally accepted norms. The Kingdom of Belgium therefore raises an objection to the reservations. This objection does not prevent the [said Convention] from taking effect between the Kingdom of Belgium and Guatemala.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Norther Ireland (13 October 1998):
"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland object to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 27, and wish to observe that the customary international law rule set out in that article applies to constitutional as well as to other internal laws. The Government of the United Kingdom object also to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 38, by which the Republic of Guatemala seek subjective application of the rule of customary international law set out in that article. The Government of the United Kingdom wish to recall their declaration of 5 June 1987 (in respect of the accession of the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics), which, in accordance with its terms, applies to the reservation entered by the Republic of Guatemala in respect of article 66 and will similarly apply to any like reservation which any other State may formulate."

17.In a communication received on 8 December 1989, the Government of Hungary notified the Secretary-General that it had decided to withdraw as from that date, its reservation regarding article 66 made upon accession which reservation reads as follows:

The Hungarian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties and declares that submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision or submission of a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall have been nominated exclusively with the common consent of the parties to the dispute.

18.In a communication received on 19 July 1990, the Government of Mongolia notified the Secretary-General of its decision to withdraw the reservation made upon accession, which reads as follows:

1. The Mongolian People's Republic does not consider itself bound by the provisions of article 66 of the Convention. The Mongolian People's Republic declares that submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 and 64 to the International Court of Justice for a decision as well as submission of any dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any other articles in Part V of the Convention to a conciliation commission for consideration shall be subject to the consent of all the parties to the dispute in each separate case, and that the conciliators constituting the conciliation commission shall be appointed by the parties to the dispute by common consent.

2. The Mongolian People's Republic is not obligated by the provisions of article 45 (b) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, since they are contrary to established international practice.

19.On 14 November 2001, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Austria the following communication:

"Austria has examined the reservation made by the Government of Peru at the time of its ratification of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, regarding the application of articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention.

The fact that Peru is making the application of the said articles subject to a general reservation referring to the contents of existing national legislation, in the absence of further clarification raises doubts as to the commitment of Peru to the object and purpose of the Convention. According to customary international law as codified in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, a reservation incompatible with the object and purpose of a treaty shall not be permitted. In Austria's view the reservation in question is therefore inadmissible to the extent that its application could negatively affect the compliance by Peru with its obligations under articles 11, 12 and 25 of the Convention.

For these reasons, Austria objects to the reservation made by the Government of Peru to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Convention in its entirety between Peru and Austria, without Peru benefiting from its reservation."

In this regard, the Secretary-General received, on 21 January 2002, from the Government of Peru the following communication:

[The Government of Peru refers to the communication made by the Government of Austria relating to the reservation made by Peru upon ratification]. In this document, Member States are informed of a communication from the Government of Austria stating its objection to the reservation entered in respect of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties by the Government of Peru on 14 September 2000 when depositing the corresponding instrument of ratification.

As the [Secretariat] is aware, article 20, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention states that "a reservation is considered to have been accepted by a State if it shall have raised no objection to the reservation by the end of a
period of twelve months after it was notified of the reservation (...). The ratification and reservation by Peru in respect of the Vienna Convention were communicated to Member States on 9 November 2000. Since the communication from the Austrian Government was received by the Secretariat on 14 November 2001 and circulated to Member States on 28 November 2001, the Peruvian Mission is of the view that there is tacit acceptance on the part of the Austrian Government of the reservation entered by Peru, the 12-month period referred to in article 20, paragraph 5, of the Vienna Convention having elapsed without any objection being raised. The Peruvian Government considers the communication from the Austrian Government as being without legal effect, since it was not submitted in a timely manner.

20. On 24 February 1998, the Secretary-General received from the Government of Guatemala the following communication:

Guatemala maintains a territorial dispute over the illegal occupation of part of its territory by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, succeeded by the Government of Belize, and Guatemala therefore continues to assert a valid claim based on international law which must be settled by restoring to it the territory which historically and legally belongs to it.

21. The nomination of the conciliators listed hereinafter was not renewed after five years. For the date of their nomination and their titles, see the preceding editions of the present publication:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State:</th>
<th>Conciliators:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>Mr. Patrick Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>Professor Stephen Verosta, Dr. Helmut Tuerk, Dr. Karl Zemanek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cyprus</td>
<td>M. Criton Tornaritis, Mr. Michalakis Triantafillides, Mrs. Stella Soulioti</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>Ambassador Paul Fischer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>Professor Isi Foighel, Professor Erik Castrén</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>Professor Thomas Oppermann (German Democratic Republic), Professor Günther Jaenicke (German Democratic Republic)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran (Islamic Republic of)</td>
<td>Mr. Morteza Kalantarian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>Professor Riccardo Monaco, Professor Luigi Ferrari-Bravo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>Professor Shigejiro Tabata, Judge Masato Fujisaki</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kenya</td>
<td>Mr. John Maximian Nazareth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>Mr. S. Amos Wako</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morocco</td>
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Vienna Convention on Succession of States in respect of Treaties
Done at Vienna on 23 August 1978

The States Parties to the present Convention,

Considering the profound transformation of the international community brought about by the decolonization process,

Considering also that other factors may lead to cases of succession of States in the future,

Convinced, in these circumstances, of the need for the codification and progressive development of the rules relating to succession of States in respect of treaties as a means for ensuring greater juridical security in international relations,

Noting that the principles of free consent, good faith and *pacta sunt servanda* are universally recognized,

Emphasizing that the consistent observance of general multilateral treaties which deal with the codification and progressive development of international law and those the object and purpose of which are of interest to the international community as a whole is of special importance for the strengthening of peace and international cooperation,

Having in mind the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations, such as the principles of the equal rights and self-determination of peoples, of the sovereign equality and independence of all States, of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, of the prohibition of the threat or use of force, and of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,

Recalling that respect for the territorial integrity and political independence of any State is required by the Charter of the United Nations,

Bearing in mind the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969,

Bearing also in mind article 73 of that Convention,

Affirming that questions of the law of treaties other than those that may arise from a succession of States are governed by the relevant rules of international law, including those rules of customary international law which are embodied in the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969,

Affirming that the rules of customary international law will continue to govern questions not regulated by the provisions of the present Convention,

Have agreed as follows:
PART I.
GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 1
Scope of the present Convention

The present Convention applies to the effects of a succession of States in respect of treaties between States.

Article 2
Use of terms

1. For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) “treaty” means an international agreement concluded between States in written form and governed by international law, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments, and whatever its particular designation;

(b) “succession of States” means the replacement of one State by another in the responsibility for the international relations of territory;

(c) “predecessor State” means the State which has been replaced by another State on the occurrence of a succession of States;

(d) “successor State” means the State which has replaced another State on the occurrence of a succession of States;

(e) “date of the succession of States” means the date upon which the successor State replaced the predecessor State in the responsibility for the international relations of the territory to which the succession of States relates;

(f) “newly independent State” means a successor State the territory of which immediately before the date of the succession of States was a dependent territory for the international relations of which the predecessor State was responsible;

(g) “notification of succession” means in relation to a multilateral treaty any notification, however phrased or named, made by a successor State expressing its consent to be considered as bound by the treaty;

(h) “full powers” means in relation to a notification of succession or any other notification under the present Convention a document emanating from the competent authority of a State designating a person or persons to represent the State for communicating the notification of succession or, as the case may be, the notification;

(i) “ratification”, “acceptance” and “approval” mean in each case the international act so named whereby a State establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty;
(j) “reservation” means a unilateral statement, however phrased or named, made by a State when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty or when making a notification of succession to a treaty, whereby it purports to exclude or to modify the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty in their application to that State;

(k) “contracting State” means a State which has consented to be bound by the treaty, whether or not the treaty has entered into force;

(l) “party” means a State which has consented to be bound by the treaty and for which the treaty is in force;

(m) “other State party” means in relation to a successor State any party, other than the predecessor State, to a treaty in force at the date of a succession of States in respect of the territory to which that succession of States relates;

(n) “international organization” means an intergovernmental organization.

2. The provisions of paragraph 1 regarding the use of terms in the present Convention are without prejudice to the use of those terms or to the meanings which may be given to them in the internal law of any State.

Article 3
Cases not within the scope of the present Convention

The fact that the present Convention does not apply to the effects of a succession of States in respect of international agreements concluded between States and other subjects of international law or in respect of international agreements not in written form shall not affect:

(a) the application to such cases of any of the rules set forth in the present Convention to which they are subject under international law independently of the Convention;

(b) the application as between States of the present Convention to the effects of a succession of States in respect of international agreements to which other subjects of international law are also parties.

Article 4
Treaties constituting international organizations and treaties adopted within an international organization

The present Convention applies to the effects of a succession of States in respect of:

(a) any treaty which is the constituent instrument of an international organization without prejudice to the rules concerning acquisition of membership and without prejudice to any other relevant rules of the organization;
(b) any treaty adopted within an international organization without prejudice to any relevant rules of the organization.

Article 5

Obligations imposed by international law independently of a treaty

The fact that a treaty is not considered to be in force in respect of a State by virtue of the application of the present Convention shall not in any way impair the duty of that State to fulfil any obligation embodied in the treaty to which it is subject under international law independently of the treaty.

Article 6

Cases of succession of States covered by the present Convention

The present Convention applies only to the effects of a succession of States occurring in conformity with international law and, in particular, the principles of international law embodied in the Charter of the United Nations.

Article 7

Temporal application of the present Convention

1. Without prejudice to the application of any of the rules set forth in the present Convention to which the effects of a succession of States would be subject under international law independently of the Convention, the Convention applies only in respect of a succession of States which has occurred after the entry into force of the Convention except as may be otherwise agreed.

2. A successor State may, at the time of expressing its consent to be bound by the present Convention or at any time thereafter, make a declaration that it will apply the provisions of the Convention in respect of its own succession of States which has occurred before the entry into force of the Convention in relation to any other contracting State or State Party to the Convention which makes a declaration accepting the declaration, of the successor State. Upon the entry into force of the Convention as between the States making the declarations or upon the making of the declaration of acceptance, whichever occurs later, the provisions of the Convention shall apply to the effects of the succession of States as from the date of that succession of States.

3. A successor State may at the time of signing or of expressing its consent to be bound by the present Convention make a declaration that it will apply the provisions of the Convention provisionally in respect of its own succession of States which has occurred before the entry into force of the Convention in relation to any other signatory or contracting State which makes a declaration accepting the declaration of the successor State; upon the making of the declaration of acceptance, those provisions shall apply provisionally to the effects of the succession of States as between those two States as from the date of that succession of States.

4. Any declaration made in accordance with paragraph 2 or 3 shall be contained in a written notification communicated to the depositary, who shall inform the Parties and the States entitled to
become Parties to the present Convention of the communication to him of that notification and of its terms.

**Article 8**

*Agreements for the devolution of treaty obligations or rights from a predecessor State to a successor State*

1. The obligations or rights of a predecessor State under treaties in force in respect of a territory at the date of a succession of States do not become the obligations or rights of the successor State towards other States Parties to those treaties by reason only of the fact that the predecessor State and the successor State have concluded an agreement providing that such obligations or rights shall devolve upon the successor State.

2. Notwithstanding the conclusion of such an agreement, the effects of a succession of States on treaties which, at the date of that succession of States, were in force in respect of the territory in question are governed by the present Convention.

**Article 9**

*Unilateral declaration by a successor State regarding treaties of the predecessor State*

1. Obligations or rights under treaties in force in respect of a territory at the date of a succession of States do not become the obligations or rights of the successor State or of other States Parties to those treaties by reason only of the fact that the successor State has made a unilateral declaration providing for the continuance in force of the treaties in respect of its territory.

2. In such a case, the effects of the succession of States on treaties which, at the date of that succession of States, were in force in respect of the territory in question are governed by the present Convention.

**Article 10**

*Treaties providing for the participation of a successor State*

1. When a treaty provides that, on the occurrence of a succession of States, a successor State shall have the option to consider itself a party to the treaty, it may notify its succession in respect of the treaty in conformity with the provisions of the treaty or, failing any such provisions, in conformity with the provisions of the present Convention.

2. If a treaty provides that, on the occurrence of a succession of States, a successor State shall be considered as a party to the treaty, that provision takes effect as such only if the successor State expressly accepts in writing to be so considered.

3. In cases falling under paragraph 1 or 2, a successor State which establishes its consent to be a party to the treaty is considered as a party from the date of the succession of States unless the treaty otherwise provides or it is otherwise agreed.
Article 11
Boundary regimes

A succession of States does not as such affect:

(a) a boundary established by a treaty; or

(b) obligations and rights established by a treaty and relating to the regime of a boundary.

Article 12
Other territorial regimes

1. A succession of States does not as such affect:

(a) obligations relating to the use of any territory, or to restrictions upon its use, established by a treaty for the benefit of any territory of a foreign State and considered as attaching to the territories in question;

(b) rights established by a treaty for the benefit of any territory and relating to the use, or to restrictions upon the use, of any territory of a foreign State and considered as attaching to the territories in question.

2. A succession of States does not as such affect:

(a) obligations relating to the use of any territory, or to restrictions upon its use, established by a treaty for the benefit of a group of States or of all States and considered as attaching to that territory;

(b) rights established by a treaty for the benefit of a group of States or of all States and relating to the use of any territory, or to restrictions upon its use, and considered as attaching to that territory.

3. The provisions of the present article do not apply to treaty obligations of the predecessor State providing for the establishment of foreign military bases on the territory to which the succession of States relates.

Article 13
The present Convention and permanent sovereignty over natural wealth and resources

Nothing in the present Convention shall affect the principles of international law affirming the permanent sovereignty of every people and every State over its natural wealth and resources.

Article 14
Questions relating to the validity of a treaty

Nothing in the present Convention shall be considered as prejudging in any respect any question relating to the validity of a treaty.
PART II.
SUCCESSION IN RESPECT OF
PART OF TERRITORY

Article 15
Succession in respect of part of territory

When part of the territory of a State, or when any territory for the international relations of which a State is responsible, not being part of the territory of that State, becomes part of the territory of another State:

(a) treaties of the predecessor State cease to be in force in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates from the date of the succession of States; and

(b) treaties of the successor State are in force in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates from the date of the succession of States, unless it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty to that territory would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

PART III.
NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATES

SECTION 1. GENERAL RULE

Article 16
Position in respect of the treaties of the predecessor State

A newly independent State is not bound to maintain in force, or to become a party to, any treaty by reason only of the fact that at the date of the succession of States the treaty was in force in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates.

SECTION 2. MULTILATERAL TREATIES

Article 17
Participation in treaties in force at the date of the succession of States

1. Subject to paragraphs 2 and 3, a newly independent State may, by a notification of succession, establish its status as a party to any multilateral treaty which at the date of the succession of States was in force in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates.

2. Paragraph 1 does not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the newly independent State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.
3. When, under the terms of the treaty or by reason of the limited number of the negotiating States and the object and purpose of the treaty, the participation of any other State in the treaty must be considered as requiring the consent of all the parties, the newly independent State may establish its status as a party to the treaty only with such consent.

Article 18
Participation in treaties not in force at the date of the succession of States

1. Subject to paragraphs 3 and 4, a newly independent State may, by a notification of succession, establish its status as a contracting State to a multilateral treaty which is not in force if at the date of the succession of States the predecessor State was a contracting State in respect of the territory to which that succession of States relates.

2. Subject to paragraphs 3 and 4, a newly independent State may, by a notification of succession, establish its status as a party to a multilateral treaty which enters into force after the date of the succession of States if at the date of the succession of States the predecessor State was a contracting State in respect of the territory to which that succession of States relates.

3. Paragraphs 1 and 2 do not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the newly independent State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

4. When, under the terms of the treaty or by reason of the limited number of the negotiating States and the object and purpose of the treaty, the participation of any other State in the treaty must be considered as requiring the consent of all the parties or of all the contracting States, the newly independent State may establish its status as a party or as a contracting State to the treaty only with such consent.

5. When a treaty provides that a specified number of contracting States shall be necessary for its entry into force, a newly independent State which establishes its status as a contracting State to the treaty under paragraph 1 shall be counted as a contracting State for the purpose of that provision unless a different intention appears from the treaty, or is otherwise established.

Article 19
Participation in treaties signed by the predecessor State subject to ratification, acceptance or approval

1. Subject to paragraphs 3 and 4, if before the date of the succession of States the predecessor State signed a multilateral treaty subject to ratification, acceptance or approval and by the signature intended that the treaty should extend to the territory to which the succession of States relates, the newly independent State may ratify, accept or approve the treaty as if it had signed that treaty and may thereby become a party or a contracting State to it.

2. For the purpose of paragraph 1, unless a different intention appears from the treaty or is otherwise established, the signature by the predecessor State of a treaty is considered to express the
intention that the treaty should extend to the entire territory for the international relations of which the predecessor State was responsible.

3. Paragraph 1 does not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the newly independent State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

4. When, under the terms of the treaty or by reason of the limited number of the negotiating States and the object and purpose of the treaty, the participation of any other State in the treaty must be considered as requiring the consent of all the parties or of all the contracting States, the newly independent State may become a party or a contracting State to the treaty only with such consent.

**Article 20**

**Reservations**

1. When a newly independent State establishes its status as a party or as a contracting State to a multilateral treaty by a notification of succession under article 17 or 18, it shall be considered as maintaining any reservation to that treaty which was applicable at the date of the succession of States in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates unless, when making the notification of succession, it expresses a contrary intention or formulates a reservation which relates to the same subject matter as that reservation.

2. When making a notification of succession establishing its status as a party or as a contracting State to a multilateral treaty under article 17 or 18, a newly independent State may formulate a reservation unless the reservation is one the formulation of which would be excluded by the provisions of subparagraph (a), (b) or (c) of article 19 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties.

3. When a newly independent State formulates a reservation in conformity with paragraph 2, the rules set out in articles 20 to 23 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties apply in respect of that reservation.

**Article 21**

**Consent to be bound by part of a treaty and choice between differing provisions**

1. When making a notification of succession under article 17 or 18 establishing its status as a party or contracting State to a multilateral treaty, a newly independent State may, if the treaty so permits, express its consent to be bound by part of the treaty or make a choice between differing provisions under the conditions laid down in the treaty for expressing such consent or making such choice.

2. A newly independent State may also exercise, under the same conditions as the other parties or contracting States, any right provided for in the treaty to withdraw or modify any consent expressed or choice made by itself or by the predecessor State in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates.
3. If the newly independent State does not in conformity with paragraph 1 express its consent or make a choice, or in conformity with paragraph 2 withdraw or modify the consent or choice of the predecessor State, it shall be considered as maintaining:

(a) the consent of the predecessor State, in conformity with the treaty, to be bound, in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates, by part of that treaty; or

(b) the choice of the predecessor State, in conformity with the treaty, between differing provisions in the application of the treaty in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates.

Article 22

Notification of succession

1. A notification of succession in respect of a multilateral treaty under article 17 or 18 shall be made in writing.

2. If the notification of succession is not signed by the Head of State, Head of Government or Minister for Foreign Affairs, the representative of the State communicating it may be called upon to produce full powers.

3. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, the notification of succession shall:

(a) be transmitted by the newly independent State to the depositary, or, if there is no depositary, to the parties or the contracting States;

(b) be considered to be made by the newly independent State on the date on which it is received by the depositary or, if there is no depositary, on the date on which it is received by all the parties or, as the case may be, by all the contracting States.

4. Paragraph 3 does not affect any duty that the depositary may have, in accordance with the treaty or otherwise, to inform the parties or the contracting States of the notification of succession or any communication made in connection therewith by the newly independent State.

5. Subject to the provisions of the treaty, the notification of succession or the communication made in connection therewith shall be considered as received by the State for which it is intended only when the latter State has been informed by the depositary.

Article 23

Effects of a notification of succession

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or it is otherwise agreed, a newly independent State which makes a notification of succession under article 17 or article 18, paragraph 2, shall be considered a party to the treaty from the date of the succession of States or from the date of entry into force of the treaty, whichever is the later date.
2. Nevertheless, the operation of the treaty shall be considered as suspended as between the newly independent State and the other parties to the treaty until the date of making of the notification of succession except insofar as that treaty may be applied provisionally in accordance with article 27 or as may be otherwise agreed.

3. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or it is otherwise agreed, a newly independent State which makes a notification of succession under article 18, paragraph 1, shall be considered a contracting State to the treaty from the date on which the notification of succession is made.

SECTION 3. BILATERAL TREATIES

Article 24
Conditions under which a treaty is considered as being in force in the case of a succession of States

1. A bilateral treaty which at the date of a succession of States was in force in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates is considered as being in force between a newly independent State and the other State party when:

(a) they expressly so agree; or

(b) by reason of their conduct they are to be considered as having so agreed.

2. A treaty considered as being in force under paragraph 1 applies in the relations between the newly independent State and the other State party from the date of the succession of States, unless a different intention appears from their agreement or is otherwise established.

Article 25
The position as between the predecessor State and the newly independent State

A treaty which under article 24 is considered as being in force between a newly independent State and the other State party is not by reason only of that fact to be considered as being in force also in the relations between the predecessor State and the newly independent State.

Article 26
Termination, suspension of operation or amendment of the treaty as between the predecessor State and the other State party

1. When under article 24 a treaty is considered as being in force between a newly independent State and the other State party, the treaty:

(a) does not cease to be in force between them by reason only of the fact that it has subsequently been terminated as between the predecessor State and the other State party;

(b) is not suspended in operation as between them by reason only of the fact that it has subsequently been suspended in operation as between the predecessor State and the other State party;
(c) is not amended as between them by reason only of the fact that it has subsequently been amended as between the predecessor State and the other State party.

2. The fact that a treaty has been terminated or, as the case may be, suspended in operation as between the predecessor State and the other State party after the date of the succession of States does not prevent the treaty from being considered to be in force or, as the case may be, in operation as between the newly independent State and the other State party if it is established in accordance with article 24 that they so agreed.

3. The fact that a treaty has been amended as between the predecessor State and the other State party after the date of the succession of States does not prevent the unamended treaty from being considered to be in force under article 24 as between the newly independent State and the other State party, unless it is established that they intended the treaty as amended to apply between them.

SECTION 4. PROVISIONAL APPLICATION

Article 27
Multilateral treaties

1. If, at the date of the succession of States, a multilateral treaty was in force in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates and the newly independent State gives notice of its intention that the treaty should be applied provisionally in respect of its territory, that treaty shall apply provisionally between the newly independent State and any party which expressly so agrees or by reason of its conduct is to be considered as having so agreed.

2. Nevertheless, in the case of a treaty which falls within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the consent of all the parties to such provisional application is required.

3. If, at the date of the succession of States, a multilateral treaty not yet in force was being applied provisionally in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates and the newly independent State gives notice of its intention that the treaty should continue to be applied provisionally in respect of its territory, that treaty shall apply provisionally between the newly independent State and any contracting State which expressly so agrees or by reason of its conduct is to be considered as having so agreed.

4. Nevertheless, in the case of a treaty which falls within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the consent of all the contracting States to such continued provisional application is required.

5. Paragraphs 1 to 4 do not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the newly independent State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.
Article 28

Bilateral treaties

A bilateral treaty which at the date of a succession of States was in force or was being provisionally applied in respect of the territory to which the succession of States relates is considered as applying provisionally between the newly independent State and the other State concerned when:

(a) they expressly so agree; or

(b) by reason of their conduct they are to be considered as having so agreed.

Article 29

Termination of provisional application

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or it is otherwise agreed, the provisional application of a multilateral treaty under article 27 may be terminated:

(a) by reasonable notice of termination given by the newly independent State or the party or contracting State provisionally applying the treaty and the expiration of the notice; or

(b) in the case of a treaty which falls within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, by reasonable notice of termination given by the newly independent State or all of the parties or, as the case may be, all of the contracting States and the expiration of the notice.

2. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or it is otherwise agreed, the provisional application of a bilateral treaty under article 28 may be terminated by reasonable notice of termination given by the newly independent State or the other State concerned and the expiration of the notice.

3. Unless the treaty provides for a shorter period for its termination or it is otherwise agreed, reasonable notice of termination shall be twelve months’ notice from the date on which it is received by the other State or States provisionally applying the treaty.

4. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or it is otherwise agreed, the provisional application of a multilateral treaty under article 27 shall be terminated if the newly independent State gives notice of its intention not to become a party to the treaty.

SECTION 5. NEWLY INDEPENDENT STATES FORMED FROM TWO OR MORE TERRITORIES

Article 30

Newly independent States formed from two or more territories

1. Articles 16 to 29 apply in the case of a newly independent State formed from two or more territories.
2. When a newly independent State formed from two or more territories is considered as or becomes a party to a treaty by virtue of article 17, 18 or 24 and at the date of the succession of States the treaty was in force, or consent to be bound had been given, in respect of one or more, but not all, of those territories, the treaty shall apply in respect of the entire territory of that State unless:

(a) it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the entire territory would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation;

(b) in the case of a multilateral treaty not falling under article 17, paragraph 3, or under article 18, paragraph 4, the notification of succession is restricted to the territory in respect of which the treaty was in force at the date of the succession of States, or in respect of which consent to be bound by the treaty had been given prior to that date;

(c) in the case of a multilateral treaty falling under article 17, paragraph 3, or under article 18, paragraph 4, the newly independent State and the other States Parties or, as the case may be, the other contracting States otherwise agree; or

(d) in the case of a bilateral treaty, the newly independent State and the other State concerned otherwise agree.

3. When a newly independent State formed from two or more territories becomes a party to a multilateral treaty under article 19 and by the signature or signatures of the predecessor State or States it had been intended that the treaty should extend to one or more, but not all, of those territories, the treaty shall apply in respect of the entire territory of the newly independent State unless:

(a) it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the entire territory would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation;

(b) in the case of a multilateral treaty not falling under article 19, paragraph 4, the ratification, acceptance or approval of the treaty is restricted to the territory or territories to which it was intended that the treaty should extend; or

(c) in the case of a multilateral treaty falling under article 19, paragraph 4, the newly independent State and the other States Parties or, as the case may be, the other contracting States otherwise agree.

PART IV.
UNITING AND SEPARATION OF STATES
Article 31
Effects of a uniting of States in respect of treaties in force at the date of the succession of States

1. When two or more States unite and so form one successor State, any treaty in force at the date of the succession of States in respect of any of them continues in force in respect of the successor State unless:

(a) the successor State and the other State party or States Parties otherwise agree; or

(b) it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

2. Any treaty continuing in force in conformity with paragraph 1 shall apply only in respect of the part of the territory of the successor State in respect of which the treaty was in force at the date of the succession of States unless:

(a) in the case of a multilateral treaty not falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State makes a notification that the treaty shall apply in respect of its entire territory;

(b) in the case of a multilateral treaty falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State and the other States Parties otherwise agree; or

(c) in the case of a bilateral treaty, the successor State and the other State party otherwise agree.

3. Paragraph 2 (a) does not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the entire territory of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

Article 32
Effects of a uniting of States in respect of treaties not in force at the date of the succession of States

1. Subject to paragraphs 3 and 4, a successor State falling under article 31 may, by making a notification, establish its status as a contracting State to a multilateral treaty which is not in force if, at the date of the succession of States, any of the predecessor States was a contracting State to the treaty.

2. Subject to paragraphs 3 and 4, a successor State falling under article 31 may, by making a notification, establish its status as a party to a multilateral treaty which enters into force after the date of the succession of States if, at that date, any of the predecessor States was a contracting State to the treaty.
3. Paragraphs 1 and 2 do not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

4. If the treaty is one falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State may establish its status as a party or as a contracting State to the treaty only with the consent of all the parties or of all the contracting States.

5. Any treaty to which the successor State becomes a contracting State or a party in conformity with paragraph 1 or 2 shall apply only in respect of the part of the territory of the successor State in respect of which consent to be bound by the treaty had been given prior to the date of the succession of States unless:

(a) in the case of a multilateral treaty not falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State indicates in its notification made under paragraph 1 or 2 that the treaty shall apply in respect of its entire territory; or

(b) in the case of a multilateral treaty falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State and all the parties or, as the case may be, all the contracting States otherwise agree.

6. Paragraph 5 (a) does not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the entire territory of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

Article 33
Effects of a uniting of States in respect of treaties signed by a predecessor State subject to ratification, acceptance or approval

1. Subject to paragraphs 2 and 3, if before the date of the succession of States one of the predecessor States had signed a multilateral treaty subject to ratification, acceptance or approval, a successor State falling under article 31 may ratify, accept or approve the treaty as if it had signed that treaty and may thereby become a party or a contracting State to it.

2. Paragraph 1 does not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

3. If the treaty is one falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State may become a party or a contracting State to the treaty only with the consent of all the parties or of all the contracting States.

4. Any treaty to which the successor State becomes a party or a contracting State in conformity with paragraph 1 shall apply only in respect of the part of the territory of the successor State in respect of which the treaty was signed by one of the predecessor States unless:
(a) in the case of a multilateral treaty not falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State when ratifying, accepting or approving the treaty gives notice that the treaty shall apply in respect of its entire territory; or

(b) in the case of a multilateral treaty falling within the category mentioned in article 17, paragraph 3, the successor State and all the parties or, as the case may be, all the contracting States otherwise agree.

5. Paragraph 4 (a) does not apply if it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the entire territory of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

Article 34
Succession of States in cases of separation of parts of a State

1. When a part or parts of the territory of a State separate to form one or more States, whether or not the predecessor State continues to exist:

(a) any treaty in force at the date of the succession of States in respect of the entire territory of the predecessor State continues in force in respect of each successor State so formed;

(b) any treaty in force at the date of the succession of States in respect only of that part of the territory of the predecessor State which has become a successor State continues in force in respect of that successor State alone.

2. Paragraph 1 does not apply if:

(a) the States concerned otherwise agree; or

(b) it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that the application of the treaty in respect of the successor State would be incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty or would radically change the conditions for its operation.

Article 35
Position if a State continues after separation of part of its territory

When, after separation of any part of the territory of a State, the predecessor State continues to exist, any treaty which at the date of the succession of States was in force in respect of the predecessor State continues in force in respect of its remaining territory unless:

(a) the States concerned otherwise agree;

(b) it is established that the treaty related only to the territory which has separated from the predecessor State; or