

MONTREAL PROTOCOL NO. 4
TO AMEND THE CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF CERTAIN RULES
RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY AIR SIGNED AT WARSAW ON 12 OCTOBER 1929
AS AMENDED BY THE PROTOCOL DONE AT THE HAGUE
ON 28 SEPTEMBER 1955
SIGNED AT MONTREAL ON 25 SEPTEMBER 1975

Entry into force	The Protocol entered into force on 14 June 1998
Status:	61 Parties.
This list, including the footnotes and reservations, reproduces the information received from the depositary, the Government of the Republic of Poland.	

State	Date of signature	Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification, Accession (a) or Succession (s)	Effective date
Argentina (1)	14 March 1990	14 March 1990	14 June 1998
Australia	24 April 1991	13 January 1997	14 June 1998
Azerbaijan		24 January 2000 (a)	23 April 2000
Bahrain		21 January 1999 (a)	21 April 1999
Barbados	25 September 1975		
Belgium	25 September 1975	19 March 2003	17 June 2003
Bosnia and Herzegovina (2)		3 March 1995 (s)	14 June 1998
Brazil	25 September 1975	27 July 1979 r	14 June 1998
Canada	30 December 1975	27 August 1999 r	25 November 1999
Chile	23 November 1984	1 October 2008 r	30 December 2008
Colombia	20 May 1982	20 May 1982	14 June 1998
Croatia (3)		14 July 1993 (s)	14 June 1998
Cyprus	10 November 1992	10 November 1992	14 June 1998
Democratic Republic of the Congo	25 September 1975		
Denmark	1 December 1976	4 May 1988	14 June 1998
Ecuador		12 February 1999 (a)	12 May 1999
Egypt	25 September 1975	17 November 1978	14 June 1998
Estonia	25 November 1997	16 March 1998	14 June 1998
Ethiopia	14 July 1987	14 July 1987	14 June 1998
Finland	2 May 1978	4 May 1988	14 June 1998
France	30 December 1975		
Ghana	25 September 1975	11 August 1997	14 June 1998
Greece	10 November 1988	12 November 1988	14 June 1998
Guatemala	25 September 1975	3 February 1997	14 June 1998
Guinea		12 February 1999 (a)	12 May 1999
Honduras		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
Hungary	29 June 1987	30 June 1987	14 June 1998
Iceland		28 June 2004 (a)	26 September 2004
Iran		16 February 2016 (a)	16 May 2016
Ireland	27 June 1989	27 June 1989	14 June 1998
Israel	27 November 1987	16 February 1988	14 June 1998
Italy	15 May 1978	2 April 1985	14 June 1998
Japan		20 June 2000 (a)	18 September 2000
Jordan		22 July 1999 (a)	20 October 1999
Kenya		6 July 1999 (a)	4 October 1999
Kuwait	21 March 1995	8 November 1996	14 June 1998
Lebanon		4 August 2000 (a)	2 November 2000
Luxembourg		25 September 2008 (a)	24 December 2008
Malaysia		18 January 2008 (a)	17 April 2008
Mauritius (11)		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
Montenegro (10)		1 April 2008 (s)	3 June 2006

State	Date of signature	Date of deposit of Instrument of Ratification, Accession (a) or Succession (s)	Effective date
Morocco	18 October 1984	26 September 2012	25 December 2012
Nauru		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
Netherlands (4)	19 May 1982	7 January 1983	14 June 1998
New Zealand (5)		3 December 1999 (a)	2 March 2000
Niger		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
North Macedonia (8)		1 September 1994 (s)	14 June 1998
Norway	21 October 1977	4 May 1988	14 June 1998
Oman		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
Peru		1 December 2020 (a)	1 March 2021
Portugal	25 September 1975	7 April 1982	14 June 1998
Qatar	28 August 1987		
Senegal	18 August 1976		
Serbia (6)		18 July 2001 (s)	14 June 1998
Seychelles		28 February 2012 (a)	28 May 2012
Singapore		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
Slovenia (7)		7 August 1998 (s)	14 June 1998
Spain	30 September 1981	8 January 1985	14 June 1998
Sweden	12 December 1977	4 May 1988	14 June 1998
Switzerland	25 September 1975	9 December 1987 r	14 June 1998
Togo	21 August 1985	5 May 1987	14 June 1998
Turkey		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
United Arab Emirates		20 March 2000 (a)	18 June 2000
United Kingdom (9)(11)	25 September 1975	5 July 1984	14 June 1998
United States	25 September 1975	4 December 1998	4 March 1999
Uzbekistan		14 June 1998 (a)	12 September 1998
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	25 September 1975		

r Reservation

RESERVATIONS

BRAZIL

The instrument of ratification contains a reservation in accordance with Article XXI (1) a) thereof.

CANADA

At the time of ratification, pursuant to Article XXI (1) a) of Montreal Protocol No. 4, the Government of Canada made the following reservation: Canada declares that the Warsaw Convention as amended at The Hague, 1955 and by Protocol No. 4 of Montreal, 1975, shall not apply to the carriage of persons, baggage and cargo for Canada's military authorities on aircraft, registered in Canada, the whole capacity of which has been reserved by or on behalf of such authorities.

CHILE

The instrument of ratification contains a reservation in accordance with Article XXI (1) a) thereof.

SWITZERLAND

The instrument of ratification by the Government of Switzerland contains a declaration that this Protocol is ratified with a reservation in accordance with Article XXI (1) b) thereof.

NOTES

- (1) The instrument of ratification by the Government of Argentina contains the following declaration:
"The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland having proceeded to ratification of the Additional Protocols to the Warsaw Convention of 1929, adopted in Montreal (Canada) in 1975, the Argentine Republic

rejects the said ratification inasmuch as it is made in the name of the ‘Malvinas Islands and of their Dependencies’, and reaffirms its sovereign right over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands which are an integral part of its national territory.

The General Assembly of the United Nations has adopted Resolutions 2065/XX/, 3160/XXVIII/, 31/49, 38/12 and 39/6 in which it recognizes the existence of a dispute relating to the question of the sovereignty of the Malvinas Islands and urges the Argentine Republic and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to resume as soon as possible their negotiations with a view to seeking by peaceful means a definitive solution to their dispute and to the other differences relating to the said question, through the good offices of the Secretary-General of the Organization who is to report on the progress achieved.

The Argentine Republic at the same time rejects the ratification referred to in the preceding paragraph inasmuch as it is made in the name of the ‘British Antarctic Territory’, and reaffirms that it does not accept any denomination which would attribute as belonging to another State, or which would admit thereof, the sector extending between longitude 25E West and longitude 74E West and between latitude 60E South and the South Pole over which the Argentine Republic exercises its sovereignty since this sector is an integral part of its territory”.

- (2) By a Note dated 9 February 1995, the Government of the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, this Protocol.
- (3) By a Note dated 8 July 1993, the Government of the Republic of Croatia declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, this Protocol (with effect from 8 October 1991).
- (4) The ratification concerns the Kingdom in Europe and the Netherlands Antilles.
- (5) New Zealand deposited its instrument of accession with a declaration that this accession shall extend to Tokelau.
- (6) The former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the Warsaw Convention on 12 October 1929 and ratified it on 27 May 1931; it signed The Hague Protocol on 3 December 1958 and ratified it on 16 April 1959; and it signed Additional Protocols Nos. 1, 2 and Montreal Protocol No. 4 on 25 September 1975 and ratified them on 11 March 1977. By a note dated 17 July 2001, deposited on 18 July 2001, the Government of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia declared itself bound, as a successor State to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, by the above-mentioned treaties, with effect from 27 April 1992, the date of State succession. On 4 February 2003, the name of the State of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia was changed to Serbia and Montenegro. Following the Declaration of Independence adopted by the National Assembly of Montenegro on 3 June 2006, Serbia advised the depositary by a note dated 7 June 2006, deposited on 8 June 2006, that the Republic of Serbia continues to exercise the state and legal identity of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro
- (7) By a Note dated 27 July 1998, deposited on 7 August 1998, the Government of the Republic of Slovenia stated that it considered itself bound by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, Montreal Protocol No. 4 (with effect from 14 June 1998).
- (8) By a Note dated 15 August 1994, the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of this Protocol.
- (9) Ratification by the United Kingdom was also done on behalf of: the Bailiwick of Jersey, the Bailiwick of Guernsey, the Isle of Man, Anguilla, Bermuda, British Antarctic Territory, British Indian Ocean Territory, British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Falkland Islands, Falkland Islands Dependencies, Gibraltar, Hong Kong, Montserrat, Pitcairn, Henderson, Ducie and Oeno Islands, Saint Helena, Saint Helena Dependencies, Turks and Caicos Islands, United Kingdom Sovereigning Base and the areas of Akrotiri and Dhekelia in the Island of Cyprus.
Furthermore, the following declaration was subsequently made:
“In reference to the declaration made by the Argentine Republic when depositing the instruments of ratification of Protocols Nos. 1, 2 and 3 as well as Montreal Protocol No. 4, signed at Montreal on 25 September 1975, the position of the United Kingdom is well known and remains unchanged. The United Kingdom has no doubt of its sovereignty over the Falkland Islands, South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and its incontestable right to apply the treaties thereto. As for the part of the declaration concerning the British Antarctic Territory, the Embassy recalls the contents of the Antarctic Treaty and particularly the provisions of Article IV of the said Treaty . . .”.
- (10) By a note dated 25 March 2008, deposited on 1 April 2008, the Government of Montenegro advised the depositary that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the Warsaw Convention, The Hague Protocol, Additional Protocols Nos. 1 and 2 and Montreal Protocol No. 4, with effect from 3 June 2006. See also Note 6 in respect of Serbia.
- (11) On 24 January 2020, the Secretary General received a copy of Circular Note No 1/2020, dated 20 January 2020, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland to which was appended Note Verbale No. 1197/28, dated 10

January 2020 from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade of the Republic of Mauritius. The text of the said Note Verbale is reproduced below:

“The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade of the Republic of Mauritius presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland and has the honour to register its strong objection against the extension by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”, of the Agreements listed at Annex and in respect of which the Government of the Republic of Poland is the depositary.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius considers that by extending these Agreements to the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”, the United Kingdom purported to exercise sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago – a claim which is untenable under international law.

The Government of the Republic of Mauritius wishes to reiterate in emphatic terms that it does not recognize the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”. The fact that the Chagos Archipelago is, and has always been, part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius, and that the United Kingdom has never had sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago, has been authoritatively established by the International Court of Justice in its Advisory Opinion of 25 February 2019, on the *Legal Consequences of the Separation of the Chagos Archipelago from Mauritius in 1965*.

In this authoritative legal determination, the Court declared that the decolonization of the Republic of Mauritius had not been lawfully completed in 1968, since the Chagos Archipelago had been unlawfully detached in 1965, in violation of the right of self-determination of peoples and the Charter of the United Nations, as applied and interpreted in accordance with UN General Assembly resolution 1514 (XV) of 14 December 1960, resolution 2066 (XX) of 16 December 1965, resolution 2232 (XXI) of 20 December 1966 and resolution 2357 (XXII) of 19 December 1967. Accordingly, it went on to hold that the United Kingdom’s ongoing administration of the Chagos Archipelago, as the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” was an internationally wrongful act, of a continuing nature, that engaged the State responsibility of the United Kingdom. It determined that the United Kingdom is under a legal obligation to terminate its unlawful colonial administration “as rapidly as possible”.

The Court further determined that all UN Member States have an obligation to cooperate with the United Nations in facilitating the completion of the decolonization of the Republic of Mauritius as rapidly as possible, including an obligation not to support the continuing wrongful conduct of the United Kingdom in maintaining its colonial administration in the Chagos Archipelago.

On 22 May 2019, the General Assembly, by an overwhelming majority of 116 votes to 6, adopted resolution 73/295. By this resolution, it endorsed the Court’s Advisory Opinion, affirmed that the Chagos Archipelago forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius, and demanded that the United Kingdom terminate its unlawful colonial administration within a maximum of six months, that is, by no later than 22 November 2019. That deadline has now expired.

Moreover, the General Assembly in its resolution called upon Member States to “cooperate with the United Nations to ensure the completion of the decolonization of Mauritius as rapidly as possible” and to refrain from conduct that might impede or delay the completion of decolonization. It further called upon the United Nations and all its specialized agencies to recognize that the Chagos Archipelago forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius, to support the decolonization of the Republic of Mauritius as rapidly as possible, and to refrain from impeding that process by recognizing the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”. Lastly, the resolution also called upon “all other international, regional and intergovernmental organizations, *including those established by treaty*” to recognize that the Chagos Archipelago forms an integral part of the territory of the Republic of Mauritius, to support its speedy decolonization, and to “refrain from impeding that process” by recognizing the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”.

The Republic of Mauritius has, over the years, consistently asserted, and hereby reasserts, its full sovereignty over the Chagos Archipelago. The Government of the Republic of Mauritius therefore unequivocally protests against the extension by the United Kingdom of the Agreements listed at Annex to the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory” and against the purported exercise by the United Kingdom of any sovereignty, rights or jurisdiction within the territory of the Republic of Mauritius.

For the above stated reasons, which arise from established principles of international law as authoritatively interpreted and applied by the International Court of Justice and endorsed by the UN General Assembly, the Government of the Republic of Mauritius does not recognize the extension by the United Kingdom of the Agreements listed at Annex to the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”, reserves all its rights in this regard, and calls upon all States Parties to the Agreements listed at Annex to reject the United Kingdom’s extension of these Agreements to the so-called “British Indian Ocean Territory”.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade of the Republic of Mauritius

kindly requests that the present objection be duly recorded, circulated and registered with the Secretariat of the United Nations pursuant to Article 102 of the Charter of the United Nations.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade of the Republic of Mauritius avails itself of his opportunity to renew of the Republic of Poland the assurances of its highest consideration.

[SEAL] Port Louis, 10 January 2020

ANNEX

LIST OF AGREEMENTS DEPOSITED WITH THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF POLAND AND WHICH THE UNITED KINGDOM HAS EXTENDED TO THE SO-CALLED "BRITISH INDIAN OCEAN TERRITORY" ("BIOT")

Name of Agreement	Action Taken by the United Kingdom
Protocol to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929, The Hague, 28 September 1955	Extension of the Protocol to the so-called "BIOT" on 3 March 1967
Additional Protocol No. 1 to Amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929, Montreal, 25 September 1975	Ratification of the Protocol extended to the so-called "BIOT" on 5 July 1984
Additional Protocol No. 2 to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929 as amended by the Protocol done at The Hague on 28 September 1955, Montreal, 25 September 1975	Ratification of the Protocol extended to the so-called "BIOT" on 5 July 1984
Additional Protocol No. 3 to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929 as amended by the Protocols done at The Hague on 28 September 1955 and at Guatemala City on 8 March 1971, Montreal, 25 September 1975	Ratification of the Protocol extended to the so-called "BIOT" on 5 July 1984
Montreal Protocol No. 4 to amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929 as amended by the Protocol done at The Hague on 28 September 1955, Montreal, 25 September 1975	Ratification of the Protocol extended to the so-called "BIOT" on 5 July 1984"

On 24 February 2020, the Secretary General received Circular Note No 2/2020, dated 21 February 2020, from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Poland to which was appended Note Verbale number OTD/003/2020, dated 11 February 2020 from the Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The text of the said Note Verbale is reproduced below:

“The Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland and has the honour to refer to a Note Verbale from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade of the Republic of Mauritius dated 10 January 2020 (1197/28). This concerns the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland's extension of Protocols under the Warsaw Convention to the British Indian Ocean Territory (BIOT).

The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland rejects the claims contained in the Note Verbale of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, Regional Integration and International Trade of the Republic of Mauritius. The United Kingdom has no doubt about its sovereignty over the territory of BIOT, which has been under continuous British sovereignty since 1814. Mauritius has never held sovereignty over the islands that now form BIOT and the United Kingdom does not recognise its claim.

The Foreign and Commonwealth Office of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland avails itself of the opportunity to renew to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Poland the assurances of its highest consideration.

FOREIGN AND COMMONWEALTH OFFICE LONDON
[11 FEBRUARY 2020] [SEAL]”