

**CONTRACTING PARTIES TO THE CONVENTION FOR THE UNIFICATION OF
CERTAIN RULES RELATING TO INTERNATIONAL CARRIAGE BY AIR
SIGNED AT WARSAW ON 12 OCTOBER 1929
AND THE PROTOCOL MODIFYING THE SAID CONVENTION
SIGNED AT THE HAGUE ON 28 SEPTEMBER 1955**

Convention	Entry into force	The Convention entered into force on 13 February 1933.
	Status:	152 Parties.
Protocol	Entry into force	The Protocol entered into force on 1 August 1963.
	Status:	137 Parties.
This list, including the footnotes and reservations, reproduces the information received from the depositary, the Government of the Republic of Poland.		

States	WARSAW CONVENTION			THE HAGUE PROTOCOL		
	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force
Afghanistan		20/2/69	21/5/69		20/2/69	21/5/69
Algeria		2/6/64	31/8/64		2/6/64	31/8/64
Angola		10/3/98	8/6/98		10/3/98	8/6/98
Argentina		21/3/52	19/6/52		12/6/69	10/9/69
Armenia		25/11/98	23/2/99			
Australia (1)	12/10/29	1/8/35	30/10/35	12/7/56	23/6/59	1/8/63
Austria	12/10/29	28/9/61	27/12/61		26/3/71	24/6/71
Azerbaijan		24/1/00	23/4/00		24/1/00	23/4/00
Bahamas (2)		23/5/75 (s)	10/7/73		23/5/75 (s)	10/7/73
Bahrain		12/3/98	10/6/98		12/3/98	10/6/98
Bangladesh (3)		1/3/79 (s)	26/3/71		1/3/79 (s)	26/3/71
Barbados (4)		29/1/70 (s)	30/11/66			
Belarus		26/9/59	25/12/59	9/4/60	17/1/61	1/8/63
Belgium	12/10/29	13/7/36	11/10/36	28/9/55	27/8/63	25/11/63
Benin (5)		27/1/62 (s)	1/8/60		27/1/62 (s)	1/8/63
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)		29/12/98	29/3/99			
Bosnia and Herzegovina (6)		3/3/95 (s)	6/3/92		3/3/95 (s)	6/3/92
Botswana (7)		21/3/77 (s)	30/9/66			
Brazil	12/10/29	2/5/31	13/2/33	28/9/55	16/6/64	14/9/64
Brunei Darussalam (8)		28/2/84 (s)	1/1/84			
Bulgaria		25/6/49	23/9/49		14/12/63	13/3/64
Burkina Faso		9/12/61	9/3/62			
Cambodia		12/12/96	12/3/97		12/12/96	12/3/97
Cameroon (9)		2/9/61 (s)	1/1/60		2/9/61 (s)	1/8/63
Canada		10/6/47r	8/9/47	16/8/56	18/4/64	17/7/64
Cabo Verde		7/2/02	8/5/02		7/2/02	8/5/02
Chile		2/3/79r	31/5/79		2/3/79	31/5/79
China (10)		20/7/58	18/10/58		20/8/75	18/11/75
Colombia		15/8/66	13/11/66		15/8/66	13/11/66
Comoros		11/6/91	9/9/91			
Congo (11)		19/1/62r (s)	15/8/60		19/1/62r (s)	1/8/63
Costa Rica		10/5/84	8/8/84		10/5/84	8/8/84
Côte d'Ivoire (12)		22/2/62 (s)	7/8/60		22/2/62 (s)	1/8/63
Croatia (13)		14/7/93 (s)	8/10/91		14/7/93 (s)	8/10/91

States	WARSAW CONVENTION			THE HAGUE PROTOCOL		
	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force
Cuba		21/7/64r	19/10/64		30/8/65	28/11/65
Cyprus (14)		8/5/63 (s)	16/8/60		23/7/70	21/10/70
Czech Republic (15)		29/11/94 (s)	1/1/93		29/11/94 (s)	1/1/93
Democratic People's Republic of Korea		1/3/61	30/5/61		4/11/80	2/2/81
Democratic Republic of the Congo (16)		1/12/62 (s)	30/6/60			
Denmark	12/10/29	3/7/37	1/10/37	16/3/57	3/5/63	1/8/63
Dominican Republic		25/2/72	25/5/72		25/2/72	25/5/72
Ecuador		1/12/69	1/3/70		1/12/69	1/3/70
Egypt (17)		6/9/55	5/12/55	28/9/55	26/4/56	1/8/63
El Salvador				28/9/55	17/9/56	1/8/63
Equatorial Guinea		20/12/88	19/3/89			
Estonia		16/3/98	14/6/98		16/3/98	14/6/98
Eswatini					20/7/71	18/10/71
Ethiopia		14/8/50r	12/11/50			
Fiji (18)		15/3/72 (s)	10/10/70		15/3/72 (s)	10/10/70
Finland		3/7/37	1/10/37		25/5/77	23/8/77
France	12/10/29	15/11/32	13/2/33	28/9/55	19/5/59	1/8/63
Gabon		15/2/69	16/5/69		15/2/69	16/5/69
Germany (19)	12/10/29	30/9/33	29/12/33	28/9/55	27/10/60	1/8/63
Ghana		11/8/97	9/11/97		11/8/97	9/11/97
Greece	12/10/29	11/1/38	11/4/38	28/9/55	23/6/65	21/9/65
Grenada					15/8/85	13/11/85
Guatemala (20)		3/2/97	4/5/97		28/7/71	26/10/71
Guinea		11/9/61	10/12/61		9/10/90	7/1/91
Honduras		27/6/94	25/9/94			
Hungary		29/5/36	27/8/36	28/9/55	4/10/57	1/8/63
Iceland		21/8/48	19/11/48	3/5/63	3/5/63	1/8/63
India (21)		9/2/70 (s)	15/8/47		14/2/73	15/5/73
Indonesia (22)		21/2/52 (s)	17/8/45			
Iran (Islamic Republic of)		8/7/75	6/10/75		8/7/75	6/10/75
Iraq (23)		28/6/72	26/9/72		28/6/72	26/9/72
Ireland		20/9/35	19/12/35	28/9/55	12/10/59	1/8/63
Israel		8/10/49	6/1/50	28/9/55	5/8/64	3/11/64
Italy	12/10/29	14/2/33	15/5/33	28/9/55	4/5/63	2/8/63
Japan	12/10/29	20/5/53	18/8/53	2/5/56	10/8/67	8/11/67
Jordan (24)		8/12/69 (s)	25/5/46		15/11/73	13/2/74
Kazakhstan					30/8/02	28/11/02
Kenya (25)		7/10/64 (s)	12/12/63		6/7/99	4/10/99
Kuwait		11/8/75	9/11/75		11/8/75	9/11/75
Kyrgyzstan		9/2/00	9/5/00		9/2/00	9/5/00
Lao People's Democratic Republic (26)		9/5/56 (s)	19/7/49	28/9/55	9/5/56	1/8/63
Latvia	12/10/29	15/11/32	13/2/33		2/10/98	31/12/98
Lebanon (27)		20/4/62 (s)	22/11/43		10/5/78	8/8/78

States	WARSAW CONVENTION			THE HAGUE PROTOCOL		
	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force
Lesotho (28)		12/5/75 (s)	4/10/66		17/10/75	15/1/76
Liberia		2/5/42	31/7/42			
Libya		16/5/69	14/8/69		16/5/69	14/8/69
Liechtenstein		9/5/34	7/8/34	28/9/55	3/1/66	3/4/66
Lithuania					21/11/96	19/2/97
Luxembourg	12/10/29	7/10/49	5/1/50	28/9/55	13/2/57	1/8/63
Madagascar (29)		27/8/62 (s)	26/6/60		27/8/62 (s)	1/8/63
Malawi		27/10/77	25/1/78		9/6/71	7/9/71
Malaysia (30)		16/12/70 (s)	16/9/63		20/9/74r	19/12/74
Maldives		13/10/95	11/1/96		13/10/95	11/1/96
Mali		26/1/61	26/4/61	16/8/62	30/12/63	29/3/64
Malta (31)		19/2/86 (s)	21/9/64			
Mauritania		6/8/62	4/11/62			
Mauritius (58)		17/10/89	15/1/90		17/10/89	15/1/90
Mexico		14/2/33	15/5/33	28/9/55	24/5/57	1/8/63
Monaco					9/4/79	8/7/79
Mongolia		30/4/62	29/7/62			
Montenegro (57)		1/4/08 (s)	3/6/06		1/4/08 (s)	3/6/06
Morocco		5/1/58	5/4/58	31/5/63	17/11/75	15/2/76
Myanmar (32)		2/1/52 (s)	4/1/48			
Nauru (33)		16/11/70 (s)	31/1/68		16/11/70 (s)	31/1/68
Nepal		12/2/66	13/5/66		12/2/66	13/5/66
Netherlands (34)	12/10/29	1/7/33	29/9/33	28/9/55	21/9/60	1/8/63
New Zealand (35)		6/4/37	5/7/37	19/3/58	16/3/67	14/6/67
Niger (36)		8/3/62 (s)	3/8/60		8/3/62 (s)	1/8/63
Nigeria (37)		15/10/63 (s)	1/10/60		1/7/69	29/9/69
North Macedonia (51)		1/9/94 (s)	17/9/91		1/9/94 (s)	17/9/91
Norway	12/10/29	3/7/37	1/10/37		3/5/63	1/8/63
Oman		6/8/76	4/11/76		4/8/87	2/11/87
Pakistan (38)		30/12/69 (s)	14/8/47	8/8/60	16/1/61	1/8/63
Panama		12/11/96	10/2/97		12/11/96	10/2/97
Papua New Guinea (39)		12/12/75 (s)	16/9/75		12/12/75	16/9/75
Paraguay		28/8/69	26/11/69		28/8/69	26/11/69
Peru		5/7/88	3/10/88		5/7/88	3/10/88
Philippines		9/11/50r	7/2/51	28/9/55	30/11/66	28/2/67
Poland	12/10/29	15/11/32	13/2/33	28/9/55	23/4/56	1/8/63
Portugal (40)		20/3/47	18/6/47	28/9/55	16/9/63	15/12/63
Qatar		22/12/86	22/3/87		22/12/86	22/3/87
Republic of Korea					13/7/67	11/10/67
Republic of Moldova		20/3/97	19/6/97		20/3/97	19/6/97
Romania	12/10/29	8/7/31	13/2/33	28/9/55	3/12/58	1/8/63
Russian Federation (41)	12/10/29	20/8/34	18/11/34	28/9/55	25/3/57	1/8/63
Rwanda (42)		16/12/64 (s)	1/7/62		27/12/90	27/3/91
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		3/12/01 (s)	27/10/79		3/12/01	3/3/02
Samoa (43)		20/1/64 (s)	1/1/62		16/10/72	14/1/73
Saudi Arabia		27/1/69	27/4/69		27/1/69	27/4/69
Senegal		19/6/64	17/9/64		19/6/64	17/9/64

States	WARSAW CONVENTION			THE HAGUE PROTOCOL		
	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force
Serbia (44)		18/7/01 (s)	27/4/92		18/7/01 (s)	27/4/92
Seychelles		24/6/80	22/9/80		24/6/80	22/9/80
Sierra Leone (45)		2/4/68 (s)	27/4/61			
Singapore		4/9/71	3/12/71		6/11/67	4/2/68
Slovakia (46)		24/3/95 (s)	1/1/93		24/3/95 (s)	1/1/93
Slovenia (47)		7/8/98 (s)	25/6/91		7/8/98 (s)	25/6/91
Solomon Islands (48)		9/9/81 (s)	7/7/78		9/9/81 (s)	7/7/78
South Africa	12/10/29	22/12/54	22/3/55		18/9/67	17/12/67
Spain	12/10/29	31/3/30	13/2/33		6/12/65	6/3/66
Sri Lanka (49)		2/5/51 (s)	4/2/48		21/2/97	22/5/97
Sudan		11/2/75	12/5/75		11/2/75	12/5/75
Suriname		30/6/03	28/9/03		19/10/04	17/1/05
Sweden		3/7/37	1/10/37	28/9/55	3/5/63	1/8/63
Switzerland	12/10/29	9/5/34	7/8/34	28/9/55	19/10/62	1/8/63
Syrian Arab Republic (50)		3/6/64 (s)	2/3/59		3/6/64 (s)	1/8/63
Togo		2/7/80	30/9/80		2/7/80	30/9/80
Tonga (52)		21/2/77 (s)	4/6/70		21/2/77	22/5/77
Trinidad and Tobago (53)		10/5/83 (s)	31/8/62		10/5/83	8/8/83
Tunisia		15/11/63	13/2/64		15/11/63	13/2/64
Turkey		25/3/78	23/6/78		25/3/78	23/6/78
Turkmenistan		21/12/94	20/3/95			
Uganda		24/7/63	22/10/63			
Ukraine		14/8/59	12/11/59	15/1/60	23/6/60	1/8/63
United Arab Emirates		4/4/86	3/7/86		18/10/93	16/1/94
United Kingdom (54)(58)	12/10/29	14/2/33	15/5/33	23/3/56	3/3/67	1/6/67
United Kingdom for the following territories: - Bermuda - British Antarctic Territory - Cayman, Turks, and Caicos Islands - Akrotiri and Dhekelia - Falkland Islands and Dependencies - Hong Kong - Montserrat - St. Helena and Ascension		3/12/34	3/3/35		3/3/67	1/6/67
United Republic of Tanzania		7/4/65	6/7/65			
United States		31/7/34r	29/10/34	28/6/56	15/9/03	14/12/03
Uruguay		4/7/79	2/10/79			
Uzbekistan		27/2/97	28/5/97		27/2/97	28/5/97
Vanuatu		26/10/81	24/1/82		26/10/81	24/1/82

States	WARSAW CONVENTION			THE HAGUE PROTOCOL		
	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force	Signature	Ratification, Adherence or Succession (s)	Date of entry into force
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		15/6/55	13/9/55	28/9/55	26/8/60r	1/8/63
Viet Nam		11/10/82	9/1/83		11/10/82	9/1/83
Yemen		6/5/82	4/8/82		6/5/82	4/8/82
Zambia (55)		25/3/70 (s)	24/10/64		25/3/70	23/6/70
Zimbabwe (56)		27/10/80 (s)	18/4/80		27/10/80	25/1/81

r Reservation

RESERVATIONS

CANADA

Canada has deposited the following reservation: “Article 2, paragraph 1, of the present Convention shall not apply to international air transport effected directly by Canada”.

CHILE

The document of adherence of Chile contains the reservation provided for in the Additional Protocol to Article 2 of the Warsaw Convention of 1929.

CONGO

Congo has deposited the following reservation: “The Government of the Congo (Brazzaville) wishes to state that, in application of the Additional Protocol (Article 2) and of Article XXVI of the Hague Protocol, it will not apply these texts

- to international air transport effected directly by the State,
- to the carriage of persons, cargo and baggage for its military authorities on aircraft registered in the Congo, the whole capacity of which has been reserved by or on behalf of such authorities”.

CUBA

Cuba has deposited the following reservation: “Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Convention shall not apply to international air transport effected directly by Cuba”.

ETHIOPIA

Ethiopia has deposited the following reservation: “Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Convention shall not apply to international air transport effected directly by Ethiopia”.

MALAYSIA

Malaysia deposited at the time of its adherence to the Hague Protocol the following reservation: “. . . in accordance with Article XXVI of the Protocol, the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air, signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929, as amended by this Protocol shall not apply to the carriage of persons, cargo and baggage for the military authorities of Malaysia on aircraft, registered in Malaysia, the whole capacity of which has been reserved by or on behalf of such authorities”.

PHILIPPINES

The Philippines has deposited the following reservation: “Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Convention shall not apply to international air transport effected by the Republic of the Philippines”.

UNITED STATES

The United States of America has deposited the following reservation: “Article 2, paragraph 1, of the present Convention shall not apply to international air transport which may be effected by the United States of America or any territory or possession under its jurisdiction”.

VENEZUELA

The Government of Venezuela has filed the following reservation: “Pursuant to the provisions of Article XXVI of the said Protocol, the Government of the Republic of Venezuela has declared that the Convention as amended by the Protocol shall not apply to the carriage of persons, goods and baggage performed for the military authorities of the Republic of Venezuela on board aircraft which are registered in Venezuela and whose entire capacity has been reserved by or on the behalf of these authorities”.

FOOTNOTES

- (1) With the following territories: Papua, Norfolk Island, New Guinea.
- (2) By a note from the Minister of Foreign Affairs dated 15 May 1975, the Government of the Bahamas informed the depositary that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and by the provisions of the Hague Protocol of 1955 which, before that State became independent, had been extended to its territory by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934.
- (3) By a “declaration of continuity” of the Minister of Foreign Affairs on 13 February 1979, the Government of the People’s Republic of Bangladesh informed the depositary that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and by the provisions of the Hague Protocol of 1955 which, before the People’s Republic of Bangladesh became independent, had been extended to its territory by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan on 26 December 1969.
- (4) In a document dated 8 December 1969 transmitted to the depositary by a note dated 8 January 1970, the Government of Barbados stipulated that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 (before Barbados became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (5) By a note dated 9 January 1962, Dahomey (now Benin) declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention and the Protocol (before Benin became independent, acceptance was effected by France: of the Convention, on 15 November 1932; of the Protocol, on 19 May 1959).
- (6) By a note dated 9 February 1995, deposited on 3 March 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*, the Warsaw Convention of 1929.
- (7) By a letter dated 31 January 1977 from the Office of the President, the Government of Botswana informed the depositary that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 which, before that State became independent, had been extended to its territory by the United Kingdom on 2 September 1952.
- (8) In its instrument of succession of 6 February 1984, received by the depositary on 28 February 1984, the Government of Brunei Darussalam declared that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 which had been extended to its territory by the United Kingdom on 4 July 1936.
- (9) By a note dated 21 August 1961, the Government of the Republic of Cameroon declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention and the Protocol (before Cameroon became independent, acceptance was effected by France: of the Convention, on 15 November 1932; of the Protocol, on 19 May 1959).
- (10) The instrument of accession by the People’s Republic of China contains the following declaration: “The Government of the People’s Republic of China is the sole legal government representing the Chinese people. The [Warsaw] Convention to which the Government of the People’s Republic of China adheres shall of course apply to the entire Chinese territory including Taiwan”.

Notification by the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China dated 16 June 1997:

“. . . In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland signed on 19 December 1984, the People’s Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People’s Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People’s Government of the People’s Republic of China. In this connection I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People’s Republic of China to make the following notification. The Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air done in Warsaw on 12 October 1929 to which the Government of the People’s Republic of China deposited its instrument of accession on 20 July 1958 and the Protocol Amending the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules Relating to International Carriage by Air done in Warsaw on 12 October 1929 to which the Government of the People’s Republic of China deposited its instrument of accession on 20 August 1975 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention and Protocol) will apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the People’s Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the above Convention and Protocol to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.”

Notification by the Embassy of the People’s Republic of China dated 8 October 1999:

“In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People’s Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao signed on 13 April 1987, the Government

of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999. Macao will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

In this connection, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to inform your Excellency of the following:

The Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air, done on 12 October 1929, as amended by the Hague Protocol done on 28 September 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention), to which the Government of the People's Republic of China deposited its instrument of accession on 20 August 1975, will apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999.

The Government of the People's Republic of China will assume responsibility for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the above Convention and Protocol to the Macao Special Administrative Region."

- (11) By a note dated 5 January 1962, the People's Republic of the Congo declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention and the Protocol (before Congo became independent, acceptance was effected by France: of the Convention, on 15 November 1932; of the Protocol, on 19 May 1959).
- (12) By a note dated 7 February 1962, Côte d'Ivoire declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention and the Protocol (before Côte d'Ivoire became independent, acceptance was effected by France: of the Convention, on 15 November 1932; of the Protocol, on 19 May 1959).
- (13) By a note dated 8 July 1993, deposited on 14 July 1993, the Government of Croatia declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and the Hague Protocol of 1955 (with effect from 8 October 1991).
- (14) By a note dated 23 April 1963, Cyprus declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention (before Cyprus became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (15) By a declaration dated 14 November 1994, transmitted with a note dated 23 November 1994 from the Embassy of the Czech Republic in Warsaw, deposited on 29 November 1994, the Government of the Czech Republic declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, the Warsaw Convention and the Hague Protocol (with effect from 1 January 1993).
- (16) By a note dated 27 July 1962, the Democratic Republic of the Congo declared that it considered itself bound by the Warsaw Convention of 1929 (before the Democratic Republic of the Congo became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by Belgium on 13 July 1936).
- (17) By a note dated 2 March 1959, the Arab Republic of Egypt declared that it considered itself bound by the ratifications previously made by the United Arab Republic: of the Convention, on 6 September 1955; of the Protocol, on 26 April 1956.
- (18) In a declaration dated 25 February 1972, deposited on 15 March 1972, Fiji announced that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and by the provisions of the Hague Protocol of 1955 which, before that State became independent, had been extended to its territory by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934.
- (19) The German Democratic Republic, which ratified the Protocol on 19 May 1959, acceded to the Federal Republic of Germany on 3 October 1990.
- (20) On 3 February 1997, Guatemala deposited its instrument of adherence to the Warsaw Convention of 1929, having been party to the Hague Protocol of 1955 since 26 October 1971.
- (21) By a note dated 29 January 1970, India declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention (before India became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 20 November 1934).
- (22) By a note dated 2 February 1952, Indonesia declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention (before Indonesia became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the Netherlands on 1 July 1933).
- (23) The instrument of adherence of the Republic of Iraq contains the following declaration: "The adherence of the Republic of Iraq to the Convention (to the Protocol) in no way signifies the recognition of Israel or the establishment with Israel of any relations whatsoever".
- (24) By a note dated 17 November 1969, Jordan declared that it considered itself bound without interruption by the Convention (before Jordan became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 17 December 1937).

- (25) Kenya deposited its instrument of adherence on 7 October 1964, with validity as from 12 December 1963, on which date it became an independent State (before Kenya became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (26) By a note dated 14 March 1956, deposited on 9 May 1956, the Lao People's Democratic Republic declared that it considered itself bound by the Warsaw Convention of 1929; and by a note dated 12 March 1956, deposited on 9 May 1956, declared that it considered itself bound by the Hague Protocol (before the Lao People's Democratic Republic became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by France on 15 November 1932).
- (27) By a note dated 10 February 1962, Lebanon declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention, to which the trustee authorities adhered on its behalf on 26 October 1933.
- (28) Lesotho, in the declaration of 3 March 1975 by its Prime Minister and Minister for External Affairs, submitted by means of a note dated 29 April 1975 of the Lesotho High Commissioner's Office in London, stated that it considers itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 (prior to Lesotho's accession to independence, adherence to the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 2 September 1952).
- (29) By a note dated 17 August 1962, deposited on 27 August 1962, Madagascar declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention and the Protocol (before Madagascar became independent, acceptance was effected by France: of the Convention, on 15 November 1932; of the Protocol, on 19 May 1959).
- (30) By a note dated 3 September 1970, deposited on 16 December 1970, Malaysia declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention (before this State became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 4 July 1936).
- (31) By a note from the Minister of Foreign Affairs dated 27 January 1986, received by the depositary on 19 February 1986, the Government of Malta declared that it considered itself bound, with effect from 21 September 1964, by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 which had been extended to its territory by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934.
- (32) In the instrument of adherence of 20 November 1951 received by the depositary on 2 January 1952, the Government of Burma (now Myanmar) stipulated that it considered itself bound without interruption by the Convention (before Myanmar became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 20 November 1934).
- (33) The Republic of Nauru, in the statement of the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Nauru included in the note dated 4 November 1970 from the Office of the High Commissioner of Australia in London, has declared that it considers itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and the Hague Protocol of 1955. (Before the Republic of Nauru became independent, the acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 1 August 1935; the acceptance of the Protocol was effected by Australia on 23 June 1959).
- (34) In the document of ratification of the Hague Protocol, it is stipulated that ratification concerns the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Dutch New Guinea. By a note dated 27 December 1985 the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands informed the depositary that as of 1 January 1986 the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and the Hague Protocol of 1955 are applicable to the Netherlands Antilles [without Aruba] and to Aruba.
- (35) Before New Zealand became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 6 April 1937.
- (36) By a note dated 20 February 1962, Niger declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention and the Protocol (before Niger became independent, acceptance was effected by France: of the Convention, on 15 November 1932; of the Protocol, on 19 May 1959).
- (37) By a note dated 9 October 1963, Nigeria declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention (before Nigeria became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (38) By a note dated 26 December 1969, Pakistan declared that it became a party to the Convention with effect from 14 August 1947 by virtue of the statute relating to the independence of India (International Arrangements), 1947 (before Pakistan became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 20 November 1934).
- (39) By a note dated 6 November 1975, the Government of Papua New Guinea informed that it considered itself to be bound by the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and the Hague Protocol of 1955. Before it became independent (on 16 September 1975), acceptance of the Convention and Protocol was effected on behalf of its territory by Australia.

- (40) By a note dated 15 May 1997, the Government of Portugal informed that the Hague Protocol of 1955 applied to the Territory of Macao.
By a note dated 23 September 1999, deposited on 8 October 1999, the Government of Portugal made the following notifications:
- a) “I am instructed by my Government to refer to the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air, signed at Warsaw on 12 October 1929 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Convention’) which applies to Macao at present, and to state as follows.
In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Macao signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macao until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People’s Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999.
From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Macao.”
- b) “I am instructed by my Government to refer to the Protocol to Amend the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air signed at The Hague on 28 September 1955 (hereinafter referred to as the ‘Protocol’) which applies to Macao at present, and to state as follows.
In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Macao signed on 13 April 1987, the Portuguese Republic will continue to have international responsibility for Macao until 19 December 1999 and from that date onwards the People’s Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999.
From 20 December 1999 onwards the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Protocol to Macao.”
- (41) By a note dated 11 February 1992, the Government of the Russian Federation declared that it considered itself bound by the provisions of all international obligations concluded by the former Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics, *inter alia*, the Warsaw Convention, to which the former Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics was party.
- (42) By a note dated 1 December 1964, deposited on 16 December 1964, the Government of the Republic of Rwanda declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention (before Rwanda became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by Belgium on 13 July 1936).
- (43) By a note dated 16 October 1963, deposited on 20 January 1964, the Government of Samoa declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of the Convention (before Samoa became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 6 April 1937).
- (44) 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.
- (45) In its declaration of 6 March 1968 transmitted by a note from the Office of the High Commissioner dated 21 March 1968, deposited on 2 April 1968, the Government of Sierra Leone stated that it considers itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of the Convention (before Sierra Leone became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (46) In its declaration dated 16 February 1995, deposited on 24 March 1995, the Government of the Slovak Republic stated that it considered itself bound by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and The Hague Protocol of 1955 (with effect from 1 January 1993).
- (47) In its notification 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*, the Warsaw Convention of 1929 and the Hague Protocol of 1955 (with effect from 25 June 1991).

- (48) By a note dated 21 August 1981, the Solomon Islands declared that it considered itself bound by the Warsaw Convention and the Hague Protocol (before the Solomon Islands attained independence, acceptance was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934 for the Convention and on 3 March 1967 for the Protocol).
- (49) By a note dated 24 April 1951, Ceylon (now Sri Lanka) declared that it considered itself bound by the Convention (before Sri Lanka became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (50) By a note dated 13 April 1964, the Syrian Arab Republic declared that “Constitutional Decree No. 25 of 13 June 1962 decided to consider adherence to the multilateral international Conventions and Agreements effected during the period of its union with Egypt to be valid for the Syrian Arab Republic – and since the United Arab Republic had, in 1959, taken the appropriate measures for its adherence to the Warsaw Convention, signed on 12 October 1929 and the Protocol modifying the said Convention, signed at The Hague on 28 September 1955, the Syrian Arab Republic, considering the aforementioned Constitutional Decree, considers itself a party to the Warsaw Convention and its Protocol mentioned above”.
- (51) By a note dated 15 August 1994, deposited on 1 September 1994, the Government of the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia declared that it considered itself bound, by virtue of succession, by the provisions of, *inter alia*, the Warsaw Convention and the Hague Protocol (with effect from 8 September 1991).
- (52) The Government of Tonga, in a letter from its Prime Minister and the Minister for External Affairs dated 31 January 1977, informed that it considers itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929. Before this State became independent, acceptance was effected by the United Kingdom on 4 July 1936.
- (53) The Republic of Trinidad and Tobago, in its note dated 11 March 1983, deposited on 10 May 1983, declared that it considered itself to be bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929, the acceptance of which was effected on its territory by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934.
- (54) According to a note dated 3 March 1967 made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland in accordance with Article XXV, paragraph 2, of the said Protocol, the Protocol does not apply to the following territories: Aden, Antigua, Brunei, Dominica, Grenada, Kamaran, Kuria Muria Islands, Perim, Protectorate of Southern Arabia, Southern Rhodesia, St. Christopher, Nevis and Anguilla, St. Lucia, St. Vincent, Swaziland and Tonga.
- According to a note dated 17 June 1980, the United Kingdom informed the depositary that the following territories, to which the Convention and the Protocol had been previously applied, should be omitted as they attained independence: Dominica (date of independence: 3 November 1978), Gilbert Islands (12 July 1979), Ellice Islands, now Tuvalu (12 July 1979), Grenada (7 February 1974), Saint Lucia (22 February 1979), Saint Vincent (27 October 1979), Seychelles (29 June 1978), Solomon Islands (7 July 1978), Zimbabwe, formerly Southern Rhodesia (18 April 1980).
- Notification by the Embassy of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, dated 26 June 1997: “. . . I am instructed by Her Britannic Majesty’s Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to refer to the Convention for the Unification of Certain Rules relating to International Carriage by Air, done at Warsaw on 12 October 1929 as amended by the Hague Protocol 1955 (hereinafter referred to the ‘Convention’) which applies to Hong Kong at present. I am also instructed to state that in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People’s Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong, signed on 19 December 1984, the Government of the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People’s Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date. Therefore, from that date the Government of the United Kingdom will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Hong Kong.”
- (55) In its declaration dated 17 February 1970 transmitted to the depositary on 25 March 1970, the Government of Zambia stated that it considered itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929 (before Zambia became independent, acceptance of the Convention was effected by the United Kingdom on 3 December 1934).
- (56) The Government of Zimbabwe, in a note dated 10 September 1980 from the Ministry for External Affairs, informed the depositary that it considers itself bound by the provisions of the Warsaw Convention of 1929, the acceptance of which was effected on its territory by the United Kingdom on 3 April 1935.
- (57) 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 44 with respect to Serbia.

- (58) 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]”