



# General Assembly

Distr.: General  
3 July 2006

Original: English

---

## Sixty-first session

Item 74 of the preliminary list\*

**Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives**

## **Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives**

### **Report of the Secretary-General**

#### *Summary*

Thirteen States submitted reports, pursuant to paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 59/37, by the established deadline (see section II of the report);

Two views were received from States pursuant to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 59/37 (see section III of the report);

Twenty-five additional States became participants to the instruments relevant to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives and one State notified its withdrawal from one of the instruments (see section IV of the report), since the previous report (A/59/125) on the topic.

---

\* A/61/50 and Corr.1.



## I. Introduction

1. On 2 December 2004, the General Assembly adopted resolution 59/37, entitled “Consideration of effective measures to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives”. Paragraphs 10, 12 and 13 of the resolution read as follows:

“*The General Assembly,*

“10. *Requests:*

(a) All States to report to the Secretary-General as promptly as possible serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as missions and representatives with diplomatic status to international intergovernmental organizations;

(b) The State in which the violation took place — and, to the extent possible, the State where the alleged offender is present — to report to the Secretary-General as promptly as possible on measures taken to bring the offender to justice and eventually to communicate, in accordance with its laws, the final outcome of the proceedings against the offender, and to report on measures adopted with a view to preventing a repetition of such violations;

(c) The States so reporting to consider using or taking into account the guidelines prepared by the Secretary-General;<sup>2</sup>

“... ”

“12. *Also requests* the Secretary-General to invite States, in the circular note referred to in paragraph 11 (a) above, to inform him of their views with respect to any measures needed or already taken to enhance the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as well as missions and representatives with diplomatic status to international intergovernmental organizations;

“13. *Further requests* the Secretary-General to submit to the General Assembly at its sixty-first session a report containing:

(a) Information on the state of ratification of, and accessions to, the instruments referred to in paragraph 8 above;

(b) A summary of the reports received and views expressed pursuant to paragraphs 10 and 12 above;”

2. By a note dated 13 January 2005, the Secretary-General drew the attention of States to the request contained in paragraph 10 (a) of General Assembly resolution 59/37 and invited them to report to the Secretary-General serious violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives.

3. The present report is prepared pursuant to paragraph 13 of resolution 59/37.

4. Section II of the report contains a summary of the reports received and the text of those reports.

---

<sup>2</sup> A/42/485, annex.

5. Section III of the report contains the views expressed pursuant to paragraph 12 of resolution 59/37.

6. Section IV of the report contains information on the status of participation of States, as at 20 June 2006, in the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961,<sup>1</sup> the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963,<sup>2</sup> and the respective optional protocols thereto, as well as the 1973 Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents.<sup>3</sup>

## II. Reports received from States pursuant to paragraph 10 of General Assembly resolution 59/37

7. The report by **Sweden**, dated 8 October 2004,\* provided information on incidents in Sweden, involving the premises of the Austrian Honorary Consulate in Malmö, a car driven by a diplomat from Saudi Arabia, the premises and several cars of the Russian Embassy and the premises of the Syrian Arab Republic. The relevant part of the report reads as follows:

### “1. Austria

“During the night of 18/19 July 2002, a stone was thrown, smashing a window in the premises that used to be the Austrian Honorary Consul’s office in Malmö. Someone had written “stop the right wing” and drawn an anarchist symbol on the wall. No witnesses or leads.

“In the early morning of 20 June 2003, three cobblestones were thrown through an office window close to the same Austrian Honorary Consulate. Two window panes were smashed. It is likely that the intended target of this action was the Austrian Consulate.

### “2. Saudi Arabia

“On 1 May 2003, a car with diplomatic licence plates driven by a Saudi diplomat was attacked and damaged by demonstrators at Stureplan in the centre of Stockholm. Stones, empty bottles and metal rods were used. The policemen who saw the diplomat’s car being attacked said that they were too busy controlling a group of demonstrators representing ‘Reclaim the streets’ who had turned violent and were throwing stones. They gave the diplomat the address of the nearest police station, where he could report the incident. The prosecutor later found that there were no grounds for suspecting that an indictable crime had been committed.

### “3. Russian Federation

“In the early morning of 8 November 2002, it was discovered that somebody had been inside the Embassy grounds, broken into four of the five cars parked inside the fence and attempted to break into the fifth. All five cars were damaged. The four that had been broken into had been searched and the interior fittings left in disorder. No leads.

---

\* The above-mentioned report submitted by Sweden was received by the Codification Division after the conclusion of the debate by the Sixth Committee on the topic during the fifty-ninth session of the General Assembly and, consequently, was included in the present report of the Secretary-General.

“On 8 July 2003 at 4 pm, an unknown man was discovered in one of the offices on the premises of the Mission. The man was armed with an axe and behaving aggressively. People tried to block his way, but he managed to escape by smashing a window pane. He then broke into a diplomat’s car and forced his way through the closed gates and out into the street. Both the car and the perpetrator were later found. On 14 August he was sentenced to six months’ imprisonment for unlawful intrusion, damage to property, and vehicle theft.

#### “4. Syrian Arab Republic

“In connection with a legal demonstration in the vicinity of the Embassy on 16 June 2003, three people were able to enter the Embassy claiming they wanted to apply for visas. The purpose of the demonstration was to have the Mujahedin in Iran removed from the United States Government’s list of terrorist organizations. The Syrian ambassador viewed these three people as threatening, as they represented the Mujahedin. When the police arrived, they asked these men to leave the Embassy, which they did at once, assuring the police that they had not intended to cause any trouble and had only come to ask for an appointment. The case was closed on 18 June 2003 on the grounds that a crime could not be established.

“When the embassy staff arrived at the Embassy on 22 July 2003, they found a funeral wreath with a sash that read: ‘To H.E. the Syrian Ambassador. On behalf of the resting soul of the Lebanese martyr Josef Hoyes, who died in a Syrian prison. Free Lebanese group, Sweden.’ The case was closed on 30 July 2003, owing to the lack of evidence.

“On 20 August 2003 between 10 and 11 am, the Syrian Embassy received a telephone threat. A man, reportedly a Swede, speaking both Swedish and English, said: ‘You are responsible for the killing of 20 people in Baghdad ... You have killed the representatives of Kofi Annan in cold blood ... You are a terrorist and Syria is a terrorist country and you must be expelled from my country, Sweden.’ When he was asked about his identity, the man answered: ‘Why? Are you willing to kill me too?’ (The telephone number was registered.) The case was closed on 15 October 2003 on the grounds that a crime could not be established.

“On 10 October 2003, the Syrian Embassy informed the Ministry for Foreign Affairs that two letters threatening the Embassy had been received. They could be interpreted as expressions of opinion against Arabs and Islam. Pictures of tortured people were included, as well as threats such as: ‘If you don’t agree, you will be killed!’ The letters were forwarded to the police. On 17 February 2004, the decision was taken not to initiate a preliminary investigation. No further action on this matter was taken by the police.”

8. The **Syrian Arab Republic** submitted a report, dated 13 February 2006, regarding the acts of violence that occurred on 4 February 2006, resulting in material damage to a number of embassies in Damascus. The relevant part of the report reads as follows:

“I have the honour to report to you hereinafter the measures taken by the Government of the Syrian Arab Republic in connection with the enhancement of the protection of embassies and consulates accredited to the Syrian Arab Republic following the publication by newspapers in a number of countries of

offensive drawings of the Prophet Muhammad, as well as the measures taken in connection with the demonstrations of anger and protest against the publication of those drawings and the steps taken to deal with their consequences.

“A few days prior to the start of the demonstrations of anger and protest, the competent authorities in the Syrian Arab Republic took a number of anticipatory measures to strengthen the guarding and protection of all embassies and consulates, their members and members’ places of residence, in particular the embassies and consulates of the countries whose media published the offensive cartoons.

“Numerous demonstrations were held during the days that preceded 4 February 2006. Those who took part in them numbered in the dozens, and they peacefully expressed their protest and anger over the publication of the offensive drawings of the Prophet.

“On 4 February, a large demonstration was held. The demonstration began peacefully; its participants, who were reckoned to be in the thousands, gathering in front of a building housing a group of embassies. The forces of law and order were increased immediately with a view to ensuring the security and safety of the accredited embassies. However, the peaceful demonstration suddenly turned to the use of violence, and, despite the efforts made by the police and security forces, who tried with available means, namely, tear gas, water hoses and the formation of a human shield, to prevent the demonstrators from approaching the embassies in question, and, despite the appeals made by officials and spiritual leaders, some of the demonstrators managed to cause damage to a number of embassies.

“The use of force by some of those participating in the demonstration resulted in the injury of dozens of members of the police and security forces as they performed their duty of protecting the embassies, and a number of them were taken to hospitals to receive first-aid treatment.

“The moment the peaceful demonstrations suddenly turned violent, the security authorities increased their presence and stepped up their security measures around all diplomatic and consular missions and places of residence of diplomatic and consular representatives. They set up barriers in all streets leading to the embassies which the demonstrators were trying to reach after the outbreak of the acts of violence and turmoil, and used water hoses and tear-gas canisters to disperse the demonstrators and prevent them from approaching those embassies.

“The security authorities arrested and questioned those suspected of having caused damage to a number of diplomatic missions and legal measures against those responsible for causing such damage are currently being prepared.

“Telephone calls were made between the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic and the Ministers for Foreign Affairs of Denmark, Sweden and Norway, in which the Minister expressed his regret over what had happened. He pointed out that protective measures had been stepped up and reaffirmed Syria’s commitment to and respect for international agreements. The Syrian Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs made calls to a number of

ambassadors of States whose embassies had been damaged and to the Ambassador of Austria, whose country currently chairs the European Union, to express regret over the events that had taken place. He also assured him of the commitment of the Syrian Arab Republic with regard to international agreements and informed him that the appropriate investigations had had been initiated.

“The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Syrian Arab Republic issued a press release in which it expressed its regret over the acts of violence that had accompanied the protest demonstrations on 4 February 2006, resulting in material damage to a number of embassies in Damascus. The Ministry added that, though the feelings of enormous popular wrath at the offences targeting the Prophet were understandable, it was not permissible to violate the rules of law and order in the Syrian Arab Republic. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs reaffirmed the obligations of the Syrian Arab Republic under the international agreements pertaining to the guarantee of security for embassies and their members. He stated that further measures had been adopted to guard and protect diplomatic missions and that there was no truth whatsoever to the claim of the existence of any threat aimed at nationals of certain countries in the Syrian Arab Republic.

“On 6 February 2006, the Deputy Minister for Foreign Affairs met with the European Troika, which is chaired by the Austrian Ambassador and includes the Ambassador of Finland, the Swiss Chargé d'affaires and the Ambassador of the European Commission, who was also acting on behalf of Norway and Canada. The Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs met with the Norwegian Ambassador on 8 February and with a delegation from the Chilean Ministry of Foreign Affairs on 9 February. During those meetings, the regret of the Syrian Arab Republic over what had taken place was expressed, as was its willingness to honour its liability for the damage that had resulted from the acts of violence. That liability arises under international agreements, in particular article 22 of the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations.

“A committee made up of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and the Damascus Governorate has begun its work of making an inventory of the damage and restoring the damaged embassy buildings with a view to satisfying the liabilities of the Syrian Arab Republic under international agreements. In addition, a temporary headquarters has been provided for the Chilean Embassy.

“The Austrian Ambassador, whose country chairs the European Union, communicated with the Assistant Minister for Foreign Affairs and thanked him for the security measures taken.

“The French Ambassador stated that the demonstrators had tried to enter the French Embassy, but the security and police forces had succeeded in preventing them. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs in France, moreover, contacted the Syrian Ambassador in Paris to express to her its thanks for the security measures taken by the Syrian authorities to protect the embassy.

“As we present these facts, it is regrettable that officials in one country, which has made it a policy to exert pressure on the Syrian Arab Republic and deliberately distort its positions, are ignoring the measures referred to above

and are issuing statements without basis in reality. They have twisted the facts and misrepresented the measures taken by the Syrian Government based on its commitment to international law and the performance of its obligation to protect diplomatic missions. This unfair campaign has been joined by newspapers and media known for their malicious and misleading stands.

“The Syrian Arab Republic looks to the international community to do its duty in confronting the campaign against the symbols of the revealed religions, with a view to ensuring respect for all religions and their symbols, and to continue working towards a dialogue of civilizations and striving together to strengthen the spirit of tolerance among all peoples.”

9. **Iraq** submitted a report, dated 13 February 2006, informing that the Iraqi Security Authorities had “reinforced its protection and guarding measures on a 24-hour basis each day, for the diplomatic missions and diplomats accredited to Iraq”.

10. **Lebanon** submitted a report, dated 4 April 2006, regarding incidents that had occurred on 3 January 2000 and 5 February 2006 involving the premises of the Embassies of the Russian Federation and Denmark. The relevant part of the report reads as follows:

“I. Regarding violations undergone by diplomatic and consular missions in Lebanon:

“On 3 January 2000, the premises of the Russian Embassy were subject to an armed attack by a person of Palestinian citizenship, who was killed following a gun battle in a neighbouring building.

“On 5 February 2006 the building housing the Danish Embassy was set on fire by demonstrators in the wake of the publication by some Danish newspapers of drawings insulting to the Prophet Muhammad. A large number of demonstrators were detained and investigations are ongoing to determine what elements and parties were behind this attack.”

11. A report by the **Holy See**, dated 10 April 2006, referred to incidents that occurred in the period from 2003 to 2006 involving the Nunciatures in Jakarta, Nicosia, Baghdad, Bujumbura, Port Moresby and the Pontifical Representative’s office at UNESCO in Paris. The relevant part of the report reads as follows:

“15 May 2004, in Jakarta, Indonesia, some thieves entered the Nunciature and stole the diplomatic passports and items of the Councillor, as well as his VISA credit card and international licenses.

“19 January 2005, in Nicosia, Cyprus, some unknown intruders attempted to enter into the Nunciature.

“30 September 2005, in Paris, France, three thieves entered into the Pontifical Representative’s office at UNESCO and stole some personal objects belonging to the Permanent Observer. The stolen items were immediately recovered by the Paris police.

“29 January 2006, at 16:30 o’clock, in Baghdad, Iraq, there was a car explosion next to the garden wall of the Apostolic Nunciature. There were no deaths or injuries, but the wall was damaged for some metres and some windows were broken in the building. The suspects remain unknown. The explosion was contemporaneous with four car bombs in Baghdad and two in

Kirkuk against Christian Churches that killed three people and injured three others.

“5 December 2003, at Nicosia, Cyprus, a worker in the Nunciature was savagely assaulted and hit in the head with an iron bar.

“29 December 2003, fifty kilometres south of Bujumbura, Burundi, His Excellency, Michael Courtney, Apostolic Nuncio in Burundi, was mortally wounded and the perpetrators have still not been identified and brought to justice.

“20 February 2004, in Port Moresby, Papua New Guinea, some young people destroyed the apostolic seal and the words near the principal gate of the Nunciature.”

12. **Finland** submitted a report, dated 10 May 2006, regarding incidents that occurred in Helsinki in 2003-2005 involving the compound of the Embassy of the Russian Federation and the residences of the Ambassador of Serbia and Montenegro and the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea. The relevant part of the report reads as follows:

“The Permanent Representative of Finland wishes to inform that in relation to the incident on 6 October 2003, reported earlier, where a person intruded into the compound of the Embassy of the Russian Federation in Helsinki after raiding a shop nearby, the Helsinki District Court sentenced the person to pay fines for breach of public peace.

“On 1 August 2004 an unknown person tried to break into the residence of the Ambassador of Serbia and Montenegro in Helsinki but was not able to open the door. Minor damage was caused to the residence. The person remained unidentified.

“On 23 July 2005 a person broke into the residence of the Ambassador of the Republic of Korea in Helsinki. The person was caught by the police and sentenced to imprisonment by the Helsinki District Court for one year for committing several housebreakings in that same neighbourhood.”

13. **Norway** submitted a report, dated 11 May 2006, regarding incidents that occurred in Damascus on 4 February 2006 and in Teheran on 7 February 2006 involving the premises of Royal Norwegian Embassies, as well as incidents that occurred in Norway within the period of 2004-2005 involving the Embassies of Slovakia, the Russian Federation, Israel, the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, the Czech Republic, Poland, Switzerland, Greece, Turkey, the Netherlands, Canada, the United States of America and the chancery of the Palestine Liberation Organization. The relevant part of the report reads as follows:

**“Violations of the protection, security and safety of Norwegian diplomatic missions**

“The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Damascus

“The Embassy was attacked by a crowd on 4 February 2006. The premises were destroyed after having been vandalized and set on fire. The private residence of one of the diplomatic agents at the Embassy was also destroyed. Norway has protested in the strongest possible terms against the breaches of the inviolability of the diplomatic mission of Norway and has

claimed full compensation from the Syrian Arab Republic for the losses caused by the attack.

“The Royal Norwegian Embassy in Teheran

“The Embassy was attacked by a crowd on 7 February 2006. The premises were damaged and the crowd attempted to set the Embassy on fire. Norway has protested against breaches of the inviolability of the diplomatic mission of Norway and has claimed full compensation from the Islamic Republic of Iran for the losses caused by the attack.

**“Violations of the protection, security and safety of diplomatic missions in Norway**

**“2004**

“Slovak Embassy

“Burglary at the chancery. A diplomat’s personal belongings were stolen. The perpetrator was arrested and fined. Stolen items were returned to owner.

“Russian Embassy

“Burglary in a car on the Embassy parking lot. The car belonged to an Embassy employee. The case was reported and investigated. No one was arrested or charged.

“Israeli Embassy

“Paint was thrown at the Embassy gate. The case was reported and investigated. No one has been charged.

“Threatening behaviour from a man who tried to gain access to Embassy grounds. The man was arrested and fined.

**“2005**

“UK Embassy

“Graffiti on Embassy fence. Case was reported and investigated. No one was arrested or charged.

“Vandalism to chancery. The Embassy’s calling system was destroyed. A woman was apprehended and the woman has agreed to compensate for the damages.

“Czech Embassy

“Burglary at a diplomat’s residence. Valuables, keys and passports were stolen. The case was reported and investigated. The case has been dropped as the perpetrator remains unknown.

“Palestine Liberation Organization

“Burglary at chancery. Money and easily-sold valuables were stolen. The case has been investigated, but no one has been arrested or charged.

“Polish Embassy

“Graffiti on Embassy fence. Case was reported and investigated. No one was arrested or charged. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has paid for paint removal.

“Swiss Embassy

“Graffiti on Embassy fence. Case was reported and investigated. No one was arrested or charged. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has paid for paint removal.

“Greek Embassy

“Graffiti on Embassy fence. Case was reported and investigated. No one was arrested or charged. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has paid for paint removal.

“Turkish Embassy

“Graffiti on chancery wall. Case was reported and investigated. No one was arrested or charged. The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has paid for paint removal.

“Dutch Embassy

“Burglary at a diplomat’s residence. Valuables, keys, passports, a list of Embassy employees and an Embassy phone were stolen. The case was reported and investigated. No one has been arrested or charged. Passports, keys and the list of employees have turned up.

“Canadian Embassy

“Bomb threat sent by letter. The case has been investigated. No special precautions have been taken.

“United States Embassy

“Vandalism to chancery and damage to recently planted trees and lamp posts. One person has been apprehended, tried and convicted.

“The Norwegian Ministry of Foreign Affairs has compensated the various missions for the damage to their property in cases where this was requested on the basis of ex gratia payments. It has also covered the cost of removing graffiti.”

14. **Iceland, Colombia, Qatar, Slovenia, Ireland and Saudi Arabia** reported that there had been no violations during the reporting period.

### **III. Views expressed by States pursuant to paragraph 12 of General Assembly resolution 59/37**

15. In its report, dated 8 May 2005, **Qatar**, “with regard to the necessary measures proposed” in accordance with General Assembly resolution 59/37, considered it necessary “to emphasize the principle of reciprocity”.

16. In its report, dated 10 May 2006, **Finland** emphasized “the importance of cooperation on security matters not only at the international level, but also at the national level between the missions and the competent local authorities”.

---

#### **IV. Status of participation in international conventions pertaining to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives as at 20 June 2006<sup>4</sup>**

17. Each instrument listed below is represented in tables 1 and 2 by the letter shown on the left in the list.

- A. Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations of 1961 (signed at Vienna on 18 April 1961; entered into force on 24 April 1964, in accordance with article 51);
- B. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality of 1961 (signed at Vienna on 18 April 1961; entered into force on 24 April 1964, in accordance with article VI);
- C. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes of 1961 (signed at Vienna on 18 April 1961; entered into force on 24 April 1964);
- D. Vienna Convention on Consular Relations of 1963 (signed at Vienna on 24 April 1963; entered into force on 19 March 1967, in accordance with article 77);
- E. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning Acquisition of Nationality of 1963 (signed at Vienna on 24 April 1963; entered into force on 19 March 1967);
- F. Optional Protocol to the Vienna Convention on Consular Relations concerning the Compulsory Settlement of Disputes of 1963 (signed at Vienna on 24 April 1963; entered into force on 19 March 1967);
- G. Convention on the Prevention and Punishment of Crimes against Internationally Protected Persons, including Diplomatic Agents, of 1973 (adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on 14 December 1973; entered into force on 20 February 1977).

**Table 1**  
**Total participation in international conventions pertaining to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives**

<i>Signature, succession to signature</i>						
<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
60	18	29	48	18	37	25

  

<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>						
<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
184	51	64	170	39	45	162

**Table 2**  
**Status of participation in international conventions pertaining to the protection, security and safety of diplomatic and consular missions and representatives**

<i>State</i>	<i>Signature, succession to signature</i>							<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>						
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Afghanistan								A						G
Albania		A						A			D			G
Algeria								A			D			G
Andorra								A			D			G
Angola								A			D			
Antigua and Barbuda											D			G
Argentina		A	B		D		F	A	B		D			G
Armenia								A			D			G
Australia		A			D		G	A		C	D		F	G
Austria		A		C	D		F	A		C	D		F	G
Azerbaijan								A			D			G
Bahamas								A		C	D			G
Bahrain								A			D			G
Bangladesh								A			D			G
Barbados								A			D			G
Belarus		A					G	A			D			G
Belgium		A		C	D		F	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Belize								A			D			G
Benin					D		F	A			D			G
Bhutan								A			D			G
Bolivia					D			A			D			G
Bosnia and Herzegovina					E	F		A	B	C	D			G
Botswana								A	B	C				G

<i>State</i>	<i>Signature, succession to signature</i>							<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>						
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Brazil	A			D	E			A			D			G
Brunei Darussalam														G
Bulgaria	A						G	A		C	D	E	F	G
Burkina Faso				D		F		A			D		F	G
Burundi								A						G
Cambodia								A	B	C	D			
Cameroon				D	E	F		A			D			G
Canada	A						G	A			D			G
Cape Verde								A			D			G
Central African Republic	A	B	C	D		F		A	B	C				
Chad								A						
Chile	A			D		F		A			D			G
China								A			D			G
Colombia	A		C	D	E	F		A			D			G
Comoros								A						G
Congo				D	E	F		A						
Cook Islands														
Costa Rica	A			D				A		C	D			G
Côte d'Ivoire				D		F		A						G
Croatia								A			D			G
Cuba	A			D				A			D			G
Cyprus								A			D			G
Czech Republic								A			D			G
Democratic People's Republic of Korea								A			D			G
Democratic Republic of the Congo	A			D	E	F		A	B	C	D			G
Denmark	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Djibouti								A			D			G
Dominica								A		C	D			G
Dominican Republic	A	B	C	D	E	F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Ecuador	A		C	D			G	A		C	D			G
Egypt								A	B		D	E		G
El Salvador								A			D			G
Equatorial Guinea								A			D			G
Eritrea								A			D			
Estonia								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Ethiopia								A						G
Fiji								A		C	D			

<i>State</i>	<i>Signature, succession to signature</i>							<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>						
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Finland	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
France	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Gabon				D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Gambia														
Georgia								A			D			G
Germany	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Ghana	A	B	C	D	E	F		A			D	E		G
Greece	A							A			D			G
Grenada								A			D			G
Guatemala	A						G	A			D			G
Guinea								A	B	C	D			G
Guinea-Bissau								A						
Guyana								A			D			
Haiti								A			D			G
Holy See	A			D				A			D			
Honduras								A			D			G
Hungary	A						G	A		C	D		F	G
Iceland							G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
India								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Indonesia								A	B		D	E		
Iran (Islamic Republic of)	A	B	C	D				A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Iraq	A	B	C					A	B	C	D	E		G
Ireland	A		C	D		F		A			D			G
Israel	A		C	D				A						G
Italy	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Jamaica								A			D			G
Japan	A		C					A		C	D		F	G
Jordan								A			D			G
Kazakhstan								A			D			G
Kenya								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Kiribati								A			D			G
Kuwait				D	E	F		A		C	D			G
Kyrgyzstan								A			D			G
Lao People's Democratic Republic								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Latvia								A			D			G
Lebanon	A	B	C	D		F		A			D			G
Lesotho								A			D			
Liberia	A			D	E	F		A	B	C	D			G

<i>State</i>	<i>Signature, succession to signature</i>							<i>Ratification, accession or succession</i>						
	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>	<i>A</i>	<i>B</i>	<i>C</i>	<i>D</i>	<i>E</i>	<i>F</i>	<i>G</i>
Libyan Arab Jamahiriya								A	B		D			G
Liechtenstein	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Lithuania								A			D			G
Luxembourg	A		C	D		F		A		C	D		F	G
Madagascar								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Malawi								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Malaysia								A	B	C	D			G
Maldives											D			G
Mali								A			D			G
Malta								A		C	D			G
Marshall Islands								A			D			G
Mauritania								A			D			G
Mauritius								A		C	D		F	G
Mexico	A			D				A			D		F	G
Micronesia (Federated States of)								A			D			G
Monaco								A			D			G
Mongolia							G	A			D			G
Morocco								A	B		D	E		G
Mozambique								A			D			G
Myanmar								A	B		D			G
Namibia								A			D			
Nauru								A						G
Nepal								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Netherlands								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
New Zealand	A		C					A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Nicaragua							G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Niger				D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Nigeria	A							A			D			
Niue														
Norway	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Oman								A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Pakistan	A							A		C	D		F	G
Palau														G
Panama	A			D	E	F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Papua New Guinea								A			D			G
Paraguay							G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Peru				D		F		A			D			G

Philippines	A	B	C	D	F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Poland	A			D		G	A			D			G	
Portugal							A			D			G	
Qatar							A			D			G	
Republic of Korea	A	B	C				A	B	C	D	E	F	G	
Republic of Moldova							A			D			G	
Romania	A					G	A			D			G	
Russian Federation	A					G	A			D			G	
Rwanda						G	A			D			G	
Saint Kitts and Nevis														
Saint Lucia							A			D				
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines							A			D			G	
Samoa							A			D				
San Marino	A						A							
Sao Tome and Principe							A			D			G	
Saudi Arabia							A			D			G	
Senegal	A	B					A			D	E	F	G	
Serbia and Montenegro*					E	F	A	B	C	D			G	
Seychelles							A		C	D		F	G	
Sierra Leone							A						G	
Singapore							A			D				
Slovakia							A		C	D		F	G	
Slovenia							A		C	D			G	
Solomon Islands														
Somalia							A			D				
South Africa	A						A			D			G	
Spain							A			D			G	
Sri Lanka	A						A	B	C	D			G	
Sudan							A			D			G	
Suriname							A	B	C	D	E	F		
Swaziland							A						G	
Sweden	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
Switzerland	A		C	D		F		A	B	C	D	E	F	G

\* The Secretary-General of the United Nations received a letter dated 3 June 2006 from the President of the Republic of Serbia informing him that the membership of Serbia and Montenegro in the United Nations is continued by the Republic of Serbia and that the name "Republic of Serbia" is to be henceforth used instead of the name "Serbia and Montenegro". On 19 June 2006, the Secretary-General received a communication dated 16 June 2006 from the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Serbia informing him, inter alia, that (1) the Republic of Serbia continues to exercise its rights and honour its commitments deriving from international treaties concluded by Serbia and Montenegro, and (2) the Ministry for Foreign Affairs requests that the Republic of Serbia be considered a party to all international agreements in force, instead of Serbia and Montenegro.

---

Syrian Arab Republic						A	B		D	E		G	
Tajikistan						A			D			G	
Thailand	A	B				A	B		D	E			
The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia						A	B	C	D			G	
Timor-Leste						A			D				
Togo						A			D			G	
Tonga						A			D			G	
Trinidad and Tobago						A			D			G	
Tunisia					G	A	B		D	E		G	
Turkey						A			D			G	
Turkmenistan						A			D			G	
Tuvalu						A			D				
Uganda						A						G	
Ukraine	A				G	A			D			G	
United Arab Emirates						A			D			G	
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	A		C	D	F	G	A		C	D		F	G
United Republic of Tanzania	A	B	C				A	B	C	D			
United States of America*	A		C	D	[F]	G	A		C	D		[F]	G
Uruguay	A			D	F		A		D			G	
Uzbekistan							A		D			G	
Vanuatu									D				
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	A			D			A		D			G	
Viet Nam							A		D			G	
Yemen							A		D			G	
Zambia							A						
Zimbabwe							A		D				

---

\* On 7 March 2005, the Secretary-General received from the Government of the United States of America, a communication notifying its withdrawal from the Optional Protocol.

*Notes*

<sup>1</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 500, No. 7310, p. 95.

<sup>2</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 596, No. 8638, p. 261.

<sup>3</sup> *Ibid.*, vol. 1035, No. 15410, p.167.

<sup>4</sup> For detailed information, see <http://untreaty.un.org>.