United Nations A/77/264



Distr.: General 4 August 2022

Original: English

## Seventy-seventh session

Item 82 of the provisional agenda\*
Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva
Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts

Status of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts

Report of the Secretary-General

## Summary

The present report is submitted pursuant to the request of the General Assembly in its resolution 75/138. Twenty Member States and the International Committee of the Red Cross transmitted to the Secretary-General the information requested by the Assembly in that resolution. A list of States parties to the Additional Protocols of 1977 and 2005 is contained in the annex to the report.

\* A/77/150.





## Contents

Information received from Member States
Argentina
Armenia
Austria
Belgium
Brazil
Burkina Faso
Canada
Colombia
Costa Rica
Côte d'Ivoire
Cuba
Czechia
El Salvador.
Georgia
Ireland
Islamic Republic of Iran
Italy
Philippines
Portugal
Saudi Arabia
Senegal
Slovenia
Sweden
Switzerland
Türkiye
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland
Information received from the International Committee of the Red Cross

## I. Introduction

- 1. In paragraph 11 of its resolution 75/138, the General Assembly requested the Secretary-General to submit to it, at its seventy-seventh session, a comprehensive report on the status of the Additional Protocols relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts and on measures taken to strengthen the existing body of international humanitarian law, inter alia, with respect to its dissemination and full implementation at the national level, based on information received from Member States and the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC).
- 2. Pursuant to that request, the Secretary-General, by notes verbales dated 19 January 2021 and 17 January 2022 and letters dated 19 January 2021 and 17 January 2022, invited Member States and ICRC to transmit to him, by 1 June 2022, the information requested for inclusion in the present report.
- 3. Information has been received from the following Member States: Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Brazil, Burkina Faso, Canada, Colombia, Costa Rica, Côte d'Ivoire, Cuba, Czechia, El Salvador, Georgia, Iran (Islamic Republic of), Ireland, Italy, Philippines, Portugal, Saudi Arabia, Senegal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Türkiye and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.
- 4. The report was prepared on the basis of information submitted by Member States and ICRC and should be read together with previous reports of the Secretary-General under this item.<sup>1</sup>
- 5. Summaries of the information submitted by Member States are contained in section II of the present report and a summary of the information submitted by ICRC is presented in section III. The full texts of information received for the purposes of the present report and for previous reports under this item since the fifty-fifth session of the General Assembly are available on the website of the Sixth Committee of the General Assembly (www.un.org/en/ga/sixth/).
- 6. The list of all States that are parties to the Additional Protocols of 1977 and of 2005<sup>2</sup> to the Geneva Conventions of 1949<sup>3</sup> as at 26 July 2022 is contained in the annex to the report.

## **II.** Information received from Member States

## **Argentina**

- 7. Argentina noted its commitment with regard to the activities of the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission. Argentinian nationals have been part of the Commission, events have been held in Argentina in 2014 and 2015, and pledges have been submitted during the two most recent International Conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent to express Argentina's support to the Commission's mandate and its commitment to continue to raise awareness of the existence of the Commission.
- 8. Argentina reported that it had been actively involved in the consultations of States that concluded with the adoption of the Safe Schools Declaration in 2015. In

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> See, for instance, A/75/263 and A/75/263/Add.1; A/73/277; A/71/183 and A/71/183/Add.1; A/69/184 and A/69/184/Add.1; A/67/182 and A/67/182/Add.1; A/65/138 and A/65/138/Add.1; A/63/118 and A/63/118/Add.1; A/61/222 and A/61/222/Add.1; A/59/321; A/57/164 and A/57/164/Add.1; A/55/173, A/55/173/Corr.1, A/55/173/Corr.2 and A/55/173/Add.1; A/53/287; A/51/215, A/51/215/Corr.1 and A/51/215/Add.1; and A/49/255, A/49/255/Corr.1 and A/49/255/Add.1.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1125, Nos. 17512 and 17513; vol. 2404, No. 43425.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Ibid., vol. 75, Nos. 970–973.

that regard, Argentina organized in 2017 and participated in 2019 in the International Conference on Safe Schools. It played an active role together with Norway in the development of the Safe Schools initiative. Argentina further reported that it had made pledges to, in particular, the Safe Schools initiative, to review of the integration of international humanitarian law into the training of the armed forces, and to a comprehensive approach to combating sexual abuse and exploitation in the context of operations abroad.

- 9. Argentina reported that the activities of the National Commission for the Implementation of International Humanitarian Law had continued to expand, through the creation of specific academic programmes on international humanitarian law and its relation with international human rights law, to carrying out permanent capacity-building activities for the national armed forces, the identification of cultural property of high cultural value in accordance with the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict; the mapping of schools in the context of the Safe Schools initiative and the dissemination of international humanitarian law through audiovisual tools.
- 10. Argentina noted that it was currently working, with the collaboration of the regional office of ICRC, on preparing its first national voluntary report on the implementation of international humanitarian law at the domestic level.

## Armenia

- 11. Armenia reported that it acknowledged the imperative of protecting children in situations of armed conflict and ensuring their right to learn. It reaffirmed that States had the responsibility to protect cultural heritage from intentional destruction at all times.
- 12. Armenia reported that it continued to actively integrate norms of international humanitarian law into domestic legal frameworks, including through the adoption, in 2021, of a new criminal code with stronger provisions prohibiting violations of such norms and their incorporation into academic curricula.
- 13. Armenia further reported that it continued to implement its national strategy for protection of human rights and its derivative action plan for 2020–2022, which is aimed at raising awareness and improving the protection of the right to life, including among conscripts and servicemen. In fulfilling obligations under international humanitarian law, Armenia remains committed to the promotion and protection of the rights of all women and girls. In 2019, Armenia became the eightieth State Member of the United Nations to have adopted a national action plan to implement Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security. Armenia's second national action plan, developed for the period of 2022–2024, is focused on the problems faced by women and girls in the context of emergency situations.
- 14. In 2020, Armenia joined the list of 170 signatories endorsing the global appeal for an immediate ceasefire in all corners of the world launched by the Secretary-General of the United Nations.
- 15. Armenia reported its concern about the events in Nagorno-Karabakh and its consequences resulting in thousands of casualties, displacement, destruction and a major humanitarian crisis. It was reported that there had been conduct contrary to rules of international humanitarian law, and that ICRC had expanded its presence in Armenia by establishing local offices. Such cooperation with ICRC had included activities including search operations for remains, ensuring communications between prisoners of war and their families, and channelling urgent humanitarian assistance in the region.

## Austria

- 16. Austria reported that it had taken several measures since the previous report. It had pledged to host several activities which were postponed owing to the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic.
- 17. In 2021, the Austrian Red Cross Law was amended to provide a legal basis for the Austrian national committee for the implementation of international humanitarian law, and included a provision on an annual subsidy to the Austrian Red Cross.
- 18. Austria reported that, further to the entry into force of the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in 2021, it would continue its cooperation with States Members of the United Nations, international organizations, including the United Nations, ICRC and civil society to raise awareness and make progress in addressing the issue of the catastrophic and unacceptable humanitarian consequences and risks of nuclear weapons and the need to attain a world free of nuclear weapons. It noted that the first meeting of States parties chaired by Austria would take place in Vienna in June 2022 and that a conference of experts on the impact of nuclear weapons would be held at the same time.
- 19. Austria further reported that its Ministry of Defence had, among other things, held a course for military legal advisers, published a compilation of legal documents on international humanitarian law to serve as a key reference document for, in particular, legal advisers and law professors, and training members of the Austrian armed forces in international humanitarian law.
- 20. Austria stated that it remained a strong supporter of the International Criminal Court and of the universality of the Rome Statute. Its support had taken the form of voluntary financial contributions and cooperation between its judicial authorities and the Court. Together with 40 other States parties to the Rome Statute, it had referred the situation in Ukraine to the Court on 2 March 2022.
- 21. Austria reported that, in 2020, it had amended the Federal Law on Cooperation with International Courts that enabled Austrian judicial authorities to cooperate in criminal matters with investigative or evidence-gathering bodies of the United Nations, such as the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011, the Independent Investigative Mechanism for Myanmar or the United Nations Investigative Team to Promote Accountability for Crimes Committed by Da'esh/Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant. In 2021, it continued voluntary financial contributions to such mechanisms and to other institutions such as the Residual Special Court for Sierra Leone and the Extraordinary Chambers in the Courts of Cambodia.

## **Belgium**

22. Belgium referred to its previous comments of 2010, 2012, 2014, 2016, 2018 and 2020, which supplement the report of the Secretary-General on the status of the Protocols of 2008 (A/63/118). It reported that the most significant legislative development since 2020 had been the Act of 28 November 2021 on more humane, swifter and firmer justice, by which were amended, among other things, several provisions of the Act of 29 March 2004 on cooperation with the International Criminal Court and the international criminal tribunals with a view to enhancing cooperation between Belgium and international criminal courts.

22-12069 5/33

- 23. Belgium reported that it had organized national and international events on topics related to international humanitarian law, including one on the impact of climate change and environmental degradation in conflict zones, one on the protection of children, the invisible victims of armed conflict and the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, one on humanitarian protection, and a meeting of experts in the field of protection with a focus on gender-based violence and the inclusion of disability in humanitarian action.
- 24. Belgium reported that it had led a session on gender-based violence and had supported the Belgian Study Centre for Military Law and the Law of War in the organization of a one-day seminar on the protection of civilians in armed conflict.
- 25. The Belgian authorities have continued to work with the Belgian Red Cross on multiple initiatives during the reporting period, including the organization of a training course in international humanitarian law for trainee diplomats, the continuation, subject to the availability of funds, of a training course for experts in cultural property deploying abroad, and participation in the course for advisers on the law of armed conflict organized annually by the Ministry of Defence at the Royal Military Academy.
- 26. Belgium reiterated that the Interministerial Commission for Humanitarian Law, in close collaboration with the Belgian Red Cross, had worked to implement commitments made and the resolutions adopted at the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent.

#### Brazil

- 27. Brazil reported that humanitarian response and promotion of human rights was one of the priorities it had established for its term in the Security Council in 2022 and 2023. It noted that it was a member of the Group of Friends on the protection of civilians in armed conflict and that it was engaged in the international diplomatic process to develop a political declaration on the use of explosive weapons in populated areas.
- 28. Brazil stated that it had been active on the discussions of the open-ended intergovernmental working group to consider the possibility of elaborating an international regulatory framework on the regulation, monitoring and oversight of the activities of private military and security companies during its sessions held in 2019, 2020 and 2022. It reported that it had engaged in discussions regarding the protection of education during armed conflicts. It had participated in the International Conferences on Safe Schools held in 2019 and 2021. In February 2020, during the Warsaw Ministerial Conference to Promote a Future of Peace and Security in the Middle East, Brazil co-chaired a working group on humanitarian affairs and refugees with the United States of America and Poland. Brazil participated as an observer in the Regional Meeting of National Committees on International Humanitarian Law and Other Similar Entities of the Americas, in 2021.
- 29. Brazil noted that it had endeavoured to disseminate and implement international humanitarian law, including professional training to the armed forces, including special forces, and to officials deployed in United Nations peacekeeping operations. In addition, it was evaluating possibilities to redesign its national commission for the implementation of international humanitarian law to pursue more initiatives, engage different actors and better respond to the implementation of such rules.
- 30. Brazil reported that migrants, refugees and asylum seekers received full access to public services, including health care and vaccination services. It added that it had honoured its commitment to protect and assist migrants and refugees through certain

programmes, including "Operation Welcome", to coordinate its response to the Venezuelan flow, and established humanitarian visas to persons affected by armed conflict or situations of instability in Ukraine, Afghanistan, Haiti and the Syrian Arab Republic, which allow for their regularization and documentation upon arrival in Brazil, which ensures access to all public services and benefits.

## **Burkina Faso**

- 31. Burkina Faso reported that it had taken normative and institutional steps and disseminated the rules of international humanitarian law to its defence and security forces, other socioprofessional groups and the general population. A number of domestic laws had been enacted, including on the use and protection of the Red Cross and Red Crescent emblems; the prohibition of certain weapons pursuant to international conventions; the protection of civilians in various situations of armed conflict; and the punishment of grave crimes and the organization of judicial cooperation with the International Criminal Court.
- 32. Burkina Faso also reported on the existence of government entities, including task forces to monitor the implementation of international obligations, including in the context of disarmament and in the dissemination of rules of international humanitarian law, including the Additional Protocols, for the protection of refugees and for monitoring adherence to and implementation of those rules.
- 33. Burkina Faso reported the creation of its national arms control commission, in 2021, to combat the illicit circulation and proliferation of arms, and to monitor any transfer of arms by means of border control measures, awareness-raising and training of those involved and affected. Burkina Faso reported that action had been taken to disseminate the rules of international humanitarian law, including as part of the training of defence and security forces in various aspects of the protection of civilians, children, persons deprived of their freedom and the integration of gender into contingency plans for humanitarian emergencies, among other things.
- 34. It reported the creation of a national action plan for the implementation of international humanitarian law for the period 2019–2023, which made possible actions to disseminate international humanitarian law, protect civilian populations and undertake international and regional cooperation in the field of international humanitarian law. In accordance with the mechanism for monitoring the implementation of the action plan, an annual report had been prepared containing a review of the implementation of activities carried out during the year in question, the difficulties encountered and recommendations for achieving the expected results.
- 35. In 2019, an inventory was made to take stock of the national implementation measures required to implement the four Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols of 1977 and 2005.
- 36. In order to comply with the rules for the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict, Burkina Faso had drawn up a preparatory study for the identification of cultural property in Burkina Faso, in accordance with the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Protocols, and an action plan for the period 2020–2022 for the implementation of action regarding the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. In 2019, Burkina Faso submitted to the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) its first report due under article 26 of the Hague Convention and its Protocols.
- 37. Burkina Faso reported that the lack of education on international humanitarian law at universities, schools and vocational training centres and the inaccessibility of

22-12069 7/33

certain areas owing to insecurity had constrained the implementation of the Additional Protocols of 1977. It noted that some vocational training schools of the defence and security forces had not had intensive training in international humanitarian law.

## Canada

- 38. Canada reported that it had taken several measures for the promotion and dissemination of international humanitarian law, including the publication of a statement on international law applicable in cyberspace in 2022, and that Global Affairs Canada, in collaboration with the International Committee of the Red Cross, had offered a course on the protection of civilians in armed Conflict and other situations of violence for foreign service officers.
- 39. Canada reported that all members of the Canadian Armed Forces received mandatory predeployment training in international humanitarian law and that military lawyers were deployed to operational theatres as required. It reported that, since 2001, the Canadian Armed Forces had published a doctrine manual which set out their interpretation of international humanitarian law, and that under the National Defence Act, members of the armed forces were bound by the criminal law of Canada wherever they served worldwide. This included liability for any war crimes committed.
- 40. Canada reported that, along with several other States parties to the International Criminal Court, it had referred the situation in Ukraine to the Court in early March 2022.
- 41. Canada noted that the Canadian National Committee for Humanitarian Law had engaged in various activities, including supporting workshops and presentations related to international humanitarian law. The Government of Canada and the Canadian Red Cross work closely together to promote awareness of the principles and rules of international humanitarian law by engaging in several dissemination activities, including trainings for high school teachers.
- 42. Canada reported that it continued to participate in and promote regular cooperation including exchanges of information, analysis and best practices related to better international humanitarian law implementation at the multilateral level and international fora. It also reported that it had continued to engage on weaponry issues, including the implementation of the Arms Trade Treaty through domestic legislation, and at international fora regarding lethal autonomous weapon systems and the use of explosive weapons in populated areas. In 2018, while it was President of the Group of Seven, the Foreign Ministers of the Group of Seven committed to encouraging the effective implementation of international humanitarian law.
- 43. In addition, Canada noted that addressing conflict-related sexual and gender-based violence is a major objective of Canada's national action plan on women, peace and security for the period 2017–2022. Among the activities undertaken with regard to the topic are supporting the deployment of experts; carrying out investigations and accountability processes in several countries; supporting the work of the United Nations Development Programme to fight impunity and support survivors of sexual violence in the Democratic Republic of the Congo; and leading the drafting of a public statement in 2021 in which the Governments of Ethiopia and Eritrea were urged to investigate and prosecute perpetrators of violence and to provide health-care support to victims.

#### Colombia

- 44. Colombia has ratified various international humanitarian law treaties, primarily the four Geneva Conventions and their three Additional Protocols. It reported that compliance with and application of the postulates of international humanitarian law had a legal basis in the "block of constitutionality", established in the Political Constitution, whereby international human rights treaties and conventions ratified by Colombia prevailed in the domestic order.
- 45. Colombia reported that the Government attached special importance to international humanitarian law in its public policy instruments. Colombia noted that it had a national human rights and international humanitarian law system, established in various decrees, that was amended in 2019 and was designed to organize the entities at the local and national levels and coordinate their actions to promote compliance and enforcement of human rights and the application of international humanitarian law
- 46. Colombia reported that the Presidential Council for Human Rights and International Affairs had consolidated an action plan for the international humanitarian law subsystem in October 2021 and proposed the creation of a national commission for the application of international humanitarian law by means of a draft decree, which is currently under review.
- 47. Colombia reported that it had given a presentation about the functioning of its international humanitarian law subsystem and the structure of the action plan for the subsystem at the universal meeting of national committees and similar bodies on international humanitarian law, held from 29 November to 2 December 2021.
- 48. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs conducts an annual course on international humanitarian law with a view to enhancing the technical skills of public officials in their functions relating to the application and implementation of international humanitarian law in the territories.

## Costa Rica

- 49. Costa Rica has been a State party to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and their Additional Protocols of 1977 and 2005, and made a commitment to respect and ensure respect for international humanitarian law in all circumstances.
- 50. The following normative milestones were highlighted it its report:
  - Costa Rica became a State party to the Geneva Conventions of 1949, ratified by Act No. 4364 of 4 August 1969.
  - By Act No. 4602 of 16 July 1970, it ratified the Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict.
  - Act No. 6793 of 26 August 1982, by which it ratified the Protocols Additional
    to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, was prepared during the four
    sessions of the Diplomatic Conference on the Reaffirmation and Development
    of International Humanitarian Law Applicable in Armed Conflicts, held from
    1974 to 1977.
  - By Act No. 8083 of 7 February 2001, Costa Rica ratified the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court.
  - Costa Rica adopted Act No. Act 8272 of 2 May 2002, on Criminal Repression as Punishment for War Crimes and Crimes against Humanity (Reforming and Supplementing the Criminal Code).

- By Act No. 8247 of 22 April 2002, Costa Rica ratified the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict.
- The Costa Rican International Humanitarian Rights Commission was established by executive decree No. 32077-RE of 21 May 2004 as an advisory body of the executive branch on the adoption, implementation and dissemination of international humanitarian law. The Commission was consolidated as a national reference centre for many issues concerning international humanitarian law. Its work was focused on dissemination and outreach.
- By Act No. 8609 of 1 November 2007, Costa Rica ratified the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem.
- On 16 February 2012, Costa Rica was the first country on its continent to become
  a State party to all international or relevant treaties on international humanitarian
  law, upon depositing its instrument of ratification of the International
  Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance.
- By Act No. 9287 of 18 November 2014, Costa Rica ratified the amendments to the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court on the crime of aggression and on article 8.
- Costa Rica adopted Act No. 9570 of 17 May 2018 on the Promotion of Cooperation and Legal Assistance with the International Criminal Court.
- 51. The actions of Costa Rica regarding disarmament included not just regulation, but also the elimination and non-proliferation of weapons, in particular in the light of the obligations arising from the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and the Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty.
- 52. Costa Rica participated in the International Conferences of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, at which it strongly urged all States to adopt international and national measures for the implementation of international humanitarian law.

## Côte d'Ivoire

- 53. Côte d'Ivoire reported that it had adopted Act No. 2018-570 on 13 June 2018, on the protection of witnesses, victims, whistle-blowers, experts and other relevant persons, establishing measures to protect such persons when their lives, physical integrity or property, or those of their relatives, were in danger because of their collaboration or willingness to collaborate in a judicial or extrajudicial truth-seeking procedure.
- 54. No distinction was made on the basis of the situation of the persons to be protected: the Act applied, irrespective of context, to the victims of armed conflicts whose protection appeared necessary. All those in need of protection were placed in the protection programme established under the Act; they were provided with psychosocial counselling, financial assistance and relocation or resettlement services, as appropriate. The Ministry of Justice and Human Rights had been working to train the law officers in charge of implementing the Act and to raise awareness of it through civil society organizations.
- 55. Moreover, under the Ivorian Code of Criminal Procedure, adopted in 2018, the rights of persons allegedly guilty of war crimes (their rights to defence and a fair trial) were protected in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Protocols Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 and relating to the protection of victims of armed conflicts.

- 56. In addition, at a capacity-building seminar held in May 2021 in Grand-Bassam, magistrates were trained on the handling of international crimes.
- 57. Since 2021, the annual report of the Secretary-General on sexual violence against women had contained an annex containing a list of parties credibly suspected of committing or being responsible for patterns of rape or other forms of sexual violence in situations of armed conflict on the agenda of the Security Council. To date, only one party, the armed forces of Côte d'Ivoire, had been removed from the list (see references in paras. 64 and 75 of the report of the Secretary-General (\$/2020/487)).
- 58. Côte d'Ivoire reported that it had held a series of capacity-building sessions during the coronavirus disease (COVID-19) pandemic, namely:
  - The first and second in-depth course on the law of armed conflict, held in 2021 and 2022, respectively. These courses were offered with support from the International Institute of Humanitarian Law located in San Remo, Italy.
  - From 25 October to 25 November 2021, the police academies of Abidjan and Korhogo hosted the third set of open days on international humanitarian law. The event drew 5,000 participants over six days.
- 59. Côte d'Ivoire established, by interministerial decree No. 96-853 of 25 October 1996, the National Interministerial Commission for the Implementation of International Humanitarian Law. The Commission was tasked with, among other things, ensuring compliance with and the effective implementation and teaching of international humanitarian law, studying and drafting laws and implementing regulations in areas in which national legislation may need to be amended or supplemented, and submitting them to the Government. Since the establishment of the Commission, multiple awareness-raising, training and informational work had been carried out. The Commission had been in the process of revitalization, with technical and financial support from the International Committee of the Red Cross.

## Cuba

- 60. Cuba reiterated its position as expressed in the debates during previous sessions of the General Assembly. Cuba reported that, on 10 April 2019, a new Constitution had been promulgated, which stipulated that the provisions of international treaties in force for Cuba were part of or were integrated into, as appropriate, the national legal system.
- 61. Cuba reported that several provisions of the new Constitution were relevant for the protection of fundamental rights and cultural heritage. It also reported multiple legislative developments, including the adoption of the Cultural Heritage and Natural Heritage Act, which provides for the safeguarding and conservation of cultural and natural heritage in the event of armed conflict. Another development reported was a new Criminal Code incorporating offences against international humanitarian law that were previously governed by the Military Offences Act. In addition, Cuba reported the enaction of criminal procedure acts that established the primacy of the right to a fair and lawful trial, with all the rights, safeguards and obligations established in the Constitution.
- 62. Cuba reported educational efforts including a study group on international humanitarian law at the National School of Public Health and reported that basic elements of international humanitarian law were taught to future professionals, beside specific courses offered. It was noted that the Cuban Red Cross offered various courses on international humanitarian law, with the involvement of various specialists on the subject.

63. Cuba indicated that it complied strictly with its treaty obligation to include the study of international humanitarian law in programmes of military instruction. Since 2016, three international seminars had been held on the application and development of international humanitarian law, including a seminar in 2019, with as its main theme "Actions of paramilitary bodies, mercenaries and private military and security companies", proposed by the International Committee of the Red Cross.

## Czechia

- 64. Czechia reported that, together with the Czech Red Cross, it had continued to work on the promotion and dissemination of knowledge about international humanitarian law. In addition, the basics of international humanitarian law were disseminated at schools under a programme on preparation for the defence of the State, co-organized by the Ministry of Defence.
- 65. Czechia also reported that international humanitarian law training was implemented for medical staff. It was noted that, in November 2020, Czechia had endorsed the political declaration on the protection of medical care in armed conflict of 31 October 2017. Analysis of the applicable rules of international law concerning the protection of humanitarian and medical personnel, including Security Council resolution 2286 (2016), was part of a grant on international humanitarian law issues.
- 66. Czechia further reported that the Czech national committee on international humanitarian law had prepared and published a domestic code of conduct for private military and security companies in the event of armed conflict and that, in 2021, the Czech national committee had joined the International Committee of the Red Cross online community of national committees on international humanitarian law and similar bodies, and launched its new website.
- 67. Czechia reported that, in May 2022, a new criminal offence had been created: a new provision of the Criminal Code had entered into force penalizing the participation in non-State armed groups aimed at operating in armed conflict in the territory of another State. The penalties for the new criminal offence were the same as for the already existing criminal offence of illegal service in the armed forces of another State. The new criminal offence excludes from its application organizations and persons entitled to protection under international humanitarian law and involved in humanitarian work, medical care and similar activities during armed conflict.

## El Salvador

- 68. El Salvador reported on the actions taken by the Inter-Institutional Committee on International Humanitarian Law. The Committee is an advisory body to the Government on measures related to the application and effective dissemination of international instruments of international humanitarian law; its work is made possible thanks to the efforts and support of the ministries of the executive branch responsible for foreign affairs, justice and security, education, national defence and public health, as well as the Office of the Prosecutor, the Office of the Attorney General, the Office of the Human Rights Ombudsman and the Salvadoran Red Cross.
- 69. El Salvador noted that the Inter-Institutional Committee carried out several activities, including five training activities on international humanitarian law for personnel of the armed forces and State institutions, a virtual seminar on the impact of international humanitarian law in the world, and the marking of several cultural properties with the blue shield of the 1954 Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict. Other actions included updating

national laws to ensure the long-term development of the Salvadoran Red Cross, and the preparation of the internal regulation of the committee.

- 70. After visiting 10 marked cultural properties, the Inter-Institutional Committee prepared a report detailing the condition of the blue shields, which made it possible to obtain financial support from the International Committee of the Red Cross for the restoration of damaged shields this year. That process will also provide an opportunity for the dissemination of international humanitarian law among local governments.
- 71. Following the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, held in 2019, the Inter-Institutional Committee presented four country pledges: to protect cultural assets with the blue shield, to update national laws to ensure the long-term development of society, to establish a diploma for lecturers in international humanitarian law focused on senior officers and legal officers of the armed forces, and the El Salvador national plan on international humanitarian law.

## Georgia

- 72. Georgia acceded to and, consequently, became a party to all four Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols I and II thereto together. At a later stage, in 2007, Georgia ratified Additional Protocol III. Georgia reported that, in addition, it was a party to a large number of international treaties related to international humanitarian law.
- 73. Georgia reported that its Constitution provided for the supremacy of international treaties over the national laws. Furthermore, under article 7 of the Constitution, the State is required to recognize and protect universally recognized human rights and freedoms as eternal and supreme human values. While exercising authority, the people and the State are bound by these rights and freedoms as directly applicable law.
- 74. Chapter XLVII of the Criminal Code of Georgia (articles 404 to 413) criminalizes several offences such as planning, preparing or carrying out the act of aggression; call for the planning, preparation, beginning or carrying out of the act of aggression; creating, purchasing, selling, transporting or transiting of weapons of mass destruction; genocide; crimes against humanity; ecocide; participation of mercenaries in an armed conflict or military operations; and intentional breach of the rules of international humanitarian law during an armed conflict.
- The National Commission on International Humanitarian Law in Georgia was created under government decree No. 408 of 28 October 2011 with the aim of coordinating the work of various governmental agencies in this field. The main functions of the Commission included preparing and presenting advisory opinions to the Government on issues of international humanitarian law; making proposals to the Government to ensure the alignment of national legislation with international obligations undertaken by Georgia in the field of international humanitarian law; to promote the implementation of international humanitarian law programmes and various educational activities in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC); and to report on national achievements to the International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, the Secretary-General of the United Nations, and the meetings of national committees for international humanitarian law. The Commission had been conducting its working process in line with the national action plans, which were focused on awareness-raising activities for various target groups. Georgia was in the process of adopting the new national action Plan for the period 2022–2023.

- 76. Each year, the Ministry of Justice of Georgia, in close cooperation with the LEPL Training Centre of Justice of Georgia and ICRC, organizes national international humanitarian law competitions for students.
- 77. The Inter-Agency Commission for International Humanitarian Law had been cooperating with ICRC to address gaps in national legislation and to develop new initiatives directed at the improvement of current legislation or awareness-raising with regard to international humanitarian law. One of the most recent activities conducted by ICRC was a study on the legal framework regarding missing persons in Georgia. Discussions were ongoing among the members of the Inter-Agency Commission for International Humanitarian Law about the findings and recommendations provided by the study.
- 78. In addition to measures taken at the national level, Georgia reported that it was conducting several international legal proceedings against Russia before the European Court of Human Rights and International Criminal Court.

## **Ireland**

- 79. Ireland reported that it continued to lead consultations on a political declaration on strengthening the protection of civilians from the humanitarian consequences arising from the use of explosive weapons in populated areas, which would be aimed at strengthening compliance with international humanitarian law and the protection of civilians. It is hoped that negotiations will conclude and the declaration will be adopted in the coming months.
- 80. Ireland reported that, since its election to the Security Council in January 2021, it has consistently called at the Council for compliance with international humanitarian law and accountability for international humanitarian law violations. In 2021, Ireland submitted detailed comments on the draft principles on protection of the environment in relation to armed conflicts prepared by the International Law Commission.
- 81. Ireland's national committee on international humanitarian law meets regularly under the chairmanship of the Department of Foreign Affairs and provides an effective means of promoting wider knowledge of international humanitarian law within the State system. The national committee most recently met on 17 December 2021.
- 82. In 2022, Ireland established a national advisory committee on the protection of cultural property in the event of armed conflict. The committee will be an important element in the implementation of the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict and its Second Protocol. The first meeting of the committee is scheduled to take place in June 2022.

## Islamic Republic of Iran

- 83. The Islamic Republic of Iran reported that an ad hoc working group had been established within the judiciary for the codification of a draft law on the national criminalization of the most heinous international crimes, including war crimes.
- 84. The Islamic Republic of Iran noted that it promoted universal adherence to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons and that the entry into force of the Treaty from 2020 was a successful achievement for the global movement towards nuclear disarmament. It indicated that it believed that the Treaty should be

- complemented by negotiations and the conclusion of a convention leading to the total elimination of all nuclear weapons.
- 85. The Islamic Republic of Iran reported that it had endeavoured to disseminate and implement international humanitarian law and its related instruments through the activities of the Iranian national committee on humanitarian law and with the support of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), which included the translation of several ICRC resources into Farsi, and other activities such as issuing publications and holding conferences, seminars and workshops at the national level. The national committee on humanitarian law had also provided practical manuals on the implementation of international humanitarian law for the armed forces.
- 86. The Islamic Republic of Iran asserted that it had fully adhered to the rules of international humanitarian law that its practices could be found in the customary international humanitarian law database maintained by ICRC. It expressed appreciation for the efforts of ICRC to update, in collaboration with academia, both the commentaries on the Geneva Conventions and the ICRC customary international humanitarian law database on the practice of the Islamic Republic of Iran.
- 87. In addition, it reported that ICRC facilitated the participation of the national committee on humanitarian law in the fifth universal meeting of national committees and similar bodies on international humanitarian law, in the forty-fourth Sanremo round table on international humanitarian law, which was focused on the following topics: pandemic, armed conflict and international humanitarian law; voluntary reports on national implementation of international humanitarian law sharing practical experiences and perspectives; and Asia-Pacific online sessions on international humanitarian law. Moreover, ICRC assisted the national committee on humanitarian law in officially joining the online community of national committees and similar bodies on international humanitarian law.

## Italy

- 88. Italy reported that it had recently established a national committee for the study and development of international humanitarian law, set up in accordance with the resolution on bringing international humanitarian law home, adopted at the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent. The Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation, the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Defence, as well as the Italian Red Cross are permanent members of the committee. Nevertheless, depending on the topics on the agenda, participation as observers can be extended from time to time to other institutions, such as the Ministry of Interior, the Ministry of Culture, the Italian Committee for the United Nations Children's Fund (UNICEF), the National Commission for the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the International Institute of Humanitarian Law.
- 89. Among other initiatives, Italy underscored its strong commitment to the safety of children in armed conflict, including by ensuring their access to education. At the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, Italy made a solemn, open pledge to take all necessary actions to ensure that children live safely and enjoy their fundamental rights, including the right to education, also in situations of armed conflict.
- 90. Italy reported that, in recent years, it had organized numerous events in the main United Nations forums dedicated to human rights for the purpose of raising awareness on the matter, while offering full support to the Universities Network for Children in Armed Conflict, the first such international academic network, which is currently gathering 40 universities around the world to tackle this issue. Finally, the fourth

Italian national action plan for the period 2020–2024, with a special focus on girls in situations of armed conflict and post-conflict situations, was adopted in November 2020, in accordance with Security Council resolution 1325 (2000) on women and peace and security.

## **Philippines**

- 91. The Philippines reported that its Commission on Human Rights had created the Center for Crisis, Conflict, and Humanitarian Protection, which acts as the Commission's focal unit on international humanitarian law and the protection of human rights in conflict settings. It releases reports, information materials, and comments and inputs on issues related to international humanitarian law, including, but not limited to, displacements caused by armed conflict.
- 92. The Philippines has consistently been participating in the creation of campaigns and programmes of the national ad hoc committee on international humanitarian law created under executive order No. 134, s. 1999 of the President. The Commission currently supports the institutionalization of the ad hoc committee, which will ensure better opportunities for the members of the committee to mainstream its international humanitarian law advocacy.
- 93. The Commission is mandated to perform investigative functions with regard to international humanitarian law violations in support of the country's obligation to uphold international humanitarian law under Republic Act No. 9851.
- 94. With regard to the Act, the Commission adopted, in 2018, policy guidelines in the advocacy for the observance of international humanitarian law and in the investigation and monitoring of violations of international humanitarian law, genocide and other crimes against humanity under the Act. They provide guidance to the offices within the Commission regarding the conduct of investigations and advocacy activities related to international humanitarian law.
- 95. The Commission has been campaigning actively for the achievement of the 2030 Agenda for Sustainable Development, which is aimed at strengthening universal peace, and commits to redoubling efforts to resolve or prevent conflict. In that endeavour, the Commission commits itself to a whole-of-agency approach in ensuring that human rights are protected, promoted, respected and fulfilled even in situations of armed conflict.
- 96. The Commission has been coordinating closely with the Philippine Statistics Authority to develop protocols for tracking the Philippine Government's commitment to indicator 16.1.2 of the Sustainable Development Goals on measuring conflict-related deaths per 100,000 population.
- 97. The Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Human Rights has conducted a series of capacity-building activities for staff of the Commission and the Philippine Statistics Authority to identify the methodologies and roles of the two agencies in developing the data ecosystem for the aforementioned indicator.

## **Portugal**

98. Portugal reported that, at the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, Portugal and the Portuguese Red Cross pledged to create a national committee on international humanitarian law before the next International Conference would take place (2023). In late 2021, Portugal created the National

Commission on International Humanitarian Law, which will start its activities in 2022.

99. The National Committee was created with a broad mandate covering multiple competences that may be exercised *proprio motu* or by request. Such functions include the dissemination of international humanitarian law at the national level; to advise the Government on matters related to international humanitarian law; to ensure the implementation of international humanitarian law at the national level; to organize studies on the implementation of international humanitarian law at the national level; and to promote special training programmes on international humanitarian law to the armed forces, security forces and health-care professionals.

100. The main bodies represented in the National Committee are the Ministries of Foreign Affairs, National Defence, Internal Administration and Justice, as well as the Portuguese Red Cross. Other persons, internal or external to public administration, may be invited to take part in the work of the National Committee. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs will chair the National Committee, with the executive secretariat being ensured by the Portuguese Red Cross.

## Saudi Arabia

101. Saudi Arabia reported several efforts to implement international humanitarian law at the national level, most notably: developing the legislative environment and aligning national legislation with international conventions and customary rules; acceding to international treaties and conventions related to international humanitarian law; propagating the provisions of international humanitarian law on a wider scale, and studying its applications, including through cooperation with foreign parties.

102. Saudi Arabia established, in 2007, a standing committee for international humanitarian law within the Saudi Red Crescent Authority, which included many sovereign ministries and relevant government agencies. A legal team from the Ministries of Defence and Foreign Affairs as well as the Council of Experts, the Human Rights Commission and the Saudi Red Crescent Authority, were providing seminars and counselling to raise awareness of international humanitarian law. Other measures included a list of not-to-be-targeted places that had been constantly updated and circulated within coalition forces to ensure that all concerned parties know about it.

103. The Government of Saudi Arabia reported that it was receiving and processing requests from countries and international organizations to evacuate their nationals from Yemen; to facilitate the entry of relief materials and humanitarian aid in accordance with the land, sea and air embargo imposed on Yemen and Security Council resolution 2216 (2015); and to issue the necessary permits for countries and international organizations to enter and exit Yemen.

104. It was reported that the coordination cell worked to streamline cooperation between the military's joint forces and the King Salman Center for Humanitarian Aid and Relief to facilitate aid delivery to Yemenis. In addition, the coordination cell supervised the treatment of the wounded in coordination with the King Salman Centre. A child protection unit was established to protect civilians and children, which also helped in reuniting children with their families and reintegrating them into society, while deploying all measures necessary to limit casualties.

## Senegal

105. Senegal reported that it had ratified and incorporated into domestic law multiple treaties related to international humanitarian law.

106. In 2004, Senegal established the Office of the High Commissioner for Human Rights and the Promotion of Peace. By decree No. 2018-1969, the Office of the High Commissioner was replaced by the National Consultative Council on Human Rights and International Humanitarian Law. Its functions included coordinating the collection of data and preparing reports for international, regional and subregional mechanisms, collaborating with those mechanisms, coordinating and monitoring compliance with treaty obligations and the implementation of recommendations emanating from international human rights and international humanitarian law mechanisms.

107. Senegal indicated that it had not prepared a report dealing specifically with the implementation of international humanitarian law, and that the periodic reports on torture and other inhuman and degrading treatment, the report on civil and political rights and the report on the 2000 Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict raised relevant issues.

108. Senegal reported that, in 2007, it had amended the Code of Criminal Procedure and the Criminal Code, to implement the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court. Articles of the Penal Code clearly described war crimes, genocide and crimes against humanity. The Code of Criminal Procedure set forth the modes of cooperation with the International Criminal Court in relation to war crimes proceedings. In terms of implementation, Senegal brought up war crimes in the proceedings against Hissein Habré before the Extraordinary African Chambers.

109. It was indicated that national law ensured a fair trial for any person against whom proceedings were brought, regardless of the seriousness of the offence. The courts with jurisdiction over violations of international humanitarian law had been clearly identified. International humanitarian law had been taken into account in the curricula and in rules of engagement of the defence and security forces. Training in international humanitarian law had been provided at the academies and schools for officers and non-commissioned officers of the armed forces.

## Slovenia

110. Slovenia reported multiple efforts by the national committee on international humanitarian law, including the organization of events on international humanitarian law issues held during the Slovenian presidency of the Council of the European Union, in September and November 2021. It also reported that it addressed international humanitarian law issues in multilateral and regional forums, and was a co-sponsor of a Swiss side event titled "Protecting water in armed conflicts is protecting civilians", held in May 2022.

111. Slovenia noted that it supported the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission and a number of international humanitarian law initiatives, including the call for action to strengthen respect for international humanitarian law and principled humanitarian action of 2019. Slovenia reported on the progress made in the implementation of resolutions and pledges adopted by the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent, held in 2019.

112. Slovenia reported efforts to disseminate international humanitarian law at the national level, including training members of its armed forces with basic knowledge of the principles, concepts and rules of the international law of armed conflict as part

of the military education programme and prior to international operations and missions. In addition, the training programme of the police, for which an e-learning centre was established, included annual courses in individual military skills and courses on international humanitarian law.

113. Slovenia reported that international humanitarian law was taught at the University of Ljubljana and that there were multiple additional activities, including the organization of the All-European International Humanitarian and Refugee Law Moot Court Competition, in cooperation with the International Committee of the Red Cross, the Office of the United Nations High Commissioner for Refugees (UNHCR) and the Slovenian Red Cross.

114. Slovenia expressed its support for the full implementation of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court and mentioned that it had participated in the Assembly of the States Parties to the Rome Statute, that it had been part of the Bureau until 2021 and that it had concluded an agreement with the Court on the enforcement of its sentences and ratified it in 2022.

## Sweden

115. Sweden reiterated the information it had reported earlier (see A/75/263). The following information supplements previous reports. Sweden reported that its prosecutors had initiated a structural investigation into suspected war crimes during Russia's aggression against Ukraine and would, where possible and appropriate, be cooperating fully with other States, the European Union Agency for Criminal Justice Cooperation (Eurojust), Ukraine and the International Criminal Court.

116. Sweden reported that it was one of the States that had referred the situation in Ukraine to the International Criminal Court and that it supported the work of the Office of the Prosecutor of the Court both financially and by making national experts available. It also reported that, on 1 January 2022, legislative amendments had entered into force criminalizing the crime of aggression under Swedish criminal law, and that that legislation was based on the criteria set out in the Rome Statute.

117. Sweden reported that it supported investigative mechanisms such as the International, Impartial and Independent Mechanism to Assist in the Investigation and Prosecution of Persons Responsible for the Most Serious Crimes under International Law Committed in the Syrian Arab Republic since March 2011 and the United Nations Investigative Team to Promote Accountability for Crimes Committed by Da'esh/Islamic State in Iraq and the Levant and that, in 2021, it had concluded cooperation agreements on information- and evidence-sharing with both institutions. In 2021, Sweden, together with the International Committee of the Red Cross, launched a guidance document for armed forces on the protection of health care in armed conflict.

118. Sweden further reported two domestic judgments: one of May 2021, in which the Swedish Supreme Court had found a man guilty of war crimes committed in Iraq in 2015; and one of March 2022, in which the Stockholm District Court found a woman guilty of grave war crimes and grave crimes against international law.

119. Sweden reported that, since June 2020, it had seconded a national humanitarian law expert to the European Union Special Representative for Human Rights, co-sponsored a high-level side-event on protection of health care that marked the five-year anniversary of the adoption of Security Council resolution 2286 (2016) on the protection of health care, and participated in the high-level meeting entitled "International humanitarian law: enhancing monitoring, improving compliance", held during the high-level segment of the General Assembly in September 2021.

120. Sweden also reported that it had joined the call for action to strengthen respect for international humanitarian law and principled humanitarian action, in 2019, and the Group of Friends on Accountability Following the Aggression against Ukraine, in March 2022, and that it had co-sponsored the Arria-formula meeting at the Security Council on ensuring accountability for atrocities committed in Ukraine.

## **Switzerland**

- 121. Switzerland reiterated the information it had submitted previously (see A/75/263). In 2020, Switzerland prepared its first voluntary report on the implementation of international humanitarian law at the national level, and in 2021, together with the International Committee of the Red Cross, it organized two international events to promote voluntary reporting. In November 2020, Switzerland led a meeting of government experts on international humanitarian law on the protection of medical activities in armed conflict, with over 280 experts from 100 States.
- 122. Switzerland noted that it was committed to clarifying the questions raised regarding the application of international humanitarian law in cyberspace, and had actively participated in the relevant United Nations processes and multiple initiatives to develop and establish a cyberspace that is open, accessible, secure and peaceful, and to promote the recognition, compliance with and application of international law in that setting.
- 123. Switzerland reported that it had contributed to the work of the Group of Governmental Experts on Emerging Technologies in the Area of Lethal Autonomous Weapons Systems. Switzerland is fully engaged in the process of examining an operational and normative framework that could form the basis of a future convention and pave the way for the relevant negotiations. Switzerland has published its position in its arms control and disarmament strategy for the period 2022–2025.
- 124. Switzerland reported that it was committed to international criminal justice, in particular through its support for the International Criminal Court, and noted that it was involved in the follow-up to the report produced by the review of the International Criminal Court by the Group of Independent Experts and the resulting response, including as a member of the study group on governance.
- 125. Switzerland further reported that it served as the secretariat of the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission and had presided over the elections of the Commission's members in November 2021, who would assume their responsibilities at the annual meeting held in March 2022.

## Türkiye

126. Türkiye reported that it was a signatory, but not a party, to the Protocol Additional to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, and relating to the Adoption of an Additional Distinctive Emblem (Protocol III), adopted on 8 December 2005. Türkiye is a party to the Convention on the Rights of the Child (1989) and its Optional Protocol on the involvement of children in armed conflict (2000), the Hague Convention for the Protection of Cultural Property in the Event of Armed Conflict (1954) and its First Protocol (1954), as well as several international conventions prohibiting or restricting the development, stockpiling or use of various weapons, among other multilateral treaties.

- 127. Law No 6458 on aliens and international protection, adopted by the Grand National Assembly of Türkiye in 2013, contained provisions specifically related to victims of armed conflicts.
- 128. The relevant steps and measures taken by the national authorities included the translation of international legal documents relating to international humanitarian laws, and additional reference documents and guides of an international nature as well as presentations, handbooks and other useful sources prepared by Turkish authorities were available. Turkish authorities, in particular the Turkish Armed Forces and the Ministry of Defence, regularly took various steps and measures to disseminate and strengthen respect for and compliance with international humanitarian law as applicable.
- 129. Türkiye also reported that various educational institutions had continued to provide trainings and programmes on international humanitarian law. Turkish authorities organized educational programmes on international humanitarian law that are open to international participation, and Türkiye participated in all major international meetings and conferences relating to international humanitarian law topics.

## United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland

- 130. The United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland reiterated what it had reported in previous contributions (see A/71/183) and added that it continued to collaborate with the British Red Cross to provide practical assistance and support for selected States to produce a report detailing their activities to implement international humanitarian law at the domestic level, including a toolkit accessible in multiple languages.
- 131. The United Kingdom reported that the Ministry of Defence joint service manual on the law of armed conflict was available online and that there was a programme to update it. It also reported the publication of instruments on captured persons in September 2020, and on human security in defence in December 2021. It noted that a second publication would be forthcoming in 2022 that would provide authoritative policy on the incorporation of human security in the management of wider defence activities.
- 132. The United Kingdom reported multiple actions related to the prevention and prosecution of sexual violence, including having a special representative on preventing sexual violence in conflict. It reported that, in 2021, the Foreign Secretary had announced that the United Kingdom would explore all options for strengthening the international response to conflict-related sexual violence, including a new convention, and that, in 2022, the United Kingdom would host a conference. The United Kingdom noted that it participated actively in the first policy of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) on conflict-related sexual violence.
- 133. The United Kingdom underlined that it continued to support the International Criminal Court and international and hybrid tribunals. It reported that, following the appeal by the Prosecutor of the International Criminal Court for support, it had donated funds to the trust fund for advanced technology and specialized capacity of the Court. It also reported that it had a specialized team that was responsible for the investigation of all allegations of war crimes, crimes against humanity, genocide and torture, and was involved in gathering evidence regarding the commission of war crimes in Ukraine, which may be used in support of the Court's investigation into the situation in Ukraine.

22-12069 21/33

134. The United Kingdom further reported several activities carried out by the United Kingdom National Committee on International Humanitarian Law. It also reported that, since endorsing the Safe Schools Declaration in April 2018, it had encouraged other States to sign it and had included such document at the local level, participated in conferences, and co-sponsored Security Council resolution 2601 (2021) on the protection of education in armed conflict.

135. Finally, the United Kingdom reported that it continued to engage on weaponry matters, participating in the various forums set up under the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, and that it remained involved in discussions concerning the development of a political declaration on the use of explosive weapons in populated areas.

## III. Information received from the International Committee of the Red Cross

136. Following up on information that it had submitted previously (see A/75/263), the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC) reported on the period from June 2020 to June 2022. At the time of reporting, the total numbers of States parties to Additional Protocols I, II and III was 174, 169 and 79, respectively. Seventy-six States have current declarations under article 90 of Additional Protocol I accepting the competence of the International Humanitarian Fact-Finding Commission.

137. During the period under review, ICRC noted the following accessions and ratifications: Cameroon and Ecuador to Additional Protocol III; Suriname to the Optional Protocol to the Convention on the Rights of the Child on the involvement of children in armed conflict; the Philippines to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, its article 1 as amended and its Protocol on Explosive Remnants of War (Protocol V), and to the Arms Trade Treaty; Croatia, Denmark, Luxembourg, Slovenia and the Sudan to the International Convention for the Protection of All Persons from Enforced Disappearance; Chile, the Congo, Côte d'Ivoire, Guinea-Bissau, Mongolia, Peru and Seychelles to the Treaty on the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons; Italy, Romania, and Sweden to the amendment to article 8 of the Rome Statute of the International Criminal Court, adopted in Kampala in 2010; Italy and Sweden to articles 8 bis, 15 bis and 15 ter, adopted in Kampala in 2010; Liechtenstein, Spain, Sweden to the amendment to article 124 of the Rome Statute, adopted in The Hague in 2015; Romania to the amendment to article 8 of the Rome Statute (blinding laser weapons), adopted in New York in 2017; Romania to the amendment to article 8 of the Rome Statute (weapons, the primary effect of which is to injure by fragments undetectable by x-rays in the human body), adopted in New York in 2017; Liechtenstein, Romania and Sweden to the amendment to article 8 of the Rome Statute (weapons which use microbial or other biological agents, or toxins), adopted in New York in 2017. In addition, Liechtenstein and Romania ratified and accepted, respectively, the amendment to article 8 of the Rome Statute (intentionally using starvation of civilians), adopted in The Hague in 2019.

138. During the period under review, 142 new laws and examples of domestic caselaw were added to the public ICRC database on national implementation of international humanitarian law. ICRC reported that it continued to provide support to States in implementing their criminal repression obligations through domestic legislation, adopting counter-terrorism legislation in compliance with international

humanitarian law and supporting judicial training entities in integrating international humanitarian law into their judicial training curricula.

- 139. The Committee continued to provide support to States in the development of comprehensive legal frameworks on missing persons, including through the Global Alliance for the Missing, launched by ICRC and Switzerland in 2021. In addition, ICRC started a five-year transformation programme of its Central Tracing Agency to improve its capacity to search, adapt to technological changes of recent decades and reinforce the services it provides.
- 140. The Committee reported that it had conducted an internal review and had developed a recommendation on "Gender and diversity dimensions of the separated, missing, deceased and their families" to strengthen the application of a gender perspective throughout that work.
- 141. The Committee continued to work on recalling and strengthening respect for the well-established prohibitions of sexual violence as a war crime in international and non-international armed conflict. It developed a Checklist on the Domestic Implementation of IHL Prohibiting Sexual Violence and is also in the process of supporting several States in updating their domestic legal frameworks.
- 142. The Committee took various steps to support national committees in implementing the commitments they have undertaken as part of the thirty-third International Conference of the Red Cross and Red Crescent with respect to the domestic implementation of international humanitarian law. It was reported that, at the time of submission, five additional national committees on international humanitarian law or similar bodies had been created or re-established and that ICRC continued to support the strengthening of existing ones. In 2021, ICRC published Bringing IHL Home: Guidelines on the National Implementation of International Humanitarian Law and held universal and regional meetings for national committees on international humanitarian law.
- 143. The Committee reported that 11 States had published voluntary reports describing the state of international humanitarian law implementation within their domestic legal systems, often with the support of their national international humanitarian law committees. To support States in that endeavour, ICRC and Switzerland held an expert workshop in June 2021, complemented by a side-event held during International Law Week in October 2021. The Committee supported several States in drafting a voluntary report and/or a submission to the report of the Secretary-General and facilitated sessions at which experiences were exchanged at the regional level.
- 144. The Committee continued to publish several reports, checklists and other documents, including an updated commentary to the Geneva Convention relative to the Treatment of Prisoners of War and a report on the effects of explosive weapons with wide area effects. In close cooperation with the British Red Cross, ICRC was able to make available new practice from seven States in the online customary international humanitarian law database.
- 145. As the first ICRC access to education strategy, which covered the period 2018-2020, concluded, a comprehensive review was undertaken to understand what lessons were learned and how to improve programmes in the future. It led to the adoption of a new strategy for the period 2021-2026.

22-12069 23/33

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> The following States have published voluntary reports: Belgium, Bulgaria, Burkina Faso, Germany, Nicaragua, Niger, Poland, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland and United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland.

146. The Committee noted that it had continued to work globally to promote the protection of cultural property during armed conflict, in partnerships with the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) and the African Union.

147. The Committee further developed and updated reference tools to support the teaching of international humanitarian law and research at universities worldwide. In particular, it created a ready-to-use international humanitarian law syllabus to support lecturers teaching remotely during the pandemic, and launched a new version of the ICRC international humanitarian law app. In addition, it organized and supported various international humanitarian law student competitions, round tables and training courses for academics all around the world.

**24/33** 22-12069

Annex

# List of States parties to the Additional Protocols of 1977 and 2005 to the Geneva Conventions of 1949 as at 26 July 2022 $^{\scriptscriptstyle \perp}$

State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
Afghanistan	I and II	10 November 2009
Albania	I and II	16 July 1993
	III	6 February 2008
Algeria <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	16 August 1989
Angola	$\mathbf{I}^b$	20 September 1984
	II	7 October 2019
Antigua and Barbuda	I and II	6 October 1986
Argentina <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	26 November 1986
	$\mathrm{III}^c$	16 March 2011
Armenia	I and II	7 June 1993
	III	12 August 2011
Australia <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	21 June 1991
	III	15 July 2009
Austria <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	13 August 1982
	III	3 June 2009
Bahamas	I and II	10 April 1980
Bahrain	I and II	30 October 1986
Bangladesh	I and II	8 September 1980
Barbados	I and II	19 February 1990
Belarus <sup>a</sup>	I and II	23 October 1989
	III	31 March 2011
Belgium <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	20 May 1986
	III	12 May 2015
Belize	I and II	29 June 1984
	III	3 April 2007
Benin	I and II	28 May 1986

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Switzerland is the depositary of the Geneva Conventions and Additional Protocols. Information was taken from the website of the Swiss Federal Department of Foreign Affairs (www.dfae.admin.ch/depositaire).

State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
Bolivia (Plurinational State of) <sup>a</sup>	I and II	8 December 1983
Bosnia and Herzegovina <sup>a</sup>	I and II	31 December 1992
Botswana	I and II	23 May 1979
$Brazil^a$	I and II	5 May 1992
	III	28 August 2009
Brunei Darussalam	I and II	14 October 1991
Bulgaria <sup>a</sup>	I and II	26 September 1989
	III	13 September 2006
Burkina Faso <sup>a</sup>	I and II	20 October 1987
	III	7 October 2016
Burundi	I and II	10 June 1993
Cambodia	I and II	14 January 1998
Cameroon	I and II	16 March 1984
	III	23 September 2021
Canada <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	20 November 1990
	$\mathrm{III}_{c}$	26 November 2007
Cabo Verde <sup>a</sup>	I and II	16 March 1995
Central African Republic	I and II	17 July 1984
Chad	I and II	17 January 1997
Chile <sup>a</sup>	I and II	24 April 1991
	III	6 July 2009
China	$I^b$ and $II^b$	14 September 1983
Colombia <sup>a</sup>	I	1 September 1993
	II	14 August 1995
Comoros	I and II	21 November 1985
Congo	I and II	10 November 1983
Cook Islands <sup>a</sup>	I and II	7 May 2002
	III	7 September 2011
Costa Rica <sup>a</sup>	I and II	15 December 1983
	III	30 June 2008
Côte d'Ivoire	I and II	20 September 1989

**26/33** 22-12069

		D 4 10
State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
Croatia <sup>a</sup>	I and II	11 May 1992
	III	13 June 2007
Cuba	I	25 November 1982
	II	23 June 1999
Cyprus <sup>a</sup>	I	1 June 1979
	II	18 March 1996
	III	27 November 2007
Czechia <sup>a</sup>	I and II	5 February 1993
	III	23 May 2007
Democratic People's Republic of Korea	I	9 March 1988
Democratic Republic of the	I	3 June 1982
$Congo^a$	II	12 December 2002
Denmark <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II$	17 June 1982
	III	25 May 2007
Djibouti	I and II	8 April 1991
Dominica	I and II	25 April 1996
Dominican Republic	I and II	26 May 1994
	III	1 April 2009
Ecuador	I and II	10 April 1979
	III	6 October 2020
Egypt	$I^b$ and $II^b$	9 October 1992
El Salvador	I and II	23 November 1978
	III	12 September 2007
Equatorial Guinea	I and II	24 July 1986
Estonia <sup>a</sup>	I and II	18 January 1993
	III	28 February 2008
Eswatini	I and II	2 November 1995
Ethiopia	I and II	8 April 1994
Fiji	I, II and III	30 July 2008
Finland <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II$	7 August 1980

State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
	III	14 January 2009
France	$\mathrm{I}^b$	11 April 2001
	$\Pi^b$	24 February 1984
	III	17 July 2009
Gabon	I and II	8 April 1980
Gambia	I and II	12 January 1989
Georgia	I and II	14 September 1993
	III	19 March 2007
Germany <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}^b$	14 February 1991
	III	17 June 2009
Ghana	I and II	28 February 1978
Greece <sup>a</sup>	I	31 March 1989
	II	15 February 1993
	III	26 October 2009
Grenada	I and II	23 September 1998
Guatemala	I and II	19 October 1987
	III	14 March 2008
Guinea <sup>a</sup>	I and II	11 July 1984
Guinea-Bissau	I and II	21 October 1986
Guyana	I and II	18 January 1988
	III	21 September 2009
Haiti	I and II	20 December 2006
Holy See	$I^b$ and $II^b$	21 November 1985
Honduras	I and II	16 February 1995
	III	8 December 2006
Hungary <sup>a</sup>	I and II	12 April 1989
	III	15 November 2006
celanda	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	10 April 1987
	III	4 August 2006
Iraq	I	1 April 2010
relanda	$I^b$ and $II^b$	19 May 1999

**28/33** 22-12069

State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or
State	Protocol	succession 2007
Israel	$\Pi I^b$	22 November 2007
Italy <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	27 February 1986
	III	29 January 2009
Jamaica	I and II	29 July 1986
Japan <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	31 August 2004
Jordan	I and II	1 May 1979
Kazakhstan	I and II	5 May 1992
	III	24 June 2009
Kenya	I and II	23 February 1999
	III	28 October 2013
Kuwait <sup>a</sup>	I and II	17 January 1985
Kyrgyzstan	I and II	18 September 1992
	III	25 January 2019
Lao People's Democratic Republic <sup>a</sup>	I and II	18 November 1980
Latvia	I and II	24 December 1991
	III	2 April 2007
Lebanon	I and II	23 July 1997
Lesotho <sup>a</sup>	I and II	20 May 1994
	III	6 January 2020
Liberia	I and II	30 June 1988
Libya	I and II	7 June 1978
Liechtenstein <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	10 August 1989
	III	24 August 2006
Lithuania <sup>a</sup>	I and II	13 July 2000
	III	28 November 2007
Luxembourg <sup>a</sup>	I and II	29 August 1989
	III	27 January 2015
Madagascar <sup>a</sup>	I and II	8 May 1992
	III	10 July 2018
Malawi <sup>a</sup>	I and II	7 October 1991

Maldives         I and II         3 September 1991           Malia*         I and II         8 February 1989           Malta*         Ib and IIb         17 April 1989           Mauritania         I and II         14 March 1980           Mauritius         Ib and IIb         22 March 1982           Mexico         I         10 March 1983           III         7 July 2008           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         19 September 1995           Monaco*         I and II         7 January 2000           III         12 March 2007           Mongolia*         Ib and II         6 December 1995           Montenegro*         I and II         2 August 2006           Morocco         Ib and II         3 June 2011           Mozambique         I         14 March 1983           II         12 November 2002           Namibia*         Ib and IIb         18 October 1983           Nauru         I and II         27 June 2006           III         4 December 2012           Netherlands*         Ib and IIb         26 June 1987           III*         13 December 2006           New Zealand*         Ib and II         23 October 2013	State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
Malta"         Ib and IIb         17 April 1989           Mauritania         I and II         14 March 1980           Mauritius         Ib and IIb         22 March 1982           Mexico         I         10 March 1983           III         7 July 2008           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         19 September 1995           Monaco"         I and II         7 January 2000           III         12 March 2007           Mongolia"         Ib and II         6 December 1995           Montenegro"         I and II         2 August 2006           Morocco         Ib and II         3 June 2011           Mozambique         I         14 March 1983           II         12 November 2002           Namibia"         Ib and IIb         18 October 1983           Nauru         I and II         27 June 2006           III         4 December 2012           Netherlands"         Ib and IIb         26 June 1987           III         13 December 2006           New Zealand"         Ib and IIb         23 October 2013           Nicaragua         I and II         19 July 1999           Nigeria         I and II         2 April 2009	Maldives	I and II	3 September 1991
Mauritania         I and II         14 March 1980           Mauritius         I² and II²         22 March 1982           Mexico         I         10 March 1983           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         7 July 2008           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         19 September 1995           Monaco*         I and II         7 January 2000           III         12 March 2007           Mongolia*         I² and II         6 December 1995           Montenegro*         I and II         2 August 2006           Morocco         I² and II         3 June 2011           Mozambique         I         14 March 1983           II         12 November 2002           Namibia*         I² and II         18 October 1983           Nauru         I and II         27 June 2006           III         4 December 2012           Netherlands*         I² and II²         26 June 1987           III*         13 December 2006           New Zealand*         I² and II²         8 February 1988           III         2 April 2009           Niger         I and II         19 July 1999           III         2 April 2009           Nigeria	Mali <sup>a</sup>	I and II	8 February 1989
Mauritius         IP and IIP         22 March 1982           Mexico         I         10 March 1983           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         7 July 2008           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         19 September 1995           Monaco <sup>a</sup> I and II         7 January 2000           Mongolia <sup>a</sup> IP and II         6 December 1995           Montenegro <sup>a</sup> I and II         2 August 2006           Morocco         IP and II         3 June 2011           Mozambique         I         14 March 1983           II         12 November 2002           Namibia <sup>a</sup> IP and IIP         18 October 1983           Nauru         I and II         27 June 2006           Netherlands <sup>a</sup> IP and IIP         26 June 1987           III         4 December 2012           New Zealand <sup>a</sup> IP and IIP         8 February 1988           III         23 October 2013           Nicaragua         I and II         19 July 1999           Niger         I and II         10 October 1988           North Macedonia <sup>a</sup> IP and II         1 September 1993           III         14 October 2008           Norway <sup>a</sup>	Malta <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}^b$	17 April 1989
Mexico         I         10 March 1983           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         7 July 2008           Micronesia (Federated States of)         I and II         19 September 1995           Monaco <sup>a</sup> I and II         7 January 2000           III         12 March 2007           Mongolia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II         6 December 1995           Montenegro <sup>a</sup> I and II         2 August 2006           Morocco         I <sup>b</sup> and II         3 June 2011           Mozambique         I         14 March 1983           II         12 November 2002           Namibia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 18 October 1983           Nauru         I and II         27 June 2006           Netherlands <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 26 June 1987           III         4 December 2012           New Zealand <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 8 February 1988           III         23 October 2013           Nicaragua         I and II         19 July 1999           Niger         I and II         2 April 2009           Niger         I and II         10 October 1988           North Macedonia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II         1 September 1993           III	Mauritania	I and II	14 March 1980
Micronesia (Federated States of)       I and II       19 September 1995         Monaco*       I and II       7 January 2000         Mongolia*       I* and II       12 March 2007         Mongolia*       I* and II       2 August 2006         Morocco       I* and II       3 June 2011         Mozambique       I       14 March 1983         Namibia*       I*       12 November 2002         Namibia*       I* and II*       27 June 2006         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         Netherlands*       I* and II*       26 June 1987         New Zealand*       I* and II*       3 December 2012         New Zealand*       I* and II*       19 July 1999         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia*       I* and II       1 September 1993         North Macedonia*       I and II       14 October 2008         Norway*       I and II       14 December 1981         Norway*       I and II       14 December 1981	Mauritius	$I^b$ and $II^b$	22 March 1982
Micronesia (Federated States of)       I and II       19 September 1995         Monaco*       I and II       7 January 2000         III       12 March 2007         Mongolia*       Ib and II       6 December 1995         Montenegro*       I and II       2 August 2006         Morocco       Ib and II       3 June 2011         Mozambique       I       14 March 1983         III       12 November 2002         Namibia**       Ib and IIb       18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands**       Ib and IIb       26 June 1987         III*       13 December 2006         New Zealand**       Ib and IIb       8 February 1988         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       19 July 1999         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia**       Ib and II       1 September 1993         Norway**       I and II       14 October 2008         Norway**       I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006	Mexico	I	10 March 1983
Monaco <sup>a</sup> I and II       7 January 2000         Mongolia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II       6 December 1995         Montenegro <sup>a</sup> I and II       2 August 2006         Morocco       I <sup>b</sup> and II       3 June 2011         Mozambique       I       14 March 1983         II       12 November 2002         Namibia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 26 June 1987         New Zealand <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       8 June 1979         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II       14 December 1981         Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006		III	7 July 2008
III	Micronesia (Federated States of)	I and II	19 September 1995
Mongolia²       I³ and II       6 December 1995         Montenegro³       I and II       2 August 2006         Morocco       I³ and II       3 June 2011         Mozambique       I       14 March 1983         II       12 November 2002         Namibia³       I³ and II³       18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands³       I³ and II³       26 June 1987         III°       13 December 2006         New Zealand³       I³ and II³       8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         III       2 April 2009         Niger       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia³       I³ and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway³       I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006	Monaco <sup>a</sup>	I and II	7 January 2000
Montenegro <sup>a</sup> I and II       2 August 2006         Morocco       I <sup>b</sup> and II       3 June 2011         Mozambique       I       14 March 1983         III       12 November 2002         Namibia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands <sup>a</sup> II <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 26 June 1987         III <sup>c</sup> 13 December 2006         New Zealand <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       8 June 1979         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II       14 December 1981         Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006		III	12 March 2007
Morocco         Ib and II         3 June 2011           Mozambique         I         14 March 1983           II         12 November 2002           Namibiaa         Ib and IIb         18 October 1983           Nauru         I and II         27 June 2006           III         4 December 2012           Netherlandsa         Ib and IIb         26 June 1987           III         13 December 2006           New Zealanda         Ib and IIb         8 February 1988           III         23 October 2013           Nicaragua         I and II         19 July 1999           Niger         I and II         8 June 1979           Nigeria         I and II         10 October 1988           North Macedoniaa         Ib and II         1 September 1993           III         14 October 2008           Norwaya         I and II         14 December 1981           Norwaya         I and II         14 December 1981	$Mongolia^a$	$I^b$ and $II$	6 December 1995
Mozambique       I       14 March 1983         Namibia <sup>a</sup> Ib and IIb and IIb       18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         IIII       4 December 2012         Netherlands <sup>a</sup> Ib and IIb and IIb and IIb and IIb and IIb and III       26 June 1987         New Zealand <sup>a</sup> Ib and IIb and III and II and	$Montenegro^a$	I and II	2 August 2006
Namibia $^a$ II       12 November 2002         Namibia $^a$ I $^b$ and II $^b$ 18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands $^a$ $I^b$ and II $^b$ 26 June 1987         III $^c$ 13 December 2006         New Zealand $^a$ $I^b$ and II $^b$ 8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       2 April 2009         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia $^a$ $I^b$ and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway $^a$ I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006	Morocco	$I^b$ and $II$	3 June 2011
Namibia $^a$ I $^b$ and II $^b$ 18 October 1983         Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands $^a$ $I^b$ and II $^b$ 26 June 1987         III $^c$ 13 December 2006         New Zealand $^a$ $I^b$ and II $^b$ 8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       2 April 2009         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia $^a$ $I^b$ and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway $^a$ I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006	Mozambique	I	14 March 1983
Nauru       I and II       27 June 2006         III       4 December 2012         Netherlands $^a$ $I^b$ and $II^b$ 26 June 1987         III $^c$ 13 December 2006         New Zealand $^a$ $I^b$ and $II^b$ 8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       2 April 2009         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia $^a$ $I^b$ and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway $^a$ I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006		II	12 November 2002
Netherlands $^a$ III       4 December 2012         Netherlands $^a$ I $^b$ and II $^b$ 26 June 1987         III $^c$ 13 December 2006         New Zealand $^a$ I $^b$ and II $^b$ 8 February 1988         III       23 October 2013         Nicaragua       I and II       19 July 1999         Niger       I and II       2 April 2009         Nigeria       I and II       10 October 1988         North Macedonia $^a$ I $^b$ and II       1 September 1993         III       14 October 2008         Norway $^a$ I and II       14 December 1981         III       13 June 2006	Namibia <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	18 October 1983
Netherlands $^a$ $I^b$ and $II^b$ $26$ June 1987III $^c$ $13$ December 2006New Zealand $^a$ $I^b$ and $II^b$ $8$ February 1988III $23$ October 2013NicaraguaI and II $19$ July 1999NigerI and II $2$ April 2009NigeriaI and II $8$ June 1979NigeriaI and II $10$ October 1988North Macedonia $^a$ $I^b$ and II $1$ September 1993Norway $^a$ I and II $14$ October 2008Norway $^a$ I and II $14$ December 1981III $13$ June 2006	Nauru	I and II	27 June 2006
$\begin{array}{c} \text{III}^c & 13  \text{December 2006} \\ \text{New Zealand}^a & I^b  \text{and II}^b & 8  \text{February 1988} \\ & \text{III} & 23  \text{October 2013} \\ \text{Nicaragua} & I  \text{and II} & 19  \text{July 1999} \\ & \text{III} & 2  \text{April 2009} \\ \text{Niger} & I  \text{and II} & 8  \text{June 1979} \\ \text{Nigeria} & I  \text{and II} & 10  \text{October 1988} \\ \text{North Macedonia}^a & I^b  \text{and II} & 1  \text{September 1993} \\ & \text{III} & 14  \text{October 2008} \\ \text{Norway}^a & I  \text{and II} & 14  \text{December 1981} \\ & \text{III} & 13  \text{June 2006} \\ \end{array}$		III	4 December 2012
New Zealanda $I^b$ and $II^b$ 8 February 1988III23 October 2013NicaraguaI and II19 July 1999III2 April 2009NigerI and II8 June 1979NigeriaI and II10 October 1988North Macedoniaa $I^b$ and II1 September 1993III14 October 2008NorwayaI and II14 December 1981III13 June 2006	Netherlands <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	26 June 1987
Nicaragua III 23 October 2013  Nicaragua I and II 19 July 1999  III 2 April 2009  Niger I and II 8 June 1979  Nigeria I and II 10 October 1988  North Macedonia Ib and II 1 September 1993  III 14 October 2008  Norway I and II 14 December 1981  III 13 June 2006		$III_c$	13 December 2006
NicaraguaI and II19 July 1999III2 April 2009NigerI and II8 June 1979NigeriaI and II10 October 1988North MacedoniaaIb and II1 September 1993III14 October 2008NorwayaI and II14 December 1981III13 June 2006	New Zealand <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	8 February 1988
Niger I and II 8 June 1979  Nigeria I and II 10 October 1988  North Macedonia Ib and II 1 September 1993  III 14 October 2008  Norway I and II 14 December 1981  III 13 June 2006		III	23 October 2013
NigerI and II8 June 1979NigeriaI and II10 October 1988North Macedonia $^a$ I $^b$ and II1 September 1993III14 October 2008Norway $^a$ I and II14 December 1981III13 June 2006	Nicaragua	I and II	19 July 1999
NigeriaI and II10 October 1988North Macedonia $^a$ I $^b$ and II1 September 1993III14 October 2008Norway $^a$ I and II14 December 1981III13 June 2006		III	2 April 2009
North Macedonia <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II 1 September 1993 III 14 October 2008 Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II 14 December 1981 III 13 June 2006	Niger	I and II	8 June 1979
Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II 14 December 1981 III 13 June 2006	Nigeria	I and II	10 October 1988
Norway <sup>a</sup> I and II 14 December 1981 III 13 June 2006	North Macedonia <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II$	1 September 1993
III 13 June 2006		III	14 October 2008
	$Norway^a$	I and II	14 December 1981
Oman I <sup>b</sup> and II <sup>b</sup> 29 March 1984		III	13 June 2006
======================================	Oman	$I^b$ and $II^b$	29 March 1984

**30/33** 22-12069

State	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
Palau	I and II	25 June 1996
Panama <sup>a</sup>	I and II	18 September 1995
	III	30 April 2012
Paraguay <sup>a</sup>	I and II	30 November 1990
	III	13 October 2008
Peru	I and II	14 July 1989
	III	9 October 2018
Philippines	$\mathrm{I}^b$	30 March 2012
	II	11 December 1986
	III	22 August 2006
$\operatorname{Poland}^a$	I and II	23 October 1991
	III	26 October 2009
Portugal <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	27 May 1992
	III	22 April 2014
Qatar <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$	5 April 1988
	II	5 January 2005
Republic of Korea <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II$	15 January 1982
Republic of Moldova	I and II	24 May 1993
	$\mathrm{III}_{p}$	19 August 2008
Romania <sup>a</sup>	I and II	21 June 1990
	III	15 May 2015
Russian Federation <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	29 September 1989
Rwanda <sup>a</sup>	I and II	19 November 1984
Saint Kitts and Nevis <sup>a</sup>	I and II	14 February 1986
Saint Lucia	I and II	7 October 1982
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines <sup>a</sup>	I and II	8 April 1983
Samoa	I and II	23 August 1984
San Marino	I and II	5 April 1994
	III	22 June 2007
Sao Tome and Principe	I and II	5 July 1996

Saudi Arabia	Cana	Posterial	Date of ratification, accession or
II	State	Protocol	succession
Senegal   I and II   7 May 1985	Saudi Arabia	-	
Serbia   I and II			
III	Senegal	I and II	7 May 1985
Seychelles <sup>a</sup>	Serbia <sup>a</sup>	I and II	16 October 2001
Sierra Leone		III	18 August 2010
Singapore       III       7 July 2008         Slovakia <sup>a</sup> I and II       2 April 1993         III       30 May 2007         Slovenia <sup>a</sup> I and II       26 March 1992         III       10 March 2008         Solomon Islands       I and II       19 September 1988         South Africa       I and II       21 November 1995         South Sudan       I, II and III       25 January 2013         Spain <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II       21 April 1989         III       10 December 2010         State of Palestine       I <sup>b</sup> and III       4 January 2015         Sudan       I       7 March 2006         II       13 July 2006         Suriname       I and II       16 December 1985         III       25 June 2013         Sweden <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II       31 August 1979         III <sup>c</sup> 21 August 2014         Switzerland <sup>a</sup> I and II       17 February 1982         III <sup>b</sup> 14 July 2006         Syrian Arab Republic       I <sup>b</sup> 14 November 1983         Tajikistan <sup>a</sup> I and II       12 April 2005	Seychelles <sup>a</sup>	I and II	8 November 1984
I and II   2 April 1993	Sierra Leone	I and II	21 October 1986
III   30 May 2007     Slovenia*   I and II   26 March 1992     III   10 March 2008     Solomon Islands   I and II   19 September 1988     South Africa   I and II   21 November 1995     South Sudan   I, II and III   25 January 2013     Spain*   I* and III   21 April 1989     III   10 December 2010     State of Palestine   I* 2 April 2014     II and III   4 January 2015     Sudan   I   7 March 2006     II   13 July 2006     Suriname   I and II   16 December 1985     III   25 June 2013     Sweden*   I* and II   31 August 1979     III*   21 August 2014     Switzerland*   I and II   17 February 1982     III*   14 July 2006     Syrian Arab Republic   I* 14 November 1983     Tajikistan*   I and II   13 January 1993     Timor-Leste   I and II   12 April 2005     Timor-Leste   I and II   12 April 2005     Tajikistan*   I and II   12 April 2005     Tajikistan*   I and II   12 April 2005	Singapore	III	7 July 2008
I and II   26 March 1992   III   10 March 2008   Solomon Islands   I and II   19 September 1988   South Africa   I and II   21 November 1995   South Sudan   I, II and III   25 January 2013   Spain <sup>a</sup>   I <sup>b</sup> and II   21 April 1989   III   10 December 2010   State of Palestine   I <sup>b</sup>   2 April 2014   II and III   4 January 2015   Sudan   I   7 March 2006   II   13 July 2006   Suriname   I and II   16 December 1985   III   25 June 2013   Sweden <sup>a</sup>   I <sup>b</sup> and II   31 August 1979   III <sup>c</sup>   21 August 2014   Switzerland <sup>a</sup>   I and II   17 February 1982   III <sup>b</sup>   14 July 2006   Syrian Arab Republic   I <sup>b</sup>   14 November 1983   Tajikistan <sup>a</sup>   I and II   13 January 1993   Timor-Leste   I and II   12 April 2005   III   III   III   III   III   III   III   III   III   IIII   IIII   IIII   IIII   IIIII   IIIII   IIIIII	Slovakia <sup>a</sup>	I and II	2 April 1993
III		III	30 May 2007
Solomon Islands	Slovenia <sup>a</sup>	I and II	26 March 1992
South Africa   I and II   21 November 1995		III	10 March 2008
South Sudan   I, II and III   25 January 2013	Solomon Islands	I and II	19 September 1988
Spain   Ib and II   21 April 1989   III   10 December 2010	South Africa	I and II	21 November 1995
III	South Sudan	I, II and III	25 January 2013
State of Palestine $I^b$ 2 April 2014II and III4 January 2015SudanI7 March 2006II13 July 2006SurinameI and II16 December 1985III25 June 2013Sweden $^a$ $I^b$ and II31 August 1979III $^c$ 21 August 2014Switzerland $^a$ I and II17 February 1982III $^b$ 14 July 2006Syrian Arab Republic $I^b$ 14 November 1983Tajikistan $^a$ I and II13 January 1993Timor-LesteI and II12 April 2005	Spain <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	21 April 1989
II and III		III	10 December 2010
Sudan	State of Palestine	$\mathrm{I}^b$	2 April 2014
Suriname I and II 13 July 2006 Suriname I and II 16 December 1985 III 25 June 2013 Sweden <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II 31 August 1979 III <sup>c</sup> 21 August 2014 Switzerland <sup>a</sup> I and II 17 February 1982 III <sup>b</sup> 14 July 2006 Syrian Arab Republic I <sup>b</sup> 14 November 1983 Tajikistan <sup>a</sup> I and II 13 January 1993 Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005		II and III	4 January 2015
Suriname I and II 16 December 1985 III 25 June 2013 Sweden <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II 31 August 1979 III <sup>c</sup> 21 August 2014 Switzerland <sup>a</sup> I and II 17 February 1982 III <sup>b</sup> 14 July 2006 Syrian Arab Republic I <sup>b</sup> 14 November 1983 Tajikistan <sup>a</sup> I and II 13 January 1993 Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005	Sudan	I	7 March 2006
Sweden <sup>a</sup> III 25 June 2013  Sweden <sup>a</sup> I <sup>b</sup> and II 31 August 1979  III <sup>c</sup> 21 August 2014  Switzerland <sup>a</sup> I and II 17 February 1982  III <sup>b</sup> 14 July 2006  Syrian Arab Republic I <sup>b</sup> 14 November 1983  Tajikistan <sup>a</sup> I and II 13 January 1993  Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005		II	13 July 2006
Sweden $^a$ I $^b$ and II31 August 1979III $^c$ 21 August 2014Switzerland $^a$ I and II17 February 1982III $^b$ 14 July 2006Syrian Arab RepublicI $^b$ 14 November 1983Tajikistan $^a$ I and II13 January 1993Timor-LesteI and II12 April 2005	Suriname	I and II	16 December 1985
$III^{c} \qquad \qquad 21 \text{ August 2014}$ $Switzerland^{a} \qquad \qquad I \text{ and II} \qquad \qquad 17 \text{ February 1982}$ $III^{b} \qquad \qquad 14 \text{ July 2006}$ $Syrian \text{ Arab Republic} \qquad \qquad I^{b} \qquad \qquad 14 \text{ November 1983}$ $Tajikistan^{a} \qquad \qquad I \text{ and II} \qquad \qquad 13 \text{ January 1993}$ $Timor-Leste \qquad \qquad I \text{ and II} \qquad \qquad 12 \text{ April 2005}$		III	25 June 2013
Switzerland <sup>a</sup> I and II 17 February 1982 III <sup>b</sup> 14 July 2006 Syrian Arab Republic I <sup>b</sup> 14 November 1983 Tajikistan <sup>a</sup> I and II 13 January 1993 Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005	Sweden <sup>a</sup>	$\mathrm{I}^b$ and $\mathrm{II}$	31 August 1979
$III^b                                  $		$\mathrm{III}^c$	21 August 2014
Syrian Arab Republic I $^b$ 14 November 1983  Tajikistan $^a$ I and II 13 January 1993  Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005	Switzerland <sup>a</sup>	I and II	17 February 1982
Tajikistan <sup>a</sup> I and II 13 January 1993 Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005		$\Pi\Pi^b$	14 July 2006
Timor-Leste I and II 12 April 2005	Syrian Arab Republic	$\mathrm{I}^b$	14 November 1983
·	Tajikistan <sup>a</sup>	I and II	13 January 1993
	Timor-Leste	I and II	12 April 2005
		III	_

itate	Protocol	Date of ratification, accession or succession
$\Gamma$ ogo $^a$	I and II	21 June 1984
Γonga <sup>a</sup>	I and II	20 January 2003
Γrinidad and Tobago <sup>a</sup>	I and II	20 July 2001
Γunisia	I and II	9 August 1979
Γurkmenistan	I and II	10 April 1992
Uganda	I and II	13 March 1991
	III	21 May 2008
Jkraine <sup>b</sup>	I and II	25 January 1990
	III	19 January 2010
United Arab Emirates <sup>a</sup>	$I^b$ and $II^b$	9 March 1983
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland <sup>a</sup>	$\mathbf{I}^b$ and $\mathbf{II}^b$	28 January 1998
	$\mathrm{III}^b$	23 October 2009
United Republic of Tanzania	I and II	15 February 1983
United States of America	$\mathrm{III}^b$	8 March 2007
Jruguay <sup>a</sup>	I and II	13 December 1985
	III	19 October 2012
Uzbekistan	I and II	8 October 1993
Vanuatu	I and II	28 February 1985
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)	I and II	23 July 1998
Viet Nam	I	19 October 1981
Yemen	I and II	17 April 1990
Zambia	I and II	4 May 1995
Zimbabwe	I and II	19 October 1992

22-12069 33/33

 $<sup>^</sup>a$  Party that has made the declaration provided for under article 90 of Protocol I.  $^b$  Ratification, accession or succession accompanied by a reservation and/or a declaration.