

070

SCSL - 2003 - 11 - PT

1836

(1836 - 2165)

SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE

OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR

FREETOWN - SIERRA LEONE

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

Before: Judge Bankole Thompson
Judge Pierre Boutet
Judge Benjamin Mutanga Itoe

Registrar: Mr Robin Vincent

Date filed: 21 November 2003

THE PROSECUTOR

Against

MOININA FOFANA

CASE NO. SCSL - 2003 - 11 - PT


**PROSECUTION RESPONSE TO THE DEFENCE PRELIMINARY MOTION
BASED ON LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION: ILLEGAL
DELEGATION OF JURISDICTION BY SIERRA LEONE**

Office of the Prosecutor:

Mr Desmond de Silva, QC, Deputy Prosecutor
Mr Luc Côté, Chief of Prosecutions
Mr Walter Marcus-Jones, Senior Appellate Counsel
Mr Christopher Staker, Senior Appellate Counsel
Mr Abdul Tejan-Cole, Appellate Counsel

Defence Counsel

Mr Michiel Pestman
Mr Victor Koppe
Mr Arrow John Bockarie
Prof. Andre Nollkaemper
Dr. Liesbeth Zegveld



SPECIAL COURT FOR SIERRA LEONE
OFFICE OF THE PROSECUTOR
FREETOWN – SIERRA LEONE

THE PROSECUTOR

Against

MOINANA FOFANA

CASE NO. SCSL – 2003 – 11 – PT

**PROSECUTION RESPONSE TO THE DEFENCE PRELIMINARY MOTION
BASED ON LACK OF PERSONAL JURISDICTION: ILLEGAL
DELEGATION OF JURISDICTION BY SIERRA LEONE**

I. INTRODUCTION

1. The Prosecution files this response to the Defence preliminary motion filed on behalf of Moinina Fofana (the “**Accused**”) on 14 November 2003¹ and entitled “Preliminary Defence Motion on the Lack of Personal Jurisdiction: Illegal Delegation of Jurisdiction by Sierra Leone” (the “**Preliminary Motion**”).
2. The Preliminary Motion argues essentially that the jurisdiction of the Special Court over the accused was unlawfully transferred to the Special Court by Sierra Leone. It contends that since Sierra Leone no longer had the right to try the Accused due to the amnesty granted to him by the Lomé Agreement, it could not transfer that jurisdiction over the Accused to the Special Court.² It is alleged that consequently the Special Court “lacks personal jurisdiction over the defendant.”³

For the reasons given below, the Preliminary Motion should be dismissed in its entirety.

¹ Registry Page (“RP”) 1312-1317.

² “Peace Agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF/SL)” (the “**Lomé Agreement**”).

³ Preliminary Motion, para. 2.

II. ARGUMENT

3. The Prosecution submits that the Preliminary Motion is vague and unclear. It does not even state what, in the Defence's submission, is the legal nature and effect (if any) of the Lomé Agreement. It does not state how, or by virtue of what legal principle, a document of whatever type could deprive Sierra Leone of the capacity to enter into an international treaty for the establishment of an international criminal court to try the Accused.
4. The Prosecution should not be required to guess what the Defence's arguments might be in order to rebut them. The Prosecution files this response without prejudice to its right to seek leave to respond further at a subsequent stage should the Defence or the Appeals Chamber clarify the Defence's position.
5. The Preliminary Motion acknowledges that the Special Court was established by a treaty concluded between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone.⁴ It thereby acknowledges that the Special Court Agreement is a treaty under international law. The relevant question is therefore whether the Lomé Agreement could deprive Sierra Leone of the capacity under international law to enter into the Special Court Agreement.
6. In order to answer this question, the starting point is to determine what is the legal nature (if any) of the Lomé Agreement. The Prosecution submits that the Lomé Agreement is not a treaty under international law,⁵ but an agreement signed between two national bodies, the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF. Others who signed it were not parties to it, but merely signed as "moral guarantors" or as international organizations and governments who were "facilitating and supporting" the conclusion of the Agreement. The Lomé Agreement thus has no force under international law. It is therefore in no way evident how it could affect the capacity of a State under international law to enter into an agreement for the establishment of an international criminal court.
7. Indeed, the Lomé Agreement had no basis in law at all until the Lomé Peace Agreement (Ratification) Act 1999 was enacted by the Sierra Leone Parliament, but even then, its basis was limited to Sierra Leone domestic law. Even if there were a conflict between Sierra

⁴ Preliminary Motion, para. 4.

⁵ Article 2 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties defines a "treaty" as "an international agreement concluded *between States* ..." (emphasis added).

Leone's domestic law and the Special Court Agreement (and this is in no way conceded by the Prosecution), domestic law cannot be invoked to invalidate a treaty or particular provisions thereof. Article 27(1) of the 1986 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties Between States and International Organizations or Between International Organizations provides that:

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

Article 46 of that Convention provides:

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

...

3. A violation is manifest if it would be objectively evident to any State or any international organization conducting itself in the matter in accordance with the normal practice of States and, where appropriate, of international organizations and in good faith."

8. Materially identical provision is made in Articles 27 and 46 of the 1969 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Although Sierra Leone is not a party to either of these two Vienna Conventions,⁶ their provisions reflect customary international law.⁷ It follows from these rules that, except in situations to which Article 46 of the Vienna Convention applies (of which this is not one), provisions of national law do not deprive a State of the capacity under

⁶ The United Nations became a party to the 1986 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations by a formal confirmation dated 21 December 1998.

⁷ See Aust, *Modern Treaty Law and Practice* (2000), p. 10-11 ("When questions of treaty law arise during negotiations, whether for a new treaty or about one concluded before the entry into force of the [Vienna] Convention, the rules set forth in the Convention are invariably relied upon even when the states are not parties to it ... In its 1997 *Gabcikovo* judgment ... the [International] Court [of Justice] ... applied Articles 60-62 as reflecting customary law, even though they had been considered rather controversial. ... [I]t is reasonable to assume that the Court will take the same approach in respect of virtually all of the substantive provisions of the Convention. There has been as yet no case where the Court has found that the Convention does not reflect customary law"). See also Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law* (5th edn, 1998), p. 608 (noting that while the 1969 Vienna Convention is not as a whole declaratory of general international law, "a good number of articles are essentially declaratory of existing law and certainly those provisions which are not constitute presumptive evidence of emergent rules of general international law") and p. 618 (noting the International Law Commission's view that "the decisions of international tribunals and State practice, if they are not conclusive, appear to support" the solution adopted in Article 46 of the 1969 Vienna Convention).

international law to enter into treaty obligations, or affect the validity of specific provisions of treaties that they conclude.

9. In the present case, even if it is assumed for the sake of argument that the consent of the Government of Sierra Leone to be bound by the Special Court Agreement was expressed in violation of the Lomé Ratification Act (and this is in no way conceded by the Prosecution), that Act was not a provision of Sierra Leone's internal law "regarding competence to conclude treaties" for the purposes of Article 46 of the two Vienna Conventions. It certainly cannot be said that there has been any "*manifest*" breach of a provision of Sierra Leone's internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties. There is simply no basis for suggesting that the capacity and jurisdiction of Sierra Leone under international law to enter into an international treaty for the creation of an international criminal court could be affected by provisions of Sierra Leone municipal law. Article 10 of the Special Court Agreement provides that "An amnesty granted to any person falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Court in respect of the crimes referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall not be a bar to prosecution". This provision must be given effect according to its terms.
10. In any event, even if Article IX of the Lomé Agreement somehow had some potential legal effect of restricting the jurisdiction that could be conferred on an international court established by a treaty to which Sierra Leone is a party, that provision of the Lomé Agreement, properly construed, was not intended to cover crimes under Articles 2-4 of the Special Court Statute.
11. At the time of signature of the Lomé Agreement, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra-Leone appended to his signature on behalf of the United Nations a disclaimer to the effect that the United Nations holds the understanding that the amnesty provision in Article IX of the Agreement shall not apply to international crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law.⁸ In other words, this was a statement on behalf of the United Nations of the correct interpretation of that provision. Neither of the parties to the Lomé Agreement,

⁸ See Security Council resolution 1315 (2000), 14 August 2000, preambular paragraph 5; Report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone, 4 October 2000, S/2000/915 (the "Report of the Secretary-General"), para. 23.

nor any of the international organizations or States represented at the signing, voiced any objection or disagreement with this interpretation at the time, or at any subsequent time. Indeed, in the negotiations on the Statute of the Special Court, the Government of Sierra Leone concurred with the position of the United Nations.⁹ The inclusion of Article 10 in the Special Court's Statute can itself be seen as additional confirmation of this interpretation.

12. The Prosecution submits that this interpretation is further supported by a crystallising international norm that a government cannot grant amnesty for serious violations of crimes under international law.¹⁰ The matters referred to in the previous paragraph are themselves a practical example of this norm. Further evidence of this norm can be found in the fact that several international instruments that are closely related to the issue of crimes against humanity either expressly or impliedly prohibit amnesty.¹¹ This duty to prosecute or extradite torturers has been interpreted by the United Nations to act as a bar to granting amnesty.¹² The International Criminal Tribunal for the former Yugoslavia has also declared amnesties for torture void, and has stated that amnesties granted will not receive international recognition.¹³ The Report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone also expressed the view that to the extent that the Lomé Agreement purported to confer an amnesty for serious violations of international humanitarian law, it would be illegal under international law.¹⁴ It has been said that States "cannot use domestic

⁹ See Report of the Secretary-General, para. 24.

¹⁰ See, e.g., Brownlie, *Principles of Public International Law* (5th edn, 1998), pp. 514-515, indicating that *jus cogens* norms are "rules of customary law which cannot be set aside by treaty or acquiescence but only by the formation of a subsequent customary rule of contrary effect. The least controversial examples of the class are the prohibition of the use of force, the law of genocide, the principle of racial non-discrimination, crimes against humanity, and the rules prohibiting trade in slaves and piracy" (footnotes omitted); Cassese, *International Criminal Law* (2003), p. 316 that "whenever general rules prohibiting specific international crimes come to acquire the nature of peremptory norms (*jus cogens*), they may be construed as imposing among other things the obligation not to cancel by legislative or executive fiat the crimes they proscribe."

¹¹ Declaration on the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearances, General Assembly Resolution 47/133, 18 December 1992, UN Doc. A/45/44 (1990), Articles 14 and 18; Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, New York, 10 December 1984, 1965 UNTS 85 (the "Torture Convention").

¹² See Report of the Committee Against Torture, UN GAOR, 45th Sess., Supp No. 44, Annex Vat 109 – 13, U.N. Doc. A./45/44 (1990).

¹³ *Prosecutor v. Furundzija, Judgment*, Case No. IT-95-17/1, T. Ch., 10 December 1998, paras. 153-157, especially footnote 172 and accompanying text.

¹⁴ See Report of the Secretary-General, para. 24: "With the denial of legal effect to the amnesty granted at Lomé, to the extent of its illegality under international law ...".

legislation to bar international criminal liability”,¹⁵ and that national amnesties “clearly have no standing in international law and would not afford a defence to criminal or civil proceedings before an International Court ...”¹⁶ On a true and proper construction of the Lomé Agreement, it is submitted that crimes under Articles 2 to 4 of the Statute of the Special Court were not covered by the amnesty provisions. Consequently, contrary to the allegations of the Defence, the Government of Sierra Leone could not have given up “its right to exercise jurisdiction over the persons covered by Article IX(2)”. Indeed, it would be open to the Special Court in this case to go further, and to hold that even if Article IX of the Lomé Agreement did purport to apply to such crimes, it would to that extent be illegal under international law, and of no legal effect.


14. There is therefore no basis for holding that the Lomé Agreement could, as a matter of international law limit the jurisdiction that could be conferred on an international criminal court created by a treaty to which Sierra Leone is a party.

III. CONCLUSION


For the reasons given above, the Court should therefore dismiss the Preliminary Motion in its entirety.

Freetown, 21 November 2003.



For the Prosecution,



Desmond de Silva, QC
Deputy Prosecutor



Walter Marcus-Jones
Senior Appellate Counsel


Luc Côté
Chief of Prosecutions
Abdul Tejan-Cole
Appellate Counsel

¹⁵ See Garth Meintjes, *Domestic Amnesties and International Accountability*, in INTERNATIONAL CRIMES, PEACE, AND HUMAN RIGHTS 83,86 (Dinah Shelton ed. 2000)

¹⁶ RICHARD J. GOLDSTONE: For Humanity: Reflections of a War Crimes Investigator 122 (2000)

PROSECUTION INDEX OF AUTHORITIES

1. Lome Peace Agreement of 7 July 1999
2. Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations of 4 October 2000
S/2000/915
3. Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969.
4. Vienna Convention of the Law of Treaties between States and International
Organisations and between International Organisations.
5. Aust, Modern Treaty Law and Practice (2000) (extract)
6. Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo ICJ Judgment 25 September 1997.
7. Brownlie, Principles of Public International Law (5th edn, 1998) (extract)
8. Lome Agreement Ratification Act 1999.
9. Security Council Resolution 1315(2000) 14 August 2000
10. Declaration on the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearances, General
Assembly Resolution 47/133, 18 December 1992, UN Doc. A/45/44 (1990),
Articles 14 and 18;
11. Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or
Punishment, New York, 10 December 1984, 1965 UNTS 85 (the “Torture
Convention”).
12. *Prosecutor v. Furundzija, Judgment*, Case No. IT-95-17/1, T. Ch., 10 December
1998, paras. 153-157.

ANNEX 1:
Lome Peace Agreement 7 July 1999

Annex

[Original: English and French]

**PEACE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENT OF SIERRA LEONE
AND THE
REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT
OF SIERRA LEONE**

**THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE and
THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE (RUF/SL)**

Having met in Lomé, Togo, from the 25 May 1999 to 7 July 1999 under the auspices of the Current Chairman of ECOWAS, President Gnassingbé Eyadéma;

Recalling earlier initiatives undertaken by the countries of the sub-region and the International Community, aimed at bringing about a negotiated settlement of the conflict in Sierra Leone, and culminating in the Abidjan Peace Agreement of 30 November, 1996 and the ECOWAS Peace Plan of 23 October, 1997;

Moved by the imperative need to meet the desire of the people of Sierra Leone for a definitive settlement of the fratricidal war in their country and for genuine national unity and reconciliation;

/...

Committed to promoting full respect for human rights and humanitarian law;

Committed to promoting popular participation in the governance of the country and the advancement of democracy in a socio-political framework free of inequality, nepotism and corruption;

Concerned with the socio-economic well being of all the people of Sierra Leone;

~~Determined to foster mutual trust and confidence between themselves;~~

Determined to establish sustainable peace and security; to pledge forthwith, to settle all past, present and future differences and grievances by peaceful means; and to refrain from the threat and use of armed force to bring about any change in Sierra Leone;

Reaffirming the conviction that sovereignty belongs to the people, and that Government derives all its powers, authority and legitimacy from the people;

Recognising the imperative that the children of Sierra Leone, especially those affected by armed conflict, in view of their vulnerability, are entitled to special care and the protection of their inherent right to life, survival and development, in accordance with the provisions of the International Convention on the Rights of the Child;

Guided by the Declaration in the Final Communiqué of the Meeting in Lome of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of ECOWAS of 25 May 1999, in which they stressed the importance of democracy as a factor of regional peace and security, and as essential to the socio-economic development of ECOWAS Member States; and in which they pledged their commitment to the consolidation of democracy and respect of human rights while reaffirming the need for all Member States to consolidate their democratic base, observe the principles of good governance and good economic management in order to ensure the emergence and development of a democratic culture which takes into account the interests of the peoples of West Africa ;

Recommitting themselves to the total observance and compliance with the Cease-fire Agreement signed in Lome on 18 May 1999, and appended as Annex 1 until the signing of the present Peace Agreement ;

HEREBY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

PART ONE

CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

ARTICLE I

CEASE-FIRE

The armed conflict between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL is hereby ended with immediate effect. Accordingly, the two sides shall ensure that a total and permanent cessation of hostilities is observed forthwith.

ARTICLE II

CEASE-FIRE MONITORING

1. A Cease-fire Monitoring Committee (hereinafter termed the CMC) to be chaired by the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (hereinafter termed UNOMSIL) with representatives of the Government of Sierra Leone, RUF/SL, the Civil Defence Forces (hereinafter termed the CDF) and ECOMOG shall be established at provincial and district levels with immediate effect to monitor, verify and report all violations of the cease-fire.

/...

2. A Joint Monitoring Commission (hereinafter termed the JMC) shall be established at the national level to be chaired by UNOMSIL with representatives of the Government of Sierra Leone, RUF/SL, CDF and ECOMOG. The JMC shall receive, investigate and take appropriate action on reports of violations of the cease-fire from the CMC. The parties agree to the definition of cease-fire violations as contained in Annex 2 which constitutes an integral part of the present Agreement.

3. The parties shall seek the assistance of the International Community in providing funds and other logistics to enable the JMC to carry out its mandate.

PART TWO

GOVERNANCE

The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL, recognizing the right of the people of Sierra Leone to live in peace, and desirous of finding a transitional mechanism to incorporate the RUF/SL into governance within the spirit and letter of the Constitution, agree to the following formulas for structuring the government for the duration of the period before the next elections, as prescribed by the Constitution, managing scarce public resources for the benefit of the development of the people of Sierra Leone and sharing the responsibility of implementing the peace. Each of these formulas (not in priority order) is contained in a separate Article of this Part of the present Agreement; and may be further detailed in protocols annexed to it.

Article III Transformation of the RUF/SL Into a Political Party

Article IV Enabling Members of the RUF/SL to Hold Public Office

Article V Enabling the RUF/SL to Join a Broad-based Government of National Unity Through Cabinet Appointment

/...

Article VI Commission for the Consolidation of Peace

Article VII Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development

Article VIII Council of Elders and Religious Leaders.

ARTICLE III

TRANSFORMATION OF THE RUF/SL INTO A POLITICAL PARTY

1. The Government of Sierra Leone shall accord every facility to the RUF/SL to transform itself into a political party and enter the mainstream of the democratic process. To that end:
2. Immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement, the RUF/SL shall commence to organize itself to function as a political movement, with the rights, privileges and duties accorded to all political parties in Sierra Leone. These include the freedom to publish, unhindered access to the media, freedom of association, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, and the right to mobilize and associate freely.
3. Within a period of thirty days, following the signing of the present Agreement, the necessary legal steps shall be taken by the Government of Sierra Leone to enable the RUF/SL to register as a political party.

/...

4. The Parties shall approach the International Community with a view to mobilizing resources for the purposes of enabling the RUF/SL to function as a political party. These resources may include but shall not be limited to:

- (i) Setting up a trust fund;
- (ii) Training for RUF/SL membership in party organization and functions; and
- (iii) Providing any other assistance necessary for achieving the goals of this section.

ARTICLE IV

ENABLING MEMBERS OF THE RUF/SL TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE

1. The Government of Sierra Leone shall take the necessary steps to enable those RUF/SL members nominated by the RUF/SL to hold public office, within the time-frames agreed and contained in the present Agreement for the integration of the various bodies named herein.
2. Accordingly, necessary legal steps shall be taken by the Government of Sierra Leone, within a period of fourteen days following the signing of the present Agreement, to amend relevant laws and regulations that may constitute an impediment or bar to RUF/SL and AFRC personnel holding public office.
3. Within seven days of the removal of any such legal impediments, both parties shall meet to discuss and agree on the appointment of RUF/SL members to positions in parastatals, diplomacy and any other public sector.

/...

ARTICLE V

ENABLING THE RUF/SL TO JOIN A BROAD-BASED GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL UNITY THROUGH CABINET APPOINTMENTS

1. The Government of Sierra Leone shall accord every opportunity to the RUF/SL to join a broad-based government of national unity through cabinet appointments. To that end:

2. The Chairmanship of the Board of the Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (CMRRD) as provided for in Article VII of the present Agreement shall be offered to the leader of the RUF/SL, Corporal Foday Sankoh. For this purpose he shall enjoy the status of Vice President and shall therefore be answerable only to the President of Sierra Leone.

3. The Government of Sierra Leone shall give ministerial positions to the RUF/SL in a moderately expanded cabinet of 18, bearing in mind that the interests of other political parties and civil society organizations should also be taken into account, as follows:

(i) One of the senior cabinet appointments such as finance, foreign affairs and justice ;

(ii) Three other cabinet positions.

4. In addition, the Government of Sierra Leone shall, in the same spirit, make available to the RUF/SL the following senior government positions: Four posts of Deputy Minister.

5. Within a period of fourteen days following the signing of the present Agreement, the necessary steps shall be taken by the Government of Sierra Leone to remove any legal impediments that may prevent RUF/SL members from holding cabinet and other positions.

/...

ARTICLE VI

COMMISSION FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF PEACE

1. A Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (hereinafter after termed the CCP), shall be established within two weeks of the signing of the present Agreement to implement a post-conflict programme that ensures reconciliation and the welfare of all parties to the conflict, especially the victims of war. The CCP shall have the overall goal and responsibility for supervising and monitoring the implementation of and compliance with the provisions of the present Agreement relative to the promotion of national reconciliation and the consolidation of peace .

2. The CCP shall ensure that all structures for national reconciliation and the consolidation of peace already in existence and those provided for in the present Agreement are operational and given the necessary resources for realizing their respective mandates. These structures shall comprise :

- (i) the Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development;
- (ii) the Joint Monitoring Commission;
- (iii) the Provincial and District Cease-fire Monitoring Committees;
- (iv) the Committee for the Release of Prisoners of War and Non-Combatants;
- (v) the Committee for Humanitarian Assistance;
- (vi) the National Commission on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration;
- (vii) the National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction;

/...

(viii) the Human Rights Commission; and

(ix) the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

3. The CCP shall have the right to inspect any activity or site connected with the implementation of the present Agreement.

4. The CCP shall have full powers to organize its work in any manner it deems appropriate and to appoint any group or sub-committee which it deems necessary in the discharge of its functions.

5. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

i) Two representatives of the civil society ;

ii) One representative each named by the Government, the RUF/SL and the Parliament.

6. The CCP shall have its own offices, adequate communication facilities and secretariat support staff.

7. Recommendations for improvements or modifications shall be made to the President of Sierra Leone for appropriate action. Likewise, failures of the structures to perform their assigned duties shall also be brought to the attention of the President.

8. Disputes arising out of the preceding paragraph shall be brought to the Council of Elders and Religious Leaders for resolution, as specified in Article VIII of the present Agreement.

9. Should Protocols be needed in furtherance of any provision in the present Agreement, the CCP shall have the responsibility for their preparation.

10. The mandate of the CCP shall terminate at the end of the next general elections.

/...

ARTICLE VII

COMMISSION FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF STRATEGIC RESOURCES, NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

1. Given the emergency situation facing the country, the parties agree that the Government shall exercise full control of the exploitation of gold, diamonds and other resources, for the benefit of the people of Sierra Leone. Accordingly, a Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (hereinafter termed the CMRRD) shall be established and charged with the responsibility of securing and monitoring the legitimate exploitation of Sierra Leone's gold and diamonds, and other resources that are determined to be of strategic importance for national security and welfare as well as cater for post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction, as provided for under Article XXVIII of the present Agreement.
2. The Government shall take the necessary legal action within a period not exceeding two weeks from the signing of the present Agreement to the effect that all exploitation, sale, export, or any other transaction of gold and diamonds shall be forbidden except those sanctioned by the CMRRD. All previous concessions shall be null and void.
3. The CMRRD shall authorize licensing of artisanal production of diamonds and gold, in accordance with prevailing laws and regulations. All gold and diamonds extracted or otherwise sourced from any Sierra Leonean territory shall be sold to the Government.
4. The CMRRD shall ensure, through the appropriate authorities, the security of the areas covered under this Article, and shall take all necessary measures against unauthorized exploitation.

/...

5. For the export or local resale of gold and diamonds by the Government, the CMRRD shall authorize a buying and selling agreement with one or more reputable international and specialized mineral companies. All exports of Sierra Leonean gold and diamonds shall be transacted by the Government, under these agreements.
6. The proceeds from the transactions of gold and diamonds shall be public monies which shall enter a special Treasury account to be spent exclusively on the development of the people of Sierra Leone, with appropriations for public education, public health, infrastructural development, and compensation for incapacitated war victims as well as post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction. Priority spending shall go to rural areas.
7. The Government shall, if necessary, seek the assistance and cooperation of other governments and their instruments of law enforcement to detect and facilitate the prosecution of violations of this Article.
8. The management of other natural resources shall be reviewed by the CMRRD to determine if their regulation is a matter of national security and welfare, and recommend appropriate policy to the Government.
9. The functions of ~~the~~ Ministry of Mines shall continue to be carried out by the current authorized ministry. However, in respect of strategic mineral resources, the CMRRD shall be an autonomous body in carrying out its duties concerning the regulation of Sierra Leone's strategic natural resources.
10. All agreements and transactions referred to in this Article shall be subject to full public disclosure and records of all correspondence, negotiations, business transactions and any other matters related to exploitation, management local or international marketing, and any other matter shall be public documents.
11. The Commission shall issue monthly reports, including the details of all the transactions related to gold and diamonds, and other licenses or concessions of natural resources, and its own administrative costs.

12. The Commission shall be governed by a Board whose Chairmanship shall be offered to the Leader of the RUF/SL, Corporal Foday Sankoh. The Board shall also comprise :

- i) Two representatives of the Government appointed by the President;
- ii) Two representatives of the political party to be formed by the RUF/SL;
- iii) Three representatives of the civil society; and
- iv) Two representatives of other political parties appointed by Parliament.

13. The Government shall take the required administrative actions to implement the commitments made in the present Agreement; and in the case of enabling legislation, it shall draft and submit to Parliament within thirty days of the signature of the present Agreement, the relevant bills for their enactment into law.

14. The Government commits itself to propose and support an amendment to the Constitution to make the exploitation of gold and diamonds the legitimate domain of the people of Sierra Leone, and to determine that the proceeds be used for the development of Sierra Leone, particularly public education, public health, infrastructure development, and compensation of incapacitated war victims as well as post-war reconstruction and development.

ARTICLE VIII

COUNCIL OF ELDERS AND RELIGIOUS LEADERS

1. The signatories agree to refer any conflicting differences of interpretation of this Article or any other Article of the present Agreement or its protocols, to a Council of Elders and Religious Leaders comprised as follows:

/...

- i) Two members appointed by the Inter-Religious Council;
- ii) One member each appointed by the Government and the RUF/SL; and
- iii) One member appointed by ECOWAS.

2. The Council shall designate its own chairperson from among its members. All of its decisions shall be taken by the concurrence of at least four members, and shall be binding and public, provided that an aggrieved party may appeal to the Supreme Court.

PART THREE

OTHER POLITICAL ISSUES

This Part of the present Agreement Consists of the following Articles :

Article IX Pardon and Amnesty

Article X Review of the Present Constitution

Article XI Elections

Article XII National Electoral Commission

ARTICLE IX

PARDON AND AMNESTY

1. In order to bring lasting peace to Sierra Leone, the Government of Sierra Leone shall take appropriate legal steps to grant Corporal Foday Sankoh absolute and free pardon.

/...

2. After the signing of the present Agreement, the Government of Sierra Leone shall also grant absolute and free pardon and reprieve to all combatants and collaborators in respect of anything done by them in pursuit of their objectives, up to the time of the signing of the present Agreement.

3. To consolidate the peace and promote the cause of national reconciliation, the Government of Sierra Leone shall ensure that no official or judicial action is taken against any member of the RUF/SL, ex-AFRC, ex-SLA or CDF in respect of anything done by them in pursuit of their objectives as members of those organisations, since March 1991, up to the time of the signing of the present Agreement. In addition, legislative and other measures necessary to guarantee immunity to former combatants, exiles and other persons, currently outside the country for reasons related to the armed conflict shall be adopted ensuring the full exercise of their civil and political rights, with a view to their reintegration within a framework of full legality.

ARTICLE X

REVIEW OF THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION

In order to ensure that the Constitution of Sierra Leone represents the needs and aspirations of the people of Sierra Leone and that no constitutional or any other legal provision prevents the implementation of the present Agreement, the Government of Sierra Leone shall take the necessary steps to establish a Constitutional Review Committee to review the provisions of the present Constitution, and where deemed appropriate recommend revisions and amendments, in accordance with Part V, Section 108 of the Constitution of 1991.

/...

ARTICLE XI

DATE OF NEXT ELECTIONS

The next national elections in Sierra Leone shall be held in accordance with the present Constitution of Sierra Leone.

ARTICLE XII

NATIONAL ELECTORAL COMMISSION

1. A new independent National Electoral Commission (hereinafter termed the NEC) shall be set up by the Government, not later than three months after the signing of the present Agreement.
2. In setting up the new NEC the President shall consult all political parties, including the RUF/SL, to determine the membership and terms of reference of the Commission, paying particular attention to the need for a level playing field in the nation's elections.
3. No member of the NEC shall be eligible for appointment to political office by any government formed as a result of an election he or she was mandated to conduct.
4. The NEC shall request the assistance of the International Community, including the UN, the OAU, ECOWAS and the Commonwealth of Nations, in monitoring the next presidential and parliamentary elections in Sierra Leone.

/...

PART FOUR

POST-CONFLICT MILITARY AND SECURITY ISSUES

1. The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL, recognizing that the maintenance of peace and security is of paramount importance for the achievement of lasting peace in Sierra Leone and for the welfare of its people, have agreed to the following formulas for dealing with post-conflict military and security matters. Each of these formulas (not in priority order) is contained in separate Articles of this Part of the present Agreement and may be further detailed in protocols annexed to the Agreement.

Article XIII Transformation and New Mandate of ECOMOG

Article XIV New Mandate of UNOMSIL

Article XV Security Guarantees for Peace Monitors

Article XVI Encampment, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration

Article XVII Restructuring and Training of the Sierra Leone Armed Forces

Article XVIII Withdrawal of Mercenaries

Article XIX Notification to Joint Monitoring Commission

Article XX Notification to Military Commands.

/...

ARTICLE XIII

TRANSFORMATION AND NEW MANDATE OF ECOMOG

1. Immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement, the parties shall request ECOWAS to revise the mandate of ECOMOG in Sierra Leone as follows:

- (i) Peacekeeping;
- (ii) Security of the State of Sierra Leone;
- (iii) Protection of UNOMSIL.
- (iv) Protection of Disarmament, Demobilisation and Reintegration personnel.

2. The Government shall, immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement, request ECOWAS for troop contributions from at least two additional countries. The additional contingents shall be deployed not later than 30 days from the date of signature of the present Agreement. The Security Council shall be requested to provide assistance in support of ECOMOG.

3. The Parties agree to develop a timetable for the phased withdrawal of ECOMOG, including measures for securing all of the territory of Sierra Leone by the restructured armed forces. The phased withdrawal of ECOMOG will be linked to the phased creation and deployment of the restructured armed forces.

ARTICLE XIV

NEW MANDATE OF UNOMSIL

1. The UN Security Council is requested to amend the mandate of UNOMSIL to enable it to undertake the various provisions outlined in the present Agreement.

/...

ARTICLE XV

SECURITY GUARANTEES FOR PEACE MONITORS

1. The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL agree to guarantee the safety, security and freedom of movement of UNOMSIL Military Observers throughout Sierra Leone. This guarantee shall be monitored by the Joint Monitoring Commission.
2. The freedom of movement includes complete and unhindered access for UNOMSIL Military Observers in the conduct of their duties throughout Sierra Leone. Before and during the process of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, officers and escorts to be provided by both Parties shall be required to facilitate this access.
3. Such freedom of movement and security shall also be accorded to non-military UNOMSIL personnel such as Human Rights Officers in the conduct of their duties. These personnel shall, in most cases, be accompanied by UNOMSIL Military Observers.
4. The provision of security to be extended shall include United Nations aircraft, vehicles and other property.

/...

ARTICLE XVI

ENCAMPMENT, DISARMAMENT, DEMOBILIZATION AND REINTEGRATION

1. A neutral peace keeping force comprising UNOMSIL and ECOMOG shall disarm all combatants of the RUF/SL, CDF, SLA and paramilitary groups. The encampment, disarmament and demobilization process shall commence within six weeks of the signing of the present Agreement in line with the deployment of the neutral peace keeping force.
2. The present SLA shall be restricted to the barracks and their arms in the armoury and their ammunitions in the magazines and placed under constant surveillance by the neutral peacekeeping force during the process of disarmament and demobilization.
- 3 UNOMSIL shall be present in all disarmament and demobilization locations to monitor the process and provide security guarantees to all ex-combatants.
4. Upon the signing of the present Agreement, the Government of Sierra Leone shall immediately request the International Community to assist with the provision of the necessary financial and technical resources needed for the adaptation and extension of the existing Encampment, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Programme in Sierra Leone, including payment of retirement benefits and other emoluments due to former members of the SLA.

ARTICLE XVII

RESTRUCTURING AND TRAINING OF THE SIERRA LEONE ARMED FORCES

1. The restructuring, composition and training of the new Sierra Leone armed forces will be carried out by the Government with a view to creating truly national armed forces, bearing loyalty solely to the State of Sierra Leone, and able and willing to perform their constitutional role.

/...

2. Those ex-combatants of the RUF/SL, CDF and SLA who wish to be integrated into the new restructured national armed forces may do so provided they meet established criteria.

3. Recruitment into the armed forces shall reflect the geo-political structure of Sierra Leone within the established strength.

ARTICLE XVIII

WITHDRAWAL OF MERCENARIES

All mercenaries, in any guise, shall be withdrawn from Sierra Leone immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement. Their withdrawal shall be supervised by the Joint Monitoring Commission.

ARTICLE XLX

NOTIFICATION TO JOINT MONITORING COMMISSION

Immediately upon the establishment of the JMC provided for in Article II of the present Agreement, each party shall furnish to the JMC information regarding the strength and locations of all combatants as well as the positions and descriptions of all known unexploded bombs (UXBs), explosive ordnance devices (EODs), minefields, booby traps, wire entanglements, and all other physical or military hazards. The JMC shall seek all necessary technical assistance in mine clearance and the disposal or destruction of similar devices and weapons under the operational control of the neutral peacekeeping force. The parties shall keep the JMC updated on changes in this information so that it can notify the public as needed, to prevent injuries.

/...

ARTICLE XX

NOTIFICATION TO MILITARY COMMANDS

Each party shall ensure that the terms of the present Agreement, and written orders requiring compliance, are immediately communicated to all of its forces.

PART FIVE

HUMANITARIAN, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES

1. The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL recognizing the importance of upholding, promoting and protecting the human rights of every Sierra Leonean as well as the enforcement of humanitarian law, agree to the following formulas for the achievement of these laudable objectives. Each of these formulas (not in priority order) is contained in separate Articles of this Part of the present Agreement

Article XXI Release of Prisoners and Abductees

Article XXII Refugees and Displaced Persons

Article XXIII Guarantee of the Security of Displaced Persons and Refugees

Article XXIV Guarantee and Promotion of Human Rights

Article XXV Human Rights Commission

Article XXVI Human Rights Violations

Article XXVII Humanitarian Relief

/...

Article XXVIII Post War Rehabilitation and Reconstruction

Article XXIX Special Fund for War Victims

Article XXX Child Combatants

Article XXXI Education and Health

ARTICLE XXI

RELEASE OF PRISONERS AND ABDUCTEES

All political prisoners of war as well as all non-combatants shall be released immediately and unconditionally by both parties, in accordance with the Statement of June 2, 1999, which is contained in Annex 3 and constitutes an integral part of the present Agreement.

ARTICLE XXII

REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

The Parties through the National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction agree to seek funding from and the involvement of the UN and other agencies, including friendly countries, in order to design and implement a plan for voluntary repatriation and reintegration of Sierra Leonean refugees and internally displaced persons, including non-combatants, in conformity with international conventions, norms and practices.

/...

ARTICLE XXIII

GUARANTEE OF THE SECURITY OF DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES

As a reaffirmation of their commitment to the observation of the conventions and principles of human rights and the status of refugees, the Parties shall take effective and appropriate measures to ensure that the right of Sierra Leoneans to asylum is fully respected and that no camps or dwellings of refugees or displaced persons are violated.

ARTICLE XXIV

GUARANTEE AND PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

1. The basic civil and political liberties recognized by the Sierra Leone legal system and contained in the declarations and principles of Human Rights adopted by the UN and OAU, especially the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the African Charter on Human and People's Rights, shall be fully protected and promoted within Sierra Leonean society.

2. These include the right to life and liberty, freedom from torture, the right to a fair trial, freedom of conscience, expression and association, and the right to take part in the governance of one's country.

ARTICLE XXV

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

1. The Parties pledge to strengthen the existing machinery for addressing grievances of the people in respect of alleged violations of their basic human rights by the creation, as a matter of urgency and not later than 90 days after the signing of the present Agreement, of an autonomous quasi-judicial national Human Rights Commission.

/...

2. The Parties further pledge to promote Human Rights education throughout the various sectors of Sierra Leonean society, including the schools, the media, the police, the military and the religious community.
3. In pursuance of the above, technical and material assistance may be sought from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights and other relevant international organisations.
4. A consortium of local human rights and civil society groups in Sierra Leone shall be encouraged to help monitor human rights observance.

ARTICLE XXVI

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

1. A Truth and Reconciliation Commission shall be established to address impunity, break the cycle of violence, provide a forum for both the victims and perpetrators of human rights violations to tell their story, get a clear picture of the past in order to facilitate genuine healing and reconciliation.

2. In the spirit of national reconciliation, the Commission shall deal with the question of human rights violations since the beginning of the Sierra Leonean conflict in 1991.

This Commission shall, among other things, recommend measures to be taken for the rehabilitation of victims of human rights violations.

3. Membership of the Commission shall be drawn from a cross-section of Sierra Leonean society with the participation and some technical support of the International Community. This Commission shall be established within 90 days after the signing of the present Agreement and shall, not later than 12 months after the commencement of its work, submit its report to the Government for immediate implementation of its recommendations.

/...

ARTICLE XXVII

HUMANITARIAN RELIEF

1. The Parties reaffirm their commitment to their Statement on the Delivery of Humanitarian Assistance in Sierra Leone of June 3, 1999 which is contained in Annex 4 and constitutes an integral part of the present Agreement. To this end, the Government shall request appropriate international humanitarian assistance for the people of Sierra Leone who are in need all over the country.
2. The Parties agree to guarantee safe and unhindered access by all humanitarian organizations throughout the country in order to facilitate delivery of humanitarian assistance, in accordance with international conventions, principles and norms which govern humanitarian operations. In this respect, the parties agree to guarantee the security of the presence and movement of humanitarian personnel.
3. The Parties also agree to guarantee the security of all properties and goods transported, stocked or distributed by humanitarian organizations, as well as the security of their projects and beneficiaries.
4. The Government shall set up at various levels throughout the country, the appropriate and effective administrative or security bodies which will monitor and facilitate the implementation of these guarantees of safety for the personnel, goods and areas of operation of the humanitarian organizations.

ARTICLE XXVIII

POST - WAR REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

1. The Government, through the National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction and with the support of the International Community, shall provide appropriate financial and technical resources for post-war rehabilitation, reconstruction and development.

2. Given that women have been particularly victimized during the war, special attention shall be accorded to their needs and potentials in formulating and implementing national rehabilitation, reconstruction and development programmes, to enable them to play a central role in the moral, social and physical reconstruction of Sierra Leone.

ARTICLE XXIX

SPECIAL FUND FOR WAR VICTIMS

The Government, with the support of the International Community, shall design and implement a programme for the rehabilitation of war victims. For this purpose, a special fund shall be set up.

ARTICLE XXX

CHILD COMBATANTS

The Government shall accord particular attention to the issue of child soldiers. It shall, accordingly, mobilize resources, both within the country and from the International Community, and especially through the Office of the UN Special Representative for Children in Armed Conflict, UNICEF and other agencies, to address the special needs of these children in the existing disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes.

/...

ARTICLE XXXI

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

The Government shall provide free compulsory education for the first nine years of schooling (Basic Education) and shall endeavour to provide free schooling for a further three years. The Government shall also endeavour to provide affordable primary health care throughout the country.

PART SIX

IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT

ARTICLE XXXII

JOINT IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE

A Joint Implementation Committee consisting of members of the Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (CCP) and the Committee of Seven on Sierra Leone, as well as the Moral Guarantors, provided for in Article XXXIV of the present Agreement and other international supporters shall be established. Under the chairmanship of ECOWAS, the Joint Implementation Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and assessing the state of implementation of the Agreement, and shall meet at least once every three months. Without prejudice to the functions of the Commission for the Consolidation of Peace as provided for in Article VI, the Joint Implementation Committee shall make recommendations deemed necessary to ensure effective implementation of the present Agreement according to the Schedule of Implementation, which appears as Annex 5.

/...

ARTICLE XXXIII

REQUEST FOR INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT

The parties request that the provisions of the present Agreement affecting the United Nations shall enter into force upon the adoption by the UN Security Council of a resolution responding affirmatively to the request made in this Agreement. Likewise, the decision-making bodies of the other international organisations concerned are requested to take similar action, where appropriate.

PART SEVEN

MORAL GUARANTORS AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT

ARTICLE XXXIV

MORAL GUARANTORS

The Government of the Togolese Republic, the United Nations, the OAU, ECOWAS and the Commonwealth of Nations shall stand as Moral Guarantors that this Peace Agreement is implemented with integrity and in good faith by both parties.

ARTICLE XXXV

INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT

Both parties call on the International Community to assist them in implementing the present Agreement with integrity and good faith. The international organisations mentioned in Article XXXIV and the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Nigeria, Togo, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are facilitating and supporting the conclusion of this Agreement. These States and organisations believe that this Agreement must protect the paramount interests of the people of Sierra Leone in peace and security.

/...

PART EIGHT

FINAL PROVISIONS

ARTICLE XXXVI

REGISTRATION AND PUBLICATION

The Sierra Leone Government shall register the signed Agreement not later than 15 days from the date of the signing of this Agreement. The signed Agreement shall also be published in the Sierra Leone Gazette not later than 48 (Forty - Eight) hours after the date of registration of this Agreement. This Agreement shall be laid before the Parliament of Sierra Leone not later than 21 (Twenty - One) days after the signing of this Agreement.


ARTICLE XXXVII


ENTRY INTO FORCE


The present Agreement shall enter into force immediately upon its signing by the Parties.

/...


Done in Lomé this seven day of the month of July 1999
in twelve (12) original texts in English and French, each text being equally
authentic.


ALHAJI DR AHMAD TEJAN KABBAH
PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC
OF SIERRA LEONE



CORPORAL FODAY SAYBANA SANKOH
LEADER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY
UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE



HIS EXCELLENCY GNASSINGBE EYADEMA
PRESIDENT OF THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC,
CHAIRMAN OF ECOWAS



HIS EXCELLENCY BLAISE COMPAORE
PRESIDENT OF BURKINA FASO


HIS EXCELLENCY DAHRKPANAH
DR. CHARLES GHANKEY TAYLOR
PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA


1875



HIS EXCELLENCY OLUSEGUN OBASANJO
PRESIDENT AND COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE ARMED
FORCES OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA



HIS EXCELLENCY VICTOR GBEHO,
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE REPUBLIC OF GHANA


HIS EXCELLENCY YOUSOUFOU BAMBA
MINISTER OF STATE AT THE
FOREIGN MINISTRY IN CHARGE OF
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
OF COTE D'IVOIRE


Mr. Roger LALOUPO
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ECOWAS
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY


Ambassador Francis G. OKELO
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE UNITED NATIONS
SECRETARY GENERAL


Ms. Adwoa COLEMAN
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY


Dr. Moses K.Z. ANAFU
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

/...

ANNEX 1

AGREEMENT ON CEASEFIRE IN SIERRA LEONE

President Ahmad Tejan KABBAH and Rev. Jesse Jackson met on 18 May 1999 with Corporal Foday Saybana SANKOH, under the auspices of President Gnassingbe EYADEMA. At that meeting, the question of the peace process for Sierra Leone was discussed.

* * *

The Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF/SL),

- Desirous to promote the ongoing dialogue process with a view to establishing durable peace and stability in Sierra Leone ; and

- Wishing to create an appropriate atmosphere conducive to the holding of peace talks in Lome, which began with the RUF internal consultations to be followed by dialogue between the Government and the RUF ;

- Have jointly decided to :

1- Agree to ceasefire as from 24 May 1999, the day that President EYADEMA invited Foreign Ministers of ECOWAS to discuss problems pertaining to Sierra Leone. It was further agreed that the dialogue between the Government of Sierra Leone and RUF would commence on 25 May 1999 ;

2- Maintain their present and respective positions in Sierra Leone as of the 24th May 1999 ; and refrain from any hostile or aggressive act which could undermine the peace process ;

3- Commit to start negotiations in good faith, involving all relevant parties in the discussions, not later than May 25 in Lome ;

/...

4- Guarantee safe and unhindered access by humanitarian organizations to all people in need ; establish safe corridors for the provision of food and medical supplies to ECOMOG soldiers behind RUF lines, and to RUF combatants behind ECOMOG lines ;

5- Immediate release of all prisoners of war and non-combatants ;

6- Request the United Nations, subject to the Security Council's authorization, to deploy military observers as soon as possible to observe compliance by the Government forces (ECOMOG and Civil Defence Forces) and the RUF, including former AFRC forces, with this ceasefire agreement.


This agreement is without prejudice to any other agreement or additional protocols which may be discussed during the dialogue between the Government and the RUF.

Signed in Lome (Togo) 18 May 1999, in Six (6) Originals in English and French.

For the Government of Sierra Leone


ALHADJI Dr. Ahmad Tejan KABBAH
President of the Republic of Sierra Leone

For the Revolutionary United Front
of Sierra Leone


Corporal Foday Saybana SANKOH
Leader of the Revolutionary
United Front (RUF)

Witnessed by :

For the Government of Togo and
Current Chairman of ECOWAS

Gnassingbe EYADEMA
President of the Republic of Togo

For the Organization of African Unity

Adwoa COLEMAN
Representative of the Organization
of African Unity

For the United Nations

Francis G. OKELO
Special Representative of the
Secretary General

US Presidential Special Envoy for
the Promotion of Democracy in Africa

Rev. Jesse JACKSON

/...

ANNEX 2

DEFINITION OF CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

1. In accordance with Article II of the present Agreement, both parties agree that the following constitute cease-fire violations and a breach of the Cease-fire Agreement:

- a. The use of weapons of any kind in any circumstance including:
 - (i) Automatic and semi-automatic rifles, pistols, machine guns and any other small arms weapon systems.
 - (ii) Heavy machine guns and any other heavy weapon systems.
 - (iii) Grenades and rocket-propelled grenade weapon systems.
 - (iv) Artillery, rockets, mortars and any other indirect fire weapon systems.
 - (v) All types of mine, explosive devices and improvised booby traps.
 - (vi) Air assets outside of respective areas of control, of any nature, including reconnaissance aircraft with the exception of pre-agreed flights.
 - (vii) Air Defence weapon systems of any nature.
 - (viii) Any other weapon not included in the above paragraphs.
- b. Troop movements of any nature outside of the areas recognized as being under the control of respective fighting forces without prior notification to the Cease-fire Monitoring Committee of any movements at least 48 hours in advance.
- c. The movement of arms and ammunition. To be considered in the context of Security Council Resolution 1171 (1998).

/...

- d. Troop movements of any nature;
 - e. The construction and/or the improvement of defensive works and positions within respective areas of control, but outside a geographical boundary of 500m from existing similar positions.
 - f. Reconnaissance of any nature outside of respective areas of control.
 - g. Any other offensive or aggressive action.
2. Any training or other military activities not provided for in Articles XIII to XIX of the present Agreement, constitute a cease-fire violation.
3. In the event of a hostile external force threatening the territorial integrity or sovereignty of Sierra Leone, military action may be undertaken by the Sierra Leone Government.

ANNEX 3

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SIERRA LEONE AND THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE ON THE RELEASE OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND NON-COMBATANTS

The Government of Sierra Leone (GOSL) and the Revolutionary United Front (RUF/SL) have agreed to implement as soon as possible the provision of the Cease-fire Agreement which was signed on 18 May 1999 in Lome, relating to the immediate release of prisoners of war and non-combatants.

Both sides reaffirmed the importance of the implementation of this provision in the interest of the furtherance of the talks.

They therefore decided that an appropriate Committee is established to handle the release by them of all prisoners of war and non-combatants.

Both the Government of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone decided that such a Committee be established by the UN and chaired by the UN Chief Military Observer in Sierra Leone and comprising representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), UNICEF and other relevant UN Agencies and NGOS

This Committee should begin its work immediately by contacting both parties to the conflict with a view to effecting the immediate release of these prisoners of war and non-combatants.

Lomé - 2 June 1999

/...

ANNEX 4

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SIERRA LEONE AND THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE ON THE DELIVERY OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN SIERRA LEONE

The parties to the conflict in Sierra Leone meeting in Lome Togo on 3rd June 1999 in the context of the Dialogue between the Government of Sierra Leone (GSL) and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF/SL):

Reaffirm their respect for international convention, principles and norms, which govern the right of people to receive humanitarian assistance and the effective delivery of such assistance.

Reiterate their commitment to the implementation of the Cease-fire Agreement signed by the two parties on 18th May 1999 in Lome.

Aware of the fact that the protracted civil strife in Sierra Leone has created a situation whereby the vast majority of Sierra Leoneans in need of humanitarian assistance cannot be reached.

Hereby agree as follows:

1. That all duly registered humanitarian agencies shall be guaranteed safe and unhindered access to all areas under the control of the respective parties in order that humanitarian assistance can be delivered safely and effectively, in accordance with international conventions, principles and norms govern humanitarian operations.
2. In this respect the two parties shall:
 - a. guarantee safe access and facilitate the fielding of independent assessment missions by duly registered humanitarian agencies.

/...

- b. identify, in collaboration with the UN Humanitarian Co-ordinator in Sierra Leone and UNOMSIL, mutually agreed routes (road, air and waterways) by which humanitarian goods and personnel shall be transported to the beneficiaries to provide needed assistance.
 - c. allow duly registered humanitarian agencies to deliver assistance according to needs established through independent assessments.
 - d. guarantee the security of all properties of and goods transported, stocked or distributed by the duly registered humanitarian agencies, as well as the security of their project areas and beneficiaries.
3. The two parties undertake to establish with immediate effect, and not later than seven days, an Implementation Committee formed by appropriately designated and mandated representatives from the Government of Sierra Leone, the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone, the Civil Society, the NGO community, and the UNOMSIL ; and chaired by the United Nations Humanitarian Co-ordinator, in co-ordination with the Special Representative of the Secretary General in Sierra Leone.

The Implementation Committee will be mandated to:

- a. Ascertain and assess the security of proposed routes to be used by the humanitarian agencies, and disseminate information on routes to interested humanitarian agencies.
 - b. Receive and review complaints which may arise in the implementation of this arrangement, in order to re-establish full compliance.
4. The parties agree to set up at various levels in their areas of control, the appropriate and effective administrative and security bodies which will monitor and facilitate the effective delivery of humanitarian assistance in all approved points of delivery, and ensure the security of the personnel, goods and project areas of the humanitarian agencies as well as the safety of the beneficiaries.

Issued in Lomé

June 3 1999

/...

ANNEX 5
DRAFT SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PEACE AGREEMENT

I. ACTIVITIES WITH SPECIFIC TIMING:

TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
DAY 1	Signing of the Peace Agreement		
	Amnesty	The Government to grant absolute and free pardon to the RUF leader Foday Sankoh through appropriate legal steps	
	Transformation and new mandate of ECOMOG	Request to ECOWAS by the parties for revision of the mandate of ECOMOG in Sierra Leone Request to the UN Security Council to amend the mandate of UNOMSIL to enable it to undertake the various provisions outlined in the present Agreement. Request to the international community to provide substantial financial and logistical assistance to facilitate implementation of the Peace Agreement. Request to ECOWAS by the parties for contribution of additional troops	
	Transformation of the RUF into a political party	RUF/SL to commence to organize itself to function as a political party	
	Encampment, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR)	Request for international assistance in adapting and extending the existing DDR programme	
	Withdrawal of mercenaries	Supervision by Joint Monitoring Commission	
	Notification to Joint Monitoring Commission	Communication by the parties of positions and description of all known unlike devices/materials	
	Notification to Military Commands	Communication by the parties of written orders requiring compliance	

/...

DAY 15	Enabling members of the RUF/SL to hold public office, and to join a broad-based Government of National Unity through Cabinet appointments	Removal by the Government of all legal impediments	
	Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (COP)	Creation of the Commission to implement a post-conflict reconciliation and welfare programme	Mandate of the Commission to terminate at the end of next general elections Jan.-Feb.2001
TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
DAY 15 (cont.)	Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (CMRRD)	Ban on all exploitation, sale, export, or any transaction of gold and diamonds except those sanctioned by the CMRRD	
DAY 22	Enabling members of the RUF/SL to hold public office	Discussion and agreement between both parties on the appointments of RUF/SL members to positions in parastatal, diplomacy and any other public sector	For a period of fourteen days
DAY 31	Transformation of the RUF into a political party Commission for the management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (CMRRD) Transformation, new mandate, and phased withdrawal of ECOMOG	Necessary legal steps by the Government for registration of the RUF as a political party Preparation and submission by Government to the Parliament of relevant bills for enabling legislative commitments made under the peace agreement Deployment of troops from at least two additional countries	
DAY 60	Completion of encampment, disarmament and demobilization	Restriction of SLA soldiers to the barracks and storage of their arms and ammunition under constant surveillance by the Neutral Peace-Keeping Force during the disarmament process Monitoring of disarmament and demobilization by UNOMISIL	
DAY 90	Human Rights Commission	Creation of an autonomous quasi-judicial national Human Rights Commission Request for technical and material assistance from the UN High	

/...

1885

		Commission for Human Rights, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights and other relevant organizations	
		Creation of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission	
	Elections	Establishment of a new independent National Electoral Commission (NEC), in consultation with all political parties including the RUF/SL	
		Request for financial and logistical support for the operations of the NEC	
		Request for assistance from the international community in monitoring the next presidential and parliamentary elections in Sierra Leone	
DAY 456	Human Rights Violations	Submission by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of its report and recommendation to the Government for immediate implementation	

II. ACTIVITIES WITHOUT SPECIFIC TIMING: (SHORT/MEDIUM/LONG TERM):

SERIAL NO.	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1.	Ceasefire monitoring (Ceasefire Agreement signed on 18 May 1999)	Establishment of Ceasefire Monitoring Committees at provincial and district levels Request for international assistance in providing funds and other logistics for the operations of the JMC	JMC already established and operational
2.	Review of the present Constitution	Establishment of a Constitutional Review Committee	
3.	Mediation by the Council of Elders and Religious Leaders	Appointment of members of the Council by the Interreligious Council, the Government, the RUF and ECOWAS	
4.	Timetable for the phased withdrawal of ECOMOG	Formulation of the timetable in connection with the phased creation and deployment of the restructured armed forces	
5.	Security guarantees for peace monitors	Communication, in writing, of security guarantees to UNMIIBs	
6.	Restructuring and training of the SLA	Creation by the Government of truly national armed forces reflecting the socio-political structure of Sierra Leone within the established	

		strength	
7.	Release of prisoners of war and abductees	Establishment of a Committee on the Release of Prisoners of War and Non-combatants	Operation underway. Parties to be encouraged to continue vigorously
8.	Refugees and displaced persons	Formulation of plan of voluntary repatriation and reintegration of Sierra Leonean refugees and IDPs, with the financial assistance and involvement of UN and other agencies and friendly countries	
9.	Guarantee and protection of Human Rights	Respect of the right to life and liberty, freedom from torture, the right to a fair trial, freedom of conscience, expression and association, and the right to take part in the governance of one's country	
10.	Guarantee of the security of displaced persons and refugees	Adoption by the parties of effective and appropriate security measures	
11.	Humanitarian relief	Continued delivery of humanitarian assistance with appropriate international support Establishment by the Government of appropriate and effective administrative or security bodies to monitor and facilitate implementation of security guarantees to personnel, goods and areas of operations	
12.	Post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction	Provision by the Government of appropriate financial and technical resources	
13.	Special Fund for war victims	Formulation and implementation by the Government of a programme for the rehabilitation of war victims	
14.	Child combatants	Mobilization of internal and international resources by the Government to address the needs of child combatants	
15.	Education and Health	Mobilization of adequate funding for free compulsory basic education and primary health care	
16.	Amnesty	The Government to grant amnesty and pardon to RUF and AFRC personnel through appropriate legal measures	

ANNEX 2:

Report of the Secretary-General of the United Nations of 4 October 2000 S/2000/915



Distr.: General
4 October 2000

Original: English

Report of the Secretary-General on the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone

I. Introduction

1. The Security Council, by its resolution 1315 (2000) of 14 August 2000, requested me to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Sierra Leone to create an independent special court (hereinafter "the Special Court") to prosecute persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law, as well as crimes under relevant Sierra Leonean law committed within the territory of Sierra Leone.
2. The Security Council further requested that I submit a report on the implementation of the resolution, in particular on my consultations and negotiations with the Government of Sierra Leone concerning the establishment of the Special Court. In the report I was requested, in particular, to address the questions of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court; an appeals process, including the advisability, feasibility and appropriateness of an appeals chamber in the Special Court, or of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda; and a possible alternative host State, should it be necessary to convene the Special Court outside the seat of the Court in Sierra Leone, if circumstances so require.
3. Specific recommendations were also requested by the Security Council on the following issues:
 - (a) Any additional agreements that might be required for the provision of the international assistance necessary for the establishment and functioning of the Special Court;
 - (b) The level of participation, support and technical assistance of qualified persons required from Member States, including, in particular, States members of the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) and the Commonwealth, and from the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone (UNAMSIL) that would be necessary for the efficient, independent and impartial functioning of the Special Court;
 - (c) The amount of voluntary contributions of funds, equipment and services, including expert personnel from States, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations;
 - (d) Whether the Special Court could receive, as necessary and feasible, expertise and advice from the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda.
4. The present report, submitted in response to the above requests, is in two parts. The first part (chaps. II-VI) examines and analyses the nature and specificity of the Special Court, its jurisdiction (subject-matter, temporal and personal), the organizational structure (the Chambers and the nature of the appeals process, the offices of the Prosecutor and the Registry), enforcement of sentences in third States and the choice of the alternative seat. The second part (chaps. VII and VIII) deals with the practical implementation of the resolution on the establishment of the Special Court. It describes the requirements of the Court in terms of personnel, equipment, services and funds that would be required of States, intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations, the type of advice and expertise that may be expected from the two International Tribunals, and the logistical support and

security requirements for premises and personnel that could, under an appropriate mandate, be provided by UNAMSIL. The Court's requirements in all of these respects have been placed within the specific context of Sierra Leone, and represent the minimum necessary, in the words of resolution 1315 (2000), "for the efficient, independent and impartial functioning of the Special Court". An assessment of the viability and sustainability of the financial mechanism envisaged, together with an alternative solution for the consideration of the Security Council, concludes the second part of the report.

5. The negotiations with the Government of Sierra Leone, represented by the Attorney General and the Minister of Justice, were conducted in two stages. The first stage of the negotiations, held at United Nations Headquarters from 12 to 14 September 2000, focused on the legal framework and constitutive instruments establishing the Special Court: the Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone and the Statute of the Special Court which is an integral part thereof. (For the texts of the Agreement and the Statute, see the annex to the present report.)

6. Following the Attorney General's visit to Headquarters, a small United Nations team led by Ralph Zacklin, Assistant Secretary-General for Legal Affairs, visited Freetown from 18 to 20 September 2000. Mr. Zacklin was accompanied by Daphna Shraga, Senior Legal Officer, Office of the Legal Counsel, Office of Legal Affairs; Gerald Ganz, Security Coordination Officer, Office of the United Nations Security Coordinator; and Robert Kirkwood, Chief, Buildings Management, International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia. During its three-day visit, the team concluded the negotiations on the remaining legal issues, assessed the adequacy of possible premises for the seat of the Special Court, their operational state and security conditions, and had substantive discussions on all aspects of the Special Court with the President of Sierra Leone, senior government officials, members of the judiciary and the legal profession, the Ombudsman, members of civil society, national and international non-governmental organizations and institutions involved in child-care programmes and rehabilitation of child ex-combatants, as well as with senior officials of UNAMSIL.

7. In its many meetings with Sierra Leoneans of all segments of society, the team was made aware of the high level of expectations created in anticipation of the

establishment of a special court. If the role of the Special Court in dealing with impunity and developing respect for the rule of law in Sierra Leone is to be fully understood and its educative message conveyed to Sierra Leoneans of all ages, a broad public information and education campaign will have to be undertaken as an integral part of the Court's activities. The purpose of such a campaign would be both to inform and to reassure the population that while a credible Special Court cannot be established overnight, everything possible will be done to expedite its functioning; that while the number of persons prosecuted before the Special Court will be limited, it would not be selective or otherwise discriminatory; and that although the children of Sierra Leone may be among those who have committed the worst crimes, they are to be regarded first and foremost as victims. For a nation which has attested to atrocities that only few societies have witnessed, it will require a great deal of persuasion to convince it that the exclusion of the death penalty and its replacement by imprisonment is not an "acquittal" of the accused, but an imposition of a more humane punishment. In this public information campaign, UNAMSIL, alongside the Government and non-governmental organizations, could play an important role.

8. Since the present report is limited to an analysis of the legal framework and the practical operation of the Special Court, it does not address in detail specifics of the relationship between the Special Court and the national courts in Sierra Leone, or between the Court and the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission. It is envisaged, however, that upon the establishment of the Special Court and the appointment of its Prosecutor, arrangements regarding cooperation, assistance and sharing of information between the respective courts would be concluded and the status of detainees awaiting trial would be urgently reviewed. In a similar vein, relationship and cooperation arrangements would be required between the Prosecutor and the National Truth and Reconciliation Commission, including the use of the Commission as an alternative to prosecution, and the prosecution of juveniles, in particular.

II. Nature and specificity of the Special Court

9. The legal nature of the Special Court, like that of any other legal entity, is determined by its constitutive instrument. Unlike either the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, which were established by resolutions of the Security Council and constituted as subsidiary organs of the United Nations, or national courts established by law, the Special Court, as foreseen, is established by an Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone and is therefore a treaty-based *sui generis* court of mixed jurisdiction and composition. Its implementation at the national level would require that the agreement is incorporated in the national law of Sierra Leone in accordance with constitutional requirements. Its applicable law includes international as well as Sierra Leonean law, and it is composed of both international and Sierra Leonean judges,¹ prosecutors and administrative support staff.² As a treaty-based organ, the Special Court is not anchored in any existing system (i.e., United Nations administrative law or the national law of the State of the seat) which would be automatically applicable to its non-judicial, administrative and financial activities. In the absence of such a framework, it would be necessary to identify rules for various purposes, such as recruitment, staff administration, procurement, etc., to be applied as the need arose.³

10. The Special Court has concurrent jurisdiction with and primacy over Sierra Leonean courts. Consequently, it has the power to request at any stage of the proceedings that any national Sierra Leonean court defer to its jurisdiction (article 8, para. 2 of the Statute). The primacy of the Special Court, however, is limited to the national courts of Sierra Leone and does not extend to the courts of third States. Lacking the power to assert its primacy over national courts in third States in connection with the crimes committed in Sierra Leone, it also lacks the power to request the surrender of an accused from any third State and to induce the compliance of its authorities with any such request. In examining measures to enhance the deterrent powers of the Special Court, the Security Council may wish to consider endowing it with Chapter VII powers for the specific purpose of requesting the surrender of an accused from outside the jurisdiction of the Court.

11. Beyond its legal and technical aspects, which in many ways resemble those of other international jurisdictions, the Special Court is Sierra Leone-specific. Many of the legal choices made are intended to address the specificities of the Sierra Leonean conflict, the brutality of the crimes committed and the young age of those presumed responsible. The moral dilemma that some of these choices represent has not been lost upon those who negotiated its constitutive instruments.

III. Competence of the Special Court

A. Subject-matter jurisdiction

12. The subject-matter jurisdiction of the Special Court comprises crimes under international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law. It covers the most egregious practices of mass killing, extrajudicial executions, widespread mutilation, in particular amputation of hands, arms, legs, lips and other parts of the body, sexual violence against girls and women, and sexual slavery, abduction of thousands of children and adults, hard labour and forced recruitment into armed groups, looting and setting fire to large urban dwellings and villages. In recognition of the principle of legality, in particular *nullum crimen sine lege*, and the prohibition on retroactive criminal legislation, the international crimes enumerated, are crimes considered to have had the character of customary international law at the time of the alleged commission of the crime.

1. Crimes under international law

13. In its resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council recommended that the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Special Court should include crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law. Because of the lack of any evidence that the massive, large-scale killing in Sierra Leone was at any time perpetrated against an identified national, ethnic, racial or religious group with an intent to annihilate the group as such, the Security Council did not include the crime of genocide in its recommendation, nor was it considered appropriate by the Secretary-General to include it in the list of international crimes falling within the jurisdiction of the Court.

14. The list of crimes against humanity follows the enumeration included in the Statutes of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, which were patterned on article 6 of the Nürnberg Charter. Violations of common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions and of article 4 of Additional Protocol II thereto committed in an armed conflict not of an international character have long been considered customary international law, and in particular since the establishment of the two International Tribunals, have been recognized as customarily entailing the individual criminal responsibility of the accused. Under the Statute of the International Criminal Court (ICC), though it is not yet in force, they are recognized as war crimes.

15. Other serious violations of international humanitarian law falling within the jurisdiction of the Court include:

(a) Attacks against the civilian population as such, or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities;

(b) Attacks against peacekeeping personnel involved in a humanitarian assistance or a peacekeeping mission, as long as they are entitled to the protection given to civilians under the international law of armed conflict; and

(c) Abduction and forced recruitment of children under the age of 15 years into armed forces or groups for the purpose of using them to participate actively in hostilities.

16. The prohibition on attacks against civilians is based on the most fundamental distinction drawn in international humanitarian law between the civilian and the military and the absolute prohibition on directing attacks against the former. Its customary international law nature is, therefore, firmly established. Attacks against peacekeeping personnel, to the extent that they are entitled to protection recognized under international law to civilians in armed conflict, do not represent a new crime. Although established for the first time as an international crime in the Statute of the International Criminal Court, it was not viewed at the time of the adoption of the Rome Statute as adding to the already existing customary international law crime of attacks against civilians and persons hors de combat. Based on the distinction between peacekeepers as civilians and peacekeepers turned combatants, the crime defined in article 4 of the Statute of the Special Court is a

specification of a targeted group within the generally protected group of civilians which because of its humanitarian or peacekeeping mission deserves special protection. The specification of the crime of attacks against peacekeepers, however, does not imply a more serious crime than attacks against civilians in similar circumstances and should not entail, therefore, a heavier penalty.

17. The prohibition on the recruitment of children below the age of 15, a fundamental element of the protection of children, was for the first time established in the 1977 Additional Protocol II to the Geneva Conventions, article 4, paragraph 3 (c), of which provides that children shall be provided with the care and aid they require, and that in particular:

“Children who have not attained the age of fifteen years shall neither be recruited in the armed forces or groups nor allowed to take part in hostilities”.

A decade later, the prohibition on the recruitment of children below 15 into armed forces was established in article 38, paragraph 3, of the 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child; and in 1998, the Statute of the International Criminal Court criminalized the prohibition and qualified it as a war crime. But while the prohibition on child recruitment has by now acquired a customary international law status, it is far less clear whether it is customarily recognized as a war crime entailing the individual criminal responsibility of the accused.

18. Owing to the doubtful customary nature of the ICC Statutory crime which criminalizes the conscription or enlistment of children under the age of 15, whether forced or “voluntary”, the crime which is included in article 4 (c) of the Statute of the Special Court is not the equivalent of the ICC provision. While the definition of the crime as “conscribing” or “enlisting” connotes an administrative act of putting one’s name on a list and formal entry into the armed forces, the elements of the crime under the proposed Statute of the Special Court are: (a) abduction, which in the case of the children of Sierra Leone was the original crime and is in itself a crime under common article 3 of the Geneva Conventions; (b) forced recruitment in the most general sense — administrative formalities, obviously, notwithstanding; and (c) transformation of the child into, and its use as, among other degrading uses, a “child-combatant”.

2. Crimes under Sierra Leonean law

19. The Security Council recommended that the subject-matter jurisdiction of the Special Court should also include crimes under relevant Sierra Leonean law committed within the territory of Sierra Leone. While most of the crimes committed in the Sierra Leonean conflict during the relevant period are governed by the international law provisions set out in articles 2 to 4 of the Statute, recourse to Sierra Leonean law has been had in cases where a specific situation or an aspect of it was considered to be either unregulated or inadequately regulated under international law. The crimes considered to be relevant for this purpose and included in the Statute are: offences relating to the abuse of girls under the 1926 Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act and offences relating to the wanton destruction of property, and in particular arson, under the 1861 Malicious Damage Act.

20. The applicability of two systems of law implies that the elements of the crimes are governed by the respective international or national law, and that the Rules of Evidence differ according to the nature of the crime as a common or international crime. In that connection, article 14 of the Statute provides that the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis* to proceedings before the Special Court, and that the judges shall have the power to amend or adopt additional rules, where a specific situation is not provided for. In so doing, they may be guided, as appropriate, by the 1965 Criminal Procedure Act of Sierra Leone.

B. Temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court

21. In addressing the question of the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court as requested by the Security Council, a determination of the validity of the sweeping amnesty granted under the Lomé Peace Agreement of 7 July 1999 was first required. If valid, it would limit the temporal jurisdiction of the Court to offences committed after 7 July 1999; if invalid, it would make possible a determination of a beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court at any time in the pre-Lomé period.

1. The amnesty clause in the Lomé Peace Agreement

22. While recognizing that amnesty is an accepted legal concept and a gesture of peace and reconciliation at the end of a civil war or an internal armed conflict,⁴ the United Nations has consistently maintained the position that amnesty cannot be granted in respect of international crimes, such as genocide, crimes against humanity or other serious violations of international humanitarian law.

23. At the time of the signature of the Lomé Peace Agreement, the Special Representative of the Secretary-General for Sierra Leone was instructed to append to his signature on behalf of the United Nations a disclaimer to the effect that the amnesty provision contained in article IX of the Agreement ("absolute and free pardon") shall not apply to international crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law. This reservation is recalled by the Security Council in a preambular paragraph of resolution 1315 (2000).

24. In the negotiations on the Statute of the Special Court, the Government of Sierra Leone concurred with the position of the United Nations and agreed to the inclusion of an amnesty clause which would read as follows:

"An amnesty granted to any person falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Court in respect of the crimes referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall not be a bar to prosecution."

With the denial of legal effect to the amnesty granted at Lomé, to the extent of its illegality under international law, the obstacle to the determination of a beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court within the pre-Lomé period has been removed.

2. Beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction

25. It is generally accepted that the decade-long civil war in Sierra Leone dates back to 1991, when on 23 March of that year forces of the Revolutionary United Front (RUF) entered Sierra Leone from Liberia and launched a rebellion to overthrow the one-party military rule of the All People's Congress (APC). In determining a beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court within the period since

23 March 1991, the Secretary-General has been guided by the following considerations: (a) the temporal jurisdiction should be reasonably limited in time so that the Prosecutor is not overburdened and the Court overloaded; (b) the beginning date should correspond to an event or a new phase in the conflict without necessarily having any political connotations; and (c) it should encompass the most serious crimes committed by persons of all political and military groups and in all geographical areas of the country. A temporal jurisdiction limited in any of these respects would rightly be perceived as a selective or discriminatory justice.

26. Imposing a temporal jurisdiction on the Special Court reaching back to 1991 would create a heavy burden for the prosecution and the Court. The following alternative dates were therefore considered as realistic options:

(a) *30 November 1996* — the conclusion of the Abidjan Peace Agreement, the first comprehensive Peace Agreement between the Government of Sierra Leone and RUF. Soon after its signature the Peace Agreement had collapsed and large-scale hostilities had resumed;

(b) *25 May 1997* — the date of the coup d'état orchestrated by the Armed Forces Revolutionary Council (AFRC) against the Government that was democratically elected in early 1996. The period which ensued was characterized by serious violations of international humanitarian law, including, in particular, mass rape and abduction of women, forced recruitment of children and summary executions;

(c) *6 January 1999* — the date on which RUF/AFRC launched a military operation to take control of Freetown. The first three-week period of full control by these entities over Freetown marked the most intensified, systematic and widespread violations of human rights and international humanitarian law against the civilian population. During its retreat in February 1999, RUF abducted hundreds of young people, particularly young women used as forced labourers, fighting forces, human shields and sexual slaves.

27. In considering the three options for the beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Court, the parties have concluded that the choice of 30 November 1996 would have the benefit of putting the Sierra Leone conflict in perspective without unnecessarily

extending the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court. It would also ensure that the most serious crimes committed by all parties and armed groups would be encompassed within its jurisdiction. The choice of 25 May 1997 would have all these advantages, with the disadvantage of having a political connotation, implying, wrongly, that the prosecution of those responsible for the most serious violations of international humanitarian law is aimed at punishment for their participation in the coup d'état. The last option marks in many ways the peak of the campaign of systematic and widespread crimes against the civilian population, as experienced mostly by the inhabitants of Freetown. If the temporal jurisdiction of the Court were to be limited to that period only, it would exclude all crimes committed before that period in the rural areas and the countryside. In view of the perceived advantages of the first option and the disadvantages associated with the other options, the date of 30 November 1996 was selected as the beginning date of the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court, a decision in which the government negotiators have actively concurred.

28. As the armed conflict in various parts of the territory of Sierra Leone is still ongoing, it was decided that the temporal jurisdiction of the Special Court should be left open-ended. The lifespan of the Special Court, however, as distinguished from its temporal jurisdiction, will be determined by a subsequent agreement between the parties upon the completion of its judicial activities, an indication of the capacity acquired by the local courts to assume the prosecution of the remaining cases, or the unavailability of resources. In setting an end to the operation of the Court, the Agreement would also determine all matters relating to enforcement of sentences, pardon or commutation, transfer of pending cases to the local courts and the disposition of the financial and other assets of the Special Court.

C. Personal jurisdiction

1. Persons "most responsible"

29. In its resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council recommended that the personal jurisdiction of the Special Court should extend to those "who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of the crimes", which is understood as an indication of a limitation on the number of accused by reference to

their command authority and the gravity and scale of the crime. I propose, however, that the more general term "persons most responsible" should be used.

30. While those "most responsible" obviously include the political or military leadership, others in command authority down the chain of command may also be regarded "most responsible" judging by the severity of the crime or its massive scale. "Most responsible", therefore, denotes both a leadership or authority position of the accused, and a sense of the gravity, seriousness or massive scale of the crime. It must be seen, however, not as a test criterion or a distinct jurisdictional threshold, but as a guidance to the Prosecutor in the adoption of a prosecution strategy and in making decisions to prosecute in individual cases.

31. Within the meaning attributed to it in the present Statute, the term "most responsible" would not necessarily exclude children between 15 and 18 years of age. While it is inconceivable that children could be in a political or military leadership position (although in Sierra Leone the rank of "Brigadier" was often granted to children as young as 11 years), the gravity and seriousness of the crimes they have allegedly committed would allow for their inclusion within the jurisdiction of the Court.

2. Individual criminal responsibility at 15 years of age

32. The possible prosecution of children for crimes against humanity and war crimes presents a difficult moral dilemma. More than in any other conflict where children have been used as combatants, in Sierra Leone, child combatants were initially abducted, forcibly recruited, sexually abused, reduced to slavery of all kinds and trained, often under the influence of drugs, to kill, maim and burn. Though feared by many for their brutality, most if not all of these children have been subjected to a process of psychological and physical abuse and duress which has transformed them from victims into perpetrators.

33. The solution to this terrible dilemma with respect to the Special Court⁵ could be found in a number of options: (a) determining a minimum age of 18 and exempting all persons under that age from accountability and individual criminal responsibility; (b) having children between 15 to 18 years of age, both victims and perpetrators, recount their story before the

Truth and Reconciliation Commission or similar mechanisms, none of which is as yet functional; and (c) having them go through the judicial process of accountability without punishment, in a court of law providing all internationally recognized guarantees of juvenile justice.

34. The question of child prosecution was discussed at length with the Government of Sierra Leone both in New York and in Freetown. It was raised with all the interlocutors of the United Nations team: the members of the judiciary, members of the legal profession and the Ombudsman, and was vigorously debated with members of civil society, non-governmental organizations and institutions actively engaged in child-care and rehabilitation programmes.

35. The Government of Sierra Leone and representatives of Sierra Leone civil society clearly wish to see a process of judicial accountability for child combatants presumed responsible for the crimes falling within the jurisdiction of the Court. It was said that the people of Sierra Leone would not look kindly upon a court which failed to bring to justice children who committed crimes of that nature and spared them the judicial process of accountability. The international non-governmental organizations responsible for child-care and rehabilitation programmes, together with some of their national counterparts, however, were unanimous in their objection to any kind of judicial accountability for children below 18 years of age for fear that such a process would place at risk the entire rehabilitation programme so painstakingly achieved. While the extent to which this view represents the majority view of the people of Sierra Leone is debatable, it nevertheless underscores the importance of the child rehabilitation programme and the need to ensure that in the prosecution of children presumed responsible, the rehabilitation process of scores of other children is not endangered.

36. Given these highly diverging opinions, it is not easy to strike a balance between the interests at stake. I am mindful of the Security Council's recommendation that only those who bear "the greatest responsibility" should be prosecuted. However, in view of the most horrific aspects of the child combatancy in Sierra Leone, the employment of this term would not necessarily exclude persons of young age from the jurisdiction of the Court. I therefore thought that it would be most prudent to demonstrate to the Security Council for its consideration how provisions on

prosecution of persons below the age of 18 — “children” within the definition of the Convention on the Rights of the Child — before an international jurisdiction could be formulated.⁶ Therefore, in order to meet the concerns expressed by, in particular, those responsible for child care and rehabilitation programmes, article 15, paragraph 5, of the Statute contains the following provision:

“In the prosecution of juvenile offenders, the Prosecutor shall ensure that the child-rehabilitation programme is not placed at risk, and that, where appropriate, resort should be had to alternative truth and reconciliation mechanisms, to the extent of their availability.”

37. Furthermore, the Statute of the Special Court, in article 7 and throughout the text, contains internationally recognized standards of juvenile justice and guarantees that juvenile offenders are treated in dignity and with a sense of worth. Accordingly, the overall composition of the judges should reflect their experiences in a variety of fields, including in juvenile justice (article 13, para. 1); the Office of the Prosecutor should be staffed with persons experienced in gender-related crimes and juvenile justice (article 15, para. 4). In a trial of a juvenile offender, the Special Court should, to the extent possible, order the immediate release of the accused, constitute a “Juvenile Chamber”, order the separation of the trial of a juvenile from that of an adult, and provide all legal and other assistance and order protective measures to ensure the privacy of the juvenile. The penalty of imprisonment is excluded in the case of a juvenile offender, and a number of alternative options of correctional or educational nature are provided for instead.

38. Consequently, if the Council, also weighing in the moral-educational message to the present and next generation of children in Sierra Leone, comes to the conclusion that persons under the age of 18 should be eligible for prosecution, the statutory provisions elaborated will strike an appropriate balance between all conflicting interests and provide the necessary guarantees of juvenile justice. It should also be stressed that, ultimately, it will be for the Prosecutor to decide if, all things considered, action should be taken against a juvenile offender in any individual case.

IV. Organizational structure of the Special Court

39. Organizationally, the Special Court has been conceived as a self-contained entity, consisting of three organs: the Chambers (two Trial Chambers and an Appeals Chamber), the Prosecutor’s Office and the Registry. In the establishment of ad hoc international tribunals or special courts operating as separate institutions, independently of the relevant national legal system, it has proved to be necessary to comprise within one and the same entity all three organs. Like the two International Tribunals, the Special Court for Sierra Leone is established outside the national court system, and the inclusion of the Appeals Chamber within the same Court was thus the obvious choice.

A. The Chambers

40. In its resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council requested that the question of the advisability, feasibility and appropriateness of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda should be addressed. In analysing this option from the legal and practical viewpoints, I have concluded that the sharing of a single Appeals Chamber between jurisdictions as diverse as the two International Tribunals and the Special Court for Sierra Leone is legally unsound and practically not feasible, without incurring unacceptably high administrative and financial costs.

41. While in theory the establishment of an overarching Appeals Chamber as the ultimate judicial authority in matters of interpretation and application of international humanitarian law offers a guarantee of developing a coherent body of law, in practice, the same result may be achieved by linking the jurisprudence of the Special Court to that of the International Tribunals, without imposing on the shared Appeals Chamber the financial and administrative constraints of a formal institutional link. Article 20, paragraph 3, of the Statute accordingly provides that the judges of the Appeals Chamber of the Special Court shall be guided by the decisions of the Appeals Chamber of the Yugoslav and the Rwanda Tribunals; article 14, paragraph 1, of the Statute provides that the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the Rwanda Tribunal shall be applicable *mutatis mutandis* to the proceedings before the Special Court.

42. The sharing of one Appeals chamber between all three jurisdictions would strain the capacity of the already heavily burdened Appeals Chamber of the two Tribunals in ways which could either bring about the collapse of the appeals system as a whole, or delay beyond acceptable human rights standards the detention of accused pending the hearing of appeals from either or all jurisdictions. On the assumption that all judgements and sentencing decisions of the Trial Chambers of the Special Court will be appealed, as they have been in the cases of the two International Tribunals, and that the number of accused will be roughly the same as in each of the International Tribunals, the Appeals Chamber would be required to add to its current workload a gradual increase of approximately one third.

43. Faced with an exponential growth in the number of appeals lodged on judgements and interlocutory appeals in relation to an increasing number of accused and decisions rendered, the existing workload of the Appeals Chamber sitting in appeals from six Trial Chambers of the two ad hoc Tribunals is constantly growing. Based on current and anticipated growth in workload, existing trends⁷ and the projected pace of three to six appeals on judgements every year, the Appeals Chamber has requested additional resources in funds and personnel. With the addition of two Trial Chambers of the Special Court, making a total of eight Trial Chambers for one Appeals Chamber, the burden on the Yugoslav and Rwanda Appeals Chamber would be untenable, and the Special Court would be deprived of an effective and viable appeals process.

44. The financial costs which would be entailed for the Appeals Chamber when sitting on appeals from the Special Court will have to be borne by the regular budget, regardless of the financial mechanism established for the Special Court itself. These financial costs would include also costs of translation into French, which is one of the working languages of the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals; the working language of the Special Court will be English.

45. In his letter to the Legal Counsel in response to the request for comments on the eventuality of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the two international Tribunals with the Special Court, the President of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia wrote:

“With regard to paragraph 7 of Security Council resolution 1315 (2000), while the sharing of the Appeals Chamber of [the two International Tribunals] with that of the Special Court would bear the significant advantage of ensuring a better standardization of international humanitarian law, it appeared that the disadvantages of this option — excessive increase of the Appeals Chambers’ workload, problems arising from the mixing of sources of law, problems caused by the increase in travelling by the judges of the Appeals Chambers and difficulties caused by mixing the different judges of the three tribunals — outweigh its benefits.”⁸

46. For these reasons, the parties came to the conclusion that the Special Court should have two Trial Chambers, each with three judges, and an Appeals Chamber with five judges. Article 12, paragraph 4, provides for extra judges to sit on the bench in cases where protracted proceedings can be foreseen and it is necessary to make certain that the proceedings do not have to be discontinued in case one of the ordinary judges is unable to continue hearing the case.

B. The Prosecutor

47. An international prosecutor will be appointed by the Secretary-General to lead the investigations and prosecutions, with a Sierra Leonean Deputy. The appointment of an international prosecutor will guarantee that the Prosecutor is, and is seen to be, independent, objective and impartial.

C. The Registrar

48. The Registrar will service the Chambers and the Office of the Prosecutor and will have the responsibility for the financial management and external relations of the Court. The Registrar will be appointed by the Secretary-General as a staff member of the United Nations.

V. Enforcement of sentences

49. The possibility of serving prison sentences in third States is provided for in article 22 of the Statute. While imprisonment shall normally be served in Sierra Leone, particular circumstances, such as the security

risk entailed in the continued imprisonment of some of the convicted persons on Sierra Leonean territory, may require their relocation to a third State.

50. Enforcement of sentences in third countries will be based on an agreement between the Special Court⁹ and the State of enforcement. In seeking indications of the willingness of States to accept convicted persons, priority should be given to those which have already concluded similar agreements with either of the International Tribunals, as an indication that their prison facilities meet the minimum standards of conditions of detention. Although an agreement for the enforcement of sentences will be concluded between the Court and the State of enforcement, the wishes of the Government of Sierra Leone should be respected. In that connection, preference was expressed for such locations to be identified in an East African State.

VI. An alternative host country

51. In paragraph 7 of resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council requested that the question of a possible alternative host State be addressed, should it be necessary to convene the Special Court outside its seat in Sierra Leone, if circumstances so required. As the efforts of the United Nations Secretariat, the Government of Sierra Leone and other interested Member States are currently focused on the establishment of the Special Court in Sierra Leone, it is proposed that the question of the alternative seat should be addressed in phases. An important element in proceeding with this issue is also the way in which the Security Council addresses the present report, that is, if a Chapter VII element is included.

52. In the first phase, criteria for the choice of the alternative seat should be determined and a range of potential host countries identified. An agreement, in principle, should be sought both from the Government of Sierra Leone for the transfer of the Special Court to the State of the alternative seat, and from the authorities of the latter, for the relocation of the seat to its territory.

53. In the second phase, a technical assessment team would be sent to identify adequate premises in the third State or States. Once identified, the three parties, namely, the United Nations, the Government of Sierra Leone and the Government of the alternative seat, would conclude a Framework Agreement, or "an

agreement to agree" for the transfer of the seat when circumstances so required. The Agreement would stipulate the nature of the circumstances which would require the transfer of the seat and an undertaking to conclude in such an eventuality a Headquarters Agreement. Such a principled Agreement would facilitate the transfer of the seat on an emergency basis and enable the conclusion of a Headquarters Agreement soon thereafter.

54. In the choice of an alternative seat for the Special Court, the following considerations should be taken into account: the proximity to the place where the crimes were committed, and easy access to victims, witnesses and accused. Such proximity and easy access will greatly facilitate the work of the Prosecutor, who will continue to conduct his investigations in the territory of Sierra Leone.¹⁰ During the negotiations, the Government expressed a preference for a West African alternative seat, in an English-speaking country sharing a common-law legal system.

VII. Practical arrangements for the operation of the Special Court

55. The Agreement and the Statute of the Special Court establish the legal and institutional framework of the Court and the mutual obligations of the parties with regard, in particular, to appointments to the Chambers, the Office of the Prosecutor and the Registry and, the provision of premises. However, the practical arrangements for the establishment and operation of the Special Court remain outside the scope of the Agreement in the sense that they depend on contributions of personnel, equipment, services and funds from Member States and intergovernmental and non-governmental organizations. It is somewhat anomalous, therefore, that the parties which establish the Special Court, in practice, are dependent for the implementation of their treaty obligations on States and international organizations which are not parties to the Agreement or otherwise bound by its provisions.

56. Proceeding from the premise that voluntary contributions would constitute the financial mechanism of the Special Court, the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to include in the report recommendations regarding the amount of voluntary contributions, as appropriate, of funds, equipment and services to the Special Court, contributions in

personnel, the kind of advice and expertise expected of the two ad hoc Tribunals, and the type of support and technical assistance to be provided by UNAMSIL. In considering the estimated requirements of the Special Court in all of these respects, it must be borne in mind that at the current stage, the Government of Sierra Leone is unable to contribute in any significant way to the operational costs of the Special Court, other than in the provision of premises, which would require substantial refurbishment, and the appointment of personnel, some of whom may not even be Sierra Leonean nationals. The requirements set out below should therefore be understood for all practical purposes as requirements that have to be met through contributions from sources other than the Government of Sierra Leone.

A. Estimated requirements of the Special Court for the first operational phase

1. Personnel and equipment

57. The personnel requirements of the Special Court for the initial operational phase¹¹ are estimated to include:

(a) Eight Trial Chamber judges (3 sitting judges and 1 alternate judge in each Chamber) and 6 Appeals Chamber judges (5 sitting judges and 1 alternate judge), 1 law clerk, 2 support staff for each Chamber and 1 security guard detailed to each judge (14);

(b) A Prosecutor and a Deputy Prosecutor, 20 investigators, 20 prosecutors and 26 support staff;

(c) A Registrar, a Deputy Registrar, 27 administrative support staff and 40 security officers;

(d) Four staff in the Victims and Witnesses Unit;

(e) One correction officer and 12 security officers in the detention facilities.

58. Based on the United Nations scale of salaries for a one-year period, the personnel requirements along with the corresponding equipment and vehicles are estimated on a very preliminary basis to be US\$ 22 million. The calculation of the personnel requirements is premised on the assumption that all persons appointed (whether by the United Nations or the Government of Sierra Leone) will be paid from United Nations sources.

59. In seeking qualified personnel from States Members of the United Nations, the importance of obtaining such personnel from members of the Commonwealth, sharing the same language and common-law legal system, has been recognized. The Office of Legal Affairs has therefore approached the Commonwealth Secretariat with a request to identify possible candidates for the positions of judges, prosecutors, Registrar, investigators and administrative support staff. How many of the Commonwealth countries would be in a position to voluntarily contribute such personnel with their salaries and emoluments is an open question. A request similar to that which has been made to the Commonwealth will also be made to the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS).

2. Premises

60. The second most significant component of the requirements of the Court for the first operational phase is the cost of premises. During its visit to Freetown, the United Nations team visited a number of facilities and buildings which the Government believes may accommodate the Special Court and its detention facilities: the High Court of Sierra Leone, the Miatta Conference Centre and an adjacent hotel, the Presidential Lodge, the Central Prison (Pademba Road Prison), and the New England Prison. In evaluating their state of operation, the team concluded that none of the facilities offered were suitable or could be made operational without substantial investment. The use of the existing High Court would incur the least expenditure (estimated at \$1.5 million); but would considerably disrupt the ordinary schedule of the Court and eventually bring it to a halt. Since it is located in central Freetown, the use of the High Court would pose, in addition, serious security risks. The use of the Conference Centre, the most secure site visited, would require large-scale renovation, estimated at \$5.8 million. The Presidential Lodge was ruled out on security grounds.

61. In the light of the above, the team has considered the option of constructing a prefabricated, self-contained compound on government land. This option would have the advantage of an easy expansion paced with the growth of the Special Court, a salvage value at the completion of the activities of the Court, the prospect of a donation in kind and construction at no

rental costs. The estimated cost of this option is \$2.9 million.

62. The two detention facilities visited by the team were found to be inadequate in their current state. The Central Prison (Pademba Road Prison) was ruled out for lack of space and security reasons. The New England Prison would be a possible option at an estimated renovation cost of \$600,000.

63. The estimated cost requirements of personnel and premises set out in the present report cover the two most significant components of its prospective budget for the first operational stage. Not included in the present report are the general operational costs of the Special Court and of the detention facilities; costs of prosecutorial and investigative activities; conference services, including the employment of court translators from and into English, Krio and other tribal languages; and defence counsel, to name but a few.

B. Expertise and advice from the two International Tribunals

64. The kind of advice and expertise which the two International Tribunals may be expected to share with the Special Court for Sierra Leone could take the form of any or all of the following: consultations among judges of both jurisdictions on matters of mutual interest; training of prosecutors, investigators and administrative support staff of the Special Court in The Hague, Kigali and Arusha, and training of such personnel on the spot by a team of prosecutors, investigators and administrators from both Tribunals; advice on the requirements for a Court library and assistance in its establishment, and sharing of information, documents, judgements and other relevant legal material on a continuous basis.

65. Both International Tribunals have expressed willingness to share their experience in all of these respects with the Special Court. They have accordingly offered to convene regular meetings with the judges of the Special Court to assist in adopting and formulating Rules of Procedure based on experience acquired in the practice of both Tribunals; to train personnel of the Special Court in The Hague and Arusha to enable them to acquire practical knowledge of the operation of an international tribunal; and when necessary, to temporarily deploy experienced staff, including a librarian, to the Special Court. In addition, the

International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has offered to provide to the Special Court legal material in the form of CD-ROMs containing motions, decisions, judgements, court orders and the like. The transmission of such material to the Special Court in the period pending the establishment of a full-fledged library would be of great assistance.

C. Support and technical assistance from UNAMSIL

66. The support and technical assistance of UNAMSIL in providing security, logistics, administrative support and temporary accommodation would be necessary in the first operational phase of the Special Court. In the precarious security situation now prevailing in Sierra Leone and given the state of the national security forces, UNAMSIL represents the only credible force capable of providing adequate security to the personnel and the premises of the Special Court. The specificities of the security measures required would have to be elaborated by the United Nations, the Government of Sierra Leone and UNAMSIL, it being understood, however, that any such additional tasks entrusted to UNAMSIL would have to be approved by the Security Council and reflected in a revised mandate with a commensurate increase in financial, staff and other resources.

67. UNAMSIL's administrative support could be provided in the areas of finance, personnel and procurement. Utilizing the existing administrative support in UNAMSIL, including, when feasible, shared facilities and communication systems, would greatly facilitate the start-up phase of the Special Court and reduce the overall resource requirements. In that connection, limited space at the headquarters of UNAMSIL could be made available for the temporary accommodation of the Office of the Prosecutor, pending the establishment or refurbishment of a site for the duration of the Special Court.

VIII. Financial mechanism of the Special Court

68. In paragraph 8 (c) of resolution 1315 (2000), the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to include recommendations on "the amount of voluntary contributions, as appropriate, of funds, equipment and

services to the special court, including through the offer of expert personnel that may be needed from States, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations". It would thus seem that the intention of the Council is that a Special Court for Sierra Leone would be financed from voluntary contributions. Implicit in the Security Council resolution, therefore, given the paucity of resources available to the Government of Sierra Leone, was the intention that most if not all operational costs of the Special Court would be borne by States Members of the Organization in the form of voluntary contributions.

69. The experience gained in the operation of the two ad hoc International Tribunals provides an indication of the scope, costs and long-term duration of the judicial activities of an international jurisdiction of this kind. While the Special Court differs from the two Tribunals in its nature and legal status, the similarity in the kind of crimes committed, the temporal, territorial and personal scope of jurisdiction, the number of accused, the organizational structure of the Court and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence suggest a similar scope and duration of operation and a similar need for a viable and sustainable financial mechanism.

70. A financial mechanism based entirely on voluntary contributions will not provide the assured and continuous source of funding which would be required to appoint the judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar, to contract the services of all administrative and support staff and to purchase the necessary equipment. The risks associated with the establishment of an operation of this kind with insufficient funds, or without long-term assurances of continuous availability of funds, are very high, in terms of both moral responsibility and loss of credibility of the Organization, and its exposure to legal liability. In entering into contractual commitments which the Special Court and, vicariously, the Organization might not be able to honour, the United Nations would expose itself to unlimited third-party liability. A special court based on voluntary contributions would be neither viable nor sustainable.

71. In my view, the only realistic solution is financing through assessed contributions. This would produce a viable and sustainable financial mechanism affording secure and continuous funding. It is understood, however, that the financing of the Special Court through assessed contributions of the Member

States would for all practical purposes transform a treaty-based court into a United Nations organ governed in its financial and administrative activities by the relevant United Nations financial and staff regulations and rules.

72. The Security Council may wish to consider an alternative solution, based on the concept of a "national jurisdiction" with international assistance, which would rely on the existing — however inadequate — Sierra Leonean court system, both in terms of premises (for the Court and the detention facilities) and administrative support. The judges, prosecutors, investigators and administrative support staff would be contributed by interested States. The legal basis for the special "national" court would be a national law, patterned on the Statute as agreed between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone (the international crimes being automatically incorporated into the Sierra Leonean common-law system). Since the mandate of the Secretary-General is to recommend measures consistent with resolution 1315 (2000), the present report does not elaborate further on this alternative other than to merely note its existence.

IX. Conclusion

73. At the request of the Security Council, the present report sets out the legal framework and practical arrangements for the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone. It describes the requirements of the Special Court in terms of funds, personnel and services and underscores the acute need for a viable financial mechanism to sustain it for the duration of its lifespan. It concludes that assessed contributions is the only viable and sustainable financial mechanism of the Special Court.

74. As the Security Council itself has recognized, in the past circumstances of Sierra Leone, a credible system of justice and accountability for the very serious crimes committed there would end impunity and would contribute to the process of national reconciliation and to the restoration and maintenance of peace in that country. In reviewing the present report and considering what further action must be taken, the Council should bear in mind the expectations that have been created and the state of urgency that permeates all discussions of the problem of impunity in Sierra Leone.

Notes

- ¹ At the request of the Government, reference in the Statute and the Agreement to "Sierra Leonean judges" was replaced by "judges appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone". This would allow the Government flexibility of choice between Sierra Leonean and non-Sierra Leonean nationals and broaden the range of potential candidates from within and outside Sierra Leone.
- ² In the case of the Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda, the non-inclusion in any position of nationals of the country most directly affected was considered a condition for the impartiality, objectivity and neutrality of the Tribunal.
- ³ This method may not be advisable, since the Court would be manned by a substantial number of staff and financed through voluntary contributions in the amount of millions of dollars every year.
- ⁴ Article 6, paragraph 5, of the 1977 Protocol II Additional to the Geneva Conventions and Relating to the Protection of Non-international Armed Conflicts provides that:

"At the end of hostilities, the authorities in power shall endeavour to grant the broadest possible amnesty to persons who have participated in the armed conflict, or those deprived of their liberty for reasons related to the armed conflict, whether they are interned or detained."
- ⁵ The jurisdiction of the national courts of Sierra Leone is not limited by the Statute, except in cases where they have to defer to the Special Court.
- ⁶ While there is no international law standard for the minimum age for criminal responsibility, the ICC Statute excludes from the jurisdiction of the Court persons under the age of 18. In so doing, however, it was not the intention of its drafters to establish, in general, a minimum age for individual criminal responsibility. Premised on the notion of complementarity between national courts and ICC, it was intended that persons under 18 presumed responsible for the crimes for which the ICC had jurisdiction would be brought before their national courts, if the national law in question provides for such jurisdiction over minors.
- ⁷ The Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia has so far disposed of a total of 5 appeals from judgements and 44 interlocutory appeals; and the Appeals Chamber of the Rwanda Tribunal of only 1 judgement on the merits with 28 interlocutory appeals.
- ⁸ Letter addressed to Mr. Hans Corell, Under-Secretary-General, The Legal Counsel, from Judge Claude Jorda, President of the International Criminal Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia, dated 29 August 2000.
- ⁹ Article 10 of the Agreement between the United Nations and the Government endows the Special Court with a treaty-making power "to enter into agreements with States as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and for the operation of the Court".
- ¹⁰ Criteria for the choice of the seat of the Rwanda Tribunal were drawn up by the Security Council in its resolution 955 (1994). The Security Council decided that the seat of the International Tribunal shall be determined by the Council "having regard to considerations of justice and fairness as well as administrative efficiency, including access to witnesses, and economy".
- ¹¹ It is important to stress that this estimate should be regarded as an illustration of a possible scenario. Not until the Registrar and the Prosecutor are in place will it be possible to make detailed and precise estimates.

Annex**Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone on the Establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone**

Whereas the Security Council, in its resolution 1315 (2000) of 14 August 2000, expressed deep concern at the very serious crimes committed within the territory of Sierra Leone against the people of Sierra Leone and United Nations and associated personnel and at the prevailing situation of impunity;

Whereas by the said resolution, the Security Council requested the Secretary-General to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Sierra Leone to create an independent special court to prosecute persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of serious violations of international humanitarian law and crimes committed under Sierra Leonean law;

Whereas the Secretary-General of the United Nations (hereinafter "the Secretary-General") and the Government of Sierra Leone (hereinafter "the Government") have held such negotiations for the establishment of a Special Court for Sierra Leone (hereinafter "the Special Court");

Now therefore the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone have agreed as follows:

Article 1**Establishment of the Special Court**

1. There is hereby established a Special Court for Sierra Leone to prosecute persons most responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996.
2. The Special Court shall function in accordance with the Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone. The Statute is annexed to this Agreement and forms an integral part thereof.

Article 2**Composition of the Special Court and appointment of judges**

1. The Special Court shall be composed of two Trial Chambers and an Appeals Chamber.
2. The Chambers shall be composed of eleven independent judges who shall serve as follows:
 - (a) Three judges shall serve in each of the Trial Chambers, of whom one shall be appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone, and two judges appointed by the Secretary-General upon nominations forwarded by States, and in particular the member States of the Economic Community of West African States and the Commonwealth, at the invitation of the Secretary-General;
 - (b) Five judges shall serve in the Appeals Chamber, of whom two shall be appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone and three judges shall be appointed by

the Secretary-General upon nominations forwarded by States, and in particular the member States of the Economic Community of West African States and the Commonwealth, at the invitation of the Secretary-General.

3. The Government of Sierra Leone and the Secretary-General shall consult on the appointment of judges.

4. Judges shall be appointed for a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

5. In addition to the judges sitting in the Chambers and present at every stage of the proceedings, the presiding judge of a Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber shall designate an alternate judge appointed by either the Government of Sierra Leone or the Secretary-General to be present at each stage of the trial and to replace a judge if that judge is unable to continue sitting.

Article 3

Appointment of a Prosecutor and a Deputy Prosecutor

1. The Secretary-General, after consultation with the Government of Sierra Leone, shall appoint a Prosecutor for a four-year term. The Prosecutor shall be eligible for reappointment.

2. The Government of Sierra Leone, in consultation with the Secretary-General and the Prosecutor, shall appoint a Sierra Leonean Deputy Prosecutor to assist the Prosecutor in the conduct of the investigations and prosecutions.

3. The Prosecutor and the Deputy Prosecutor shall be of high moral character and possess the highest level of professional competence and extensive experience in the conduct of investigations and prosecution of criminal cases. The Prosecutor and the Deputy Prosecutor shall be independent in the performance of their functions and shall not accept or seek instructions from any Government or any other source.

4. The Prosecutor shall be assisted by such Sierra Leonean and international staff as may be required to perform the functions assigned to him or her effectively and efficiently.

Article 4

Appointment of a Registrar

1. The Secretary-General, in consultation with the President of the Special Court, shall appoint a Registrar who shall be responsible for the servicing of the Chambers and the Office of the Prosecutor, and for the recruitment and administration of all support staff. He or she shall also administer the financial and staff resources of the Special Court.

2. The Registrar shall be a staff member of the United Nations. He or she shall serve a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment.

Article 5

Premises

The Government shall provide the premises for the Special Court and such utilities, facilities and other services as may be necessary for its operation.

Article 6**Expenses of the Special Court^a**

The expenses of the Special Court shall ...

Article 7**Inviolability of premises, archives and all other documents**

1. The premises of the Special Court shall be inviolable. The competent authorities shall take whatever action may be necessary to ensure that the Special Court shall not be dispossessed of all or any part of the premises of the Court without its express consent.
2. The property, funds and assets of the Special Court, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be immune from search, seizure, requisition, confiscation, expropriation and any other form of interference, whether by executive, administrative, judicial or legislative action.
3. The archives of the Court, and in general all documents and materials made available, belonging to or used by it, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall be inviolable.

Article 8**Funds, assets and other property**

1. The Special Court, its funds, assets and other property, wherever located and by whomsoever held, shall enjoy immunity from every form of legal process, except insofar as in any particular case the Court has expressly waived its immunity. It is understood, however, that no waiver of immunity shall extend to any measure of execution.
2. Without being restricted by financial controls, regulations or moratoriums of any kind, the Special Court:
 - (a) May hold and use funds, gold or negotiable instruments of any kind and maintain and operate accounts in any currency and convert any currency held by it into any other currency;
 - (b) Shall be free to transfer its funds, gold or currency from one country to another, or within Sierra Leone, to the United Nations or any other agency.

Article 9**Seat of the Special Court**

The Special Court shall have its seat in Sierra Leone. The Court may meet away from its seat if it considers it necessary for the efficient exercise of its functions, and may be relocated outside Sierra Leone, if circumstances so require, and subject to the conclusion of a Headquarters Agreement between the Secretary-General of the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone, on the one hand, and the Government of the alternative seat, on the other.

^a The formulation of this article is dependent on a decision on the financial mechanism of the Special Court.

Article 10**Juridical capacity**

The Special Court shall possess the juridical capacity necessary to:

- (a) Contract;
- (b) Acquire and dispose of movable and immovable property;
- (c) Institute legal proceedings;
- (d) Enter into agreements with States as may be necessary for the exercise of its functions and for the operation of the Court.

Article 11**Privileges and immunities of the judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar**

1. The judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar, together with their families forming part of their household, shall enjoy the privileges and immunities, exemptions and facilities accorded to diplomatic agents in accordance with the 1961 Vienna Convention on Diplomatic Relations. They shall, in particular, enjoy:

- (a) Personal inviolability, including immunity from arrest or detention;
- (b) Immunity from criminal, civil and administrative jurisdiction in conformity with the Vienna Convention;
- (c) Inviolability for all papers and documents;
- (d) Exemption, as appropriate, from immigration restrictions and other alien registrations;
- (e) The same immunities and facilities in respect of their personal baggage as are accorded to diplomatic agents by the Vienna Convention;
- (f) Exemption from taxation in Sierra Leone on their salaries, emoluments and allowances.

2. Privileges and immunities are accorded to the judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar in the interest of the Special Court and not for the personal benefit of the individuals themselves. The right and the duty to waive the immunity, in any case where it can be waived without prejudice to the purpose for which it is accorded, shall lie with the Secretary-General, in consultation with the President.

Article 12**Privileges and immunities of international and Sierra Leonean personnel**

1. Sierra Leonean and international personnel of the Special Court shall be accorded:

- (a) Immunity from legal process in respect of words spoken or written and all acts performed by them in their official capacity. Such immunity shall continue to be accorded after termination of employment with the Special Court;
- (b) Immunity from taxation on salaries, allowances and emoluments paid to them.

2. International personnel shall, in addition thereto, be accorded:

- (a) Immunity from immigration restriction;
 - (b) The right to import free of duties and taxes, except for payment for services, their furniture and effects at the time of first taking up their official duties in Sierra Leone.
3. The privileges and immunities are granted to the officials of the Special Court in the interest of the Court and not for their personal benefit. The right and the duty to waive the immunity in any particular case where it can be waived without prejudice to the purpose for which it is accorded shall lie with the Registrar of the Court.

Article 13

Counsel

1. The Government shall ensure that the counsel of a suspect or an accused who has been admitted as such by the Special Court shall not be subjected to any measure which may affect the free and independent exercise of his or her functions.
2. In particular, the counsel shall be accorded:
 - (a) Immunity from personal arrest or detention and from seizure of personal baggage;
 - (b) Inviolability of all documents relating to the exercise of his or her functions as a counsel of a suspect or accused;
 - (c) Immunity from criminal or civil jurisdiction in respect of words spoken or written and acts performed in his or her capacity as counsel. Such immunity shall continue to be accorded after termination of his or her functions as a counsel of a suspect or accused.

Article 14

Witnesses and experts

Witnesses and experts appearing from outside Sierra Leone on a summons or a request of the judges or the Prosecutor shall not be prosecuted, detained or subjected to any restriction on their liberty by the Sierra Leonean authorities. They shall not be subjected to any measure which may affect the free and independent exercise of their functions.

Article 15

Security, safety and protection of persons referred to in this Agreement

Recognizing the responsibility of the Government under international law to ensure the security, safety and protection of persons referred to in this Agreement and its present incapacity to do so pending the restructuring and rebuilding of its security forces, it is agreed that the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone shall provide the necessary security to premises and personnel of the Special Court, subject to an appropriate mandate by the Security Council and within its capabilities.

Article 16**Cooperation with the Special Court**

1. The Government shall cooperate with all organs of the Special Court at all stages of the proceedings. It shall, in particular, facilitate access to the Prosecutor to sites, persons and relevant documents required for the investigation.
2. The Government shall comply without undue delay with any request for assistance by the Special Court or an order issued by the Chambers, including, but not limited to:
 - (a) Identification and location of persons;
 - (b) Service of documents;
 - (c) Arrest or detention of persons;
 - (d) Transfer of an indictee to the Court.

Article 17**Working language**

The official working language of the Special Court shall be English.

Article 18**Practical arrangements**

1. With a view to achieving efficiency and cost-effectiveness in the operation of the Special Court, a phased-in approach shall be adopted for its establishment in accordance with the chronological order of the legal process.
2. In the first phase of the operation of the Special Court, judges, the Prosecutor and the Registrar will be appointed along with investigative and prosecutorial staff. The process of investigations and prosecutions and the trial process of those already in custody shall then be initiated. While the judges of the Appeals Chamber shall serve whenever the Appeals Chamber is seized of a matter, they shall take office shortly before the trial process has been completed.

Article 19**Settlement of disputes**

Any dispute between the Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Agreement shall be settled by negotiation, or by any other mutually agreed-upon mode of settlement.

Article 20**Entry into force**

The present Agreement shall enter into force on the day after both Parties have notified each other in writing that the legal instruments for entry into force have been complied with.

DONE at [place] on [day, month] 2000 in two copies in the English language.

For the United Nations

For the Government of Sierra Leone

Enclosure**Statute of the Special Court for Sierra Leone**

Having been established by an Agreement between the United Nations and the Government of Sierra Leone pursuant to Security Council resolution 1315 (2000) of 14 August 2000, the Special Court for Sierra Leone (hereinafter "the Special Court") shall function in accordance with the provisions of the present Statute.

Article 1**Competence of the Special Court**

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons most responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996.

Article 2**Crimes against humanity**

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who committed the following crimes as part of a widespread or systematic attack against any civilian population:

- (a) Murder;
- (b) Extermination;
- (c) Enslavement;
- (d) Deportation;
- (e) Imprisonment;
- (f) Torture;
- (g) Rape, sexual slavery, enforced prostitution, forced pregnancy and any other form of sexual violence;
- (h) Persecution on political, racial, ethnic or religious grounds;
- (i) Other inhumane acts.

Article 3**Violations of article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions and of Additional Protocol II**

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who committed or ordered the commission of serious violations of article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949 for the Protection of War Victims, and of Additional Protocol II thereto of 8 June 1977. These violations shall include:

- (a) Violence to life, health and physical or mental well-being of persons, in particular murder as well as cruel treatment such as torture, mutilation or any form of corporal punishment;
- (b) Collective punishments;
- (c) Taking of hostages;

- (d) Acts of terrorism;
- (e) Outrages upon personal dignity, in particular humiliating and degrading treatment, rape, enforced prostitution and any form of indecent assault;
- (f) Pillage;
- (g) The passing of sentences and the carrying out of executions without previous judgement pronounced by a regularly constituted court, affording all the judicial guarantees which are recognized as indispensable by civilized peoples;
- (h) Threats to commit any of the foregoing acts.

Article 4

Other serious violations of international humanitarian law

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who committed the following serious violations of international humanitarian law:

- (a) Intentionally directing attacks against the civilian population as such or against individual civilians not taking direct part in hostilities;
- (b) Intentionally directing attacks against personnel, installations, material, units or vehicles involved in a humanitarian assistance or peacekeeping mission in accordance with the Charter of the United Nations, as long as they are entitled to the protection given to civilians or civilian objects under the international law of armed conflict;
- (c) Abduction and forced recruitment of children under the age of 15 years into armed forces or groups for the purpose of using them to participate actively in hostilities.

Article 5

Crimes under Sierra Leonean law

The Special Court shall have the power to prosecute persons who have committed the following crimes under Sierra Leonean law:

- (a) Offences relating to the abuse of girls under the Prevention of Cruelty to Children Act, 1926 (Cap. 31):
 - (i) Abusing a girl under 13 years of age, contrary to section 6;
 - (ii) Abusing a girl between 13 and 14 years of age, contrary to section 7;
 - (iii) Abduction of a girl for immoral purposes, contrary to section 12.
- (b) Offences relating to the wanton destruction of property under the Malicious Damage Act, 1861:
 - (i) Setting fire to dwelling-houses, any person being therein to section 2;
 - (ii) Setting fire to public buildings, contrary to sections 5 and 6;
 - (iii) Setting fire to other buildings, contrary to section 6.

Article 6**Individual criminal responsibility**

1. A person who planned, instigated, ordered, committed or otherwise aided and abetted in the planning, preparation or execution of a crime referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall be individually responsible for the crime.
2. The official position of any accused persons, whether as Head of State or Government or as a responsible government official, shall not relieve such person of criminal responsibility nor mitigate punishment.
3. The fact that any of the acts referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute was committed by a subordinate does not relieve his or her superior of criminal responsibility if he or she knew or had reason to know that the subordinate was about to commit such acts or had done so and the superior had failed to take the necessary and reasonable measures to prevent such acts or to punish the perpetrators thereof.
4. The fact that an accused person acted pursuant to an order of a Government or of a superior shall not relieve him or her of criminal responsibility, but may be considered in mitigation of punishment if the Special Court determines that justice so requires.
5. Individual criminal responsibility for the crimes referred to in article 5 shall be determined in accordance with the respective laws of Sierra Leone.

Article 7**Jurisdiction over persons of 15 years of age**

1. The Special Court shall have jurisdiction over persons who were 15 years of age at the time of the alleged commission of the crime.
2. At all stages of the proceedings, including investigation, prosecution and adjudication, an accused below the age of 18 (hereinafter "a juvenile offender") shall be treated with dignity and a sense of worth, taking into account his or her young age and the desirability of promoting his or her rehabilitation, reintegration into and assumption of a constructive role in society.
3. In a trial of a juvenile offender, the Special Court shall:
 - (a) Consider, as a priority, the release of the juvenile, unless his or her safety and security requires that the juvenile offender be placed under close supervision or in a remand home; detention pending trial shall be used as a measure of last resort;
 - (b) Constitute a "Juvenile Chamber" composed of at least one sitting judge and one alternate judge possessing the required qualifications and experience in juvenile justice;
 - (c) Order the separation of his or her trial, if jointly accused with adults;
 - (d) Provide the juvenile with the legal, social and any other assistance in the preparation and presentation of his or her defence, including the participation in legal proceedings of the juvenile offender's parent or legal guardian;
 - (e) Provide protective measures to ensure the privacy of the juvenile; such measures shall include, but not be limited to, the protection of the juvenile's identity, or the conduct of in camera proceedings;

(f) In the disposition of his or her case, order any of the following: care guidance and supervision orders, community service orders, counselling, foster care, correctional, educational and vocational training programmes, approved schools and, as appropriate, any programmes of disarmament, demobilization and reintegration or programmes of child protection agencies.

Article 8

Concurrent jurisdiction

1. The Special Court and the national courts of Sierra Leone shall have concurrent jurisdiction.
2. The Special Court shall have primacy over the national courts of Sierra Leone. At any stage of the procedure, the Special Court may formally request a national court to defer to its competence in accordance with the present Statute and the Rules of Procedure and Evidence.

Article 9

Non bis in idem

1. No person shall be tried before a national court of Sierra Leone for acts for which he or she has already been tried by the Special Court.
2. A person who has been tried by a national court for the acts referred to in articles 2 and 4 of the present Statute may be subsequently tried by the Special Court if:
 - (a) The act for which he or she was tried was characterized as an ordinary crime; or
 - (b) The national court proceedings were not impartial or independent, were designed to shield the accused from international criminal responsibility or the case was not diligently prosecuted.
3. In considering the penalty to be imposed on a person convicted of a crime under the present Statute, the Special Court shall take into account the extent to which any penalty imposed by a national court on the same person for the same act has already been served.

Article 10

Amnesty

An amnesty granted to any person falling within the jurisdiction of the Special Court in respect of the crimes referred to in articles 2 to 4 of the present Statute shall not be a bar to prosecution.

Article 11

Organization of the Special Court

The Special Court shall consist of the following organs:

- (a) The Chambers, comprising two Trial Chambers and an Appeals Chamber;
- (b) The Prosecutor; and
- (c) The Registry.

Article 12**Composition of the Chambers**

1. The Chambers shall be composed of eleven independent judges, who shall serve as follows:

(a) Three judges shall serve in each of the Trial Chambers, of whom one shall be a judge appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone, and two judges appointed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations (hereinafter "the Secretary-General");

(b) Five judges shall serve in the Appeals Chamber, of whom two shall be judges appointed by the Government of Sierra Leone, and three judges appointed by the Secretary-General.

2. Each judge shall serve only in the Chamber to which he or she has been appointed.

3. The judges of the Appeals Chamber and the judges of the Trial Chambers, respectively, shall elect a presiding judge who shall conduct the proceedings in the Chamber to which he or she was elected. The presiding judge of the Appeals Chamber shall be the President of the Special Court.

4. In addition to the judges sitting in the Chambers and present at every stage of the proceedings, the presiding judge of a Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber shall designate an alternate judge appointed by either the Government of Sierra Leone or the Secretary-General, to be present at each stage of the trial, and to replace a judge, if that judge is unable to continue sitting.

Article 13**Qualification and appointment of judges**

1. The judges shall be persons of high moral character, impartiality and integrity who possess the qualifications required in their respective countries for appointment to the highest judicial offices. They shall be independent in the performance of their functions, and shall not accept or seek instructions from any Government or any other source.

2. In the overall composition of the Chambers, due account shall be taken of the experience of the judges in international law, including international humanitarian law and human rights law, criminal law and juvenile justice.

3. The judges shall be appointed for a four-year period and shall be eligible for reappointment.

Article 14**Rules of Procedure and Evidence**

1. The Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda obtaining at the time of the establishment of the Special Court shall be applicable mutatis mutandis to the conduct of the legal proceedings before the Special Court.

2. The judges of the Special Court as a whole may amend the Rules of Procedure and Evidence or adopt additional rules where the applicable Rules do not, or do not

adequately, provide for a specific situation. In so doing, they may be guided, as appropriate, by the Criminal Procedure Act, 1965, of Sierra Leone.

Article 15

The Prosecutor

1. The Prosecutor shall be responsible for the investigation and prosecution of persons most responsible for serious violations of international humanitarian law and crimes under Sierra Leonean law committed in the territory of Sierra Leone since 30 November 1996. The Prosecutor shall act independently as a separate organ of the Special Court. He or she shall not seek or receive instructions from any Government or from any other source.
2. The Office of the Prosecutor shall have the power to question suspects, victims and witnesses, to collect evidence and to conduct on-site investigations. In carrying out these tasks, the Prosecutor shall, as appropriate, be assisted by the Sierra Leonean authorities concerned.
3. The Prosecutor shall be appointed by the Secretary-General for a four-year term and shall be eligible for reappointment. He or she shall be of high moral character and possess the highest level of professional competence and have extensive experience in the conduct of investigations and prosecution of criminal cases.
4. The Prosecutor shall be assisted by a Sierra Leonean Deputy Prosecutor, and by such other Sierra Leonean and international staff as may be required to perform the functions assigned to him or her effectively and efficiently. Given the nature of the crimes committed and the particular sensitivities of girls, young women and children victims of rape, sexual assault, abduction and slavery of all kinds, due consideration should be given in the appointment of staff to the employment of prosecutors and investigators experienced in gender-related crimes and juvenile justice.
5. In the prosecution of juvenile offenders, the Prosecutor shall ensure that the child-rehabilitation programme is not placed at risk and that, where appropriate, resort should be had to alternative truth and reconciliation mechanisms, to the extent of their availability.

Article 16

The Registry

1. The Registry shall be responsible for the administration and servicing of the Special Court.
2. The Registry shall consist of a Registrar and such other staff as may be required.
3. The Registrar shall be appointed by the Secretary-General after consultation with the President of the Special Court and shall be a staff member of the United Nations. He or she shall serve for a four-year term and be eligible for reappointment.
4. The Registrar shall set up a Victims and Witnesses Unit within the Registry. This Unit shall provide, in consultation with the Office of the Prosecutor, protective measures and security arrangements, counselling and other appropriate assistance

for witnesses, victims who appear before the Court and others who are at risk on account of testimony given by such witnesses. The Unit personnel shall include experts in trauma, including trauma related to crimes of sexual violence and violence against children.

Article 17

Rights of the accused

1. All accused shall be equal before the Special Court.
2. The accused shall be entitled to a fair and public hearing, subject to measures ordered by the Special Court for the protection of victims and witnesses.
3. The accused shall be presumed innocent until proved guilty according to the provisions of the present Statute.
4. In the determination of any charge against the accused pursuant to the present Statute, he or she shall be entitled to the following minimum guarantees, in full equality:
 - (a) To be informed promptly and in detail in a language which he or she understands of the nature and cause of the charge against him or her;
 - (b) To have adequate time and facilities for the preparation of his or her defence and to communicate with counsel of his or her own choosing;
 - (c) To be tried without undue delay;
 - (d) To be tried in his or her presence, and to defend himself or herself in person or through legal assistance of his or her own choosing; to be informed, if he or she does not have legal assistance, of this right; and to have legal assistance assigned to him or her, in any case where the interests of justice so require, and without payment by him or her in any such case if he or she does not have sufficient means to pay for it;
 - (e) To examine, or have examined, the witnesses against him or her and to obtain the attendance and examination of witnesses on his or her behalf under the same conditions as witnesses against him or her;
 - (f) To have the free assistance of an interpreter if he or she cannot understand or speak the language used in the Special Court;
 - (g) Not to be compelled to testify against himself or herself or to confess guilt.

Article 18

Judgement

The judgement shall be rendered by a majority of the judges of the Trial Chamber or of the Appeals Chamber, and shall be delivered in public. It shall be accompanied by a reasoned opinion in writing, to which separate or dissenting opinions may be appended.

Article 19**Penalties**

1. The Trial Chamber shall impose upon a convicted person, other than a juvenile offender, imprisonment for a specified number of years. In determining the terms of imprisonment, the Trial Chamber shall, as appropriate, have recourse to the practice regarding prison sentences in the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda and the national courts of Sierra Leone.
2. In imposing the sentences, the Trial Chamber should take into account such factors as the gravity of the offence and the individual circumstances of the convicted person.
3. In addition to imprisonment, the Trial Chamber may order the forfeiture of the property, proceeds and any assets acquired unlawfully or by criminal conduct, and their return to their rightful owner or to the State of Sierra Leone.

Article 20**Appellate proceedings**

1. The Appeals Chamber shall hear appeals from persons convicted by a Trial Chamber or from the Prosecutor on the following grounds:
 - (a) A procedural error;
 - (b) An error on a question of law invalidating the decision;
 - (c) An error of fact which has occasioned a miscarriage of justice.
2. The Appeals Chamber may affirm, reverse or revise the decisions taken by the Trial Chamber.
3. The judges of the Appeals Chamber of the Special Court shall be guided by the decisions of the Appeals Chamber of the International Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and for Rwanda. In the interpretation and application of the laws of Sierra Leone, they shall be guided by the decisions of the Supreme Court of Sierra Leone.

Article 21**Review proceedings**

1. Where a new fact has been discovered which was not known at the time of the proceedings before the Trial Chamber or the Appeals Chamber and which could have been a decisive factor in reaching the decision, the convicted person or the Prosecutor may submit an application for review of the judgement.
2. An application for review shall be submitted to the Appeals Chamber. The Appeals Chamber may reject the application if it considers it to be unfounded. If it determines that the application is meritorious, it may, as appropriate:
 - (a) Reconvene the Trial Chamber;
 - (b) Retain jurisdiction over the matter.

Article 22**Enforcement of sentences**

1. Imprisonment shall be served in Sierra Leone. If circumstances so require, imprisonment may also be served in any of the States which have concluded with the International Criminal Tribunal for Rwanda or the International Tribunal for the Former Yugoslavia an agreement for the enforcement of sentences, and which have indicated to the Registrar of the Special Court their willingness to accept convicted persons. The Special Court may conclude similar agreements for the enforcement of sentences with other States.

2. Conditions of imprisonment, whether in Sierra Leone or in a third State, shall be governed by the law of the State of enforcement subject to the supervision of the Special Court. The State of enforcement shall be bound by the duration of the sentence, subject to article 23 of the present Statute.

Article 23**Pardon or commutation of sentences**

If, pursuant to the applicable law of the State in which the convicted person is imprisoned, he or she is eligible for pardon or commutation of sentence, the State concerned shall notify the Special Court accordingly. There shall only be pardon or commutation of sentence if the President of the Special Court, in consultation with the judges, so decides on the basis of the interests of justice and the general principles of law.

Article 24**Working language**

The working language of the Special Court shall be English.

Article 25**Annual report**

The President of the Special Court shall submit an annual report on the operation and activities of the Court to the Secretary-General and to the Government of Sierra Leone.

ANNEX 3:
Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties 1969.

1918



International Law Commission

Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties*

The States Parties to the present Convention,

Considering the fundamental role of treaties in the history of international relations,

Recognizing the ever-increasing importance of treaties as a source of international law and as a means of developing peaceful co-operation among nations, whatever their constitutional and social systems,

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

Affirming that disputes concerning treaties, like other international disputes, should be settled by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law,

Recalling the determination of the peoples of the United Nations to establish conditions under which justice and respect for the obligations arising from treaties can be maintained,

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

Believing that the codification and progressive development of the law of treaties achieved in the present Convention will promote the purposes of the United Nations set forth in the Charter, namely, the maintenance of international peace and security, the development of friendly relations and the achievement of co-operation among nations,

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

Have agreed as follows:

PART I INTRODUCTION

Article 1 Scope of the present Convention

The present Convention applies to treaties between States.

Article 2 Use of terms

1. For the purposes of the present Convention:

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

199

(b) "ratification", "acceptance", "approval" and "accession" mean in each case the international act so named whereby a State establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty;

(c) "full powers" means a document emanating from the competent authority of a State designating a person or persons to represent the State for negotiating, adopting or authenticating the text of a treaty, for expressing the consent of the State to be bound by a treaty, or for accomplishing any other act with respect to a treaty;

(d) "reservation" means a unilateral statement, however phrased or named, made by a State, when signing, ratifying, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty, whereby it purports to exclude or to modify the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty in their application to that State;

(e) "negotiating State" means a State which took part in the drawing up and adoption of the text of the treaty;

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

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

(h) "third State" means a State not a party to the treaty;

(i) "international organization" means an intergovernmental organization.

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

Article 3

International agreements not within the scope of the present Convention

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

(a) the legal force of such agreements;

(b) the application to them of any of the rules set forth in the present Convention to which they would be subject under international law independently of the Convention;

(c) the application of the Convention to the relations of States as between themselves under international agreements to which other subjects of international law are also parties.

Article 4

Non-retroactivity of the present Convention

Without prejudice to the application of any rules set forth in the present Convention to which treaties would be subject under international law independently of the Convention, the Convention applies only to treaties which are concluded by States after the entry into force of the present Convention with regard to such States.

Article 5

Treaties constituting international organizations and treaties adopted within an international organization

1920

The present Convention applies to any treaty which is the constituent instrument of an international organization and to any treaty adopted within an international organization without prejudice to any relevant rules of the organization.

PART II CONCLUSION AND ENTRY INTO FORCE OF TREATIES

SECTION 1. CONCLUSION OF TREATIES

Article 6 Capacity of States to conclude treaties

Every State possesses capacity to conclude treaties.

Article 7 Full powers

1. A person is considered as representing a State for the purpose of adopting or authenticating the text of a treaty or for the purpose of expressing the consent of the State to be bound by a treaty if:

(a) he produces appropriate full powers; or

(b) it appears from the practice of the States concerned or from other circumstances that their intention was to consider that person as representing the State for such purposes and to dispense with full powers.

2. In virtue of their functions and without having to produce full powers, the following are considered as representing their State:

(a) Heads of State, Heads of Government and Ministers for Foreign Affairs, for the purpose of performing all acts relating to the conclusion of a treaty;

(b) heads of diplomatic missions, for the purpose of adopting the text of a treaty between the accrediting State and the State to which they are accredited;

(c) representatives accredited by States to an international conference or to an international organization or one of its organs, for the purpose of adopting the text of a treaty in that conference, organization or organ.

Article 8 Subsequent confirmation of an act performed without authorization

An act relating to the conclusion of a treaty performed by a person who cannot be considered under article 7 as authorized to represent a State for that purpose is without legal effect unless afterwards confirmed by that State.

Article 9 Adoption of the text

1. The adoption of the text of a treaty takes place by the consent of all the States participating in its drawing up except as provided in paragraph 2.

2. The adoption of the text of a treaty at an international conference takes place by the vote of two-thirds of the States present and voting, unless by the same majority they shall decide to apply a different rule.

Article 10

1921

Authentication of the text

The text of a treaty is established as authentic and definitive:

- (a) by such procedure as may be provided for in the text or agreed upon by the States participating in its drawing up; or
- (b) failing such procedure, by the signature, signature *ad referendum* or initialling by the representatives of those States of the text of the treaty or of the Final Act of a conference incorporating the text.

Article 11

Means of expressing consent to be bound by a treaty

The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty may be expressed by signature, exchange of instruments constituting a treaty, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or by any other means if so agreed.

Article 12

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by signature

1. The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty is expressed by the signature of its representative when:

- (a) the treaty provides that signature shall have that effect;
- (b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States were agreed that signature should have that effect; or
- (c) the intention of the State to give that effect to the signature appears from the full powers of its representative or was expressed during the negotiation.

2. For the purposes of paragraph 1:

- (a) the initialling of a text constitutes a signature of the treaty when it is established that the negotiating States so agreed;
- (b) the signature *ad referendum* of a treaty by a representative, if confirmed by his State, constitutes a full signature of the treaty.

Article 13

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by an exchange of instruments constituting a treaty

The consent of States to be bound by a treaty constituted by instruments exchanged between them is expressed by that exchange when:

- (a) the instruments provide that their exchange shall have that effect; or
- (b) it is otherwise established that those States were agreed that the exchange of instruments should have that effect.

Article 14

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by ratification, acceptance or approval

1. The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty is expressed by ratification when:

1922

- (a) the treaty provides for such consent to be expressed by means of ratification;
- (b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States were agreed that ratification should be required;
- (c) the representative of the State has signed the treaty subject to ratification; or
- (d) the intention of the State to sign the treaty subject to ratification appears from the full powers of its representative or was expressed during the negotiation.

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

Article 15 Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by accession

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

- (a) the treaty provides that such consent may be expressed by that State by means of accession;
- (b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States were agreed that such consent may be expressed by that State by means of accession; or
- (c) all the parties have subsequently agreed that such consent may be expressed by that State by means of accession.

Article 16 Exchange or deposit of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession

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

- (a) their exchange between the contracting States;
- (b) their deposit with the depositary; or
- (c) their notification to the contracting States or to the depositary, if so agreed.

Article 17 Consent to be bound by part of a treaty and choice of differing provisions

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

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

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

- (a) it has signed the treaty or has exchanged instruments constituting the treaty subject to ratification,

1923

acceptance or approval, until it shall have made its intention clear not to become a party to the treaty; or

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

SECTION 2. RESERVATIONS

Article 19

Formulation of reservations

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

- (a) the reservation is prohibited by the treaty;
- (b) the treaty provides that only specified reservations, which do not include the reservation in question, may be made; or
- (c) in cases not falling under sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

Article 20

Acceptance of and objection to reservations

1. A reservation expressly authorized by a treaty does not require any subsequent acceptance by the other contracting States unless the treaty so provides.
2. When it appears from the limited number of the negotiating States and the object and purpose of a treaty that the application of the treaty in its entirety between all the parties is an essential condition of the consent of each one to be bound by the treaty, a reservation requires acceptance by all the parties.
3. When a treaty is a constituent instrument of an international organization and unless it otherwise provides, a reservation requires the acceptance of the competent organ of that organization.
4. In cases not falling under the preceding paragraphs and unless the treaty otherwise provides:
 - (a) acceptance by another contracting State of a reservation constitutes the reserving State a party to the treaty in relation to that other State if or when the treaty is in force for those States;
 - (b) an objection by another contracting State to a reservation does not preclude the entry into force of the treaty as between the objecting and reserving States unless a contrary intention is definitely expressed by the objecting State;
 - (c) an act expressing a State's consent to be bound by the treaty and containing a reservation is effective as soon as at least one other contracting State has accepted the reservation.
5. For the purposes of paragraphs 2 and 4 and unless the treaty otherwise provides, a reservation is considered to have been accepted by a State if it shall have raised no objection to the reservation by the end of a period of twelve months after it was notified of the reservation or by the date on which it expressed its consent to be bound by the treaty, whichever is later.

Article 21

Legal effects of reservations and of objections to reservations

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

1924

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

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

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

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

Article 22

Withdrawal of reservations and of objections to reservations

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

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

3. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, or it is otherwise agreed:

(a) the withdrawal of a reservation becomes operative in relation to another contracting State only when notice of it has been received by that State;

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

Article 23

Procedure regarding reservations

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

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

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

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

SECTION 3. ENTRY INTO FORCE AND PROVISIONAL APPLICATION OF TREATIES

Article 24

Entry into force

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

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

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

1925

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

Article 25 Provisional application

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

- (a) the treaty itself so provides; or
- (b) the negotiating States have in some other manner so agreed.

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

PART III OBSERVANCE, APPLICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES

SECTION 1. OBSERVANCE OF TREATIES

Article 26 *Pacta sunt servanda*

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

Article 27 Internal law and observance of treaties

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

SECTION 2. APPLICATION OF TREATIES

Article 28 Non-retroactivity of treaties

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

Article 29 Territorial scope of treaties

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

Article 30 Application of successive treaties relating to the same subject-matter

1926

1. Subject to Article 103 of the Charter of the United Nations, the rights and obligations of States parties to successive treaties relating to the same subject-matter shall be determined in accordance with the following paragraphs.
2. When a treaty specifies that it is subject to, or that it is not to be considered as incompatible with, an earlier or later treaty, the provisions of that other treaty prevail.
3. When all the parties to the earlier treaty are parties also to the later treaty but the earlier treaty is not terminated or suspended in operation under article 59, the earlier treaty applies only to the extent that its provisions are compatible with those of the latter treaty.
4. When the parties to the later treaty do not include all the parties to the earlier one:

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

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

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

SECTION 3. INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES

Article 31

General rule of interpretation

1. A treaty shall be interpreted in good faith in accordance with the ordinary meaning to be given to the terms of the treaty in their context and in the light of its object and purpose.
2. The context for the purpose of the interpretation of a treaty shall comprise, in addition to the text, including its preamble and annexes:

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

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

3. There shall be taken into account, together with the context:

(a) any subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or the application of its provisions;

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

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

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

Article 32

Supplementary means of interpretation

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

1927

determine the meaning when the interpretation according to article 31:

- (a) leaves the meaning ambiguous or obscure; or
- (b) leads to a result which is manifestly absurd or unreasonable.

Article 33

Interpretation of treaties authenticated in two or more languages

1. When a treaty has been authenticated in two or more languages, the text is equally authoritative in each language, unless the treaty provides or the parties agree that, in case of divergence, a particular text shall prevail.
2. A version of the treaty in a language other than one of those in which the text was authenticated shall be considered an authentic text only if the treaty so provides or the parties so agree.
3. The terms of the treaty are presumed to have the same meaning in each authentic text.
4. Except where a particular text prevails in accordance with paragraph 1, when a comparison of the authentic texts discloses a difference of meaning which the application of articles 31 and 32 does not remove, the meaning which best reconciles the texts, having regard to the object and purpose of the treaty, shall be adopted.

SECTION 4. TREATIES AND THIRD STATES

Article 34

General rule regarding third States

A treaty does not create either obligations or rights for a third State without its consent.

Article 35

Treaties providing for obligations for third States

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

Article 36

Treaties providing for rights for third States

1. A right arises for a third State from a provision of a treaty if the parties to the treaty intend the provision to accord that right either to the third State, or to a group of States to which it belongs, or to all States, and the third State assents thereto. Its assent shall be presumed so long as the contrary is not indicated, unless the treaty otherwise provides.
2. A State exercising a right in accordance with paragraph 1 shall comply with the conditions for its exercise provided for in the treaty or established in conformity with the treaty.

Article 37

Revocation or modification of obligations or rights of third States

1. When an obligation has arisen for a third State in conformity with article 35, the obligation may be revoked or modified only with the consent of the parties to the treaty and of the third State, unless it is established that they had otherwise agreed.
2. When a right has arisen for a third State in conformity with article 36, the right may not be revoked or modified by the

1928

parties if it is established that the right was intended not to be revocable or subject to modification without the consent of the third State.

Article 38

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

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

PART IV AMENDMENT AND MODIFICATION OF TREATIES

Article 39

General rule regarding the amendment of treaties

A treaty may be amended by agreement between the parties. The rules laid down in Part II apply to such an agreement except in so far as the treaty may otherwise provide.

Article 40

Amendment of multilateral treaties

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, the amendment of multilateral treaties shall be governed by the following paragraphs.
2. Any proposal to amend a multilateral treaty as between all the parties must be notified to all the contracting States, each one of which shall have the right to take part in:
 - (a) the decision as to the action to be taken in regard to such proposal;
 - (b) the negotiation and conclusion of any agreement for the amendment of the treaty.
3. Every State entitled to become a party to the treaty shall also be entitled to become a party to the treaty as amended.
4. The amending agreement does not bind any State already a party to the treaty which does not become a party to the amending agreement; article 30, paragraph 4(b), applies in relation to such State.
5. Any State which becomes a party to the treaty after the entry into force of the amending agreement shall, failing an expression of a different intention by that State:
 - (a) be considered as a party to the treaty as amended; and
 - (b) be considered as a party to the unamended treaty in relation to any party to the treaty not bound by the amending agreement.

Article 41

Agreements to modify multilateral treaties between certain of the parties only

1. Two or more of the parties to a multilateral treaty may conclude an agreement to modify the treaty as between themselves alone if:
 - (a) the possibility of such a modification is provided for by the treaty; or
 - (b) the modification in question is not prohibited by the treaty and:

1929

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

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

2. Unless in a case falling under paragraph 1(a) the treaty otherwise provides, the parties in question shall notify the other parties of their intention to conclude the agreement and of the modification to the treaty for which it provides.

PART V INVALIDITY, TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF TREATIES

SECTION 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 42

Validity and continuance in force of treaties

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

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

Article 43

Obligations imposed by international law independently of a treaty

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

Article 44

Separability of treaty provisions

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

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

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

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

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

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

4. In cases falling under articles 49 and 50 the State entitled to invoke the fraud or corruption may do so with respect either to the whole treaty or, subject to paragraph 3, to the particular clauses alone.

5. In cases falling under articles 51, 52 and 53, no separation of the provisions of the treaty is permitted.

Article 45

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

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

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

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

SECTION 2. INVALIDITY OF TREATIES

Article 46

Provisions of internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties

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

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

Article 47

Specific restrictions on authority to express the consent of a State

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

Article 48

Error

1. A State may invoke an error in a treaty as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty if the error relates to a fact or situation which was assumed by that State to exist at the time when the treaty was concluded and formed an essential basis of its consent to be bound by the treaty.

2. Paragraph 1 shall not apply if the State in question contributed by its own conduct to the error or if the circumstances were such as to put that State on notice of a possible error.

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

Article 49

Fraud

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

1931

Article 50
Corruption of a representative of a State

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

Article 51
Coercion of a representative of a State

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

Article 52
Coercion of a State by the threat or use of force

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

Article 53
Treaties conflicting with a peremptory norm of general international law (*jus cogens*)

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

SECTION 3. TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF TREATIES

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

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

- (a) in conformity with the provisions of the treaty; or
- (b) at any time by consent of all the parties after consultation with the other contracting States.

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

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

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

1. A treaty which contains no provision regarding its termination and which does not provide for denunciation or

1932

withdrawal is not subject to denunciation or withdrawal unless:

- (a) it is established that the parties intended to admit the possibility of denunciation or withdrawal; or
- (b) a right of denunciation or withdrawal may be implied by the nature of the treaty.

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

Article 57

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

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

- (a) in conformity with the provisions of the treaty; or
- (b) at any time by consent of all the parties after consultation with the other contracting States.

Article 58

Suspension of the operation of a multilateral treaty by agreement between certain of the parties only

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

- (a) the possibility of such a suspension is provided for by the treaty; or
- (b) the suspension in question is not prohibited by the treaty and:
 - (i) does not affect the enjoyment by the other parties of their rights under the treaty or the performance of their obligations;
 - (ii) is not incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

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

Article 59

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

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

- (a) it appears from the later treaty or is otherwise established that the parties intended that the matter should be governed by that treaty; or
- (b) the provisions of the later treaty are so far incompatible with those of the earlier one that the two treaties are not capable of being applied at the same time.

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

1933

Article 60

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

1. A material breach of a bilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles the other to invoke the breach as a ground for terminating the treaty or suspending its operation in whole or in part.
2. A material breach of a multilateral treaty by one of the parties entitles:
 - (a) the other parties by unanimous agreement to suspend the operation of the treaty in whole or in part or to terminate it either:
 - (i) in the relations between themselves and the defaulting State, or
 - (ii) as between all the parties;
 - (b) a party specially affected by the breach to invoke it as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty in whole or in part in the relations between itself and the defaulting State;
 - (c) any party other than the defaulting State to invoke the breach as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty in whole or in part with respect to itself if the treaty is of such a character that a material breach of its provisions by one party radically changes the position of every party with respect to the further performance of its obligations under the treaty.
3. A material breach of a treaty, for the purposes of this article, consists in:
 - (a) a repudiation of the treaty not sanctioned by the present Convention; or
 - (b) the violation of a provision essential to the accomplishment of the object or purpose of the treaty.
4. The foregoing paragraphs are without prejudice to any provision in the treaty applicable in the event of a breach.
5. Paragraphs 1 to 3 do not apply to provisions relating to the protection of the human person contained in treaties of a humanitarian character, in particular to provisions prohibiting any form of reprisals against persons protected by such treaties.

Article 61

Supervening impossibility of performance

1. A party may invoke the impossibility of performing a treaty as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from it if the impossibility results from the permanent disappearance or destruction of an object indispensable for the execution of the treaty. If the impossibility is temporary, it may be invoked only as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty.
2. Impossibility of performance may not be invoked by a party as a ground for terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty if the impossibility is the result of a breach by that party either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.

Article 62

Fundamental change of circumstances

1. A fundamental change of circumstances which has occurred with regard to those existing at the time of the conclusion of a treaty, and which was not foreseen by the parties, may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from the treaty unless:
 - (a) the existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty; and

1934

(b) the effect of the change is radically to transform the extent of obligations still to be performed under the treaty.

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

(a) if the treaty establishes a boundary; or

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

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

Article 63

Severance of diplomatic or consular relations

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

Article 64

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

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

SECTION 4. PROCEDURE

Article 65

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

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

2. If, after the expiry of a period which, except in cases of special urgency, shall not be less than three months after the receipt of the notification, no party has raised any objection, the party making the notification may carry out in the manner provided in article 67 the measure which it has proposed.

3. If, however, objection has been raised by any other party, the parties shall seek a solution through the means indicated in article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

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

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

Article 66

Procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation

1935

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

- (a) any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of articles 53 or 64 may, by a written application, submit it to the International Court of Justice for a decision unless the parties by common consent agree to submit the dispute to arbitration;
- (b) any one of the parties to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any of the other articles in Part V of the present Convention may set in motion the procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention by submitting a request to that effect to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 67

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

1. The notification provided for under article 65 paragraph 1 must be made in writing.
2. Any act declaring invalid, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty pursuant to the provisions of the treaty or of paragraphs 2 or 3 of article 65 shall be carried out through an instrument communicated to the other parties. If the instrument is not signed by the Head of State, Head of Government or Minister for Foreign Affairs, the representative of the State communicating it may be called upon to produce full powers.

Article 68

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

A notification or instrument provided for in articles 65 or 67 may be revoked at any time before it takes effect.

SECTION 5. CONSEQUENCES OF THE INVALIDITY, TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF A TREATY

Article 69

Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty

1. A treaty the invalidity of which is established under the present Convention is void. The provisions of a void treaty have no legal force.
2. If acts have nevertheless been performed in reliance on such a treaty:
 - (a) each party may require any other party to establish as far as possible in their mutual relations the position that would have existed if the acts had not been performed;
 - (b) acts performed in good faith before the invalidity was invoked are not rendered unlawful by reason only of the invalidity of the treaty.
3. In cases falling under articles 49, 50, 51 or 52, paragraph 2 does not apply with respect to the party to which the fraud, the act of corruption or the coercion is imputable.
4. In the case of the invalidity of a particular State's consent to be bound by a multilateral treaty, the foregoing rules apply in the relations between that State and the parties to the treaty.

Article 70

Consequences of the termination of a treaty

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or the parties otherwise agree, the termination of a treaty under its provisions or in

1936

accordance with the present Convention:

- (a) releases the parties from any obligation further to perform the treaty;
- (b) does not affect any right, obligation or legal situation of the parties created through the execution of the treaty prior to its termination.

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

Article 71

Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty which conflict with a peremptory norm of general international law

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

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

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

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

Article 72

Consequences of the suspension of the operation of a treaty

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

- (a) releases the parties between which the operation of the treaty is suspended from the obligation to perform the treaty in their mutual relations during the period of the suspension;
- (b) does not otherwise affect the legal relations between the parties established by the treaty.

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

PART VI

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 73

Cases of State succession, State responsibility and outbreak of hostilities

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

1937

Article 74

Diplomatic and consular relations and the conclusion of treaties

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

Article 75

Case of an aggressor State

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

PART VII

DEPOSITARIES, NOTIFICATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND REGISTRATION

Article 76

Depositaries of treaties

1. The designation of the depositary of a treaty may be made by the negotiating States, either in the treaty itself or in some other manner. The depositary may be one or more States, an international organization or the chief administrative officer of the organization.
2. The functions of the depositary of a treaty are international in character and the depositary is under an obligation to act impartially in their performance. In particular, the fact that a treaty has not entered into force between certain of the parties or that a difference has appeared between a State and a depositary with regard to the performance of the latter's functions shall not affect that obligation.

Article 77

Functions of depositaries

1. The functions of a depositary, unless otherwise provided in the treaty or agreed by the contracting States, comprise in particular:
 - (a) keeping custody of the original text of the treaty and of any full powers delivered to the depositary;
 - (b) preparing certified copies of the original text and preparing any further text of the treaty in such additional languages as may be required by the treaty and transmitting them to the parties and to the States entitled to become parties to the treaty;
 - (c) receiving any signatures to the treaty and receiving and keeping custody of any instruments, notifications and communications relating to it;
 - (d) examining whether the signature or any instrument, notification or communication relating to the treaty is in due and proper form and, if need be, bringing the matter to the attention of the State in question;
 - (e) informing the parties and the States entitled to become parties to the treaty of acts, notifications and communications relating to the treaty;
 - (f) informing the States entitled to become parties to the treaty when the number of signatures or of instruments of ratification, acceptance, approval or accession required for the entry into force of the treaty has been received or deposited;

1938

- (g) registering the treaty with the Secretariat of the United Nations;
- (h) performing the functions specified in other provisions of the present Convention.

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

Article 78 Notifications and communications

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

- (a) if there is no depositary, be transmitted direct to the States for which it is intended, or if there is a depositary, to the latter;
- (b) be considered as having been made by the State in question only upon its receipt by the State to which it was transmitted or, as the case may be, upon its receipt by the depositary;
- (c) if transmitted to a depositary, be considered as received by the State for which it was intended only when the latter State has been informed by the depositary in accordance with article 77, paragraph 1 (e).

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

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

- (a) by having the appropriate correction made in the text and causing the correction to be initialled by duly authorized representatives;
- (b) by executing or exchanging an instrument or instruments setting out the correction which it has been agreed to make; or
- (c) by executing a corrected text of the whole treaty by the same procedure as in the case of the original text.

2. Where the treaty is one for which there is a depositary, the latter shall notify the signatory States and the contracting States of the error and of the proposal to correct it and shall specify an appropriate time-limit within which objection to the proposed correction may be raised. If, on the expiry of the time-limit:

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

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

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

1939

5. The correction of the text of a treaty that has been registered shall be notified to the Secretariat of the United Nations.
6. Where an error is discovered in a certified copy of a treaty, the depositary shall execute a *procès-verbal* specifying the rectification and communicate a copy of it to the signatory States and to the contracting States.

Article 80 Registration and publication of treaties

1. Treaties shall, after their entry into force, be transmitted to the Secretariat of the United Nations for registration or filing and recording, as the case may be, and for publication.
2. The designation of a depositary shall constitute authorization for it to perform the acts specified in the preceding paragraph.

PART VIII FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 81 Signature

The present Convention shall be open for signature by all States Members of the United Nations or of any of the specialized agencies or of the International Atomic Energy Agency or parties to the Statute of the International Court of Justice, and by any other State invited by the General Assembly of the United Nations to become a party to the Convention, as follows: until 30 November 1969, at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria, and subsequently, until 30 April 1970, at United Nations Headquarters, New York.

Article 82 Ratification

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

Article 83 Accession

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

Article 84 Entry into force

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

Article 85 Authentic texts

1940

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

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

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

A N N E X

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

2. When a request has been made to the Secretary-General under article 66, the Secretary-General shall bring the dispute before a conciliation commission constituted as follows:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

6. The Commission shall report within twelve months of its constitution. Its report shall be deposited with the Secretary-General and transmitted to the parties to the dispute. The report of the Commission, including any conclusions stated therein regarding the facts or questions of law, shall not be binding upon the parties and it shall have no other character than that of recommendations submitted for the consideration of the parties in order to facilitate an amicable settlement of the dispute.

1941

7. The Secretary-General shall provide the Commission with such assistance and facilities as it may require. The expenses of the Commission shall be borne by the United Nations.

Abstract:-

* (back)

The Convention was adopted on 22 May 1969 and opened for signature on 23 May 1969 by the *United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties*. The Conference was convened pursuant to General Assembly resolutions 2166 (XXI) of 5 December 1966 and 2287 (XXII) of 6 December 1967. The Conference held two sessions, both at the Neue Hofburg in Vienna, the first session from 26 March to 24 May 1968 and the second session from 9 April to 22 May 1969. In addition to the Convention, the Conference adopted the Final Act and certain declarations and resolutions, which are annexed to that Act. By unanimous decision of the Conference, the original of the Final Act was deposited in the archives of the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of Austria.

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

Text: United Nations, *Treaty Series*, vol. 1155, p.331.

ANNEX 4:

1986 Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties between States and International
Organizations or Between International Organizations.

1943



*International Law
Commission*

**VIENNA CONVENTION ON THE LAW OF TREATIES
BETWEEN STATES AND INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS
OR BETWEEN INTERNATIONAL ORGANIZATIONS**

(21 March 1986)

The Parties to the present Convention,

Considering the fundamental role of treaties in the history of
international relations,

Recognizing the consensual nature of treaties and their
ever-increasing importance as a source of international law,

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

Affirming the importance of enhancing the process of codification and
progressive development of international law at a universal level,

Believing that the codification and progressive development of the
rules relating to treaties between States and international organizations
or between international organizations are means of enhancing legal order
in international relations and of serving the purposes of the United
Nations,

Having in mind the principles of international law embodied in the
Charter of the United Nations, such as the principles of the equal rights

1944

and self-determination of peoples, of the sovereign equality and independence of all States, of non-interference in the domestic affairs of States, of the prohibition of the threat or use of force and of universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms for all,

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

Recognizing the relationship between the law of treaties between States and the law of treaties between States and international organizations or between international organizations,

Considering the importance of treaties between States and international organizations or between international organizations as a useful means of developing international relations and ensuring conditions for peaceful cooperation among nations, whatever their constitutional and social systems,

Having in mind the specific features of treaties to which international organizations are parties as subjects of international law distinct from States,

Noting that international organizations possess the capacity to conclude treaties which is necessary for the exercise of their functions and the fulfillment of their purposes,

Recognizing that the practice of international organizations in

1945

concluding treaties with States or between themselves should be in accordance with their constituent instruments,

Affirming that nothing in the present Convention should be interpreted as affecting those relations between an international organization and its members which are regulated by the rules of the organization,

Affirming also that disputes (concerning treaties, like other international disputes, should be settled, in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations, by peaceful means and in conformity with the principles of justice and international law,

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

Have agreed as follows:

PART I

INTRODUCTION

Article 1

Scope of the present Convention

The present Convention applies to:

(a) treaties between one or more States and one or more international

1946

organizations, and

(b) treaties between international organizations.

Article 2

Use of terms

1. For the purposes of the present Convention:

(a) "treaty" means an international agreement governed by international law and concluded in written form:

(i) between one or more States and one or more international organizations; or

(ii) between international organizations,

whether that agreement is embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation;

(b) "ratification" means the international act so named whereby a State establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty;

(b bis) "act of formal confirmation" means an international act corresponding to that of ratification by a State, whereby an international organization establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty;

(b ter) "acceptance", "approval" and "accession" mean in each case the

1947

international act so named whereby a State or an international organization establishes on the international plane its consent to be bound by a treaty;

(c) "full powers" means a document emanating from the competent authority of a State or from the competent organ of an international organization designating a person or persons to represent the State or the organization for negotiating, adopting or authenticating the text of a treaty, for expressing the consent of the State or of the organization to be bound by a treaty, or for accomplishing any other act with respect to a treaty;

(d) "reservation" means a unilateral statement, however phrased or named, made by a State or by an international organization when signing, ratifying, formally confirming, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty, whereby it purports to exclude or to modify the legal effect of certain provisions of the treaty in their application to that State or to that organization;

(e) "negotiating State" and "negotiating organization" mean respectively:

(i) a State, or

(ii) an international organization,

which took part in the drawing up and adoption of the text of the treaty;

(f) "contracting State" and "contracting organization" mean

1948

respectively:

- (i) a State, or
- (ii) an international organization,

which has consented to be bound by the treaty, whether or not the treaty has entered into force;

(g) "party" means a State or an international organization which has consented to be bound by the treaty and for which the treaty is in force;

(h) "third State" and "third organization" mean respectively:

- (i) a State, or
- (ii) an international organization,

not a party to the treaty;

(i) "international organization" means an intergovernmental organization;

(j) "rules of the organization" means, in particular, the constituent instruments, decisions and resolutions adopted in accordance with them, and established practice of the organization.

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

1949

Article 3

International agreements not within the scope
of the present Convention

The fact that the present Convention does not apply:

(i) to international agreements to which one or more States, one
or more international organizations and one or more subjects
of international law other than States or organizations are
parties;

(ii) to international agreements to which one or more
international organizations and one or more subjects of
international law other than States or organizations are
parties;

(iii) to international agreements not in written form between one
or more States and one or more international organizations,
or between international organizations; or

(iv) to international agreements between subjects of international
law other than States or international organizations;

shall not affect:

(a) the legal force of such agreements;

(b) the application to them of any of the rules set forth in the
present Convention to which they would be subject under international law

1950

independently of the Convention;

(c) the application of the Convention to the relations between States and international organizations or to the relations of organizations as between themselves, when those relations are governed by international agreements to which other subjects of international law are also parties.

Article 4

Non-retroactivity of the present Convention

Without prejudice to the application of any rules set forth in the present Convention to which treaties between one or more States and one or more international organizations or between international organizations would be subject under international law independently of the Convention, the Convention applies only to such treaties concluded after the entry into force of the present Convention with regard to those States and those organizations.

Article 5

Treaties constituting international organizations and
treaties adopted within an international organization

The present Convention applies to any treaty between one or more States and one or more international organizations which is the constituent instrument of an international organization and to any treaty adopted within an international organization, without prejudice to any

1951

relevant rules of the organization.

PART II

CONCLUSION AND ENTRY INTO FORCE OF TREATIES

SECTION 1. CONCLUSION OF TREATIES

Article 6

Capacity of international organizations to conclude treaties

The capacity of an international organization to conclude treaties is governed by the rules of that organization.

Article 7

Full powers

1. A person is considered as representing a State for the purpose of adopting or authenticating the text of a treaty or for the purpose of expressing the consent of the State to be bound by a treaty if:

(a) that person produces appropriate full powers; or

(b) it appears from practice or from other circumstances that it was the intention of the States and international organizations concerned to consider that person as representing the State for such purposes without having to produce full powers.

2. In virtue of their functions and without having to produce full

1952

powers, the following are considered as representing their State:

(a) Heads of State, Heads of Government and Ministers for Foreign Affairs, for the purpose of performing all acts relating to the conclusion of a treaty between one or more States and one or more international organizations;

(b) representatives accredited by States to an international conference, for the purpose of adopting the text of a treaty between States and international organizations;

(c) representatives accredited by States to an international organization or one of its organs, for the purpose of adopting the text of a treaty in that organization or organ;

(d) heads of permanent missions to an international organization, for the purpose of adopting the text of a treaty between the accrediting States and that organization.

3. A person is considered as representing an international organization for the purpose of adopting or authenticating the text of a treaty, or expressing the consent of that organization to be bound by a treaty if:

(a) that person produces appropriate full powers; or

(b) it appears from the circumstances that it was the intention of the States and international organizations concerned to consider that person as representing the organization for such purposes, in accordance with

1953

the rules of the organization, without having to produce full powers.

Article 8

Subsequent confirmation of an act performed without authorization

An act relating to the conclusion of a treaty performed by a person who cannot be considered under article 7 as authorized to represent a State or an international organization for that purpose is without legal effect unless afterwards confirmed by that State or that organization.

Article 9

Adoption of the text

1. The adoption of the text of a treaty takes place by the consent of all the states and international organizations or, as the case may be, all the organizations participating in its drawing up except as provided in paragraph 2.

2. The adoption of the text of a treaty at an international conference takes place in accordance with the procedure agreed upon by the participants in that conference. If, however, no agreement is reached on any such procedure, the adoption of the text shall take place by the vote of two-thirds of the participants present and voting unless by the same majority they shall decide to apply a different rule.

Article 10

Authentication of the text

1954

1. The text of a treaty between one or more States and one or more international organizations is established as authentic and definitive:

(a) by such procedure as may be provided for in the text or agreed upon by the States and organizations participating in its drawing up; or

(b) failing such procedure, by the signature, signature ad referendum or initialling by the representatives of those States and those organizations of the text of the treaty or of the Final Act of a conference incorporating the text.

2. The text of a treaty between international organizations is established as authentic and definitive:

(a) by such procedure as may be provided for in the text or agreed upon by the organizations participating in its drawing up; or

(b) failing such procedure, by the signature, signature ad referendum or initialling by the representatives of those organizations of the text of the treaty or of the Final Act of a conference incorporating the text.

Article 11

Means of expressing consent to be bound by a treaty

1. The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty may be expressed by signature, exchange of instruments constituting a treaty, ratification, acceptance, approval or accession, or by any other means if so agreed.

1955

2. The consent of an international organization to be bound by a treaty may be expressed by signature, exchange of instruments constituting a treaty, act of formal confirmation, acceptance, approval or accession, or by any other means if so agreed.

Article 12

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by signature

1. The consent of a State or of an international organization to be bound by a treaty is expressed by the signature of the representative of that State or of that organization when:

- (a) the treaty provides that signature shall have that effect;
- (b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the case may be, the negotiating organizations were agreed that signature should have that effect; or
- (c) the intention of the State or organization to give that effect to the signature appears from the full powers of its representative or was expressed during the negotiation.

2. For the purposes of paragraph 1:

- (a) the initialling of a text constitutes a signature of the treaty when it is established that the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the case may be, the negotiating organizations so agreed;

1956

(b) the signature and referendum of a treaty by the representative of a State or an international organization, if confirmed by his State or organization, constitutes a full signature of the treaty.

Article 13

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed
by an exchange of instruments constituting a treaty

The consent of States or of international organizations to be bound by a treaty constituted by instruments exchanged between them is expressed by that exchange when:

(a) the instruments provide that their exchange shall have that effect;
or

(b) it is otherwise established that those States and those organizations or, as the case may be, those organizations were agreed that the exchange of instruments should have that effect.

Article 14

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by ratification,
act of formal confirmation, acceptance or approval

1. The consent of a State to be bound by a treaty is expressed by ratification when;

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

1957

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

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

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

2. The consent of an international organization to be bound by a treaty is expressed by an act of formal confirmation when:

(a) the treaty provides for such consent to be expressed by means of an act of formal confirmation;

(b) it is otherwise established that the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the case may be, the negotiating organizations were agreed that an act of formal confirmation should be required;

(c) the representative of the organization has signed the treaty subject to an act of formal confirmation; or

(d) the intention of the organization to sign the treaty subject to an act of formal confirmation appears from the full powers of its

1958

representative or was expressed during the negotiation.

3. The consent of a State or of an international organization to be bound by a treaty is expressed by acceptance or approval under conditions similar to those which apply to ratification or, as the case may be, to an act of formal confirmation.

Article 15

Consent to be bound by a treaty expressed by accession

The consent of a State or of an international organization to be bound by a treaty is expressed by accession when:

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

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

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

Article 16

Exchange or deposit of instruments of ratification, formal confirmation, acceptance, approval or accession

1959

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, instruments of ratification, instruments relating to an act of formal confirmation or instruments of acceptance, approval or accession establish the consent of a State or of an international organization to be bound by treaty between one or more States and one or more international organizations upon:

(a) their exchange between the contracting States and contracting organizations;

(b) their deposit with the depositary; or

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

2. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, instruments relating to an act of formal confirmation or instruments of acceptance, approval or accession establish the consent of an international organization to be bound by a treaty between international organizations upon:

(a) their exchange between the contracting organizations;

(b) their deposit with the depositary; or

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

Article 17

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

1960

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

Article 18

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

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

- (a) that State or that organization has signed the treaty or has exchanged instruments constituting the treaty subject to ratification, act of formal confirmation, acceptance or approval, until that State or that organization shall have made its intention clear not to become a party to the treaty; or
- (b) that State or that organization has expressed its consent to be bound by the treaty, pending the entry into force of the treaty and

provided that such entry into force is not unduly delayed.

1961

SECTION 2.

RESERVATIONS

Article 19

Formulation of reservations

A State or an international organization may, when signing, ratifying, formally confirming, accepting, approving or acceding to a treaty, formulate a reservation unless:

- (a) the reservation is prohibited by the treaty;
- (b) the treaty provides that only specified reservations, which do not include the reservation in question, may be made; or
- (c) in cases not falling under sub-paragraphs (a) and (b), the reservation is incompatible with the object and purpose of the treaty.

Article 20

Acceptance of and objection to reservations

1. A reservation expressly authorized by a treaty does not require any subsequent acceptance by the contracting States and contracting organizations or, as the case may be, by the contracting organizations unless the treaty so provides.

1962

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

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

4. In cases not falling under the preceding paragraphs and unless the treaty otherwise provides:

(a) acceptance of a reservation by a contracting State or by a contracting organization constitutes the reserving State or international organization a party to the treaty in relation to the accepting State or organization if or when the treaty is in force for the reserving State or organization and for the accepting State or organization;

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

(c) an act expressing the consent of a State or of an international

1963

organization to be bound by the treaty and containing a reservation is effective as soon as at least one contracting State or one contracting organization has accepted the reservation.

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

Article 21

Legal effects of reservations and of objections to reservations

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

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

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

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

3. When a State or an international organization objecting to a

1964

reservation has not opposed the entry into force of the treaty between itself and the reserving State or organization, the provisions to which the reservation relates do not apply as between the reserving State or organization and the objecting State or organization to the extent of the reservation.

Article 22

Withdrawal of reservations and of objections to reservations

1. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, a reservation may be withdrawn at any time and the consent of a State or of an international organization which has accepted the reservation is not required for its withdrawal.
2. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, an objection to a reservation may be withdrawn at any time.
3. Unless the treaty otherwise provides, or it is otherwise agreed:
 - (a) the withdrawal of a reservation becomes operative in relation to a contracting State or a contracting organization only when notice of it has been received by that State or that organization;
 - (b) the withdrawal of an objection to a reservation becomes operative only when notice of it has been received by the State or international organization which formulated the reservation.

Article 23

1965

Procedure regarding reservations

1. A reservation, an express acceptance of a reservation and an objection to a reservation must be formulated in writing and communicated to the contracting States and contracting organizations and other States and international organizations entitled to become parties to the treaty.
2. If formulated when signing the treaty subject to ratification, act of formal confirmation, acceptance or approval, a reservation must be formally confirmed by the reserving State or international organization when expressing its consent to be bound by the treaty. In such a case the reservation shall be considered as having been made on the date of its confirmation.
3. An express acceptance of, or an objection to, a reservation made previously to confirmation of the reservation does not itself require confirmation.
4. The withdrawal of a reservation or of an objection to a reservation must be formulated in writing.

SECTION 3.

ENTRY INTO FORCE AND PROVISIONAL APPLICATION OF TREATIES

Article 24

Entry into force

1. A treaty enters into force in such manner and upon such date as it

1966

may provide or as the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the case may be, the negotiating organizations may agree.

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

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

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

Article 25

Provisional application

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

(a) the treaty itself so provides; or

(b) the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the

1967

case may be, the negotiating organizations have in some other manner so agreed.

2. Unless the treaty otherwise provides or the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the case may be, the negotiating organizations have otherwise agreed, the provisional application of a treaty or a part of a treaty with respect to a State or an international organization shall be terminated if that State or that organization notifies the States and organizations with regard to which the treaty is being applied provisionally of its intention not to become a party to the treaty.

PART III

OBSERVANCE, APPLICATION AND INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES

SECTION 1.

OBSERVANCE OF TREATIES

Article 26

Pacta sunt servanda

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

Article 27

Internal law of States, rules of international organizations

1968

and observance of treaties

1. A State party to a treaty may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform the treaty.
2. An international organization party to a treaty may not invoke the rules of the organization as justification for its failure to perform the treaty.
3. The rules contained in the preceding paragraphs are without prejudice to article 46.

SECTION 2.

APPLICATION OF TREATIES

Article 28

Non-retroactivity of treaties

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

Article 29

Territorial scope of treaties

Unless a different intention appears from the treaty or is otherwise established, a treaty between one or more States and one or more

1969

international organizations is binding upon each State party in respect of its entire territory.

Article 30

Application of successive treaties
relating to the same subject-matter

1. The rights and obligations of States and international organizations parties to successive treaties relating to the same subject-matter shall be determined in accordance with the following paragraphs.
2. When a treaty specifies that it is subject to, or that it is not to be considered as incompatible with, an earlier or later treaty, the provisions of that other treaty prevail.
3. When all the parties to the earlier treaty are parties also to the later treaty but the earlier treaty is not terminated or suspended in operation under article 59, the earlier treaty applies only to the extent that its provisions are compatible with those of the later treaty.
4. When the parties to the later treaty do not include all the parties to the earlier one:
 - (a) as between two parties, each of which is a party to both treaties, the same rule applies as in paragraph 3;
 - (b) as between a party to both treaties and a party to only one of the treaties, the treaty to which both are parties governs their mutual

1970

rights and obligations.

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

6. The preceding paragraphs are without prejudice to the fact that, in the event of a conflict between obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and obligations under a treaty, the obligations under the Charter shall prevail.

SECTION 3.

INTERPRETATION OF TREATIES

Article 31

General rule of interpretation

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

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

(a) any agreement relating to the treaty which was made between all

1971

the parties in connection with the conclusion of the treaty;

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

3. There shall be taken into account, together with the context:

(a) any subsequent agreement between the parties regarding the interpretation of the treaty or the application of its provisions;

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

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

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

Article 32

Supplementary means of interpretation

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

1972

(a) leaves the meaning ambiguous or obscure; or

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

Article 33

Interpretation of treaties authenticated in two or more languages

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

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

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

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

SECTION 4.

TREATIES AND THIRD STATES OR THIRD ORGANIZATIONS

1973

Article 34

General rule regarding third States and third organizations

A treaty does not create either obligations or rights for a third State or a third organization without the consent of that State or that organization.

Article 35

Treaties providing for obligations for third States or third organizations

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

Acceptance by the third organization of such an obligation shall be governed by the rules of that organization.

Article 36

Treaties providing for rights for third States or third organizations

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

1974

provides.

2. A right arises for a third organization from a provision of a treaty if the parties to the treaty intend the provision to accord that right either to the third organization, or to a group of international organizations to which it belongs, or to all organizations, and the third organization assents thereto. Its assent shall be governed by the rules of the organization.

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

Article 37

Revocation or modification of obligations or rights of third States or third organizations

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

2. When a right has arisen for a third State or a third organization in conformity with article 36, the right may not be revoked or modified by the parties if it is established that the right was intended not to be

1975

revocable or subject to modification without the consent of the third State or the third organization.

3. The consent of an international organization party to the treaty or of a third organization, as provided for in the foregoing paragraphs, shall be governed by the rules of that organization.

Article 38

Rules in a treaty becoming binding on third States or third organizations through international custom

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

PART IV

AMENDMENT AND MODIFICATION OF TREATIES

Article 39

General rule regarding the amendment of treaties

1. A treaty may be amended by agreement between the parties. The rules laid down in Part II apply to such an agreement except in so far as the treaty may otherwise provide.

2. The consent of an international organization to an agreement provided for in paragraph 1 shall be governed by the rules of that organization.

1976

Article 40

Amendment of multilateral treaties

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Any State or international organization which becomes a party to the treaty after the entry into force of the amending agreement shall,

1977

failing an expression of a different intention by that State or that organization:

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

Article 41

Agreements to modify multilateral treaties

between certain of the parties only

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

- (a) the possibility of such a modification is provided for by the treaty; or
- (b) the modification in question is not prohibited by the treaty and:
 - (i) does not affect the enjoyment by the other parties of their rights under the treaty or the performance of their obligations;
 - (ii) does not relate to a provision, derogation from which is incompatible with the effective execution of the object and purpose of the treaty as a whole.

2. Unless in a case falling under paragraph 1 (a) the treaty otherwise provides, the parties in question shall notify the other parties of their

1978

intention to conclude the agreement and of the modification to the treaty for which it provides.

PART V

INVALIDITY, TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF TREATIES

SECTION 1. GENERAL PROVISIONS

Article 42

Validity and continuance in force of treaties

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

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

Article 43

Obligations imposed by international law independently of a treaty

The invalidity, termination or denunciation of a treaty, the withdrawal of a party from it, or the suspension of its operation, as a result of the application of the present Convention or of the provisions

1979

of the treaty, shall not in any way impair the duty of any State or of any international organization to fulfil any obligation embodied in the treaty to which that State or that organization would be subject under international law independently of the treaty.

Article 44

Separability of treaty provisions

1. A right of a party, provided for in a treaty or arising under article 56, to denounce, withdraw from or suspend the operation of the treaty may be exercised only with respect to the whole treaty unless the treaty otherwise provides or the parties otherwise agree.
2. A ground for invalidating, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty recognized in the present Convention may be invoked only with respect to the whole treaty except as provided in the following paragraphs or in article 60.
3. If the ground relates solely to particular clauses, it may be invoked only with respect to those clauses where:
 - (a) the said clauses are separable from the remainder of the treaty with regard to their application;
 - (b) it appears from the treaty or is otherwise established that acceptance of those clauses was not an essential basis of the consent of the other party or parties to be bound by the treaty as a whole; and

1980

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

4. In cases falling under articles 49 and 50, the State or international organization entitled to invoke the fraud or corruption may do so with respect either to the whole treaty or, subject to paragraph 3, to the particular clauses alone.

5. In cases falling under articles 51, 52 and 53, no separation of the provisions of the treaty is permitted.

Article 45

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

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

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

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

2. An international organization may no longer invoke a ground for invalidating, terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation

1981

of a treaty under articles 46 to 50 or articles 60 and 62 if, after becoming aware of the facts:

- (a) it shall have expressly agreed that the treaty is valid or remains in force or continues in operation, as the case may be; or
- (b) it must by reason of the conduct of the competent organ be considered as having renounced the right to invoke that ground.

SECTION 2. INVALIDITY OF TREATIES

Article 46

Provisions of internal law of a State and rules of an international organization regarding competence to conclude treaties

1. A State may not invoke the fact that its consent to be bound by a treaty has been expressed in violation of a provision of its internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties as invalidating its consent unless that violation was manifest and concerned a rule of its internal law of fundamental importance.
2. An international organization may not invoke the fact that its consent to be bound by a treaty has been expressed in violation of the rules of the organization regarding competence to conclude treaties as invalidating its consent unless that violation was manifest and concerned a rule of fundamental importance.
3. A violation is manifest if it would be objectively evident to any

1982

State or any international organization conducting itself in the matter in accordance with the normal practice of States and, where appropriate, of international organizations and in good faith.

Article 47

Specific restrictions on authority to express the consent of a State or an international organization

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

Article 48

Error

1. A State or an international organization may invoke an error in a treaty as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty if the error relates to a fact or situation which was assumed by that State or that organization to exist at the time when the treaty was concluded and formed an essential basis of the consent of that State or that organization to be bound by the treaty.

2. Paragraph 1 shall not apply if the State or international

1983

organization in question contributed by its own conduct to the error or if the circumstances were such as to put that State or that organization on notice of a possible error.

3. An error relating only to the wording of the text of a treaty does not affect its validity; article 80 then applies.

Article 49

Fraud

A State or an international organization induced to conclude a treaty by the fraudulent conduct of a negotiating State or a negotiating organization may invoke the fraud as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty.

Article 50

Corruption of a representative of a State
or of an international organization

A State or an international organization the expression of whose consent to be bound by a treaty has been procured through the corruption of its representative directly or indirectly by a negotiating State or a negotiating organization may invoke such corruption as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty.

Article 51

Coercion of a representative of a State

1984

or of an international organization

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

Article 52

Coercion of a State or of an international organization
by the threat or use of force

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

Article 53

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

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

1985

SECTION 3.

TERMINATION AND SUSPENSION OF
THE OPERATION OF TREATIES

Article 54

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

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

- (a) in conformity with the provisions of the treaty; or
- (b) at any time by consent of all the parties after consultation with
the contracting States and contracting organizations.

Article 55

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

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

Article 56

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

1986

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

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

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

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

Article 57

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

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

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

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

Article 58

Suspension of the operation of a multilateral treaty by

1987

agreement between certain of the parties only

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

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

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

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

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

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

Article 59

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

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

1988

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

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

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

Article 60

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

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

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

(a) the other parties by unanimous agreement to suspend the operation of the treaty in whole or in part or to terminate it either:

(i) in the relations between themselves and the defaulting State

1989

or international organization, or

(ii) as between all the parties;

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

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

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

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

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

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

5. Paragraphs 1 to 3 do not apply to provisions relating to the

1990

protection of the human person contained in treaties of a humanitarian character, in particular to provisions prohibiting any form of reprisals against persons protected by such treaties.

Article 61

Supervening impossibility of performance

1. A party may invoke the impossibility of performing a treaty as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from it if the impossibility results from the permanent disappearance or destruction of an object indispensable for the execution of the treaty. If the impossibility is temporary, it may be invoked only as a ground for suspending the operation of the treaty.
2. Impossibility of performance may not be invoked by a party as a ground for terminating, withdrawing from or suspending the operation of a treaty if the impossibility is the result of a breach by that party either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.

Article 62

Fundamental change of circumstances

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

1991

terminating or withdrawing from the treaty unless:

(a) the existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty; and

(b) the effect of the change is radically to transform the extent of obligations still to be performed under the treaty.

2. A fundamental change of circumstances may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty between two or more States and one or more international organizations if the treaty establishes a boundary.

3. A fundamental change of circumstances may not be invoked as a ground for terminating or withdrawing from a treaty if the fundamental change is the result of a breach by the party invoking it either of an obligation under the treaty or of any other international obligation owed to any other party to the treaty.

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

Article 63

Severance of diplomatic or consular relations

The severance of diplomatic or consular relations between States

1992

parties to a treaty between two or more States and one or more international organizations does not affect the legal relations established between those States by the treaty except in so far as the existence of diplomatic or consular relations is indispensable for the application of the treaty.

Article 64

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

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

SECTION 4. PROCEDURE

Article 65

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

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

1993

2. If, after the expiry of a period which, except in cases of special urgency, shall not be less than three months after the receipt of the notification, no party has raised any objection, the party making the notification may carry out in the manner provided in article 67 the measure which it has proposed.

3. If, however, objection has been raised by any other party, the parties shall seek a solution through the means indicated in Article 33 of the Charter of the United Nations.

4. The notification or objection made by an international organization shall be governed by the rules of that organization.

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

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

Article 66

Procedures for judicial settlement, arbitration and conciliation

1. If, under paragraph 3 of article 65, no solution has been reached

1994

within a period of twelve months following the date on which the objection was raised, the procedures specified in the following paragraphs shall be followed.

2. With respect to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of article 53 or 64:

(a) if a State is a party to the dispute with one or more States, it may, by a written application, submit the dispute to the International Court of Justice for a decision;

(b) if a State is a party to the dispute to which one or more international organizations are parties, the State may, through a Member State of the United Nations if necessary, request the General Assembly or the Security Council or, where appropriate, the competent organ of an international organization which is a party to the dispute and is authorized in accordance with Article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations, to request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in accordance with article 65 of the Statute of the Court;

(c) if the United Nations or an international organization that is authorized in accordance with Article 96 of the Charter of the United Nations is a party to the dispute, it may request an advisory opinion of the International Court of Justice in accordance with article 65 of the Statute of the Court;

(d) if an international organization other than those referred to in

1995

sub-paragraph (c) is a party to the dispute, it may, through a Member State of the United Nations, follow the procedure specified in sub-paragraph (b);

(e) the advisory opinion given pursuant to sub-paragraph (b), (c) or (d) shall be accepted as decisive by all the parties to the dispute concerned;

(f) if the request under sub-paragraph (b), (c) or (d) for an advisory opinion of the Court is not granted, any one of the parties to the dispute may, by written notification to the other party or parties, submit it to arbitration in accordance with the provisions of the Annex to the present Convention.

3. The provisions of paragraph 2 apply unless all the parties to a dispute referred to in that paragraph by common consent agree to submit the dispute to an arbitration procedure, including the one specified in the Annex to the present Convention.

4. With respect to a dispute concerning the application or the interpretation of any of the articles in Part V, other than articles 53 and 64, of the present Convention, any one of the parties to the dispute may set in motion the conciliation procedure specified in the Annex to the Convention by submitting a request to that effect to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 67

1996

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

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

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

Article 68

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

A notification or instrument provided for in articles 65 or 67 may be revoked at any time before it takes effect.

SECTION 5.

CONSEQUENCES OF THE INVALIDITY

1997

TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION OF THE OPERATION OF A TREATY

Article 69

Consequences of the invalidity of a treaty

1. A treaty the invalidity of which is established under the present Convention is void. The provisions of a void treaty have no legal force.
2. If acts have nevertheless been performed in reliance on such a treaty:
 - (a) each party may require any other party to establish as far as possible in their mutual relations the position that would have existed if the acts had not been performed;
 - (b) acts performed in good faith before the invalidity was invoked are not rendered unlawful by reason only of the invalidity of the treaty.
3. In cases falling under articles 49, 50, 51 or 52, paragraph 2 does not apply with respect to the party to which the fraud, the act of corruption or the coercion is imputable.
4. In the case of the invalidity of the consent of a particular State or a particular international organization to be bound by a multilateral treaty, the foregoing rules apply in the relations between that State or that organization and the parties to the treaty.

Article 70

1998

Consequences of the termination of a treaty

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

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

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

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

Article 71

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

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

(a) eliminate as far as possible the consequences of any act performed in reliance on any provision which conflicts with the peremptory norm of general international law; and

1999

(b) bring their mutual relations into conformity with the peremptory norm of general international law.

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

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

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

Article 72

Consequences of the suspension of the operation of a treaty

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

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

(b) does not otherwise affect the legal relations between the parties

2000

established by the treaty.

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

PART VI

MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS

Article 73

Relationship to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties

As between States parties to the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties of 1969, the relations of those States under a treaty between two or more States and one or more international organizations shall be governed by that Convention.

Article 74

Questions not prejudged by the present Convention

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

2. The provisions of the present Convention shall not prejudice any question that may arise in regard to a treaty from the international

2001

responsibility of an international organization, from the termination of the existence of the organization or from the termination of participation by a State in the membership of the organization.

3. The provisions of the present Convention shall not prejudice any question that may arise in regard to the establishment of obligations and rights for States members of an international organization under a treaty to which that organization is a party.

Article 75

Diplomatic and consular relations and the conclusion of treaties

The severance or absence of diplomatic or consular relations between two or more States does not prevent the conclusion of treaties between two or more of those States and one or more international organizations. The conclusion of such a treaty does not in itself affect the situation in regard to diplomatic or consular relations.

Article 76

Case of an aggressor State

The provisions of the present Convention are without prejudice to any obligation in relation to a treaty between one or more States and one or more international organizations which may arise for an aggressor State in consequence of measures taken in conformity with the Charter of the United Nations with reference to that State's aggression.

2002

PART VII

DEPOSITARIES, NOTIFICATIONS, CORRECTIONS AND REGISTRATION

Article 77

Depositaries of treaties

1. The designation of the depositary of a treaty may be made by the negotiating States and negotiating organizations or, as the case may be, the negotiating organizations, either in the treaty itself or in some other manner. The depositary may be one or more States, an international organization or the chief administrative officer of the organization.
2. The functions of the depositary of a treaty are international in character and the depositary is under an obligation to act impartially in their performance. In particular, the fact that a treaty has not entered into force between certain of the parties or that a difference has appeared between a State or an international organization and a depositary with regard to the performance of the latter's functions shall not affect that obligation.

Article 78

Functions of depositaries

1. The functions of a depositary, unless otherwise provided in the treaty or agreed by the contracting States and contracting organizations or, as the case may be, by the contracting organizations, comprise in

2003

particular:

- (a) keeping custody of the original text of the treaty and of any full powers delivered to the depositary;
- (b) preparing certified copies of the original text and preparing any further text of the treaty in such additional languages as may be required by the treaty and transmitting them to the parties and to the States and international organizations entitled to become parties to the treaty;
- (c) receiving any signatures to the treaty and receiving and keeping custody of any instruments, notifications and communications relating to it;
- (d) examining whether the signature or any instrument, notification or communication relating to the treaty is in due and proper form and, if need be, bringing the matter to the attention of the State or international organization in question;
- (e) informing the parties and the States and international organizations entitled to become parties to the treaty of acts, notifications and communications relating to the treaty;
- (f) informing the States and international organizations entitled to become parties to the treaty when the number of signatures or of instruments of ratification, instruments relating to an act of formal confirmation, or of instruments of acceptance, approval or accession

2004

required for the entry into force of the treaty has been received or deposited;

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

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

2. In the event of any difference appearing between a State or an international organization and the depositary as to the performance of the latter's functions, the depositary shall bring the question to the attention of:

(a) the signatory States and organizations and the contracting States and contracting organizations; or

(b) where appropriate, the competent organ of the international organization concerned.

Article 79

Notifications and communications

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

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

2005

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

(c) if transmitted to a depositary, be considered as received by the State or organization for which it was intended only when the latter State or organization has been informed by the depositary in accordance with article 78, paragraph 1(e).

Article 80

Correction of errors in texts or in certified copies of treaties

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

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

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

(c) by executing a corrected text of the whole treaty by the same

2006

procedure as in the case of the original text.

2. Where the treaty is one for which there is a depositary, the latter shall notify the signatory States and international organizations and the contracting States and contracting organizations of the error and of the proposal to correct it and shall specify an appropriate time-limit within which objection to the proposed correction may be raised. If, on the expiry of the time-limit:

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

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

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

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

2007

States and contracting organizations otherwise decide.

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

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

Article 81

Registration and publication of treaties

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

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

PART VIII

FINAL PROVISIONS

Article 82

Signature

2008

The present Convention shall be open for signature until 31 December 1986 at the Federal Ministry for Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Austria, and subsequently, until 30 June 1987, at United Nations Headquarters, New York by:

- (a) all States;
- (b) Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia;
- (c) international organizations invited to participate in the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties between States and International Organizations or between International Organizations.

Article 83

Ratification or act of formal confirmation

The present Convention is subject to ratification by States and by Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and to acts of formal confirmation by international organizations. The instruments of ratification and those relating to acts of formal confirmation shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 84

Accession

1. The present Convention shall remain open for accession by any State, by Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, and by

2009

any international organization which has the capacity to conclude treaties.

2. An instrument of accession of an international organization shall contain a declaration that it has the capacity to conclude treaties.

3. The instruments of accession shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 85

Entry into force

1. The present Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day following the date of deposit of the thirty-fifth instrument of ratification or accession by States or by Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia.

2. For each State or for Namibia, represented by the United Nations Council for Namibia, ratifying or acceding to the Convention after the condition specified in paragraph 1 has been fulfilled, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after deposit by such State or by Namibia of its instrument of ratification or accession.

3. For each international organization depositing an instrument relating to an act of formal confirmation or an instrument of accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after such deposit, or at the date the Convention enters into force pursuant to

2010

paragraph 1, whichever is later.

Article 86

Authentic texts

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

IN WITNESS WHEREOF the undersigned Plenipotentiaries, being duly authorized by their respective Governments, and duly authorized representatives of the United Nations Council for Namibia and of international organizations have signed the present Convention.

DONE at VIENNA this twenty-first day of March one thousand nine hundred and eighty-six.

ANNEX

ARBITRATION AND CONCILIATION PROCEDURES ESTABLISHED IN APPLICATION OF ARTICLE 66

I. ESTABLISHMENT OF THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL OR CONCILIATION COMMISSION

1. A list consisting of qualified jurists, from which the parties to a dispute may choose the persons who are to constitute an arbitral tribunal or, as the case may be, a conciliation commission, shall be drawn up and

2011

maintained by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. To this end, every State which is a Member of the United Nations and every party to the present Convention shall be invited to nominate two persons, and the names of the persons so nominated shall constitute the list, a copy of which shall be transmitted to the President of the International Court of Justice. The term of office of a person on the list, including that of any person nominated to fill a casual vacancy, shall be five years and may be renewed. A person whose term expires shall continue to fulfil any function for which he shall have been chosen under the following paragraphs.

2. When notification has been made under article 66, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (f), or agreement on the procedure in the present Annex has been reached under paragraph 3, the dispute shall be brought before an arbitral tribunal. When a request has been made to the Secretary-General under article 66, paragraph 4, the Secretary-General shall bring the dispute before a conciliation commission. Both the arbitral tribunal and the conciliation commission shall be constituted as follows:

The States, international organizations or, as the case may be, the States and organizations which constitute one of the parties to the dispute shall appoint by common consent:

- (a) one arbitrator or, as the case may be, one conciliator, who may or may not be chosen from the list referred to in paragraph 1; and
- (b) one arbitrator or, as the case may be, one conciliator, who shall

2012

be chosen from among those included in the list and shall not be of the nationality of any of the States or nominated by any of the organizations which constitute that party to the dispute, provided that a dispute between two international organizations is not considered by nationals of one and the same State.

The States, international organizations or, as the case may be, the States and organizations which constitute the other party to the dispute shall appoint two arbitrators or, as the case may be, two conciliators, in the same way. The four persons chosen by the parties shall be appointed within sixty days following the date on which the other party to the dispute receives notification under article 66, paragraph 2, sub-paragraph (f), or on which the agreement on the procedure in the present Annex under paragraph 3 is reached, or on which the Secretary-General receives the request for conciliation.

The four persons so chosen shall, within sixty days following the date of the last of their own appointments, appoint from the list a fifth arbitrator or, as the case may be, conciliator, who shall be chairman.

If the appointment of the chairman, or any of the arbitrators or, as the case may be, conciliators, has not been made within the period prescribed above for such appointment, it shall be made by the Secretary-General of the United Nations within sixty days following the expiry of that period. The appointment of the chairman may be made by the Secretary-General either from the list or from the membership of the

8013

International Law Commission. Any of the periods within which appointments must be made may be extended by agreement between the parties to the dispute. If the United Nations is a party or is included in one of the parties to the dispute, the Secretary-General shall transmit the above-mentioned request to the President of the International Court of Justice, who shall perform the functions conferred upon the Secretary-General under this sub-paragraph.

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

The appointment of arbitrators or conciliators by an international organization provided for in paragraphs 1 and 2 shall be governed by the rules of that organization.

II. FUNCTIONING OF THE ARBITRAL TRIBUNAL

3. Unless the parties to the dispute otherwise agree, the Arbitral Tribunal shall decide its own procedure, assuring to each party to the dispute a full opportunity to be heard and to present its case.

4. The Arbitral Tribunal, with the consent of the parties to the dispute, may invite any interested State or international organization to submit to it its views orally or in writing.

5. Decisions of the Arbitral Tribunal shall be adopted by a majority vote of the members. In the event of an equality of votes, the vote of the Chairman shall be decisive.

2014

6. When one of the parties to the dispute does not appear before the Tribunal or fails to defend its case, the other party may request the Tribunal to continue the proceedings and to make its award. Before making its award, the Tribunal must satisfy itself not only that it has jurisdiction over the dispute but also that the claim is well founded in fact and law.

7. The award of the Arbitral Tribunal shall be confined to the subject-matter of the dispute and state the reasons on which it is based. Any member of the Tribunal may attach a separate or dissenting opinion to the award.

8. The award shall be final and without appeal. It shall be complied with by all parties to the dispute.

9. The Secretary-General shall provide the Tribunal with such assistance and facilities as it may require. The expenses of the Tribunal shall be borne by the United Nations.

III. FUNCTIONING OF THE CONCILIATION COMMISSION

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

2015

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

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

13. The Commission shall report within twelve months of its constitution. Its report shall be deposited with the Secretary-General and transmitted to the parties to the dispute. The report of the Commission, including any conclusions stated therein regarding the facts or questions of law, shall not be binding upon the parties and it shall have no other character than that of recommendations submitted for the consideration of the parties in order to facilitate an amicable settlement of the dispute.

14. The Secretary-General shall provide the Commission with such assistance and facilities as it may require. The expenses of the Commission shall be borne by the United Nations.

ANNEX 5:

Aust, Modern Treaty Law and Practice (2000) (extract)

2017

MODERN TREATY LAW AND PRACTICE

ANTHONY AUST



CAMBRIDGE
UNIVERSITY PRESS

2018

PUBLISHED BY THE PRESS SYNDICATE OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CAMBRIDGE
The Pitt Building, Trumpington Street, Cambridge, United Kingdom

CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS
The Edinburgh Building, Cambridge CB2 2RU, UK www.cup.cam.ac.uk
40 West 20th Street, New York, NY 10011-4211, USA www.cup.org
10 Stamford Road, Oakleigh, Melbourne 3166, Australia
Ruiz de Alarcón 13, 28014 Madrid, Spain

© Anthony Aust 2000

This book is in copyright. Subject to statutory exception
and to the provisions of relevant collective licensing agreements,
no reproduction of any part may take place without
the written permission of Cambridge University Press.

First published 2000

Printed in the United Kingdom at the University Press, Cambridge

Typeset in Minion 10.5/14 pt System QuarkXpress® [SE]

A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

Library of Congress Cataloguing in Publication data

Aust, Anthony.
Modern treaty law and practice / Anthony Aust.
p. cm.

Includes bibliographical references and index.

ISBN 0 521 59153 8 (hardbound)

1. Treaties. I. Title.

KZ1301.A93 2000

341.3'7-dc21 99-33753 CIP

ISBN 0 521 59153 8 hardback
ISBN 0 521 59846 X paperback

Entry into force

The treaty becomes international law after 40 countries have ratified it.¹

This is a common misconception. When a treaty has entered into force, it is in force *only* for those states which have consented to be bound by it. A treaty is therefore not like national legislation which, once in force, is in force for all to whom it is directed. A treaty is much closer in character to a contract. For the position of third states, see Chapter 14.

Each of the states for which a treaty is in force is a 'party' (Article 2(1)(g)). Thereafter it should never be referred to by the – uninformative and misleading – term 'signatory'.² But it must also be remembered that when a state expresses its consent to be bound it does not necessarily mean that the treaty will enter into force for it at that time: that will depend on whether the treaty is already in force (for the states which have already consented to be bound) or whether further consents are needed to bring it into force. A state's consent may of course have the effect of bringing the treaty into force if it is the last one needed to do that.

However, this does not mean that a treaty will have no legal effects before it enters into force. Certain of its provisions have to apply from the moment it is adopted, such as those on authentication of the text, right to participate, entry into force and depositary functions (Article 24(4)).

Express provisions

A treaty enters into force in such manner and on such date as provided for in the treaty or as the negotiating states may agree (Article 24(1)). There are various ways:

- (1) On a date specified in the treaty. The parties are free to specify a date later than that of signature, or even for the treaty to operate retrospectively. Because of

¹ *The Times*, 26 June 1998, on the Landmines Convention. ² See p. 91 above.

the difficulties in getting multilateral treaties ratified, it is unusual for them to specify a date for entry into force. Inserting a specific date may serve a political purpose by encouraging states – or, perhaps more to the point, their parliaments – to meet the deadline. Such a provision is therefore usually subject to a proviso. Article 16 of the Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer 1987 provided that it would enter into force on 1 January 1989, but only if by then it had been ratified by eleven states or regional economic integration organisations, and certain other conditions had been satisfied.³

- (2) On signature *only* by all the negotiating states. This is common for bilateral treaties which do not have to be approved by parliaments (see Appendix B), and is sometimes found in treaties between a few states (plurilateral treaties) even when the subject is of major importance, such as the Dayton Agreement 1995⁴ or the London Agreement 1945, which established the Nuremberg Tribunal.⁵
- (3) On ratification by both (or all) signatory states. If a multilateral treaty requires ratification by all the negotiating states, entry into force may be expressed to be on, or at a specific time after, the deposit of the last instrument of ratification. Article 45(1) of the Europol Convention 1995 provides that:

This Convention shall enter into force on the first day of the month following the expiry of a three-month period after the notification [that it has completed its constitutional requirements] by the Member State which, being a member of the European Union *on the date of adoption by the Council of the Act drawing up this Convention*, is the last to fulfill that formality.⁶

This apparently elaborate formula is essential. First, it ensures that the treaty cannot enter into force until all EU Member States have consented to be bound. Secondly, it has the effect of excluding from that calculation any *new* Member States. Since the treaty gives them the right to accede at any time, without the emphasised words the entry into force of the treaty could be delayed for many years if new states join the EU before all the Member States at the time of the adoption of the treaty have consented to be bound. Thirdly, without the special formula, the treaty might not enter into force at all if not all new Member States were to accede. Some non-EU treaties fall into this trap.⁷ The alternative is for the treaty to prohibit accessions by new Member

States until purpose of e

(4) Conditional specified by 1968 provid including r United Kin Protocol to (EMEP) re geographic instrument force of th Nuclear-Te states nam

(5) On signat negotiatin itself). Th Geneva C treaties of enter into two states protect m tarian law between into forc Vienna (1982 (U Internat ensure t into for financia UNCLC ratify v effectiv

³ 1522 UNTS 3 (No. 26369); ILM (1987), p. 1550. See also the Maastricht Treaty 1992, Title VII, Article R (UKTS (1994) 12). ⁴ ILM (1996), p. 75. See p. 79 above.

⁵ 82 UNTS 279. ⁶ (UK) European Communities Series No. 13 (1995), Cm 3050.

⁷ Cf. Article 4 of Protocol No. 11 to the European Convention on Human Rights (ILM (1994), p. 960). Similar problems can occur with amendments: see p. 218 below.

⁸ 729 UNTS why there

⁹ ILM (1981) Implementer

¹⁰ ILM (1991)

¹¹ 75 UNTS

¹² ILM (1991)

States until the treaty is in force, or not to count their accession for the purpose of entry into force. But the former may not be feasible politically.

- (4) Conditional on the signature (or, more usually, ratification) of certain states specified by number, name or category. The Nuclear Non-Proliferation Treaty 1968 provided for entry into force after ratification by forty signatory states, including ratification by the three depositary states, the Soviet Union, the United Kingdom and the United States.⁸ The entry into force of the 1984 Protocol to the Convention on Long-Range Transboundary Air Pollution (EMEP) required ratification by nineteen states and organisations within the geographical scope of the Protocol which, being Europe, meant that the instruments deposited by Canada and the United States before the entry into force of the Protocol did not count for that purpose.⁹ The Comprehensive Nuclear-Test-Ban Treaty 1996 cannot enter into force until the forty-four states named in Annex 2 to the Treaty have ratified.¹⁰
- (5) On signature (or, more usually, ratification) by a minimum number of the negotiating states (see, for example, Article 84(1) of the Vienna Convention itself). The minimum number for a multilateral treaty is two. The four Geneva Conventions of 1949, their Additional Protocols of 1977,¹¹ and other treaties on international humanitarian law, require only two ratifications to enter into force. In those cases, although the treaty will at first bind only the two states, this reflects the nature of such treaties, the purpose of which is to protect military personnel of the parties to a conflict and civilians. A humanitarian law treaty therefore creates, in effect, a network of 'bilateral treaties' between the parties. But for most multilateral treaties the number for entry into force is larger, often much more than the thirty-five needed to bring the Vienna Convention into force. The UN Convention on the Law of the Sea 1982 (UNCLOS) needed sixty ratifications, as does the Statute of the International Criminal Court 1998.¹² A large number is usually chosen to ensure that the treaty receives a broad measure of acceptance before it enters into force. This will be important if it requires parties to make significant financial contributions to a new international organisation. In the case of UNCLOS, this aim was not realised because the industrialised states did not ratify until after entry into force, and then only after UNCLOS had been effectively amended by the 1994 Implementation Agreement.¹³ The 1984

⁸ 729 UNTS 161 (No. 10485); ILM (1968), p. 809; UKTS (1970) 88; TIAS 6839. For the reason why there are three depositaries, see p. 263 below.

⁹ ILM (1988), p. 701; UKTS (1988) 75: see Article 10(1)(a). See also Article 6 of the UNCLOS Implementation Agreement 1994 (ILM (1994), p. 1313; UKTS (1999) 82.

¹⁰ ILM (1996), p. 1443. They include India, Pakistan and the United States.

¹¹ 75 UNTS 3 (No. 17512); ILM (1977), p. 1391; UKTS (1999) 29 and 30.

¹² ILM (1998), p. 1002. ¹³ ILM (1994), p. 1313; UKTS (1999) 82. See pp. 90–1 above.

Protocol amending the Chicago Convention required 102 ratifications, and, not surprisingly, did not enter into force until 1998.¹⁴ Certain treaties to which international organisations are parties, in particular regional economic integration organisations, such as the European Community, provide that, in addition to its Member States, the organisation can become a party in its own right, except that its instrument of ratification shall not be counted in addition to those deposited by its Member States.¹⁵

- (6) As in 4 or 5 above, but the minimum number of states or organisations must also fulfil other conditions. These are often financial or economic, and designed to ensure that the treaty does not enter into force until the states which have a significant interest in the subject matter have ratified or, as in the case of commodity agreements, there is a balance between producing and consuming states. Article 10(1)(b) of the EMEP (see (4) above) imposed a further condition for entry into force: that the aggregate of the UN assessment rates for the European states which ratify had to exceed 40 per cent. The Montreal Protocol on Substances that Deplete the Ozone Layer 1987 had a similar provision, entry into force being dependent on eleven ratifications 'representing at least two-thirds of the 1986 estimated global consumption of the controlled substances [i.e., CFCs]'.¹⁶ Since the Protocol did not define 'estimated global consumption', the UN Secretary-General, as depositary, notified the entry into force of the Protocol only after having obtained confirmation, in the form of data provided by the states concerned, that the necessary conditions for entry into force had been met.¹⁷
- (7) On the exchange of instruments of ratification (bilateral treaty).
- (8) On notification by each signatory state to the other (or others) of the completion of its constitutional requirements. This formula can be used even if the other state (or some of the other states) does not have to satisfy any such requirements, in which case the notification would be a mere formality. The notification is usually by third-person diplomatic note. Again, this is more common for bilateral treaties or multilateral treaties which are between only a few states.
- (9) In the case of a treaty constituted by an exchange of notes, on the date of the reply note, though a further stage (such as in 8 above) is frequently added.

¹⁴ ILM (1984), p. 705.

¹⁵ See Article 305(1)(f) of, and Article 8 of Annex IX to, UNCLOS (ILM (1982), p. 1261; UKTS (1999) 81; and Article XI(2) of the FAO Compliance Agreement 1993 (ILM (1994), p. 968). Nor can the organisation and its member states usually have more votes in aggregate than the total votes of the member states (see p. 55, note 39, above).

¹⁶ 1522 UNTS 3 (No. 26369); ILM (1987), p. 1550; UKTS (1990) 19. The deadline was met.

¹⁷ See also Article 15 of the Bribery Convention 1997 (ILM (1998), p. 1). See further examples in *UN Depositary Practice*, paras. 226–32.

2022
(10) As in 9
(11) On a de
on a Sc
bombin

If the treaty
agreement
into force
24(2)). Th
(actually
force.¹⁹ Th
the 1995 tr
disposal o
assurances
installatio

In the cas
entry into
lowing th
bring the
Conventi
is from th
itary tim
force. In
impleme
enact it)

One r
period is
time run
the treat
it will r

¹⁸ ILM (1
1999. S

²⁰ UKTS

- (10) As in 9 above, but on a date earlier or later than that of the reply note.
- (11) On a date to be agreed. The 1998 Netherlands–United Kingdom Agreement on a Scottish Trial in the Netherlands (for those accused of the Lockerbie bombing) provides that it shall enter force on a date to be agreed.¹⁸

No provision or agreement on entry into force

If the treaty has no express provision on entry into force, and there is no agreement about it between the negotiating states, the treaty will enter into force as soon as all those states have consented to be bound (Article 24(2)). The Iraq–United Nations Memorandum of Understanding 1998 (actually a treaty) had no provision for ratification or entry into force.¹⁹ The agreement may be implicit. No provisions were needed in the 1995 treaty between Norway and the United Kingdom concerning the disposal of the ‘Brent Spar’ offshore installation since it contains only assurances by the United Kingdom about the eventual disposal of the installation.²⁰

Date of entry into force

In the case of *multilateral* treaties it is usual to provide that the *date* of entry into force will be a specified number of days, weeks or months following the deposit of the last instrument of ratification which is needed to bring the treaty into force (see, for example, Article 84(1) of the Vienna Convention itself). The period may be of any length, but the normal range is from thirty days to twelve months. This breathing space gives the depositary time to notify the contracting states of the forthcoming entry into force. In addition, contracting states may need time to bring into effect implementing legislation which they have previously enacted (or even to enact it). It also allows time for other necessary preparations.

One must be careful in calculating the date of entry into force. If the period is thirty days following deposit of the last necessary instrument, the time runs from the day *after* the date of deposit. If that date is 14 January the treaty will enter into force on 13 February. If the period is one month, it will run from the date of deposit. If that is 14 January, the treaty will

¹⁸ ILM (1999), p. 926; UKTS (1999) 43; UN Doc. S/1995/795. It entered into force on 8 January 1999. See also p. 148 below. ¹⁹ ILM (1998), p. 501.

²⁰ UKTS (1995) 65. For the 1998 Brent Spar Treaty, see UKTS (1998) 46.

Invalidity

a matter upon which there exists abundant literary authority, a little diplomatic authority, and almost no judicial authority.¹

*
Not much has changed since McNair made this dispiriting observation, except that the Convention has nine main articles on invalidity of treaties (Articles 46–53 and 64). It has to be said, however, that the subject is not of the slightest importance in the day-to-day work of a foreign ministry. The author does not recall during more than thirty years of practice a single serious suggestion that an existing treaty might be invalid. The International Law Commission was well aware that invalidity was a rarity, there being a natural presumption that a treaty is valid and its continuance in force being the normal state of things. Nevertheless, learned works continue to devote considerable space to the topic, which has a certain fascination for lawyers.² What follows is a short account, in which we can step back in time a little.

Violation of internal law on competence to conclude treaties

The overriding need for certainty in treaty relations is clearly reflected in the wording of Article 46, which provides that:

- (1) A State may not invoke the fact that its consent to be bound by a treaty has been expressed in violation of a provision of its internal law regarding competence to conclude treaties as invalidating its consent unless that violation was manifest and concerned a rule of its internal law of fundamental importance.
- (2) A violation is manifest if it would be objectively evident to any State conducting itself in the matter in accordance with normal practice and in good faith.

¹ McNair, p. 207, or duress.

² Sinclair, pp. 159–81 and 203–26, contains a thorough account.

The provision is expressed in negative form ('may not invoke . . . unless') to emphasise the exceptional character of the cases in which this ground might be invoked. There are a number of procedures in treaty-making, such as ratification, which have been specifically designed to enable a state to reflect fully before deciding whether or not to become a party, and to comply with any constitutional requirements. States are entitled to regard other states as having acted in good faith when its representatives express their consent to be bound. *

Although not directly relevant, the judgment of the European Court of Justice in *France v. Commission*³ is instructive. The Court held that the European Community (EC) had concluded a treaty with the United States in contravention of internal EC rules governing the competence of various EC organs to conclude treaties. However, the Court did not claim that the treaty was not binding on the EC in international law. Given the complexity of EC internal rules,⁴ if the EC enters into a treaty in breach of those rules any internal irregularity is most unlikely to be manifest. It is therefore unlikely that the EC could invoke any rule of customary international law which might be reflected in Article 46, or rather the equivalent article in the 1986 Convention.⁵

If a state seeks to invoke constitutional defects after the treaty has entered into force and after the state has been carrying it out, it will be estopped⁶ (i.e., prevented) from asserting the invalidity of its consent to be bound.

Article 46 must be distinguished from Article 27, which provides that a party may not invoke the provisions of its internal law as justification for its failure to perform a treaty.⁷ That rule applies unless the treaty has been held to be invalid.

Violation of specific restrictions on authority to express consent

An omission by the representative of a state to observe a specific (internal) restriction on his authority to express the consent of his state to be bound may not be invoked as invalidating that consent unless the restriction was

³ [1994] ECR V-3641. ⁴ See pp. 55–6 above.

⁵ The EC is not party to the 1986 Convention, but the European Court of Justice has held that the rules in the 1969 Convention apply to the EC to the extent that they reflect rules of customary international law: *Racke* (Case C-162/96; ILM (1998), p. 1128) AJIL (1999) 205–9.

⁶ See p. 45 above. ⁷ See p. 144 above.

ANNEX 6:

Case Concerning the Gabčíkovo ICJ Judgment 25 September 1997.

2027

INTERNATIONAL COURT OF JUSTICE

YEAR 1997

1997
25 September
General List
No. 92

25 September 1997

CASE CONCERNING THE GABČIKOVO-NAGYMAROS PROJECT

(HUNGARY/SLOVAKIA)

Treaty of 16 September 1977 concerning the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros System of Locks — "Related instruments".

Suspension and abandonment by Hungary, in 1989, of works on the Project — Applicability of the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties — Law of treaties and law of State responsibility — State of necessity as a ground for precluding the wrongfulness of an act — "Essential interest" of the State committing the act — Environment — "Grave and imminent peril" — Act having to constitute the "only means" of safeguarding the interest threatened — State having "contributed to the occurrence of the state of necessity".

Czechoslovakia's proceeding, in November 1991, to "Variant C" and putting into operation, from October 1992, this Variant — Arguments drawn from a proposed principle of approximate application — Respect for the limits of the Treaty — Right to an equitable and reasonable share of the resources of an international watercourse — Commission of a wrongful act and prior conduct of a preparatory character — Obligation to mitigate damages — Principle concerning only the calculation of damages — Countermeasures — Response to an internationally wrongful act — Proportionality — Assumption of unilateral control of a shared resource.

Notification by Hungary, on 19 May 1992, of the termination of the 1977 Treaty and related instruments — Legal effects — Matter falling within the law of treaties — Articles 60 to 62 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties — Customary law — Impossibility of performance — Permanent disappearance or destruction of an "object" indispensable for execution — Impossibility of performance resulting from the breach, by the party invoking it, of an obligation under the Treaty — Fundamental change of circumstances — Essential basis of the consent of the parties — Extent of obligations still to be performed — Stability of treaty relations — Material breach of the Treaty — Date on which the breach occurred and date of notification of termination — Victim of a breach having itself committed a prior breach of the Treaty — Emergence of new norms of environmental law — Sustainable development — Treaty provisions permitting the parties, by mutual consent, to take account of those norms — Repudiation of the Treaty — Reciprocal non-compliance — Integrity of the rule pacta sunt servanda — Treaty remaining in force until terminated by mutual consent.

Legal consequences of the Judgment of the Court — Dissolution of Czechoslovakia — Article 12 of the Vienna Convention of 1978 on Succession of States in respect of Treaties — Customary law —

2028

Succession of States without effect on a treaty creating rights and obligations "attaching" to the territory — Irregular state of affairs as a result of failure of both Parties to comply with their treaty obligations — Ex injuria jus non oritur — Objectives of the Treaty — Obligations overtaken by events — Positions adopted by the parties after conclusion of the Treaty — Good faith negotiations — Effects of the Project on the environment — Agreed solution to be found by the Parties — Joint régime — Reparation for acts committed by both Parties — Co-operation in the use of shared water resources — Damages — Succession in respect of rights and obligations relating to the Project — Intersecting wrongs — Settlement of accounts for the construction of the works.

JUDGMENT

Present: President SCHWEBEL; Vice-President WEERAMANTRY; Judges ODA, BEDJAOU, GUILLAUME, RANJEVA, HERCZEGH, SHI, FLEISCHHAUER, KOROMA, VERESHCHETIN, PARRA-ARANGUREN, KOOIJMANS, REZEK; Judge ad hoc SKUBISZEWSKI; Registrar VALENCIA-OSPINA.

In the case concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project,

between

the Republic of Hungary,

represented by

H. E. Mr. György Szénási, Ambassador, Head of the International Law Department,
Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

as Agent and Counsel;

H. E. Mr. Dénes Tomaj, Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary to the Netherlands,

as Co-Agent;

Mr. James Crawford, Whewell Professor of International Law, University of Cambridge,

Mr. Pierre-Marie Dupuy, Professor at the University Panthéon-Assas (Paris II) and Director
of the *Institut des hautes études internationales* of Paris,

Mr. Alexandre Kiss, Director of Research, *Centre national de la recherche scientifique*
(ret.),

Mr. László Valki, Professor of International Law, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest,

Mr. Boldizsár Nagy, Associate Professor of International Law, Eötvös Loránd University,
Budapest,

Mr. Philippe Sands, Reader in International Law, University of London, School of Oriental
and African Studies, and Global Professor of Law, New York University,

2029

Ms Katherine Gorove, consulting Attorney,

as Counsel and Advocates;

Dr. Howard Wheeler, Professor of Hydrology, Imperial College, London,

Dr. Gábor Vida, Professor of Biology, Eötvös Loránd University, Budapest, Member of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences,

Dr. Roland Carbiener, Professor emeritus of the University of Strasbourg,

Dr. Klaus Kern, consulting Engineer, Karlsruhe,

as Advocates;

Mr. Edward Helgeson,

Mr. Stuart Oldham,

Mr. Péter Molnár

as Advisers;

Dr. György Kovács,

Mr. Timothy Walsh,

Mr. Zoltán Kovács

as Technical Advisers;

Dr. Attila Nyikos,

as Assistant;

Mr. Axel Gosseries, LL.M.,

as Translator;

Ms Éva Kocsis,

Ms Katinka Tompa,

as Secretaries,

and

2030

the Slovak Republic,

represented by

H. E. Dr. Peter Tomka, Ambassador, Legal Adviser of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

as Agent;

Dr. Václav Mikulka, Member of the International Law Commission,

as Co-Agent, Counsel and Advocate;

Mr. Derek W. Bowett, C.B.E., Q.C., F.B.A., Whewell Professor emeritus of International Law at the University of Cambridge, Former Member of the International Law Commission,

as Counsel;

Mr. Stephen C. McCaffrey, Professor of International Law at the University of the Pacific, McGeorge School of Law, Sacramento, United States of America, Former Member of the International Law Commission,

Mr. Alain Pellet, Professor at the University of Paris X-Nanterre and at the Institute of Political Studies, Paris, Member of the International Law Commission,

Mr. Walter D. Sohler, Member of the Bar of the State of New York and of the District of Columbia,

Sir Arthur Watts, K.C.M.G., Q.C., Barrister, Member of the Bar of England and Wales,

Mr. Samuel S. Wordsworth, *avocat à la Cour d'appel de Paris*, Solicitor of the Supreme Court of England and Wales, Frere Cholmeley, Paris,

as Counsel and Advocates;

Mr. Igor Mucha, Professor of Hydrogeology and Former Head of the Groundwater Department at the Faculty of Natural Sciences of Comenius University in Bratislava,

Mr. Karra Venkateswara Rao, Director of Water Resources Engineering, Department of Civil Engineering, City University, London,

Mr. Jens Christian Refsgaard, Head of Research and Development, Danish Hydraulic Institute,

as Counsel and Experts;

Dr. Cecília Kandráiová, Director of Department, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

Mr. Ludík Krajhanzl, Attorney at Law, Vyroubal Krajhanzl Skácel and Partners, Prague,

2031

Mr. Miroslav Liška, Head of the Division for Public Relations and Expertise, Water Resources Development State Enterprise, Bratislava,

Dr. Peter Vršanský, Minister-Counsellor, Chargé d'affaires *a.i.*, of the Embassy of the Slovak Republic, The Hague,

as Counsellors;

Miss Anouche Beaudouin, *allocataire de recherche* at the University of Paris X-Nanterre,

Ms Cheryl Dunn, Frere Cholmeley, Paris,

Ms Nikoleta Glindová, *attachée*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

Mr. Drahošlav Štefánek, *attaché*, Ministry of Foreign Affairs,

as Legal Assistants,

THE COURT

composed as above,

after deliberation,

delivers the following Judgment:

1. By a letter dated 2 July 1993, filed in the Registry of the Court on the same day, the Ambassador of the Republic of Hungary (hereinafter called "Hungary") to the Netherlands and the Chargé d'affaires *ad interim* of the Slovak Republic (hereinafter called "Slovakia") to the Netherlands jointly notified to the Court a Special Agreement in English that had been signed at Brussels on 7 April 1993 and had entered into force on 28 June 1993, on the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification.

2. The text of the Special Agreement reads as follows:

"The Republic of Hungary and the Slovak Republic,

Considering that differences have arisen between the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the Republic of Hungary regarding the implementation and the termination of the Treaty on the Construction and Operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Barrage System signed in Budapest on 16 September 1977 and related instruments (hereinafter referred to as "the Treaty"), and on the construction and operation of the "provisional solution";

Bearing in mind that the Slovak Republic is one of the two successor States of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the sole successor State in respect of rights and obligations relating to the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project;

Recognizing that the Parties concerned have been unable to settle these differences by negotiations;

Having in mind that both the Czechoslovak and Hungarian delegations expressed their

2032

commitment to submit the differences connected with the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project in all its aspects to binding international arbitration or to the International Court of Justice;

Desiring that these differences should be settled by the International Court of Justice;

Recalling their commitment to apply, pending the Judgment of the International Court of Justice, such a temporary water management régime of the Danube as shall be agreed between the Parties;

Desiring further to define the issues to be submitted to the International Court of Justice,

Have agreed as follows:

Article 1

The Parties submit the questions contained in Article 2 to the International Court of Justice pursuant to Article 40, paragraph 1, of the Statute of the Court.

Article 2

(1) The Court is requested to decide on the basis of the Treaty and rules and principles of general international law, as well as such other treaties as the Court may find applicable,

(a) whether the Republic of Hungary was entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon, in 1989, the works on the Nagymaros Project and on the part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the Treaty attributed responsibility to the Republic of Hungary;

(b) whether the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was entitled to proceed, in November 1991, to the "provisional solution" and to put into operation from October 1992 this system, described in the Report of the Working Group of Independent Experts of the Commission of the European Communities, the Republic of Hungary and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic dated 23 November 1992 (damming up of the Danube at river kilometre 1851.7 on Czechoslovak territory and resulting consequences on water and navigation course);

(c) what are the legal effects of the notification, on 19 May 1992, of the termination of the Treaty by the Republic of Hungary.

(2) The Court is also requested to determine the legal consequences, including the rights and obligations for the Parties, arising from its Judgment on the questions in paragraph 1 of this Article.

Article 3

(1) All questions of procedure and evidence shall be regulated in accordance with the provisions of the Statute and the Rules of Court.

(2) However, the Parties request the Court to order that the written proceedings should

2033

consist of:

- (a) a Memorial presented by each of the Parties not later than ten months after the date of notification of this Special Agreement to the Registrar of the International Court of Justice;
- (b) a Counter-Memorial presented by each of the Parties not later than seven months after the date on which each has received the certified copy of the Memorial of the other Party;
- (c) a Reply presented by each of the Parties within such time-limits as the Court may order.
- (d) The Court may request additional written pleadings by the Parties if it so determines.

(3) The above-mentioned parts of the written proceedings and their annexes presented to the Registrar will not be transmitted to the other Party until the Registrar has received the corresponding part of the proceedings from the said Party.

Article 4

- (1) The Parties agree that, pending the final Judgment of the Court, they will establish and implement a temporary water management régime for the Danube.
- (2) They further agree that, in the period before such a régime is established or implemented, if either Party believes its rights are endangered by the conduct of the other, it may request immediate consultation and reference, if necessary, to experts, including the Commission of the European Communities, with a view to protecting those rights; and that protection shall not be sought through a request to the Court under Article 41 of the Statute.
- (3) This commitment is accepted by both Parties as fundamental to the conclusion and continuing validity of the Special Agreement.

Article 5

- (1) The Parties shall accept the Judgment of the Court as final and binding upon them and shall execute it in its entirety and in good faith.
- (2) Immediately after the transmission of the Judgment the Parties shall enter into negotiations on the modalities for its execution.
- (3) If they are unable to reach agreement within six months, either Party may request the Court to render an additional Judgment to determine the modalities for executing its Judgment.

Article 6

- (1) The present Special Agreement shall be subject to ratification.

2034

(2) The instruments of ratification shall be exchanged as soon as possible in Brussels.

(3) The present Special Agreement shall enter into force on the date of exchange of instruments of ratification. Thereafter it will be notified jointly to the Registrar of the Court.

In witness whereof the undersigned being duly authorized thereto, have signed the present Special Agreement and have affixed thereto their seals."

3. Pursuant to Article 40, paragraph 3, of the Statute and Article 42 of the Rules of Court, copies of the notification and of the Special Agreement were transmitted by the Registrar to the Secretary-General of the United Nations, Members of the United Nations and other States entitled to appear before the Court.
4. Since the Court included upon the Bench no judge of Slovak nationality, Slovakia exercised its right under Article 31, paragraph 2, of the Statute to choose a judge *ad hoc* to sit in the case: it chose Mr. Krzysztof Jan Skubiszewski.
5. By an Order dated 14 July 1993, the Court fixed 2 May 1994 as the time-limit for the filing by each of the Parties of a Memorial and 5 December 1994 for the filing by each of the Parties of a Counter-Memorial, having regard to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 2 (a) and (b), of the Special Agreement. Those pleadings were duly filed within the prescribed time-limits.
6. By an Order dated 20 December 1994, the President of the Court, having heard the Agents of the Parties, fixed 20 June 1995 as the time-limit for the filing of the Replies, having regard to the provisions of Article 3, paragraph 2 (c), of the Special Agreement. The Replies were duly filed within the time-limit thus prescribed and, as the Court had not asked for the submission of additional pleadings, the case was then ready for hearing.
7. By letters dated 27 January 1997, the Agent of Slovakia, referring to the provisions of Article 56, paragraph 1, of the Rules of Court, expressed his Government's wish to produce two new documents; by a letter dated 10 February 1997, the Agent of Hungary declared that his Government objected to their production. On 26 February 1997, after having duly ascertained the views of the two Parties, the Court decided, in accordance with Article 56, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Court, to authorize the production of those documents under certain conditions of which the Parties were advised. Within the time-limit fixed by the Court to that end, Hungary submitted comments on one of those documents under paragraph 3 of that same Article. The Court authorized Slovakia to comment in turn upon those observations, as it had expressed a wish to do so; its comments were received within the time-limit prescribed for that purpose.
8. Moreover, each of the Parties asked to be allowed to show a video cassette in the course of the oral proceedings. The Court agreed to those requests, provided that the cassettes in question were exchanged in advance between the Parties, through the intermediary of the Registry. That exchange was effected accordingly.
9. In accordance with Article 53, paragraph 2, of the Rules of Court, the Court decided, after having ascertained the views of the Parties, that copies of the pleadings and documents annexed would be made available to the public as from the opening of the oral proceedings.
10. By a letter dated 16 June 1995, the Agent of Slovakia invited the Court to visit the locality to which the case relates and there to exercise its functions with regard to the obtaining of evidence, in accordance with Article 66 of the Rules of Court. For his part, the Agent of Hungary indicated, by a letter dated 28

2035

June 1995, that, if the Court should decide that a visit of that kind would be useful, his Government would be pleased to co-operate in organizing it. By a letter dated 14 November 1995, the Agents of the Parties jointly notified to the Court the text of a Protocol of Agreement, concluded in Budapest and New York the same day, with a view to proposing to the Court the arrangements that might be made for such a visit *in situ*; and, by a letter dated 3 February 1997, they jointly notified to it the text of Agreed Minutes drawn up in Budapest and New York the same day, which supplemented the Protocol of Agreement of 14 November 1995. By an Order dated 5 February 1997, the Court decided to accept the invitation to exercise its functions with regard to the obtaining of evidence at a place to which the case relates and, to that end, to adopt the arrangements proposed by the Parties. The Court visited the area from 1 to 4 April 1997; it visited a number of locations along the Danube and took note of the technical explanations given by the representatives who had been designated for the purpose by the Parties.

11. The Court held a first round of ten public hearings from 3 to 7 March and from 24 to 27 March 1997, and a second round of four public hearings on 10, 11, 14 and 15 April 1997, after having made the visit *in situ* referred to in the previous paragraph. During those hearings, the Court heard the oral arguments and replies of:

For Hungary : H. E. Mr. Szénási,
Professor Valki,
Professor Kiss,
Professor Vida,
Professor Carbiener,
Professor Crawford,
Professor Nagy,
Dr. Kern,
Professor Wheeler,
Ms Gorove,
Professor Dupuy,
Professor Sands.

For Slovakia : H. E. Dr. Tomka,
Dr. Mikulka,
Mr. Wordsworth,
Professor McCaffrey,
Professor Mucha,
Professor Pellet,
Mr. Refsgaard,
Sir Arthur Watts.

12. The Parties replied orally and in writing to various questions put by Members of the Court. Referring to the provisions of Article 72 of the Rules of Court, each of the Parties submitted to the Court its comments upon the replies given by the other Party to some of those questions.

*

13. In the course of the written proceedings, the following submissions were presented by the Parties:

2036

On behalf of Hungary,

in the Memorial, the Counter-Memorial and the Reply (mutatis mutandis identical texts):

"On the basis of the evidence and legal argument presented in the Memorial, Counter-Memorial and this Reply, the Republic of Hungary

Requests the Court to adjudge and declare

First, that the Republic of Hungary was entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon the works on the Nagymaros Project and on the part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the Treaty attributed responsibility to the Republic of Hungary;

Second, that the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was not entitled to proceed to the 'provisional solution' (damming up of the Danube at river kilometres 1,851.7 on Czechoslovak territory and resulting consequences on water and navigation course);

Third, that by its Declaration of 19 May 1992, Hungary validly terminated the Treaty on the Construction and Operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Barrage System of 16 September 1977;

Requests the Court to adjudge and declare further

that the legal consequences of these findings and of the evidence and the arguments presented to the Court are as follows:

(1) that the Treaty of 16 September 1977 has never been in force between the Republic of Hungary and the Slovak Republic;

(2) that the Slovak Republic bears responsibility to the Republic of Hungary for maintaining in operation the 'provisional solution' referred to above;

(3) that the Slovak Republic is internationally responsible for the damage and loss suffered by the Republic of Hungary and by its nationals as a result of the 'provisional solution';

(4) that the Slovak Republic is under an obligation to make reparation in respect of such damage and loss, the amount of such reparation, if it cannot be agreed by the Parties within six months of the date of the Judgment of the Court, to be determined by the Court;

(5) that the Slovak Republic is under the following obligations:

(a) to return the waters of the Danube to their course along the international frontier between the Republic of Hungary and the Slovak Republic, that is to say the main navigable channel as defined by applicable treaties;

(b) to restore the Danube to the situation it was in prior to the putting into effect of the provisional solution; and

2037

(c) to provide appropriate guarantees against the repetition of the damage and loss suffered by the Republic of Hungary and by its nationals."

On behalf of Slovakia:

in the Memorial, the Counter-Memorial and the Reply (mutatis mutandis identical texts):

"On the basis of the evidence and legal arguments presented in the Slovak Memorial, Counter-Memorial and in this Reply, and reserving the right to supplement or amend its claims in the light of further written pleadings, the Slovak Republic

Requests the Court to adjudge and declare:

- 1. That the Treaty between Czechoslovakia and Hungary of 16 September 1977 concerning the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo/Nagymaros System of Locks, and related instruments, and to which the Slovak Republic is the acknowledged successor, is a treaty in force and has been so from the date of its conclusion; and that the notification of termination by the Republic of Hungary on 19 May 1992 was without legal effect.*
- 2. That the Republic of Hungary was not entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon the works on the Nagymaros Project and on that part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the 1977 Treaty attributed responsibility to the Republic of Hungary.*
- 3. That the act of proceeding with and putting into operation Variant C, the 'provisional solution', was lawful.*
- 4. That the Republic of Hungary must therefore cease forthwith all conduct which impedes the full and bona fide implementation of the 1977 Treaty and must take all necessary steps to fulfil its own obligations under the Treaty without further delay in order to restore compliance with the Treaty.*
- 5. That, in consequence of its breaches of the 1977 Treaty, the Republic of Hungary is liable to pay, and the Slovak Republic is entitled to receive, full compensation for the loss and damage caused to the Slovak Republic by those breaches, plus interest and loss of profits, in the amounts to be determined by the Court in a subsequent phase of the proceedings in this case."*

14. In the oral proceedings, the following submissions were presented by the Parties

On behalf of Hungary,

at the hearing of 11 April 1997:

The submissions read at the hearing were mutatis mutandis identical to those presented by Hungary during the written proceedings.

On behalf of Slovakia:

at the hearing of 15 April 1997:

2038

"On the basis of the evidence and legal arguments presented in its written and oral pleadings, the Slovak Republic,

Requests the Court to adjudge and declare:

- 1. That the Treaty, as defined in the first paragraph of the Preamble to the Compromis between the Parties, dated 7 April 1993, concerning the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo/Nagymaros System of Locks and related instruments, concluded between Hungary and Czechoslovakia and with regard to which the Slovak Republic is the successor State, has never ceased to be in force and so remains, and that the notification of 19 May 1992 of purported termination of the Treaty by the Republic of Hungary was without legal effect;*
- 2. That the Republic of Hungary was not entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon the works on the Nagymaros Project and on that part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the 1977 Treaty attributes responsibility to the Republic of Hungary;*
- 3. That the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was entitled, in November 1991, to proceed with the 'provisional solution' and to put this system into operation from October 1992; and that the Slovak Republic was, and remains, entitled to continue the operation of this system;*
- 4. That the Republic of Hungary shall therefore cease forthwith all conduct which impedes the bona fide implementation of the 1977 Treaty and shall take all necessary steps to fulfil its own obligations under the Treaty without further delay in order to restore compliance with the Treaty, subject to any amendments which may be agreed between the Parties;*
- 5. That the Republic of Hungary shall give appropriate guarantees that it will not impede the performance of the Treaty, and the continued operation of the system;*
- 6. That, in consequence of its breaches of the 1977 Treaty, the Republic of Hungary shall, in addition to immediately resuming performance of its Treaty obligations, pay to the Slovak Republic full compensation for the loss and damage, including loss of profits, caused by those breaches together with interest thereon;*
- 7. That the Parties shall immediately begin negotiations with a view, in particular, to adopting a new timetable and appropriate measures for the implementation of the Treaty by both Parties, and to fixing the amount of compensation due by the Republic of Hungary to the Slovak Republic; and that, if the Parties are unable to reach an agreement within six months, either one of them may request the Court to render an additional Judgment to determine the modalities for executing its Judgment."*

*

* *

15. The present case arose out of the signature, on 16 September 1977, by the Hungarian People's Republic and the Czechoslovak People's Republic, of a treaty "concerning the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros System of Locks" (hereinafter called the "1977 Treaty"). The names of the two contracting States have varied over the years; hereinafter they will be referred to as Hungary and Czechoslovakia. The 1977 Treaty entered into force on 30 June 1978.

2039

It provides for the construction and operation of a System of Locks by the parties as a "joint investment". According to its Preamble, the barrage system was designed to attain "the broad utilization of the natural resources of the Bratislava-Budapest section of the Danube river for the development of water resources, energy, transport, agriculture and other sectors of the national economy of the Contracting Parties". The joint investment was thus essentially aimed at the production of hydroelectricity, the improvement of navigation on the relevant section of the Danube and the protection of the areas along the banks against flooding. At the same time, by the terms of the Treaty, the contracting parties undertook to ensure that the quality of water in the Danube was not impaired as a result of the Project, and that compliance with the obligations for the protection of nature arising in connection with the construction and operation of the System of Locks would be observed.

*16. The Danube is the second longest river in Europe, flowing along or across the borders of nine countries in its 2,860-kilometre course from the Black Forest eastwards to the Black Sea. For 142 kilometres, it forms the boundary between Slovakia and Hungary. The sector with which this case is concerned is a stretch of approximately 200 kilometres, between Bratislava in Slovakia and Budapest in Hungary. Below Bratislava, the river gradient decreases markedly, creating an alluvial plain of gravel and sand sediment. This plain is delimited to the north-east, in Slovak territory, by the Malý Danube and to the south-west, in Hungarian territory, by the Mosoni Danube. The boundary between the two States is constituted, in the major part of that region, by the main channel of the river. The area lying between the Malý Danube and that channel, in Slovak territory, constitutes the *itný Ostrov*; the area between the main channel and the Mosoni Danube, in Hungarian territory, constitutes the *Szigetköz*. *Cunovo* and, further downstream, *Gabčíkovo*, are situated in this sector of the river on Slovak territory, *Cunovo* on the right bank and *Gabčíkovo* on the left. Further downstream, after the confluence of the various branches, the river enters Hungarian territory and the topography becomes hillier. *Nagymaros* lies in a narrow valley at a bend in the Danube just before it turns south, enclosing the large river island of *Szentendre* before reaching Budapest (see sketch-map No. 1 - 85 kb).*

17. The Danube has always played a vital part in the commercial and economic development of its riparian States, and has underlined and reinforced their interdependence, making international co-operation essential. Improvements to the navigation channel have enabled the Danube, now linked by canal to the Main and thence to the Rhine, to become an important navigational artery connecting the North Sea to the Black Sea. In the stretch of river to which the case relates, flood protection measures have been constructed over the centuries, farming and forestry practised, and, more recently, there has been an increase in population and industrial activity in the area. The cumulative effects on the river and on the environment of various human activities over the years have not all been favourable, particularly for the water régime.

Only by international co-operation could action be taken to alleviate these problems. Water management projects along the Danube have frequently sought to combine navigational improvements and flood protection with the production of electricity through hydroelectric power plants. The potential of the Danube for the production of hydroelectric power has been extensively exploited by some riparian States. The history of attempts to harness the potential of the particular stretch of the river at issue in these proceedings extends over a 25-year period culminating in the signature of the 1977 Treaty.

*18. Article 1, paragraph 1, of the 1977 Treaty describes the principal works to be constructed in pursuance of the Project. It provided for the building of two series of locks, one at *Gabčíkovo* (in Czechoslovak territory) and the other at *Nagymaros* (in Hungarian territory), to constitute "a single and indivisible operational system of works" (see sketch-map No. 2 - 85 kb). The Court will subsequently have occasion to revert in more detail to those works, which were to comprise, inter alia, a reservoir upstream of *Dunakiliti*, in Hungarian and Czechoslovak territory; a dam at *Dunakiliti*, in Hungarian territory; a bypass canal, in Czechoslovak territory, on which was to be constructed the *Gabčíkovo**

2040

System of Locks (together with a hydroelectric power plant with an installed capacity of 720 megawatts (MW)); the deepening of the bed of the Danube downstream of the place at which the bypass canal was to rejoin the old bed of the river; a reinforcement of flood-control works along the Danube upstream of Nagymaros; the Nagymaros System of Locks, in Hungarian territory (with a hydroelectric power plant of a capacity of 158 MW); and the deepening of the bed of the Danube downstream.

Article 1, paragraph 4, of the Treaty further provided that the technical specifications concerning the system would be included in the "Joint Contractual Plan" which was to be drawn up in accordance with the Agreement signed by the two Governments for this purpose on 6 May 1976; Article 4, paragraph 1, for its part, specified that "the joint investment [would] be carried out in conformity with the joint contractual plan".

According to Article 3, paragraph 1,

"Operations connected with the realization of the joint investment and with the performance of tasks relating to the operation of the System of Locks shall be directed and supervised by the Governments of the Contracting Parties through . . . ('government delegates')."

Those delegates had, inter alia, "to ensure that construction of the System of Locks is . . . carried out in accordance with the approved joint contractual plan and the Project work schedule". When the works were brought into operation, they were moreover "To establish the operating and operational procedures of the System of Locks and ensure compliance therewith."

Article 4, paragraph 4, stipulated that:

"Operations relating to the joint investment [should] be organized by the Contracting Parties in such a way that the power generation plants [would] be put into service during the period 1986-1990."

Article 5 provided that the cost of the joint investment would be borne by the contracting parties in equal measure. It specified the work to be carried out by each one of them. Article 8 further stipulated that the Dunakiliti dam, the bypass canal and the two series of locks at Gabčíkovo and Nagymaros would be "jointly owned" by the contracting parties "in equal measure". Ownership of the other works was to be vested in the State on whose territory they were constructed.

The parties were likewise to participate in equal measure in the use of the system put in place, and more particularly in the use of the base-load and peak-load power generated at the hydroelectric power plants (Art. 9).

According to Article 10, the works were to be managed by the State on whose territory they were located, "in accordance with the jointly-agreed operating and operational procedures", while Article 12 stipulated that the operation, maintenance (repair) and reconstruction costs of jointly owned works of the System of Locks were also to be borne jointly by the contracting parties in equal measure.

According to Article 14,

"The discharge specified in the water balance of the approved joint contractual plan shall be ensured in the bed of the Danube [between Dunakiliti and Sap] unless natural conditions or other circumstances temporarily require a greater or smaller discharge."

2041

Paragraph 3 of that Article was worded as follows:

"In the event that the withdrawal of water in the Hungarian-Czechoslovak section of the Danube exceeds the quantities of water specified in the water balance of the approved joint contractual plan and the excess withdrawal results in a decrease in the output of electric power, the share of electric power of the Contracting Party benefiting from the excess withdrawal shall be correspondingly reduced."

Article 15 specified that the contracting parties "shall ensure, by the means specified in the joint contractual plan, that the quality of the water in the Danube is not impaired as a result of the construction and operation of the System of Locks".

Article 16 set forth the obligations of the contracting parties concerning the maintenance of the bed of the Danube.

Article 18, paragraph 1, provided as follows:

"The Contracting Parties, in conformity with the obligations previously assumed by them, and in particular with article 3 of the Convention concerning the regime of navigation on the Danube, signed at Belgrade on 18 August 1948, shall ensure uninterrupted and safe navigation on the international fairway both during the construction and during the operation of the System of Locks."

It was stipulated in Article 19 that:

"The Contracting Parties shall, through the means specified in the joint contractual plan, ensure compliance with the obligations for the protection of nature arising in connection with the construction and operation of the System of Locks."

Article 20 provided for the contracting parties to take appropriate measures, within the framework of their national investments, for the protection of fishing interests in conformity with the Convention concerning Fishing in the Waters of the Danube, signed at Bucharest on 29 January 1958.

According to Article 22, paragraph 1, of the Treaty, the contracting parties had, in connection with the construction and operation of the System of Locks, agreed on minor revision to the course of the State frontier between them as follows:

"(d) In the Dunakiliti-Hrušov head-water area, the State frontier shall run from boundary point 161.V.O.á. to boundary stone No. I.5. in a straight line in such a way that the territories affected, to the extent of about 10-10 hectares shall be offset between the two States."

It was further provided, in paragraph 2, that the revision of the State frontier and the exchange of territories so provided for should be effected "by the Contracting Parties on the basis of a separate treaty". No such treaty was concluded.

Finally a dispute settlement provision was contained in Article 27, worded as follows:

"1. The settlement of disputes in matters relating to the realization and operation of the System of Locks shall be a function of the government delegates."

2042

2. If the government delegates are unable to reach agreement on the matters in dispute, they shall refer them to the Governments of the Contracting Parties for decision."

19. The Joint Contractual Plan, referred to in the previous paragraph, set forth, on a large number of points, both the objectives of the system and the characteristics of the works. In its latest version it specified in paragraph 6.2 that the Gabčíkovo bypass canal would have a discharge capacity of 4,000 cubic metres per second (m^3/s). The power plant would include "Eight . . . turbines with 9.20 m diameter running wheels" and would "mainly operate in peak-load time and continuously during high water". This type of operation would give an energy production of 2,650 gigawatt/hours (GWh) per annum. The plan further stipulated in paragraph 4.4.2:

"The low waters are stored every day, which ensures the peak load time operation of the Gabčíkovo hydropower plant . . . a minimum of $50 m^3/s$ additional water is provided for the old bed [of the Danube] besides the water supply of the branch system."

The Plan further specified that, in the event that the discharge into the bypass canal exceeded 4,000-4,500 m^3/s , the excess amounts of water would be channelled into the old bed. Lastly, according to paragraph 7.7 of the Plan:

"The common operational regulation stipulates that concerning the operation of the Dunakiliti barrage in the event of need during the growing season 200 m^3/s discharge must be released into the old Danube bed, in addition to the occasional possibilities for rinsing the bed."

The Joint Contractual Plan also contained "Preliminary Operating and Maintenance Rules", Article 23 of which specified that "The final operating rules [should] be approved within a year of the setting into operation of the system." (Joint Contractual Plan, Summary Documentation, Vol. O-1-A.)

Nagymaros, with six turbines, was, according to paragraph 6.3 of the Plan, to be a "hydropower station . . . type of a basic power-station capable of operating in peak-load time for five hours at the discharge interval between 1,000-2,500 m^3/s " per day. The intended annual production was to be 1,025 GWh (i.e., 38 per cent of the production of Gabčíkovo, for an installed power only equal to 21 per cent of that of Gabčíkovo).

20. Thus, the Project was to have taken the form of an integrated joint project with the two contracting parties on an equal footing in respect of the financing, construction and operation of the works. Its single and indivisible nature was to have been realized through the Joint Contractual Plan which complemented the Treaty. In particular, Hungary would have had control of the sluices at Dunakiliti and the works at Nagymaros, whereas Czechoslovakia would have had control of the works at Gabčíkovo.

*

21. The schedule of work had for its part been fixed in an Agreement on mutual assistance signed by the two parties on 16 September 1977, at the same time as the Treaty itself. The Agreement moreover made some adjustments to the allocation of the works between the parties as laid down by the Treaty.

Work on the Project started in 1978. On Hungary's initiative, the two parties first agreed, by two Protocols signed on 10 October 1983 (one amending Article 4, paragraph 4, of the 1977 Treaty and the

2043

other the Agreement on mutual assistance), to slow the work down and to postpone putting into operation the power plants, and then, by a Protocol signed on 6 February 1989 (which amended the Agreement on mutual assistance), to accelerate the Project.

22. As a result of intense criticism which the Project had generated in Hungary, the Hungarian Government decided on 13 May 1989 to suspend the works at Nagymaros pending the completion of various studies which the competent authorities were to finish before 31 July 1989. On 21 July 1989, the Hungarian Government extended the suspension of the works at Nagymaros until 31 October 1989, and, in addition, suspended the works at Dunakiliti until the same date. Lastly, on 27 October 1989, Hungary decided to abandon the works at Nagymaros and to maintain the status quo at Dunakiliti.

23. During this period, negotiations were being held between the parties. Czechoslovakia also started investigating alternative solutions. One of them, subsequently known as "Variant C", entailed a unilateral diversion of the Danube by Czechoslovakia on its territory some 10 kilometres upstream of Dunakiliti (see sketch-map No. 3 - 88 kb). In its final stage, Variant C included the construction at Cunovo of an overflow dam and a levee linking that dam to the south bank of the bypass canal. The corresponding reservoir was to have a smaller surface area and provide approximately 30 per cent less storage than the reservoir initially contemplated. Provision was made for ancillary works, namely: an intake structure to supply the Mosoni Danube; a weir to enable, inter alia, floodwater to be directed along the old bed of the Danube; an auxiliary shiplock; and two hydroelectric power plants (one capable of an annual production of 4 GWh on the Mosoni Danube, and the other with a production of 174 GWh on the old bed of the Danube). The supply of water to the side-arms of the Danube on the Czechoslovak bank was to be secured by means of two intake structures in the bypass canal at Dobrohošť and Gabčíkovo. A solution was to be found for the Hungarian bank. Moreover, the question of the deepening of the bed of the Danube at the confluence of the bypass canal and the old bed of the river remained outstanding.

On 23 July 1991, the Slovak Government decided "to begin, in September 1991, construction to put the Gabčíkovo Project into operation by the provisional solution". That decision was endorsed by the Federal Czechoslovak Government on 25 July. Work on Variant C began in November 1991. Discussions continued between the two parties but to no avail, and, on 19 May 1992, the Hungarian Government transmitted to the Czechoslovak Government a Note Verbale terminating the 1977 Treaty with effect from 25 May 1992. On 15 October 1992, Czechoslovakia began work to enable the Danube to be closed and, starting on 23 October, proceeded to the damming of the river.

24. On 23 October 1992, the Court was seised of an "Application of the Republic of Hungary v. The Czech and Slovak Federal Republic on The Diversion of the Danube River"; however, Hungary acknowledged that there was no basis on which the Court could have founded its jurisdiction to entertain that application, on which Czechoslovakia took no action. In the meanwhile, the Commission of the European Communities had offered to mediate and, during a meeting of the two parties with the Commission held in London on 28 October 1992, the parties entered into a series of interim undertakings. They principally agreed that the dispute would be submitted to the International Court of Justice, that a tripartite fact-finding mission should report on Variant C not later than 31 October, and that a tripartite group of independent experts would submit suggestions as to emergency measures to be taken.

25. On 1 January 1993 Slovakia became an independent State. On 7 April 1993, the "Special Agreement for Submission to the International Court of Justice of the Differences Between the Republic of Hungary and the Slovak Republic Concerning the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project" was signed in Brussels, the text of which is reproduced in paragraph 2 above. After the Special Agreement was notified to the Court, Hungary informed the Court, by a letter dated 9 August 1993, that it considered its "initial

Application [to be] now without object, and . . . lapsed".

2044

According to Article 4 of the Special Agreement, "The Parties [agreed] that, pending the final Judgment of the Court, they [would] establish and implement a temporary water management régime for the Danube." However, this régime could not easily be settled. The filling of the Cunovo dam had rapidly led to a major reduction in the flow and in the level of the downstream waters in the old bed of the Danube as well as in the side-arms of the river. On 26 August 1993, Hungary and Slovakia reached agreement on the setting up of a tripartite group of experts (one expert designated by each party and three independent experts designated by the Commission of the European Communities)

"In order to provide reliable and undisputed data on the most important effects of the current water discharge and the remedial measures already undertaken as well as to make recommendations for appropriate measures."

On 1 December 1993, the experts designated by the Commission of the European Communities recommended the adoption of various measures to remedy the situation on a temporary basis. The Parties were unable to agree on these recommendations. After lengthy negotiations, they finally concluded an Agreement "concerning Certain Temporary Technical Measures and Discharges in the Danube and Mosoni branch of the Danube", on 19 April 1995. That Agreement raised the discharge of water into the Mosoni Danube to 43 m³/s. It provided for an annual average of 400 m³/s in the old bed (not including flood waters). Lastly, it provided for the construction by Hungary of a partially underwater weir near to Dunakiliti with a view to improving the water supply to the side-arms of the Danube on the Hungarian side. It was specified that this temporary agreement would come to an end 14 days after the Judgment of the Court.

*

* *

26. The first sub-paragraph of the Preamble to the Special Agreement covers the disputes arising between Czechoslovakia and Hungary concerning the application and termination, not only of the 1977 Treaty, but also of "related instruments"; the sub-paragraph specifies that, for the purposes of the Special Agreement, the 1977 Treaty and the said instruments shall be referred to as "the Treaty". "The Treaty" is expressly referred to in the wording of the questions submitted to the Court in Article 2, paragraph 1, sub-paragraphs (a) and (c), of the Special Agreement.

The Special Agreement however does not define the concept of "related instruments", nor does it list them. As for the Parties, they gave some consideration to that question — essentially in the written proceedings — without reaching agreement as to the exact meaning of the expression or as to the actual instruments referred to. The Court notes however that the Parties seemed to agree to consider that that expression covers at least the instruments linked to the 1977 Treaty which implement it, such as the Agreement on mutual assistance of 16 September 1977 and its amending Protocols dated, respectively, 10 October 1983 and 6 February 1989 (see paragraph 21 above), and the Agreement as to the common operational regulations of Plenipotentiaries fulfilling duties related to the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Barrage System signed in Bratislava on 11 October 1979. The Court notes that Hungary, unlike Slovakia, declined to apply the description of related instruments to the 1977 Treaty to the Joint Contractual Plan (see paragraph 19 above), which it refused to see as "an agreement at the same level as the other [...] related Treaties and inter State agreements".

Lastly the Court notes that the Parties, in setting out the replies which should in their view be given to

2045

the questions put in the Special Agreement, concentrated their reasoning on the 1977 Treaty; and that they would appear to have extended their arguments to "related instruments" in considering them as accessories to a whole treaty system, whose fate was in principle linked to that of the main part, the 1977 Treaty. The Court takes note of the positions of the Parties and considers that it does not need to go into this matter further at this juncture.

*

* *

27. The Court will now turn to a consideration of the questions submitted by the Parties. In terms of Article 2, paragraph 1 (a), of the Special Agreement, the Court is requested to decide first

"whether the Republic of Hungary was entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon, in 1989, the works on the Nagymaros Project and on the part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the Treaty attributed responsibility to the Republic of Hungary".

28. The Court would recall that the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros System of Locks is characterized in Article 1, paragraph 1, of the 1977 Treaty as a "single and indivisible operational system of works".

The principal works which were to constitute this system have been described in general terms above (see paragraph 18). Details of them are given in paragraphs 2 and 3 of Article 1 of the Treaty.

For Gabčíkovo, paragraph 2 lists the following works:

"(a) The Dunakiliti-Hrušov head-water installations in the Danube sector at r.km. (river kilometre(s)) 1860-1842, designed for a maximum flood stage of 131.10 m.B. (metres above sea-level, Baltic system), in Hungarian and Czechoslovak territory;

(b) The Dunakiliti dam and auxiliary navigation lock at r.km. 1842, in Hungarian territory;

(c) The by-pass canal (head-water canal and tail-water canal) at r.km. 1842-1811, in Czechoslovak territory;

(d) Series of locks on the by-pass canal, in Czechoslovak territory, consisting of a hydroelectric power plant with installed capacity of 720 MW, double navigation locks and appurtenances thereto;

(e) Improved old bed of the Danube at r.km. 1842-1811, in the joint Hungarian-Czechoslovak section;

(f) Deepened and regulated bed of the Danube at r.km. 1811-1791, in the joint Hungarian-Czechoslovak section."

For Nagymaros, paragraph 3 specifies the following works:

"(a) Head-water installations and flood-control works in the Danube sector at r.km. 1791-1696.25 and in the sectors of tributaries affected by flood waters, designed for a maximum flood stage of 107.83 m.B., in Hungarian and Czechoslovak territory;

2046

(b) Series of locks at r.km. 1696.25, in Hungarian territory, consisting of a dam, a hydroelectric power plant with installed capacity of 158 MW, double navigation locks and appurtenances thereto;

(c) Deepened and regulated bed of the Danube, in both its branches, at r.km. 1696.25-1657, in the Hungarian section."

29. Moreover, the precise breakdown of the works incumbent on each party was set out in Article 5, paragraph 5, of the 1977 Treaty, as follows:

"5. The labour and supplies required for the realization of the joint investment shall be apportioned between the Contracting Parties in the following manner:

(a) The Czechoslovak Party shall be responsible for:

(1) The Dunakiliti-Hrušov head-water installations on the left bank, in Czechoslovak territory;

(2) The head-water canal of the by-pass canal, in Czechoslovak territory;

(3) The Gabčíkovo series of locks, in Czechoslovak territory;

(4) The flood-control works of the Nagymaros head-water installations, in Czechoslovak territory, with the exception of the lower Ipel district;

(5) Restoration of vegetation in Czechoslovak territory;

(b) The Hungarian Party shall be responsible for:

(1) The Dunakiliti-Hrušov head-water installations on the right bank, in Czechoslovak territory, including the connecting weir and the diversionary weir;

(2) The Dunakiliti-Hrušov head-water installations on the right bank, in Hungarian territory;

(3) The Dunakiliti dam, in Hungarian territory;

(4) The tail-water canal of the by-pass canal, in Czechoslovak territory;

(5) Deepening of the bed of the Danube below Palkovièovo, in Hungarian and Czechoslovak territory;

(6) Improvement of the old bed of the Danube, in Hungarian and Czechoslovak territory;

(7) Operational equipment of the Gabčíkovo system of locks (transport equipment, maintenance machinery), in Czechoslovak territory;

(8) The flood-control works of the Nagymaros head-water installations in the lower Ipel district, in Czechoslovak territory;

2047

(9) *The flood-control works of the Nagymaros head-water installations, in Hungarian territory;*

(10) *The Nagymaros series of locks, in Hungarian territory;*

(11) *Deepening of the tail-water bed below the Nagymaros system of locks, in Hungarian territory;*

(12) *Operational equipment of the Nagymaros system of locks (transport equipment, maintenance machinery), in Hungarian territory;*

(13) *Restoration of vegetation in Hungarian territory."*

30. As the Court has already indicated (see paragraph 18 above), Article 1, paragraph 4, of the 1977 Treaty stipulated in general terms that the "technical specifications" concerning the System of Locks would be included in the "joint contractual plan". The schedule of work had for its part been fixed in an Agreement on mutual assistance signed by the two parties on 16 September 1977 (see paragraph 21 above). In accordance with the provisions of Article 1, paragraph 1, of that Agreement, the whole of the works of the barrage system were to have been completed in 1991. As indicated in paragraph 2 of that same article, a summary construction schedule was appended to the Agreement, and provision was made for a more detailed schedule to be worked out in the Joint Contractual Plan. The Agreement of 16 September 1977 was twice amended further. By a Protocol signed on 10 October 1983, the parties agreed first to postpone the works and the putting into operation of the power plants for four more years; then, by a Protocol signed on 6 February 1989, the parties decided, conversely, to bring them forward by 15 months, the whole system having to be operational in 1994. A new summary construction schedule was appended to each of those Protocols; those schedules were in turn to be implemented by means of new detailed schedules, included in the Joint Contractual Plan.

31. In spring 1989, the work on the Gabčíkovo sector was well advanced: the Dunakiliti dam was 90 per cent complete, the Gabčíkovo dam was 85 per cent complete, and the bypass canal was between 60 per cent complete (downstream of Gabčíkovo) and 95 per cent complete (upstream of Gabčíkovo) and the dykes of the Dunakiliti-Hrušov reservoir were between 70 and 98 per cent complete, depending on the location. This was not the case in the Nagymaros sector where, although dykes had been built, the only structure relating to the dam itself was the coffer-dam which was to facilitate its construction.

32. In the wake of the profound political and economic changes which occurred at this time in central Europe, the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project was the object, in Czechoslovakia and more particularly in Hungary, of increasing apprehension, both within a section of public opinion and in some scientific circles. The uncertainties not only about the economic viability of the Project, but also, and more so, as to the guarantees it offered for preservation of the environment, engendered a climate of growing concern and opposition with regard to the Project.

33. It was against this background that, on 13 May 1989, the Government of Hungary adopted a resolution to suspend works at Nagymaros, and ordered:

"the Ministers concerned to commission further studies in order to place the Council of Ministers in a position where it can make well-founded suggestions to the Parliament in connection with the amendment of the international treaty on the investment. In the interests of the above, we must examine the international and legal consequences, the technical considerations, the obligations related to continuous navigation on the Danube and the

2048

environmental/ecological and seismic impacts of the eventual stopping of the Nagymaros investment. To be further examined are the opportunities for the replacement of the lost electric energy and the procedures for minimising claims for compensation."

The suspension of the works at Nagymaros was intended to last for the duration of these studies, which were to be completed by 31 July 1989. Czechoslovakia immediately protested and a document defining the position of Czechoslovakia was transmitted to the Ambassador of Hungary in Prague on 15 May 1989. The Prime Ministers of the two countries met on 24 May 1989, but their talks did not lead to any tangible result. On 2 June, the Hungarian Parliament authorized the Government to begin negotiations with Czechoslovakia for the purpose of modifying the 1977 Treaty.

34. At a meeting held by the Plenipotentiaries on 8 and 9 June 1989, Hungary gave Czechoslovakia a number of assurances concerning the continuation of works in the Gabčíkovo sector, and the signed Protocol which records that meeting contains the following passage:

"The Hungarian Government Commissioner and the Hungarian Plenipotentiary stated, that the Hungarian side will complete construction of the Gabčíkovo Project in the agreed time and in accordance with the project plans. Directives have already been given to continue works suspended in the area due to misunderstanding."

These assurances were reiterated in a letter that the Commissioner of the Government of Hungary addressed to the Czechoslovak Plenipotentiary on 9 June 1989.

35. With regard to the suspension of work at Nagymaros, the Hungarian Deputy-Prime Minister, in a letter dated 24 June 1989 addressed to his Czechoslovak counterpart, expressed himself in the following terms:

"The Hungarian Academy of Sciences (HAS) has studied the environmental, ecological and water quality as well as the seismological impacts of abandoning or implementing the Nagymaros Barrage of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Barrage System (GNBS).

.....

Having studied the expected impacts of the construction in accordance with the original plan, the Committee [ad hoc] of the Academy [set up for this purpose] came to the conclusion that we do not have adequate knowledge of the consequences of environmental risks.

In its opinion, the risk of constructing the Barrage System in accordance with the original plan cannot be considered acceptable. Of course, it cannot be stated either that the adverse impacts will ensue for certain, therefore, according to their recommendation, further thorough and time consuming studies are necessary."

36. The Hungarian and Czechoslovak Prime Ministers met again on 20 July 1989 to no avail. Immediately after that meeting, the Hungarian Government adopted a second resolution, under which the suspension of work at Nagymaros was extended to 31 October 1989. However, this resolution went further, as it also prescribed the suspension, until the same date, of the "Preparatory works on the closure of the riverbed at . . . Dunakiliti"; the purpose of this measure was to invite "international scientific institutions [and] foreign scientific institutes and experts" to co-operate with "the Hungarian and Czechoslovak institutes and experts" with a view to an assessment of the ecological impact of the

2049

Project and the "development of a technical and operational water quality guarantee system and . . . its implementation".

37. In the ensuing period, negotiations were conducted at various levels between the two States, but proved fruitless. Finally, by a letter dated 4 October 1989, the Hungarian Prime Minister formally proposed to Czechoslovakia that the Nagymaros sector of the Project be abandoned and that an agreement be concluded with a view to reducing the ecological risks associated with the Gabčíkovo sector of the Project. He proposed that that agreement should be concluded before 30 July 1990.

The two Heads of Government met on 26 October 1989, and were unable to reach agreement. By a Note Verbale dated 30 October 1989, Czechoslovakia, confirming the views it had expressed during those talks, proposed to Hungary that they should negotiate an agreement on a system of technical, operational and ecological guarantees relating to the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project, "on the assumption that the Hungarian party will immediately commence preparatory work on the refilling of the Danube's bed in the region of Dunakiliti". It added that the technical principles of the agreement could be initialled within two weeks and that the agreement itself ought to be signed before the end of March 1990. After the principles had been initialled, Hungary "[was to] start the actual closure of the Danube bed". Czechoslovakia further stated its willingness to "conclu[de] . . . a separate agreement in which both parties would oblige themselves to limitations or exclusion of peak hour operation mode of the . . . System". It also proposed "to return to deadlines indicated in the Protocol of October 1983", the Nagymaros construction deadlines being thus extended by 15 months, so as to enable Hungary to take advantage of the time thus gained to study the ecological issues and formulate its own proposals in due time. Czechoslovakia concluded by announcing that, should Hungary continue unilaterally to breach the Treaty, Czechoslovakia would proceed with a provisional solution.

In the meantime, the Hungarian Government had on 27 October adopted a further resolution, deciding to abandon the construction of the Nagymaros dam and to leave in place the measures previously adopted for suspending the works at Dunakiliti. Then, by Notes Verbales dated 3 and 30 November 1989, Hungary proposed to Czechoslovakia a draft treaty incorporating its earlier proposals, relinquishing peak power operation of the Gabčíkovo power plant and abandoning the construction of the Nagymaros dam. The draft provided for the conclusion of an agreement on the completion of Gabčíkovo in exchange for guarantees on protection of the environment. It finally envisaged the possibility of one or other party seising an arbitral tribunal or the International Court of Justice in the event that differences of view arose and persisted between the two Governments about the construction and operation of the Gabčíkovo dam, as well as measures to be taken to protect the environment. Hungary stated that it was ready to proceed immediately "with the preparatory operations for the Dunakiliti bed-decanting", but specified that the river would not be dammed at Dunakiliti until the agreement on guarantees had been concluded.

38. During winter 1989-1990, the political situation in Czechoslovakia and Hungary alike was transformed, and the new Governments were confronted with many new problems.

In spring 1990, the new Hungarian Government, in presenting its National Renewal Programme, announced that the whole of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project was a "mistake" and that it would initiate negotiations as soon as possible with the Czechoslovak Government "on remedying and sharing the damages". On 20 December 1990, the Hungarian Government adopted a resolution for the opening of negotiations with Czechoslovakia on the termination of the Treaty by mutual consent and the conclusion of an agreement addressing the consequences of the termination. On 15 February 1991, the Hungarian Plenipotentiary transmitted a draft agreement along those lines to his Czechoslovak counterpart.

2050

On the same day, the Czechoslovak President declared that the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project constituted a "totalitarian, gigomaniac monument which is against nature", while emphasizing that "the problem [was] that [the Gabčíkovo power plant] [had] already been built". For his part, the Czechoslovak Minister of the Environment stated, in a speech given to Hungarian parliamentary committees on 11 September 1991, that "the G/N Project [was] an old, obsolete one", but that, if there were "many reasons to change, modify the treaty . . . it [was] not acceptable to cancel the treaty . . . and negotiate later on".

During the ensuing period, Hungary refrained from completing the work for which it was still responsible at Dunakiliti. Yet it continued to maintain the structures it had already built and, at the end of 1991, completed the works relating to the tailrace canal of the bypass canal assigned to it under Article 5, paragraph 5 (b), of the 1977 Treaty.

* *

39. The two Parties to this case concur in recognizing that the 1977 Treaty, the above-mentioned Agreement on mutual assistance of 1977 and the Protocol of 1989 were validly concluded and were duly in force when the facts recounted above took place.

Further, they do not dispute the fact that, however flexible they may have been, these texts did not envisage the possibility of the signatories unilaterally suspending or abandoning the work provided for therein, or even carrying it out according to a new schedule not approved by the two partners.

40. Throughout the proceedings, Hungary contended that, although it did suspend or abandon certain works, on the contrary, it never suspended the application of the 1977 Treaty itself. To justify its conduct, it relied essentially on a "state of ecological necessity".

Hungary contended that the various installations in the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros System of Locks had been designed to enable the Gabčíkovo power plant to operate in peak mode. Water would only have come through the plant twice each day, at times of peak power demand. Operation in peak mode required the vast expanse (60 km²) of the planned reservoir at Dunakiliti, as well as the Nagymaros dam, which was to alleviate the tidal effects and reduce the variation in the water level downstream of Gabčíkovo. Such a system, considered to be more economically profitable than using run-of-the-river plants, carried ecological risks which it found unacceptable.

According to Hungary, the principal ecological dangers which would have been caused by this system were as follows. At Gabčíkovo/Dunakiliti, under the original Project, as specified in the Joint Contractual Plan, the residual discharge into the old bed of the Danube was limited to 50 m³/s, in addition to the water provided to the system of side-arms. That volume could be increased to 200 m³/s during the growing season. Additional discharges, and in particular a number of artificial floods, could also be effected, at an unspecified rate. In these circumstances, the groundwater level would have fallen in most of the Szigetköz. Furthermore, the groundwater would then no longer have been supplied by the Danube — which, on the contrary, would have acted as a drain — but by the reservoir of stagnant water at Dunakiliti and the side-arms which would have become silted up. In the long term, the quality of water would have been seriously impaired. As for the surface water, risks of eutrophication would have arisen, particularly in the reservoir; instead of the old Danube there would have been a river choked with sand, where only a relative trickle of water would have flowed. The network of arms would have been for the most part cut off from the principal bed. The fluvial fauna and flora, like those in the alluvial plains, would have been condemned to extinction.

As for Nagymaros, Hungary argued that, if that dam had been built, the bed of the Danube upstream would have silted up and, consequently, the quality of the water collected in the bank-filtered wells would have deteriorated in this sector. What is more, the operation of the Gabčíkovo power plant in peak mode would have occasioned significant daily variations in the water level in the reservoir upstream, which would have constituted a threat to aquatic habitats in particular. Furthermore, the construction and operation of the Nagymaros dam would have caused the erosion of the riverbed downstream, along Szentendre Island. The water level of the river would therefore have fallen in this section and the yield of the bank-filtered wells providing two-thirds of the water supply of the city of Budapest would have appreciably diminished. The filter layer would also have shrunk or perhaps even disappeared, and fine sediments would have been deposited in certain pockets in the river. For this twofold reason, the quality of the infiltrating water would have been severely jeopardized.

From all these predictions, in support of which it quoted a variety of scientific studies, Hungary concluded that a "state of ecological necessity" did indeed exist in 1989.

41. In its written pleadings, Hungary also accused Czechoslovakia of having violated various provisions of the 1977 Treaty from before 1989 — in particular articles 15 and 19 relating, respectively, to water quality and nature protection — in refusing to take account of the now evident ecological dangers and insisting that the works be continued, notably at Nagymaros. In this context Hungary contended that, in accordance with the terms of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Agreement of 6 May 1976 concerning the Joint Contractual Plan, Czechoslovakia bore responsibility for research into the Project's impact on the environment; Hungary stressed that the research carried out by Czechoslovakia had not been conducted adequately, the potential effects of the Project on the environment of the construction having been assessed by Czechoslovakia only from September 1990. However, in the final stage of its argument, Hungary does not appear to have sought to formulate this complaint as an independent ground formally justifying the suspension and abandonment of the works for which it was responsible under the 1977 Treaty. Rather, it presented the violations of the Treaty prior to 1989, which it imputes to Czechoslovakia, as one of the elements contributing to the emergence of a state of necessity.

42. Hungary moreover contended from the outset that its conduct in the present case should not be evaluated only in relation to the law of treaties. It also observed that, in accordance with the provisions of Article 4, the Vienna Convention of 23 May 1969 on the Law of Treaties could not be applied to the 1977 Treaty, which was concluded before that Convention entered into force as between the parties. Hungary has indeed acknowledged, with reference to the jurisprudence of the Court, that in many respects the Convention reflects the existing customary law. Hungary nonetheless stressed the need to adopt a cautious attitude, while suggesting that the Court should consider, in each case, the conformity of the prescriptions of the Convention with customary international law.

43. Slovakia, for its part, denied that the basis for suspending or abandoning the performance of a treaty obligation can be found outside the law of treaties. It acknowledged that the 1969 Vienna Convention could not be applied as such to the 1977 Treaty, but at the same time stressed that a number of its provisions are a reflection of pre-existing rules of customary international law and specified that this is, in particular, the case with the provisions of Part V relating to invalidity, termination and suspension of the operation of treaties. Slovakia has moreover observed that, after the Vienna Convention had entered into force for both parties, Hungary affirmed its accession to the substantive obligations laid down by the 1977 Treaty when it signed the Protocol of 6 February 1989 that cut short the schedule of work; and this led it to conclude that the Vienna Convention was applicable to the "contractual legal régime" constituted by the network of interrelated agreements of which the Protocol of 1989 was a part.

44. In the course of the proceedings, Slovakia argued at length that the state of necessity upon which

8052

Hungary relied did not constitute a reason for the suspension of a treaty obligation recognized by the law of treaties. At the same time, it cast doubt upon whether "ecological necessity" or "ecological risk" could, in relation to the law of State responsibility, constitute a circumstance precluding the wrongfulness of an act.

In any event, Slovakia denied that there had been any kind of "ecological state of necessity" in this case either in 1989 or subsequently. It invoked the authority of various scientific studies when it claimed that Hungary had given an exaggeratedly pessimistic description of the situation. Slovakia did not, of course, deny that ecological problems could have arisen. However, it asserted that they could to a large extent have been remedied. It accordingly stressed that no agreement had been reached with respect to the modalities of operation of the Gabčíkovo power plant in peak mode, and claimed that the apprehensions of Hungary related only to operating conditions of an extreme kind. In the same way, it contended that the original Project had undergone various modifications since 1977 and that it would have been possible to modify it even further, for example with respect to the discharge of water reserved for the old bed of the Danube, or the supply of water to the side-arms by means of underwater weirs.

45. Slovakia moreover denied that it in any way breached the 1977 Treaty — particularly its Articles 15 and 19 — and maintained, inter alia, that according to the terms of Article 3, paragraph 2, of the Agreement of 6 May 1976 relating to the Joint Contractual Plan — research into the impact of the Project on the environment was not the exclusive responsibility of Czechoslovakia but of either one of the parties, depending on the location of the works.

Lastly, in its turn, it reproached Hungary with having adopted its unilateral measures of suspension and abandonment of the works in violation of the provisions of Article 27 of the 1977 Treaty (see paragraph 18 above), which it submits required prior recourse to the machinery for dispute settlement provided for in that Article.

* *

*46. The Court has no need to dwell upon the question of the applicability in the present case of the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties. It needs only to be mindful of the fact that it has several times had occasion to hold that some of the rules laid down in that Convention might be considered as a codification of existing customary law. The Court takes the view that in many respects this applies to the provisions of the Vienna Convention concerning the termination and the suspension of the operation of treaties, set forth in Articles 60 to 62 (see *Legal Consequences for States of the Continued Presence of South Africa in Namibia (South-West Africa) notwithstanding Security Council Resolution 276 (1970)*), Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1971, p. 47 and *Fisheries Jurisdiction (United Kingdom v. Iceland)*, Jurisdiction of the Court, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1973, p. 18; see also *Interpretation of the Agreement of 25 March 1951 between the WHO and Egypt*, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1980, pp. 95-96).*

Neither has the Court lost sight of the fact that the Vienna Convention is in any event applicable to the Protocol of 6 February 1989 whereby Hungary and Czechoslovakia agreed to accelerate completion of the works relating to the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project.

47. Nor does the Court need to dwell upon the question of the relationship between the law of treaties and the law of State responsibility, to which the Parties devoted lengthy arguments, as those two branches of international law obviously have a scope that is distinct. A determination of whether a convention is or is not in force, and whether it has or has not been properly suspended or denounced, is to be made pursuant to the law of treaties. On the other hand, an evaluation of the extent to which the

2053

suspension or denunciation of a convention, seen as incompatible with the law of treaties, involves the responsibility of the State which proceeded to it, is to be made under the law of State responsibility.

Thus the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties confines itself to defining — in a limitative manner — the conditions in which a treaty may lawfully be denounced or suspended; while the effects of a denunciation or suspension seen as not meeting those conditions are, on the contrary, expressly excluded from the scope of the Convention by operation of Article 73. It is moreover well established that, when a State has committed an internationally wrongful act, its international responsibility is likely to be involved whatever the nature of the obligation it has failed to respect (cf. Interpretation of Peace Treaties with Bulgaria, Hungary and Romania, Second Phase, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1950, p. 228; and see Article 17 of the Draft Articles on State Responsibility provisionally adopted by the International Law Commission on first reading, Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1980, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 32).

48. The Court cannot accept Hungary's argument to the effect that, in 1989, in suspending and subsequently abandoning the works for which it was still responsible at Nagymaros and at Dunakiliti, it did not, for all that, suspend the application of the 1977 Treaty itself or then reject that Treaty. The conduct of Hungary at that time can only be interpreted as an expression of its unwillingness to comply with at least some of the provisions of the Treaty and the Protocol of 6 February 1989, as specified in the Joint Contractual Plan. The effect of Hungary's conduct was to render impossible the accomplishment of the system of works that the Treaty expressly described as "single and indivisible".

The Court moreover observes that, when it invoked the state of necessity in an effort to justify that conduct, Hungary chose to place itself from the outset within the ambit of the law of State responsibility, thereby implying that, in the absence of such a circumstance, its conduct would have been unlawful. The state of necessity claimed by Hungary — supposing it to have been established — thus could not permit of the conclusion that, in 1989, it had acted in accordance with its obligations under the 1977 Treaty or that those obligations had ceased to be binding upon it. It would only permit the affirmation that, under the circumstances, Hungary would not incur international responsibility by acting as it did. Lastly, the Court points out that Hungary expressly acknowledged that, in any event, such a state of necessity would not exempt it from its duty to compensate its partner.

*

49. The Court will now consider the question of whether there was, in 1989, a state of necessity which would have permitted Hungary, without incurring international responsibility, to suspend and abandon works that it was committed to perform in accordance with the 1977 Treaty and related instruments.

50. In the present case, the Parties are in agreement in considering that the existence of a state of necessity must be evaluated in the light of the criteria laid down by the International Law Commission in Article 33 of the Draft Articles on the International Responsibility of States that it adopted on first reading. That provision is worded as follows:

"Article 33. State of necessity

1. A state of necessity may not be invoked by a State as a ground for precluding the wrongfulness of an act of that State not in conformity with an international obligation of the State unless:

(a) the act was the only means of safeguarding an essential interest of the State against a grave and imminent peril; and

2054

(b) the act did not seriously impair an essential interest of the State towards which the obligation existed.

2. In any case, a state of necessity may not be invoked by a State as a ground for precluding wrongfulness:

(a) if the international obligation with which the act of the State is not in conformity arises out of a peremptory norm of general international law; or

(b) if the international obligation with which the act of the State is not in conformity is laid down by a treaty which, explicitly or implicitly, excludes the possibility of invoking the state of necessity with respect to that obligation; or

(c) if the State in question has contributed to the occurrence of the state of necessity." (Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1980, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 34.)

In its Commentary, the Commission defined the "state of necessity" as being

"the situation of a State whose sole means of safeguarding an essential interest threatened by a grave and imminent peril is to adopt conduct not in conformity with what is required of it by an international obligation to another State" (ibid., para. 1).

It concluded that "the notion of state of necessity is . . . deeply rooted in general legal thinking" (ibid., p. 49, para. 31).

51. The Court considers, first of all, that the state of necessity is a ground recognized by customary international law for precluding the wrongfulness of an act not in conformity with an international obligation. It observes moreover that such ground for precluding wrongfulness can only be accepted on an exceptional basis. The International Law Commission was of the same opinion when it explained that it had opted for a negative form of words in Article 33 of its Draft

"in order to show, by this formal means also, that the case of invocation of a state of necessity as a justification must be considered as really constituting an exception — and one even more rarely admissible than is the case with the other circumstances precluding wrongfulness . . ." (ibid., p. 51, para. 40).

Thus, according to the Commission, the state of necessity can only be invoked under certain strictly defined conditions which must be cumulatively satisfied; and the State concerned is not the sole judge of whether those conditions have been met.

52. In the present case, the following basic conditions set forth in Draft Article 33 are relevant: it must have been occasioned by an "essential interest" of the State which is the author of the act conflicting with one of its international obligations; that interest must have been threatened by a "grave and imminent peril"; the act being challenged must have been the "only means" of safeguarding that interest; that act must not have "seriously impair[ed]" an essential interest" of the State towards which the obligation existed; and the State which is the author of that act must not have "contributed to the occurrence of the state of necessity". Those conditions reflect customary international law.

The Court will now endeavour to ascertain whether those conditions had been met at the time of the suspension and abandonment, by Hungary, of the works that it was to carry out in accordance with the

2055

1977 Treaty.

53. The Court has no difficulty in acknowledging that the concerns expressed by Hungary for its natural environment in the region affected by the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project related to an "essential interest" of that State, within the meaning given to that expression in Article 33 of the Draft of the International Law Commission.

The Commission, in its Commentary, indicated that one should not, in that context, reduce an "essential interest" to a matter only of the "existence" of the State, and that the whole question was, ultimately, to be judged in the light of the particular case (see Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1980, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 49, para. 32); at the same time, it included among the situations that could occasion a state of necessity, "a grave danger to . . . the ecological preservation of all or some of [the] territory [of a State]" (ibid., p. 35, para. 3); and specified, with reference to State practice, that "It is primarily in the last two decades that safeguarding the ecological balance has come to be considered an 'essential interest' of all States." (Ibid., p. 39, para. 14.)

The Court recalls that it has recently had occasion to stress, in the following terms, the great significance that it attaches to respect for the environment, not only for States but also for the whole of mankind:

"the environment is not an abstraction but represents the living space, the quality of life and the very health of human beings, including generations unborn. The existence of the general obligation of States to ensure that activities within their jurisdiction and control respect the environment of other States or of areas beyond national control is now part of the corpus of international law relating to the environment." (Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, Advisory Opinion, I.C.J. Reports 1996, pp. 241-242, para. 29.)

54. The verification of the existence, in 1989, of the "peril" invoked by Hungary, of its "grave and imminent" nature, as well as of the absence of any "means" to respond to it, other than the measures taken by Hungary to suspend and abandon the works, are all complex processes.

As the Court has already indicated (see paragraphs 33 et seq. above), Hungary on several occasions expressed, in 1989, its "uncertainties" as to the ecological impact of putting in place the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros barrage system, which is why it asked insistently for new scientific studies to be carried out.

The Court considers, however, that, serious though these uncertainties might have been they could not, alone, establish the objective existence of a "peril" in the sense of a component element of a state of necessity. The word "peril" certainly evokes the idea of "risk"; that is precisely what distinguishes "peril" from material damage. But a state of necessity could not exist without a "peril" duly established at the relevant point in time; the mere apprehension of a possible "peril" could not suffice in that respect. It could moreover hardly be otherwise, when the "peril" constituting the state of necessity has at the same time to be "grave" and "imminent". "Imminence" is synonymous with "immediacy" or "proximity" and goes far beyond the concept of "possibility". As the International Law Commission emphasized in its commentary, the "extremely grave and imminent" peril must "have been a threat to the interest at the actual time" (Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1980, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 49, para. 33). That does not exclude, in the view of the Court, that a "peril" appearing in the long term might be held to be "imminent" as soon as it is established, at the relevant point in time, that the realization of that peril, however far off it might be, is not thereby any less certain and inevitable.

The Hungarian argument on the state of necessity could not convince the Court unless it was at least

2056

proven that a real, "grave" and "imminent" "peril" existed in 1989 and that the measures taken by Hungary were the only possible response to it.

Both Parties have placed on record an impressive amount of scientific material aimed at reinforcing their respective arguments. The Court has given most careful attention to this material, in which the Parties have developed their opposing views as to the ecological consequences of the Project. It concludes, however, that, as will be shown below, it is not necessary in order to respond to the questions put to it in the Special Agreement for it to determine which of those points of view is scientifically better founded.

55. The Court will begin by considering the situation at Nagymaros. As has already been mentioned (see paragraph 40 above), Hungary maintained that, if the works at Nagymaros had been carried out as planned, the environment — and in particular the drinking water resources — in the area would have been exposed to serious dangers on account of problems linked to the upstream reservoir on the one hand and, on the other, the risks of erosion of the riverbed downstream.

The Court notes that the dangers ascribed to the upstream reservoir were mostly of a long-term nature and, above all, that they remained uncertain. Even though the Joint Contractual Plan envisaged that the Gabčíkovo power plant would "mainly operate in peak-load time and continuously during high water", the final rules of operation had not yet been determined (see paragraph 19 above); however, any dangers associated with the putting into service of the Nagymaros portion of the Project would have been closely linked to the extent to which it was operated in peak mode and to the modalities of such operation. It follows that, even if it could have been established — which, in the Court's appreciation of the evidence before it, was not the case — that the reservoir would ultimately have constituted a "grave peril" for the environment in the area, one would be bound to conclude that the peril was not "imminent" at the time at which Hungary suspended and then abandoned the works relating to the dam.

With regard to the lowering of the riverbed downstream of the Nagymaros dam, the danger could have appeared at once more serious and more pressing, in so far as it was the supply of drinking water to the city of Budapest which would have been affected. The Court would however point out that the bed of the Danube in the vicinity of Szentendre had already been deepened prior to 1980 in order to extract building materials, and that the river had from that time attained, in that sector, the depth required by the 1977 Treaty. The peril invoked by Hungary had thus already materialized to a large extent for a number of years, so that it could not, in 1989, represent a peril arising entirely out of the project. The Court would stress, however, that, even supposing, as Hungary maintained, that the construction and operation of the dam would have created serious risks, Hungary had means available to it, other than the suspension and abandonment of the works, of responding to that situation. It could for example have proceeded regularly to discharge gravel into the river downstream of the dam. It could likewise, if necessary, have supplied Budapest with drinking water by processing the river water in an appropriate manner. The two Parties expressly recognized that that possibility remained open even though — and this is not determinative of the state of necessity — the purification of the river water, like the other measures envisaged, clearly would have been a more costly technique.

56. The Court now comes to the Gabčíkovo sector. It will recall that Hungary's concerns in this sector related on the one hand to the quality of the surface water in the Dunakiliti reservoir, with its effects on the quality of the groundwater in the region, and on the other hand, more generally, to the level, movement and quality of both the surface water and the groundwater in the whole of the Szigetköz, with their effects on the fauna and flora in the alluvial plain of the Danube (see paragraph 40 above).

Whether in relation to the Dunakiliti site or to the whole of the Szigetköz, the Court finds here again, that the peril claimed by Hungary was to be considered in the long term, and, more importantly,

2057

remained uncertain. As Hungary itself acknowledges, the damage that it apprehended had primarily to be the result of some relatively slow natural processes, the effects of which could not easily be assessed.

Even if the works were more advanced in this sector than at Nagymaros, they had not been completed in July 1989 and, as the Court explained in paragraph 34 above, Hungary expressly undertook to carry on with them, early in June 1989. The report dated 23 June 1989 by the ad hoc Committee of the Hungarian Academy of Sciences, which was also referred to in paragraph 35 of the present Judgment, does not express any awareness of an authenticated peril — even in the form of a definite peril, whose realization would have been inevitable in the long term — when it states that:

"The measuring results of an at least five-year monitoring period following the completion of the Gabčíkovo construction are indispensable to the trustworthy prognosis of the ecological impacts of the barrage system. There is undoubtedly a need for the establishment and regular operation of a comprehensive monitoring system, which must be more developed than at present. The examination of biological indicator objects that can sensitively indicate the changes happening in the environment, neglected till today, have to be included."

The report concludes as follows:

"It can be stated, that the environmental, ecological and water quality impacts were not taken into account properly during the design and construction period until today. Because of the complexity of the ecological processes and lack of the measured data and the relevant calculations the environmental impacts cannot be evaluated.

The data of the monitoring system newly operating on a very limited area are not enough to forecast the impacts probably occurring over a longer term. In order to widen and to make the data more frequent a further multi-year examination is necessary to decrease the further degradation of the water quality playing a dominant role in this question. The expected water quality influences equally the aquatic ecosystems, the soils and the recreational and tourist land-use."

The Court also notes that, in these proceedings, Hungary acknowledged that, as a general rule, the quality of the Danube waters had improved over the past 20 years, even if those waters remained subject to hypertrophic conditions.

However "grave" it might have been, it would accordingly have been difficult, in the light of what is said above, to see the alleged peril as sufficiently certain and therefore "imminent" in 1989.

The Court moreover considers that Hungary could, in this context also, have resorted to other means in order to respond to the dangers that it apprehended. In particular, within the framework of the original Project, Hungary seemed to be in a position to control at least partially the distribution of the water between the bypass canal, the old bed of the Danube and the side-arms. It should not be overlooked that the Dunakiliti dam was located in Hungarian territory and that Hungary could construct the works needed to regulate flows along the old bed of the Danube and the side-arms. Moreover, it should be borne in mind that Article 14 of the 1977 Treaty provided for the possibility that each of the parties might withdraw quantities of water exceeding those specified in the Joint Contractual Plan, while making it clear that, in such an event, "the share of electric power of the Contracting Party benefitting from the excess withdrawal shall be correspondingly reduced".

2058

57. *The Court concludes from the foregoing that, with respect to both Nagymaros and Gabčíkovo, the perils invoked by Hungary, without prejudging their possible gravity, were not sufficiently established in 1989, nor were they "imminent"; and that Hungary had available to it at that time means of responding to these perceived perils other than the suspension and abandonment of works with which it had been entrusted. What is more, negotiations were under way which might have led to a review of the Project and the extension of some of its time-limits, without there being need to abandon it. The Court infers from this that the respect by Hungary, in 1989, of its obligations under the terms of the 1977 Treaty would not have resulted in a situation "characterized so aptly by the maxim summum jus summa injuria" (Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1980, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 49, para. 31).*

Moreover, the Court notes that Hungary decided to conclude the 1977 Treaty, a Treaty which — whatever the political circumstances prevailing at the time of its conclusion — was treated by Hungary as valid and in force until the date declared for its termination in May 1992. As can be seen from the material before the Court, a great many studies of a scientific and technical nature had been conducted at an earlier time, both by Hungary and by Czechoslovakia. Hungary was, then, presumably aware of the situation as then known, when it assumed its obligations under the Treaty. Hungary contended before the Court that those studies had been inadequate and that the state of knowledge at that time was not such as to make possible a complete evaluation of the ecological implications of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project. It is nonetheless the case that although the principal object of the 1977 Treaty was the construction of a System of Locks for the production of electricity, improvement of navigation on the Danube and protection against flooding, the need to ensure the protection of the environment had not escaped the parties, as can be seen from Articles 15, 19 and 20 of the Treaty.

What is more, the Court cannot fail to note the positions taken by Hungary after the entry into force of the 1977 Treaty. In 1983, Hungary asked that the works under the Treaty should go forward more slowly, for reasons that were essentially economic but also, subsidiarily, related to ecological concerns. In 1989, when, according to Hungary itself, the state of scientific knowledge had undergone a significant development, it asked for the works to be speeded up, and then decided, three months later, to suspend them and subsequently to abandon them. The Court is not however unaware that profound changes were taking place in Hungary in 1989, and that, during that transitory phase, it might have been more than usually difficult to co-ordinate the different points of view prevailing from time to time.

The Court infers from all these elements that, in the present case, even if it had been established that there was, in 1989, a state of necessity linked to the performance of the 1977 Treaty, Hungary would not have been permitted to rely upon that state of necessity in order to justify its failure to comply with its treaty obligations, as it had helped, by act or omission to bring it about.

58. *It follows that the Court has no need to consider whether Hungary, by proceeding as it did in 1989, "seriously impair[ed] an essential interest" of Czechoslovakia, within the meaning of the aforementioned Article 33 of the Draft of the International Law Commission — a finding which does not in any way prejudice the damage Czechoslovakia claims to have suffered on account of the position taken by Hungary.*

Nor does the Court need to examine the argument put forward by Hungary, according to which certain breaches of Articles 15 and 19 of the 1977 Treaty, committed by Czechoslovakia even before 1989, contributed to the purported state of necessity; and neither does it have to reach a decision on the argument advanced by Slovakia, according to which Hungary breached the provisions of Article 27 of the Treaty, in 1989, by taking unilateral measures without having previously had recourse to the machinery of dispute settlement for which that Article provides.

* *

2059

59. *In the light of the conclusions reached above, the Court, in reply to the question put to it in Article 2, paragraph 1 (a), of the Special Agreement (see paragraph 27), finds that Hungary was not entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon, in 1989, the works on the Nagymaros Project and on the part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the 1977 Treaty and related instruments attributed responsibility to it.*

*

* *

60. *By the terms of Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Special Agreement, the Court is asked in the second place to decide*

"(b) whether the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic was entitled to proceed, in November 1991, to the 'provisional solution' and to put into operation from October 1992 this system, described in the Report of the Working Group of Independent Experts of the Commission of the European Communities, the Republic of Hungary and the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic dated 23 November 1992 (damming up of the Danube at river kilometre 1851.7 on Czechoslovak territory and resulting consequences on water and navigation course)".

61. *The Court will recall that, as soon as Hungary suspended the works at Nagymaros on 13 May 1989 and extended that suspension to certain works to be carried out at Dunakiliti, Czechoslovakia informed Hungary that it would feel compelled to take unilateral measures if Hungary were to persist in its refusal to resume the works. This was inter alia expressed as follows in Czechoslovakia's Note Verbale of 30 October 1989 to which reference is made in paragraph 37 above:*

"Should the Republic of Hungary fail to meet its liabilities and continue unilaterally to breach the Treaty and related legal documents then the Czechoslovak party will be forced to commence a provisional, substitute project on the territory of the Czechoslovak Socialist Republic in order to prevent further losses. Such a provisional project would entail directing as much water into the Gabčíkovo dam as agreed in the Joint Construction Plan."

As the Court has already indicated (see paragraph 23 above), various alternative solutions were contemplated by Czechoslovakia. In September 1990, the Hungarian authorities were advised of seven hypothetical alternatives defined by the firm of Hydroconsult of Bratislava. All of those solutions implied an agreement between the parties, with the exception of one variant, subsequently known as "Variant C", which was presented as a provisional solution which could be brought about without Hungarian co-operation. Other contacts between the parties took place, without leading to a settlement of the dispute. In March 1991, Hungary acquired information according to which perceptible progress had been made in finalizing the planning of Variant C; it immediately gave expression to the concern this caused.

62. *Inter-governmental negotiation meetings were held on 22 April and 15 July 1991.*

On 22 April 1991, Hungary proposed the suspension, until September 1993, of all the works begun on the basis of the 1977 Treaty, on the understanding that the parties undertook to abstain from any unilateral action, and that joint studies would be carried out in the interval. Czechoslovakia maintained its previous position according to which the studies contemplated should take place within the framework of the 1977 Treaty and without any suspension of the works.

On 15 July 1991, Czechoslovakia confirmed its intention of putting the Gabčíkovo power plant into

2060

service and indicated that the available data enabled the effects of four possible scenarios to be assessed, each of them requiring the co-operation of the two Governments. At the same time, it proposed the setting up of a tripartite committee of experts (Hungary, Czechoslovakia, European Communities) which would help in the search for technical solutions to the problems arising from the entry into operation of the Gabčíkovo sector. Hungary, for its part, took the view that

"In the case of a total lack of understanding the so-called C variation or 'theoretical opportunity' suggested by the Czecho-Slovak party as a unilateral solution would be such a grave transgression of Hungarian territorial integrity and International Law for which there is no precedent even in the practices of the formerly socialist countries for the past 30 years";

it further proposed the setting up of a bilateral committee for the assessment of environmental consequences, subject to work on Czechoslovak territory being suspended.

63. By a letter dated 24 July 1991, the Government of Hungary communicated the following message to the Prime Minister of Slovakia:

"Hungarian public opinion and the Hungarian Government anxiously and attentively follows the [Czechoslovakian] press reports of the unilateral steps of the Government of the Slovak Republic in connection with the barrage system.

The preparatory works for diverting the water of the Danube near the Dunakiliti dam through unilaterally are also alarming. These steps are contrary to the 1977 Treaty and to the good relationship between our nations."

On 30 July 1991 the Slovak Prime Minister informed the Hungarian Prime Minister of

"the decision of the Slovak Government and of the Czech and Slovak Federal Government to continue work on the Gabčíkovo power plant, as a provisional solution, which is aimed at the commencement of operations on the territory of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic".

On the same day, the Government of Hungary protested, by a Note Verbale, against the filling of the headrace canal by the Czechoslovak construction company, by pumping water from the Danube.

By a letter dated 9 August 1991 and addressed to the Prime Minister of Slovakia, the Hungarian authorities strenuously protested against "any unilateral step that would be in contradiction with the interests of our [two] nations and international law" and indicated that they considered it "very important [to] receive information as early as possible on the details of the provisional solution". For its part, Czechoslovakia, in a Note Verbale dated 27 August 1991, rejected the argument of Hungary that the continuation of the works under those circumstances constituted a violation of international law, and made the following proposal:

"Provided the Hungarian side submits a concrete technical solution aimed at putting into operation the Gabčíkovo system of locks and a solution of the system of locks based on the 1977 Treaty in force and the treaty documents related to it, the Czechoslovak side is prepared to implement the mutually agreed solution."

64. The construction permit for Variant C was issued on 30 October 1991. In November 1991

2061

construction of a dam started at Cunovo, where both banks of the Danube are on Czechoslovak (now Slovak) territory.

In the course of a new inter-governmental negotiation meeting, on 2 December 1991, the parties agreed to entrust the task of studying the whole of the question of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project to a Joint Expert Committee which Hungary agreed should be complemented with an expert from the European Communities. However whereas, for Hungary, the work of that Committee would have been meaningless if Czechoslovakia continued construction of Variant C, for Czechoslovakia, the suspension of the construction, even on a temporary basis, was unacceptable.

That meeting was followed by a large number of exchanges of letters between the parties and various meetings between their representatives at the end of 1991 and early in 1992. On 23 January 1992, Czechoslovakia expressed its readiness "to stop work on the provisional solution and continue the construction upon mutual agreement" if the tripartite committee of experts whose constitution it proposed, and the results of the test operation of the Gabčíkovo part, were to "confirm that negative ecological effects exceed its benefits". However, the positions of the parties were by then comprehensively defined, and would scarcely develop any further. Hungary considered, as it indicated in a Note Verbale of 14 February 1992, that Variant C was in contravention

"of [the Treaty of 1977] . . . and the convention ratified in 1976 regarding the water management of boundary waters.

.....

with the principles of sovereignty, territorial integrity, with the inviolability of State borders, as well as with the general customary norms on international rivers and the spirit of the 1948 Belgrade Danube Convention";

and the suspension of the implementation of Variant C was, in its view, a prerequisite. As for Czechoslovakia, it took the view that recourse to Variant C had been rendered inevitable, both for economic and ecological as well as navigational reasons, because of the unlawful suspension and abandonment by Hungary of the works for which provision was made in the 1977 Treaty. Any negotiation had, in its view, to be conducted within the framework of the Treaty and without the implementation of Variant C — described as "provisional" — being called into question.

65. On 5 August 1992, the Czechoslovak representative to the Danube Commission informed it that "work on the severance cutting through of the Danube's flow will begin on 15 October 1992 at the 1,851.759-kilometre line" and indicated the measures that would be taken at the time of the "severance". The Hungarian representative on the Commission protested on 17 August 1992, and called for additional explanations.

During the autumn of 1992, the implementation of Variant C was stepped up. The operations involved in damming the Danube at Cunovo had been scheduled by Czechoslovakia to take place during the second half of October 1992, at a time when the waters of the river are generally at their lowest level. On the initiative of the Commission of the European Communities, trilateral negotiations took place in Brussels on 21 and 22 October 1992, with a view to setting up a committee of experts and defining its terms of reference. On that date, the first phase of the operations leading to the damming of the Danube (the reinforcement of the riverbed and the narrowing of the principal channel) had been completed. The closure of the bed was begun on 23 October 1992 and the construction of the actual dam continued from 24 to 27 October 1992: a pontoon bridge was built over the Danube on Czechoslovak territory using

2062

river barges, large stones were thrown into the riverbed and reinforced with concrete, while 80 to 90 percent of the waters of the Danube were directed into the canal designed to supply the Gabčíkovo power plant. The implementation of Variant C did not, however, come to an end with the diversion of the waters, as there still remained outstanding both reinforcement work on the dam and the building of certain auxiliary structures.

The Court has already referred in paragraph 24 above to the meeting held in London on 28 October 1992 under the auspices of the European Communities, in the course of which the parties to the negotiations agreed, inter alia, to entrust a tripartite Working Group composed of independent experts (i.e., four experts designated by the European Commission, one designated by Hungary and another by Czechoslovakia) with the task of reviewing the situation created by the implementation of Variant C and making proposals as to urgent measures to adopt. After having worked for one week in Bratislava and one week in Budapest, the Working Group filed its report on 23 November 1992.

66. A summary description of the constituent elements of Variant C appears at paragraph 23 of the present Judgment. For the purposes of the question put to the Court, the official description that should be adopted is, according to Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Special Agreement, the one given in the aforementioned report of the Working Group of independent experts, and it should be emphasized that, according to the Special Agreement, "Variant C" must be taken to include the consequences "on water and navigation course" of the dam closing off the bed of the Danube.

In the section headed "Variant C Structures and Status of Ongoing Work", one finds, in the report of the Working Group, the following passage:

"In both countries the original structures for the Gabčíkovo scheme are completed except for the closure of the Danube river at Dunakiliti and the

(1) Completion of the hydropower station (installation and testing of turbines) at Gabčíkovo.

Variant C consists of a complex of structures, located in Czecho-Slovakia . . . The construction of these are planned for two phases. The structures include . . . :

(2) By-pass weir controlling the flow into the river Danube.

(3) Dam closing the Danubian river bed.

(4) Floodplain weir (weir in the inundation).

(5) Intake structure for the Mosoni Danube.

(6) Intake structure in the power canal.

(7) Earth barrages/dykes connecting structures.

(8) Ship lock for smaller ships (15 m x 80 m).

(9) Spillway weir.

(10) Hydropower station.

2063

The construction of the structures 1-7 are included in Phase 1, while the remaining 8-10 are a part of Phase 2 scheduled for construction 1993-1995."

* *

67. Czechoslovakia had maintained that proceeding to Variant C and putting it into operation did not constitute internationally wrongful acts; Slovakia adopted this argument. During the proceedings before the Court Slovakia contended that Hungary's decision to suspend and subsequently abandon the construction of works at Dunakiliti had made it impossible for Czechoslovakia to carry out the works as initially contemplated by the 1977 Treaty and that the latter was therefore entitled to proceed with a solution which was as close to the original Project as possible. Slovakia invoked what it described as a "principle of approximate application" to justify the construction and operation of Variant C. It explained that this was the only possibility remaining to it "of fulfilling not only the purposes of the 1977 Treaty, but the continuing obligation to implement it in good faith".

68. Slovakia also maintained that Czechoslovakia was under a duty to mitigate the damage resulting from Hungary's unlawful actions. It claimed that a State which is confronted with a wrongful act of another State is under an obligation to minimize its losses and, thereby, the damages claimable against the wrong-doing State. It argued furthermore that "Mitigation of damages is also an aspect of the performance of obligations in good faith." For Slovakia, these damages would have been immense in the present case, given the investments made and the additional economic and environmental prejudice which would have resulted from the failure to complete the works at Dunakiliti/Gabčíkovo and to put the system into operation. For this reason, Czechoslovakia was not only entitled, but even obliged, to implement Variant C.

69. Although Slovakia maintained that Czechoslovakia's conduct was lawful, it argued in the alternative that, even were the Court to find otherwise, the putting into operation of Variant C could still be justified as a countermeasure.

70. Hungary for its part contended that Variant C was a material breach of the 1977 Treaty. It considered that Variant C also violated Czechoslovakia's obligations under other treaties, in particular the Convention of 31 May 1976 on the Regulation of Water Management Issues of Boundary Waters concluded at Budapest, and its obligations under general international law.

71. Hungary contended that Slovakia's arguments rested on an erroneous presentation of the facts and the law. Hungary denied, inter alia, having committed the slightest violation of its treaty obligations which could have justified the putting into operation of Variant C. It considered that "no such rule" of "approximate application" of a treaty exists in international law; as to the argument derived from "mitigation of damage[s]", it claimed that this has to do with the quantification of loss, and could not serve to excuse conduct which is substantively unlawful. Hungary furthermore stated that Variant C did not satisfy the conditions required by international law for countermeasures, in particular the condition of proportionality.

* *

72. Before dealing with the arguments advanced by the Parties, the Court wishes to make clear that it is aware of the serious problems with which Czechoslovakia was confronted as a result of Hungary's decision to relinquish most of the construction of the System of Locks for which it was responsible by virtue of the 1977 Treaty. Vast investments had been made, the construction at Gabčíkovo was all but finished, the bypass canal was completed, and Hungary itself, in 1991, had duly fulfilled its obligations

2064

under the Treaty in this respect in completing work on the tailrace canal. It emerges from the report, dated 31 October 1992, of the tripartite fact-finding mission the Court has referred to in paragraph 24 of the present Judgment, that not using the system would have led to considerable financial losses, and that it could have given rise to serious problems for the environment.

73. Czechoslovakia repeatedly denounced Hungary's suspension and abandonment of works as a fundamental breach of the 1977 Treaty and consequently could have invoked this breach as a ground for terminating the Treaty; but this would not have brought the Project any nearer to completion. It therefore chose to insist on the implementation of the Treaty by Hungary, and on many occasions called upon the latter to resume performance of its obligations under the Treaty.

When Hungary steadfastly refused to do so — although it had expressed its willingness to pay compensation for damage incurred by Czechoslovakia — and when negotiations stalled owing to the diametrically opposed positions of the parties, Czechoslovakia decided to put the Gabčíkovo system into operation unilaterally, exclusively under its own control and for its own benefit.

74. That decision went through various stages and, in the Special Agreement, the Parties asked the Court to decide whether Czechoslovakia "was entitled to proceed, in November 1991" to Variant C, and "to put [it] into operation from October 1992".

75. With a view to justifying those actions, Slovakia invoked what it described as "the principle of approximate application", expressed by Judge Sir Hersch Lauterpacht in the following terms:

"It is a sound principle of law that whenever a legal instrument of continuing validity cannot be applied literally owing to the conduct of one of the parties, it must, without allowing that party to take advantage of its own conduct, be applied in a way approximating most closely to its primary object. To do that is to interpret and to give effect to the instrument — not to change it." (Admissibility of Hearings of Petitioners by the Committee on South West Africa, separate opinion of Sir Hersch Lauterpacht, I.C.J. Reports 1956, p. 46.)

It claimed that this is a principle of international law and a general principle of law.

76. It is not necessary for the Court to determine whether there is a principle of international law or a general principle of law of "approximate application" because, even if such a principle existed, it could by definition only be employed within the limits of the treaty in question. In the view of the Court, Variant C does not meet that cardinal condition with regard to the 1977 Treaty.

77. As the Court has already observed, the basic characteristic of the 1977 Treaty is, according to Article 1, to provide for the construction of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros System of Locks as a joint investment constituting a single and indivisible operational system of works. This element is equally reflected in Articles 8 and 10 of the Treaty providing for joint ownership of the most important works of the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros project and for the operation of this joint property as a co-ordinated single unit. By definition all this could not be carried out by unilateral action. In spite of having a certain external physical similarity with the original Project, Variant C thus differed sharply from it in its legal characteristics.

78. Moreover, in practice, the operation of Variant C led Czechoslovakia to appropriate, essentially for its use and benefit, between 80 and 90 per cent of the waters of the Danube before returning them to the main bed of the river, despite the fact that the Danube is not only a shared international watercourse but

2065

also an international boundary river.

Czechoslovakia submitted that Variant C was essentially no more than what Hungary had already agreed to and that the only modifications made were those which had become necessary by virtue of Hungary's decision not to implement its treaty obligations. It is true that Hungary, in concluding the 1977 Treaty, had agreed to the damming of the Danube and the diversion of its waters into the bypass canal. But it was only in the context of a joint operation and a sharing of its benefits that Hungary had given its consent. The suspension and withdrawal of that consent constituted a violation of Hungary's legal obligations, demonstrating, as it did, the refusal by Hungary of joint operation; but that cannot mean that Hungary forfeited its basic right to an equitable and reasonable sharing of the resources of an international watercourse.

The Court accordingly concludes that Czechoslovakia, in putting Variant C into operation, was not applying the 1977 Treaty but, on the contrary, violated certain of its express provisions, and, in so doing, committed an internationally wrongful act.

79. The Court notes that between November 1991 and October 1992, Czechoslovakia confined itself to the execution, on its own territory, of the works which were necessary for the implementation of Variant C, but which could have been abandoned if an agreement had been reached between the parties and did not therefore predetermine the final decision to be taken. For as long as the Danube had not been unilaterally dammed, Variant C had not in fact been applied.

Such a situation is not unusual in international law or, for that matter, in domestic law. A wrongful act or offence is frequently preceded by preparatory actions which are not to be confused with the act or offence itself. It is as well to distinguish between the actual commission of a wrongful act (whether instantaneous or continuous) and the conduct prior to that act which is of a preparatory character and which "does not qualify as a wrongful act" (see for example the Commentary on Article 41 of the Draft Articles on State Responsibility, "Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its forty-eighth session, 6 May-26 July 1996", Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/51/10), p. 141 and Yearbook of the International Law Commission, 1993, Vol. II, Part 2, p. 57, para. 14).

*

80. Slovakia also maintained that it was acting under a duty to mitigate damages when it carried out Variant C. It stated that "It is a general principle of international law that a party injured by the non-performance of another contract party must seek to mitigate the damage he has sustained."

It would follow from such a principle that an injured State which has failed to take the necessary measures to limit the damage sustained would not be entitled to claim compensation for that damage which could have been avoided. While this principle might thus provide a basis for the calculation of damages, it could not, on the other hand, justify an otherwise wrongful act.

81. Since the Court has found that the putting into operation of Variant C constituted an internationally wrongful act, the duty to mitigate damage invoked by Slovakia does not need to be examined further.

*

82. Although it did not invoke the plea of countermeasures as a primary argument, since it did not consider Variant C to be unlawful, Slovakia stated that "Variant C could be presented as a justified

2066

countermeasure to Hungary's illegal acts".

The Court has concluded, in paragraph 78 above, that Czechoslovakia committed an internationally wrongful act in putting Variant C into operation. Thus, it now has to determine whether such wrongfulness may be precluded on the ground that the measure so adopted was in response to Hungary's prior failure to comply with its obligations under international law.

83. *In order to be justifiable, a countermeasure must meet certain conditions (see Military and Paramilitary Activities in and against Nicaragua (Nicaragua v. United States of America) Merits, Judgment, I.C.J. Reports 1986, p. 127, para. 249. See also Arbitral Award of 9 December 1978 in the case concerning the Air Service Agreement of 27 March 1946 between the United States of America and France, United Nations, Reports of International Arbitral Awards (RIAA), Vol. XVIII, pp. 443 et seq.; also Articles 47 to 50 of the Draft Articles on State Responsibility adopted by the International Law Commission on first reading, "Report of the International Law Commission on the work of its forty-eighth session, 6 May-26 July 1996", Official Records of the General Assembly, Fifty-first Session, Supplement No. 10 (A/51/10), pp. 144-145.)*

In the first place it must be taken in response to a previous international wrongful act of another State and must be directed against that State. Although not primarily presented as a countermeasure, it is clear that Variant C was a response to Hungary's suspension and abandonment of works and that it was directed against that State; and it is equally clear, in the Court's view, that Hungary's actions were internationally wrongful.

84. *Secondly, the injured State must have called upon the State committing the wrongful act to discontinue its wrongful conduct or to make reparation for it. It is clear from the facts of the case, as recalled above by the Court (see paragraphs 61 et seq.), that Czechoslovakia requested Hungary to resume the performance of its treaty obligations on many occasions.*

85. *In the view of the Court, an important consideration is that the effects of a countermeasure must be commensurate with the injury suffered, taking account of the rights in question.*

In 1929, the Permanent Court of International Justice, with regard to navigation on the River Oder, stated as follows:

"[the] community of interest in a navigable river becomes the basis of a common legal right, the essential features of which are the perfect equality of all riparian States in the user of the whole course of the river and the exclusion of any preferential privilege of any one riparian State in relation to the others" (Territorial Jurisdiction of the International Commission of the River Oder, Judgment No. 16, 1929, P.C.I.J., Series A, No. 23, p. 27).

Modern development of international law has strengthened this principle for non-navigational uses of international watercourses as well, as evidenced by the adoption of the Convention of 21 May 1997 on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses by the United Nations General Assembly.

The Court considers that Czechoslovakia, by unilaterally assuming control of a shared resource, and thereby depriving Hungary of its right to an equitable and reasonable share of the natural resources of the Danube — with the continuing effects of the diversion of these waters on the ecology of the riparian area of the Szigetköz — failed to respect the proportionality which is required by international law.

86. Moreover, as the Court has already pointed out (see paragraph 78), the fact that Hungary had agreed in the context of the original Project to the diversion of the Danube (and, in the Joint Contractual Plan, to a provisional measure of withdrawal of water from the Danube) cannot be understood as having authorized Czechoslovakia to proceed with a unilateral diversion of this magnitude without Hungary's consent.

87. The Court thus considers that the diversion of the Danube carried out by Czechoslovakia was not a lawful countermeasure because it was not proportionate. It is therefore not required to pass upon one other condition for the lawfulness of a countermeasure, namely that its purpose must be to induce the wrongdoing State to comply with its obligations under international law, and that the measure must therefore be reversible.

* *

88. In the light of the conclusions reached above, the Court, in reply to the question put to it in Article 2, paragraph 1 (b), of the Special Agreement (see paragraph 60), finds that Czechoslovakia was entitled to proceed, in November 1991, to Variant C in so far as it then confined itself to undertaking works which did not predetermine the final decision to be taken by it. On the other hand, Czechoslovakia was not entitled to put that Variant into operation from October 1992.

*

* *

89. By the terms of Article 2, paragraph 1 (c), of the Special Agreement, the Court is asked, thirdly, to determine

"what are the legal effects of the notification, on 19 May 1992, of the termination of the Treaty by the Republic of Hungary".

The Court notes that it has been asked to determine what are the legal effects of the notification given on 19 May 1992 of the termination of the Treaty. It will consequently confine itself to replying to this question.

90. The Court will recall that, by early 1992, the respective parties to the 1977 Treaty had made clear their positions with regard to the recourse by Czechoslovakia to Variant C. Hungary in a Note Verbale of 14 February 1992 had made clear its view that Variant C was a contravention of the 1977 Treaty (see paragraph 64 above); Czechoslovakia insisted on the implementation of Variant C as a condition for further negotiation. On 26 February 1992, in a letter to his Czechoslovak counterpart, the Prime Minister of Hungary described the impending diversion of the Danube as "a serious breach of international law" and stated that, unless work was suspended while further enquiries took place, "the Hungarian Government [would] have no choice but to respond to this situation of necessity by terminating the 1977 inter-State Treaty". In a Note Verbale dated 18 March 1992, Czechoslovakia reaffirmed that, while it was prepared to continue negotiations "on every level", it could not agree "to stop all work on the provisional solution".

On 24 March 1992, the Hungarian Parliament passed a resolution authorizing the Government to terminate the 1977 Treaty if Czechoslovakia did not stop the works by 30 April 1992. On 13 April 1992, the Vice-President of the Commission of the European Communities wrote to both parties confirming the willingness of the Commission to chair a committee of independent experts including representatives

2068

of the two countries, in order to assist the two Governments in identifying a mutually acceptable solution. Commission involvement would depend on each Government not taking "any steps . . . which would prejudice possible actions to be undertaken on the basis of the report's findings". The Czechoslovak Prime Minister stated in a letter to the Hungarian Prime Minister dated 23 April 1992, that his Government continued to be interested in the establishment of the proposed committee "without any preliminary conditions"; criticizing Hungary's approach, he refused to suspend work on the provisional solution, but added, "in my opinion, there is still time, until the damming of the Danube (i.e., until October 31, 1992), for resolving disputed questions on the basis of agreement of both States".

On 7 May 1992, Hungary, in the very resolution in which it decided on the termination of the Treaty, made a proposal, this time to the Slovak Prime Minister, for a six-month suspension of work on Variant C. The Slovak Prime Minister replied that the Slovak Government remained ready to negotiate, but considered preconditions "inappropriate".

91. On 19 May 1992, the Hungarian Government transmitted to the Czechoslovak Government a Declaration notifying it of the termination by Hungary of the 1977 Treaty as of 25 May 1992. In a letter of the same date from the Hungarian Prime Minister to the Czechoslovak Prime Minister, the immediate cause for termination was specified to be Czechoslovakia's refusal, expressed in its letter of 23 April 1992, to suspend the work on Variant C during mediation efforts of the Commission of the European Communities. In its Declaration, Hungary stated that it could not accept the deleterious effects for the environment and the conservation of nature of the implementation of Variant C which would be practically equivalent to the dangers caused by the realization of the original Project. It added that Variant C infringed numerous international agreements and violated the territorial integrity of the Hungarian State by diverting the natural course of the Danube.

* *

92. During the proceedings, Hungary presented five arguments in support of the lawfulness, and thus the effectiveness, of its notification of termination. These were the existence of a state of necessity; the impossibility of performance of the Treaty; the occurrence of a fundamental change of circumstances; the material breach of the Treaty by Czechoslovakia; and, finally, the development of new norms of international environmental law. Slovakia contested each of these grounds.

93. On the first point, Hungary stated that, as Czechoslovakia had "remained inflexible" and continued with its implementation of Variant C, "a temporary state of necessity eventually became permanent, justifying termination of the 1977 Treaty".

Slovakia, for its part, denied that a state of necessity existed on the basis of what it saw as the scientific facts; and argued that even if such a state of necessity had existed, this would not give rise to a right to terminate the Treaty under the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties.

94. Hungary's second argument relied on the terms of Article 61 of the Vienna Convention, which is worded as follows:

"Article 61

Supervening impossibility of performance

2069

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

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

Hungary declared that it could not be "obliged to fulfil a practically impossible task, namely to construct a barrage system on its own territory that would cause irreparable environmental damage". It concluded that

"By May 1992 the essential object of the Treaty — an economic joint investment which was consistent with environmental protection and which was operated by the two parties jointly — had permanently disappeared, and the Treaty had thus become impossible to perform."

In Hungary's view, the "object indispensable for the execution of the treaty", whose disappearance or destruction was required by Article 61 of the Vienna Convention, did not have to be a physical object, but could also include, in the words of the International Law Commission, "a legal situation which was the raison d'être of the rights and obligations".

Slovakia claimed that Article 61 was the only basis for invoking impossibility of performance as a ground for termination, that paragraph 1 of that Article clearly contemplated physical "disappearance or destruction" of the object in question, and that, in any event, paragraph 2 precluded the invocation of impossibility "if the impossibility is the result of a breach by that party . . . of an obligation under the treaty".

95. *As to "fundamental change of circumstances", Hungary relied on Article 62 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties which states as follows:*

"Article 62

Fundamental change of circumstances

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

(a) the existence of those circumstances constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the treaty; and

(b) the effect of the change is radically to transform the extent of obligations still to be performed under the treaty.

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

(a) if the treaty establishes a boundary; or

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

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

Hungary identified a number of "substantive elements" present at the conclusion of the 1977 Treaty which it said had changed fundamentally by the date of notification of termination. These included the notion of "socialist integration", for which the Treaty had originally been a "vehicle", but which subsequently disappeared; the "single and indivisible operational system", which was to be replaced by a unilateral scheme; the fact that the basis of the planned joint investment had been overturned by the sudden emergence of both States into a market economy; the attitude of Czechoslovakia which had turned the "framework treaty" into an "immutable norm"; and, finally, the transformation of a treaty consistent with environmental protection into "a prescription for environmental disaster".

Slovakia, for its part, contended that the changes identified by Hungary had not altered the nature of the obligations under the Treaty from those originally undertaken, so that no entitlement to terminate it arose from them.

96. Hungary further argued that termination of the Treaty was justified by Czechoslovakia's material breaches of the Treaty, and in this regard it invoked Article 60 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, which provides:

"Article 60

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

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

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

(a) the other parties by unanimous agreement to suspend the operation of the treaty in whole or in part or to terminate it either:

(i) in the relations between themselves and the defaulting State, or

(ii) as between all the parties;

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

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

2071

obligations under the treaty.

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

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

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

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

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

Hungary claimed in particular that Czechoslovakia violated the 1977 Treaty by proceeding to the construction and putting into operation of Variant C, as well as failing to comply with its obligations under Articles 15 and 19 of the Treaty. Hungary further maintained that Czechoslovakia had breached other international conventions (among them the Convention of 31 May 1976 on the Regulation of Water Management Issues of Boundary Waters) and general international law.

Slovakia denied that there had been, on the part of Czechoslovakia or on its part, any material breach of the obligations to protect water quality and nature, and claimed that Variant C, far from being a breach, was devised as "the best possible approximate application" of the Treaty. It furthermore denied that Czechoslovakia had acted in breach of other international conventions or general international law.

97. Finally, Hungary argued that subsequently imposed requirements of international law in relation to the protection of the environment precluded performance of the Treaty. The previously existing obligation not to cause substantive damage to the territory of another State had, Hungary claimed, evolved into an erga omnes obligation of prevention of damage pursuant to the "precautionary principle". On this basis, Hungary argued, its termination was "forced by the other party's refusal to suspend work on Variant C".

Slovakia argued, in reply, that none of the intervening developments in environmental law gave rise to norms of jus cogens that would override the Treaty. Further, it contended that the claim by Hungary to be entitled to take action could not in any event serve as legal justification for termination of the Treaty under the law of treaties, but belonged rather "to the language of self-help or reprisals".

* *

98. The question, as formulated in Article 2, paragraph 1 (c), of the Special Agreement, deals with treaty law since the Court is asked to determine what the legal effects are of the notification of termination of the Treaty. The question is whether Hungary's notification of 19 May 1992 brought the 1977 Treaty to an end, or whether it did not meet the requirements of international law, with the consequence that it did not terminate the Treaty.

99. The Court has referred earlier to the question of the applicability to the present case of the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties. The Vienna Convention is not directly applicable to the

1977 Treaty inasmuch as both States ratified that Convention only after the Treaty's conclusion. Consequently only those rules which are declaratory of customary law are applicable to the 1977 Treaty. As the Court has already stated above (see paragraph 46), this is the case, in many respects, with Articles 60 to 62 of the Vienna Convention, relating to termination or suspension of the operation of a treaty. On this, the Parties, too, were broadly in agreement.

100. The 1977 Treaty does not contain any provision regarding its termination. Nor is there any indication that the parties intended to admit the possibility of denunciation or withdrawal. On the contrary, the Treaty establishes a long-standing and durable régime of joint investment and joint operation. Consequently, the parties not having agreed otherwise, the Treaty could be terminated only on the limited grounds enumerated in the Vienna Convention.

*

101. The Court will now turn to the first ground advanced by Hungary, that of the state of necessity. In this respect, the Court will merely observe that, even if a state of necessity is found to exist, it is not a ground for the termination of a treaty. It may only be invoked to exonerate from its responsibility a State which has failed to implement a treaty. Even if found justified, it does not terminate a Treaty; the Treaty may be ineffective as long as the condition of necessity continues to exist; it may in fact be dormant, but — unless the parties by mutual agreement terminate the Treaty — it continues to exist. As soon as the state of necessity ceases to exist, the duty to comply with treaty obligations revives.

*

102. Hungary also relied on the principle of the impossibility of performance as reflected in Article 61 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. Hungary's interpretation of the wording of Article 61 is, however, not in conformity with the terms of that Article, nor with the intentions of the Diplomatic Conference which adopted the Convention. Article 61, paragraph 1, requires the "permanent disappearance or destruction of an object indispensable for the execution" of the treaty to justify the termination of a treaty on grounds of impossibility of performance. During the conference, a proposal was made to extend the scope of the article by including in it cases such as the impossibility to make certain payments because of serious financial difficulties (Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, First Session, Vienna, 26 March-24 May 1968, Doc. A/CONF.39/11, Summary records of the plenary meetings and of the meetings of the Committee of the Whole, 62nd Meeting of the Committee of the Whole, pp. 361-365). Although it was recognized that such situations could lead to a preclusion of the wrongfulness of non-performance by a party of its treaty obligations, the participating States were not prepared to consider such situations to be a ground for terminating or suspending a treaty, and preferred to limit themselves to a narrower concept.

103. Hungary contended that the essential object of the Treaty — an economic joint investment which was consistent with environmental protection and which was operated by the two contracting parties jointly — had permanently disappeared and that the Treaty had thus become impossible to perform. It is not necessary for the Court to determine whether the term "object" in Article 61 can also be understood to embrace a legal régime as in any event, even if that were the case, it would have to conclude that in this instance that régime had not definitively ceased to exist. The 1977 Treaty — and in particular its Articles 15, 19 and 20 — actually made available to the parties the necessary means to proceed at any time, by negotiation, to the required readjustments between economic imperatives and ecological imperatives. The Court would add that, if the joint exploitation of the investment was no longer possible, this was originally because Hungary did not carry out most of the works for which it was responsible under the 1977 Treaty; Article 61, paragraph 2, of the Vienna Convention expressly provides that impossibility of performance may not be invoked for the termination of a treaty by a party to that treaty

when it results from that party's own breach of an obligation flowing from that treaty.

*

104. Hungary further argued that it was entitled to invoke a number of events which, cumulatively, would have constituted a fundamental change of circumstances. In this respect it specified profound changes of a political nature, the Project's diminishing economic viability, the progress of environmental knowledge and the development of new norms and prescriptions of international environmental law (see paragraph 95 above).

The Court recalls that, in the Fisheries Jurisdiction case (I.C.J. Reports 1973, p. 63, para. 36), it stated that,

"Article 62 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, . . . may in many respects be considered as a codification of existing customary law on the subject of the termination of a treaty relationship on account of change of circumstances".

The prevailing political situation was certainly relevant for the conclusion of the 1977 Treaty. But the Court will recall that the Treaty provided for a joint investment programme for the production of energy, the control of floods and the improvement of navigation on the Danube. In the Court's view, the prevalent political conditions were thus not so closely linked to the object and purpose of the Treaty that they constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties and, in changing, radically altered the extent of the obligations still to be performed. The same holds good for the economic system in force at the time of the conclusion of the 1977 Treaty. Besides, even though the estimated profitability of the Project might have appeared less in 1992 than in 1977, it does not appear from the record before the Court that it was bound to diminish to such an extent that the treaty obligations of the parties would have been radically transformed as a result.

The Court does not consider that new developments in the state of environmental knowledge and of environmental law can be said to have been completely unforeseen. What is more, the formulation of Articles 15, 19 and 20, designed to accommodate change, made it possible for the parties to take account of such developments and to apply them when implementing those treaty provisions.

The changed circumstances advanced by Hungary are, in the Court's view, not of such a nature, either individually or collectively, that their effect would radically transform the extent of the obligations still to be performed in order to accomplish the Project. A fundamental change of circumstances must have been unforeseen; the existence of the circumstances at the time of the Treaty's conclusion must have constituted an essential basis of the consent of the parties to be bound by the Treaty. The negative and conditional wording of Article 62 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties is a clear indication moreover that the stability of treaty relations requires that the plea of fundamental change of circumstances be applied only in exceptional cases.

*

105. The Court will now examine Hungary's argument that it was entitled to terminate the 1977 Treaty on the ground that Czechoslovakia had violated its Articles 15, 19 and 20 (as well as a number of other conventions and rules of general international law); and that the planning, construction and putting into operation of Variant C also amounted to a material breach of the 1977 Treaty.

106. As to that part of Hungary's argument which was based on other treaties and general rules of

2074

international law, the Court is of the view that it is only a material breach of the treaty itself, by a State party to that treaty, which entitles the other party to rely on it as a ground for terminating the treaty. The violation of other treaty rules or of rules of general international law may justify the taking of certain measures, including countermeasures, by the injured State, but it does not constitute a ground for termination under the law of treaties.

107. Hungary contended that Czechoslovakia had violated Articles 15, 19 and 20 of the Treaty by refusing to enter into negotiations with Hungary in order to adapt the Joint Contractual Plan to new scientific and legal developments regarding the environment. Articles 15, 19 and 20 oblige the parties jointly to take, on a continuous basis, appropriate measures necessary for the protection of water quality, of nature and of fishing interests.

Articles 15 and 19 expressly provide that the obligations they contain shall be implemented by the means specified in the Joint Contractual Plan. The failure of the parties to agree on those means cannot, on the basis of the record before the Court, be attributed solely to one party. The Court has not found sufficient evidence to conclude that Czechoslovakia had consistently refused to consult with Hungary about the desirability or necessity of measures for the preservation of the environment. The record rather shows that, while both parties indicated, in principle, a willingness to undertake further studies, in practice Czechoslovakia refused to countenance a suspension of the works at Dunakiliti and, later, on Variant C, while Hungary required suspension as a prior condition of environmental investigation because it claimed continuation of the work would prejudice the outcome of negotiations. In this regard it cannot be left out of consideration that Hungary itself, by suspending the works at Nagymaros and Dunakiliti, contributed to the creation of a situation which was not conducive to the conduct of fruitful negotiations.

108. Hungary's main argument for invoking a material breach of the Treaty was the construction and putting into operation of Variant C. As the Court has found in paragraph 79 above, Czechoslovakia violated the Treaty only when it diverted the waters of the Danube into the bypass canal in October 1992. In constructing the works which would lead to the putting into operation of Variant C, Czechoslovakia did not act unlawfully.

In the Court's view, therefore, the notification of termination by Hungary on 19 May 1992 was premature. No breach of the Treaty by Czechoslovakia had yet taken place and consequently Hungary was not entitled to invoke any such breach of the Treaty as a ground for terminating it when it did.

109. In this regard, it should be noted that, according to Hungary's Declaration of 19 May 1992, the termination of the 1977 Treaty was to take effect as from 25 May 1992, that is only six days later. Both Parties agree that Articles 65 to 67 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, if not codifying customary law, at least generally reflect customary international law and contain certain procedural principles which are based on an obligation to act in good faith. As the Court stated in its Advisory Opinion on the Interpretation of the Agreement of 25 March 1951 between the WHO and Egypt (in which case the Vienna Convention did not apply):

"Precisely what periods of time may be involved in the observance of the duties to consult and negotiate, and what period of notice of termination should be given, are matters which necessarily vary according to the requirements of the particular case. In principle, therefore, it is for the parties in each case to determine the length of those periods by consultation and negotiation in good faith." (I.C.J. Reports 1980, p. 96, para. 49.)

The termination of the Treaty by Hungary was to take effect six days after its notification. On neither of

these dates had Hungary suffered injury resulting from acts of Czechoslovakia. The Court must therefore confirm its conclusion that Hungary's termination of the Treaty was premature.

110. Nor can the Court overlook that Czechoslovakia committed the internationally wrongful act of putting into operation Variant C as a result of Hungary's own prior wrongful conduct. As was stated by the Permanent Court of International Justice:

"It is, moreover, a principle generally accepted in the jurisprudence of international arbitration, as well as by municipal courts, that one Party cannot avail himself of the fact that the other has not fulfilled some obligation or has not had recourse to some means of redress, if the former Party has, by some illegal act, prevented the latter from fulfilling the obligation in question, or from having recourse to the tribunal which would have been open, to him." (Factory at Chorzów, Jurisdiction, Judgment No. 8, 1927, P.C.I.J., Series A, No. 9, p. 31.)

Hungary, by its own conduct, had prejudiced its right to terminate the Treaty; this would still have been the case even if Czechoslovakia, by the time of the purported termination, had violated a provision essential to the accomplishment of the object or purpose of the Treaty.

*

111. Finally, the Court will address Hungary's claim that it was entitled to terminate the 1977 Treaty because new requirements of international law for the protection of the environment precluded performance of the Treaty.

112. Neither of the Parties contended that new peremptory norms of environmental law had emerged since the conclusion of the 1977 Treaty, and the Court will consequently not be required to examine the scope of Article 64 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. On the other hand, the Court wishes to point out that newly developed norms of environmental law are relevant for the implementation of the Treaty and that the parties could, by agreement, incorporate them through the application of Articles 15, 19 and 20 of the Treaty. These articles do not contain specific obligations of performance but require the parties, in carrying out their obligations to ensure that the quality of water in the Danube is not impaired and that nature is protected, to take new environmental norms into consideration when agreeing upon the means to be specified in the Joint Contractual Plan.

By inserting these evolving provisions in the Treaty, the parties recognized the potential necessity to adapt the Project. Consequently, the Treaty is not static, and is open to adapt to emerging norms of international law. By means of Articles 15 and 19, new environmental norms can be incorporated in the Joint Contractual Plan.

The responsibility to do this was a joint responsibility. The obligations contained in Articles 15, 19 and 20 are, by definition, general and have to be transformed into specific obligations of performance through a process of consultation and negotiation. Their implementation thus requires a mutual willingness to discuss in good faith actual and potential environmental risks.

It is all the more important to do this because as the Court recalled in its Advisory Opinion on the Legality of the Threat or Use of Nuclear Weapons, "the environment is not an abstraction but represents the living space, the quality of life and the very health of human beings, including generations unborn" (I.C.J. Reports 1996, para. 29; see also paragraph 53 above).

2076

The awareness of the vulnerability of the environment and the recognition that environmental risks have to be assessed on a continuous basis have become much stronger in the years since the Treaty's conclusion. These new concerns have enhanced the relevance of Articles 15, 19 and 20.

113. The Court recognizes that both Parties agree on the need to take environmental concerns seriously and to take the required precautionary measures, but they fundamentally disagree on the consequences this has for the joint Project. In such a case, third-party involvement may be helpful and instrumental in finding a solution, provided each of the Parties is flexible in its position.

114. Finally, Hungary maintained that by their conduct both parties had repudiated the Treaty and that a bilateral treaty repudiated by both parties cannot survive. The Court is of the view, however, that although it has found that both Hungary and Czechoslovakia failed to comply with their obligations under the 1977 Treaty, this reciprocal wrongful conduct did not bring the Treaty to an end nor justify its termination. The Court would set a precedent with disturbing implications for treaty relations and the integrity of the rule pacta sunt servanda if it were to conclude that a treaty in force between States, which the parties have implemented in considerable measure and at great cost over a period of years, might be unilaterally set aside on grounds of reciprocal non-compliance. It would be otherwise, of course, if the parties decided to terminate the Treaty by mutual consent. But in this case, while Hungary purported to terminate the Treaty, Czechoslovakia consistently resisted this act and declared it to be without legal effect.

* *

115. In the light of the conclusions it has reached above, the Court, in reply to the question put to it in Article 2, paragraph 1 (c), of the Special Agreement (see paragraph 89), finds that the notification of termination by Hungary of 19 May 1992 did not have the legal effect of terminating the 1977 Treaty and related instruments.

*

* *

116. In Article 2, paragraph 2, of the Special Agreement, the Court is requested to determine the legal consequences, including the rights and obligations for the Parties, arising from its Judgment on the questions formulated in paragraph 1. In Article 5 of the Special Agreement the Parties agreed to enter into negotiations on the modalities for the execution of the Judgment immediately after the Court has rendered it.

117. The Court must first turn to the question whether Slovakia became a party to the 1977 Treaty as successor to Czechoslovakia. As an alternative argument, Hungary contended that, even if the Treaty survived the notification of termination, in any event it ceased to be in force as a treaty on 31 December 1992, as a result of the "disappearance of one of the parties". On that date Czechoslovakia ceased to exist as a legal entity, and on 1 January 1993 the Czech Republic and the Slovak Republic came into existence.

118. According to Hungary, "There is no rule of international law which provides for automatic succession to bilateral treaties on the disappearance of a party" and such a treaty will not survive unless another State succeeds to it by express agreement between that State and the remaining party. While the second paragraph of the Preamble to the Special Agreement recites that "the Slovak Republic is one of the two successor States of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic and the sole successor State

2077

in respect of rights and obligations relating to the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project", Hungary sought to distinguish between, on the one hand, rights and obligations such as "continuing property rights" under the 1977 Treaty, and, on the other hand, the treaty itself. It argued that, during the negotiations leading to signature of the Special Agreement, Slovakia had proposed a text in which it would have been expressly recognized "as the successor to the Government of the CSFR" with regard to the 1977 Treaty, but that Hungary had rejected that formulation. It contended that it had never agreed to accept Slovakia as successor to the 1977 Treaty. Hungary referred to diplomatic exchanges in which the two Parties had each submitted to the other lists of those bilateral treaties which they respectively wished should continue in force between them, for negotiation on a case-by-case basis; and Hungary emphasized that no agreement was ever reached with regard to the 1977 Treaty.

119. Hungary claimed that there was no rule of succession which could operate in the present case to override the absence of consent.

Referring to Article 34 of the Vienna Convention of 23 August 1978 on Succession of States in respect of Treaties, in which "a rule of automatic succession to all treaties is provided for", based on the principle of continuity, Hungary argued not only that it never signed or ratified the Convention, but that the "concept of automatic succession" contained in that Article was not and is not, and has never been accepted as, a statement of general international law.

Hungary further submitted that the 1977 Treaty did not create "obligations and rights . . . relating to the regime of a boundary" within the meaning of Article 11 of that Convention, and noted that the existing course of the boundary was unaffected by the Treaty. It also denied that the Treaty was a "localized" treaty, or that it created rights "considered as attaching to [the] territory" within the meaning of Article 12 of the 1978 Convention, which would, as such, be unaffected by a succession of States. The 1977 Treaty was, Hungary insisted, simply a joint investment. Hungary's conclusion was that there is no basis on which the Treaty could have survived the disappearance of Czechoslovakia so as to be binding as between itself and Slovakia.

120. According to Slovakia, the 1977 Treaty, which was not lawfully terminated by Hungary's notification in May 1992, remains in force between itself, as successor State, and Hungary.

Slovakia acknowledged that there was no agreement on succession to the Treaty between itself and Hungary. It relied instead, in the first place, on the "general rule of continuity which applies in the case of dissolution"; it argued, secondly, that the Treaty is one "attaching to [the] territory" within the meaning of Article 12 of the 1978 Vienna Convention, and that it contains provisions relating to a boundary.

121. In support of its first argument Slovakia cited Article 34 of the 1978 Vienna Convention, which it claimed is a statement of customary international law, and which imposes the principle of automatic succession as the rule applicable in the case of dissolution of a State where the predecessor State has ceased to exist. Slovakia maintained that State practice in cases of dissolution tends to support continuity as the rule to be followed with regard to bilateral treaties. Slovakia having succeeded to part of the territory of the former Czechoslovakia, this would be the rule applicable in the present case.

122. Slovakia's second argument rests on "the principle of ipso jure continuity of treaties of a territorial or localized character". This rule, Slovakia said, is embodied in Article 12 of the 1978 Convention, which in part provides as follows:

"Article 12

2078

Other territorial regimes

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

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

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

....."

According to Slovakia, "[this] article [too] can be considered to be one of those provisions of the Vienna Convention that represent the codification of customary international law". The 1977 Treaty is said to fall within its scope because of its "specific characteristics . . . which place it in the category of treaties of a localized or territorial character". Slovakia also described the Treaty as one "which contains boundary provisions and lays down a specific territorial régime" which operates in the interest of all Danube riparian States, and as "a dispositive treaty, creating rights in rem, independently of the legal personality of its original signatories". Here, Slovakia relied on the recognition by the International Law Commission of the existence of a "special rule" whereby treaties "intended to establish an objective régime" must be considered as binding on a successor State (Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Succession of States in respect of Treaties, Vol. III, Doc. A/CONF.80/16/Add.2, p. 34). Thus, in Slovakia's view, the 1977 Treaty was not one which could have been terminated through the disappearance of one of the original parties.

*

123. The Court does not find it necessary for the purposes of the present case to enter into a discussion of whether or not Article 34 of the 1978 Convention reflects the state of customary international law. More relevant to its present analysis is the particular nature and character of the 1977 Treaty. An examination of this Treaty confirms that, aside from its undoubted nature as a joint investment, its major elements were the proposed construction and joint operation of a large, integrated and indivisible complex of structures and installations on specific parts of the respective territories of Hungary and Czechoslovakia along the Danube. The Treaty also established the navigational régime for an important sector of an international waterway, in particular the relocation of the main international shipping lane to the bypass canal. In so doing, it inescapably created a situation in which the interests of other users of the Danube were affected. Furthermore, the interests of third States were expressly acknowledged in Article 18, whereby the parties undertook to ensure "uninterrupted and safe navigation on the international fairway" in accordance with their obligations under the Convention of 18 August 1948 concerning the Régime of Navigation on the Danube.

In its Commentary on the Draft Articles on Succession of States in respect of Treaties, adopted at its twenty-sixth session, the International Law Commission identified "treaties of a territorial character" as having been regarded both in traditional doctrine and in modern opinion as unaffected by a succession of States (Official Records of the United Nations Conference on the Succession of States in respect of Treaties, Vol. III, Doc. A/CONF 80/16/Add.2, p. 27, para. 2). The draft text of Article 12, which reflects

2079

this principle, was subsequently adopted unchanged in the 1978 Vienna Convention. The Court considers that Article 12 reflects a rule of customary international law; it notes that neither of the Parties disputed this. Moreover, the Commission indicated that "treaties concerning water rights or navigation on rivers are commonly regarded as candidates for inclusion in the category of territorial treaties" (ibid., p. 33, para. 26). The Court observes that Article 12, in providing only, without reference to the treaty itself, that rights and obligations of a territorial character established by a treaty are unaffected by a succession of States, appears to lend support to the position of Hungary rather than of Slovakia. However the Court concludes that this formulation was devised rather to take account of the fact that, in many cases, treaties which had established boundaries or territorial régimes were no longer in force (ibid., pp. 26-37). Those that remained in force would nonetheless bind a successor State.

Taking all these factors into account, the Court finds that the content of the 1977 Treaty indicates that it must be regarded as establishing a territorial régime within the meaning of Article 12 of 1978 Vienna Convention. It created rights and obligations "attaching to" the parts of the Danube to which it relates; thus the Treaty itself cannot be affected by a succession of States. The Court therefore concludes that the 1977 Treaty became binding upon Slovakia on 1 January 1993.

124. It might be added that Slovakia also contended that, while still a constituent part of Czechoslovakia, it played a role in the development of the Project, as it did later, in the most critical phase of negotiations with Hungary about the fate of the Project. The evidence shows that the Slovak Government passed resolutions prior to the signing of the 1977 Treaty in preparation for its implementation; and again, after signature, expressing its support for the Treaty. It was the Slovak Prime Minister who attended the meeting held in Budapest on 22 April 1991 as the Plenipotentiary of the Federal Government to discuss questions arising out of the Project. It was his successor as Prime Minister who notified his Hungarian counterpart by letter on 30 July 1991 of the decision of the Government of the Slovak Republic, as well as of the Government of the Czech and Slovak Federal Republic, to proceed with the "provisional solution" (see paragraph 63 above); and who wrote again on 18 December 1991 to the Hungarian Minister without Portfolio, renewing an earlier suggestion that a joint commission be set up under the auspices of the European Communities to consider possible solutions. The Slovak Prime Minister also wrote to the Hungarian Prime Minister in May 1992 on the subject of the decision taken by the Hungarian Government to terminate the Treaty, informing him of resolutions passed by the Slovak Government in response.

It is not necessary, in the light of the conclusions reached in paragraph 123 above, for the Court to determine whether there are legal consequences to be drawn from the prominent part thus played by the Slovak Republic. Its role does, however, deserve mention.

*

* *

125. The Court now turns to the other legal consequences arising from its Judgment.

As to this, Hungary argued that future relations between the Parties, as far as Variant C is concerned, are not governed by the 1977 Treaty. It claims that it is entitled, pursuant to the Convention of 1976 on the Regulation of Water Management Issues of Boundary Waters, to "50% of the natural flow of the Danube at the point at which it crosses the boundary below Cunovo" and considers that the Parties

"are obliged to enter into negotiations in order to produce the result that the water conditions along the area from below Cunovo to below the confluence at Sap become

2080

jointly defined water conditions as required by Article 3 (a) of the 1976 Convention".

Hungary moreover indicated that any mutually accepted long-term discharge régime must be "capable of avoiding damage, including especially damage to biodiversity prohibited by the [1992 Rio Convention on Biological Diversity]". It added that "a joint environmental impact assessment of the region and of the future of Variant C structures in the context of the sustainable development of the region" should be carried out.

126. Hungary also raised the question of financial accountability for the failure of the original project and stated that both Parties accept the fact that the other has "proprietary and financial interests in the residues of the original Project and that an accounting has to be carried out". Furthermore, it noted that:

"Other elements of damage associated with Variant C on Hungarian territory also have to be brought into the accounting . . . , as well as electricity production since the diversion"

and that

"The overall situation is a complex one, and it may be most easily resolved by some form of lump sum settlement."

127. Hungary stated that Slovakia had incurred international responsibility and should make reparation for the damage caused to Hungary by the operation of Variant C. In that connection, it referred, in the context of reparation of the damage to the environment, to the rule of restitutio in integrum, and called for the re-establishment of "joint control by the two States over the installations maintained as they are now", and the "re-establishment of the flow of [the] waters to the level at which it stood prior to the unlawful diversion of the river". It also referred to reparation of the damage to the fauna, the flora, the soil, the sub-soil, the groundwater and the aquifer, the damages suffered by the Hungarian population on account of the increase in the uncertainties weighing on its future (pretium doloris), and the damage arising from the unlawful use, in order to divert the Danube, of installations over which the two Parties exercised joint ownership.

Lastly, Hungary called for the "cessation of the continuous unlawful acts" and a "guarantee that the same actions will not be repeated", and asked the Court to order "the permanent suspension of the operation of Variant C".

128. Slovakia argued for its part that Hungary should put an end to its unlawful conduct and cease to impede the application of the 1977 Treaty, taking account of its "flexibility and of the important possibilities of development for which it provides, or even of such amendments as might be made to it by agreement between the Parties, further to future negotiations". It stated that joint operations could resume on a basis jointly agreed upon and emphasized the following:

"whether Nagymaros is built as originally planned, or built elsewhere in a different form, or, indeed, not built at all, is a question to be decided by the Parties some time in the future.

.....

Provided the bypass canal and the Gabčíkovo Power-station and Locks — both part of the original Treaty, and not part of Variant C — remain operational and economically viable and efficient, Slovakia is prepared to negotiate over the future roles of Dunakiliti and

Cunovo, bearing Nagymaros in mind."

It indicated that the Gabčíkovo power plant would not operate in peak mode "if the evidence of environmental damage [was] clear and accepted by both Parties". Slovakia noted that the Parties appeared to agree that an accounting should be undertaken "so that, guided by the Court's findings on responsibility, the Parties can try to reach a global settlement". It added that the Parties would have to agree on how the sums due are to be paid.

129. Slovakia stated that Hungary must make reparation for the deleterious consequences of its failures to comply with its obligations, "whether they relate to its unlawful suspensions and abandonments of works or to its formal repudiation of the Treaty as from May 1992", and that compensation should take the form of a restitutio in integrum. It indicated that "Unless the Parties come to some other arrangement by concluding an agreement, restitutio in integrum ought to take the form of a return by Hungary, at a future time, to its obligations under the Treaty" and that "For compensation to be 'full'. . ., to 'wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act'. . ., a payment of compensation must . . . be added to the restitutio . . ." Slovakia claims compensation which must include both interest and loss of profits and should cover the following heads of damage, which it offers by way of guidance:

(1) Losses caused to Slovakia in the Gabčíkovo sector: costs incurred from 1990 to 1992 by Czechoslovakia in protecting the structures of the G/N project and adjacent areas; the cost of maintaining the old bed of the River Danube pending the availability of the new navigation canal, from 1990 to 1992; losses to the Czechoslovak navigation authorities due to the unavailability of the bypass canal from 1990 to 1992; construction costs of Variant C (1990-1992).

(2) Losses caused to Slovakia in the Nagymaros sector: losses in the field of navigation and flood protection incurred since 1992 by Slovakia due to the failure of Hungary to proceed with the works.

(3) Loss of electricity production.

Slovakia also calls for Hungary to "give the appropriate guarantees that it will abstain from preventing the application of the Treaty and the continuous operation of the system". It argued from that standpoint that it is entitled "to be given a formal assurance that the internationally wrongful acts of Hungary will not recur", and it added that "the maintenance of the closure of the Danube at Cunovo constitutes a guarantee of that kind", unless Hungary gives an equivalent guarantee "within the framework of the negotiations that are to take place between the Parties".

*

130. The Court observes that the part of its Judgment which answers the questions in Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Special Agreement has a declaratory character. It deals with the past conduct of the Parties and determines the lawfulness or unlawfulness of that conduct between 1989 and 1992 as well as its effects on the existence of the Treaty.

131. Now the Court has, on the basis of the foregoing findings, to determine what the future conduct of the Parties should be. This part of the Judgment is prescriptive rather than declaratory because it determines what the rights and obligations of the Parties are. The Parties will have to seek agreement on the modalities of the execution of the Judgment in the light of this determination, as they agreed to do in Article 5 of the Special Agreement.

* *

2082

132. In this regard it is of cardinal importance that the Court has found that the 1977 Treaty is still in force and consequently governs the relationship between the Parties. That relationship is also determined by the rules of other relevant conventions to which the two States are party, by the rules of general international law and, in this particular case, by the rules of State responsibility; but it is governed, above all, by the applicable rules of the 1977 Treaty as a *lex specialis*.

133. The Court, however, cannot disregard the fact that the Treaty has not been fully implemented by either party for years, and indeed that their acts of commission and omission have contributed to creating the factual situation that now exists. Nor can it overlook that factual situation — or the practical possibilities and impossibilities to which it gives rise — when deciding on the legal requirements for the future conduct of the Parties.

This does not mean that facts — in this case facts which flow from wrongful conduct — determine the law. The principle *ex injuria jus non oritur* is sustained by the Court's finding that the legal relationship created by the 1977 Treaty is preserved and cannot in this case be treated as voided by unlawful conduct.

What is essential, therefore, is that the factual situation as it has developed since 1989 shall be placed within the context of the preserved and developing treaty relationship, in order to achieve its object and purpose in so far as that is feasible. For it is only then that the irregular state of affairs which exists as the result of the failure of both Parties to comply with their treaty obligations can be remedied.

134. What might have been a correct application of the law in 1989 or 1992, if the case had been before the Court then, could be a miscarriage of justice if prescribed in 1997. The Court cannot ignore the fact that the Gabčíkovo power plant has been in operation for nearly five years, that the bypass canal which feeds the plant receives its water from a significantly smaller reservoir formed by a dam which is built not at Dunakiliti but at Cunovo, and that the plant is operated in a run-of-the-river mode and not in a peak hour mode as originally foreseen. Equally, the Court cannot ignore the fact that, not only has Nagymaros not been built, but that, with the effective discarding by both Parties of peak power operation, there is no longer any point in building it.

135. As the Court has already had occasion to point out, the 1977 Treaty was not only a joint investment project for the production of energy, but it was designed to serve other objectives as well: the improvement of the navigability of the Danube, flood control and regulation of ice-discharge, and the protection of the natural environment. None of these objectives has been given absolute priority over the other, in spite of the emphasis which is given in the Treaty to the construction of a System of Locks for the production of energy. None of them has lost its importance. In order to achieve these objectives the parties accepted obligations of conduct, obligations of performance, and obligations of result.

136. It could be said that that part of the obligations of performance which related to the construction of the System of Locks — in so far as they were not yet implemented before 1992 — have been overtaken by events. It would be an administration of the law altogether out of touch with reality if the Court were to order those obligations to be fully reinstated and the works at Cunovo to be demolished when the objectives of the Treaty can be adequately served by the existing structures.

137. Whether this is indeed the case is, first and foremost, for the Parties to decide. Under the 1977 Treaty its several objectives must be attained in an integrated and consolidated programme, to be developed in the Joint Contractual Plan. The Joint Contractual Plan was, until 1989, adapted and amended frequently to better fit the wishes of the parties. This Plan was also expressly described as the means to achieve the objectives of maintenance of water quality and protection of the environment.

2083

138. The 1977 Treaty never laid down a rigid system, albeit that the construction of a system of locks at Gabčíkovo and Nagymaros was prescribed by the Treaty itself. In this respect, however, the subsequent terminating construction at Nagymaros, but Czechoslovakia stated, on various occasions in the course of negotiations, that it was willing to consider a limitation or even exclusion of operation in peak hour mode. In the latter case the construction of the Nagymaros dam would have become pointless. The explicit terms of the Treaty itself were therefore in practice acknowledged by the parties to be negotiable.

139. The Court is of the opinion that the Parties are under a legal obligation, during the negotiations to be held by virtue of Article 5 of the Special Agreement, to consider, within the context of the 1977 Treaty, in what way the multiple objectives of the Treaty can best be served, keeping in mind that all of them should be fulfilled.

140. It is clear that the Project's impact upon, and its implications for, the environment are of necessity a key issue. The numerous scientific reports which have been presented to the Court by the Parties — even if their conclusions are often contradictory — provide abundant evidence that this impact and these implications are considerable.

In order to evaluate the environmental risks, current standards must be taken into consideration. This is not only allowed by the wording of Articles 15 and 19, but even prescribed, to the extent that these articles impose a continuing — and thus necessarily evolving — obligation on the parties to maintain the quality of the water of the Danube and to protect nature.

The Court is mindful that, in the field of environmental protection, vigilance and prevention are required on account of the often irreversible character of damage to the environment and of the limitations inherent in the very mechanism of reparation of this type of damage.

Throughout the ages, mankind has, for economic and other reasons, constantly interfered with nature. In the past, this was often done without consideration of the effects upon the environment. Owing to new scientific insights and to a growing awareness of the risks for mankind — for present and future generations — of pursuit of such interventions at an unconsidered and unabated pace, new norms and standards have been developed, set forth in a great number of instruments during the last two decades. Such new norms have to be taken into consideration, and such new standards given proper weight, not only when States contemplate new activities but also when continuing with activities begun in the past. This need to reconcile economic development with protection of the environment is aptly expressed in the concept of sustainable development.

For the purposes of the present case, this means that the Parties together should look afresh at the effects on the environment of the operation of the Gabčíkovo power plant. In particular they must find a satisfactory solution for the volume of water to be released into the old bed of the Danube and into the side-arms on both sides of the river.

141. It is not for the Court to determine what shall be the final result of these negotiations to be conducted by the Parties. It is for the Parties themselves to find an agreed solution that takes account of the objectives of the Treaty, which must be pursued in a joint and integrated way, as well as the norms of international environmental law and the principles of the law of international watercourses. The Court will recall in this context that, as it said in the *North Sea Continental Shelf* cases:

"[the Parties] are under an obligation so to conduct themselves that the negotiations are

2084

meaningful, which will not be the case when either of them insists upon its own position without contemplating any modification of it" (I.C.J. Reports 1969, p. 47, para. 85).

142. What is required in the present case by the rule *pacta sunt servanda*, as reflected in Article 26 of the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties, is that the Parties find an agreed solution within the co-operative context of the Treaty.

Article 26 combines two elements, which are of equal importance. It provides that "Every treaty in force is binding upon the parties to it and must be performed by them in good faith". This latter element, in the Court's view, implies that, in this case, it is the purpose of the Treaty, and the intentions of the parties in concluding it, which should prevail over its literal application. The principle of good faith obliges the Parties to apply it in a reasonable way and in such a manner that its purpose can be realized.

143. During this dispute both Parties have called upon the assistance of the Commission of the European Communities. Because of the diametrically opposed positions the Parties took with regard to the required outcome of the trilateral talks which were envisaged, those talks did not succeed. When, after the present Judgment is given, bilateral negotiations without pre-conditions are held, both Parties can profit from the assistance and expertise of a third party. The readiness of the Parties to accept such assistance would be evidence of the good faith with which they conduct bilateral negotiations in order to give effect to the Judgment of the Court.

144. The 1977 Treaty not only contains a joint investment programme, it also establishes a régime. According to the Treaty, the main structures of the System of Locks are the joint property of the Parties; their operation will take the form of a co-ordinated single unit; and the benefits of the project shall be equally shared.

Since the Court has found that the Treaty is still in force and that, under its terms, the joint régime is a basic element, it considers that, unless the Parties agree otherwise, such a régime should be restored.

145. Article 10, paragraph 1, of the Treaty states that works of the System of Locks constituting the joint property of the contracting parties shall be operated, as a co-ordinated single unit and in accordance with jointly-agreed operating and operational procedures, by the authorized operating agency of the contracting party in whose territory the works are built. Paragraph 2 of that Article states that works on the System of Locks owned by one of the contracting parties shall be independently operated or maintained by the agencies of that Contracting Party in the jointly prescribed manner.

The Court is of the opinion that the works at Cunovo should become a jointly operated unit within the meaning of Article 10, paragraph 1, in view of their pivotal role in the operation of what remains of the Project and for the water-management régime. The dam at Cunovo has taken over the role which was originally destined for the works at Dunakiliti, and therefore should have a similar status.

146. The Court also concludes that Variant C, which it considers operates in a manner incompatible with the Treaty, should be made to conform to it. By associating Hungary, on an equal footing, in its operation, management and benefits, Variant C will be transformed from a *de facto* status into a treaty-based régime.

It appears from various parts of the record that, given the current state of information before the Court, Variant C could be made to function in such a way as to accommodate both the economic operation of the system of electricity generation and the satisfaction of essential environmental concerns.

2085

Regularization of Variant C by making it part of a single and indivisible operational system of works also appears necessary to ensure that Article 9 of the Treaty, which provides that the contracting parties shall participate in the use and in the benefits of the System of Locks in equal measure, will again become effective.

147. *Re-establishment of the joint régime will also reflect in an optimal way the concept of common utilization of shared water resources for the achievement of the several objectives mentioned in the Treaty, in concordance with Article 5, paragraph 2, of the Convention on the Law of the Non-Navigational Uses of International Watercourses, according to which:*

"Watercourse States shall participate in the use, development and protection of an international watercourse in an equitable and reasonable manner. Such participation includes both the right to utilize the watercourse and the duty to cooperate in the protection and development thereof, as provided in the present Convention." (General Assembly Doc. A/51/869 of 11 April 1997.)

* *

148. *Thus far the Court has indicated what in its view should be the effects of its finding that the 1977 Treaty is still in force. Now the Court will turn to the legal consequences of the internationally wrongful acts committed by the Parties.*

149. *The Permanent Court of International Justice stated in its Judgment of 13 September 1928 in the case concerning the Factory at Chorzów:*

"reparation must, as far as possible, wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act and reestablish the situation which would, in all probability, have existed if that act had not been committed" (P.C.I.J., Series A, No. 17, p. 47).

150. *Reparation must, "as far as possible", wipe out all the consequences of the illegal act. In this case, the consequences of the wrongful acts of both Parties will be wiped out "as far as possible" if they resume their co-operation in the utilization of the shared water resources of the Danube, and if the multi-purpose programme, in the form of a co-ordinated single unit, for the use, development and protection of the watercourse is implemented in an equitable and reasonable manner. What it is possible for the Parties to do is to re-establish co-operative administration of what remains of the Project. To that end, it is open to them to agree to maintain the works at Cunovo, with changes in the mode of operation in respect of the allocation of water and electricity, and not to build works at Nagymaros.*

151. *The Court has been asked by both Parties to determine the consequences of the Judgment as they bear upon payment of damages. According to the Preamble to the Special Agreement, the Parties agreed that Slovakia is the sole successor State of Czechoslovakia in respect of rights and obligations relating to the Gabčíkovo-Nagymaros Project. Slovakia thus may be liable to pay compensation not only for its own wrongful conduct but also for that of Czechoslovakia, and it is entitled to be compensated for the damage sustained by Czechoslovakia as well as by itself as a result of the wrongful conduct of Hungary.*

152. *The Court has not been asked at this stage to determine the quantum of damages due, but to indicate on what basis they should be paid. Both Parties claimed to have suffered considerable financial losses and both claim pecuniary compensation for them.*

2086

It is a well-established rule of international law that an injured State is entitled to obtain compensation from the State which has committed an internationally wrongful act for the damage caused by it. In the present Judgment, the Court has concluded that both Parties committed internationally wrongful acts, and it has noted that those acts gave rise to the damage sustained by the Parties; consequently, Hungary and Slovakia are both under an obligation to pay compensation and are both entitled to obtain compensation.

Slovakia is accordingly entitled to compensation for the damage suffered by Czechoslovakia as well as by itself as a result of Hungary's decision to suspend and subsequently abandon the works at Nagymaros and Dunakiliti, as those actions caused the postponement of the putting into operation of the Gabčíkovo power plant, and changes in its mode of operation once in service.

Hungary is entitled to compensation for the damage sustained as a result of the diversion of the Danube, since Czechoslovakia, by putting into operation Variant C, and Slovakia, in maintaining it in service, deprived Hungary of its rightful part in the shared water resources, and exploited those resources essentially for their own benefit.

153. *Given the fact, however, that there have been intersecting wrongs by both Parties, the Court wishes to observe that the issue of compensation could satisfactorily be resolved in the framework of an overall settlement if each of the Parties were to renounce or cancel all financial claims and counter-claims.*

154. *At the same time, the Court wishes to point out that the settlement of accounts for the construction of the works is different from the issue of compensation, and must be resolved in accordance with the 1977 Treaty and related instruments. If Hungary is to share in the operation and benefits of the Cunovo complex, it must pay a proportionate share of the building and running costs.*

*

* *

155. *For these reasons,*

THE COURT,

(1) Having regard to Article 2, paragraph 1, of the Special Agreement,

A. Finds, by fourteen votes to one, that Hungary was not entitled to suspend and subsequently abandon, in 1989, the works on the Nagymaros Project and on the part of the Gabčíkovo Project for which the Treaty of 16 September 1977 and related instruments attributed responsibility to it;

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Shi, Fleischhauer, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans, Rezek; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: Judge Herczegh;

B. Finds, by nine votes to six, that Czechoslovakia was entitled to proceed, in November 1991, to the "provisional solution" as described in the terms of the Special Agreement;

IN FAVOUR: Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Guillaume, Shi, Koroma,

2087

Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: President Schwebel; Judges Bedjaoui, Ranjeva, Herczegh, Fleischhauer, Rezek;

C. Finds, by ten votes to five, that Czechoslovakia was not entitled to put into operation, from October 1992, this "provisional solution";

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Herczegh, Shi, Fleischhauer, Kooijmans, Rezek;

AGAINST: Judges Oda, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

D. Finds, by eleven votes to four, that the notification, on 19 May 1992, of the termination of the Treaty of 16 September 1977 and related instruments by Hungary did not have the legal effect of terminating them;

IN FAVOUR: Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Shi, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: President Schwebel; Judges Herczegh, Fleischhauer, Rezek;

(2) Having regard to Article 2, paragraph 2, and Article 5 of the Special Agreement,

A. Finds, by twelve votes to three, that Slovakia, as successor to Czechoslovakia, became a party to the Treaty of 16 September 1977 as from 1 January 1993;

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Shi, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: Judges Herczegh, Fleischhauer, Rezek;

B. Finds, by thirteen votes to two, that Hungary and Slovakia must negotiate in good faith in the light of the prevailing situation, and must take all necessary measures to ensure the achievement of the objectives of the Treaty of 16 September 1977, in accordance with such modalities as they may agree upon;

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Shi, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans, Rezek; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: Judges Herczegh, Fleischhauer;

C. Finds, by thirteen votes to two, that, unless the Parties otherwise agree, a joint operational régime must be established in accordance with the Treaty of 16 September 1977;

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Shi, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans, Rezek; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

2088

AGAINST: Judges Herczegh, Fleischhauer;

D. Finds, by twelve votes to three, that, unless the Parties otherwise agree, Hungary shall compensate Slovakia for the damage sustained by Czechoslovakia and by Slovakia on account of the suspension and abandonment by Hungary of works for which it was responsible; and Slovakia shall compensate Hungary for the damage it has sustained on account of the putting into operation of the "provisional solution" by Czechoslovakia and its maintenance in service by Slovakia;

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Herczegh, Shi, Fleischhauer, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans, Rezek; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: Judges Oda, Koroma, Vereshchetin;

E. Finds, by thirteen votes to two, that the settlement of accounts for the construction and operation of the works must be effected in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Treaty of 16 September 1977 and related instruments, taking due account of such measures as will have been taken by the Parties in application of points 2 B and C of the present operative paragraph.

IN FAVOUR: President Schwebel; Vice-President Weeramantry; Judges Oda, Bedjaoui, Guillaume, Ranjeva, Shi, Koroma, Vereshchetin, Parra-Aranguren, Kooijmans, Rezek; Judge ad hoc Skubiszewski;

AGAINST: Judges Herczegh, Fleischhauer.

Done in English and in French, the English text being authoritative, at the Peace Palace, The Hague, this twenty-fifth day of September, one thousand nine hundred and ninety-seven, in three copies, one of which will be placed in the archives of the Court and the others transmitted to the Government of the Republic of Hungary and the Government of the Slovak Republic, respectively.

(Signed) Stephen M. SCHWEBEL,

President.

(Signed) Eduardo VALENCIA-OSPINA,

Registrar.

President SCHWEBEL and Judge REZEK append declarations to the Judgment of the Court.

Vice-President WEERAMANTRY, Judges BEDJAOUI and KOROMA append separate opinions to the Judgment of the Court.

Judges ODA, RANJEVA, HERCZEGH, FLEISCHHAUER, VERESHCHETIN and PARRA-ARANGUREN, and Judge ad hoc SKUBISZEWSKI append dissenting opinions to the Judgment of the Court.

(Initialled) S. M. S.

2089

(Initialled) E. V. O.

ANNEX 7:

Brownlie, Principles of Public International Law (5th edn, 1998) (extract)

2091

PRINCIPLES OF PUBLIC INTERNATIONAL LAW

BY

IAN BROWNLIE, CBE, QC, FBA

Bencher of Gray's Inn

Chichele Professor of Public International Law in the University of Oxford

Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford

Member of the Institute of International Law

Member of the International Law Commission

FIFTH EDITION

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

OXFORD

UNIVERSITY PRESS

Great Clarendon Street, Oxford OX2 6DP

Oxford University Press is a department of the University of Oxford.
It furthers the University's objective of excellence in research, scholarship,
and education by publishing worldwide in

Oxford New York

Athens Auckland Bangkok Bogotá Buenos Aires Calcutta
Cape Town Chennai Dar es Salaam Delhi Florence Hong Kong Istanbul
Karachi Kuala Lumpur Madrid Melbourne Mexico City Mumbai
Nairobi Paris São Paulo Singapore Taipei Tokyo Toronto Warsaw
with associated companies in Berlin Ibadan

Oxford is a registered trade mark of Oxford University Press
in the UK and in certain other countries

Published in the United States
by Oxford University Press Inc., New York

© Ian Brownlie 1998

First edition 1966

Second edition 1973

Third edition 1979

Fourth edition 1990

Fifth edition 1998, reprinted 1999, 2001, 2002

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced,
stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means,
without the prior permission in writing of Oxford University Press,
or as expressly permitted by law, or under terms agreed with the appropriate
reprographics rights organization. Enquiries concerning reproduction
outside the scope of the above should be sent to the Rights Department,
Oxford University Press, at the address above.

You must not circulate this book in any other binding or cover
and you must impose this same condition on any acquirer.

British Library Cataloguing in Publication Data
Data available

Library of Congress Cataloging in Publication Data
Brownlie, Ian.

Principles of public international law by Ian Brownlie.—5th ed.
Includes bibliographical references.

1. International law. I. Title.

JX3225.B78 1990 341—dc20 89-23244

ISBN 0-19-876298-4

ISBN 0-19-876299-2 (Pbk)

Typeset by Hope Services (Abingdon) Ltd.

Printed in Great Britain by

Biddles Ltd

www.biddles.co.uk

Convention on the Law of Treaties, consisting of eighty-five articles and an Annex. The Convention³ entered into force on 27 January 1980 and not less than eighty-one states have become parties.⁴

The Convention is not as a whole declaratory of general international law: it does not express itself so to be (see the preamble). Various provisions clearly involve progressive development of the law; and the preamble affirms that questions not regulated by its provisions will continue to be governed by the rules of customary international law. Nonetheless, a good number of articles are essentially declaratory of existing law and certainly those provisions which are not constitute presumptive evidence of emergent rules of general international law.⁵ The provisions of the Convention are normally regarded as a primary source: as, for example, in the oral proceedings before the International Court in the *Namibia* case. In its Advisory Opinion in that case the Court observed:⁶ 'The rules laid down by the Vienna Convention . . . concerning termination of a treaty relationship on account of breach (adopted without a dissenting vote) may in many respects be considered as a codification of existing customary law on the subject'.

The Convention was adopted by a very substantial majority at the Conference⁷ and constitutes a comprehensive code of the main areas of the law of treaties. However, it does not deal with (a) treaties between states and organizations, or between two or more organizations;⁸ (b) questions of state succession;⁹ (c) the effect of war on treaties.¹⁰ The Convention is not retroactive in effect.¹¹

A provisional draft of the International Law Commission¹² defined a 'treaty' as:

any international agreement in written form, whether embodied in a single instrument or in two or more related instruments and whatever its particular designation (treaty, convention, protocol, covenant, charter, statute, act,

³ Text: 63 AJ (1969), 875; 8 ILM (1969), 679; Brownlie, *Documents*, p. 388. For the preparatory materials see: items in n. 2; *United Nations Conference on the Law of Treaties, First Session, Official Records, A/CONF. 39/11*; *Second Session, A/CONF. 39/11*; Add. 1; Rosenne, *The Law of Treaties* (1970). For comment see Reuter, *La Convention de Vienne sur le droit des traités* (1970); Elias, *The Modern Law of Treaties* (1974); Sinclair, *The Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties* (2nd edn. 1984); Kearney and Dalton, 64 AJ (1970), 495-561; Jennings, 121 *Hague Recueil* (1967, II), 527-81; Deleau, *Ann. français* (1969), 7-23; Nahlik, *ibid.* 24-53; Frankowska, 3 *Polish Yrbk.* (1970), 227-55.

⁴ Art. 84.

⁵ Cf. *North Sea Continental Shelf Cases*, *supra*, p. 12.
⁶ ICJ Reports (1971), 16 at 47. See also *Appeal relating to Jurisdiction of ICAO Council*, ICJ Reports (1972), 46 at 67; *Fisheries Jurisdiction Case*, ICJ Reports (1973), 3 at 18; *Iran-United States, Case No. A/18*; ILR 75, 176 at 187-8; *Lithagow*, *ibid.* 439 at 483-4; *Restrictions on the Death Penalty* (Adv. Op. of Inter-American Ct. of HR, 8 Sept. 1983), ILR 70, 449 at 465-71; and Briggs, 68 AJ (1974), 51-68.

⁷ 79 votes in favour; 1 against; 19 abstentions.

⁸ *Infra*, p. 661.

¹¹ See McDade, 35 *ICLQ* (1986), 499-511.

⁸ *Infra*, p. 678.

¹⁰ See *infra*, p. 621.

¹² *Yrbk. ILC* (1962), ii. 161.

from the first in that only 'notorious' constitutional limitations are effective on the international plane. The third view is that a state is bound irrespective of internal limitations by consent given by an agent properly authorized according to international law. Some advocates of this view qualify the rule in cases where the other state is aware of the failure to comply with internal law or where the irregularity is manifest. This position, which involves a presumption of competence and excepts manifest irregularity, was approved by the International Law Commission, in its draft Article 43, in 1966. The Commission stated that 'the decisions of international tribunals and State practice, if they are not conclusive, appear to support' this type of solution.⁵⁷

At the Vienna Conference the draft provision was strengthened and the result appears in the Convention, Article 46:

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

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

(b) *Representative's lack of authority.*⁵⁸ The Vienna Convention provides that if the authority of a representative to express the consent of his state to be bound by a particular treaty has been made subject to a specific restriction, his omission to observe the restriction may not be invoked as a ground of invalidity unless the restriction was previously notified to the other negotiating states.

(c) *Corruption of a state representative.* The International Law Commission decided that corruption of representatives was not adequately dealt with as a case of fraud⁵⁹ and an appropriate provision appears in the Vienna Convention, Article 50.

(d) *Error.*⁶⁰ The Vienna Convention, Article 48,⁶¹ contains two principal provisions which probably reproduce the existing law and are as follows:

1. A State may invoke an error in a treaty as invalidating its consent to be bound by the treaty if the error relates to a fact or situation which was

⁵⁷ *Yrbk. ILC* (1966), ii. 240-2.

⁵⁸ *ILC draft*, Art. 32; *Yrbk. ILC* (1963), ii. 193; Waldock, *ibid.* 46-7; Final Draft, Art. 44; *Yrbk. ILC* (1966), ii. 242; Vienna Conv., Art. 47.

⁵⁹ *Yrbk. ILC* (1966), ii. 245.

⁶⁰ See Lauterpacht, *Yrbk. ILC* (1953), ii. 153; Fitzmaurice, 2 *ILCQ* (1953), 25, 35-7; Waldock, *Yrbk. ILC* (1963), ii. 48-50; Oraison, *L'Erreur dans les traités* (1972); Thirlway, 63 *BY* (1992), 22-8.

⁶¹ See also *Yrbk. ILC* (1966), ii. 243-4.

ANNEX 8:
Lome Agreement Ratification Act 1999.

2096

1999

SIGNED this 18th day of July, 1999.

ALHAJI AHMAD TEJAN KABBAH,
President.

LS

Sum Voted
Le
910,000.00
145,913.00
079,300.00
000,000.00
000,000.00
620,000.00
194,800.00
541,000.00
000,000.00
715,650.00
938,000.00
028,200.00

n respect of
ges incurred
arrants dated
pectively in

No. 3



Sierra Leone

1999

ir Lord one

RPENTER,
Parliament.

with the Bill
printed copy

RPENTER,
Parliament.

The Lomé Peace Agreement (Ratification) Act, 1999 Short title.

Being an Act to ratify a Peace Agreement dated 7th July, 1999 and signed by the President in the name of Sierra Leone, of the one part, and the Leader of the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone, of the other part.

[22nd July, 1999] Date of Commencement.

SIGNED this 18th day of July, 1999.

ALHAJI AHMAD TEJAN KABBAH,
President.

LS

No. 3



Sierra Leone

1999

The Lomé Peace Agreement (Ratification) Act, 1999 Short title.

Being an Act to ratify a Peace Agreement dated 7th July, 1999 and signed by the President in the name of Sierra Leone, of the one part, and the Leader of the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone, of the other part.

[22nd July, 1999] Date of Commencement.

WHEREAS a Peace Agreement was, on 7th July, 1999, signed in Lomé, Togo, between the President, Alhaji Ahmad Tejan Kabbah in the name of Sierra Leone, of the one part, and Corporal Foday Saybana Sankoh, Leader of the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone, of the other part:

AND WHEREAS the Peace Agreement contains provisions which alter the law of Sierra Leone and impose a charge on the Consolidated Fund and other funds of Sierra Leone to be established under the Peace Agreement by Acts of Parliament:

AND WHEREAS by the proviso to subsection (4) of section 40 of the Constitution of Sierra Leone, 1991, it is necessary in the light of the foregoing, for the Peace Agreement to be ratified by Act of Parliament:

NOW, THEREFORE, it is enacted by the President and Members of Parliament in this present Parliament assembled as follows: —

Ratification of
Peace
Agreement

1. The Peace Agreement referred to in the preamble and set out more fully in the Schedule is hereby ratified by Parliament.

Ratification
to include
alteration of
the law, etc.,
of Sierra
Leone.

2. The ratification effected by section 1 shall extend to the alteration of the law of Sierra Leone and the charge imposed on the Consolidated Fund and other funds to be established under the Peace Agreement by Acts of Parliament.

Interpretation.
Act No. 6 of
1991.

3. In this Act, "law" has the same meaning assigned thereto in subsection (1) of Section 171 of the Constitution of Sierra Leone, 1991.

SCHEDULE

(Section 1)

PEACE AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE
GOVERNMENT OF SIERRA LEONE
AND THE
REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT
OF SIERRA LEONE

THE GOVERNMENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF SIERRA LEONE and
THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE (RUF/SL)

Having met in Lomé, Togo, from the 25 May, 1999, to 7 July, 1999 under the
auspices of the Current Chairman of ECOWAS, President Gnassingbé Eyadéma;

Recalling earlier initiatives undertaken by the countries of the sub-region and
the International Community, aimed at bringing about a negotiated settlement of the
conflict in Sierra Leone, and culminating in the Abidjan Peace Agreement of 30
November, 1996 and the ECOWAS Peace Plan of 23 October, 1997;

Moved by the imperative need to meet the desire of the people of Sierra Leone
for a definitive settlement of the fratricidal war in their country and for genuine
national unity and reconciliation;

Committed to promoting full respect for human rights and humanitarian law;

Committed to promoting popular participation in the governance of the
country and the advancement of democracy in a socio-political framework free of
inequality, nepotism and corruption;

Concerned with the socio-economic well being of all the people of Sierra
Leone;

Determined to foster mutual trust and confidence between themselves;

Determined to establish sustainable peace and security; to pledge forthwith,
to settle all past, present and future differences and grievances by peaceful means;
and to refrain from the threat and use of armed force to bring about any change in
Sierra Leone;

Reaffirming the conviction that sovereignty belongs to the people, and that Government derives all its powers, authority and legitimacy from the people;

Recognising the imperative that the children of Sierra Leone, especially those affected by armed conflict, in view of their vulnerability, are entitled to special care and the protection of their inherent right to life, survival and development, in accordance with the provisions of the International Convention on the Rights of the Child;

Guided by the Declaration in the Final Communiqué of the Meeting in Lomé of the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of ECOWAS of 25 May, 1999, in which they stressed the importance of democracy as a factor of regional peace and security, and as essential to the socio-economic development of ECOWAS Member States; and in which they pledged their commitment to the consolidation of democracy and respect of human rights while reaffirming the need for all Member States to consolidate their democratic base, observe the principles of good governance and good economic management in order to ensure the emergence and development of a democratic culture which takes into account the interests of the peoples of West Africa ;

Recommitting themselves to the total observance and compliance with the Cease-fire Agreement signed in Lomé on 18 May, 1999, and appended as Annex 1 until the signing of the present Peace Agreement ;

HEREBY AGREE AS FOLLOWS:

PART ONE

CESSATION OF HOSTILITIES

ARTICLE I

CEASE-FIRE

The armed conflict between the Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL is hereby ended with immediate effect. Accordingly, the two sides shall ensure that a total and permanent cessation of hostilities is observed forthwith.

ARTICLE II

CEASE-FIRE MONITORING

1. A Cease-fire Monitoring Committee (hereinafter termed the CMC) to be chaired by the United Nations Observer Mission in Sierra Leone (hereinafter termed UNOMSIL) with representatives of the Government of Sierra Leone, RUF/SL, the Civil Defence Forces (hereinafter termed the CDF) and ECOMOG shall be established at provincial and district levels with immediate effect to monitor, verify and report all violations of the cease-fire.

2. A Joint Monitoring Commission (hereinafter termed the JMC) shall be established at the national level to be chaired by UNOMSIL with representatives of the Government of Sierra Leone, RUF/SL, CDF and ECOMOG. The JMC shall receive, investigate and take appropriate action on reports of violations of the cease-fire from the CMC. The parties agree to the definition of cease-fire violations as contained in Annex 2 which constitutes an integral part of the present Agreement.

3. The parties shall seek the assistance of the International Community in providing funds and other logistics to enable the JMC to carry out its mandate.

PART TWO

GOVERNANCE

The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL, recognizing the right of the people of Sierra Leone to live in peace, and desirous of finding a transitional mechanism to incorporate the RUF/SL into governance within the spirit and letter of the Constitution, agree to the following formulas for structuring the government for the duration of the period before the next elections, as prescribed by the Constitution, managing scarce public resources for the benefit of the development of the people of Sierra Leone and sharing the responsibility of implementing the peace. Each of these formulas (not in priority order) is contained in a separate Article of this Part of the present Agreement; and may be further detailed in protocols annexed to it.

Article III Transformation of the RUF/SL into a Political Party

Article IV Enabling Members of the RUF/SL to Hold Public Office

Article V Enabling the RUF/SL to Join a Broad-based Government of National Unity through Cabinet Appointment

Article VI Commission for the Consolidation of Peace

Article VII Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development

Article VIII Council of Elders and Religious Leaders.

ARTICLE III

TRANSFORMATION OF THE RUF/SL INTO A POLITICAL PARTY

1. The Government of Sierra Leone shall accord every facility to the RUF/SL to transform itself into a political party and enter the mainstream of the democratic process. To that end:
2. Immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement, the RUF/SL shall commence to organize itself to function as a political movement, with the rights, privileges and duties accorded to all political parties in Sierra Leone. These include the freedom to publish, unhindered access to the media, freedom of association, freedom of expression, freedom of assembly, and the right to mobilize and associate freely.
3. Within a period of thirty days, following the signing of the present Agreement, the necessary legal steps shall be taken by the Government of Sierra Leone to enable the RUF/SL to register as a political party.
4. The Parties shall approach the International Community with a view to mobilizing resources for the purposes of enabling the RUF/SL to function as a political party. These resources may include but shall not be limited to:
 - (i) Setting up a trust fund;
 - (ii) Training for RUF/SL membership in party organization and functions; and
 - (iii) Providing any other assistance necessary for achieving the goals of this section.

ARTICLE IV

ENABLING MEMBERS OF THE RUF/SL TO HOLD PUBLIC OFFICE

1. The Government of Sierra Leone shall take the necessary steps to enable those RUF/SL members nominated by the RUF/SL to hold public office, within the time-frames agreed and contained in the present Agreement for the integration of the various bodies named herein.

2. Accordingly, necessary legal steps shall be taken by the Government of Sierra Leone, within a period of fourteen days following the signing of the present Agreement, to amend relevant laws and regulations that may constitute an impediment or bar to RUF/SL and AFRC personnel holding public office.

3. Within seven days of the removal of any such legal impediments, both parties shall meet to discuss and agree on the appointment of RUF/SL members to positions in parastatals, diplomacy and any other public sector.

ARTICLE V

ENABLING THE RUF/SL TO JOIN A BROAD-BASED GOVERNMENT OF NATIONAL UNITY THROUGH CABINET APPOINTMENTS

1. The Government of Sierra Leone shall accord every opportunity to the RUF/SL to join a broad-based government of national unity through cabinet appointments. To that end:

2. The Chairmanship of the Board of the Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (CMRRD) as provided for in Article VII of the present Agreement shall be offered to the leader of the RUF/SL, Corporal Foday Sankoh. For this purpose he shall enjoy the status of Vice President and shall therefore be answerable only to the President of Sierra Leone.

3. The Government of Sierra Leone shall give ministerial positions to the RUF/SL in a moderately expanded cabinet of 18, bearing in mind that the interests of other political parties and civil society organizations should also be taken into account, as follows:

- (i) One of the senior cabinet appointments such as finance, foreign affairs and justice;
- (ii) Three other cabinet positions.

4. In addition, the Government of Sierra Leone shall, in the same spirit, make available to the RUF/SL the following senior government positions: Four posts of Deputy Minister.

5. Within a period of fourteen days following the signing of the present Agreement, the necessary steps shall be taken by the Government of Sierra Leone to remove any legal impediments that may prevent RUF/SL members from holding cabinet and other positions.

ARTICLE VI

COMMISSION FOR THE CONSOLIDATION OF PEACE

1. A Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (hereinafter after termed the CCP), shall be established within two weeks of the signing of the present Agreement to implement a post-conflict programme that ensures reconciliation and the welfare of all parties to the conflict, especially the victims of war. The CCP shall have the overall goal and responsibility for supervising and monitoring the implementation of and compliance with the provisions of the present Agreement relative to the promotion of national reconciliation and the consolidation of peace.

2. The CCP shall ensure that all structures for national reconciliation and the consolidation of peace already in existence and those provided for in the present Agreement are operational and given the necessary resources for realizing their respective mandates. These structures shall comprise:

- (i) the Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development;
- (ii) the Joint Monitoring Commission;
- (iii) the Provincial and District Cease-fire Monitoring Committees;
- (iv) the Committee for the Release of Prisoners of War and Non-Combatants;

- (v) the Committee for Humanitarian Assistance;
- (vi) the National Commission on Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration;
- (vii) the National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction;
- (viii) the Human Rights Commission; and
- (ix) the Truth and Reconciliation Commission.

3. The CCP shall have the right to inspect any activity or site connected with the implementation of the present Agreement.

4. The CCP shall have full powers to organize its work in any manner it deems appropriate and to appoint any group or sub-committee which it deems necessary in the discharge of its functions.

5. The Commission shall be composed of the following members:

- (i) Two representatives of the civil society;
- (ii) One representative each named by the Government, the RUF/SL and the Parliament.

6. The CCP shall have its own offices, adequate communication facilities and secretariat support staff.

7. Recommendations for improvements or modifications shall be made to the President of Sierra Leone for appropriate action. Likewise, failures of the structures to perform their assigned duties shall also be brought to the attention of the President.

8. Disputes arising out of the preceding paragraph shall be brought to the Council of Elders and Religious Leaders for resolution, as specified in Article VIII of the present Agreement.

9. Should Protocols be needed in furtherance of any provision in the present Agreement, the CCP shall have the responsibility for their preparation.

10. The mandate of the CCP shall terminate at the end of the next general elections.

ARTICLE VII

COMMISSION FOR THE MANAGEMENT OF STRATEGIC RESOURCES, NATIONAL RECONSTRUCTION AND DEVELOPMENT

1. Given the emergency situation facing the country, the parties agree that the Government shall exercise full control of the exploitation of gold, diamonds and other resources, for the benefit of the people of Sierra Leone. Accordingly, a Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (hereinafter termed the CMRRD) shall be established and charged with the responsibility of securing and monitoring the legitimate exploitation of Sierra Leone's gold and diamonds, and other resources that are determined to be of strategic importance for national security and welfare as well as cater for post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction, as provided for under Article XXVIII of the present Agreement.

2. The Government shall take the necessary legal action within a period not exceeding two weeks from the signing of the present Agreement to the effect that all exploitation, sale, export, or any other transaction of gold and diamonds shall be forbidden except those sanctioned by the CMRRD. All previous concessions shall be null and void.

3. The CMRRD shall authorize licensing of artisanal production of diamonds and gold, in accordance with prevailing laws and regulations. All gold and diamonds extracted or otherwise sourced from any Sierra Leonean territory shall be sold to the Government.

4. The CMRRD shall ensure, through the appropriate authorities, the security of the areas covered under this Article, and shall take all necessary measures against unauthorized exploitation.

5. For the export or local resale of gold and diamonds by the Government, the CMRRD shall authorize a buying and selling agreement with one or more reputable international and specialized mineral companies. All exports of Sierra Leonean gold and diamonds shall be transacted by the Government, under these agreements.

6. The proceeds from the transactions of gold and diamonds shall be public monies which shall enter a special Treasury account to be spent exclusively on the development of the people of Sierra Leone, with appropriations for public education, public health, infrastructural development, and compensation for incapacitated war victims as well as post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction. Priority spending shall go to rural areas.

7. The Government shall, if necessary, seek the assistance and cooperation of other governments and their instruments of law enforcement to detect and facilitate the prosecution of violations of this Article.

8. The management of other natural resources shall be reviewed by the CMRRD to determine if their regulation is a matter of national security and welfare, and recommend appropriate policy to the Government.

9. The functions of the Ministry of Mines shall continue to be carried out by the current authorized ministry. However, in respect of strategic mineral resources, the CMRRD shall be an autonomous body in carrying out its duties concerning the regulation of Sierra Leone's strategic natural resources.

10. All agreements and transactions referred to in this Article shall be subject to full public disclosure and records of all correspondence, negotiations, business transactions and any other matters related to exploitation, management, local or international marketing, and any other matter shall be public documents.

11. The Commission shall issue monthly reports, including the details of all the transactions related to gold and diamonds, and other licenses or concessions of natural resources, and its own administrative costs.

12. The Commission shall be governed by a Board whose Chairmanship shall be offered to the Leader of the RUF/SL, Corporal Foday Sankoh. The Board shall also comprise:

- (i) Two representatives of the Government appointed by the President;
- (ii) Two representatives of the political party to be formed by the RUF/SL;

- (iii) Three representatives of the civil society; and
- (iv) Two representatives of other political parties appointed by Parliament.

13. The Government shall take the required administrative actions to implement the commitments made in the present Agreement; and in the case of enabling legislation, it shall draft and submit to Parliament within thirty days of the signature of the present Agreement, the relevant bills for their enactment into law.

14. The Government commits itself to propose and support an amendment to the Constitution to make the exploitation of gold and diamonds the legitimate domain of the people of Sierra Leone, and to determine that the proceeds be used for the development of Sierra Leone, particularly public education, public health, infrastructure development, and compensation of incapacitated war victims as well as post-war reconstruction and development.

ARTICLE VIII

COUNCIL OF ELDERS AND RELIGIOUS LEADERS

1. The signatories agree to refer any conflicting differences of interpretation of this Article or any other Article of the present Agreement or its protocols, to a Council of Elders and Religious Leaders comprised as follows:

- (i) Two members appointed by the Inter-Religious Council;
- (ii) One member each appointed by the Government and the RUF/SL;
and
- (iii) One member appointed by ECOWAS.

2. The Council shall designate its own chairperson from among its members. All of its decisions shall be taken by the concurrence of at least four members, and shall be binding and public, provided that an aggrieved party may appeal to the Supreme Court.

PART THREE**OTHER POLITICAL ISSUES**

This Part of the present Agreement Consists of the following Articles:

Article IX Pardon and Amnesty

Article X Review of the Present Constitution

Article XI Elections

Article XII National Electoral Commission

ARTICLE IX**PARDON AND AMNESTY**

1. In order to bring lasting peace to Sierra Leone, the Government of Sierra Leone shall take appropriate legal steps to grant Corporal Foday Sankoh absolute and free pardon.

2. After the signing of the present Agreement, the Government of Sierra Leone shall also grant absolute and free pardon and reprieve to all combatants and collaborators in respect of anything done by them in pursuit of their objectives, up to the time of the signing of the present Agreement.

3. To consolidate the peace and promote the cause of national reconciliation, the Government of Sierra Leone shall ensure that no official or judicial action is taken against any member of the RUF/SL, ex-AFRC, ex-SLA or CDF in respect of anything done by them in pursuit of their objectives as members of those organisations, since March 1991, up to the time of the signing of the present Agreement. In addition, legislative and other measures necessary to guarantee immunity to former combatants, exiles and other persons, currently outside the country for reasons related to the armed conflict shall be adopted ensuring the full exercise of their civil and political rights, with a view to their reintegration within a framework of full legality.

ARTICLE X

REVIEW OF THE PRESENT CONSTITUTION

In order to ensure that the Constitution of Sierra Leone represents the needs and aspirations of the people of Sierra Leone and that no constitutional or any other legal provision prevents the implementation of the present Agreement, the Government of Sierra Leone shall take the necessary steps to establish a Constitutional Review Committee to review the provisions of the present Constitution, and where deemed appropriate, recommend revisions and amendments, in accordance with Part V, Section 108 of the Constitution of 1991.

ARTICLE XI

DATE OF NEXT ELECTIONS

The next national elections in Sierra Leone shall be held in accordance with the present Constitution of Sierra Leone.

ARTICLE XII

NATIONAL ELECTORAL COMMISSION

1. A new independent National Electoral Commission (hereinafter termed the NEC) shall be set up by the Government, not later than three months after the signing of the present Agreement.
2. In setting up the new NEC the President shall consult all political parties, including the RUF/SL, to determine the membership and terms of reference of the Commission, paying particular attention to the need for a level playing field in the nation's elections.
3. No member of the NEC shall be eligible for appointment to political office by any government formed as a result of an election he or she was mandated to conduct.
4. The NEC shall request the assistance of the International Community, including the UN, the OAU, ECOWAS and the Commonwealth of Nations, in monitoring the next presidential and parliamentary elections in Sierra Leone.

PART FOUR**POST-CONFLICT MILITARY AND SECURITY ISSUES**

1. The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL, recognizing that the maintenance of peace and security is of paramount importance for the achievement of lasting peace in Sierra Leone and for the welfare of its people, have agreed to the following formulas for dealing with post-conflict military and security matters. Each of these formulas (not in priority order) is contained in separate Articles of this Part of the present Agreement and may be further detailed in protocols annexed to the Agreement.

Article XIII Transformation and New Mandate of ECOMOG

Article XIV New Mandate of UNOMSIL and Phased Withdrawal of ECOMOG

Article XV Security Guarantees for Peace Monitors

Article XVI Encampment, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration

Article XVII Restructuring and Training of the Sierra Leone Armed Forces

Article XVIII Withdrawal of Mercenaries

Article XIX Notification to Joint Monitoring Commission

Article XX Notification to Military Commands.

ARTICLE XIII**TRANSFORMATION AND NEW MANDATE OF ECOMOG**

1. Immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement, the parties shall request ECOWAS to revise the mandate of ECOMOG in Sierra Leone as follows:

- (i) Peacekeeping;
- (ii) Security of the State of Sierra Leone;
- (iii) Protection of UNOMSIL.
- (iv) Protection of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration personnel.

2. The Government shall, immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement, request ECOWAS for troop contributions from at least two additional countries. The additional contingents shall be deployed not later than 30 days from the date of signature of the present Agreement. The Security Council shall be requested to provide assistance in support of ECOMOG.

3. The Parties agree to develop a timetable for the phased withdrawal of ECOMOG, including measures for securing all of the territory of Sierra Leone by the restructured armed forces. The phased withdrawal of ECOMOG will be linked to the phased creation and deployment of the restructured armed forces.

ARTICLE XIV

NEW MANDATE OF UNOMSIL

1. The UN Security Council is requested to amend the mandate of UNOMSIL to enable it to undertake the various provisions outlined in the present Agreement.

ARTICLE XV

SECURITY GUARANTEES FOR PEACE MONITORS

1. The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL agree to guarantee the safety, security and freedom of movement of UNOMSIL Military Observers throughout Sierra Leone. This guarantee shall be monitored by the Joint Monitoring Commission.

2. The freedom of movement includes complete and unhindered access for UNOMSIL Military Observers in the conduct of their duties throughout Sierra Leone. Before and during the process of Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration, officers and escorts to be provided by both Parties shall be required to facilitate this access.

3. Such freedom of movement and security shall also be accorded to non-military UNOMSIL personnel such as Human Rights Officers in the conduct of their duties. These personnel shall, in most cases, be accompanied by UNOMSIL Military Observers.

4. The provision of security to be extended shall include United Nations aircraft, vehicles and other property.

ARTICLE XVI

ENCAMPMENT, DISARMAMENT, DEMOBILIZATION AND REINTEGRATION

1. A neutral peace keeping force comprising UNOMSIL and ECOMOG shall disarm all combatants of the RUF/SL, CDF, SLA and paramilitary groups. The encampment, disarmament and demobilization process shall commence within six weeks of the signing of the present Agreement in line with the deployment of the neutral peace keeping force.

2. The present SLA shall be restricted to the barracks and their arms in the armoury and their ammunitions in the magazines and placed under constant surveillance by the neutral peacekeeping force during the process of disarmament and demobilization.

3. UNOMSIL shall be present in all disarmament and demobilization locations to monitor the process and provide security guarantees to all ex-combatants.

4. Upon the signing of the present Agreement, the Government of Sierra Leone shall immediately request the International Community to assist with the provision of the necessary financial and technical resources needed for the adaptation and extension of the existing Encampment, Disarmament, Demobilization and Reintegration Programme in Sierra Leone, including payment of retirement benefits and other emoluments due to former members of the SLA.

ARTICLE XVII

RESTRUCTURING AND TRAINING OF THE SIERRA LEONE ARMED FORCES

1. The restructuring, composition and training of the new Sierra Leone armed forces will be carried out by the Government with a view to creating truly national armed forces, bearing loyalty solely to the State of Sierra Leone, and able and willing to perform their constitutional role.

2. Those ex-combatants of the RUF/SL, CDF and SLA who wish to be integrated into the new restructured national armed forces may do so provided they meet established criteria.

3. Recruitment into the armed forces shall reflect the geo-political structure of Sierra Leone within the established strength.

ARTICLE XVIII

WITHDRAWAL OF MERCENARIES

All mercenaries, in any guise, shall be withdrawn from Sierra Leone immediately upon the signing of the present Agreement. Their withdrawal shall be supervised by the Joint Monitoring Commission.

ARTICLE XIX

NOTIFICATION TO JOINT MONITORING COMMISSION

Immediately upon the establishment of the JMC provided for in Article II of the present Agreement, each party shall furnish to the JMC information regarding the strength and locations of all combatants as well as the positions and descriptions of all known Unexploded Bombs (UXBs), Explosive Ordnance Devices (EODs), minefields, booby traps, wire entanglements, and all other physical or military hazards. The JMC shall seek all necessary technical assistance in mine clearance and the disposal or destruction of similar devices and weapons under the operational control of the neutral peacekeeping force. The parties shall keep the JMC updated on changes in this information so that it can notify the public as needed, to prevent injuries.

ARTICLE XX

NOTIFICATION TO MILITARY COMMANDS

Each party shall ensure that the terms of the present Agreement, and written orders requiring compliance, are immediately communicated to all of its forces.

PART FIVE

HUMANITARIAN, HUMAN RIGHTS AND SOCIO-ECONOMIC ISSUES

1. The Government of Sierra Leone and the RUF/SL recognizing the importance of upholding, promoting and protecting the human rights of every Sierra Leonean as well as the enforcement of humanitarian law, agree to the following formulas for the achievement of these laudable objectives. Each of these formulas (not in priority order) is contained in separate Articles of this Part of the present Agreement

Article XXI Release of Prisoners and Abductees

Article XXII Refugees and Displaced Persons

Article XXIII Guarantee of the Security of Displaced Persons and Refugees

Article XXIV Guarantee and Promotion of Human Rights

Article XXV Human Rights Commission

Article XXVI Human Rights Violations

Article XXVII Humanitarian Relief

Article XXVIII Post War Rehabilitation and Reconstruction

Article XXIX Special Fund for War Victims

Article XXX Child Combatants

Article XXXI Education and Health

ARTICLE XXI

RELEASE OF PRISONERS AND ABDUCTEES

All political prisoners of war as well as all non-combatants shall be released immediately and unconditionally by both parties, in accordance with the Statement of June 2, 1999, which is contained in Annex 3 and constitutes an integral part of the present Agreement.

ARTICLE XXII

REFUGEES AND DISPLACED PERSONS

The Parties through the National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction agree to seek funding from and the involvement of the UN and other agencies, including friendly countries, in order to design and implement a plan for voluntary repatriation and reintegration of Sierra Leonean refugees and internally displaced persons, including non-combatants, in conformity with international conventions, norms and practices.

ARTICLE XXIII

GUARANTEE OF THE SECURITY OF DISPLACED PERSONS AND REFUGEES

As a reaffirmation of their commitment to the observation of the conventions and principles of human rights and the status of refugees, the Parties shall take effective and appropriate measures to ensure that the right of Sierra Leoneans to asylum is fully respected and that no camps or dwellings of refugees or displaced persons are violated.

ARTICLE XXIV

GUARANTEE AND PROMOTION OF HUMAN RIGHTS

1. The basic civil and political liberties recognized by the Sierra Leone legal system and contained in the declarations and principles of Human Rights adopted by the UN and OAU, especially the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and the African Charter on Human and People's Rights, shall be fully protected and promoted within Sierra Leonean society.
2. These include the right to life and liberty, freedom from torture, the right to a fair trial, freedom of conscience, expression and association, and the right to take part in the governance of one's country.

ARTICLE XXV

HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION

1. The Parties pledge to strengthen the existing machinery for addressing grievances of the people in respect of alleged violations of their basic human rights by the creation, as a matter of urgency and not later than 90 days after the signing of the present Agreement, of an autonomous quasi-judicial national Human Rights Commission.

2. The Parties further pledge to promote Human Rights education throughout the various sectors of Sierra Leonean society, including the schools, the media, the police, the military and the religious community.

3. In pursuance of the above, technical and material assistance may be sought from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights and other relevant international organisations.

4. A consortium of local human rights and civil society groups in Sierra Leone shall be encouraged to help monitor human rights observance.

ARTICLE XXVI

HUMAN RIGHTS VIOLATIONS

1. A Truth and Reconciliation Commission shall be established to address impunity, break the cycle of violence, provide a forum for both the victims and perpetrators of human rights violations to tell their story, get a clear picture of the past in order to facilitate genuine healing and reconciliation.

2. In the spirit of national reconciliation, the Commission shall deal with the question of human rights violations since the beginning of the Sierra Leonean conflict in 1991.

This Commission shall, among other things, recommend measures to be taken for the rehabilitation of victims of human rights violations.

3. Membership of the Commission shall be drawn from a cross-section of Sierra Leonean society with the participation and some technical support of the International Community. This Commission shall be established within 90 days after the signing of the present Agreement and shall, not later than 12 months after the commencement of its work, submit its report to the Government for immediate implementation of its recommendations.

ARTICLE XXVII

HUMANITARIAN RELIEF

1. The Parties reaffirm their commitment to their *Statement on the Delivery of Humanitarian Assistance in Sierra Leone of June 3, 1999* which is contained in Annex 4 and constitutes an integral part of the present Agreement. To this end, the Government shall request appropriate international humanitarian assistance for the people of Sierra Leone who are in need all over the country.

2. The Parties agree to guarantee safe and unhindered access by all humanitarian organizations throughout the country in order to facilitate delivery of humanitarian assistance, in accordance with international conventions, principles and norms which govern humanitarian operations. In this respect, the parties agree to guarantee the security of the presence and movement of humanitarian personnel.

3. The Parties also agree to guarantee the security of all properties and goods transported, stocked or distributed by humanitarian organizations, as well as the security of their projects and beneficiaries.

4. The Government shall set up at various levels throughout the country, the appropriate and effective administrative or security bodies which will monitor and facilitate the implementation of these guarantees of safety for the personnel, goods and areas of operation of the humanitarian organizations.

ARTICLE XXVIII

POST-WAR REHABILITATION AND RECONSTRUCTION

1. The Government, through the National Commission for Resettlement, Rehabilitation and Reconstruction and with the support of the International Community, shall provide appropriate financial and technical resources for post-war rehabilitation, reconstruction and development.

2. Given that women have been particularly victimized during the war, special attention shall be accorded to their needs and potentials in formulating and implementing national rehabilitation, reconstruction and development programmes, to enable them to play a central role in the moral, social and physical reconstruction of Sierra Leone.

ARTICLE XXIX

SPECIAL FUND FOR WAR VICTIMS

The Government, with the support of the International Community, shall design and implement a programme for the rehabilitation of war victims. For this purpose, a special fund shall be set up.

ARTICLE XXX

CHILD COMBATANTS

The Government shall accord particular attention to the issue of child soldiers. It shall, accordingly, mobilize resources, both within the country and from the International Community, and especially through the Office of the UN Special Representative for Children in Armed Conflict, UNICEF and other agencies, to address the special needs of these children in the existing disarmament, demobilization and reintegration processes.

ARTICLE XXXI

EDUCATION AND HEALTH

The Government shall provide free compulsory education for the first nine years of schooling (Basic Education) and shall endeavour to provide free schooling for a further three years. The Government shall also endeavour to provide affordable primary health care throughout the country.

PART SIX**IMPLEMENTATION OF THE AGREEMENT****ARTICLE XXXII****JOINT IMPLEMENTATION COMMITTEE**

A Joint Implementation Committee consisting of members of the Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (CCP) and the Committee of Seven on Sierra Leone, as well as the Moral Guarantors, provided for in Article XXXIV of the present Agreement and other international supporters shall be established. Under the chairmanship of ECOWAS, the Joint Implementation Committee shall be responsible for reviewing and assessing the state of implementation of the Agreement, and shall meet at least once every three months. Without prejudice to the functions of the Commission for the Consolidation of Peace as provided for in Article VI, the Joint Implementation Committee shall make recommendations deemed necessary to ensure effective implementation of the present Agreement according to the Schedule of Implementation, which appears as Annex 5.

ARTICLE XXXIII**REQUEST FOR INTERNATIONAL INVOLVEMENT**

The Parties request that the provisions of the present Agreement affecting the United Nations shall enter into force upon the adoption by the UN Security Council of a resolution responding affirmatively to the request made in this Agreement. Likewise, the decision-making bodies of the other international organisations concerned are requested to take similar action, where appropriate.

PART SEVEN**MORAL GUARANTORS AND INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT****ARTICLE XXXIV****MORAL GUARANTORS**

The Government of the Togolese Republic, the United Nations, the OAU, ECOWAS and the Commonwealth of Nations shall stand as Moral Guarantors that this Peace Agreement is implemented with integrity and in good faith by both parties.

ARTICLE XXXV**INTERNATIONAL SUPPORT**

Both parties call on the International Community to assist them in implementing the present Agreement with integrity and good faith. The international organisations mentioned in Article XXXIV and the Governments of Benin, Burkina Faso, Côte d'Ivoire, Ghana, Guinea, Liberia, Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Mali, Nigeria, Togo, the United Kingdom and the United States of America are facilitating and supporting the conclusion of this Agreement. These States and organisations believe that this Agreement must protect the paramount interests of the people of Sierra Leone in peace and security.

PART EIGHT**FINAL PROVISIONS****ARTICLE XXXVI****REGISTRATION AND PUBLICATION**

The Sierra Leone Government shall register the signed Agreement not later than 15 days from the date of the signing of this Agreement. The signed Agreement shall also be published in the *Sierra Leone Gazette* not later than 48 (Forty - Eight) hours after the date of registration of this Agreement. This Agreement shall be laid before the Parliament of Sierra Leone not later than 21 (Twenty - One) days after the signing of this Agreement.

ARTICLE XXXVII

ENTRY INTO FORCE

The present Agreement shall enter into force immediately upon its signing by the Parties.

Done in Lomé this 7th day of the month of July, 1999 in (12) twelve original texts in English and French, each text being equally authentic.

ALHAJI DR. AHMAD TEJAN KABBAH	CORPORAL Poday Saybana Sankoh
PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC	LEADER OF THE REVOLUTIONARY
OF SIERRA LEONE	UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE

HIS EXCELLENCY GNASSINGBÉ EYADÉMA
PRESIDENT OF THE TOGOLESE REPUBLIC,
CHAIRMAN OF ECOWAS

HIS EXCELLENCY BLAISE COMPAORÉ
PRESIDENT OF BURKINA FASO

HIS EXCELLENCY DAHKPANAH
DR. CHARLES GHANKEY TAYLOR
PRESIDENT OF THE REPUBLIC OF LIBERIA

HIS EXCELLENCY OLUSEGUN OBASANJO
PRESIDENT AND COMMANDER-IN-CHIEF OF THE ARMED
FORCES OF THE FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF NIGERIA

HIS EXCELLENCY YOUSSEUFOU BAMBA
SECRETARY OF STATE AT THE
FOREIGN MINISTRY IN CHARGE OF
INTERNATIONAL COOPERATION
OF CÔTE D'IVOIRE

HIS EXCELLENCY VICTOR GBEHO
MINISTER OF FOREIGN AFFAIRS
OF THE REPUBLIC OF GHANA

Mr. Roger LALOUPO
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE ECOWAS
EXECUTIVE SECRETARY

Ambassador Francis G. OKELLO
SPECIAL REPRESENTATIVE
OF THE UNITED NATIONS
SECRETARY-GENERAL

Ms. Adwoa COLEMAN
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
ORGANIZATION OF AFRICAN UNITY

Dr. Moses K. Z. ANAFU
REPRESENTATIVE OF THE
COMMONWEALTH OF NATIONS

ANNEX 1

AGREEMENT ON CEASEFIRE IN SIERRA LEONE

President Ahmad Tejan KABBAH and Rev. Jesse Jackson met on 18 May 1999 with Corporal Foday Saybana SANKOH, under the auspices of President Gnassingbé EYADÉMA. At that meeting, the question of the peace process for Sierra Leone was discussed.

The Government of the Republic of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF/SL),

— Desirous to promote the ongoing dialogue process with a view to establishing durable peace and stability in Sierra Leone; and

— Wishing to create an appropriate atmosphere conducive to the holding of peace talks in Lomé, which began with the RUF internal consultations to be followed by dialogue between the Government and the RUF ;

— Have jointly decided to:

1— Agree to ceasefire as from 24 May, 1999, the day that President EYADÉMA invited Foreign Ministers of ECOWAS to discuss problems pertaining to Sierra Leone. It was further agreed that the dialogue between the Government of Sierra Leone and RUF would commence on 25 May, 1999;

2— Maintain their present and respective positions in Sierra Leone as of the 24th May, 1999; and refrain from any hostile or aggressive act which could undermine the peace process;

3— Commit to start negotiations in good faith, involving all relevant parties in the discussions, not later than May 25 in Lomé;

4— Guarantee safe and unhindered access by humanitarian organizations to all people in need; establish safe corridors for the provision of food and medical supplies to ECOMOG soldiers behind RUF lines, and to RUF combatants behind

5- Immediate release of all prisoners of war and non-combatants;

6- Request the United Nations, subject to the Security Council's authorization, to deploy military observers as soon as possible to observe compliance by the Government forces (ECOMOG and Civil Defence Forces) and the RUF, including former AFRC forces, with this cease-fire agreement.

This agreement is without prejudice to any other agreement or additional protocols which may be discussed during the dialogue between the Government and the RUF.

Signed in Lomé (Togo) 18 May, 1999, in Six (6) Originals in English and French.

For the Government of Sierra Leone

For the Revolutionary United Front
of Sierra Leone

ALHAJI Dr. Ahmad Tejan KABBAH
President of the Republic of Sierra Leone

Corporal Foday Saybana SANKOH
*Leader of the Revolutionary United
Front (RUF)*

Witnessed by:

For the Government of Togo and
Current Chairman of ECOWAS

For the United Nations

Gnassingbé EYADÉMA
President of the Republic of Togo

Francis G. OKELO
*Special Representative of the
Secretary-General*

For the Organization of African Unity

US Presidential Special Envoy for the
Promotion of Democracy in Africa

Adwoa COLEMAN
*Representative of the Organization
of African Unity*

Rev. Jesse JACKSON

2126
2126

ANNEX 2

DEFINITION OF CEASE-FIRE VIOLATIONS

1. In accordance with Article II of the present Agreement, both parties agree that the following constitute cease-fire violations and a breach of the Cease-fire Agreement:

- a. The use of weapons of any kind in any circumstance including:
 - (i) Automatic and semi-automatic rifles, pistols, machine guns and any other small arms weapon systems.
 - (ii) Heavy machine guns and any other heavy weapon systems.
 - (iii) Grenades and rocket-propelled grenade weapon systems.
 - (iv) Artillery, rockets, mortars and any other indirect fire weapon systems.
 - (v) All types of mine, explosive devices and improvised booby traps.
 - (vi) Air assets outside of respective areas of control, of any nature, including reconnaissance aircraft, with the exception of pre-agreed flights.
 - (vii) Air Defence weapon systems of any nature.
 - (viii) Any other weapon not included in the above paragraphs.
- b. Troop movements of any nature outside of the areas recognized as being under the control of respective fighting forces without prior notification to the Cease-fire Monitoring Committee of any movements at least 48 hours in advance.
- c. The movement of arms and ammunition. To be considered in the context of Security Council Resolution 1171 (1998).
- d. Troop movements of any nature;
- e. The construction and/or the improvement of defensive works and positions within respective areas of control, but outside a geographical boundary of 500m from existing similar positions.

No

to

or
Le

S

Fr
Ce
im

in

ha

Si
by
of
U

pa
of

- f. Reconnaissance of any nature outside of respective areas of control.
 - g. Any other offensive or aggressive action.
2. Any training or other military activities ~~not provided~~ for in Articles XIII to XIX of the present Agreement, constitute a cease-fire violation.
3. In the event of a hostile external force threatening the territorial integrity or sovereignty of Sierra Leone, military action may be undertaken by the Sierra Leone Government.

ANNEX 3

STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SIERRA LEONE AND THE REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE ON THE RELEASE OF PRISONERS OF WAR AND NON-COMBATANTS

The Government of Sierra Leone (GOSL) and the Revolutionary United Front (RUF/SL) have agreed to implement as soon as possible the provision of the Cease-fire Agreement which was signed on 18 May, 1999 in Lomé, relating to the immediate release of prisoners of war and non-combatants.

Both sides reaffirmed the importance of the implementation of this provision in the interest of the furtherance of the talks.

They therefore decided that an appropriate Committee is established to handle the release by them of all prisoners of war and non-combatants.

Both the Government of Sierra Leone and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone decided that such a Committee be established by the UN and chaired by the UN Chief Military Observer in Sierra Leone and comprising representatives of the International Committee of the Red Cross (ICRC), UNICEF and other relevant UN Agencies and NGOs.

This Committee should begin its work immediately by contacting both parties to the conflict with a view to effecting the immediate release of these prisoners of war and non-combatants.

Lomé — 2 June, 1999

ANNEX 4**STATEMENT BY THE GOVERNMENT OF SIERRA LEONE AND THE
REVOLUTIONARY UNITED FRONT OF SIERRA LEONE ON THE
DELIVERY OF HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE IN SIERRA LEONE**

The parties to the conflict in Sierra Leone meeting in Lomé Togo on 3rd June, 1999 in the context of the Dialogue between the Government of Sierra Leone (GOSL) and the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone (RUF/SL):

Reaffirm their respect for international convention, principles and norms, which govern the right of people to receive humanitarian assistance and the effective delivery of such assistance.

Reiterate their commitment to the implementation of the Cease-fire Agreement signed by the two parties on 18th May, 1999 in Lomé.

Aware of the fact that the protracted civil strife in Sierra Leone has created a situation whereby the vast majority of Sierra Leoneans in need of humanitarian assistance cannot be reached.

Hereby agree as follows:

1. That all duly registered humanitarian agencies shall be guaranteed safe and unhindered access to all areas under the control of the respective parties in order that humanitarian assistance can be delivered safely and effectively, in accordance with international conventions, principles and norms which govern humanitarian operations.

2. In this respect the two parties shall:

- a. guarantee safe access and facilitate the fielding of independent assessment missions by duly registered humanitarian agencies.
- b. identify, in collaboration with the UN Humanitarian Co-ordinator in Sierra Leone and UNOMSIL, mutually agreed routes (road, air and waterways) by which humanitarian goods and personnel shall be transported to the beneficiaries to provide needed assistance.

- c. allow duly registered humanitarian agencies to deliver assistance according to needs established through independent assessments.
- d. guarantee the security of all properties and of goods transported, stocked or distributed by the duly registered humanitarian agencies, as well as the security of their project areas and beneficiaries.

3. The two parties undertake to establish with immediate effect, and not later than seven days, an Implementation Committee formed by appropriately designated and mandated representatives from the Government of Sierra Leone, the Revolutionary United Front of Sierra Leone, the Civil Society, the NGO community, and the UNOMSIL ; and chaired by the United Nations Humanitarian Co-ordinator, in co-ordination with the Special Representative of the Secretary General in Sierra Leone.

The Implementation Committee will be mandated to:

- a. Ascertain and assess the security of proposed routes to be used by the humanitarian agencies, and disseminate information on routes to interested humanitarian agencies.
- b. Receive and review complaints which may arise in the implementation of this arrangement, in order to re-establish full compliance.

4. The parties agree to set up at various levels in their areas of control, the appropriate and effective administrative and security bodies which will monitor and facilitate the effective delivery of humanitarian assistance in all approved points of delivery, and ensure the security of the personnel, goods and project areas of the humanitarian agencies as well as the safety of the beneficiaries.

Issued in Lomé
June 3, 1999

ANNEX 5

DRAFT SCHEDULE OF IMPLEMENTATION OF THE PEACE AGREEMENT

I. ACTIVITIES WITH SPECIFIC TIMING:

TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
DAY 1	Signing of the Peace Agreement		
	Amnesty	The Government to grant absolute and free pardon to the RUF Leader Foday Sankoh through appropriate legal steps	
	Transformation, new mandate, and phased withdrawal of ECOMOG	Request to ECOWAS by the parties for revision of the mandate of ECOMOG in Sierra Leone Request to the UN Security Council: (i) to amend the mandate of UNOMSIL to enable it to undertake the various provisions outlined in the present Agreement; Request to the international community to provide substantial financial and logistical assistance to facilitate implementation of the Peace Agreement. Request to ECOWAS by the parties for contribution of additional troops	

TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
	Transformation of the RUF into a political party	RUF/SL to commence to organize itself to function as a political party	
	Encampment, disarmament, demobilization and reintegration (DDR)	Request for international assistance in adapting and extending the existing DDR programme	
	Withdrawal of mercenaries	Supervision by Joint Monitoring Commission	
	Notification to Joint Monitoring Commission	Communication by the parties of positions and description of all known warlike devices/materials	
	Notification to Military Commands	Communication by the parties of written orders requiring compliance	
DAY 15	Enabling members of the RUF/SL to hold public office, and to join a broad-based Government of National Unity through Cabinet appointments	Removal by the Government of all legal impediments	
	Commission for the Consolidation of Peace (CCP)	Creation of the Commission to implement a post-conflict reconciliation and welfare programme	Mandate of the Commission to terminate at the end of next General Elections Jan.-Feb., 2001

TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
DAY 15 (cont.)	Commission for the Management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (CMRRD)	Ban on all exploitation, sale, export, or any transaction of gold and diamonds except those sanctioned by the CMRRD	
DAY 22	Enabling members of the RUF/SL to hold public office	Discussion and agreement between both parties on the appointments of RUF/SL members to positions in parastatal, diplomacy and any other public sector	For a period of fourteen days
DAY 31	Transformation of the RUF into a political party Commission for the management of Strategic Resources, National Reconstruction and Development (CMRRD) Transformation, new mandate, and phased withdrawal of ECOMOG	Necessary legal steps by the Government for registration of the RUF as a political party Preparation and submission by Government to the Parliament of relevant bills for enabling legislation commitments made under the Peace Agreement Deployment of troops from at least two additional countries	
DAY 60	Completion of encampment, disarmament and demobilization	Restriction of SLA soldiers to the barracks and storage of their arms and ammunition under constant surveillance by the Neutral Peace-Keeping Force during the disarmament process Monitoring of disarmament and demobilization by UNOMSIL	

TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION,
DAY 90	Human Rights Commission	<p>Creation of an autonomous quasi judicial national Human Rights Commission</p> <p>Request for technical and material assistance from the UN High Commissioner for Human Rights, the African Commission on Human and Peoples Rights and other relevant organizations</p> <p>Creation of a Truth and Reconciliation Commission</p>	
	Elections	<p>Establishment of a new independent National Electoral Commission (NEC), in consultation with all political parties including the RUF/SL</p> <p>Request for financial and logistical support for the operations of the NEC</p> <p>Request for assistance from the international community in monitoring the next presidential and parliamentary elections in Sierra Leone</p>	

TIMING	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
DAY 456	Human Rights Violations	Submission by the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of its report and recommendation to the Government for immediate implementation	
II. ACTIVITIES WITHOUT SPECIFIC TIMING: (SHORT/MEDIUM/LONG TERM):			
SERIAL NO.	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
1.	Ceasefire monitoring (Ceasefire Agreement signed on 18 May, 1999)	Establishment of Ceasefire Monitoring Committees at provincial and district levels Request for international assistance in providing funds and other logistics for the operations of the JMC	JMC already established and operational
2.	Review of the present Constitution	Establishment of a Constitutional Review Committee	
3.	Mediation by the Council of Elders and Religious Leaders	Appointment of members of the Council by the Inter-Religious Council, the Government, the RUF and ECOWAS	
4.	Timetable for the phased withdrawal of ECOMOG	Formulation of the timetable in connection with the phased creation and deployment of the restructured armed forces	

SERIAL NO.	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
5.	Security guarantees for peace monitors	Communication, in writing, of security guarantees to UNMILOBs	
6.	Restructuring and training of the SLA	Creation by the Government of truly national armed forces reflecting the geopolitical structure of Sierra Leone within the established strength	
7.	Release of prisoners of war and abductees	Establishment of a Committee on the Release of Prisoners of War and Non-combatants	Operation under-way. Parties to be encouraged to continue vigorously
8.	Refugees and displaced persons	Formulation of plan of voluntary repatriation and reintegration of Sierra Leonean refugees and IDPs, with the financial assistance and involvement of UN and other agencies and friendly countries	
9.	Guarantee and protection of Human Rights	Respect of the right to life and liberty, freedom from torture, the right to a fair trial, freedom of conscience, expression and association, and the right to take part in the governance of one's country	

SERIAL NO.	ACTIVITIES	ACTION REQUIRED	FOLLOW-UP ACTION
10.	Guarantee of the security of displaced persons and refugees	Adoption by the parties of effective and appropriate security measures	
11.	Humanitarian relief	Continued delivery of humanitarian assistance with appropriate international support Establishment by the Government of appropriate and effective administrative or security bodies to monitor and facilitate implementation of security guarantees to personnel, goods and areas of operations	
12.	Post-war rehabilitation and reconstruction	Provision by the Government of appropriate financial and technical resources	
13.	Special Fund for war victims	Formulation and implementation by the Government of a programme for the rehabilitation of war victims	
14.	Child combatants	Mobilization of internal and international resources by the Government to address the needs of child combatants	
15.	Education and Health	Mobilization of adequate funding for free compulsory basic education and primary health care	
16.	Amnesty	The Government to grant amnesty and pardon to RUF and AFRC personnel through appropriate legal steps.	

PASSED IN Parliament this *15th* day of *July*, in the year of our Lord one thousand, nine hundred and ninety-nine.

J. A. CARPENTER,
Clerk of Parliament.

THIS PRINTED IMPRESSION has been carefully compared by me with the Bill which has passed Parliament and found by me to be a true and correctly printed copy of the said Bill.

J. A. CARPENTER,
Clerk of Parliament.

PRINCIPLES OF
PUBLIC
INTERNATIONAL
LAW

BY

IAN BROWNLIE, CBE, QC, FBA

Bencher of Gray's Inn

Chichele Professor of Public International Law in the University of Oxford

Fellow of All Souls College, Oxford

Member of the Institute of International Law

Member of the International Law Commission

FIFTH EDITION

OXFORD
UNIVERSITY PRESS

ANNEX 9:
Security Council Resolution 1315 (2000).

**Security Council**

Distr.: General
14 August 2000

Resolution 1315 (2000)

**Adopted by the Security Council at its 4186th meeting, on
14 August 2000**

The Security Council:

Deeply concerned at the very serious crimes committed within the territory of Sierra Leone against the people of Sierra Leone and United Nations and associated personnel and at the prevailing situation of impunity,

Commending the efforts of the Government of Sierra Leone and the Economic Community of West African States (ECOWAS) to bring lasting peace to Sierra Leone,

Noting that the Heads of State and Government of ECOWAS agreed at the 23rd Summit of the Organization in Abuja on 28 and 29 May 2000 to dispatch a regional investigation of the resumption of hostilities,

Noting also the steps taken by the Government of Sierra Leone in creating a national truth and reconciliation process, as required by Article XXVI of the Lomé Peace Agreement (S/1999/777) to contribute to the promotion of the rule of law,

Recalling that the Special Representative of the Secretary-General appended to his signature of the Lomé Agreement a statement that the United Nations holds the understanding that the amnesty provisions of the Agreement shall not apply to international crimes of genocide, crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law,

Reaffirming the importance of compliance with international humanitarian law, and *reaffirming further* that persons who commit or authorize serious violations of international humanitarian law are individually responsible and accountable for those violations and that the international community will exert every effort to bring those responsible to justice in accordance with international standards of justice, fairness and due process of law,

Recognizing that, in the particular circumstances of Sierra Leone, a credible system of justice and accountability for the very serious crimes committed there would end impunity and would contribute to the process of national reconciliation and to the restoration and maintenance of peace,

Taking note in this regard of the letter dated 12 June 2000 from the President of Sierra Leone to the Secretary-General and the Suggested Framework attached to it (S/2000/786, annex),

Recognizing further the desire of the Government of Sierra Leone for assistance from the United Nations in establishing a strong and credible court that will meet the objectives of bringing justice and ensuring lasting peace,

Noting the report of the Secretary-General of 31 July 2000 (S/2000/751) and, in particular, *taking note* with appreciation of the steps already taken by the Secretary-General in response to the request of the Government of Sierra Leone to assist it in establishing a special court,

Noting further the negative impact of the security situation on the administration of justice in Sierra Leone and the pressing need for international cooperation to assist in strengthening the judicial system of Sierra Leone,

Acknowledging the important contribution that can be made to this effort by qualified persons from West African States, the Commonwealth, other Member States of the United Nations and international organizations, to expedite the process of bringing justice and reconciliation to Sierra Leone and the region,

Reiterating that the situation in Sierra Leone continues to constitute a threat to international peace and security in the region,

1. *Requests* the Secretary-General to negotiate an agreement with the Government of Sierra Leone to create an independent special court consistent with this resolution, and *expresses* its readiness to take further steps expeditiously upon receiving and reviewing the report of the Secretary-General referred to in paragraph 6 below;

2. *Recommends* that the subject matter jurisdiction of the special court should include notably crimes against humanity, war crimes and other serious violations of international humanitarian law, as well as crimes under relevant Sierra Leonean law committed within the territory of Sierra Leone;

3. *Recommends further* that the special court should have personal jurisdiction over persons who bear the greatest responsibility for the commission of the crimes referred to in paragraph 2, including those leaders who, in committing such crimes, have threatened the establishment of and implementation of the peace process in Sierra Leone;

4. *Emphasizes* the importance of ensuring the impartiality, independence and credibility of the process, in particular with regard to the status of the judges and the prosecutors;

5. *Requests*, in this connection, that the Secretary-General, if necessary, send a team of experts to Sierra Leone as may be required to prepare the report referred to in paragraph 6 below;

6. *Requests* the Secretary-General to submit a report to the Security Council on the implementation of this resolution, in particular on his consultations and negotiations with the Government of Sierra Leone concerning the establishment of the special court, including recommendations, no later than 30 days from the date of this resolution;

7. *Requests* the Secretary-General to address in his report the questions of the temporal jurisdiction of the special court, an appeals process including the advisability, feasibility, and appropriateness of an appeals chamber in the special court or of sharing the Appeals Chamber of the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda or other effective options, and a possible alternative host State, should it be necessary to convene the special court outside the seat of the court in Sierra Leone, if circumstances so require;

8. *Requests* the Secretary-General to include recommendations on the following:

(a) any additional agreements that may be required for the provision of the international assistance which will be necessary for the establishment and functioning of the special court;

(b) the level of participation, support and technical assistance of qualified persons from Member States of the United Nations, including in particular, member States of ECOWAS and the Commonwealth, and from the United Nations Mission in Sierra Leone that will be necessary for the efficient, independent and impartial functioning of the special court;

(c) the amount of voluntary contributions, as appropriate, of funds, equipment and services to the special court, including through the offer of expert personnel that may be needed from States, intergovernmental organizations and non-governmental organizations;

(d) whether the special court could receive, as necessary and feasible, expertise and advice from the International Criminal Tribunals for the Former Yugoslavia and Rwanda;

9. *Decides* to remain actively seized of the matter.

ANNEX 10:

Declaration on the Protection of all Persons from Enforced Disappearances, General Assembly Resolution 47/133, 18 December 1992, UN Doc. A/45/44 (1990), Articles 14 and 18;



Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, G.A. res. 3452 (XXX), annex, 30 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 34) at 91, U.N. Doc. A/10034 (1975).

Article 1

1. For the purpose of this Declaration, torture means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted by or at the instigation of a public official on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or confession, punishing him for an act he has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating him or other persons. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to, lawful sanctions to the extent consistent with the Standard Minimum Rules for the Treatment of Prisoners.

2. Torture constitutes an aggravated and deliberate form of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 2

Any act of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is an offence to human dignity and shall be condemned as a denial of the purposes of the Charter of the United Nations and as a violation of the human rights and fundamental freedoms proclaimed in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights .

Article 3

No State may permit or tolerate torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment. Exceptional circumstances such as a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency may not be invoked as a justification of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 4

Each State shall, in accordance with the provisions of this Declaration, take effective measures to prevent torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment from being practised within its jurisdiction.

Article 5

The training of law enforcement personnel and of other public officials who may be responsible for persons deprived of their liberty shall ensure that full account is taken of the prohibition against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

2145

This prohibition shall also, where appropriate, be included in such general rules or instructions as are issued in regard to the duties and functions of anyone who may be involved in the custody or treatment of such persons.

Article 6

Each State shall keep under systematic review interrogation methods and practices as well as arrangements for the custody and treatment of persons deprived of their liberty in its territory, with a view to preventing any cases of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

Article 7

Each State shall ensure that all acts of torture as defined in article 1 are offences under its criminal law. The same shall apply in regard to acts which constitute participation in, complicity in, incitement to or an attempt to commit torture.

Article 8

Any person who alleges that he has been subjected to torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment by or at the instigation of a public official shall have the right to complain to, and to have his case impartially examined by, the competent authorities of the State concerned.

Article 9

Wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture as defined in article 1 has been committed, the competent authorities of the State concerned shall promptly proceed to an impartial investigation even if there has been no formal complaint.

Article 10

If an investigation under article 8 or article 9 establishes that an act of torture as defined in article 1 appears to have been committed, criminal proceedings shall be instituted against the alleged offender or offenders in accordance with national law. If an allegation of other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment is considered to be well founded, the alleged offender or offenders shall be subject to criminal, disciplinary or other appropriate proceedings.

Article 11

Where it is proved that an act of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment has been committed by or at the instigation of a public official, the victim shall be afforded redress and compensation in accordance with national law.

Article 12

Any statement which is established to have been made as a result of torture or other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment may not be invoked as evidence against the person concerned or against any other person in any proceedings.

2146

[HOME](#) [TREATIES](#) [SEARCH](#) [LINKS](#)

ANNEX 11:

Convention Against Torture and other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, New York, 10 December 1984, 1965 UNTS 85 (the “Torture Convention”).



Convention against Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, G.A. res. 39/46, [annex, 39 U.N. GAOR Supp. (No. 51) at 197, U.N. Doc. A/39/51 (1984)], entered into force June 26, 1987.

The States Parties to this Convention,

Considering that, in accordance with the principles proclaimed in the Charter of the United Nations, recognition of the equal and inalienable rights of all members of the human family is the foundation of freedom, justice and peace in the world,

Recognizing that those rights derive from the inherent dignity of the human person,

Considering the obligation of States under the Charter, in particular Article 55, to promote universal respect for, and observance of, human rights and fundamental freedoms,

Having regard to article 5 of the Universal Declaration of Human Rights and article 7 of the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights, both of which provide that no one shall be subjected to torture or to cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment,

Having regard also to the Declaration on the Protection of All Persons from Being Subjected to Torture and Other Cruel, Inhuman or Degrading Treatment or Punishment, adopted by the General Assembly on 9 December 1975,

Desiring to make more effective the struggle against torture and other cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment throughout the world,

Have agreed as follows:

PART I

Article I

1. For the purposes of this Convention, the term "torture" means any act by which severe pain or suffering, whether physical or mental, is intentionally inflicted on a person for such purposes as obtaining from him or a third person information or a confession, punishing him for an act he or a third person has committed or is suspected of having committed, or intimidating or coercing him or a third person, or for any reason based on discrimination of any kind, when such pain or suffering is inflicted by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. It does not include pain or suffering arising only from, inherent in or incidental to lawful sanctions.

2149

2. This article is without prejudice to any international instrument or national legislation which does or may contain provisions of wider application.

Article 2

1. Each State Party shall take effective legislative, administrative, judicial or other measures to prevent acts of torture in any territory under its jurisdiction.
2. No exceptional circumstances whatsoever, whether a state of war or a threat of war, internal political instability or any other public emergency, may be invoked as a justification of torture.
3. An order from a superior officer or a public authority may not be invoked as a justification of torture.

Article 3

1. No State Party shall expel, return ("refouler") or extradite a person to another State where there are substantial grounds for believing that he would be in danger of being subjected to torture.
2. For the purpose of determining whether there are such grounds, the competent authorities shall take into account all relevant considerations including, where applicable, the existence in the State concerned of a consistent pattern of gross, flagrant or mass violations of human rights.

Article 4

1. Each State Party shall ensure that all acts of torture are offences under its criminal law. The same shall apply to an attempt to commit torture and to an act by any person which constitutes complicity or participation in torture.
2. Each State Party shall make these offences punishable by appropriate penalties which take into account their grave nature.

Article 5

1. Each State Party shall take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over the offences referred to in article 4 in the following cases:
 - (a) When the offences are committed in any territory under its jurisdiction or on board a ship or aircraft registered in that State;
 - (b) When the alleged offender is a national of that State;
 - (c) When the victim is a national of that State if that State considers it appropriate.
2. Each State Party shall likewise take such measures as may be necessary to establish its jurisdiction over such offences in cases where the alleged offender is present in any territory

2150

under its jurisdiction and it does not extradite him pursuant to article 8 to any of the States mentioned in paragraph 1 of this article.

3. This Convention does not exclude any criminal jurisdiction exercised in accordance with internal law.

Article 6

1. Upon being satisfied, after an examination of information available to it, that the circumstances so warrant, any State Party in whose territory a person alleged to have committed any offence referred to in article 4 is present shall take him into custody or take other legal measures to ensure his presence. The custody and other legal measures shall be as provided in the law of that State but may be continued only for such time as is necessary to enable any criminal or extradition proceedings to be instituted.

2. Such State shall immediately make a preliminary inquiry into the facts.

3. Any person in custody pursuant to paragraph 1 of this article shall be assisted in communicating immediately with the nearest appropriate representative of the State of which he is a national, or, if he is a stateless person, with the representative of the State where he usually resides.

4. When a State, pursuant to this article, has taken a person into custody, it shall immediately notify the States referred to in article 5, paragraph 1, of the fact that such person is in custody and of the circumstances which warrant his detention. The State which makes the preliminary inquiry contemplated in paragraph 2 of this article shall promptly report its findings to the said States and shall indicate whether it intends to exercise jurisdiction.

Article 7

1. The State Party in the territory under whose jurisdiction a person alleged to have committed any offence referred to in article 4 is found shall in the cases contemplated in article 5, if it does not extradite him, submit the case to its competent authorities for the purpose of prosecution.

2. These authorities shall take their decision in the same manner as in the case of any ordinary offence of a serious nature under the law of that State. In the cases referred to in article 5, paragraph 2, the standards of evidence required for prosecution and conviction shall in no way be less stringent than those which apply in the cases referred to in article 5, paragraph 1.

3. Any person regarding whom proceedings are brought in connection with any of the offences referred to in article 4 shall be guaranteed fair treatment at all stages of the proceedings.

Article 8

1. The offences referred to in article 4 shall be deemed to be included as extraditable offences in any extradition treaty existing between States Parties. States Parties undertake to

2151

include such offences as extraditable offences in every extradition treaty to be concluded between them.

2. If a State Party which makes extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty receives a request for extradition from another State Party with which it has no extradition treaty, it may consider this Convention as the legal basis for extradition in respect of such offences. Extradition shall be subject to the other conditions provided by the law of the requested State.

3. States Parties which do not make extradition conditional on the existence of a treaty shall recognize such offences as extraditable offences between themselves subject to the conditions provided by the law of the requested State.

4. Such offences shall be treated, for the purpose of extradition between States Parties, as if they had been committed not only in the place in which they occurred but also in the territories of the States required to establish their jurisdiction in accordance with article 5, paragraph 1.

Article 9

1. States Parties shall afford one another the greatest measure of assistance in connection with criminal proceedings brought in respect of any of the offences referred to in article 4, including the supply of all evidence at their disposal necessary for the proceedings.

2. States Parties shall carry out their obligations under paragraph 1 of this article in conformity with any treaties on mutual judicial assistance that may exist between them.

Article 10

1. Each State Party shall ensure that education and information regarding the prohibition against torture are fully included in the training of law enforcement personnel, civil or military, medical personnel, public officials and other persons who may be involved in the custody, interrogation or treatment of any individual subjected to any form of arrest, detention or imprisonment.

2. Each State Party shall include this prohibition in the rules or instructions issued in regard to the duties and functions of any such person.

Article 11

Each State Party shall keep under systematic review interrogation rules, instructions, methods and practices as well as arrangements for the custody and treatment of persons subjected to any form of arrest, detention or imprisonment in any territory under its jurisdiction, with a view to preventing any cases of torture.

Article 12

Each State Party shall ensure that its competent authorities proceed to a prompt and impartial investigation, wherever there is reasonable ground to believe that an act of torture has been committed in any territory under its jurisdiction.

Article 13

Each State Party shall ensure that any individual who alleges he has been subjected to torture in any territory under its jurisdiction has the right to complain to, and to have his case promptly and impartially examined by, its competent authorities. Steps shall be taken to ensure that the complainant and witnesses are protected against all ill-treatment or intimidation as a consequence of his complaint or any evidence given.

Article 14

1. Each State Party shall ensure in its legal system that the victim of an act of torture obtains redress and has an enforceable right to fair and adequate compensation, including the means for as full rehabilitation as possible. In the event of the death of the victim as a result of an act of torture, his dependants shall be entitled to compensation.

2. Nothing in this article shall affect any right of the victim or other persons to compensation which may exist under national law.

Article 15

Each State Party shall ensure that any statement which is established to have been made as a result of torture shall not be invoked as evidence in any proceedings, except against a person accused of torture as evidence that the statement was made.

Article 16

1. Each State Party shall undertake to prevent in any territory under its jurisdiction other acts of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment which do not amount to torture as defined in article 1, when such acts are committed by or at the instigation of or with the consent or acquiescence of a public official or other person acting in an official capacity. In particular, the obligations contained in articles 10, 11, 12 and 13 shall apply with the substitution for references to torture of references to other forms of cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment.

2. The provisions of this Convention are without prejudice to the provisions of any other international instrument or national law which prohibits cruel, inhuman or degrading treatment or punishment or which relates to extradition or expulsion.

PART II

Article 17

1. There shall be established a Committee against Torture (hereinafter referred to as the Committee) which shall carry out the functions hereinafter provided. The Committee shall consist of ten experts of high moral standing and recognized competence in the field of human rights, who shall serve in their personal capacity. The experts shall be elected by the States Parties, consideration being given to equitable geographical distribution and to the usefulness of the participation of some persons having legal experience.

2. The members of the Committee shall be elected by secret ballot from a list of persons

2153

nominated by States Parties. Each State Party may nominate one person from among its own nationals. States Parties shall bear in mind the usefulness of nominating persons who are also members of the Human Rights Committee established under the International Covenant on Civil and Political Rights and who are willing to serve on the Committee against Torture.

3. Elections of the members of the Committee shall be held at biennial meetings of States Parties convened by the Secretary-General of the United Nations. At those meetings, for which two thirds of the States Parties shall constitute a quorum, the persons elected to the Committee shall be those who obtain the largest number of votes and an absolute majority of the votes of the representatives of States Parties present and voting.

4. The initial election shall be held no later than six months after the date of the entry into force of this Convention. At least four months before the date of each election, the Secretary-General of the United Nations shall address a letter to the States Parties inviting them to submit their nominations within three months. The Secretary-General shall prepare a list in alphabetical order of all persons thus nominated, indicating the States Parties which have nominated them, and shall submit it to the States Parties.

5. The members of the Committee shall be elected for a term of four years. They shall be eligible for re-election if renominated. However, the term of five of the members elected at the first election shall expire at the end of two years; immediately after the first election the names of these five members shall be chosen by lot by the chairman of the meeting referred to in paragraph 3 of this article.

6. If a member of the Committee dies or resigns or for any other cause can no longer perform his Committee duties, the State Party which nominated him shall appoint another expert from among its nationals to serve for the remainder of his term, subject to the approval of the majority of the States Parties. The approval shall be considered given unless half or more of the States Parties respond negatively within six weeks after having been informed by the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the proposed appointment.

7. States Parties shall be responsible for the expenses of the members of the Committee while they are in performance of Committee duties.

Article 18

1. The Committee shall elect its officers for a term of two years. They may be re-elected.

2. The Committee shall establish its own rules of procedure, but these rules shall provide, inter alia, that:

(a) Six members shall constitute a quorum;

(b) Decisions of the Committee shall be made by a majority vote of the members present.

3. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall provide the necessary staff and facilities for the effective performance of the functions of the Committee under this Convention.

2154

4. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall convene the initial meeting of the Committee. After its initial meeting, the Committee shall meet at such times as shall be provided in its rules of procedure.

5. The States Parties shall be responsible for expenses incurred in connection with the holding of meetings of the States Parties and of the Committee, including reimbursement to the United Nations for any expenses, such as the cost of staff and facilities, incurred by the United Nations pursuant to paragraph 3 of this article.

Article 19

1. The States Parties shall submit to the Committee, through the Secretary-General of the United Nations, reports on the measures they have taken to give effect to their undertakings under this Convention, within one year after the entry into force of the Convention for the State Party concerned. Thereafter the States Parties shall submit supplementary reports every four years on any new measures taken and such other reports as the Committee may request.

2. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit the reports to all States Parties.

3. Each report shall be considered by the Committee which may make such general comments on the report as it may consider appropriate and shall forward these to the State Party concerned. That State Party may respond with any observations it chooses to the Committee.

4. The Committee may, at its discretion, decide to include any comments made by it in accordance with paragraph 3 of this article, together with the observations thereon received from the State Party concerned, in its annual report made in accordance with article 24. If so requested by the State Party concerned, the Committee may also include a copy of the report submitted under paragraph 1 of this article.

Article 20

1. If the Committee receives reliable information which appears to it to contain well-founded indications that torture is being systematically practised in the territory of a State Party, the Committee shall invite that State Party to co-operate in the examination of the information and to this end to submit observations with regard to the information concerned.

2. Taking into account any observations which may have been submitted by the State Party concerned, as well as any other relevant information available to it, the Committee may, if it decides that this is warranted, designate one or more of its members to make a confidential inquiry and to report to the Committee urgently.

3. If an inquiry is made in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article, the Committee shall seek the co-operation of the State Party concerned. In agreement with that State Party, such an inquiry may include a visit to its territory.

4. After examining the findings of its member or members submitted in accordance with

2155

paragraph 2 of this article, the Commission shall transmit these findings to the State Party concerned together with any comments or suggestions which seem appropriate in view of the situation.

5. All the proceedings of the Committee referred to in paragraphs 1 to 4 of this article shall be confidential, and at all stages of the proceedings the co-operation of the State Party shall be sought. After such proceedings have been completed with regard to an inquiry made in accordance with paragraph 2, the Committee may, after consultations with the State Party concerned, decide to include a summary account of the results of the proceedings in its annual report made in accordance with article 24.

Article 21

1. A State Party to this Convention may at any time declare under this article that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications to the effect that a State Party claims that another State Party is not fulfilling its obligations under this Convention. Such communications may be received and considered according to the procedures laid down in this article only if submitted by a State Party which has made a declaration recognizing in regard to itself the competence of the Committee. No communication shall be dealt with by the Committee under this article if it concerns a State Party which has not made such a declaration. Communications received under this article shall be dealt with in accordance with the following procedure;

(a) If a State Party considers that another State Party is not giving effect to the provisions of this Convention, it may, by written communication, bring the matter to the attention of that State Party. Within three months after the receipt of the communication the receiving State shall afford the State which sent the communication an explanation or any other statement in writing clarifying the matter, which should include, to the extent possible and pertinent, reference to domestic procedures and remedies taken, pending or available in the matter;

(b) If the matter is not adjusted to the satisfaction of both States Parties concerned within six months after the receipt by the receiving State of the initial communication, either State shall have the right to refer the matter to the Committee, by notice given to the Committee and to the other State;

(c) The Committee shall deal with a matter referred to it under this article only after it has ascertained that all domestic remedies have been invoked and exhausted in the matter, in conformity with the generally recognized principles of international law. This shall not be the rule where the application of the remedies is unreasonably prolonged or is unlikely to bring effective relief to the person who is the victim of the violation of this Convention;

(d) The Committee shall hold closed meetings when examining communications under this article;

(e) Subject to the provisions of subparagraph (c), the Committee shall make available its good offices to the States Parties concerned with a view to a friendly solution of the matter on the basis of respect for the obligations provided for in this Convention. For this purpose, the Committee may, when

2156

appropriate, set up an ad hoc conciliation commission;

(f) In any matter referred to it under this article, the Committee may call upon the States Parties concerned, referred to in subparagraph (b), to supply any relevant information;

(g) The States Parties concerned, referred to in subparagraph (b), shall have the right to be represented when the matter is being considered by the Committee and to make submissions orally and/or in writing;

(h) The Committee shall, within twelve months after the date of receipt of notice under subparagraph (b), submit a report:

(i) If a solution within the terms of subparagraph (e) is reached, the Committee shall confine its report to a brief statement of the facts and of the solution reached;

(ii) If a solution within the terms of subparagraph (e) is not reached, the Committee shall confine its report to a brief statement of the facts; the written submissions and record of the oral submissions made by the States Parties concerned shall be attached to the report. In every matter, the report shall be communicated to the States Parties concerned.

2. The provisions of this article shall come into force when five States Parties to this Convention have made declarations under paragraph 1 of this article. Such declarations shall be deposited by the States Parties with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the other States Parties. A declaration may be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General. Such a withdrawal shall not prejudice the consideration of any matter which is the subject of a communication already transmitted under this article; no further communication by any State Party shall be received under this article after the notification of withdrawal of the declaration has been received by the Secretary-General, unless the State Party concerned has made a new declaration.

Article 22

1. A State Party to this Convention may at any time declare under this article that it recognizes the competence of the Committee to receive and consider communications from or on behalf of individuals subject to its jurisdiction who claim to be victims of a violation by a State Party of the provisions of the Convention. No communication shall be received by the Committee if it concerns a State Party which has not made such a declaration.

2. The Committee shall consider inadmissible any communication under this article which is anonymous or which it considers to be an abuse of the right of submission of such communications or to be incompatible with the provisions of this Convention.

3. Subject to the provisions of paragraph 2, the Committee shall bring any communications submitted to it under this article to the attention of the State Party to this Convention which has made a declaration under paragraph 1 and is alleged to be violating any provisions of the Convention. Within six months, the receiving State shall submit to the Committee written

2157

explanations or statements clarifying the matter and the remedy, if any, that may have been taken by that State.

4. The Committee shall consider communications received under this article in the light of all information made available to it by or on behalf of the individual and by the State Party concerned.

5. The Committee shall not consider any communications from an individual under this article unless it has ascertained that:

(a) The same matter has not been, and is not being, examined under another procedure of international investigation or settlement;

(b) The individual has exhausted all available domestic remedies; this shall not be the rule where the application of the remedies is unreasonably prolonged or is unlikely to bring effective relief to the person who is the victim of the violation of this Convention.

6. The Committee shall hold closed meetings when examining communications under this article.

7. The Committee shall forward its views to the State Party concerned and to the individual.

8. The provisions of this article shall come into force when five States Parties to this Convention have made declarations under paragraph 1 of this article. Such declarations shall be deposited by the States Parties with the Secretary-General of the United Nations, who shall transmit copies thereof to the other States Parties. A declaration may be withdrawn at any time by notification to the Secretary-General. Such a withdrawal shall not prejudice the consideration of any matter which is the subject of a communication already transmitted under this article; no further communication by or on behalf of an individual shall be received under this article after the notification of withdrawal of the declaration has been received by the Secretary General, unless the State Party has made a new declaration.

Article 23

The members of the Committee and of the ad hoc conciliation commissions which may be appointed under article 21, paragraph I (e), shall be entitled to the facilities, privileges and immunities of experts on mission for the United Nations as laid down in the relevant sections of the Convention on the Privileges and Immunities of the United Nations.

Article 24

The Committee shall submit an annual report on its activities under this Convention to the States Parties and to the General Assembly of the United Nations.

PART III

Article 25

1. This Convention is open for signature by all States. 2. This Convention is subject to

2158

ratification. Instruments of ratification shall be deposited with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 26

This Convention is open to accession by all States. Accession shall be effected by the deposit of an instrument of accession with the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 27

1. This Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit with the Secretary-General of the United Nations of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession.
2. For each State ratifying this Convention or acceding to it after the deposit of the twentieth instrument of ratification or accession, the Convention shall enter into force on the thirtieth day after the date of the deposit of its own instrument of ratification or accession.

Article 28

1. Each State may, at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not recognize the competence of the Committee provided for in article 20.
2. Any State Party having made a reservation in accordance with paragraph I of this article may, at any time, withdraw this reservation by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 29

1. Any State Party to this Convention may propose an amendment and file it with the Secretary-General of the United Nations. The Secretary General shall thereupon communicate the proposed amendment to the States Parties with a request that they notify him whether they favour a conference of States Parties for the purpose of considering and voting upon the proposal. In the event that within four months from the date of such communication at least one third of the States Parties favours such a conference, the Secretary General shall convene the conference under the auspices of the United Nations. Any amendment adopted by a majority of the States Parties present and voting at the conference shall be submitted by the Secretary-General to all the States Parties for acceptance.
2. An amendment adopted in accordance with paragraph I of this article shall enter into force when two thirds of the States Parties to this Convention have notified the Secretary-General of the United Nations that they have accepted it in accordance with their respective constitutional processes.
3. When amendments enter into force, they shall be binding on those States Parties which have accepted them, other States Parties still being bound by the provisions of this Convention and any earlier amendments which they have accepted.

2159

Article 30

1. Any dispute between two or more States Parties concerning the interpretation or application of this Convention which cannot be settled through negotiation shall, at the request of one of them, be submitted to arbitration. If within six months from the date of the request for arbitration the Parties are unable to agree on the organization of the arbitration, any one of those Parties may refer the dispute to the International Court of Justice by request in conformity with the Statute of the Court.
2. Each State may, at the time of signature or ratification of this Convention or accession thereto, declare that it does not consider itself bound by paragraph 1 of this article. The other States Parties shall not be bound by paragraph 1 of this article with respect to any State Party having made such a reservation.
3. Any State Party having made a reservation in accordance with paragraph 2 of this article may at any time withdraw this reservation by notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations.

Article 31

1. A State Party may denounce this Convention by written notification to the Secretary-General of the United Nations. Denunciation becomes effective one year after the date of receipt of the notification by the Secretary-General .
2. Such a denunciation shall not have the effect of releasing the State Party from its obligations under this Convention in regard to any act or omission which occurs prior to the date at which the denunciation becomes effective, nor shall denunciation prejudice in any way the continued consideration of any matter which is already under consideration by the Committee prior to the date at which the denunciation becomes effective.
3. Following the date at which the denunciation of a State Party becomes effective, the Committee shall not commence consideration of any new matter regarding that State.

Article 32

The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall inform all States Members of the United Nations and all States which have signed this Convention or acceded to it of the following:

- (a) Signatures, ratifications and accessions under articles 25 and 26;
- (b) The date of entry into force of this Convention under article 27 and the date of the entry into force of any amendments under article 29;
- (c) Denunciations under article 31.

Article 33

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

2160

2. The Secretary-General of the United Nations shall transmit certified copies of this Convention to all States.

HOME TREATIES SEARCH LINKS

ANNEX 12

Prosecutor v. Furundzija, Judgment, Case No. IT-95-17/1, T. Ch., 10 December 1998,
paras. 153-157.

2162

IN THE TRIAL CHAMBER

**Before: Judge Florence Ndepele Mwachande Mumba, Presiding
Judge Antonio Cassese
Judge Richard May**

**Registrar:
Mrs. Dorothee de Sampayo Garrido-Nijgh**

Judgement of: 10 December 1998

PROSECUTOR

v.

ANTO FURUNDZIJA

JUDGEMENT

**The Office of the Prosecutor:
Ms. Brenda Hollis
Ms. Patricia Viseur-Sellers
Ms. Michael Blaxill**

**Counsel for the Accused:
Mr. Luka Misetic
Mr. Sheldon Davidson**

I. INTRODUCTION

The trial of Anto Furundzija, hereafter "accused", a citizen of Bosnia and Herzegovina who was born on 8 July 1969, before this Trial Chamber of the International Tribunal for the Prosecution of Persons Responsible for Serious Violations of International Humanitarian Law Committed in the Territory of the Former Yugoslavia since 1991, hereafter "International Tribunal", commenced on 8 June 1998 and came to a close on 12 November 1998.

Having considered all of the evidence presented to it during the course of this trial, along with the written and oral submissions of the Office of the Prosecutor, hereafter "Prosecution", and the Defence for the accused, the Trial Chamber,

HEREBY RENDERS ITS JUDGEMENT.

A. The International Tribunal

1. The International Tribunal is governed by its Statute, adopted by the Security Council of the United Nations on 25 May 1993, hereafter "Statute",¹ and by the Rules of Procedure and Evidence of the

3. Main Features of the Prohibition Against Torture in International Law

147. There exists today universal revulsion against torture: as a USA Court put it in *Filartiga v. Pēa-Irala*, "the torturer has become, like the pirate and the slave trader before him, *hostis humani generis*, an enemy of all mankind".¹⁶⁷ This revulsion, as well as the importance States attach to the eradication of torture, has led to the cluster of treaty and customary rules on torture acquiring a particularly high status in the international normative system, a status similar to that of principles such as those prohibiting genocide, slavery, racial discrimination, aggression, the acquisition of territory by force and the forcible suppression of the right of peoples to self-determination. The prohibition against torture exhibits three important features, which are probably held in common with the other general principles protecting fundamental human rights.

(a) The Prohibition Even Covers Potential Breaches

148. Firstly, given the importance that the international community attaches to the protection of individuals from torture, the prohibition against torture is particularly stringent and sweeping. States are obliged not only to prohibit and punish torture, but also to forestall its occurrence: it is insufficient merely to intervene after the infliction of torture, when the physical or moral integrity of human beings has already been irremediably harmed. Consequently, States are bound to put in place all those measures that may pre-empt the perpetration of torture. As was authoritatively held by the European Court of Human Rights in *Soering*,¹⁶⁸ international law intends to bar not only actual breaches but also potential breaches of the prohibition against torture (as well as any inhuman and degrading treatment). It follows that international rules prohibit not only torture but also (i) the failure to adopt the national measures necessary for implementing the prohibition and (ii) the maintenance in force or passage of laws which are contrary to the prohibition.

149. Let us consider these two aspects separately. Normally States, when they undertake international obligations through treaties or customary rules, adopt all the legislative and administrative measures necessary for implementing such obligations. However, subject to obvious exceptions, failure to pass the required implementing legislation has only a potential effect: the wrongful fact occurs only when administrative or judicial measures are taken which, being contrary to international rules due to the lack of implementing legislation, generate State responsibility. By contrast, in the case of torture, the requirement that States expeditiously institute national implementing measures is an integral part of the international obligation to prohibit this practice. Consequently, States must immediately set in motion all those procedures and measures that may make it possible, within their municipal legal system, to forestall any act of torture or expeditiously put an end to any torture that is occurring.

150. Another facet of the same legal effect must be emphasised. Normally, the maintenance or passage of national legislation inconsistent with international rules generates State responsibility and consequently gives rise to a corresponding claim for cessation and reparation (*lato sensu*) only when such legislation is concretely applied.¹⁶⁹ By contrast, in the case of torture, the mere fact of keeping in force or passing legislation contrary to the international prohibition of torture generates international State responsibility. The value of freedom from torture is so great that it becomes imperative to preclude any national legislative act authorising or condoning torture or at any rate capable of bringing about this effect.

(b) The Prohibition Imposes Obligations *Erga Omnes*

151. Furthermore, the prohibition of torture imposes upon States obligations *erga omnes*, that is, obligations owed towards all the other members of the international community, each of which then has

2164

a correlative right. In addition, the violation of such an obligation simultaneously constitutes a breach of the correlative right of all members of the international community and gives rise to a claim for compliance accruing to each and every member, which then has the right to insist on fulfilment of the obligation or in any case to call for the breach to be discontinued.

152. Where there exist international bodies charged with impartially monitoring compliance with treaty provisions on torture, these bodies enjoy priority over individual States in establishing whether a certain State has taken all the necessary measures to prevent and punish torture and, if they have not, in calling upon that State to fulfil its international obligations. The existence of such international mechanisms makes it possible for compliance with international law to be ensured in a neutral and impartial manner.

(c) The Prohibition Has Acquired the Status of Jus Cogens

153. While the erga omnes nature just mentioned appertains to the area of international enforcement (lato sensu), the other major feature of the principle proscribing torture relates to the hierarchy of rules in the international normative order. Because of the importance of the values it protects, this principle has evolved into a peremptory norm or jus cogens, that is, a norm that enjoys a higher rank in the international hierarchy than treaty law and even "ordinary" customary rules.¹⁷⁰ The most conspicuous consequence of this higher rank is that the principle at issue cannot be derogated from by States through international treaties or local or special customs or even general customary rules not endowed with the same normative force.

154. Clearly, the jus cogens nature of the prohibition against torture articulates the notion that the prohibition has now become one of the most fundamental standards of the international community. Furthermore, this prohibition is designed to produce a deterrent effect, in that it signals to all members of the international community and the individuals over whom they wield authority that the prohibition of torture is an absolute value from which nobody must deviate.

155. The fact that torture is prohibited by a peremptory norm of international law has other effects at the inter-state and individual levels. At the inter-state level, it serves to internationally de-legitimise any legislative, administrative or judicial act authorising torture. It would be senseless to argue, on the one hand, that on account of the jus cogens value of the prohibition against torture, treaties or customary rules providing for torture would be null and void ab initio,¹⁷¹ and then be unmindful of a State say, taking national measures authorising or condoning torture or absolving its perpetrators through an amnesty law.¹⁷² If such a situation were to arise, the national measures, violating the general principle and any relevant treaty provision, would produce the legal effects discussed above and in addition would not be accorded international legal recognition. Proceedings could be initiated by potential victims if they had locus standi before a competent international or national judicial body with a view to asking it to hold the national measure to be internationally unlawful; or the victim could bring a civil suit for damage in a foreign court, which would therefore be asked inter alia to disregard the legal value of the national authorising act. What is even more important is that perpetrators of torture acting upon or benefiting from those national measures may nevertheless be held criminally responsible for torture, whether in a foreign State, or in their own State under a subsequent regime. In short, in spite of possible national authorisation by legislative or judicial bodies to violate the principle banning torture, individuals remain bound to comply with that principle. As the International Military Tribunal at Nuremberg put it: "individuals have international duties which transcend the national obligations of obedience imposed by the individual State".¹⁷³

156. Furthermore, at the individual level, that is, that of criminal liability, it would seem that one of the consequences of the jus cogens character bestowed by the international community upon the prohibition

2165

of torture is that every State is entitled to investigate, prosecute and punish or extradite individuals accused of torture, who are present in a territory under its jurisdiction. Indeed, it would be inconsistent on the one hand to prohibit torture to such an extent as to restrict the normally unfettered treaty-making power of sovereign States, and on the other hand bar States from prosecuting and punishing those torturers who have engaged in this odious practice abroad. This legal basis for States' universal jurisdiction over torture bears out and strengthens the legal foundation for such jurisdiction found by other courts in the inherently universal character of the crime. It has been held that international crimes being universally condemned wherever they occur, every State has the right to prosecute and punish the authors of such crimes. As stated in general terms by the Supreme Court of Israel in Eichmann, and echoed by a USA court in Demjanjuk, "it is the universal character of the crimes in question i.e. international crimes which vests in every State the authority to try and punish those who participated in their commission".¹⁷⁴

157. It would seem that other consequences include the fact that torture may not be covered by a statute of limitations, and must not be excluded from extradition under any political offence exemption.