PRINT

Contracting Parties to this Convention that are also Members of the HCCH (i.e., the Organisation) are in **bold**; Contracting Parties that are not Members of the HCCH are in *italics*.

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Albania		3-IX-2003	A	9-V-2004		1	
Andorra		15-IV-1996	A	31-XII-1996		1	
Antigua and Barbuda		1-V-1985	Su	1-XI-1981		1	
Argentina		8-V-1987	A	18-II-1988		1	D
Armenia		19-XI-1993	A	14-VIII-1994		1	
Australia		11-VII-1994	A	16-III-1995		1	D
Austria	5-X-1961	14-XI-1967	R	13-I-1968		1	D
Azerbaijan		13-V-2004	A**	2-III-2005		1	
Bahamas		30-IV-1976	Su	10-VII-1973		1	
Bahrain		10-IV-2013	A	31-XII-2013		1	D
Barbados		11-VIII-1995	Su	30-XI-1966		1	
Belarus		16-VI-1992	Su	31-V-1992		1	
Belgium	10-III-1970	11-XII-1975	R	9-II-1976		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Belize		17-VII-1992	A	11-IV-1993		1	
Bolivia (Plurinational State of)		6-IX-2017	A	7-V-2018		1	
Bosnia and Herzegovina		23-VIII-1993	Su	6-III-1992		1	D
Botswana		16-IX-1968	Su	30-IX-1966		1	
Brazil		2-XII-2015	A	14-VIII-2016		1	D
Brunei Darussalam		23-II-1987	A	3-XII-1987		1	
Bulgaria		1-VIII-2000	A	29-IV-2001		1	
Burundi		10-VI-2014	A**	13-II-2015		1	
Cabo Verde		7-V-2009	A	13-II-2010		1	
Chile		16-XII-2015	A	30-VIII-2016		1	
China			C			2	D,N
Colombia		27-IV-2000	A	30-I-2001		1	D
Cook Islands		13-VII-2004	A	30-IV-2005		1	
Costa Rica		6-IV-2011	A	14-XII-2011		1	
Croatia		23-IV-1993	Su	8-X-1991		1	
Cyprus		26-VII-1972	A	30-IV-1973		1	
Czech Republic		23-VI-1998	A	16-III-1999		1	
Denmark	20-X-2006	30-X-2006	R	29-XII-2006	1	1	D
Dominica		22-X-2002	Su	3-XI-1978		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Dominican Republic		12-XII-2008	A**	30-VIII-2009		1	
Ecuador		2-VII-2004	A	2-IV-2005		1	D
El Salvador		14-IX-1995	A	31-V-1996		1	
Estonia		11-XII-2000	A	30-IX-2001		1	D
Eswatini		3-VII-1978	Su	6-IX-1968		1	
Fiji		29-III-1971	Su	10-X-1970		1	
Finland	13-III-1962	27-VI-1985	R	26-VIII-1985		1	D
France	9-X-1961	25-XI-1964	R	24-I-1965		1	D
Georgia		21-VIII-2006	A	14-V-2007		1	D
Germany	5-X-1961	15-XII-1965	R	13-II-1966		1	D,N
Greece	5-X-1961	19-III-1985	R	18-V-1985		1	
Grenada		17-VII-2001	A	7-IV-2002		1	
Guatemala		19-I-2017	A	18-IX-2017		1	D
Guyana		30-VII-2018	A	18-IV-2019		1	
Honduras		20-I-2004	A	30-IX-2004		1	
Hungary		18-IV-1972	A	18-I-1973		1	D
Iceland	7-IX-2004	28-IX-2004	R	27-XI-2004		1	
India		26-X-2004	A**	14-VII-2005		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Indonesia		5-X-2021	A	4-VI-2022		1	D
Ireland	29-X-1996	8-I-1999	R	9-III-1999		1	
Israel		11-XI-1977	A	14-VIII-1978		1	
Italy	15-XII-1961	13-XII-1977	R	11-II-1978		1	
Jamaica		2-XI-2020	A	3-VII-2021		1	
Japan	12-III-1970	28-V-1970	R	27-VII-1970		1	
Kazakhstan		5-IV-2000	A	30-I-2001		1	D
Kosovo		6-XI-2015	A**	14-VII-2016		1	D,DC
Kyrgyzstan		15-XI-2010	A**	31-VII-2011		1	
Latvia		11-V-1995	A	30-I-1996		1	D
Lesotho		24-IV-1972	Su	4-X-1966		1	
Liberia		24-V-1995	A**	8-II-1996		1	
Liechtenstein	18-IV-1962	19-VII-1972	R	17-IX-1972		1	
Lithuania		5-XI-1996	A	19-VII-1997		1	D
Luxembourg	5-X-1961	4-IV-1979	R	3-VI-1979		1	
Malawi		24-II-1967	A	2-XII-1967		1	
Malta		12-VI-1967	A	3-III-1968		1	
Marshall Islands		18-XI-1991	A	14-VIII-1992		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Mauritius		20-XII-1968	Su	12-III-1968		1	
Mexico		1-XII-1994	A	14-VIII-1995		1	
Monaco		24-IV-2002	A	31-XII-2002		1	
Mongolia		2-IV-2009	A**	31-XII-2009		1	
Montenegro		30-I-2007	Su	3-VI-2006		1	
Morocco		27-XI-2015	A**	14-VIII-2016		1	
Namibia		25-IV-2000	A	30-I-2001		1	
Netherlands	30-XI-1962	9-VIII-1965	R	8-X-1965	4	1	D
New Zealand		7-II-2001	A	22-XI-2001		1	D
Nicaragua		7-IX-2012	A	14-V-2013		1	
Niue		10-VI-1998	A	2-III-1999		1	
North Macedonia		20-IX-1993	Su	17-XI-1991		1	
Norway	30-V-1983	30-V-1983	R	29-VII-1983		1	
Oman		12-V-2011	A	30-I-2012		1	D
Pakistan		8-VII-2022	A	9-III-2023		1	D
Palau		17-X-2019	A	23-VI-2020		1	
Panama		30-X-1990	A	4-VIII-1991		1	
Paraguay		10-XII-2013	A	30-VIII-2014		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Peru		13-I-2010	A**	30-IX-2010		1	
Philippines		12-IX-2018	A**	14-V-2019		1	D
Poland		19-XI-2004	A	14-VIII-2005		1	D
Portugal	20-VIII-1965	6-XII-1968	R	4-II-1969		1	D
Republic of Korea		25-X-2006	A	14-VII-2007		1	
Republic of Moldova		19-VI-2006	A**	16-III-2007		1	
Romania		7-VI-2000	A	16-III-2001		1	D
Russian Federation		4-IX-1991	Su	31-V-1992		1	D,N
Saint Kitts and Nevis		26-II-1994	A	14-XII-1994		1	
Saint Lucia		5-XII-2001	A	31-VII-2002		1	
Saint Vincent and the Grenadines		2-V-2002	Su	27-X-1979		1	
Samoa		18-I-1999	A	13-IX-1999		1	
San Marino		26-V-1994	A	13-II-1995		1	
Sao Tome and Principe		19-XII-2007	A	13-IX-2008		1	
Saudi Arabia		8-IV-2022	A	7-XII-2022		1	
Senegal		13-VII-2022	A	23-III-2023		1	
Serbia		26-IV-2001	Su	27-IV-1992		1	D
Seychelles		9-VI-1978	A	31-III-1979		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Singapore		18-I-2021	A	16-IX-2021		1	
Slovakia		6-VI-2001	A	18-II-2002		1	
Slovenia		8-VI-1992	Su	25-VI-1991		1	
South Africa		3-VIII-1994	A	30-IV-1995		1	
Spain	21-X-1976	27-VII-1978	R	25-IX-1978		1	D
Suriname		29-X-1976	Su	25-XI-1975		1	
Sweden	2-III-1999	2-III-1999	R	1-V-1999		1	
Switzerland	5-X-1961	10-I-1973	R	11-III-1973		1	D
Tajikistan		20-II-2015	A**	31-X-2015		1	
Tonga		28-X-1971	Su	4-VI-1970		1	D
Trinidad and Tobago		28-X-1999	A	14-VII-2000		1	
Tunisia		10-VII-2017	A**	30-III-2018		1	
Türkiye	8-V-1962	31-VII-1985	R	29-IX-1985		1	
Ukraine		2-IV-2003	A	22-XII-2003		1	D
United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland	19-X-1961	21-VIII-1964	R	24-I-1965	13	1	D
United States of America		24-XII-1980	A	15-X-1981		1	D
Uruguay		9-II-2012	A	14-X-2012		1	
Uzbekistan		25-VII-2011	A**	15-IV-2012		1	

Contracting Party	S [1]	R/A/S[2]	Type[3]	EIF[4]	EXT[5]	Auth[6]	Res/D/N/DC[7]
Vanuatu		1-VIII-2008	Su	30-VII-1980		1	
Venezuela (Bolivarian Republic of)		1-VII-1998	A	16-III-1999		1	

Type

Albania Type Accession

Belgium, Germany***, Greece, Italy** and Spain***** raised an objection to the accession of Albania within the period of six months specified in Article 12, paragraph 2, and expiring on 10 March 2004. The Convention will not enter into force between Albania and these five countries.

* On 21 December 2015, Belgium withdrew its objection. Therefore, *the Convention has entered into force between Albania and Belgium on 21 December 2015.*

** On 26 May 2011, Italy withdrew its objection. Therefore, *the Convention has entered into force between Albania and Italy on 26 May 2011.*

*** On 9 December 2016, Germany withdrew its objection. Therefore, *the Convention has entered into force between Albania and Germany on 9 December 2016.*

**** On 7 February 2017, Spain withdrew its objection. Therefore, *the Convention has entered into force between Albania and Spain on 7 February 2017.*

*****On 26 February 2018, Greece withdrew its objection*. Therefore, the Convention has entered into force between Albania and Greece on 26 February 2018.*

Antigua and Barbuda Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Antigua by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Antigua and Barbuda declared on 1 May 1985 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Azerbaijan Type Accession**

Some Contracting States raised an objection to the accession of Azerbaijan before 1 January 2005, namely the Netherlands, Germany and Hungary, whose declarations are given below. Therefore, the Convention will not enter into force between Azerbaijan and the above-mentioned Contracting States.
The Convention will enter, in accordance with its Article 12, third paragraph, into force between Azerbaijan and the other Contracting States, which have not raised an objection to the accession of Azerbaijan on 2 March 2005.

> OBJECTIONS
> Netherlands, 24-12-2004
> *Translation*
> ... the Kingdom of the Netherlands raises an objection to the accession of Azerbaijan to the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents.

On 10 August 2010, the Kingdom of the Netherlands **withdrew its declaration** made in accordance with Article 12, second paragraph, of the Convention, objecting to the accession of Azerbaijan the Convention. Therefore, the Convention will take effect between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and Azerbaijan as of 10 August 2010.

Germany, 27-12-2004
Translation
Azerbaijan has declared its accession to the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961. The Federal Republic of Germany hereby raises an objection to Azerbaijan's accession with reference to article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

Hungary, 31-12-2004
... that Hungary raises objection to the accession of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, signed in Hague, on the 5th October 1961. The objection is based on Article 6 Paragraph 1 of the Convention, according to which "Each Contracting State shall designate by reference to their official function, the authorities who are competent to issue the certificate referred to in the first paragraph of Article 3".

On 10 March 2005, Hungary made the following declaration:

... that the Republic of Hungary **revokes its objection** raised on 31 December 2004 (No. 83/J/2004.) to the accession of the Republic of Azerbaijan to the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, signed in the Hague, on the 5th October 1961. The revocation is based on the notification given by the Republic of Azerbaijan. The President of the Republic of Azerbaijan designated as competent authority - with his instruction No. 544 of December 2004 - the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Azerbaijan for documents emanating from courts, public prosecutors, and justice authorities, including documents certified in notarial order and state civil acts registration documents; and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Azerbaijan for other documents.

Therefore, the Convention has entered into force between Hungary and Azerbaijan on 10 March 2005.

On 21 January 2005 the depositary received the following objection from Belgium concerning Azerbaijan's accession. Since the objection was received after the time limit for filing objections had expired, it will have no legal consequences.

Translation
The Embassy gives notice that, pursuant to article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention, Belgium raises an objection to Azerbaijan's accession. The Convention will therefore not enter into force between Belgium and Azerbaijan.

Bahamas Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to the Bahamas by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Bahamas declared on 30 April 1976 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Barbados Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Barbados by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. By note of 11 August 1995, received at the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on 30 August 1995, the Government of Barbados stated that it considers itself bound by the Convention which was applicable to its territory before it gained independence on 30 November 1966.

Belarus Type Succession

On 16 June 1992 the Republic of Belarus declared itself to be bound by the Convention, being one of the successor States of the USSR.

Bosnia and Herzegovina Type Succession

One of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which became a Party to the Convention on 24 January 1965. On 23 August 1993 the Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina declared itself to be bound by the Convention.
No objection has been received from the Contracting States.

Botswana Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Bechuanaland (now Botswana) by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Botswana declared on 16 September 1968 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Burundi Type Accession**

The following States have raised an objection to the accession of Burundi to the Hague Apostille Convention: Austria (28 November 2014), Germany (11 December 2014), Czech Republic (12 December 2014) and Poland (15 December 2014). Consequently, the Apostille Convention will not enter into force between Burundi and these four States.

China Type Continuation

This Convention applies to the *Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong* and *Macao* only, as a result of extensions made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Portugal, respectively. When Hong Kong and Macao were restored to the People's Republic of China on 1 July 1997 and 20 December 1999, respectively, China declared that the Convention will continue to apply for Hong Kong and Macao.
Date of entry into force of the Convention for Hong Kong: 25 April 1965; date of entry into force for Macao: 4 February 1969.

Declarations / notifications:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, depositary of the Convention, gave notice that on 16 June 1997, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands received a Note dated 11 June 1997 from the Ambassador of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at The Hague and a Note dated 3 June 1997 from the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China at The Hague concerning Hong Kong.

The Note from the Ambassador of the United Kingdom reads as follows:

"Your Excellency,
I am instructed by Her Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to refer to the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents done at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention) which applies to Hong Kong at present.
I am also instructed to state that, in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the Government of the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date. Therefore, from that date the Government of the United Kingdom will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Hong Kong.
I should be grateful if the contents of this Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.
(...)
(signed Rosemary Spencer)".

The Note from the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China reads as follows:

(Translation)

"Your Excellency,

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the `Joint Declaration'), the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.

It is provided both in Section XI of Annex I to the Joint Declaration, `Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Hong Kong', and Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 4 April 1990 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not a Party but which are implemented in Hong Kong may continue to be implemented in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.

In accordance with the above provisions, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to make the following notification:

The Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents done at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"), by which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is designated as the depositary, which applies to Hong Kong at present, will continue to apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the People's Republic of China also makes the following declaration:

In accordance with Article 6 of the Convention, it designates each of the following as the competent authorities in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to issue the certificates referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3 of the Convention for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region: the Administrative Secretary, the Registrar of the High Court, the Deputy Registrar of the High Court and the Assistant Registrar of the High Court. Within the above ambit, responsibility for the international rights and obligations of a Party to the Convention will be assumed by the Government of the People's Republic of China.

It would be appreciated if the contents of this Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.

(...)

(signed Zhu Manli, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of China to the Kingdom of the Netherlands)".

By letter dated 26 November 1999, the Ambassador of Portugal to the Netherlands informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands of the following:

"Upon instructions from my Government and referring to the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents concluded at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention) which currently applies to Macao, I have the honour to inform Your Excellency of the following:

In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and of the Government of the People's Republic of China on the question of Macao, signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, the Government of the Portuguese Republic will remain internationally responsible for Macao until 19 December 1999, the People's Republic of China resuming from that date the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, with effect from 20 December 1999.

From 20 December 1999 the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in Macao. (...)."

By letter of 10 December 1999, the Ambassador of the People's Republic to the Netherlands informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands of the following:

(Courtesy translation)
"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration) signed on 13 April 1987, the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999. Macao will from that date become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.
It is provided both in Section VIII of Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Macao, which is annex I to the Joint Declaration, and Article 138 of the Basic Law of Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 31 March 1993 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, that international agreements to which the Government of the People's Republic of China is not yet a Party but which are implemented in Macao may continue to be implemented in the Macao Special Administrative Region.
In accordance with the provisions mentioned above, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to inform Your Excellency of the following:
The Convention aboslishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign publuc documents, done at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention), which applies to Macao at present, shall continue to apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999. (...)
Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Convention. (...)".

Croatia Type Succession

One of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which became a Party to the Convention on 24 January 1965. On 5 April 1993 the Republic of Croatia declared itself to be bound by the Convention.
No objection has been received from the Contracting States.

Dominica Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Dominica by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. The Commonwealth of Dominica declared on 22 October 2002 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Dominican Republic Type Accession**

Some Contracting States raised an objection to the accession of the Dominican Republic before 1 July 2009, namely Austria, ~~Belgium~~, Germany ~~and the Netherlands~~ (see below) whose declarations are given below. Therefore, the Convention will not enter into force between the Dominican Republic and the above-mentioned Contracting States.

Austria, 24-06-2009

...with reference to article 12 paragraph 2 of the Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents of 5 October 1961, the Republic of Austria raises an objection to the accession of the Dominican Republic to the said Convention.

Belgium,

24-06-2009
(Translation)
The Embassy hereby wishes to raise an objection to the accession of the Dominican Republic to the mentioned Convention, in accordance with Article 12.
08-03-2019

(Translation)
In 2009 Belgium raised an objection to the accession of the Dominican Republic in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention. [...] Belgium has decided to withdraw this objection.
Therefore, the Convention entered into force between Belgium and the Dominican Republic on 8 March 2019.

Germany, 11-06-2009

(Translation)
The Dominican Republic has declared its accession to the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961.
The Federal Republic of Germany raises an objection to the accession of the Dominican Republic with reference to Article 12, second paragraph, of the Convention.

Netherlands,

26-06-2009
(Translation)
... the Kingdom of the Netherlands (the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba) raises an objection to the accession of the Dominican Republic to the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents.
03-11-2017
The Kingdom of the Netherlands withdraws its declaration made in accordance with Article 12, second paragraph, of the Convention, objecting to the accession of the Dominican Republic to the Convention.
Therefore, the Convention will take effect between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Dominican Republic as of 3 November 2017.

Eswatini Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Swaziland by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Swaziland declared on 3 July 1978 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Fiji Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Fiji by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Fiji declared on 29 March 1971 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Georgia Type Accession

Two Contracting States raised an objection to the accession of Georgia, namely Germany***** and Greece******:

* By Note of 2 February 2010 the Embassy of Germany informed the depositary that the Federal Republic of Germany withdraws the objection to the accession of Georgia to the Convention. Therefore, the Convention **has entered into force between the Federal Republic of Germany and Georgia on 3 February 2010.**

** By Note of 17 December 2015 the Embassy of Greece informed the depositary that the Hellenic Republic withdraws the objection to the accession of Georgia to the Convention. Therefore, the Convention **has entered into force between Greece and Georgia on 17 December 2015.**

India Type Accession**

Belgium *, Finland **, Germany, the Netherlands *** and Spain **** raised an objection to the accession within the period of six months specified in Article 12, paragraph 2, and expiring on 15 May 2005. Therefore, the Convention will not enter into force between India and the above-mentioned Contracting States.

Belgium, 20-04-2005
(Translation)
The Embassy hereby notifies that Belgium believes it is necessary to make a reservation in connection with India's accession to the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents.

***** By Note dated 9 January 2008, the Embassy of Belgium informed the depositary of the withdrawal of Belgian's objection effective immediately.

Germany, 21-04-2005
(Translation)
India has declared its accession to the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961.
The Embassy hereby raises an objection to India's accession with reference to article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Finland, 02-05-2005
Pursuant to Article 15, second paragraph, of that Convention Finland hereby objects to the accession of India. Consequently, pursuant to Article 15, third paragraph, the Convention shall not enter into force between India and Finland.

****** On 5 October 2009, Finland has withdrawn the objection in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Therefore, the Convention has entered into force between Finland and India on 5 October 2009.

Netherlands, 13-05-2005
(Translation)
... the Kingdom of the Netherlands (the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba) raises an objection to the accession of India to the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents.

******* On 16 September 2008, the Kingdom of the Netherlands (the Kingdom in Europe, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba) has withdrawn the objection in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Therefore, the Convention has entered into force between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and India on 16 September 2008.

Spain, 13-05-2005
(Translation)
In accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention, Spain hereby declares that the Convention shall not enter into force between the Republic of India and the Kingdom of Spain.

******** On 12 February 2008, Spain has withdrawn the objection in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention. Therefore, the Convention has entered into force between Spain and India on 12 February 2008.

NOTICE FROM THE DEPOSITARY
On 25 May 2005 the depositary received an objection from Portugal concerning India’s accession. Since the objection was received after the time limit for filing objections had expired, it will have no legal consequences.

Indonesia Type Accession

Objection:

22-03-2022
(Translation) (original: German)
The Government of the Federal Republic of Germany has carefully examined the declaration dated 5 October 2021 made by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia on the occasion of the accession of the Republic of Indonesia to the Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalization for Foreign Public Documents (hereinafter referred to as "the Convention").

The declaration by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia pursuant to which it is bound by the provisions of Article 1 on the scope of public documents in the Convention, provided that the documents issued by the prosecutor office as the prosecuting body in the Republic of Indonesia are not included in public documents whose requirements of legalization have been abolished as set forth in this Convention, constitutes a reservation, since the purpose of the declaration made by the Government of the Republic of Indonesia is to limit the legal effect of Article 1 of the Convention as applied to the Republic of Indonesia.

Article 1(2) of the Convention provides that documents emanating from a public prosecutor shall be deemed to be public documents, unless the documents are executed by diplomatic or consular agents or relate to administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations.

Public prosecutors are an authority or an official connected with the courts or tribunals of the State; consequently, documents issued by them in this capacity are to be deemed as public documents covered by the Convention within the meaning of Article 1. A reservation excluding these documents from exemption from legalization is not compatible with the object and purpose of the Convention. The reservation made by the Republic of Indonesia is therefore inadmissible.

The Federal Republic of Germany objects to this reservation by the Republic of Indonesia. This objection does not prevent the entry into force of the Convention between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Republic of Indonesia.

Kosovo Type Accession**

Pursuant to the objections and declarations listed below, the Convention will not enter into force between Kosovo and the following Contracting States:
Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Azerbaijan, Belarus, Brazil, Chile, People’s Republic of China (for the Hong Kong and Macao Special Administrative Regions), Cyprus, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Greece, India, Israel, Mauritius, Mexico, Republic of Moldova, Namibia, Nicaragua, Paraguay, Peru, Poland, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Spain, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Venezuela.

Please note that this matter was also discussed in the context of a session of the 2016 meeting of the Council on General Affairs and Policy of the Conference. No 4 of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the Council reads as follows:

> ***New ratifications / accessions: role of the Depositary and the Permanent Bureau***
> *4. The Council took note of the different views expressed on the subject matter. It recalled the relevance of the Vienna Convention of 1969 on the Law of Treaties, in particular its Articles 76(2) and 77 on the functions of depositories, and the provisions and requirements of the relevant Hague Convention. When, following the deposit of an instrument of ratification, approval, or accession, the Depositary subsequently receives an objection from a Contracting State, including based on the issue of statehood, the Depositary brings the matter to the attention of all Contracting States to the Convention concerned.*

OBJECTIONS:

The Contracting States that raised an objection to the accession of Kosovo before 15 May 2016 are as follows:
Argentina, 3-5-2016
Armenia, 11-5-2016
Austria, 13-5-2016
Azerbaijan, 22-02-2016
Belarus, 24-02-2016
China, People's Republic of, 29-01-2016
Cyprus, 26-01-2016
Ecuador, 17-06-2016
Georgia, 15-01-2016
Germany, 12-5-2016
Greece, 12-5-2016
India, 10-5-2016
Israel, 11-5-2016
Mauritius, 31-03-2016
Mexico, 20-01-2016
Moldova, Republic of, 24-02-2016
Namibia, 13-5-2016
Nicaragua, 19-04-2016
Paraguay, 10-5-2016
Peru, 13-5-2016
Poland, 13-5-2016
Romania, 07-01-2016
Serbia, 23-12-2015
Slovakia, 3-5-2016
Ukraine, 18-4-2016
Uzbekistan, 10-5-2016
Venezuela, 10-5-2016

DECLARATIONS:

The Contracting States listed below chose to make specific formal declarations with regard to Kosovo.

Austria, 02-11-2017
Brazil, 15-08-2016
Chile, 10-10-2016
Ecuador, 17-06-2016
France, 14-11-2017
Germany, 26-09-2017
Serbia, 06-11-2015, 18-12-2015; 26-04-2016
Spain, 13-11-2015, 1-4-2016, 22-4-2016; 12-05-2016
Russian Federation, 26-11-2015
United States of America, 06-09-2017

DEPOSITARY COMMUNICATIONS:
The depository, 15-4-2016, 28-4-2016

The full text of the aforementioned Objections, Declarations and Communications can be found on the corresponding pages of website of the depositary for the Convention, available from the following links: Objections to accession; Reservations, declarations and objections; Depositary communications (see "Depositary communications concerning Spain", as such communications were made in response to *notes verbales* from the Kingdom of Spain).

Kyrgyzstan Type Accession**

On 27 April 2011, **Belgium** raised an objection to the accession of Kyrgyzstan to the Hague Apostille Convention, in accordance with Article 12.

On 19 May 2011, **Austria** raised an objection to the accession of Kyrgyzstan to the Hague Apostille Convention, in accordance with Article 12.

On 23 May 2011, **Germany** raised an objection to the accession of Kyrgyzstan to the Hague Apostille Convention, in accordance with Article 12.

On 24 May 2011, **Greece** raised an objection to the accession of Kyrgyzstan to the Hague Apostille Convention, in accordance with Article 12.

Therefore, the Convention will not enter into force between Kyrgyzstan and the above-mentioned countries.

Lesotho Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Basutoland (now Lesotho) by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Lesotho declared on 24 April 1972 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Liberia Type Accession**

Belgium, Germany [and the United States of America*****] raised an objection to the accession within the period of six months specified in Article 12, paragraph 2, and expiring on 10 December 1995.

* On 20 May 2015, the United States of America withdrew its objection. As a result, the Convention has entered into force between Liberia and the United States on 20 May 2015.

Mauritius Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Mauritius by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Mauritius declared on 20 December 1968 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Mongolia Type Accession**

Some Contracting States raised an objection to the accession of Mongolia before 1 November 2009, namely Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany and Greece, whose declarations are given below. Therefore, the Convention will not enter into force between Mongolia and the above-mentioned Contracting States.

OBJECTIONS

Austria, 18-09-2009
...with reference to Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents of 5 October 1961, the Republic of Austria raises an objection to the accession of Mongolia to the said convention.

Belgium, 21-10-2009
(Translation)
The Embassy hereby wishes to raise an objection to the accession of Mongolia to the mentioned Convention, in accordance with Article 12, second paragraph.

Finland, 28-10-2009
Pursuant to Article 12, second paragraph, of that Convention Finland hereby objects to the accession of Mongolia. Consequently, pursuant to Article 12, third paragraph, the Convention shall not enter into force between Mongolia and Finland.

Germany, 22-10-2009

(Translation)

Mongolia has declared its accession on 2 April 2009 to the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961.
The Federal Republic of Germany hereby raises an objection to the accession of Mongolia with reference to Article 12, second paragraph, of the Convention.

Greece, 30-10-2009

...in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 1961, the Government of the Hellenic Republic hereby raises an objection to the accession of Mongolia to the above mentioned Convention.

Montenegro Type Succession

One of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which became a Party to the Convention on 24 January 1965.
By letter received by the depositary on 26 April 2001, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (since 4 February 2003 called "Serbia and Montenegro") declared itself to be bound by the Convention. No objection has been received from the Contracting States.
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, depositary of the Hague Conventions, has notified the Member States of the Hague Conference on 5 July 2006 that "Following the declaration of the state independence of Montenegro, and under the Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, the Republic of Serbia is continuing international personality of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, which was confirmed also by the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia at its session held on 5 June 2006." On 30 January 2007 the Republic of Montenegro declared itself to be bound by the Convention:

> "... the Government of the Republic of Montenegro succeeds to the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents, adopted at The Hague on October, 5th, 1961, and takes faithfully to perform and carry out the stipulations therein contained as from June 3rd 2006, the date upon which the Republic of Montenegro assumed responsibility for its international relations."

Morocco Type Accession**

Germany, 14-06-2016

The Federal Republic of Germany herewith objects to the accession of [...] Morocco in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention Abolishing the Requirements of Legalization for Foreign Documents (The Hague, October 5th, 1961).

North Macedonia Type Succession

One of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which became a Party to the Convention on 24 January 1965. On 20 September 1993, The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia declared itself to be bound by the Convention.
No objection has been received from the Contracting States.

Paraguay Type Accession

10-06-2014

As the Federal Republic of Germany raised an objection to the accession of Paraguay on 10 June 2014, the Convention will not enter into force between Germany and Paraguay.

06-01-2022
"The Federal Republic of Germany herewith reverses the objection to the accession of Paraguay to the *Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents* ("Apostille Convention")."
Therefore, the Convention entered into force between Germany and Paraguay on 6 January 2022.

Peru Type Accession**

On 15 July 2010, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands (depositary) was informed of the objection of the Federal Republic of Germany to the accession of Peru to the Convention Abolishing the Requirements of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents.
On 19 December 2013, the depositary was informed of the withdrawal of the objection by Germany. The Convention has entered into force between Germany and Peru on 1 January 2014.

On 28 July 2010, the depositary was informed of the objection of **Greece** to the accession of Peru to the Convention Abolishing the Requirements of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents. The Convention will, in accordance with its Article 12, third paragraph, not enter into force between Greece and Peru.

Philippines Type Accession**

29-01-2019
(Translation)
[...] the Federal Republic of Germany herewith objects to the accession of the Philippines in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention abolishing the Requirements of Legalization for Foreign Documents (The Hague, 5 October, 1961).

07-02-2019
Pursuant to Article 12, second paragraph, of that Convention, Finland hereby raises an objection to the accession of the Republic of the Philippines.

05-03-2019
The Republic of Austria raises an objection to the accession of the Republic of the Philippines with reference to Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention.

12-03-2019
In accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of the 5th October 1961, the Government of the Hellenic Republic hereby objects to the accession of the Republic of the Philippines to the above mentioned Convention.

Republic of Moldova Type Accession**

One Contracting State raised an objection to the accession of Moldova, namely Germany, whose declaration is given below. Therefore, the Convention will not enter into force between Moldova and this Contracting State.

Declaration Germany (5 January 2007):
"The Republic of Moldova has declared its accession to the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961. The Federal Republic of Germany raises an objection to the accession of the Republic of Moldova with reference to Article 12, paragraph 2, of the aforementioned Convention."

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Saint Vincent and the Grenadines by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Saint Vincent and the Grenadines declared on 2 May 2002 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Serbia Type Succession

One of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which became a Party to the Convention on 24 January 1965. By letter received by the depositary on 26 April 2001, the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia declared itself to be bound by the Convention.
No objection has been received from the Contracting States.

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands, depositary of the Hague Conventions, has notified the Member States of the Hague Conference on 5 July 2006 that "Following the declaration of the state independence of Montenegro, and under the Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, the Republic of Serbia is continuing international personality of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, which was confirmed also by the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia at its session held on 5 June 2006."

Slovenia Type Succession

One of the successor States to the former Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia which became a Party to the Convention on 24 January 1965. On 8 June 1992 the Republic of Slovenia declared itself to be bound by the Convention.
No objection has been received from the Contracting States.

Suriname Type Succession

Suriname declared on 29 October 1976 that it considers itself bound by the Convention, which had been extended to its territory by the Kingdom of the Netherlands on 16 May 1967. The date of entry into force of the Convention is the date of independence of Suriname.

Tajikistan Type Accession**

Austria, *Belgium* and *Germany* raised an objection to the accession of Tajikistan within the period of six months specified in Article 12, paragraph 2. The Convention will not enter into force between Tajikistan and these three States.

Tonga Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to Tonga by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Tonga declared on 28 October 1971 that it considers itself bound by the Convention. The date of entry into force is the date of independence of this State.

Tunisia Type Accession**

Germany
01-12-2017
(Translation)
[...] the Federal Republic of Germany herewith objects to the accession of Tunisia in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention Abolishing the Requirements of Legalization for Foreign Documents (The Hague, October 5th, 1961).

Austria
12-01-2018
The Republic of Austria raises an objection to the accession of the Tunisian Republic with reference to Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Greece

25-01-2018

[...] in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2 of the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalization for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961, the Hellenic Republic hereby objects to the accession of the Republic of Tunisia to the above mentioned Convention.

Belgium

26-01-2018

(Transla tion)

[...] Belgium objects to the accession of Tunisia to the above mentioned Convention in accordance with Article 12 of the Convention.

Ukraine Type Accession

Belgium

03-10-2003

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium declares in accordance with Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention, that the Convention will not take effect between the Republic of Ukraine and the Kingdom of Belgium.

Withdrawal

05-07-2004

The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium withdraws its declaration made in accordance with article 12, paragraph 2 of the Convention, so the Convention will take effect between the Republic of Ukraine and the Kingdom of Belgium.

Germany

20-10-2003

Ukraine has declared its accession to the Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents of 5 October 1961. The Embassy [of the Federal Republic of Germany] hereby raises an objection to Ukraine's accession with reference to Article 12, paragraph 2, of the Convention.

Withdrawal

22-07-2010

The Federal Republic of Germany withdraws the objection to the accession of Ukraine to the Hague Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents of 5 October 1961.

Uzbekistan Type Accession**

The following States have informed the depositary of their objection to the accession of Uzbekistan to the *Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents*:

13 January 2012: Belgium
1 February 2012, Germany
3 February 2012: Austria
8 February 2012: Greece

As a result, the 1961 Convention will not enter into force between Uzbekistan and the above-mentioned States.

Vanuatu Type Succession

On 24 February 1965, the Convention had been extended to the New Hebrides (now the Republic of Vanuatu) by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland. Vanuatu declared on 1 August 2008 that it considers itself bound by the Convention.
None of the other Contracting States have objected to its succession.
The date of entry into force for Vanuatu is the date of its independence (30 July 1980).

Res/D/N

Argentina Articles Declarations

(Translation)
The Republic of Argentina objects to the extension of the application of the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents concluded at The Hague on 5 October 1961 to the Malvinas (Falkland) Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich, as notified by the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands on 24 February 1965, and reaffirms its rights of sovereignty over the Malvinas Islands, South Georgia and South Sandwich, which form an integral part of its national territory. The United Nations General Assembly adopted resolutions 2065 (XX), 3160 (XXVIII), 31/49, 37/9, 38/12, 39/6, 40/21 and 41/40 recognising the existence of a dispute concerning sovereignty in respect of the Malvinas, and urging the Republic of Argentina and the United Kingdom to continue negotiations in order to find as soon as possible a peaceful and definitive solution to the dispute, through the good offices of the Secretary General of the United Nations, who would report to the General Assembly on progress made.

The Republic of Argentina also objects to the extension of the application of the Convention to the so-called "British Antarctic Territory", lodged on the same date, while reaffirming the rights of the Republic to the Argentine Antarctic Sector, including those relating to its corresponding maritime sovereignty or jurisdiction. Furthermore, it would refer to the assurances concerning claims to territorial sovereignty in Antarctica laid down in Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty, signed in Washington on 1 December 1959, to which the Republic of Argentina and the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland are parties.

Referring to the above declaration, the Government of the Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland communicated the following on 27 August 1987:

"The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland cannot accept the declaration made by the Argentine Republic as regards the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands. The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to United Kingdom sovereignty over the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands and, accordingly, their right to extend the application of the Convention to the Falkland Islands and South Georgia and the South Sandwich Islands.

The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland also cannot accept the declaration made by the Argentine Republic as regards the British Antartic Territory. The Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland have no doubt as to the sovereignty of the United Kingdom over the British Antarctic Territory and, accordingly, their right to extend the application of the Convention to the British Antarctic Territory. The Government of the United Kingdom draw attention to Article IV of the Antarctic Treaty, to which the Governments of the United Kingdom and Argentina are parties. Article IV freezes claims to Antarctic territory South of 60 degrees South latitude."

Australia Articles Declarations

"Pursuant to Article 13, the Convention shall extend to all the territories for the international relations of which it is responsible."

Austria Articles Declarations

Declaration:
09-03-2018

Austria takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention on Civil Procedure (1954), the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980) and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) to the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, Austria declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Conventions, Austria therefore considers that the Conventions in principle continue to apply to the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

Austria further notes the Declarations by Ukraine that the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Conventions is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev will determine the procedure for relevant communication. As a consequence of the above, Austria declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev for the purposes of the application and implementation of the conventions.

Bahrain Articles Declarations

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Bahrain [...] is implementing an e-register system, with reference to Article 7 of the said Convention.

Bosnia and Herzegovina Articles Declarations

"In the certificate annexed to the Convention (apostille), in the line entitled "1. Country" shall be filled with Bosnia and Herzegovina without any entities marks in order to produce the public document to be fully legitimated."

Brazil Articles Declarations

The Government of the Federative Republic of Brazil further states that Brazil's accession to the Convention does not imply the recognition of sovereign rights over territories to which the Convention's application has been or will be extended under the terms of Article 13.

Burundi Articles

-

China Articles Declarations Notifications

This Convention applies to the *Special Administrative Regions of Hong Kong* and *Macao* only, as a result of extensions made by the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and Portugal, respectively. When Hong Kong and Macao were restored to the People's Republic of China on 1 July 1997 and 20 December 1999,

respectively, China declared that the Convention will continue to apply for Hong Kong and Macao.
Date of entry into force of the Convention for Hong Kong: 25 April 1965; date of entry into force for Macao: 4 February 1969.

Declarations / notifications:

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, depositary of the Convention, gave notice that on 16 June 1997, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands received a Note dated 11 June 1997 from the Ambassador of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland at The Hague and a Note dated 3 June 1997 from the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China at The Hague concerning Hong Kong.

The Note from the Ambassador of the United Kingdom reads as follows:

"Your Excellency,
I am instructed by Her Britannic Majesty's Principal Secretary of State for Foreign and Commonwealth Affairs to refer to the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents done at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention) which applies to Hong Kong at present.
I am also instructed to state that, in accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland and the Government of the People's Republic of China on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984, the Government of the United Kingdom will restore Hong Kong to the People's Republic of China with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the United Kingdom will continue to have international responsibility for Hong Kong until that date. Therefore, from that date the Government of the United Kingdom will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention to Hong Kong.
I should be grateful if the contents of this Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.
(...)
(signed Rosemary Spencer)".

The Note from the Ambassador of the People's Republic of China reads as follows:

(Translation)
"Your Excellency,
In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland on the Question of Hong Kong signed on 19 December 1984 (hereinafter referred to as the `Joint Declaration'), the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Hong Kong with effect from 1 July 1997. Hong Kong will, with effect from that date, become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.
It is provided both in Section XI of Annex I to the Joint Declaration, `Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Hong Kong', and Article 153 of the Basic Law of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 4 April 1990 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, that international agreements to which the People's Republic of China is not a Party but which are implemented in Hong Kong may continue to be implemented in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region.
In accordance with the above provisions, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to make the following notification:
The Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents done at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the "Convention"), by which the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands is designated as the depositary, which applies to Hong Kong at present, will continue to apply to the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region with effect from 1 July 1997. The Government of the People's Republic

of China also makes the following declaration:
In accordance with Article 6 of the Convention, it designates each of the following as the competent authorities in the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region to issue the certificates referred to in paragraph 1 of Article 3 of the Convention for the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region: the Administrative Secretary, the Registrar of the High Court, the Deputy Registrar of the High Court and the Assistant Registrar of the High Court. Within the above ambit, responsibility for the international rights and obligations of a Party to the Convention will be assumed by the Government of the People's Republic of China.
It would be appreciated if the contents of this Note could be placed formally on record and brought to the attention of the other Parties to the Convention.
(...)
(signed Zhu Manli, Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the People's Republic of China to the Kingdom of the Netherlands)".

By letter dated 26 November 1999, the Ambassador of Portugal to the Netherlands informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands of the following:

"Upon instructions from my Government and referring to the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents concluded at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention) which currently applies to Macao, I have the honour to inform Your Excellency of the following:
In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the Portuguese Republic and of the Government of the People's Republic of China on the question of Macao, signed in Beijing on 13 April 1987, the Government of the Portuguese Republic will remain internationally responsible for Macao until 19 December 1999, the People's Republic of China resuming from that date the exercise of sovereignty over Macao, with effect from 20 December 1999.
From 20 December 1999 the Portuguese Republic will cease to be responsible for the international rights and obligations arising from the application of the Convention in Macao. (...)."

By letter of 10 December 1999, the Ambassador of the People's Republic to the Netherlands informed the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the Netherlands of the following:

(Courtesy translation)
"In accordance with the Joint Declaration of the Government of the People's Republic of China and the Government of the Republic of Portugal on the Question of Macao (hereinafter referred to as the Joint Declaration) signed on 13 April 1987, the Government of the People's Republic of China will resume the exercise of sovereignty over Macao with effect from 20 December 1999. Macao will from that date become a Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China and will enjoy a high degree of autonomy, except in foreign and defence affairs which are the responsibilities of the Central People's Government of the People's Republic of China.
It is provided both in Section VIII of Elaboration by the Government of the People's Republic of China of its Basic Policies Regarding Macao, which is annex I to the Joint Declaration, and Article 138 of the Basic Law of Macao Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China, which was adopted on 31 March 1993 by the National People's Congress of the People's Republic of China, that international agreements to which the Government of the People's Republic of China is not yet a Party but which are implemented in Macao may continue to be implemented in the Macao Special Administrative Region.
In accordance with the provisions mentioned above, I am instructed by the Minister of Foreign Affairs of the People's Republic of China to inform Your Excellency of the following:
The Convention aboslishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign publuc documents, done at The Hague on 5 October 1961 (hereinafter referred to as the Convention), which applies to Macao at present, shall continue to apply to the Macao Special Administrative Region with effect from 20 December 1999. (...)
Within the above ambit, the Government of the People's Republic of China will assume the responsibility for the international rights and obligations that place on a Party to the Convention. (...)".

Declaration Hong Kong, 3 March 2006:

(...) that the Apostille Service Office of the Judiciary of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region has recently computerized the Apostille system.
As a result of the computerization of the system, there will be a change in the way that the Apostille Certificate is produced. At present, the Apostille Certificate is in the form of a chop stamped on the document requiring Apostille service with blanks completed in handwriting. After computerization, the Certificate will be generated from the computer and be affixed to the document requiring Apostille.
As the current practice, the Certificate will be signed by the Registrar, High Court, and sealed with the Seal of the Court. This new system will commence operation with effect from 20 March 2006.
Apart from the above, all existing practice and procedure remain unchanged.

Declaration Hong Kong, 18 April 2012:

The Office of the Chief Secretary for Administration [of the Government of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region ("HKSAR") of the People's Republic of China] has the further honour to inform [...] that in order to follow the recommendation of the Special Commission on the Practical Operation of the Hague Apostille Convention, the Apostille Service Office of the Judiciary of the HKSAR will indicate the limit effect of an Apostille by inserting the following statement at the top of the Apostille with effect from 23 July 2012:

> "This apostille only certifies the signature, the capacity of the signatory and the seal or stamp it bears. It does not certify the content of the document for which it is issued".

Apart from insertion of the statement mentioned above, there will be no other change to the Apostille.

Colombia Articles Declarations

... as of December 15th of 2004, the apostille issued by the Coordination of Legalizations and Apostille of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia will no longer be attached to its respective documents in the form of a sticker, but mechanically with a metallic staple.
As of December 15th of 2004, the apostille format will also include a space at the bottom reserved for identifying the document for which the apostille is issued and for the names and surnames of its holder.

Declaration received on 22 April 2005:
...as of May 1st 2005, the signature which appears on the Colombian Apostille format, will no longer be written in ink, but will be scanned.

Declaration received on 12 October 2007:
As from October 8th, 2007, Colombia has introduced a new Apostille Certificate, which sample is attached hereto. Its basic characteristics are as follows:

- The Apostille is printed in black and white, on normal paper, instead of the security paper used up to now.
- The security features of the current Apostille Certificate have been replaced and reinforced by the use of digital certificates and encrypted signatures, following the recommendations and conclusions of the Third International Forum on Digital Evidence held in Los Angeles (May 29, 2007) at which the e-APP was discussed in detail.
- The authenticity of Apostilles issued by the Government of Colombia may still be verified by using the e-Register, which is accessible on our web site www.cancilleria.gov.co/apostilla. States Parties are highly encouraged to regularly use the E-Register.
- The presentation of the e-Register has been slightly modified: instead of the current view of a summary containing the basic data of the Apostille, users are able to view an exact color image of the Apostille that has been issued.
- The use of a digital certificate will guarantee that the electronic version of the Apostille has not been tampered. Likewise, if the paper Apostille attached to the document somehow differs from the one displayed in

the e-Register, it likely means that the paper Apostille has been altered.

- For a transitional period of time, and until the stock of current Apostilles expires, the Government of Colombia will be issuing both models, that are equally valid and authentic.

Denmark Articles Declarations

Declarations:

14-10-2021

The Convention should now be applied to the Faroe Islands. The Kingdom of Denmark thus withdraws its territorial declaration with regard to the Faroe Islands in accordance with Article 13 of the Convention.

30-10-2006

(...) that the Convention as yet does not apply for Greenland and the Faro Islands.

Ecuador Articles Declarations

"(...) , the above-mentioned Ecuadorian Ministry has decided to change the design of the current "Apostille" used in Ecuador for a new design, more practical and simplified. This new seal will be issued with a 10 American dollar stamp and will be implemented as from the second quarterly of 2006."

Estonia Articles Declarations

30-04-2019

Estonia takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the service abroad of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (1965), the Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters (1970), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980) and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, Estonia declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above-mentioned Conventions, Estonia therefore considers that the conventions in principle continue to apply to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

Estonia further notes the Declaration by Ukraine that the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Conventions is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, Estonia declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv for the purposes of the application and implementation of the conventions.

Finland Articles Declarations

19-09-2018

The Government of Finland takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention on Civil Procedure (1954), the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the service abroad of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (1965), the Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters (1970), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980) and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) and the Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance (2007) to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, Finland declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Conventions, Finland therefore considers that the conventions in principle continue to apply to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

Finland further notes the Declaration by Ukraine that the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Conventions is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, Finland declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv for the purposes of the application and implementation of the said conventions.

France Articles Declarations

On depositing their instrument of ratification the French Government declared that the Convention applies to the entire territory of the French Republic.

France has declared in agreement with the Government of the United Kingdom to extend the application of the Convention to the Anglo-French Condominium of the New Hebrides on 17 December 1965. (The Convention entered into force for the New Hebrides on 15 February 1966.)

In Notes of 1 April 1970, the British Embassy and the French Embassy notified that the Government of the United Kingdom and the Government of the French Republic have reached an agreement whereby the extension of the Convention to the Anglo-French Condominium of the New Hebrides with effect from 15 February 1966, has been confirmed, and the competent authorities to issue the certificate designated. The New Hebrides achieved independence on 30 July 1980 and became the Republic of Vanuatu.

Georgia Articles Declarations

This Convention does not apply to the documents issued by the *de facto* illegitimate authorities and officials of the regions of Georgia: Autonomous Republic of Abkhazia and the former Autonomous District of South Ossetia.

Germany Articles Declarations Notifications

Notification:

On 22 November 1994, the Government of the Federal Republic of Germany gave notice to the depositary of the Convention of the following:

"With the reunification of Germany on 3 October 1990 the Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 applies to the entire territory of the Federal Republic of Germany."

Declaration:

06-12-2021
(Translation)
“Since 4 September 2021, the person responsible for issuing the apostille for public documents of the Higher Regional Court of the State of Mecklenburg-Western Pomerania is the President of the Higher Regional Court [...].”

06-06-2018
The Federal Republic of Germany takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention on Civil Procedure (1954), the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the service abroad of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (1965), the Convention on the taking of evidence abroad in civil or commercial matters (1970), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980) and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) and the Convention on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance (2007) to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, the Federal Republic of Germany declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

Regarding the territorial scope of the above Conventions, the Federal Republic of Germany therefore considers that the Conventions in principle continue to apply to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

The Federal Republic of Germany further notes the Declarations by Ukraine that the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Conventions is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the government of Ukraine will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, the Federal Republic of Germany declares that it will only engage with the government of Ukraine for the purposes of the application and implementation of the conventions with regard to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol.

Guatemala Articles Declarations

19 January 2017
The accession and the implementation of this Convention, does not imply the recognition from the Republic of Guatemala of any territory as sovereign State and any regime as Legal Government, that to the present date, are

not recognized by the Republic of Guatemala, neither implies the establishment nor reestablishment of the diplomatic relations with those countries with which they do not maintain currently.

Hungary Articles Declarations

The Republic of Hungary declares that the provisions of Article 13 of the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, done at The Hague on October 5, 1961, are contrary to resolution 1514/XV on the granting of independence to colonial countries and peoples, adopted by the General Assembly of the United Nations on December 14, 1960.

Indonesia Articles Declarations

Declaration:

05-10-2021
The Government of the Republic of Indonesia is bound by the provisions of Article 1 on the scope of public documents in the Convention with a declaration statement that provided that the documents issued by the prosecutor office as the prosecuting body in the Republic of Indonesia, are not included in public documents whose requirements of legalization have been abolished as set forth in this Convention.

Kazakhstan Articles Declarations

"(...)
Attachment: The Hague Convention dd 05.10.1961 abolishing the legalisation for foreign public documents stipulates the apostille of 9 x 9 cm in size.
It is expedient to have a stamp of the apostille, which size is 13 x 13 cm.
A script of the text can be enlarged for the comfort of its representation and reading. It is not allowed to change (translate) a language document, text and its order of placing on the stamp.
The stamp can be fulfilled in the language of the Republic of Kazakhstan only."

Kosovo Articles Declarations Depositary communications

Declaration:
26-06-2017

The Embassy of the Republic of Kosovo to the Kingdom of the Netherlands strongly objects the declaration made by the Embassy of Republic of Serbia on 29-05-2017, a territory with which Republic of Kosovo has not yet established diplomatic relations, to extend the territorial applicability of the Authorities of Serbia to the territory of the Republic of Kosovo. Any legalization of documents in the territory of the Republic of Kosovo by illegal structures of the Government of Serbia or the Government of Serbia itself presents a violation of the sovereignty of the Republic of Kosovo and an attempt to issue falsified documents by such illegal and unauthorized structures, which are considered null and void by the Government of the Republic of Kosovo. At the same time it presents a violation also of the commitments Serbia has taken in the dialogue for the normalization of relations with the Republic of Kosovo under the facilitation of the European Union to dismantle all parallel structures functioning in the territory of the Republic of Kosovo.

The Embassy of the Republic of Kosovo draws its attention to all Parties of the Apostille Convention that the Republic of Kosovo as an independent and sovereign country is recognized by 114 countries and is a member of several international organizations including the International Monetary Fund and of the World Bank Group, two United Nations Specialized Agencies. The Embassy of the Republic of Serbia in The Hague in its Note Verbale intentionally abuses with the conclusions of the International Court of Justice Advisory Opinion on the legality of the independence of Kosovo. On 22nd July 2010 the International Court of Justice has concluded that the adoption of the declaration of independence of 17 February 2008 did not violate general international law, Security Council resolution 1244 (1999) or the Constitutional Framework. Consequently the adoption of that declaration did not violate any applicable rule of international law.

At the same time the Embassy of the Republic of Kosovo strongly objects the request of the Embassy of the Republic of Serbia to change the designation of the Republic of Kosovo. The Embassy of the Republic of Kosovo recalls to all Parties of the Apostille Convention that the Republic of Kosovo has submitted the instruments of accession to the Apostille Convention by its official name "the Republic of Kosovo" and as such have been received by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands as Depository of the convention. It is not up to other Contracting Parties to change the designation of any Contracting Party to the Convention and this presents a dangerous attempt by Serbia to violate international law and the sovereign rights of each Contracting Party to decide upon its designation.

As such, the Republic of Kosovo strongly objects to the declaration of Serbia. As a party to the Convention, the Republic of Kosovo calls on all Contracting Parties to reject the declaration and asks them to be vigilant in ensuring that they reject any efforts by Serbia to illegally exercise Apostille Convention obligations in the territory of the Republic of Kosovo.

The Embassy of the Republic of Kosovo kindly requests from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, in its capacity as Depository of the Convention, to bring this Note Verbale containing the declaration of objection to all Contracting Parties of the Apostille Convention and to the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference on Private International Law.

Latvia Articles Declarations

Declaration:

04-04-2018
The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia [...] with reference to [...] the Convention on Civil Procedure (1954), the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (1965), the Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters (1970), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980),and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) has to honour to convey the following.

The Government of the Republic of Latvia takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the aforementioned Conventions to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, the Republic of Latvia declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Conventions, the Republic of Latvia therefore considers that the Conventions in principle continue to apply to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

The Republic of Latvia further notes the Declarations by Ukraine that the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Convention is limited and
not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, the Republic of Latvia declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or
through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev for the purposes of the application and implementation of the convention.

Lithuania Articles Declarations

Declaration:

16-06-2020
The Government of the Republic of Lithuania takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention on Civil Procedure (1954), the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters (1965), the Convention on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters (1970), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980) and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognize the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Conventions, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania therefore considers that the conventions in principle continue to apply to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

The Government of the Republic of Lithuania further notes the Declaration by Ukraine that the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Conventions is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, the Government of the Republic of Lithuania declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv for the purposes of the application and implementation of the said conventions.

Netherlands Articles Declarations

Declaration of 18 October 2010

The Kingdom of the Netherlands consisted of three parts: the Netherlands, the Netherlands Antilles and Aruba.
The Netherlands Antilles consisted of the islands of Curaçao, Sint Maarten, Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba.
With effect from 10 October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles ceased to exist as a part of the Kingdom of the Netherlands. Since that date, the Kingdom consists of four parts: the Netherlands, Aruba, Curaçao and Sint Maarten. Curaçao and Sint Maarten enjoy internal self-government within the Kingdom, as Aruba and, up to 10 October 2010, the Netherlands Antilles do.
These changes constitute a modification of the internal constitutional relations within the Kingdom of the

Netherlands. The Kingdom of the Netherlands will accordingly remain the subject of international law with which agreements are concluded. The modification of the structure of the Kingdom will therefore not affect the validity of the international agreements ratified by the Kingdom for the Netherlands Antilles. These agreements, including any reservations made, will continue to apply to Curaçao and Sint Maarten.
The other islands that have formed part of the Netherlands Antilles - Bonaire, Sint Eustatius and Saba - became part of the Netherlands, thus constituting 'the Caribbean part of the Netherlands'. The agreements that applied to the Netherlands Antilles will also continue to apply to these islands; however, the Government of the Netherlands will now be responsible for implementing these agreements.

New Zealand Articles Declarations

(...) this accession shall not extend to Tokelau unless and until a declaration to that effect is lodged by the Government of New Zealand with the depositary, in accordance with Article 13 of the Convention; and designates the New Zealand Department of Internal Affairs as its competent authority for the purposes of Article 6 of the Convention.

Oman Articles Declarations

Declaration:

23-03-2021
"[...] the Government of the Sultanate of Oman represented by its Ministry of Foreign Affairs has the pleasure to notify [...] its desire to confirm its position regarding Article 1 of the Convention. The Sultanate considers that the provisions of the Convention do not apply to commercial and customs documents, whatever their type, origin or value, nor do they apply to documents issued by Diplomatic or Consular Agents. In the view of the Sultanate the Convention applies only to civil public documents, pursuant to paragraphs a, b, c and d, of the aforementioned Article."

Pakistan Articles Declarations

Reservations / Declarations:

08-07-2022
The participation of the Islamic Republic of Pakistan in the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, shall in no way imply recognition of entities which it does not recognize outside the scope of the present Convention and shall not lead to entry into dealings with such entities under this Convention. Furthermore, the Convention shall not apply to India, and/or entities not recognized by the Islamic Republic of Pakistan.

Philippines Articles Declarations

Declaration:

12-09-2018
The Philippines' accession to the Apostille Convention will not apply to Contracting Parties which it does not recognize as States.

The Government of the Republic of the Philippines wishes to draw the attention of State Parties to the Apostille Convention to Sections 4 and 5 of the Philippine Extradition Law (Presidential Decree No. 1069 [s.1977]) which pertains to documents submitted to the Government of the Philippines in support of extradition requests, and wish to convey that the Apostille Convention does not supersede or override the provisions of the Philippine Extradition Law.

The Certification by apostille under the Apostille Convention does not satisfy the requirements under the Philippine Extradition Law. Extradition requests directed to the Republic of the Philippines should be conveyed in the manner provided for by the Philippine Extradition Law.

Poland Articles Declarations

Declarations:

10-08-2021

The Republic of Poland takes note of the Declaration submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents and of the Declaration submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declaration made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declaration made by the Russian Federation, the Republic of Poland declares, in accordance with the duty of non-recognition as lawful a situation created by a serious breach by State of an obligation arising under a peremptory norm of general international law and in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognize the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Convention, the Republic of Poland therefore considers that the Convention in principle continues to apply to the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

The Republic of Poland further notes the Declaration by Ukraine that the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as well as certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Convention is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the government of Ukraine will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, the Republic of Poland declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with present, de facto authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol as well as in certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine for the purposes of the application and implementation of the Convention.

Portugal Articles Declarations

Declarations:

Portugal has declared to extend the application of the Convention to the entire territory of the Republic of Portugal on 22 October 1969. (The Convention entered into force for the entire territory of the Republic of Portugal on 21 December 1969.)

13-03-2018

The Government of the Portuguese Republic takes note of the Declaration submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, done at The Hague, on 5 October 1961, to the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declaration submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declaration made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declaration made by the Russian Federation, the Government of the Portuguese Republic declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Convention, the Government of the Portuguese Republic therefore considers that the Convention in principle continues to apply to the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

The Government of the Portuguese Republic further notes the Declaration by Ukraine that the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Convention is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, the Government of the Portuguese Republic declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev for the purposes of the application and implementation of the convention.

Romania Articles Declarations

Declaration:

14-06-2018
Romania takes note of the Declarations submitted by Ukraine on 16 October 2015 regarding the application of the Convention on Civil Procedure (1954), the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (1961), the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (1980), the Convention on the service abroad of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (1965) and the Convention on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children (1996) to the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol and of the Declarations submitted by the Russian Federation on 19 July 2016 in relation to the Declarations made by Ukraine.

In relation to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation, Romania declares, in line with the conclusions of the European Council of 20/21 March 2014, that it does not recognise the illegal referendum in Crimea and the illegal annexation of the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the
city of Sevastopol to the Russian Federation.

As regards the territorial scope of the above Conventions, Romania therefore considers that the Conventions in principle continue to apply to the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol as part of the territory of Ukraine.

Romania further notes the Declarations by Ukraine that the "Autonomous Republic of Crimea" and the city of Sevastopol are temporarily not under the control of Ukraine and that the application and implementation by Ukraine of its obligations under the Conventions is limited and not guaranteed in relation to this part of Ukraine's territory, and that only the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev will determine the procedure for relevant communication.

As a consequence of the above, Romania declares that it will not engage in any direct communication or interaction with authorities in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and will not accept any documents or requests emanating from such authorities or through the authorities of the Russian Federation, but will only engage with the central authorities of Ukraine in Kiev for the purposes of the application and implementation of the conventions.

Russian Federation Articles Declarations Notifications

As the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics does not exist any more and since the Russian Federation according to its declaration contained in its Note of 13 January 1992 to the Heads of the Diplomatic Representations at Moscow (see below) continues to perform the rights and fulfil the obligations following from the international

agreements signed by the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, the depositary has asked the Russian Federation to let him know whether this declaration applies also to the present Convention and, in the affirmative, to inform him of the adaptations to be made in the notification made by the Soviet Union on 4 September 1991.

Declarations made by the Russian Federation:

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Russian Federation presents its compliments to the Heads of Diplomatic Representations in Moscow and has the honour to request them to inform their Governments about the following.
The Russian Federation continues to perform the rights and fulfil the obligations following from the international agreements signed by the Union of the Soviet Socialist Republics.
Accordingly the Government of the Russian Federation shall perform the functions of a depository in conformity with the corresponding multilateral agreements instead of the Government of the USSR.
Therefore, the Ministry kindly requests to consider the Russian Federation as a Party to all international agreements in force instead of the USSR.
The Ministry avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Heads of Diplomatic Representations the assurances of its highest consideration.
Moscow, January 13, 1992."

Please click here to read the depositary's *Notification in conformity with Article 15 of the Convention*, dated 15 May 1992.

Additional information (5-08-2008)
For the purposes of Article 6 of the Convention the Russian Side declares that, alongside with the competent authorities declared earlier by the Russian Side, the Ministry of Defense of the Russian Federation is the authority competent to issue the Certificate (Apostille), referred to in Article 3 of the Convention, on official archive documents on military service (employment) in the Armed Forces of the Russian Federation, the Armed Forces of the USSR and the Joint Armed Forces of the Commonwealth of Independent States (CIS), issued in the Russian Federation.

19-07-2016
Unofficial translation

Statement on the Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents

"Reaffirming its firm commitment to respect and fully comply with generally recognised principles and rules of international law, the Russian Federation, with reference to the declaration of Ukraine of 16 October 2015 regarding the Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, states the following.
The Russian Federation rejects to the above mentioned declaration of Ukraine and states that it cannot be taken into consideration as it is based on a bad faith and incorrect presentation and interpretation of facts and law.
The declaration of Ukraine regarding "certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine" cannot serve as a justification for non-compliance with its obligations, disregard for humanitarian considerations, refusal or failure to take necessary measures to find practical solutions for issues that have a very serious and direct impact on the ability of residents of those regions to exercise their fundamental rights and freedoms provided for by international law.
The declaration of independence of the Republic of Crimea and its voluntary accession to the Russian Federation are the result of a direct and free expression of will by the people of Crimea in accordance with democratic principles, a legitimate form of exercising their right to self-determination given an aided from abroad violent coup d'état in Ukraine which caused rampant radical nationalist elements not hesitating to use terror, intimidation and harassment against both its political opponents and the population of entire regions of Ukraine.
The Russian Federation rejects any attempts to call into question an objective status of the Republic of Crimea

and the city of Sevastopol as constituent entities of the Russian Federation, the territories of which are an integral part of the territory of the Russian Federation under its full sovereignty. Thus, the Russian Federation reaffirms that it fully complies with its international obligations under the Convention in relation to this part of its territory".

Serbia Articles Declarations

Declaration:

By Note dated 24 January 2003, the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia informed the depositary of the following:

"The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of The Netherlands and with the reference to the misunderstandings concerning the application of the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalization for Foreign Public Documents, signed at The Hague on 5 October 1961 and ratified by the Federative People's Republic of Yugoslavia on 21 May 1961, and the Convention On the Issue of Multilingual Extracts from Civil Status Records, signed in Vienna on 8 September 1976 and ratified by the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, to the succession of which the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia signed the declarations on 19 April 2001 and 16 October 2001 respectively, and, in that connection, the competencies of Yugoslav institutions to legalize public documents, has the honour to inform of the following:
1) Yugoslavia has legalized public documents in the sense of the Hague Convention under the Law on the Legalization of Public Documents in International Traffic ("Official Gazette of the SFRY", No.6, 8 February, 1973) since its adoption.
Under the article. 8 of the said Law, the courts of the first instance and the Ministries of Justice of the constituent Yugoslav Republics provide apostilles, i.e. authorize Yugoslav documents, for use in the States Parties to the Hague Convention. Under the Law, municipal courts have primary competence to certify documents issued by institutions resident in the areas under the jurisdiction of the courts. Republican and Provincial justice administration authorities are competent to authorize, as an alternative, documents issued by institutions resident in the areas under their jurisdiction if not authorized by competent courts of the first instance.
Bearing that in mind, only one authorization, i.e. apostille, by the competent court of the first instance or, exceptionally, by a Republican or Provincial justice administration authority will suffice for the authorization/acceptance of Yugoslav documents in international legal traffic. The insistence therefore on a cumulative authorization of documents by one or more Yugoslav institutions is in contravention of the provisions of the Hague Convention and the goals for the promotion of which it was signed and acceded to by a large number of countries, Yugoslavia included, as a source of international law.
2) Furthermore, and with reference to the said Note, the Embassy has noticed that the competent authorities of the Kingdom of the Netherlands frequently request that multilingual extracts from Yugoslav civil status records be legalized by alternative Yugoslav authorities (Ministries of Justice of the Republic of Serbia and the Republic of Montenegro).
That practice is contrary to the provisions of Article 8, para 2, of the Vienna Convention and Article 6, para 1, of the Hague Convention. They also request that extracts from Yugoslav civil status records in Serbian undergo the entire gamut of possible legalizations by various Yugoslav and Dutch authorities, which runs counter to the letter and spirit of Article 1 of The Hague Convention which provides for the obligation of the States Parties to accept extracts from civil status records of all States Parties, defined as public documents, if they are supplied by an apostille alone.
In advising the Ministry of the above, the Embassy of the Federal Republic of Yugoslavia would appreciate if it interceded with the competent authorities of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, as the depository of the Hague Convention, to change the existing practice and align it with the provisions of the Hague Conventions and to advise thereof the other States Parties to the Convention. (...)"

Note received on 9 June 2006:
"... following the declaration of the state of independence of Montenegro, and under the Article 60 of the Constitutional Charter of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, the Republic of Serbia is continuing

international personality of the state union of Serbia and Montenegro, which was informed also by the National Assembly of the Republic of Serbia at its session held on 5 June 2006."

Note received on 29 May 2017:
The Embassy of the Republic of Serbia to the Kingdom of the Netherlands presents its compliments to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of the Netherlands, and recalling the UN Security Council Resolution 1244 (1999), has the honour to notify esteemed Ministry that the present extension *ratione loci* of the applicability of the 1961 Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legislation for Foreign Public Documents (hereinafter the Apostille Convention) to the territory of the Serbia's Province of Kosovo and Metohija has to be interpreted in accordance with Article 13 of the Apostille Convention.
Furthermore, in conformity with above mentioned Resolution 1244 and the Constitutional Framework for Provisional Self-Government of Kosovo established by the UNMIK regulation 2001/9 of 15 May 2001, which was confirmed by the ICJ Advisory Opinion of 22 July 2010 to be in force, all references to the Province of Kosovo and Metohija and its provisional institutions need to be designated accordingly and in conformity with the UN practice.
The Embassy of the Republic of Serbia would highly appreciate if the Ministry, acting in its capacity as Depositary, brings this Note Verbale containing declaration of extension to the attention of all Contracting States to the Apostille Convention and to the Permanent Bureau of the Hague Conference on Private International Law.

Spain Articles Declarations

By Note No 4 dated 23 June 2011, the Embassy of Spain informed the depositary of the following declaration :

The Ministry of Justice of Spain has put in place a new system for the issuance of Apostilles, which includes the possibility to issue both electronic and paper Apostilles.
Starting on 16th May 2011 in two pilot Competent Authorities (Superior Courts of Justice of the Region of Murcia and Castilla-La Mancha), the new system will be progressively deployed in the Competent Authorities in Spain.
The Competent Authorities formerly designated as Secretaries of the "Territorial Courts" (Secretarios de Gobierno de las Audiencias) are now referred to by their current official denomination: "Chancellor Secretariats of the Superior Courts of Justice" (Secretarías de Gobierno de los Tribunales Superiores de Justicia).
The main features of this new system are explained below:
Format of the Apostille certificate
- As of 16th May, the Apostille issued with the new system will follow the sample format attached and will be digitally signed.
- Apostilles issued with the new system for paper documents will be printed and printed on the document or attached to it by means such as metallic staples and stamps.
- Electronic Apostilles issued with the new system will also be digitally signed and will contain the public document as an attachment. The digital certificate will guarantee that the Apostille and the electronic public document embedded in it have not been altered after its issuance.
- For a transitional period of time and until the new system for issuance of Apostilles is deployed in all Competent Authorities, the Government of Spain will be issuing both the current and the new Apostille model which are equally valid and authentic.
e-Register of Apostilles
- The authenticity of Apostilles issued by Competent Authorities in Spain may be verified at the Spanish electronic Register of Apostilles at the website of the Ministry of Justice. The exact website will be included in the Apostille.
- In the case of electronic Apostilles, the e-Register will also allow to verify the authenticity of the underlying electronic public document.

By Note No 89 dated 4 August 1997, the Embassy of Spain informed the depositary of the following declaration concerning Gibraltar:

"La Embajada de España saluda atentamente al Ministerio Real de Asuntos Exteriores y tiene el honor de poner en su conocimiento que la Colonia de Gibraltar viene expidiendo apostillas del Convenio de La Haya número XII de 5.10.1961 en las que, como "país", figura el nombre del citado territorio.
El Reino de España considera que el modelo de apostilla utilizado por las Autoridades del Reino Unido en Gibraltar implica una clara violación del Convenio de La Haya citado, cuyo artículo 13 sólo permite a los Estados-parte del mismo extender dicho Convenio a todos los territorios de cuyas relaciones internacionales estén encargados, pudiendo en consecuencia estos territorios expedir apostillas, pero nunca como "países", tal y como aparece en las expedidas por Gibraltar.
Gran Bretaña, en efecto, extendió en su momento la aplicación territorial del Convenio a Gibraltar, que tiene la consideración, según las propias Autoridades británicas, de territorio dependiente y no de "país". La autoproclamación en el modelo de apostilla citado de Gibraltar como "país" no sólo no es aceptable por España, sino que no refleja el actual estatuto que dicho territorio posee desde el punto de vista del Derecho Internacional.
En consecuencia, el Reino de España declara que no acepta la validez de las apostillas expedidas por el Reino Unido en Gibraltar en las que aparezca el nombre de la Colonia como "país".
El Reino de España solicita al Ministerio de Asuntos Exteriores de los Países Bajos que comunique esta decisión a los Estados-parte del citado Convenio. (...)".

Switzerland Articles Declarations

Declaration:

12-06-2018
(Translation)
Referring to the declaration formulated by the Republic of Serbia with regard to the Hague Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents of 5 October 1961 and received by the Depositary on 29 May 2017, Switzerland wishes to notify all Contracting States that, with regard to public documents executed in the territory of Kosovo, Switzerland will recognise as authentic only those documents for which an Apostille has been issued by the competent authorities designated by Kosovo, in accordance with the provisions of Article 6 of the Convention.

Tonga Articles Declarations

Declaration of 15 November 2010:

(...) all Apostilles issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Kingdom of Tonga and its designated Diplomatic Missions shall now be subject to an administrative fee before issuance.

Ukraine Articles Declarations

09-03-2022
”In view of the ongoing aggression of the Russian Federation against Ukraine, Ukraine hereby informs the Depositary [...] of the inability to guarantee the fulfilment by the Ukrainian side of obligations [under the above Convention] to the full extent for the period of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation and the martial law in place in the territory of Ukraine until complete termination of the encroachment upon the sovereignty, territorial integrity and inviolability of Ukraine.”

16-10-2015
In February 2014 the Russian Federation launched armed aggression against Ukraine and occupied a part of the territory of Ukraine – the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, and today exercises effective control over certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine. These actions are in gross violation of the Charter of the United Nations and constitute a threat to international peace and security. The Russian Federation, as the Aggressor State and Occupying Power, bears full responsibility for its actions and their consequences under international law.

The United Nations General Assembly Resolution A/RES/68/262 of 27 March 2014 confirmed the sovereignty and territorial integrity of Ukraine within its internationally recognized borders. The United Nations also called upon all States, international organizations and specialized agencies not to recognize any alteration of the status of the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol.

In this regard, Ukraine states that from 20 February 2014 and for the period of temporary occupation by the Russian Federation of a part of the territory of Ukraine - the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol – as a result of the armed aggression of the Russian Federation committed against the Ukraine and until the complete restoration of the constitutional law and order and effective control by Ukraine over such occupied territory, as well as over certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine, which are temporarily not under control of Ukraine as a result of the aggression of the Russian Federation, the application and implementation by Ukraine of the obligations under the above Conventions, as applied to the aforementioned occupied and uncontrolled territory of Ukraine, is limited and is not guaranteed.

Documents or requests made or issued by the occupying authorities of the Russian Federation, its officials at any level in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol and by the illegal authorities in certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine, which are temporarily not under control of Ukraine, are null and void and have no legal effect regardless of whether they are presented directly or indirectly through the authorities of the Russian Federation.

The provisions of the Conventions regarding the possibility of direct communication or interaction do not apply to the territorial organs of Ukraine in the Autonomous Republic of Crimea and the city of Sevastopol, as well as in certain districts of the Donetsk and Luhansk oblasts of Ukraine, which are temporarily not under control of Ukraine. The procedure of the relevant communication is determined by the central authorities of Ukraine in Kyiv.

United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland Articles Declarations

Territorial units	Extension	EIF	Termination	A/C/Su	EIF
Anguilla	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Antigua and Barbuda	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	1-XI-1981	1-V-1985 (Su)	1-XI-1981
Bahamas	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	10-VII-1973	30-IV-1976 (Su)	10-VII-1973
Barbados	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	30-XI-1966	11-VIII-1995 (Su)	30-XI-1966
Bermuda	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Botswana *(formerly Bechuanaland Protectorate)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	30-IX-1966	16-IX-1968 (Su)	30-IX-1966
British Antarctic Territory	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
British Virgin Islands	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			

Brunei	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	1-I-1984	23-II-1987 (A)	3-XII-1987
Cayman Islands	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Dominica	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	3-XI-1978	22-X-2006 (Su)	3-XI-1978
Eswatini *(formerly Swaziland)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	6-IX-1968	3-VII-1978 (Su)	6-IX-1968
Falkland Islands	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Fiji	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	10-X-1970	29-III-1978 (Su)	10-X-1970
Gibraltar	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Grenada	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	7-II-1974	17-VII-2001 (A)	7-IV-2002
Guernsey, Bailiwick of	21-VIII-1964	24-I-1965			
Guyana *(formerly British Guiana)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	26-V-1966	30-VII-2008 (A)	18-IV-2019
Hong Kong SAR	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965		1-VII-1997 (C)	
Isle of Man	21-VIII-1964	24-I-1965			
Jersey	21-VIII-1964	24-I-1965			
Kiribati *(formerly Gilbert and Ellice Islands)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	12-VII-1979		
Lesotho *(formerly Basutoland)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	4-X-1966	24-IV-1972 (Su)	4-X-1966
Mauritius	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	12-III-1968	20-XII-1968 (Su)	12-III-1968
Montserrat	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Saint Kitts and Nevis	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	19-XI-1983	26-II-1994 (A)	14-XII-1994
Saint Lucia	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	22-II-1979	5-XII-2001 (A)	31-VII-2002

Saint Vincent and the Grenadines	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	27-X-1979	2-V-2002 (Su)	27-X-1979
Saint Helena, Ascension, and Tristan da Cunha	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Seychelles	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	29-VI-1976	9-VI-1978 (A)	31-III-1979
Solomon Islands *(formerly British Solomon Islands Protectorate)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	7-VII-1978		
Tonga	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	4-VI-1970	28-X-1971 (Su)	4-VI-1970
Turks and Caicos Islands	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965			
Tuvalu *(formerly Gilbert and Ellice Islands)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	1-X-1978		
Vanuatu *(formerly New Hebrides)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	30-VII-1980	1-VIII-2008 (Su)	30-VII-1980
Zimbabwe *(formerly Southern Rhodesia)*	24-II-1965	25-IV-1965	18-IV-1980		

United States of America Articles Declarations

The instrument of accession was accompanied by the following statement:

"On the occasion of the deposit by the United States of America of its instrument of accession to the Convention Abolishing the Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents, concluded October 5, 1961 (1961 Convention), the Department of State wishes to draw the attention of States currently Parties to the Convention, and eventually of those becoming so in the future, to the provisions of Title 18, United States Code, Section 3190 relating to documents submitted to the United States Government in support of extradition requests. It does so for the purpose of preventing possible misunderstandings by stipulating that the 1961 Convention does not supersede or override the provisions of Section 3190.

Section 3190 provides:
Section 3190 Evidence on (Extradition) hearing
Depositions, warrants, or other papers or copies thereof offered in evidence upon the hearing of any extradition case shall be received and admitted as evidence on such hearing for all the purposes of such hearing if they shall be properly and legally authenticated so as to entitle them to be received for similar purposes by the tribunals of the foreign country from which the accused party shall have escaped, and the certificate of the principal diplomatic or consular officer of the United States resident in such foreign country shall be proof that the same, so offered, are authenticated in the manner required.

The requirement of Section 3190 is satisfied by the certification of the principal United States diplomatic or consular officer resident in the state requesting extradition that the documents are in such form as to be admissible in the tribunals of that State. The certification by apostille under the 1961 Convention does not satisfy this requirement, as it only certifies the signature, the capacity of the signer, and the seal on the documents. It does not certify the admissibility of the documents. Thus, the requirement of section 3190 is not deemed by the United States to be overridden by operation of Article 8 of the 1961 Convention.

It should be noted, however, that a certification by the principal diplomatic or consular officer of the United States as set out in section 3190 has also served to legalize such documents, and will continue to do so without the need for any other legalization by United States officials or certification by the apostille under the 1961 Convention.

In light of the above, it is recommended that States Party to the 1961 Convention continue as before to cover documents supporting extradition requests directed to the United States with the special certification provided for by section 3190. Failure to cover extradition documents in this recommended manner could regrettably result in a finding by the United States judge or magistrate hearing the extradition request that the documents do not meet the requirements of section 3190 and thus are not entitled to be received and admitted as evidence. Such a finding could, in turn, result in the irrevocable rejection of the extradition request."