Date of most recent action: January 27, 2012

Additional Protocol to the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces

Done: Brussels; June 19, 1995
In accordance with Article II, paragraph 1, the Additional Protocol shall be open for signature by any signatory of the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces.

Entry into force: June 1, 1996
In accordance with Article II, paragraph 2, the Additional Protocol shall be subject to ratification, acceptance or approval and instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval of the Additional Protocol shall be deposited with the Government of the United States of America.
In accordance with Article II, paragraph 3, the Additional Protocol entered into force thirty days after three signatory States to the Additional Protocol, at least one of which was a party to the NATO SOFA and one of which had accepted the invitation to join the Partnership for Peace and had subscribed to the Partnership for Peace Framework Document, had deposited their instruments of ratification, acceptance or approval. The Additional Protocol enters into force for each other signatory State on the date of the deposit of its instrument.

Legend: (no mark) = ratification; **A** = acceptance; **AA** = approval; **a** = accession; **w** = withdrawal or equivalent action

Participant	Signature	Consent to be bound		Entry into Force	Other Action	Notes
Albania	October 10, 1995	May 9, 1996	**a**	June 8, 1996		
Armenia	October 28, 2003	April 16, 2004		May 16, 2004		
Austria	March 27, 1997	September 2, 1998		September 2, 1998		
Azerbaijan	January 15, 1998	March 3, 2000	**AA**	April 2, 2000		
Belgium	October 31, 1995	October 10, 1997		November 9, 1997		
Bosnia and Herzegovina	February 1, 2008	February 1, 2008	**a**	March 2, 2008		
Bulgaria	October 16, 1995	May 29, 1996		June 28, 1996		
Canada	October 13, 1995	May 2, 1996		June 1, 1996		
Croatia	July 12, 2001	January 11, 2002		February 10, 2002		
Czech Republic	November 2, 1995	March 27, 1996		June 1, 1996		
Denmark	July 3, 1995	July 8, 1999		August 7, 1999		[1]
Estonia	August 29, 1995	August 7, 1996		September 6, 1996		
Finland	December 16, 1996	August 1, 1997		August 1, 1997		
France	December 1, 1995	February 1, 2000		March 2, 2000		
Georgia	July 18, 1995	May 19, 1997		June 18, 1997		

Germany	July 20, 1995	September 24, 1998		October 24, 1998		[2]
Greece	October 9, 1997	June 30, 2000		July 30, 2000		[3]
Hungary	June 21, 1995	December 14, 1995		June 1, 1996		
Iceland	March 10, 1997	May 15, 2007		June 14, 2007		
Italy	March 14, 1996	September 23, 1998		October 23, 1998		
Kazakhstan	July 31, 1996	November 6, 1997		December 6, 1997		
Kyrgyzstan	November 7, 2002	August 25, 2006		September 24, 2006		
Latvia	December 13, 1995	April 19, 1996		June 1, 1996		
Lithuania	January 31, 1996	August 15, 1996		September 14, 1996		
Luxembourg	February 18, 1997	September 14, 2001		October 14, 2001		
Macedonia	May 30, 1996	June 19, 1996		July 19, 1996		
Moldova	September 6, 1996	October 1, 1997		October 31, 1997		
Montenegro	December 13, 2011	January 27, 2012		February 26, 2012		
Netherlands	February 5, 1996	June 26, 1997	**A**	July 26, 1997		[4]
Norway	June 19, 1995	October 4, 1996		November 3, 1996		[5]
Poland	November 3, 1995	April 4, 1997		May 4, 1997		
Portugal	September 8, 1997	February 4, 2000		March 5, 2000		
Romania	November 3, 1995	June 5, 1996		July 5, 1996		
Russian Federation	April 28, 2006	August 28, 2007		September 27, 2007		[6]
Slovak Republic	August 11, 1995	September 18, 1996	**AA**	September 18, 1996		
Slovenia	July 31, 1995	January 18, 1996		June 1, 1996		
Spain	December 16, 1996	February 4, 1998		March 6, 1998		[7]
Sweden	April 4, 1996	November 13, 1996		December 13, 1996		
Switzerland	April 4, 2003	April 9, 2003		May 9, 2003		[8]
Turkey						
Ukraine	May 6, 1996	April 26, 2000		May 26, 2000		
United Kingdom						
United States						
Uzbekistan	July 24, 1996	January 30, 1997		March 1, 1997		

[1] The instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol by Denmark includes a reservation that, pending further decision, the Additional Protocol will not apply to the Faroe Islands or to Greenland.

[2] The instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol by Germany was accompanied by two understandings which read as follows:
"It is the understanding of the Federal Republic of Germany that Article I of the Agreement of 19 June 1995 among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their Forces shall not affect the EU legislation applicable in the Federal Republic of Germany with regard to the exemption of foreign armed forces and their members from taxes and duties.

"It is the understanding of the Federal Republic of Germany that, in accordance with the meaning and purpose of the Agreement of 19 June 1995 among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their Forces, Article II thereof does not conflict with the application of the Agreement throughout the whole territory of the Federal Republic of Germany."

[3] Signature of the Additional Protocol by Greece included the following declaration:
"Regarding the signing of this Protocol by the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia, the Hellenic Republic declares that its own signing of the said Protocol can in no way be interpreted as an acceptance from its part, or as recognition in any form and content of a name other than that of "the former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia", under which the Hellenic Republic has recognized the said country and under which the latter has joined the NATO "Partnership for Peace" Programme, where resolution 817/93 of the UN Security Council was taken into consideration."

[Greece confirmed this declaration upon deposit of its instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol.]

[4] Acceptance of the Additional Protocol by the Netherlands is for the Kingdom in Europe and includes the following reservation:
"The Kingdom of the Netherlands will be bound by the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces only with respect to those other States participating in the Partnership for Peace which in addition to ratifying, accepting or approving the Agreement, also ratify, accept or approve the Additional Protocol to the Agreement".

[5] The instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol by Norway includes the following reservation:
"The Government of Norway will be bound by the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces only with respect to those other States participating in the Partnership for Peace which in addition to ratifying the Agreement, also ratify the Additional Protocol to the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces".

[6] The instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol by the Russian Federation was accompanied by a statement, a Department of State English translation of which reads as follows:
"In order to implement the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces, signed June 19, 1995, the Russian Federation proceeds from the following understanding of the provisions of the Agreement among the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces, of June 19, 1951 (hereinafter the Agreement):

"1) the provision of Article III (4) of the Agreement, which obligates the authorities of the sending State to immediately inform the authorities of the receiving State of cases where a member of a force or of a civilian component fails to return to his country after being separated from the service, shall also apply to cases where those persons absent themselves without authorization from the site of deployment of the force of the sending State and are carrying weapons;

"2) on the basis of reciprocity, the Russian Federation will understand the words 'possess arms' used in Article VI of the Agreement to mean the application and use of weapons, and the words 'shall give sympathetic consideration to requests from the receiving State' to mean the obligation of the authorities of the sending State to consider the receiving State's requests concerning the shipment, transportation, use, and application of weapons;

"3) the list of offenses set forth in subparagraph c of Article VII (2) is not exhaustive and, for the Russian Federation, includes, apart from those enumerated, other offenses that are directed against the foundations of its constitutional system and security and that are covered by the Russian Federation Criminal Code;

"4) pursuant to Article VII (4) of the Agreement, the Russian Federation presumes that the authorities of the sending State have the right to exercise their jurisdiction in the event that at sites where the sending State's force is deployed, unidentified persons commit offenses against that state, members of its force, and members of its civilian component, or their family members. When a person who committed an offense is identified, the procedure established by the Agreement takes effect;

"5) the assistance mentioned in subparagraph a of Article VII (6) of the Agreement is provided in conformity with the legislation of the requested State. In providing legal assistance, the competent authorities of the States Parties to the Agreement interact directly, and if necessary, through the appropriate higher authorities;

"6) the Russian Federation allows importation of the goods and vehicles mentioned in Article XI (2), (5) and (6) of the Agreement, and the equipment and items mentioned in Article XI (4) of the Agreement which are intended for the needs of the force, in accordance with the terms of the customs regime for temporary importation that were established by the customs legislation of the Russian Federation. In this connection, such importation is carried out with full exemption from payment of customs duties, taxes, and fees, except for customs fees for storage, customs processing of goods, and similar services outside of the designated places or hours of operation of the customs authorities, and for the periods provided for in the Agreement if such periods are expressly stipulated in the Agreement.
The Russian Federation presumes that the procedure and terms for importation of the goods mentioned in Article XI (4) of the Agreement and intended for the needs of the force will be governed by separate agreements on the sending and receiving of forces between the Russian Federation and the sending State.
None of the provisions of Article XI, including paras. 3 and 8, restrict the right of Russian Federation customs authorities to take all necessary steps to monitor compliance with the terms for importation of goods and vehicles

provided for by Article XI of the Agreement, if such measures are necessary under Russian Federation customs legislation.
The Russian Federation presumes that the sending State will send confirmation to the Russian Federation customs authorities that all goods and vehicles imported into the Russian Federation in accordance with the provisions of Article XI of the Agreement and with separate arrangements on the sending and receiving of forces between the Russian Federation and the sending State may be used solely for the purposes for which they were imported. In the event they are used for other purposes, all customs payments stipulated by Russian Federation legislation must be made for such goods and vehicles, and the other requirements set by Russian Federation legislation must also be fulfilled.
Transit of the aforesaid goods and vehicles shall be carried out in accordance with Russian Federation customs legislation.
Pursuant to Article XI (11), the Russian Federation declares that it permits the importation into the customs territory of the Russian Federation of petroleum products intended for use in the process of operating official vehicles, aircraft, and vessels belonging to the forces or the civilian component, with exemption from the payment of customs duties and taxes in accordance with the requirements and restrictions established by Russian Federation legislation.
The Russian Federation permits the importation of the vehicles that are mentioned in Article XI (2), (5) and (6) of the Agreement and intended for personal use by members of the civilian component and their family members under the terms of temporary importation that are established by Russian Federation legislation.
The Russian Federation presumes that customs processing of goods imported (exported) by members of the civilian component and their family members and intended solely for their personal use, including goods for initially setting up a household, shall be carried out without the exacting of customs payments, except for customs fees for storage, customs processing of goods, and similar services outside the designated places or hours of operation of the customs authorities.

"7) The Russian Federation also presumes that documents and materials appended to them that are sent to its competent authorities within the framework of the Agreement will be accompanied by duly certified translations thereof into the Russian language."

Responses to the Statement Accompanying the Instrument of Ratification by the Russian Federation:

From Lithuania, *received September 4, 2008:*

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania presents its compliments to the United States Department of State and, whereas the Government of the United States of America is depositary to the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces and the Additional Protocol to the Agreement, done in Brussels on 19 June 1995, has the honour to transmit the following Statement of the Republic of Lithuania concerning the Statement of the Russian Federation as of 28 August 2007 made upon ratification of the Agreement and the Additional Protocol to the Agreement:

'The Seimas of the Republic of Lithuania,

complying with paragraphs 4 and 5 of Article 20 of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (official gazette *Valstybės žinios*, 2002, No 13-480),

having regard to the Statement of the Russian Federation as of 28 August 2007 made upon ratification of the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces (hereinafter referred to as the 'PfP Agreement') and the Additional Protocol to the Agreement (hereinafter referred to as the 'Statement of the Russian Federation'),

hereby states that:

1. The Republic of Lithuania considers the following provisions of the Statement of the Russian Federation as reservations to the extent that they do not conform to or modify the provisions of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces, done in London on 19 June 1951 (hereinafter referred to as "the NATO Agreement") and applied on the basis of the PfP Agreement:

1) regarding subparagraph c of paragraph 2 of Article VII of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in item 3 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

2) regarding paragraph 4 of Article VII of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in item 4 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

3) regarding subparagraph a of paragraph 6 of Article VII of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in item 5 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

4) regarding paragraph 3 of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 3 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

5) regarding paragraph 4 of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 2 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

6) regarding paragraphs 2, 4, 5 and 6 of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in the second sentence of indent 1 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

7) regarding Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 4 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

8) regarding paragraph 11 of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 6 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

9) regarding Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 8 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation.

2. The Republic of Lithuania does not object to the provisions of the Statement of the Russian Federation mentioned in paragraph 1 of this Statement to the extent that their implementation will be compatible with the object and purpose of the NATO Agreement and/or will not create additional obligations for the Republic of Lithuania which are neither provided for nor related to the provisions of the NATO Agreement.

3. The Republic of Lithuania shall apply the following provisions of the Statement of the Russian Federation on a reciprocal basis:

1) regarding the provisions of Article VI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in item 2 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

2) regarding the provisions of paragraphs 2, 4, 5 and 6 of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in the first sentence of indent 1 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

3) regarding the provisions of paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 7 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

4) regarding the provisions of Article XI of the NATO Agreement, as they are set forth in indent 5 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation;

5) regarding the provisions of the NATO Agreement related to item 7 of the Statement of the Russian Federation.

4. It is the understanding of the Republic of Lithuania that:

1) the provisions set forth in item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation do not restrict in any way the obligation of the Russian Federation to exempt the goods and equipment indicated in Article XI of the NATO Agreement from duties and taxes during re-export;

2) the provisions set forth in indent 6 of item 6 of the Statement of the Russian Federation do not restrict in any way the obligation of the Russian Federation to exempt the oil products indicated in Article XI of the NATO Agreement and intended for use when operating service vehicles, aircrafts and ships of a force or of a civilian component from duties and taxes when they are purchased within the territory of the Russian Federation.

5. The provision ‘the object and purpose of the NATO Agreement’ as contained in this Statement shall be deemed by the Republic of Lithuania as ‘the object and purpose of the NATO Agreement to the extent that it is related to the object and purpose of the PfP Agreement’; the provision ‘implementation of the NATO Agreement’ shall be deemed by the Republic of Lithuania as ‘implementation of the NATO Agreement to the extent that it is related to implementation of the PfP Agreement’.’

The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Lithuania avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the United States Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration.”

From Latvia, *received September 11, 2008:*

“The Ministry of Foreign of the Republic of Latvia presents its compliments to the Government of the United States of America and with reference to its capacities as the Depositary of the Agreement among the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces, done in Brussels, on June 19, 1995 (hereinafter refereed to as PfP SOFA) and the Additional Protocol thereto would like to convey the following information.

“The Government of the Republic of Latvia has carefully examined the ‘Statements’ made by the Russian Federation to the PfP SOFA upon ratification.

“Thus, the Government of the Republic of Latvia is of the opinion that most of the statements are in fact unilateral acts deemed to limit the scope of application of the PfP SOFA and therefore shall be regarded as reservations. Namely, statements on Art.III (4), Art.VI, Art.VII (4), Art.XI (2), (4), (5), (6) (Russian Federation’s Statement No.6 para.1), Art.XI (3) (Russian Federation’s Statement No.6 para.3), Art.XI (Russian Federation’s Statement No.6 para.5), Art.XI (11) (Russian Federation’s Statement No.6 para.6), Art.XI (2), (5), (6) (Russian Federation’s Statement No.6 para.7), Art.XI (Russian Federation’s Statement No.6 para.8) and Russian Federations Statement No.7 regarding all the PfP SOFA and the translation of all documents related to fulfilment of the PfP SOFA.

“Moreover, The Government of the Republic of Latvia has noted that the statements do not make it clear to what extent the Russian Federation considers itself bound by the provisions of the PfP SOFA and whether the way of implementation of the provisions of the aforementioned Agreement is in line with the object and purpose of the Agreement.

“The Government of the Republic of Latvia therefore objects to the following reservations made by the Russian Federation to the Agreement among the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces and the Additional Protocol thereto:

1. Reservation made to Art.VI regarding the interpretation of words "*shall give sympathetic consideration to request from receiving state*".
2. Reservation to Art.VII (4).
3. Reservation to Art.XI (3) stating that Russian Federation customs authorities should be allowed to take all necessary steps to monitor compliance with the terms of importation of goods and vehicles provided for by Art.XI of the Agreement, if such measures are necessary under Russian Federation customs legislation.
4. Reservation to Art.XI (6) stating that terms of temporary importation established by Russian Federation legislation should be applied to importation of vehicles mentioned in Art.XI (6) and intended for personal use.
5. Reservation stating that translation of documents and attached materials sent to the competent authorities under the Agreement should be accompanied with their duly certified translations into Russian.

"However, these objections shall not preclude the entry into force of the PfP Sofa between the Republic of Latvia and the Russian Federation. Thus, the PfP SOFA will become operative without Russian Federation benefiting from its reservations.

"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Latvia avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Government of the United States of America the assurances of its highest considerations."

From Slovenia, *received September 11, 2008:*
[English language translation provided by the Embassy of the Republic of Slovenia]
"**Statement of the Republic of Slovenia Concerning the Statements of the Russian Federation made upon the ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces, done in Brussels on 19 June 1995, and the Additional Protocol Thereto**
"The Republic of Slovenia considers the statements of the Russian Federation made upon the ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States Participating in the Partnership for peace regarding the Status of their Forces, done in Brussels on 19 June 1995, and the Additional Protocol Thereto as reservations and objects to them. The Republic of Slovenia considers the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States Participating in the Partnership for peace regarding the Status of their Forces as remaining in force between the Republic of Slovenia and the Russian Federation in its original Text as done in Brussels on 19 June 1995."

From Greece, *received September 11, 2008:*
"**DECLARATION OF GREECE**
"Greece understands that the statement accompanying the instrument of ratification by the Russian Federation of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces of the 19th of June 1995, shall not affect the application by the Russian Federation of the provisions of the above Agreement."

From Portugal, *received September 11, 2008:*

"The Embassy of Portugal presents its compliments to the U.S. Department of State, Treaty Section, as depositary of the Agreement regarding the Status of their Forces, NATO, and has the honor to present the following objections concerning the reservations presented by the Russian Federation.

"The Portuguese Republic welcomes the deposit by the Russian Federation of the Instrument of Ratification of the Agreement among the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces, dated 19 June 1995 and its Additional Protocol, dated 19 June 1995.

"However, the Instrument of Ratification contains understandings that exclude or modify the legal effect of certain provisions of the Agreement among the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status of their Forces, of 19 June 1951, hereinafter referred to as 'the Agreement'. These reservations on articles III(4), VI, VII(2), VII(4), VII(6), XI, and on the use of Russian language are incompatible with the object and purpose of 'the Agreement'.

"The Portuguese Republic therefore objects to the above mentioned reservations made by the Russian Federation to the Agreement.

"In the absence of implementing arrangements between the Portuguese Republic and the Russian Federation, the regime of 'the Agreement' should prevail and no internal law should override the provisions of 'the Agreement'.

"These objections shall not preclude the entry into force of 'the Agreement' in the relations between the Portuguese Republic and the Russian Federation.

"The Embassy of Portugal avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration."

From Croatia, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Embassy of the Republic of Croatia in Washington presents its compliments to the United States Department of State and has the honor, with regard to the statement of the Russian Federation attached to its instrument of ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the

Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces (hereinafter: the PfP SOFA) and the Additional Protocol to the Agreement, to communicate its position as follows:
"The Republic of Croatia takes note of the abovementioned statement which expresses the understanding of the Russian Federation of the scope of some provisions of the Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status of their Forces, done in London on 19 June 1951 (hereinafter: the NATO Agreement).
"The Republic of Croatia holds that the abovementioned statement contains certain interpretations of some provisions of the NATO Agreement that could affect the implementation of the PfP SOFA.
"In this context, the Republic of Croatia expresses its view that the PfP SOFA should be interpreted and implemented in accordance with its subject and purpose.
"The Republic of Croatia holds that any possible divergence relating to the interpretation and implementation of the PfP SOFA should be overcome in the future through the conclusion of technical arrangements.
"The Embassy of the Republic of Croatia in Washington avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the United States Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration."

From the Netherlands, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Royal Netherlands Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State of the United States of America and has the honor to convey the following from the Netherlands Ministry of Foreign Affairs with regard to [the] Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces (hereinafter referred to as "the PfP Agreement") and the Additional Protocol thereto.
"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands has carefully examined the statements made by the Russian Federation upon ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces (hereinafter referred to as "the PfP Agreement") and the Additional Protocol thereto.
"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the statements of the Russian Federation regarding Article III, paragraph 4, Article VI, Article VII, paragraph 2c, Article VII, paragraph 4, Article VII, paragraph 6a and Article XI of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces, done in London on 19 June 1951 (hereinafter referred to as "the NATO Agreement"), and applied on the basis of the PfP Agreement, as well as the statement relating to the translation of documents into Russian must in fact be considered reservations, since they have the effect of modifying and/or complementing the scope of the obligations arising from the PfP Agreement or make it unclear for the other Parties to the PfP Agreement to identify to what extent the Government of the Russian Federation intends to modify and/or complement the obligations arising from the PfP Agreement.
"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the cumulative effect of these reservations must be regarded as incompatible with the object and purpose of the PfP Agreement and therefore contrary to Article 19, paragraph c of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties. For this reason, the Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands objects to the reservations regarding Article III, paragraph 4, Article VI, Article VII, paragraph 2c, Article VII, paragraph 4, Article VII, paragraph 6a and Article XI of the NATO Agreement, applied on the basis of the PfP Agreement, as well as the statement relating to the translation of documents into Russian, made by the Government of the Russian Federation upon ratification of the PfP Agreement.
"These objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the PfP Agreement and Additional Protocol between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Russian Federation.
"The Government of the Kingdom of the Netherlands considers that the reservations and objections thereto are without prejudice to the implementation, through further agreements between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Russian Federation concluded within the PfP-framework, of the PfP Agreement between the Kingdom of the Netherlands and the Russian Federation.
"The Royal Netherlands Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State of the United States of America the assurances of its highest consideration."

From Canada, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Embassy of Canada presents its compliments to the State Department and has the honour to refer to the Statement of the Russian Federation of 28 August 2007, made upon ratification of the *Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces*.
"Canada considers that the Statement of the Russian Federation is incompatible with provisions of the *Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of their Forces*, done in London on 19 June 1951.
"Pursuant to Article 1 of the *Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces*, all States Parties shall apply the provisions of the *Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of their Forces*, done in London on 19 June 1951 as if they were Parties to it.
"Canada objects to the Statement of the Russian Federation on the basis that it constitutes a Reservation incompatible with Article 1 of the *Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces*.

"The Embassy of Canada respectfully requests the United States of America, in its capacity as Depositary of the *Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces*, to convey this information to all other States Parties to this Treaty. "The Embassy of Canada avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the State Department the assurances of its highest consideration."

From Romania, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Embassy of Romania presents its compliments to the U.S. State Department and has the honor to forward – in accordance with article V(3) from the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces* (19 June 1995) (NATO PfP SOFA) that stipulates the depositary duties of the Government of the United States of America – the following objections to the reservations stated by the Russian Federation upon ratification of the above mentioned Agreement.
"'Romania carefully assessed the statement made by the Russian Federation upon ratification of the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces* (19 June 1995) (NATO PfP SOFA) and of its Additional Protocol and considers the following:
"Romania understands the arguments of the Russian Federation for making the mentioned statement and emphasizes distinctively the decision of the Russian Federation to become a Party to the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces* and to its *Additional Protocol*.
"Romania recalls that, according to Art. I of the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces*, 'except as otherwise provided for in the Present Agreement and any Additional Protocol in respect to its own Parties, all States Parties to the Present Agreement shall apply the provisions of the Agreement between Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces, done at London on 19 June 1951, hereinafter referred to as the NATO SOFA, as if all State Parties to the Present Agreement were Parties to the NATO SOFA'.
"Romania is of the opinion that the elements contained in the declaration of the Russian Federation represent, in fact, specific details which, usually, are the object of arrangements for the effective implementation of the NATO PfP SOFA. The provisions of the NATO SOFA, which apply *mutatis mutandis* to the NATO PfP SOFA, set the general framework in the field of the status of forces.
"Romania considers that the particular statements of the Russian Federation concerning Art. III (4), Art. VI, Art. VII (2c), Art. VII (4), Art. VII (6) and Art. XI (paras. 2-6, 8, 11) of the NATO SOFA are, in fact, reservations incompatible with the object and purpose of the Agreement, for the following reasons:
"As far as Art. III (4) is concerned, the statement of the Russian Federation supplements the conventional text, in the sense that it imposes on the Parties new obligations not covered by the NATO SOFA. Obligations of that nature could be undertaken by the sending State only unilaterally, on the basis of its own, discretionary decision.
"Concerning Art. VI, the statement of the Russian Federation is a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of Art. VI as it adds-on to the text of the NATO SOFA, widening its application and converting, into a firm obligation, the discretionary approach of the sending States with regard to the requests of the receiving States.
"With regard to Art. VII (2c), the statement is problematic due to its references to the Russian criminal law provisions and, especially, to the fundaments of the constitutional system of the Russian Federation. Thus, it is not clear which are the obligations assumed by the Russian Federation on the basis of this article. The provisions of Art. VII are adequately comprehensible and broad in order to guarantee that any crime committed, falling under its application, is sanctioned.
"Regarding Art. VII (4), the statement is a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of that paragraph, as it creates new obligations not considered by the mentioned article. The declaration aims for the effective exercise of jurisdiction by the sending State, and not for setting up a cooperation procedure between the authorities of the sending State and those of the receiving State in the spirit of Art. VII (6a).
"With reference to art. VII (6), the statement is a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the mentioned article, as it relies on the legal provisions of the requested State which can be so restrictive as to impede the effective cooperation between the authorities of the States involved and, consequently, the granting of the requested assistance pursuant to paragraph 6 letter a). Should the declaration of the Russian Federation have this effect, [Romania] qualifies it a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the Agreement and, therefore, objects to it.
"As regards Art. XI (paras. 2-6, 8, 11), the statement of the Russian Federation is a reservation contrary to the object and purpose of the Agreement. The reliance on the internal legislation in the field of customs makes it difficult to asses[s] which is the legal regime of the imports and exports envisaged by Art. XI.
"As far as the last statement of the Russian Federation is concerned, that the documents addressed to it on the basis of the Agreement must be accompanied by a certified translation into the Russian language, Romania considers that this is a new obligation not envisaged by the NATO SOFA. Therefore, Romania states that this obligation cannot be imposed on it, and, thus, does not consider itself bound by it.
"Consequently, Romania objects to the abovementioned statement made by the Russian Federation upon the ratification of the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces* (19 June 1995) and of its Additional Protocol.

"This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the NATO PfP SOFA, in its entirety, between Romania and the Russian Federation.'
"The Embassy of Romania avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the U.S. State Department the assurances of its highest consideration."

From France, *received September 12, 2008:*
"France's objections to statements presented by the Russian Federation during ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces, done at Brussels on June 19, 1995 (PfP SOFA, with a further additional protocol).
"The Government of the French Republic has examined the statements made by the Russian Federation during its ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces, done at Brussels on June 19, 1995 (hereinafter 'the Agreement'). These statements elicit the following statements and objections from the Government of the French Republic.
"The Government of the French Republic understands that the Russian Federation's statement relative to Article VI of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status of their Forces [done at London on June 19, 1951; hereinafter 'NATO SOFA'], is subordinate to a condition of reciprocity and therefore cannot alone have an effect on the French Republic's interpretation of this provision.
"The Government of the French Republic objects to the Russian Federation's statement concerning Article VII, 2 (c) of [the] NATO SOFA due to its vague, imprecise nature. This objection has no effect on the competence of the State of origin pursuant to article VII, 2 (a), of the NATO SOFA.
"The Government of the French Republic considers that the Russian Federation's statement concerning article VII, §4 of the NATO SOFA can have no effect on the provisions of this article, nor can it confer upon the State of origin rights that exceed those acknowledged in Article VII, §10 of the NATO SOFA.
"The Government of the French Republic has examined the Russian Federation's statement concerning the procedures and conditions for importing the goods mentioned in article XI, §4 of the NATO SOFA. The Government of the French Republic objects to this statement, which, by subordinating the effect of this provision to the conclusion of separate agreements, undermines its legally binding scope.
"The Government of the French Republic has examine[d] the Russian Federation's statement concerning the provisions of Article XI of the NATO SOFA, including paragraphs 3 and 8. By affirming that none of these provisions restricts the jurisdiction of its customs authorities and, notably, its prerogatives with respect to monitoring compliance for imports by virtue of its national legislation, the Russian Federation seems to go beyond the wording of Article XI §1 of the NATO SOFA and makes it unclear, in particular, whether it intends to respect the inviolability of official documents under an official seal, as provided in §3 of that article. Consequently, the Government of the French Republic objects to this statement, which constitutes a vague and imprecise reservation.
"The Government of the French Republic has examined the Russian Federation's statement that the transit of goods and vehicles must be in compliance with Russian customs law. Without specifying the effect of the implementation of customs law in this regard, this statement must be considered a vague and imprecise reservation that makes it impossible to know whether the Russian Federation, as a 'receiving state' within the meaning of Article I (e) of the NATO SOFA, will apply the customs exemptions provided by the Agreement to the goods and vehicles of a force transiting its territory.
"The Government of the French Republic has examined the Russian Federation's statement concerning the 'importation of the vehicles that are mentioned in Article XI, (2), (5) and (6) of the Agreement and intended for personal use by members of the civil component and their family members.' Given the vague and imprecise nature of this statement and the uncertainties it elicits with respect to the specific scope of application of the provisions to which it relates, the Government of the French Republic considers this statement a reservation to which it must object.
"The Government of the French Republic considers that [the] Russian Federation's statement concerning the certified Russian translation of documents sent to it pursuant to the London Agreement does not constitute a simple interpretation of the existing provisions of that Agreement, and that it is aiming to establish an additional obligation for other States Party to the Agreement. The Government of the French Republic does not consider itself bound by such a statement.
"These declarations and objections do not constitute an obstacle to the entry into force of the Agreement between the French Republic and the Russian Federation."

From Germany, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany presents its compliments to the Department of State of the United States of America and has the honor to communicate the following.
"The Federal Republic of Germany attaches great importance to the Agreement of 19 June 1995 among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces (PfP Status of Forces Agreement) and welcomes its ratification by the Russian Federation. The Federal Republic of Germany is convinced that this Agreement has brought benefits to all participating States.

"However, the Federal Republic of Germany believes it is necessary to object as follows to the statements on the Agreement of 19 June 1995 among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces (PfP Status of Forces Agreement) submitted by the Russian Federation on depositing its instrument of ratification and which the Federal Republic of Germany received on 18 September 2007.
"The designation of the individual regulations relates to the Agreement of 19 June 1951 between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of their Forces (NATO Status of Forces Agreement), as the States Parties to the PfP Status of Forces Agreement apply the NATO Status of Forces Agreement as if they were parties to the NATO Status of Forces Agreement. The Federal Republic of Germany believes it is especially necessary to object because the statements of the Russian Federation refer to domestic Russian law and this creates uncertainty regarding the actual applicable legal provisions.
"1. The Federal Republic of Germany objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that it allows the importation of goods and vehicles referred to in Article XI (2), (5) and (6), as well as the importation of equipment and other items referred to in Article XI (4) intended for the deployment of the force, in accordance with the terms of the customs regime for temporary importation established by the customs legislation of the Russian Federation.
"2. The Federal Republic of Germany objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that none of the provisions contained in Article XI, including paragraph 3, restrict the right of the Russian Federation to take all necessary steps to monitor compliance with the terms for the importation of goods and vehicles provided for by Article XI of the Agreement if such measures are necessary under Russian Federation customs legislation.
"3. The Federal Republic of Germany objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that it presumes the sending State will send confirmation to the Russian Federation customs authorities that all goods and vehicles imported into the Russian Federation in accordance with the provisions of Article XI of the Agreement and with separate arrangements on the sending and receiving of forces shall be used solely for the purposes for which they were imported. The Federal Republic of Germany also objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that the transit of such goods and vehicles should be carried out in accordance with Russian Federation customs legislation.
"4. The Federal Republic of Germany objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that it intends to permit the importation of petroleum products intended for use in the process of operating official vehicles, aircraft and vessels belonging to the forces or the civilian component, with exemption from the payment of customs duties and taxes in accordance with the requirements established by Russian Federation legislation.
"5. The Federal Republic of Germany objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that it intends to permit the importation of the vehicles referred to in Article XI (2), (5) and (6) of the Agreement and intended for personal use by members of the civilian component and their family members under the terms of temporary importation established by Russian Federation legislation.
"6. The Federal Republic of Germany objects to the statement by the Russian Federation that it presumes that the documents and material sent to its competent authorities within the framework of the PfP Status of Forces Agreement will be accompanied by duly certified translations into the Russian language.
"7. The Federal Republic of Germany does not object to the entry into force of the Agreement between the Federal Republic of Germany and the Russian Federation.
"The Federal Republic of Germany stresses the importance of the aforementioned Agreement and expresses its hope that it will help intensify and enhance the cooperation among all participating States.
"The Embassy of the Federal Republic of Germany avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State of the United States of America the assurance of its high consideration."

From Estonia, *received September 12, 2008:*
"Excellency,
"The Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Estonia has the honour to inform the Government of the United States of America as the depository of the Agreement among the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces, done on 19 June 1995, of the following objection to the statements made by the Russian Federation upon the ratification of the above-mentioned Agreement and the Additional Protocol thereto.
'The Government of the Republic of Estonia has carefully examined the statements made by the Russian Federation upon the ratification of the Agreement among the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces, done on 19 June 1995 (hereinafter *PfP SOFA*), and the Additional Protocol thereto. By virtue of Article I of the PfP SOFA the provisions of the Agreement between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces, done on 19 June 1951 (hereinafter *the NATO SOFA*) apply to the Parties of the PfP SOFA as if they were parties to the NATO SOFA, except as otherwise provided for in the PfP SOFA and any additional protocol thereto.
"The Government of the Republic of Estonia considers the statements made by the Russian Federation relating to Article VI, sub-paragraph c of paragraph 2 of Article VII, paragraph 4 of Article VII, sub-paragraph a of paragraph 6 of Article VII and Article XI of the NATO SOFA, and the statement concerning the translation of documents to Russian, to be reservations that are contrary to the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.

"1. The statement relating to Article VI broadens the meaning of terms 'possess arms' and 'give sympathetic consideration' and therefore modifies the legal effects and the scope of implementation of Article VI. Adding new obligations to other States Parties is contrary to the effective implementation of the NATO SOFA and therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"2. The statement relating to sub-paragraph c of paragraph 2 of Article VII seeks to modify the legal effects and the scope of implementation of that Article. A reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its content does not clearly indicate to what extent the reserving State commits itself when ratifying the PfP SOFA and thus is contrary to the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"3. The statement relating to paragraph 4 of Article VII seeks to modify the scope of implementation of that paragraph and to create new rights for the Russian Federation in a manner not compatible with to [sic] the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"4. The statement relating to sub-paragraph a of paragraph 6 of Article VII seeks to modify the scope of implementation of that sub-paragraph. A reservation which consists of a general reference to national law without specifying its content does not clearly indicate to what extent the reserving State commits itself when ratifying the PfP SOFA. Accordingly, the reservation is contrary to the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"5. The statement relating to Article XI of the NATO SOFA seeks to modify the scope of implementation of that Article. The 1st paragraph of the statement relating to paragraphs 2, 4, 5 and 6 of Article XI, the 3rd paragraph of the statement relating to paragraphs 3 and 8 of Article XI, the 5th paragraph of the statement relating to Article XI in general, the 6th paragraph of the statement relating to paragraph 11 of Article XI and the 7th paragraph of the statement relating to paragraphs 2, 5 and 6 of Article XI consist of a general reference to national law and to national procedures without specifying their content. Such reservation does not clearly indicate to what extent the reserving State commits itself when ratifying the PfP SOFA and is therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"The 2nd paragraph of the statement relating to paragraph 4 of Article XI and the 4th paragraph of the statement relating to Article XI seek to create new obligations to other States Parties that is contrary to the effective implementation of the NATO SOFA and the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"The 8th paragraph of the statement relating to Article XI seeks to restrict the legal obligations of the Russian Federation in a manner incompatible with the aim of that Article and is therefore contrary to the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"6. The statement relating to the translation of the documents and attached materials sent to the competent authorities of the Russian Federation to Russian seeks to create an additional obligation for the other States Parties, which is contrary to the effective implementation of the NATO SOFA and the object and purpose of the NATO SOFA.
"The Government of the Republic of Estonia therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Russian Federation upon the ratification of the PfP SOFA. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the PfP SOFA between the Republic of Estonia and the Russian Federation. The PfP SOFA enters into force between the Republic of Estonia and the Russian Federation in its entirety without the Russian Federation benefiting from its reservations.'
"Please accept, Madame, the assurances of my highest consideration."

From Norway, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Royal Norwegian Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State, and, with reference to the Government of the United States acting as depository to the Agreement Among State Parties [to] the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces and the additional Protocol to the Agreement, done in Brussels on 19 June 1995, has the honor to convey the following statement of the Government of the Kingdom of Norway concerning the statement of the Russian Federation of 28 August 200[7], made upon the latter's ratification of the above-mentioned Agreement and the Additional Protocol to the Agreement:
"The Government of the Kingdom of Norway hereby states that in the implementation between the Kingdom of Norway and the Russian Federation of the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces, the Kingdom of Norway expects the provisions of the above-mentioned Agreement and, by subsequent application, the provisions of the Agreement Between the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status of their Forces, done in London on 19 June 1951, to take precedence in case of conflicting national legislation, in accordance with the principles of international law.
"The Kingdom of Norway considers itself under no legal obligation to make available certified translations of written documents within the framework of the above-mentioned Agreement.
"The Royal Norwegian Embassy avails itself of this opportunity to present to the US Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration."

From Denmark, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Royal Danish Embassy presents its compliments to the Department of State of the United States of America to which it would like to address the following statement of the Government of Denmark concerning the statement of the Government of the Russian Federation of 28 August 2007, made upon its ratification of the Agreement among the

States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces, signed June 19, 1995 (PfP SOFA).
"The Government of Denmark considers the provisions as set out in item 1-6 of the Statement of the Government of the Russian Federation as reservations incompatible with the provisions of the Agreement between Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the status of their forces, done at London on 19 June 1951 (NATO SOFA).
"NATO SOFA is applicable as Article I in the PfP SOFA provides, except as otherwise provided for in the PfP SOFA, that all States Parties to the PfP SOFA shall apply the provisions of the NATO SOFA, as if all State Parties to [the] PfP SOFA were Parties to the NATO SOFA.
"The Government of Denmark objects to the provisions as set out in item 1-6 of the Statement of the Government of the Russian Federation as reservations incompatible with the PfP SOFA Article I.
"The Government of Denmark considers the provision set out in item 7 of the Statement of the Russian Federation concerning translations into Russian as a new obligation in addition to the PfP SOFA.
"The Government of Denmark does not accept the provision. Therefore the provision is not in force in the relation between the Government of Denmark and the Government of the Russian Federation concerning [the] PfP SOFA.
"The objections do not preclude that the PfP SOFA is in force between the Government of Denmark and the Government of the Russian Federation.
"The Embassy of Denmark kindly asks the United States of America, in its capacity as Depositary of the PfP SOFA, to convey this information to all other States Parties to this Treaty.
"The Royal Danish Embassy, Washington D.C. avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of [State] its highest regards."

From Poland, *received September 12, 2008:*
"Objection of the Republic of Poland to the reservation made by the Russian Federation to the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces* done at Brussels, June 19, 1995
"The Government of the Republic of Poland has examined the reservation made by the Russian Federation upon the ratification of the *Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces* done at Brussels, June 19, 1995.
"The Government of the Republic of Poland considers the above-mentioned reservation as incompatible with the object and purpose of the Agreement and therefore objects to it.
"This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Agreement between the Republic of Poland and the Russian Federation."

From the Slovak Republic, *received September 12, 2008:*
"Subject: Objection of the Slovak Republic to the Statements made by the Russian Federation at the occasion of the ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces, done in Brussels, on June 19, 1995 (PfP SOFA) and the Additional Protocol thereto
"According to the Article 19 and subsequent Articles of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties (Vienna, 1969), [the] Slovak Republic hereby raises the objection to the Statements made by the Russian Federation at the occasion of the ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces, done in Brussels, on June 19, 1995 (PfP SOFA) and the Additional Protocol thereto (hereinafter referred to as "the Statements").
"[The] Slovak Republic considers the Statements as reservations to the PfP SOFA as they modify or complement existing obligations to the other Parties to the PfP SOFA or create new obligations to these Parties.
"However, [the] Slovak Republic considers these reservations as not precluding the entry of the PfP SOFA into force, while all the provisions to which Statements were made will be reciprocally applicable to the extent agreed in separate arrangements to be made for the implementation of the PfP SOFA during the sending and receiving of the Armed Forces of the Parties to the PfP SOFA."

From Sweden, *received September 12, 2008:*
"The Embassy of Sweden presents its compliments to the United States Department of State, and has the honour to inform the Department of State of the following:
"The Government of Sweden has examined the Statement made by the Russian Federation upon ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces ("The Partnership for Peace Agreement") and the Additional Protocol thereto. The provisions of the NATO SOFA apply according to Article I of the Partnership for Peace Agreement to the Parties to the Partnership for Peace Agreement as if they were Parties to the NATO SOFA, except as otherwise provided for in the Partnership for Peace Agreement and any Additional Protocol thereto.
"The Government of Sweden recalls that the designation assigned to a statement whereby the legal effect of certain provisions of a treaty is excluded or modified does not determine its status as a reservation to the treaty. The Government of Sweden considers that the Statement made by the Russian Federation regarding subparagraph 2 (c) and

4 of Article VII, Article XI and the presumption regarding certified translations of NATO SOFA in substance constitutes reservations to the Partnership for Peace Agreement in respect of these provisions.
"Subparagraph c of Article VII (2) NATO SOFA. If the Russian statement is to be understood to seek the addition of offences to those which otherwise might fall within the scope of Article VII (2) c of the NATO SOFA, the Government of Sweden considers that the statement would seek to modify the legal effect of the Partnership for Peace Agreement in its application to the Russian Federation. It thus constitutes a reservation to which Sweden objects.
"Article VII (4) NATO SOFA. The Government of Sweden is concerned about the wide scope of application of this Russian presumption, which would seem to seek to widen the field of Russian jurisdiction and thus modify the legal effect of the Partnership for Peace Agreement in its application to the Russian Federation in respect of Article VII (4) NATO SOFA. It therefore constitutes a reservation to which Sweden objects. In this context, Sweden recalls its reservation of November 13, 1996, regarding jurisdiction in the receiving State.
"Further regarding Article XI. The references to Russian national legislation aim to make the Partnership for Peace Agreement subject to national Russian legislation. The Russian Statement would seem to seek to modify the legal effect of the Partnership for Peace Agreement in its application to the Russian Federation in respect of Article XI NATO SOFA. It thus constitutes a reservation to which Sweden objects.
"The Statement also presumes certified translation into the Russian language of documents and materials appended to them. This would constitute an additional obligation for the other Parties to the Partnership for Peace Agreement and would seem to seek to modify the legal effect of the Partnership for Peace Agreement in its application to the Russian Federation. It thus constitutes a reservation to which Sweden objects.
"The Government of Sweden therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations made by the Russian Federation to the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their Forces and the Additional Protocol thereto. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the Partnership for Peace Agreement and the Additional Protocol thereto between the Russian Federation and Sweden, as modified by the reservation made by Sweden. The Partnership for Peace Agreement and the Additional Protocol thereto enters into force between the Russian Federation and Sweden without the Russian Federation benefiting from its reservation.
"The Embassy of Sweden avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the United States Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration."

From Belgium, *received September 12, 2008:*
[English language translation provided by the Department of State]
"Subject: Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces and the Additional Protocol, done at Brussels June 19, 1995. Objection of the Kingdom of Belgium to the Declarations made by the Russian Federation upon ratification
"The Government of the Kingdom of Belgium has reviewed the declarations made by the Russian Federation when it ratified the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces and the Additional Protocol, done at Brussels June 19, 1995.
"The Belgian Government considers that the Russian declarations regarding Article VII, paragraphs 2c, 4, and 6a, and the requirement for a certified translation into Russian of all documents and annexes, are inconsistent with the aim and purpose of the Agreement.
"The Belgian Government notes that under Article 19(c) of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, no reservation that is incompatible with the object and purpose of the Agreement can be made.
"Therefore, the Belgian Government objects to the above-mentioned reservations by the Russian Federation regarding the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces and the Additional Protocol, done at Brussels June 19, 1995.
"Belgium wishes to point out that this objection is not an obstacle to the entry into force of the Agreement between Belgium and the Russian Federation.
"According to the Belgian Government, the declarations by the Russian Federation concerning Article III, paragraph 4 and Article VI create obligations that are not provided under the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces and the Additional Protocol, done at Brussels June 19, 1995. In the opinion of the Belgian Government, these additional demands could be addressed under specific arrangements concluded at the time of joint activities.
"The declaration regarding Article XI is acceptable to the Belgian Government, except for the passage referring to separate agreements. Belgium believes that the terms and procedures governing importation must be uniform for all the forces and can only vary on the basis of objective and uniform criteria applicable to all the forces of all the nations concerned and not on the basis of separate agreements."

From Finland, *received September 19, 2008:*
"The Embassy of Finland present their compliments to the United States Department of State, and with reference to its note of 14 September 2007, received by the Embassy on 21 September 2007, including a depositary notification concerning the deposit by the Russian Federation of the instrument of ratification of the Agreement among the States

Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces (the PfP SOFA), and the Additional Protocol thereto, and has the honor to communicate the following:
"The Government of Finland considers that the statement submitted by the Russian Federation upon the ratification of the said Agreement and the Additional Protocol aims at excluding or modifying the legal effect of certain provisions of the Agreement among the Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of Their Forces (the Nato SOFA) which apply to the Parties of PfP SOFA by virtue of Article I thereof.
"*Article VII(2)(c) of the Nato SOFA*. The Government of Finland expresses its concern about the statement by the Russian Federation concerning Article VII(2)(c) of the Nato SOFA which seem to seek to widen the scope of jurisdiction of the Russian Federation beyond the provisions of Article VII of the Nato SOFA. Finland considers that this statement constitutes a reservation.
"*Article VII(4) of the Nato SOFA*. The Government of Finland expresses its concern about the statement by the Russian Federation concerning Article VII(4) of the Nato SOFA which seems to seek to widen the scope of jurisdiction of a sending State over persons who are nationals of or ordinarily resident in the receiving State. Finland considers that this statement constitutes a reservation. Finland recalls also in this connection the declaration included in the instrument of ratification of the PfP SOFA by Finland concerning the exercise, on the territory of Finland, of the jurisdiction by courts of a sending state.
"*Requirement of duly certified translations*. The Russian Federation also presumes that documents and materials appended to them that are sent to its competent authorities within the framework of the Agreement will be accompanied by duly certified translations into the Russian language. The Government of Finland recalls Article III(2)(b) of the Nato SOFA and notes that such a requirement would constitute an additional obligation for other Parties to the PfP SOFA which would unduly hamper the co-operation under this Treaty. The Government of Finland objects to this requirement.
"Reservations concerning the division of jurisdiction by the Russian Federation concern the very core of the PfP SOFA and undermine the object and purpose of the Treaty. The Government of Finland therefore objects to the aforesaid reservations and considers that such reservations are without legal effect between the Russian Federation and Finland. This objection shall not preclude the entry into force of the PfP SOFA and the Additional Protocol thereto between the Russian Federation and Finland.
"The Embassy of Finland kindly requests the United States Department of State, in the capacity as Depositary of the PfP SOFA, to convey this communication to all States Parties to this Treaty.
"The Embassy of Finland avail itself of this opportunity to present to the United States Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration."

From the Czech Republic, *received September 25, 2008:*
"The Embassy of the Czech Republic in Washington D.C. presents its compliments to the Department of State of the United States of America and has the honor to refer to the Statement of the Russian Federation of 28 August 2007, made upon ratification of the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces (hereinafter the 'PfP SOFA').
"The Czech Republic considers this Statement of the Russian Federation as reservations incompatible with the provisions of the Agreement Between Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty Regarding the Status of their Forces and the PfP SOFA, because this Statement refers to the Russian law in a manner that creates uncertainty regarding the legal rules to be applied among the States Parties to the PfP SOFA.
"Therefore, the Czech Republic objects to this Statement of the Russian Federation. This objection, however, does not preclude that the PfP SOFA is in force between the Czech Republic and Russian Federation.
"The Embassy of the Czech Republic in Washington D.C. kindly asks the United States of America, in its capacity as Depositary of the PfP SOFA, to convey this information to all other States Parties to the PfP SOFA.
"The Embassy of the Czech Republic in Washington D.C. avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the Department of State of the United States of America the assurances of its highest consideration."

From Italy, *received October 17, 2008:*
"The Embassy of Italy presents its compliments to the U.S. Department of State and has the honor to bring to its attention the following communication from the Government of Italy.
'The Government of Italy presents its compliments to the U.S. Department of State and has the honor to refer to the 28 August 2007 Statement of the Russian Federation issued upon ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of their Forces.
'After careful appraisal, the Government of the Republic of Italy hereby declares that the cited statement does not prevent the entry into force of the Agreement between the Republic of Italy and the Russian Federation, nor does it in any way prejudice the full effectiveness of said Agreement.
'Furthermore, the Government of the Republic of Italy declares that in the implementation between the Republic of Italy and the Russian Federation of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces, the Republic of Italy expects that the

provisions of the mentioned Agreement will prevail in case of conflicting national legislation, in accordance with the principles of international law.'
"The Embassy of Italy kindly requests the Government of the United States of America, in its capacity as Depositary of the NATO SOFA, to convey this information to all other States Parties to this Treaty."

From Bulgaria, *received December 23, 2008:*
"The Embassy of the Republic of Bulgaria presents its compliments to the U.S. Department of State and has the honour to inform the latter of the following:
"The Government of the Republic of Bulgaria has the honour to refer to the Statement of the Russian Federation made on 28 August 200[7] upon the ratification of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their forces, and the Additional Protocol thereto, and declares hereby that in its relations with the Russian Federation it will interpret and apply the provisions of the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the Status of their forces in accordance with the provisions of the Vienna Convention on the Law of Treaties, and will not consider itself bound by any other interpretations, which are not in compliance with the said provisions of the Vienna Convention. In this regard, in case of inconsistency of the interpretations of the Russian Party with the provisions of the Agreement, the Bulgarian Party will give priority to the provisions of the Agreement in accordance with the principles of international law.
"The Embassy of the Republic of Bulgaria avails itself of this opportunity to renew to the U.S. Department of State the assurances of its highest consideration."

[7] The instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol by Spain includes the following reservation:
"Spain shall remain bound by the Agreement Among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the Other States Participating in the Partnership for Peace Regarding the Status of Their Forces only with respect to the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace that shall have ratified the Agreement and its Additional Protocol".

[8] The instrument of ratification of the Additional Protocol by Switzerland was accompanied by the following reservations and declaration:
"On Ratification of the Agreement among the States parties to the North Atlantic Treaty and the other States participating in the Partnership for Peace regarding the status of their forces, dated 19 June 1995 and the Additional Protocol to the said Agreement, Switzerland formulates the following reservations and declaration relating to the Agreement among the States Parties to the North Atlantic Treaty regarding the Status of their forces (Status of the NATO troops), dated 19 June 1951:

Reservation concerning Article VII Paragraphs 5 and 6:

I. "Switzerland will only hand over members of a military unit, of a civilian component or their families to the authorities of the sending or receiving state according to Article VII Paragraph 5 of the NATO-Status of Forces Agreement or provide legal assistance according to Paragraph 6 in such cases, if the state in question gives the guarantee that the death penalty is neither pronounced against nor carried out on these persons.

II. Switzerland will not hand over members of a military unit, of a civilian component or their families to the authorities of the sending or receiving state according to Article VII Paragraph 5 of the NATO-Status of Forces Agreement nor and will not provide legal assistance according to Paragraph 6,
   i. If there are serious reasons for believing that these persons would be subjected to torture or to inhuman or degrading punishment or treatment,
   ii. If there are serious reasons for believing that these persons would be prosecuted on account of their race, religion, nationality or political opinion, or that these persons' positions may be prejudiced for any of these reasons."

Reservation concerning Article XIII

"Switzerland grants administrative or legal assistance in fiscal matters. The object of administrative assistance is the correct application of the agreements regarding the avoidance of double taxation and the prevention of their improper use. Switzerland offers legal assistance only in case of fiscal fraud and on condition of reciprocity."

Declaration concerning Article VII

"The acceptance by Switzerland of the penal and disciplinary jurisdiction of foreign military authorities of a sending state according to Article VII of the NATO- NATO-Status of Forces Agreement does not apply to the

proceedings, the deliberation and pronouncement of the judgement by a criminal court of the sending state on the territory of Switzerland.”