

**SEMINAR**  
**PIRACY AND ARMED ROBBERY AGAINST SHIPPING:**  
**To Prevent, Deter, Protect and Fight against an ACTUAL Threat**  
21 JANUARY 2009

---

Key points by Mr Peter Csonka, Head of Unit, DG JLS (European Commission)

**BRIEFING on international piracy**

- The existing international legal framework to fight and prevent piracy is built around the **United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)** and the **Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (SUA)**, which entered into force in 1992. It contained a Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf. Among the unlawful acts covered by the SUA Convention in Article 3 are the seizure of ships by force; acts of violence against persons on board ships; and the placing of devices on board a ship which are likely to destroy or damage it. A second protocol was adopted in 2005 but it is not yet in force (*only 2 EU MS ratified it*). The 2005 protocol to SUA covers **acts of terrorism** committed on the high seas.
- An important issue linked to fighting piracy effectively is **the question of jurisdiction**. Two Conventions provide an answer to this. Article 105<sup>1</sup> of the **UN Convention on the law of the sea** and Article 19 of **Geneva Convention on the High Seas** both define the jurisdiction by stating that **on the high seas, or in any other place outside the jurisdiction of any State, every State may seize** a pirate ship or aircraft, or a ship or aircraft taken by piracy and under the control of pirates. That state can arrest the persons and seize the property on board. **The courts of the State which carried out the seizure may then decide** upon the penalties to be imposed, and may also determine the action to be taken with regard to the ships, aircraft or property, subject to the rights of third parties acting in good faith.
- These provisions (Article 105 UNCLOS and Article 19 CHS) exceptionally authorize use of enforcement powers over private ships not belonging to the capturing state (*executive jurisdiction*)<sup>2</sup>. Jurisdiction, in the sense of exercise of judicial power by courts, will follow. It is the state that has the alleged pirates in its hands that will exercise jurisdiction: as Article 105 provides, 'The courts of the State which carried out the seizure may decide upon the penalties to be imposed'.

---

<sup>1</sup> Article 105 - Seizure of a pirate ship or aircraft

On the high seas, or in any other place outside the jurisdiction of any State, **every State may seize** a pirate ship or aircraft, or a ship or aircraft taken by piracy and under the control of pirates, and arrest the persons and seize the property on board. **The courts of the State which carried out the seizure may decide** upon the penalties to be imposed, and may also determine the action to be taken with regard to the ships, aircraft or property, subject to the rights of third parties acting in good faith.

<sup>2</sup> See : <http://207.57.19.226/journal/curdevs/sr31-03.html>

- However, while in theory these provisions provide a good solution, in practice this is not frequently implemented and pirates caught by "foreign" ships are often released. One of the reasons most likely motivating this legal regulation is that, at a time when piracy was rife and all states of the world were therefore eager to capture persons engaging in this crime, potentially innumerable 'positive conflicts of jurisdiction' were in this way settled. Indeed, if all states had been entitled to claim jurisdiction over pirates wherever they were, very many positive conflicts would have ensued; instead, granting jurisdiction to the state apprehending the pirates neatly resolved the matter. Furthermore, had the universal jurisdiction over pirates been absolute any state of the world could have issued arrest warrants against pirates. **State practice, however, does not show any such trend, and this bears out the 'conditional' nature of such category of universal jurisdiction.**
  
- Obviously, if the act is committed in the territorial waters of a country, arrested pirates will have to appear before a court of the country in whose territorial waters the act was committed. In the specific case of Somalia, under the terms of resolution 1816 (2008), which was unanimously adopted (with the consent of Somalia), the UN Security Council decided that the States cooperating with the country's transitional Government would be allowed, for a period of six months, to enter the territorial waters of Somalia and use "all necessary means" to repress acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea, in a manner consistent with relevant provisions of international law.
  
- The question remains why international Conventions granting universal jurisdiction are not applied in practice. Reasons of that state of play could be of a different nature:
  - political: avoiding conflict with a certain State not putting at risk own interests;
  - legal: lack of ratification or inappropriate ratification of international instruments.
 Even though we could see the statistics concerning ratifications in general, it is difficult to get into the details of the implementing internal law. Bearing in mind that many international provisions have a facultative nature not implementing them is still in line with the Convention itself. Practically, it must be underlined that ratification of international instrument is seen often as a source of privilege but also obligation and that is why it is for a certain State to decide upon its transposition into internal law or not. In the light of lack of legal resources obliging States to ratify international instruments it is the political will that counts.
  
- As the EU is concerned all the international law instruments, especially UN Conventions apply (either MS are bound or it is the competence of the EC). Criminal provisions falling, as a general rule, into the third pillar should be analysed in the light of the specificity of the inter-governmental cooperation. One of its consequences is the lack of possibility, in the current state of play, to challenge the lack of implementation of an instrument into the internal order of the MS. Circumstances being the basis for non-implementation may be of different nature but nonetheless it should be borne in mind that legal vacuum caused by not accepting jurisdiction can result in future in taking over this privilege by another State according to its regime/provisions on jurisdiction.

- Status of ratification:
  - **UNCLOS: 157 ratifications, all EU MS (ex. AT), EC in 1998.**  
(1988-CY; 1993-MT; 1994-DE; 1995-IT/SI/EL;  
1996-CZ/BG/SK/FR/FI/IE/SE/NL/RO; 1997-ES/UK/PT; 1998-PL/BE/EC;  
2000-LU; 2002-HU; 2003-LT; 2004-LV/DK; 2005-EE)
  - **SUA 1988: entered into force on 1 March 1992; 151 Contracting Parties;**
  - **SUA 1988 Protocol: entered into force on 1 March 1992; 139 Contracting Parties;**
  - **SUA 2005: not yet in force; 8 Contracting Parties;**
  - **SUA 2005 Protocol: not yet in force; 6 Contracting Parties;**
  
- It must be borne in mind though that the ratification procedure is long and complicated, meaning also that the pure signature is only a start. It is difficult to ascertain when and how the MS implement the international instruments.

#### **Additionally information received from Danish Ministry of Justice ('the Danish case')**

- The Danish criminal code therefore foresees only in **well defined circumstances** the possibility to put on trial pirates caught in international waters by a Danish ship and that is when a Danish ship would have been attacked or Danish citizens would have been attacked. In the case of the pirates which were released, they were only "intercepted".

## BACKGROUND

### **1. Short background on modern piracy**

Modern, 21st-century piracy, is usually committed from GPS-equipped speed boats by gangs armed with automatic weapons, anti-tank rockets and grenades asking for multi-million-pound ransoms. Pirates have little interest in the actual cargo of the ship because they do not have the means to extract the value of that cargo. Somalia, on the Horn of Africa, has become the global piracy hotspot, fuelled by a combination of a lawless country and its proximity to one of the world's major trade routes through the Suez Canal and Gulf of Aden – known as "the gates of hell". According to a BBC report, the pirates can be divided into three main categories:

- Local fishermen, considered the brains of the pirates' operations due to their skill and knowledge of the sea.
- Ex-militiamen who used to fight for the local clan warlords, used as the muscle.
- Technical experts who operate high-tech equipment such as the GPS systems.

#### ➤ **Definition of piracy**

Article 101 of the 1982 United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (**UNCLOS**) states that Piracy consists of any of the following acts:

- (a) any illegal acts of violence or detention, or any act of depredation, committed for private ends by the crew or the passengers of a private ship or a private aircraft, and directed:
  - (i) on the high seas, against another ship or aircraft, or against persons or property on board such ship or aircraft;
  - (ii) against a ship, aircraft, persons or property in a place outside the jurisdiction of any State;
- (b) any act of voluntary participation in the operation of a ship or of an aircraft with knowledge of facts making it a pirate ship or aircraft;
- (c) any act inciting or of intentionally facilitating an act described in sub-paragraph (a) or (b).

### **2005 SUA Convention**

#### **ARTICLE 3**

1 Any person commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person unlawfully and intentionally:

- (a) seizes or exercises control over a ship by force or threat thereof or any other form of intimidation; or
- (b) performs an act of violence against a person on board a ship if that act is likely to endanger the safe navigation of that ship; or
- (c) destroys a ship or causes damage to a ship or to its cargo which is likely to endanger the safe navigation of that ship; or
- (d) places or causes to be placed on a ship, by any means whatsoever, a device or substance which is likely to destroy that ship, or cause damage to that ship or its cargo which endangers or is likely to endanger the safe navigation of that ship; or

(e) destroys or seriously damages maritime navigational facilities or seriously interferes with their operation, if any such act is likely to endanger the safe navigation of a ship; or

(f) communicates information which that person knows to be false, thereby endangering the safe navigation of a ship.

2. Any person also commits an offence if that person threatens, with or without a condition, as is provided for under national law, aimed at compelling a physical or juridical person to do or refrain from doing any act, to commit any of the offences set forth in paragraphs 1 (b), (c), and (e), if that threat is likely to endanger the safe navigation of the ship in question.

### **ARTICLE 3bis**

1. Any person commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person unlawfully and intentionally:

(a) when the purpose of the act, by its nature or context, is to intimidate a population, or to compel a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act:

(i) uses against or on a ship or discharges from a ship any explosive, radioactive material or BCN weapon in a manner that causes or is likely to cause death or serious injury or damage; or

(ii) discharges, from a ship, oil, liquefied natural gas, or other hazardous or noxious substance, which is not covered by subparagraph (a)(i), in such quantity or concentration that causes or is likely to cause death or serious injury or damage; or

(iii) uses a ship in a manner that causes death or serious injury or damage; or

(iv) threatens, with or without a condition, as is provided for under national law, to commit an offence set forth in subparagraph (a)(i), (ii) or (iii); or

(b) transports on board a ship:

(i) any explosive or radioactive material, knowing that it is intended to be used to cause, or in a threat to cause, with or without a condition, as is provided for under national law, death or serious injury or damage for the purpose of intimidating a population, or compelling a government or an international organization to do or to abstain from doing any act; or

(ii) any BCN weapon, knowing it to be a BCN weapon as defined in article 1; or

(iii) any source material, special fissionable material, or equipment or material especially designed or prepared for the processing, use or production of special fissionable material, knowing that it is intended to be used in a nuclear explosive activity or in any other nuclear activity not under safeguards pursuant to an IAEA comprehensive safeguards agreement; or

(iv) any equipment, materials or software or related technology that significantly contributes to the design, manufacture or delivery of a BCN weapon, with the intention that it will be used for such purpose.

2. It shall not be an offence within the meaning of this Convention to transport an item or material covered by paragraph 1(b)(iii) or, insofar as it relates to a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device, paragraph 1(b)(iv), if such item or material is transported to or from the territory of, or is otherwise transported under the control of, a State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons where:

(a) the resulting transfer or receipt, including internal to a State, of the item or material is not contrary to such State Party's obligations under the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons and,

(b) if the item or material is intended for the delivery system of a nuclear weapon or other nuclear explosive device of a State Party to the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, the holding of such weapon or device is not contrary to that State Party's obligations under that Treaty.

### **ARTICLE 3ter**

Any person commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person unlawfully and intentionally transports another person on board a ship knowing that the person has committed an act that constitutes an offence set forth in article 3, *3bis* or *3quater* or an offence set forth in any treaty listed in the Annex, and intending to assist that person to evade criminal prosecution.

### **ARTICLE 3quater**

Any person also commits an offence within the meaning of this Convention if that person:

- (a) unlawfully and intentionally injures or kills any person in connection with the commission of any of the offences set forth in article 3, paragraph 1, article *3bis*, or article *3ter*; or
- (b) attempts to commit an offence set forth in article 3, paragraph 1, article *3bis*, paragraph 1(a)(i), (ii) or (iii), or subparagraph (a) of this article; or
- (c) participates as an accomplice in an offence set forth in article 3, article *3bis*, article *3ter*, or subparagraph (a) or (b) of this article; or
- (d) organizes or directs others to commit an offence set forth in article 3, article *3bis*, article *3ter*, or subparagraph (a) or (b) of this article; or
- (e) contributes to the commission of one or more offences set forth in article 3, article *3bis*, article *3ter* or subparagraph (a) or (b) of this article, by a group of persons acting with a common purpose, intentionally and either:
  - (i) with the aim of furthering the criminal activity or criminal purpose of the group, where such activity or purpose involves the commission of an offence set forth in article 3, *3bis* or *3ter*; or
  - (ii) in the knowledge of the intention of the group to commit an offence set forth in article 3, *3bis* or *3ter*.

### ➤ **Terrorism financing ?**

There have been early speculations on linkages between pirates and terrorism financing, however, none of these have been substantiated. Neither EUROPOL nor FATF dispose of any proofs pointing in this direction. However, according to experts it could be the next step for modern piracy *if* it is allowed to expand. Member states are reportedly looking into this but have so far not shared any intelligence on this.

## **2. Facts and figures**

A sharp increase in pirate attacks has been reported by the International Maritime Bureau<sup>3</sup> (IMB), with half of the **200 incidents** this year off Somalia, compared with just a handful four years ago. According to IMB, there were **263 pirate attacks** worldwide in **2007**, up by **10 percent** from the year before.

Nearly **700 sailors** have been taken hostage, with more than a third of them – and 15 vessels – still being held, awaiting ransom payments. Hostages are not normally harmed, but **9 crew**

---

<sup>3</sup> The **International Maritime Bureau** is a specialized department of the International Chamber of Commerce. The IMB's responsibilities lie in fighting crimes related to maritime trade and transportation, particularly piracy and commercial fraud, and in protecting the crews of ocean-going vessels. It publishes a weekly piracy report and maintains a 24-hour piracy reporting centre in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia.

**members have been killed** in attacks this year and a further **9 are missing**. According to estimations, there are some **18 gangs operating off Somalia**, using up to **60 vessels**, including "mother ships", which take pirates into deep water, from where attacks are launched in speed boats. The International Maritime Organisation<sup>4</sup>, which monitors such acts, has knowledge about **4662 incidents, adding 25 to 30 every month**. Up to **\$1 million per vessel** has so far be secured in terms of ransom.

The super tanker **Sirius Star (319.400-tonne)**, which was attacked on 16 November 2008 is the largest vessel yet hijacked. The attack took place much further out to sea – 450 miles – than previous attacks in the region. The incident would suggest any merchant vessel, however far offshore, could fall prey to pirates. The total area of "dangerous waters" is now estimated to cover some **2.5 million square miles**.

### **3. The international legal framework and recent further initiatives**

The existing international legal framework to fight and prevent piracy is build around is the **United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea (UNCLOS)** and the 1988 **Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation (SUA)**, which entered into force in 1992. It contained a Protocol for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Fixed Platforms Located on the Continental Shelf. Among the unlawful acts covered by the SUA Convention in Article 3 are the seizure of ships by force; acts of violence against persons on board ships; and the placing of devices on board a ship which are likely to destroy or damage it. A second protocol to the SUA Convention was adopted in 2005 (not yet in force: *only 2 EU MS ratified it*). This Protocol covers **acts of terrorism** committed on the high seas.

An important issue linked to fighting piracy effectively is **the question of jurisdiction**. Two Conventions provide an answer to this. UNCLOS as well as the 1988 **Convention for the Suppression of Unlawful Acts Against the Safety of Maritime Navigation** grant the possibility for the parties to the Convention to exercise jurisdiction over pirates when they have been caught in international waters. However, there is no obligation to exercise this jurisdiction. They both define jurisdiction by stating that **on the high seas, or in any other place outside the jurisdiction of any State, every State may seize** a pirate ship or aircraft, or a ship or aircraft taken by piracy and under the control of pirates. That state can arrest the persons and seize the property on board. **The courts of the State which carried out the seizure may then decide** upon the penalties to be imposed, and may also determine the action to be taken with regard to the ships, aircraft or property, subject to the rights of third parties acting in good faith. However, whether or not courts establish jurisdiction depends on specific provisions in the criminal code of the capturing member state. This for example explains why Danish authorities in early November decided to let go Somali pirates intercepted in international waters.

In practice, Article 105 UNCLOS and 19 GCHS exceptionally authorize use of enforcement powers over private ships not belonging to the capturing state (*executive jurisdiction*)<sup>5</sup>.

Obviously, if the act is committed in the territorial waters of a country, arrested pirates will have to appear before a court of the country in whose territorial waters the act was committed.

---

<sup>4</sup> A UN specialised body, IMO has been working to combat piracy since 1983, when its Assembly passed a resolution calling on governments to take urgent measures to prevent and suppress acts of piracy in or adjacent to their waters

<sup>5</sup> See : <http://207.57.19.226/journal/curdevs/sr31-03.html>

In the specific case of Somalia, by the terms of resolution 1816 (2008), which was unanimously adopted (with the consent of Somalia), the UN Security Council decided that the States cooperating with the country's transitional Government would be allowed, for a period of six months, to enter the territorial waters of Somalia and use "all necessary means" to repress acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea, in a manner consistent with relevant provisions of international law.

#### **The UN Security Council passed in 2008 Resolutions 1816, 1814 and 1838,**

- In resolution 1814 (2008), the Council had committed itself to consider a peacekeeping operation to take over from AMISOM (African Union Mission to Somalia).
- Resolution 1816 (2008) of 2 June allows States cooperating with the Government, for a period of six months, to enter Somalia's territorial waters and use "all necessary means" to repress acts of piracy and armed robbery at sea in a manner consistent with international law.
- Resolution 1838 (2008) seeks Repressive Action In Manner Consistent with United Nations Convention on Law of the Sea

**The Council of the EU** decided on 15 September 2008 to launch a European Union military coordination action (EU NAVCO) to support surveillance and protection operations led by certain Member States in Somalia and off the Somali coast. EU NAVCO is established within the framework of [UN Security Council resolution 1816 \(2008\)](#) adopted on 2 June 2008, which allows States to support the transitional government in Somalia in the fight against piracy and armed robbery. The coordination action is conducted from Brussels by a Coordination Cell supported by the Military Staff of the EU. The main purpose of the EU coordination Cell is to support the actions of Member States that deploy military resources in theatre in order to facilitate their availability and their operational action

**The European Parliament** issued on 23 October 2008 a Resolution on (sea) piracy, expressing its serious concern about the growing number of maritime piracy cases. MEPs call on the Council and Member States to adopt clear and legally incontrovertible rules of engagement for the naval forces engaged in those operations. They welcomed the Council Joint Action, which establishes a military coordination action (Council Joint Action) named EU NAVCO (part of CFSP) but regret the lack of consultation by the Council of the European Parliament on the decision to launch this operation and to provide information to the EP about the scope of this action and the exact tasks that the "EU coordination cell" in the Council will undertake in support of EU NAVCO.

#### **4. Next steps ?**

NATO is considering whether to extend its anti-piracy operation off the coast of Somalia beyond next month. NATO has currently four ships - from the U.K., Greece, Italy and Turkey - on patrol in the waters, with two protecting U.N. food aid convoys to the strife-torn Somalia. NATO's "Operation Atlanta" ends in mid-December when a bigger **European Union mission** is to be put in place, but the military alliance is considering complementary actions to the E.U. mission. In parallel, the **EP resolution** contains a long "to-do list" to Council and Commission. DG TREN is following up on each of the requests addressed to the Commission.

• **TABLES – STATUS OF RATIFICATION**

Instrument	Entry into force date	No. of Contracting States	% world tonnage*
SUA 1988	01-Mar-92	151	92.75
SUA Protocol 1988	01-Mar-92	139	87.77
SUA 2005	-	8	5.53
SUA Protocol 2005	-	6	5.42

**Chronological lists of ratifications of, accessions and successions to the Convention and the related Agreements as at**

The United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea of 10 December 1982	
157.	Liberia (25 September 2008)
156.	Congo (9 July 2008)
155.	Lesotho (31 May 2007)
154.	Morocco (31 May 2007)
153.	Moldova (6 February 2007)
152.	Montenegro (23 October 2006)
151.	Niue (11 October 2006)
150.	Belarus (30 August 2006)
149.	Estonia (26 August 2005)
148.	Burkina Faso (25 January 2005)
147.	Latvia (23 December 2004)
146.	Denmark (16 November 2004)
145.	Lithuania (12 November 2003)
144.	Canada (7 November 2003)
143.	Albania (23 June 2003)
142.	Kiribati (24 February 2003)
141.	Tuvalu (9 December 2002)
140.	Qatar (9 December 2002)

139.	Armenia (9 December 2002)	
138.	Hungary (5 February 2002)	
137.	Madagascar (22 August 2001)	
136.	Bangladesh (27 July 2001)	
135.	Serbia (12 March 2001)	
134.	Luxembourg (5 October 2000)	
133.	Maldives (7 September 2000)	
132.	Nicaragua (3 May 2000)	
131.	Vanuatu (10 August 1999)	
130.	Ukraine (26 July 1999)	
129.	Poland (13 November 1998)	
128.	Belgium (13 November 1998)	
127.	Nepal (2 November 1998)	
126.	Suriname (9 July 1998)	
125.	Lao People's Democratic Republic (5 June 1998)	
124.	European Community (1 April 1998)	
123.	Gabon (11 March 1998)	
122.	South Africa (23 December 1997)	
121.	Portugal (3 November 1997)	
120.	Benin (16 October 1997)	
119.	Chile (25 August 1997)	
118.	United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (25 July 1997)	
117.	Equatorial Guinea (21 July 1997)	
116.	Solomon Islands (23 June 1997)	
115.	Mozambique (13 March 1997)	
114.	Russian Federation (12 March 1997)	
113.	Pakistan (26 February 1997)	
112.	Guatemala (11 February 1997)	
111.	Spain (15 January 1997)	
110.	Papua New Guinea (14 January 1997)	
109.	Romania (17 December 1996)	

108.	Brunei Darussalam (5 November 1996)	
107.	Malaysia (14 October 1996)	
106.	Palau (30 September 1996)	
105.	Mongolia (13 August 1996)	
104.	Haiti (31 July 1996)	
103.	New Zealand (19 July 1996)	
102.	Mauritania (17 July 1996)	
101.	Panama (1 July 1996)	
100.	Netherlands (28 June 1996)	
99.	Sweden (25 June 1996)	
98.	Norway (24 June 1996)	
97.	Ireland (21 June 1996)	
96.	Finland (21 June 1996)	
95.	Czech Republic (21 June 1996)	
94.	Japan (20 June 1996)	
93.	Algeria (11 June 1996)	
92.	China (7 June 1996)	
91.	Myanmar (21 May 1996)	
90.	Bulgaria (15 May 1996)	
89.	Slovakia (8 May 1996)	
88.	Saudi Arabia (24 April 1996)	
87.	France (11 April 1996)	
86.	Georgia (21 March 1996 )	
85.	Monaco (20 March 1996)	
84.	Republic of Korea (29 January 1996)	
83.	Nauru (23 January 1996)	
82.	Argentina (1 December 1995)	
81.	Jordan (27 November 1995)	
80.	Samoa (14 August 1995)	
79.	Tonga (2 August 1995)	
78.	Greece (21 July 1995)	

77.	Austria (14 July 1995)	
76.	India (29 June 1995)	
75.	Slovenia (16 June 1995)	
74.	Bolivia (28 April 1995)	
73.	Croatia (5 April 1995)	
72.	Cook Islands (15 February 1995)	
71.	Italy (13 January 1995)	
70.	Lebanon (5 January 1995)	
69.	Sierra Leone (12 December 1994)	
68.	Singapore (17 November 1994)	
67.	Mauritius (4 November 1994)	
66.	Germany (14 October 1994)	
65.	Australia (5 October 1994)	
64.	The former Yugoslav Republic of Macedonia (19 August 1994)	
63.	Viet Nam (25 July 1994)	
62.	Sri Lanka (19 July 1994)	
61.	Comoros (21 June 1994)	
60.	Bosnia and Herzegovina (12 January 1994)	
59.	Guyana (16 November 1993)	
58.	Barbados (12 October 1993)	
57.	Honduras (5 October 1993)	
56.	Saint Vincent and the Grenadines (1 October 1993)	
55.	Malta (20 May 1993)	
54.	Zimbabwe (24 February 1993)	
53.	Saint Kitts and Nevis (7 January 1993)	
52.	Uruguay (10 December 1992)	
51.	Costa Rica (21 September 1992)	
50.	Dominica (24 October 1991)	
49.	Djibouti (8 October 1991)	
48.	Seychelles (16 September 1991)	

47.	Marshall Islands (9 August 1991)	
46.	Micronesia (Federated States of) (29 April 1991)	
45.	Grenada (25 April 1991)	
44.	Angola ( 5 December 1990)	
43.	Uganda (9 November 1990)	
42.	Botswana (2 May 1990)	
41.	Oman (17 August 1989)	
40.	Somalia (24 July 1989)	
39.	Kenya (2 March 1989)	
38.	Democratic Republic of the Congo (17 February 1989)	
37.	Antigua and Barbuda ( 2 February 1989)	
36.	Brazil (22 December 1988)	
35.	Cyprus (12 December 1988)	
34.	Sao Tome and Principe (3 November 1987)	
33.	Cape Verde (10 August 1987)	
32.	Yemen (21 July 1987)	
31.	Paraguay (26 September 1986)	
30.	Guinea-Bissau (25 August 1986)	
29.	Nigeria (14 August 1986)	
28.	Kuwait (2 May 1986)	
27.	Trinidad and Tobago (25 April 1986)	
26.	Indonesia (3 February 1986)	
25.	Cameroon (19 November 1985)	
24.	United Republic of Tanzania (30 September 1985)	
23.	Guinea (6 September 1985)	
22.	Iraq (30 July 1985)	
21.	Mali (16 July 1985)	
20.	Iceland (21 June 1985)	
19.	Bahrain (30 May 1985)	
18.	Tunisia (24 April 1985)	

17.	Togo (16 April 1985)	
16.	Saint Lucia (27 March 1985)	
15.	Sudan (23 January 1985)	
14.	Senegal (25 October 1984)	
13.	Cuba (15 August 1984)	
12.	Gambia (22 May 1984)	
11.	Philippines (8 May 1984)	
10.	Côte d'Ivoire (26 March 1984)	
9.	Egypt (26 August 1983)	
8.	Belize (13 August 1983)	
7.	Bahamas (29 July 1983)	
6.	Ghana (7 June 1983)	
5.	Namibia (18 April 1983)	
4.	Jamaica (21 March 1983)	
3.	Mexico (18 March 1983)	
2.	Zambia (7 March 1983)	
1.	Fiji (10 December 1982)	