FRANCE

✓ Signature: 1 10.04.1981

✓ Ratification, Acceptance, Approval, Accession, Succession:

|------------|-------------|---------------------|-------------|------------|------------|-----------------------|

✓ Interpretative statement:

“The application of this Convention will have no effect on the legal status of the parties to a conflict.”

✓ Reservations:

“France, which is not bound by Additional Protocol I of 10 June 1977 to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949:
Considers that the fourth paragraph of the preamble to the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be Excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, which reproduces the provisions of article 35, paragraph 3, of Additional Protocol I, applies only to States parties to that Protocol;
States, with reference to the scope of application defined in article 1 of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons, that it will apply the provisions of the Convention and its three Protocols to all the armed conflicts referred to in articles 2 and 3 common to the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949;
States that as regards the Geneva Conventions of 12 August 1949, the declaration of acceptance and application provided for in article 7, paragraph 4 (b), of the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons will have no effects other than those provided for in article 3 common to the Geneva Conventions, in so far as that article is applicable.”

✓ Declarations:

1 In accordance with Article 3, the Convention was “…. open for signature by all States at the United Nations Headquarters in New York for a period of twelve months from 10 April 1981.”
“After signing the Convention on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons Which May Be Deemed to Be excessively Injurious or to Have Indiscriminate Effects, the French Government, as it has already had occasion to state
- through its representative to the United Nations Conference on Prohibitions or Restrictions on the Use of Certain Conventional Weapons in Geneva, during the discussion of the proposal concerning verification arrangements submitted by the delegation of the Federal Republic of Germany and of which the French Government became a sponsor, and at the final meeting on 10 October 1980;
- on 20 November 1980 through the representative of the Netherlands, speaking on behalf of the nine States members of the European Community in the First Committee at the thirty-fifth session of the United Nations General Assembly;

Regrets that thus far it has not been possible for the States which participated in the negotiation of the Convention to reach agreement on the provisions concerning the verification of facts which might be alleged and which might constitute violations of the undertakings subscribed to.

It therefore reserves the right to submit, possibly in association with other States, proposals aimed at filling that gap at the first conference to be held pursuant to article 8 of the Convention and to utilize, as appropriate, procedures that would make it possible to bring before the international community facts and information which, if verified, could constitute violations of the provisions of the Convention and the Protocols annexed thereto.”

Declarations: 2

“Declarations concerning the scope of amended Protocol II:
[Same declarations, mutatis mutandis, as those made by Ireland in regard to article 1 and 2 of the Protocol.]

- Article 4:
France takes it that article 4 and Technical Annex to amended Protocol II do not require the removal or replacement of mines that have already been laid.

- Declaration concerning standards on marking, monitoring and protection:
The provisions of amended Protocol II such as those concerning the marking, monitoring and protection of zones which contain anti-personnel mines and are under the control of a party, are applicable to all zones containing mines, irrespective of the date on which those mines were laid.”

Interpretative declarations: 3

“The French Republic accepts the provisions of article 2, paragraphs 2 and 3, insofar as the terms used in these paragraphs do not lead to the assumption that an attack using incendiary weapons launched from an aircraft would involve any greater risk of indiscriminate hits than one launched by any other means.

It is the understanding of the French Republic that the term "clearly separated" used in article 2, paragraph 3, can be interpreted as meaning either a separation in terms of

---

2 Made upon consent to be bound by Amended Protocol II.
3 Made upon consent to be bound by Protocol III.
space or a separation by means of a physical barrier between the military target and the concentration of civilians.”