

**First meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the
 2007 Child Support Convention and on the 2007 Maintenance Obligations Protocol
 - June 2020 (tentative)**

Document	Preliminary Document <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Document <input type="checkbox"/>	No 1 of August 2019
Title	Questionnaire on the practical operation of the <i>Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance</i>	
Author	Permanent Bureau	
Agenda item		
Mandate(s)	C&R No 28 of the March 2019 meeting of the Council on General Affairs and Policy	
Objective	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - To seek information as to the implementation and practical operation of the 2007 Convention in Contracting Parties, including procedures that have been established to implement the Convention, the extent of co-operation between Contracting Parties, and the types of assistance provided to individuals; - To identify challenges or questions that have arisen and good practices regarding the practical operation of the 2007 Convention; and - To obtain views and comments on priority topics, including possible future work, for discussion at the upcoming meeting of the Special Commission. 	
Action to be taken	For Approval <input type="checkbox"/> For Decision <input type="checkbox"/> For Information <input type="checkbox"/> For Action <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	
Annexes	n.a.	
Related documents	Prel. Doc. No 2 of August 2019 - Questionnaire on the practical operation of the <i>Protocol of 23 November 2007 on the Law Applicable to Maintenance Obligations</i>	

Objectives of the Questionnaire

This Questionnaire is being circulated in preparation for a possible meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the *HCCH Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance* (hereinafter, the “2007 Convention”) and the *HCCH Protocol of 23 November 2007 on the Law Applicable to Maintenance Obligations* (hereinafter, the “2007 Protocol”), tentatively to be held in The Hague in June 2020 (dates to be confirmed). The Questionnaire focuses on the 2007 Convention; another Questionnaire will focus on the 2007 Protocol.

This Questionnaire is addressed primarily to Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention, but certain questions (so marked) are also addressed to non-Contracting Parties (*e.g.*, Contracting Parties to the United Nations Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance concluded in New York on 20 June 1956 (hereinafter, the “1956 Convention”). The Questionnaire has the following broad objectives:

- a. To seek information as to the implementation and practical operation of the 2007 Convention in Contracting Parties, including procedures that have been established to implement the Convention, the extent of co-operation between Contracting Parties, and the types of assistance provided to individuals;
- b. To identify challenges or questions that have arisen and good practices regarding the practical operation of the 2007 Convention; and
- c. To obtain views and comments on priority topics, including possible future work, for discussion at the upcoming meeting of the Special Commission.

The Questionnaire is designed to facilitate an efficient exchange of information on these matters prior to the meeting of the Special Commission and assist with the drawing up of an agenda for the meeting.

Scope of the Questionnaire

The Questionnaire covers these topics:

- Statistics
- Operational issues
- Access to information
- Enforcement issues
- Feedback on the use of the mandatory and recommended forms
- Possible additional forms
- Country profile
- Possible additional tools
- Translation of documents and dissemination of information
- Training and training material
- Joining the 2007 Convention
- iSupport
- General

In considering the questions that follow, States may find it useful to refer in particular to the following resources:

- The text of the 2007 Convention¹

¹ The text of the 2007 Convention is available at: < <https://assets.hcch.net/docs/14e71887-0090-47a3-9c49-d438eb601b47.pdf> >.

- The Explanatory Report² (Borras and Degeling) on the 2007 Convention
- The Recommended Forms³ under the 2007 Convention
- The Practical Handbook for Case Workers⁴ under the 2007 Convention
- The Practical Handbook for Competent Authorities⁵ on the 2009 EU Maintenance Regulation, the 2007 Hague Child Support Convention and its Protocol
- The Country Profile⁶ for the 2007 Convention
- The Implementation Checklist⁷ for the 2007 Convention

Instructions for completion

The Questionnaire is being sent to Central Authorities as well as National and Contact Organs. Central Authorities asked to co-ordinate as appropriate between themselves and other competent authorities. For Contracting Parties to the Convention, Central Authorities are ultimately responsible for submitting the completed questionnaire to the Permanent Bureau (PB).

In order to allow the PB to extract parts of the Questionnaire for a compilation and analysis of the responses, please use **this Word Version** of the document, and please **do not return a PDF version** of the completed Questionnaire.

We kindly request that replies to the Questionnaire be sent to the PB by e-mail to < secretariat@hcch.net > **no later than 30 November 2019** with the following subject matter captioned in the heading of the e-mail: “[name of State] Response to the 2007 Convention Questionnaire – 2020 Special Commission”. Any questions concerning the Questionnaire may be directed to < secretariat@hcch.net >.

We intend, except where expressly asked not to do so, to place all replies to the Questionnaire on the HCCH website (www.hcch.net). Please therefore clearly identify any responses which you do not want to be placed on the website.

Thank you for your kind co-operation as the PB prepares for the meeting of the Special Commission in 2020.

² The Explanatory Report is available at: < <http://assets.hcch.net/docs/09cfaa7e-30c4-4262-84d3-daf9af6c2a84.pdf> >.

³ The 2007 Convention Recommended Forms are available at: < <https://assets.hcch.net/docs/7b1c5829-81a6-46f5-902e-d59b572dff8a.pdf> >.

⁴ The Practical Handbook for Case Workers on the 2007 Convention is available at: < <https://assets.hcch.net/docs/5f160c92-b560-4b7f-b64c-8423f56c6292.pdf> >.

⁵ The Practical Handbook for Competent Authorities on the 2009 EU Maintenance Regulation, the 2007 Hague Child Support Convention and its Protocol is available at: < <https://assets.hcch.net/docs/b4c58880-8e8a-41a4-a52e-6597e1a08b42.pdf> >.

⁶ The Country Profile for the 2007 Convention is available at: < <https://assets.hcch.net/docs/7a6a8da3-4a7f-4367-89d6-f96e1e32c299.pdf> >.

⁷ The Implementation Checklist for the 2007 Convention is available at: < <https://assets.hcch.net/docs/231f2415-e12b-4bd6-8f85-9f1fc25d2658.pdf> >.

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE
CONVENTION OF 23 NOVEMBER 2007 ON THE INTERNATIONAL RECOVERY
OF CHILD SUPPORT AND OTHER FORMS OF FAMILY MAINTENANCE**

Wherever your replies to this Questionnaire make reference to domestic legislation, rules, guidance or case law relating to the practical operation of the 2007 Convention, **please provide a copy of the referenced documentation** in (a) the original language and, (b) wherever possible, accompanied by a translation into English and / or French.

Name of State or territorial unit:^[1]	United States of America
<i>For follow-up purposes</i>	
Name of contact person:	Anne Miller
Name of Authority / Office:	United States Central Authority for International Child Support Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE)
Telephone number:	202-401-5722
E-mail address:	ocseinternational@acf.hhs.gov

Please note:

- Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention are requested to complete ALL sections below.
- Non-Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention are requested to complete those sections marked with an asterisk (*).

1. Statistics under the 2007 Convention

1.1. How many active cases is your Central Authority handling at this moment under the 2007 Convention?

Outgoing cases:

OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Incoming cases:

OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

1.2. How many new cases (outgoing and incoming) were added to your caseload under the 2007 Convention each year during the last three years?

Last year:

OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the

^[1] The term "State" in this Questionnaire includes a territorial unit, where relevant.

international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Prior year:

OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Prior year:

OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Please specify the reference period for these statistics, *i.e.*, whether a calendar or fiscal year, and if the latter, the starting and ending dates:

Calendar year

Fiscal year:

starting:

Please insert text here

ending:

Please insert text here

1.3. How many requests for specific measures (Art. 7) has your Central Authority handled during the past 12 months?

Outgoing requests for specific measures:

In its role as the U.S. Central Authority, OCSE has not made any outgoing requests for specific measures. OCSE has designated state IV-D child support agencies as public bodies to transmit and receive Convention applications, and process Convention cases. In that capacity, a state IV-D agency may also make an outgoing request for specific measures. Based on anecdotal information from states, it appears that outgoing requests for specific measures are not frequent; the most common request is for address information.

Incoming requests for specific measures:

From November 2018 through October 2019, in its role as the U.S. Central Authority, OCSE received 420 parent locate requests from Convention countries. OCSE has designated state IV-D child support agencies as public bodies to transmit and receive Convention applications, and process Convention cases. In that capacity, a state IV-D agency may also make an outgoing request for specific measures. It appears that some states have received more than 100 requests for specific measures in the course of a year, whereas other states have received none. The most common incoming requests relate to location of the debtor or assistance with service of process.

1.4. How many full-time employees (FTEs) are working in your Central Authority?

In OCSE, the Central Authority is staffed by approximately 1 federal FTE and 2 contractor FTE staff.

1.5. Please identify the countries that are your State's main partners in international child support cases under the 2007 Convention:

The Convention partners that generated the most international customer service inquiries to OCSE to date in 2019 are Germany, followed by the United Kingdom, Sweden, Poland, Ireland, and Brazil. U.S. states report that Germany, the United Kingdom, Poland, Sweden, France, Norway, Portugal and the Czech Republic are among states' main Convention partners.

2. Statistics under the 1956 Convention, regional instruments and bilateral arrangements*

2.1. How many active cases is your State handling at this moment under international instruments other than the 2007 Convention?

Outgoing cases:

The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Incoming cases:

The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

2.2. How many new cases (outgoing and incoming) were added to your caseload under international instruments other than the 2007 Convention each year during the last three years?

Last year:

The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Prior year:

The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Prior year:

The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Please specify the reference period for these statistics, *i.e.*, whether a calendar or fiscal year, and if the latter, the starting and ending dates:

Calendar year

Fiscal year

starting:

Please insert text here

ending:

Please insert text here

2.3. How many full-time employees (FTEs) are working in your Central Authority / Transmitting Agency / Receiving Agency under these other international instruments?

In OCSE, the Central Authority is staffed by approximately 1 federal FTE and 2 contractor FTE staff.

2.4. Please identify the countries that are your State's main partners in international child support cases under the 1956 Convention, regional instruments or bilateral arrangements:

The U.S. is not a party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments. The U.S. has a federal bilateral agreement with the following: Australia, El Salvador, Israel, Switzerland, and the Canadian provinces/territories of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland/Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Ontario, Prince Edward island, Saskatchewan, and Yukon.

3. Operational issues

3.1. Are acknowledgments of receipt received within the required timeframe?

Always

Almost always

Half the time

Rarely

Never

3.2. Has your State encountered interpretation difficulties with regard to the term "residence" (Art. 9), which is broader than "habitual residence"?

No

Yes, please explain:

Please insert text here

If yes, please describe, if relevant, the practices your State has developed to overcome these difficulties:

Please insert text here

3.3. Has your State encountered problems with regard to applications made in the name of the child by a parent?

No

Yes, please explain:

In the U.S., a dependent child is not the creditor. Therefore most state child support systems create a case using the name of the applicant, which must be either the parent of the child or the public body; the dependent is identified as the person for whom maintenance is sought. It is problematic when a State sends an application where the child is the creditor/applicant and the name of the custodial parent is not provided.

At least one state has also reported that occasionally a State will send a case where the parent is the applicant but, once the child emancipates, the State sends a second case where the child is the applicant and there is no indication that the two cases are related. This problem could be resolved with better communication between Central Authorities.

Do the problems concern lack of information in the relevant Country Profile?

Yes

No

Do the problems concern lack of clarity in the relevant Forms?

Yes

No

3.4. Has your State encountered problems with regard to a public body acting in place of an individual to whom maintenance is owed or a public body to which reimbursement is owed for benefits provided in place of maintenance (Art. 36)?

No

Yes, please explain:

Please insert text here

3.5. Has your State encountered problems with regard to a person 21 years or older seeking to obtain legal aid for the recovery of maintenance arrears that accrued before the child turned 21?

No

Yes, please explain:

Please insert text here

3.6. Does your State provide legal aid to public bodies acting on behalf of the applicant (child)?

No

Yes

If yes, please explain if this has involved difficulties:

It has not involved difficulties.

3.7. Is the caseload in your Central Authority divided by regions or other case characteristics in order to promote a specialisation of case workers?

No

Yes, please explain:

In the United States, OCSE as the Central Authority has designated state IV-D agencies as public bodies to transmit and receive Convention applications, and process Convention cases. States vary with regard to how they organize their staff. Some state child support agencies specialize the assignment of cases based on the service needed, such as establishment or enforcement, intrastate or intergovernmental. Other state child support agencies assign cases based on the party's residential location or alphabetical breakdown of the party's surname.

3.8. Has your State encountered any other operational issues with respect to the processing of cases?

No

Yes, please explain:

In general, the experience of the United States is that the Convention is operating smoothly. However, the U.S. has experienced Convention countries sharing electronically sensitive case information such as personally identifiable information about parties and children without encrypting it to ensure its protection. This is a large concern because the U.S. has stringent data security provisions in law. When we provide sensitive case data in an encrypted manner, we want assurance that the information will remain protected.

States have also identified the following issues:

- 1) System limitations in monitoring performance and tracking applications for the Hague Convention due to the use of external forms outside of the state system of record as well as the lack of an identifier that can easily permit tracking of these cases.
- 2) Retention of qualified staff to process international applications, due to their unique training and knowledge.
- 3) Inconsistent communication between Central Authorities has caused delays in case processing, especially lack of timely responses to requests for case status of applications.

4) Occasional delays or lack of cooperation by some States in providing Convention forms and payments records when requested by U.S. states due to unique state case processing requirements. This has occurred especially with pre-existing cases with Hague Convention countries when a U.S. state needs to take an action.

4. Access to information

4.1. Has your State experienced difficulties in obtaining information required for processing cases under the Convention, as a result of restrictions on access to personal data held by the government or private institutions?

- No
 Yes – as a requesting State, please explain:

Yes – as a requested State, please explain:
[Please insert text here](#)

If yes, please describe, if relevant, the practices your State has developed to overcome these difficulties:
[Please insert text here](#)

5. Enforcement issues

5.1. Has your State experienced difficulties in enforcing decisions that set the amount of maintenance obligations on the basis of a percentage of the salary of the debtor or of the requesting State's minimum wage?

- No
 Yes, please specify:

[U.S. states are unable to enforce orders that are not stated as a sum certain; support must be set at a fixed amount.](#)

If yes, please describe, if relevant, the practices your State has developed to overcome these difficulties:

[U.S. state child support agencies report varying practices to overcome this difficulty. If it is a percentage of income order, some state agencies will work with the debtor and other income reporting sources to obtain an average monthly income for use in determining a specific amount to be enforced. The agency will then seek a hearing for the court to review the debtor's income and clarify the dollar amount to be used in enforcement of the order. The sum certain order is not considered a modification of the foreign order, but rather a clarification for purposes of identifying the appropriate conversion of a percentage of income. Other states determine the amount to be paid based on the debtor's salary at the time of accepting the order, or of taking judicial action. Adjustments will be made as required by the court. U.S. state agencies report difficulty in determining whether the foreign order is referring to gross or net salary. States have the most difficulty in enforcing percentage of income orders if the order contains references to undefined terms such as the country's minimum standard of living.](#)

5.2. Has your State experienced difficulties in enforcing orders where the debtor does not have his / her habitual residence in your State but does have property there?

- Not applicable – we have not had any requests to enforce an order in this circumstance
 No, we have been able to enforce orders in this circumstance. Please describe the processes used:

[A U.S. state may place a lien on a debtor's personal and real property that is located in the state.](#)

Yes, please specify the difficulties encountered:

Please insert text here

5.3. Can your State enforce the payment of interest (Art. 19)?

Yes

No, please explain why not:

Please insert text here

6. Feedback on the use of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms

A. As the requesting State:

6.1. Are there specific problems that you want the Special Commission to address with regard to the content or completion of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms?

No

Yes, please specify:

The availability of translated HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms is an important discussion topic. For example, it would be very helpful if contracting States placed hyperlinks to translated versions of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms within their Country Profile. One U.S. state has also requested clarification about whether the Statement of Enforceability form must accompany only the most recent decision or all decisions submitted with the application.

6.2. Is it a requirement under the domestic law of your State that the 2007 Convention application forms be signed by the applicant?

No

Yes, please explain:

Please insert text here

6.3. If you have responded yes to Question 6.2., please specify what other documents are required in combination with an unsigned application form in order for it to be acceptable under your State's law:

Please insert text here

6.4. Can your State's competent authorities complete an abstract or extract of the decision using the HCCH recommended form in lieu of a complete text of the decision?

Yes, please explain under which circumstances:

The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, as the U.S. Central Authority, has issued guidance that a state child support agency, as well as the issuing tribunal, are competent authorities to complete an abstract or extract of a decision.

No, please explain:

Please insert text here

Is this covered in your State's Country Profile?

Yes

No

6.5. Who is the competent authority in your State to complete the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms?

Please specify:

The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, as the U.S. Central Authority, has issued guidance that a state child support agency is the competent authority to complete the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms.

6.6. If the Central Authority or other competent authority in your State receives a handwritten form from an applicant, will it type the form in lieu of the applicant?

- Yes
 No, please explain:

This will vary among U.S. states. Although many U.S. states will type the form based on the handwritten form received from the applicant, other states report that they will proceed with the original handwritten form.

6.7. Is it possible in your State to process non-certified documents for the purpose of recognition and enforcement (Art. 25)?

- Yes
 No, please explain:
Please insert text here

6.8. For applications other than those for recognition and enforcement, do requested States routinely require documents in addition to those listed in the available recommended forms?

- No
 Yes, please specify:

This will vary among U.S. states. Although requested States do not routinely require additional documents, some States require a Power of Attorney form or a statement to identify the need for legal assistance.

If yes,

- Only a few States have such requirements
 Many States have such requirements

B. As the requested State:

6.9. Are there specific problems that you would like the Special Commission to address with regard to the content or completion of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms?

- No
 Yes, please specify:

In the U.S., a dependent child is not the creditor. Therefore, most state child support systems create a case using the name of the applicant, which must be either the parent of the child or the public body; the dependent is identified as the person for whom maintenance is sought. It is problematic when a State sends an application where the child is the creditor/applicant and the name of the custodial parent is not provided. We acknowledge that this is a system issue but would welcome if the forms always included the names of the child's parents.

6.10. Is it a requirement under the domestic law of your State that the 2007 Convention application forms be signed by the applicant?

- No
 Yes, please explain:

Although the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA), our domestic law implementing the 2007 Convention, does not require that a Convention application be signed by the applicant, a tribunal is only required to admit the document into evidence if it is signed under penalty of perjury. Also, one state has reported a State Supreme Court Rule requiring that all pleadings filed with the court must be signed by either an attorney or a litigant. Another state reported that where paternity is at issue, their state law requires a signed affidavit by the mother of the child.

6.11. If you have responded yes to Question 6.10, please specify what other documents are required in combination with an unsigned application form in order for it to be filed with a competent authority in your State?

The tribunal in some U.S. states may require a form, signed by the applicant, that the application and accompanying documents are submitted under penalty of perjury.

In a contested paternity case, a tribunal in some U.S. states may require that the applicant sign an affidavit under penalty of perjury, or sworn under oath or before a notary.

6.12. Do your State’s competent authorities accept an abstract or extract of the decision under certain circumstances using the HCCH recommended form in lieu of a complete text of the decision?

Yes, please explain under which circumstances:

A total of 46 U.S. states, territories, and the District of Columbia accept abstracts.

No, please explain:

A total of 8 U.S. states do not accept abstracts under their state law.

If no, please explain what could be done to facilitate the acceptance of an abstract or extract of a decision in your State:

Please insert text here

Is this covered in your State’s Country Profile?

Yes

No

6.13. Is it possible in your State to process non-certified documents for the purpose of recognition and enforcement (Art. 25)?

Yes

No, please explain:

Please insert text here

6.14. Can the recommended forms developed under the 2007 Convention be used for the purpose of a direct request (Art. 37) in your State?

Yes

No, please explain:

Please insert text here

7. Possible additional forms – Is your State interested in the development of the possible following additional forms?*

	Possible additional forms to be developed	No	Yes	Priority Level		
				Low	Med.	High
7.1.	Calculation form for maintenance arrears / statement of arrears	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.2.	Scalable model form for decision ⁸	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.3.	Statements of enforceability with respect to authentic instruments as well as private agreements (Art. 30(3)(b))	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.4.	Model form for Power of Attorney	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.5.	Form attesting that Art. 36 conditions are met	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.6.	Form for calculation of interest (with a table of interest or a link to a relevant website)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

⁸ For example, the abstract of a decision could be used as a template which could be converted into a full text decision with a simple click.

7.7.	Dynamic forms (available on the HCCH website to be completed online, printed and sent by registered mail)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
------	---	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------	-------------------------------------	--------------------------

	Possible dynamic mandatory (M) and recommended forms to be developed	No	Yes	Priority Level		
				Low	Med.	High
7.7.1.	Transmittal form (M) under Art. 12(2)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.2.	Acknowledgement form (M) under Art. 12(3)	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.3.	Application for Recognition or Recognition and Enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.4.	Abstract of a Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.5.	Statement of Enforceability of a Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.6.	Statement of Proper Notice	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.7.	Status of Application Report – Recognition or Recognition and Enforcement	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.8.	Application for Enforcement of a Decision Made or Recognised in the Requested State	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.9.	Status of Application Report – Enforcement of a Decision Made or Recognised in the Requested State	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.10.	Application for Establishment of a Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.11.	Status of Application Report – Establishment of a Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.12.	Application for Modification of a Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.13.	Status of Application Report – Modification of a Decision	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>
7.7.14.	Financial Circumstances Form	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>

7.8. Are there any other forms that your State would like to be developed?

- No
 Yes, please specify the form and level of priority:

[Art. 7 Request for Special Measures](#)

Priority:

- Low
 Medium
 High

[A Status Request Form \(that a requesting State could use to request an update\)](#)

Priority:

- Low
 Medium
 High

[Request for Legal Aid](#)

Priority:

Low

Medium

High

8. Country Profile

8.1. Are there specific problems that you would like the Special Commission to address with regard to the content or completion of the Country Profile?

No

Yes, please specify:

There are several Convention countries that have not completed a Country Profile. We would like to see recommendations from the Special Commission encouraging States to complete their Country Profile. In the absence of a Profile, it would be helpful for the Permanent Bureau to provide access to the copies of the country's child support laws and procedures that Convention Article 57 requires a country to provide at the time of ratification or accession.

Additionally there currently is no way to know when a State has updated its Country Profile. We would like a feature added that automatically generates a notice to other Contracting States any time a Country Profile is changed and identifies what section of the Profile was updated.

8.2. Is your State interested in extension of current Country Profile to cover spousal support (the current version of the Country Profile only covers children)?

No

Yes

If yes, please indicate a priority:

Low

Medium

High

8.3. Are there other areas that your State would like to see added or modified in the Country Profile?

No

Yes, please specify:

U.S. states would like a section in the Country Profile where the country identifies the availability of bilingual forms, possibly including links to such forms. See also the U.S. response to 8.1.

9. Possible additional tools – Is your State interested in the development of the possible following additional tools?*

9.1. Guide to Good Practice for Central Authorities on the implementation of the 2007 Convention (a guide as to how the Convention can be implemented in a State, with examples from States as to the way that Central Authority responsibilities are carried out)

No

Yes

If yes, please indicate a priority:

Low

Medium

High

9.2. Guidance for the completion of Mandatory and Recommended Forms under the 2007 Convention

No

Yes

If yes, please indicate a priority:

- Low
- Medium
- High

9.3. Standardised statistical report

- No
- Yes

If yes, please indicate a priority:

- Low
- Medium
- High

If yes, would it be helpful to develop a Prel. Doc. in advance of the Special Commission meeting to outline the possible statistics that should be included, the benefits of having that information, and a suggested timeline for collection?

- Yes
- No

9.4. Extension of current Country Profile to cover spousal support (the current version of the Country Profile only covers children)

- No
- Yes

If yes, please indicate a priority:

- Low
- Medium
- High

10. Translation of documents and dissemination of information

10.1. Has the text of the 2007 Convention⁹ been translated into your State's official language(s)?

- No
- Yes
- If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.
- If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):
[Please insert text here](#)

10.2. Has the Explanatory Report¹⁰ on the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

- No
- Yes
- If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.
- If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):
[Please insert text here](#)

10.3. Does your State require the use of the HCCH Recommended Forms¹¹ in your State's official language(s) (if not English or French)?

- No – Go to Question 10.4.
- Yes

⁹ See, *supra*, note 1.

¹⁰ See, *supra*, note 2.

¹¹ See, *supra*, note 3.

If yes, have the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms¹² under the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

If no, when will the translated forms be available? Are there steps that could be taken to facilitate the translation of forms into the official language(s) of your State?

Please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

Yes

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):

[Please insert text here](#)

10.4. Has the Practical Handbook for Case Workers¹³ on the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Yes

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):

[Please insert text here](#)

10.5. Has the Practical Handbook for Competent Authorities¹⁴ on the 2009 EU Maintenance Regulation, the 2007 Hague Child Support Convention and its Protocol (the Romanian project) been adapted and translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Yes

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):

[Please insert text here](#)

10.6. Has the Implementation Checklist¹⁵ for the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Yes

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):

[Please insert text here](#)

10.7. What actions to raise public awareness on the international recovery of child support (e.g., information leaflets,¹⁶ institutional circulars, etc.) have been implemented in your State?

[The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement has developed training on the Convention for child support agencies, attorneys, and judges. Other resources included judicial bench cards and policy guidance documents.](#)

¹² *Ibid.*

¹³ See, *supra*, note 4.

¹⁴ See, *supra*, note 5.

¹⁵ See, *supra*, note 7.

¹⁶ Examples of information leaflets are available at: < <http://assets.hcch.net/docs/a4e37173-54e8-4778-b8f5-e7aba66e6d98.pdf> >.

Are such materials available on the HCCH website?

- Yes
 No

If no, can the document be made available to the PB in pdf format or via hyperlink? Please specify:

The documents are available through the international page of the OCSE website. The Permanent Bureau can post a hyperlink to that page:
<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css/partners/international>

11. Training and training material

11.1. Has training regarding the 2007 Convention taken place in your State for members of the Central Authority?

- No

If no, what are the obstacles to such training?

[Please insert text here](#)

- Yes

If yes, what type of training?

Central Authority staff have worked on the Convention for many years and developed and delivered training and resources to U.S. states. Training has included live presentations as well as webinars. In addition, there have been presentations about the Convention at almost every conference hosted by the national and regional child support associations in the United States.

11.2. Has training regarding the 2007 Convention taken place in your State for members of the relevant competent authority(ies)?

- No

If no, what are the obstacles to such training?

[Please insert text here](#)

- Yes

If yes, what type of training?

OCSE has developed and presented webinar and in-person training for attorneys, judges, and other decision-makers; as well as developed judicial bench cards that are quick reference tools.

11.3. Has training regarding the 2007 Convention taken place in your State for caseworkers?

- No

If no, what are the obstacles to such training?

[Please insert text here](#)

- Yes

If yes, what type of training?

OCSE has developed resources and delivered training for caseworkers in U.S. states. Training has included live presentations as well as webinars that include expanded trainer notes. In addition, there have been presentations about the Convention at almost every conference hosted by the national and regional child support associations in the United States. A number of state child support agencies have developed training for their caseworkers and have included Convention workshops at state child support conferences.

11.4. Have you developed training material regarding the 2007 Convention in your State?

- No

- Yes

If yes, the document(s) is available on the HCCH website.

- If yes, the document(s) can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website. Please specify the language(s):
[The documents are available in English through the international page of the OCSE website. The Permanent Bureau can post a hyperlink to that page: <https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css/partners/international>](#)

11.5. To assist with training, does your State favour having additional materials on the HCCH website?

- No
 Yes, please specify:

[The HCCH website could feature training on how a State completes its Country Profile.](#)

12. Joining the 2007 Convention*

12.1. Is your State a Contracting Party to the 1956 New York Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance?

- Yes
 No

(Note: Art. 49 of the 2007 Convention provides that such Convention replaces the 1956 New York Convention in relations between Contracting Parties in so far as the scope of application under each convention is the same.)

12.2. Has your State joined the 2007 Convention?

- Yes
 No, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

If no, what could be done to facilitate your State becoming a Party (e.g., the proposed [Guide to Good Practice](#) for Central Authorities on the implementation of the 2007 Convention)?

[Please insert text here](#)

If no, does your State have concerns regarding implementing the 2007 Convention?

- No
 Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

13. iSupport*

13.1. Has your State implemented iSupport, or is it in the process of implementing iSupport?

- Yes
 No

If no, please respond as appropriate:

[OCSE is in the process of developing an interface for iSupport.](#)

13.1.1. For Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention: Does your State intend to implement iSupport?

- Yes

If yes, when?

[The timing of U.S. implementation is dependent upon a number of factors, including development of our iSupport interface for states, testing with other iSupport countries, and the completion of our security review of iSupport.](#)

If yes, please identify any assistance required:

[Please insert text here](#)

No, please explain:
[Please insert text here](#)

13.1.2. For Contracting Parties to the New York 1956 Convention which are not yet Parties to the 2007 Convention: Does your State intend to implement iSupport as it supports the New York 1956 Convention?

Yes
If yes, when?
[Please insert text here](#)

If yes, please identify any assistance required:
[Please insert text here](#)

No, please explain:
[Please insert text here](#)

13.1.3. For non-Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention which are Parties to bilateral agreements: Does your State intend to implement iSupport as it supports bilateral agreements?

Yes
If yes, when?
[Please insert text here](#)

If yes, please identify any assistance required:
[Please insert text here](#)

No, please explain:
[Please insert text here](#)

14. General

14.1. Are there any other issues or topics not covered in this Questionnaire that you would like to see the Special Commission address?

No
 Yes, please specify:

[To ensure the Convention is implemented as intended, it is essential that any country seeking to join the Convention must have in effect laws and procedures that provide for the compulsory establishment of parentage, when necessary, upon application for establishment of an order for support for a child born out-of-wedlock. Laws that only provide for establishment of parentage upon voluntary acknowledgment do not satisfy Convention requirements. Additionally, if a country categorically requires that an applicant establish parentage in the country where she resides prior to sending an Article 10 application to establish a support order, it is not complying with the Convention. Article 10 is clear that one of the applications available to a creditor in the requesting State is establishment of a decision in the requested State where there is no existing decision, including where necessary the establishment of parentage. While the U.S. believes that the Convention is clearly drafted and should not be susceptible to variable interpretation, it is essential that Contracting States adhere to this Convention requirement.](#)

[We also recommend that the Special Commission discuss how best to encourage States to accept abstracts in lieu of the complete text of an order. Acceptance of an abstract would greatly reduce the costs of translation.](#)

14.2. Are there any areas where research and/or a Preliminary Document would be helpful?

No
 Yes, please specify:

[We recommend that the Permanent Bureau write a Preliminary Document on the current status of international payments and the work of the Experts Group. Transferring international child support payments remains the most challenging operational issue in international child support.](#)

14.3. If your State is interested in attending a possible meeting of the Special Commission, would it be interested in attending, prior to the meeting, a half-day information session for new States Parties, States interested in becoming Party to the 2000 Convention or States that have not yet attended a meeting of a Special Commission to review the practical operation of a Convention?

- Yes
- No