

<b>Title</b>	<b>Access / contact under the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and 1996 Child Protection Convention</b>
<b>Document</b>	<b>Prel. Doc. No 15 of August 2023</b>
<b>Author</b>	PB
<b>Agenda Item</b>	TBD
<b>Mandate(s)</b>	<u>C&amp;R Nos 18 and 19 of the 2017 SC</u>
<b>Objective</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Identify existing variations and discrepancies between access / contact under the 1980 Convention and under the 1996 Convention;</li> <li>- Assess to what extent they could be addressed and clarified with existing HCCH tools</li> </ul>
<b>Action to be Taken</b>	For Decision <input type="checkbox"/> For Approval <input type="checkbox"/> For Discussion <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> For Action / Completion <input type="checkbox"/> For Information <input type="checkbox"/>
<b>Annexes</b>	N/A
<b>Related Documents</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <u>Prel. Doc. No 6 A of June 2023</u> – Compilation of responses received to the October 2022 Questionnaire on the Practical Operation of the 1996 Child Protection Convention (responses from Contracting Parties (HCCH Members and non-Members))</li> <li>- <u>Prel. Doc. No 7 of June 2023</u> – Compilation of responses received to the January 2023 Questionnaire on the 1980 Child Abduction Convention</li> </ul>

## **Table of Contents**

I.	Introduction .....	1
II.	Existing variations and discrepancies in the application of provisions on access – 1980 and 1996 Conventions compared .....	5
III.	Existing and possible future tools .....	7
Annex I	Services provided by Central Authorities In the case of access / contact applications under Article 21 of the 1980 Convention .....	10
Annex II	Services provided by Central Authorities in the case of request to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access under the 1996 Convention .....	11
Annex III	Services provided by Central Authorities in the case of access / contact applications (1980 Convention) and requests to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access (1996 Convention) .....	12
Annex IV	Percentage of respondents where the Central Authority is the same for both Conventions (respondents offering the same services under the 1980 and 1996 Conventions).....	13

# Access / contact under the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and 1996 Convention Child Protection Convention

## I. Introduction

- 1 This Preliminary Document (Prel. Doc.) stems from Conclusion and Recommendation (C&R) No 19 of the Seventh Meeting of the Special Commission (SC) on the Practical Operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and the 1996 Child Protection Convention (10-17 October 2017) which reads as follows:

“The Special Commission notes significant variations among Contracting States as to their interpretation of the scope of Article 21, as well as on the relationship between access / contact under the 1980 Convention and under the 1996 Convention. In the interests of securing protection for access / contact rights under both Conventions, the Special Commission invites the Permanent Bureau to: i) identify existing variations and discrepancies; ii) assess to what extent they could be addressed and clarified with existing HCCH tools; and, iii) in due course report to the Council on General Affairs and Policy, for a decision on the kind of work, if any, that should be developed in advance of the next Special Commission.”<sup>1</sup>

- 2 Both the *Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction* (1980 Child Abduction Convention or 1980 Convention) and the *Convention of 19 October 1996 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children* (1996 Child Protection Convention or 1996 Convention) include provisions on access / contact.
- 3 The 1980 Convention provides in particular:

“The objects of the present Convention are [...] to ensure that rights of custody and of access under the law of one Contracting State are effectively respected in the other Contracting States.”<sup>2</sup>

“Central Authorities shall co-operate with each other and promote co-operation amongst the competent authorities in their respective States to secure the prompt return of children and to achieve the other objects of this Convention. In particular, either directly or through any intermediary, they shall take all appropriate measures [...] to initiate or facilitate the institution of judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to obtaining the return of the child and, in a proper case, to make arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access”<sup>3</sup>

“An application to make arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access may be presented to the Central Authorities of the Contracting States in the same way as an application for the return of a child.

The Central Authorities are bound by the obligations of co-operation which are set forth in Article 7 to promote the peaceful enjoyment of access rights and the fulfilment of any conditions to which the exercise of those rights may be subject. The

---

<sup>1</sup> [Conclusions and Recommendations adopted by the Special Commission](#), Seventh Meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and 1996 Child Protection Convention (10-17 October 2017), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) under “Child Abduction Section” then “Special Commission meetings” and “Seventh Special Commission meeting (October 2017)”.

<sup>2</sup> Art. 1(b).

<sup>3</sup> Art. 7(b).

Central Authorities shall take steps to remove, as far as possible, all obstacles to the exercise of such rights.

The Central Authorities, either directly or through intermediaries, may initiate or assist in the institution of proceedings with a view to organising or protecting these rights and securing respect for the conditions to which the exercise of these rights may be subject.”<sup>4</sup>

4 On access, the 1996 Convention provides in particular:

“The objects of the present Convention are [...] to establish such co-operation between the authorities of the Contracting States as may be necessary in order to achieve the purposes of this Convention.”<sup>5</sup>

“The measures referred to in Article 1 may deal in particular with [...] rights of custody, including rights relating to the care of the person of the child and, in particular, the right to determine the child's place of residence, as well as rights of access including the right to take a child for a limited period of time to a place other than the child's habitual residence.”<sup>6</sup>

“(1) The competent authorities of a Contracting State may request the authorities of another Contracting State to assist in the implementation of measures of protection taken under this Convention, especially in securing the effective exercise of rights of access as well as of the right to maintain direct contacts on a regular basis.

(2) The authorities of a Contracting State in which the child does not habitually reside may, on the request of a parent residing in that State who is seeking to obtain or to maintain access to the child, gather information or evidence and may make a finding on the suitability of that parent to exercise access and on the conditions under which access is to be exercised. An authority exercising jurisdiction under Articles 5 to 10 to determine an application concerning access to the child, shall admit and consider such information, evidence and finding before reaching its decision.

(3) An authority having jurisdiction under Articles 5 to 10 to decide on access may adjourn a proceeding pending the outcome of a request made under paragraph 2, in particular, when it is considering an application to restrict or terminate access rights granted in the State of the child's former habitual residence.

(4) Nothing in this Article shall prevent an authority having jurisdiction under Articles 5 to 10 from taking provisional measures pending the outcome of the request made under paragraph 2.”<sup>7</sup>

5 The 1996 Convention adds coordination provisions:

“This Convention shall not affect the application of the *Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction*, as between Parties to both Conventions. Nothing, however, precludes provisions of this Convention from being invoked for the purposes of obtaining the return of a child who has been wrongfully removed or retained or of organising access rights.”<sup>8</sup>

---

4 Art. 21.  
5 Art. 1(1)(e).  
6 Art. 3(b).  
7 Art. 35.  
8 Art. 50.



6 Previous SC meetings also concluded:

“The Special Commission reaffirms the priority it attaches to ongoing work to improve transfrontier protection of rights of access / contact. It recognises the interest in this matter among many States, including those that are not Parties to the Convention of 1980 and the important role in this regard that can be played by the Convention of 1996.”<sup>9</sup>

“Central Authorities designated under the 1980 and / or 1996 Conventions are encouraged to take a pro-active and hands-on approach in carrying out their respective functions in international access / contact cases.”<sup>10</sup>

“The Special Commission reaffirms the principles set out in the General Principles and Guide to Good Practice on Transfrontier Contact Concerning Children and strongly encourages Contracting States to the 1980 and 1996 Conventions to review their practice in international access cases in light of these principles, where necessary.”<sup>11</sup>

“The Special Commission agrees that an application to make arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact under Article 21 can be presented to Central Authorities, independently of being linked or not, to an international child abduction situation.”<sup>12</sup>

7 The aforementioned Guide to Good Practice on Transfrontier Contact (GGP Contact) notes in its section 4.3, “Specific functions of Central Authorities in the context of transfrontier contact under the 1980 and 1996 Conventions”:

“In the context of transfrontier contact the Central Authority should, as far as possible, act as a focal point for the exchange of information between States about the laws and procedures applicable and the services available in the context of specific cases.

The Central Authority should also act as the centre for channelling information about the progress of specific cases.

The Central Authority should be the central point of access for the provision of certain services to help give effect to contact rights by taking appropriate measures:

- to assist in locating a child;
- to prevent further harm to a child through provisional measures;
- to bring about an amicable resolution of issues;
- to exchange information about the background of the child;
- to eliminate obstacles to the functioning of the Convention.

---

<sup>9</sup> C&R No 1.7.1, [Conclusions and Recommendations adopted by the Special Commission](#), Fifth Meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and 1996 Child Protection Convention (30 October – 9 November 2006), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) under “Child Abduction Section” then “Special Commission meetings” and “Fifth Special Commission meeting (November 2006)”.

<sup>10</sup> C&R No 18, [Conclusions and Recommendations adopted by the Special Commission](#), Sixth Meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and 1996 Child Protection Convention (1-10 June 2011), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) under “Child Abduction Section” then “Special Commission meetings” and “Sixth Special Commission meeting (Part I, June 2011; Part II, January 2012)”.

<sup>11</sup> C&R No 19, *ibid.*

<sup>12</sup> C&R No 18, [Conclusions and Recommendations adopted by the Special Commission](#), Seventh Meeting of the Special Commission on the practical operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and 1996 Child Protection Convention (10-17 October 2017), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) (see path indicated in note 1).

The Central Authority should respond to requests from other Central Authorities or competent authorities for assistance in implementing access rights or decisions in respect of access rights.

The Central Authority may also be requested to provide a report in respect of a child who is the subject of a contact dispute.”<sup>13</sup>

- 8 The GGP Contact further notes in Section 4.6, “Scope of contact cases in which Central Authorities should offer services”:

“The Central Authority should make its services available in all circumstances where cross-frontier contact rights of parents and their children are in issue. This includes cases where a foreign parent seeks to establish a contact order, as well as cases in which the application is to give effect to an existing contact order made abroad.

In the context of abduction or alleged abduction, this includes cases where an interim order for contact is sought by an applicant pending a decision on the return of the child, as well as cases in which contact arrangements are sought (for example, by the abducting parent) in the country to which the child has been returned or, where return is refused, in the country to which the child has been taken.”<sup>14</sup>

- 9 Finally, the Practical Handbook on the Operation of the 1996 Hague Child Protection Convention provides relatively brief information on Central Authority cooperation in international access / contact cases.<sup>15</sup> However, several references are made to the GGP Contact, which was adopted earlier.

## II. Existing variations and discrepancies in the application of provisions on access – 1980 and 1996 Conventions compared

- 10 As per the mandate of C&R No 19 of the 2017 SC meeting, the following analysis is based on the responses received to the two questionnaires circulated in advance of the Eighth Meeting of the SC: Prel. Doc. No 2 of October 2022 - Questionnaire on the Practical Operation of the 1996 Child Protection Convention (1996 Questionnaire) and Prel. Doc. No 4 of January 2023 - Questionnaire on the Practical Operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention (1980 Questionnaire). Thirty-three jurisdictions<sup>16</sup> responded to the 1996 Questionnaire and 48 jurisdictions<sup>17</sup> responded to the 1980 Questionnaire. These responses cover a sizeable proportion of both Conventions’ reach: the 1980 Convention has 103 Contracting States and the 1996 Convention 54 Contracting States. In addition, it is important to note that all Contracting States to the 1996 Convention are also Contracting States to the 1980 Convention. Compilations of answers to these two questionnaires

---

<sup>13</sup> [Transfrontier Contact Concerning Children – General Principles and Guide to Good Practice](#), 4.3.1 et seq. It is important to note that the GGP Contact equally applies to both the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and the 1996 Child Protection Convention, available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) under “Child Abduction Section” then “HCCH Publications”.

<sup>14</sup> *Ibid*, 4.6.1 et seq.

<sup>15</sup> [Practical Handbook on the Operation of the 1996 Hague Child Protection Convention](#), p. 126, available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) under “Child Protection Section” then “HCCH Publications”.

<sup>16</sup> Thirty States including four responses from the United Kingdom (England and Wales judiciary, Northern Ireland, Scotland and Wales) – England and Wales judiciary and Wales are counted as one respondent as they did not reply to the same questions for the purpose of this document.

<sup>17</sup> Forty-five States including two Special Administrative Regions of China and three jurisdictions of the United Kingdom (England and Wales, Northern Ireland and Scotland).

can be found in Prel. Doc. No 7 of June 2023<sup>18</sup> (1980 Convention) and Prel. Doc No 6A of June 2023<sup>19</sup> (1996 Convention).

- 11 In respect of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention, it can be noted that as many respondents to the 1980 Questionnaire declare having encountered any problems as regards cooperation with other States in making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact as those that declare not having encountered any problems (Question 29, 1980 Questionnaire). Several respondents point out the lack of uniformity in relation to how States interpret their obligations under Article 21 of the 1980 Convention. For instance, several States indicate that an applicant may have to apply directly to a competent authority, without the assistance of a Central Authority, when they are trying to have access rights enforced abroad. It is also reported that some States continue to refuse to process applications for access under Article 21 of the Convention if there has been no wrongful removal. However, only a minority (27% – 12 States and one jurisdiction of the United Kingdom) of respondents to Question 30 of the 1980 Questionnaire report having experienced challenges in making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact under Article 21 when the application was not linked to an international child abduction situation. Several respondents remark that the challenges related to Article 21 arose whether the application was linked to an international child abduction situation or not.
- 12 As regards coordination between the 1980 and 1996 Conventions, few respondents (17% – eight States) to Question 32 of the 1980 Questionnaire report being aware of any use being made of provisions of the 1996 Convention, including those under Chapter V, in lieu of or in connection with an application under Article 21 of the 1980 Convention.
- 13 For the 1996 Child Protection Convention, a larger minority (27% – eight States and one jurisdiction of the United Kingdom) of respondents to Question 46 of the 1996 Questionnaire report being aware of any use being made of provisions of the 1996 Convention, including those under Chapter V, in lieu of or in connection with an application under Article 21 of the 1980 Convention. One respondent remarks that Article 21 provides a framework that is more conducive to the implementation of effective cooperation, as its provisions are mandatory for Central Authorities, unlike those of the 1996 Convention, which are often optional.
- 14 Quite differently to the 1980 Convention, few respondents (15% – five States) to Question 28 of the 1996 Questionnaire report experiencing any challenges in applying Article 35 of the 1996 Convention.
- 15 The tables in the Annexes compare the services provided under both Conventions in terms of coverage. Generally, more respondents offer a given type of service under the 1980 Convention than under the 1996 Convention, although there are a few exceptions (Annexes I and II). Also, the most frequently offered services under the 1980 Convention are generally the most offered services under the 1996 Convention, albeit in a smaller proportion for the latter.
- 16 The table in Annex III uses a smaller sample of 26 respondents, which responded to both the 1996 Questionnaire and the 1980 Questionnaire. It provides an overview of the proportion of respondents offering the same services under both Conventions. The proportion is relatively high for four types of services and lower for five. This is generally in line with the proportions reflected in the tables in Annexes I and II.

---

<sup>18</sup> [Prel. Doc. No 7 of June 2023](#) - Compilation of responses received to the January 2023 Questionnaire on the 1980 Child Abduction Convention, available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) under “Child Abduction Section” then “Special Commission meetings” and “Eighth Special Commission meeting (October 2023)”.

<sup>19</sup> [Prel. Doc. No 6A of June 2023](#) - Compilation of responses received to the October 2022 Questionnaire on the Practical Operation of the 1996 Child Protection Convention (responses from Contracting Parties (HCCH Members and non-Members)), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) (see path indicated in note 18).



- 17 The table in Annex IV only includes respondents which indicated offering a given service under both Conventions and, among those respondents, considers the proportion of respondents where the Central Authority is the same for both Conventions. This proportion is very high for all types of services.

### III. Existing and possible future tools

- 18 The analysis above shows that the level of service offered by Central Authorities under the 1996 Child Protection Convention is generally lower than under the 1980 Child Abduction Convention. Even services that are provided for under Article 7 of the 1980 Convention are not universally provided. This is in contrast to the willingness of past Meetings of the SC to attach priority to ongoing work to improve transfrontier protection of rights of access / contact and to encourage a pro-active and hands-on approach in carrying out the functions of Central Authorities in international access / contact cases.
- 19 The analysis highlights the benefits of organisational measures such as having the same Central Authority for both Conventions. As noted by the 2011 meeting of the SC, the GGP Contact is also of continued relevance as it applies equally to both the 1980 and 1996 Conventions. Tools under development may also help to promote alignment of services under the two Conventions in future. For instance, section 7.5 of the draft Country Profile for the 1996 Convention<sup>20</sup> provides a comprehensive list of services. A similar list could be included in the 1980 Country Profile, which would make comparison of services easier. In this respect it can be noted that electronic Country Profiles for core HCCH Conventions will be developed between 2023 and 2025 with EU funding and Voluntary Contributions. Finally, the adoption of a Request for Access Recommended Model Form under the 1980 Convention<sup>21</sup> and a Cooperation Request Recommended Model Form under the 1996 Convention<sup>22</sup> could also be of assistance by raising awareness on the different services that may be requested.

### IV. Proposal from the Permanent Bureau

- 20 The Permanent Bureau invites the SC to consider adopting the following Conclusions and Recommendations:
- a) The SC reiterates that an application to make arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact under Article 21 can be presented to Central Authorities, independently of being linked or not, to an international child abduction situation.
  - b) The SC notes the complementary nature of Article 35 of the 1996 Child Protection Convention in relation to access requests made under the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and encourages Contracting States, where possible, to make use of the provisions of Article 35 for the purposes of the 1980 Convention.
  - c) The SC notes with appreciation that a majority of Central Authorities, from Contracting States which have responded to the 1980 and 1996 Questionnaires, provide or facilitate the provision of legal aid, where the circumstances so require, and provide advice to an

---

<sup>20</sup> “Draft Country Profile for the 1996 Child Protection Convention”, Prel. Doc. No 9 of July 2023 drawn up for the attention of the Eighth Meeting of the SC on the Practical Operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention and the 1996 Child Protection Convention, available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) (see path indicated in note 18).

<sup>21</sup> “Revised Request for Return Recommend Model Form and new Request for Access Recommended Model Form under the HCCH 1980 Child Abduction Convention & Explanatory Note”, Prel. Doc. No 10 of July 2023), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) (see path indicated in note 18).

<sup>22</sup> “Draft Cooperation Request Recommended Model Form under the HCCH 1996 Child Protection Convention & Explanatory Note”, Prel. Doc. No 11 of July 2023, available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) (see path indicated in note 18).

applicant from abroad, under both Conventions. The SC recalls the principles developed in the GGP Contact: “In the case of an applicant from abroad, effective access to procedures implies: i) the availability of appropriate advice and information which takes account of the special difficulties arising from unfamiliarity with language or legal systems; ii) the provision of appropriate assistance in instituting proceedings; iii) that lack of adequate means should not be a barrier; and iv) that there is an opportunity to raise issues of contact at all relevant times.”<sup>23</sup> The SC encourages other Contracting States to do the same.

- d) The SC recommends that the list of services for access in the draft Country Profile for the 1996 Convention be replicated in the Country Profile for the 1980 Convention.

---

<sup>23</sup> [Transfrontier Contact Concerning Children – General Principles and Guide to Good Practice, 5.1.2](#), available on the HCCH website at [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) (see path indicated in note 13).

## **ANNEXES**

## Annex I Services provided by Central Authorities in the case of access / contact applications under Article 21 of the 1980 Convention<sup>1</sup>

Request of assistance to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access in another Contracting Party (as requesting State) % of respondents providing		A request of assistance to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access in your State (as requested State) % of respondents providing	
Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the 1980 Convention	96%	Providing information on the operation of the 1980 Convention and / or the relevant laws and procedures in your State	92%
Assistance in obtaining information on the relevant laws and procedures in the requested State	79%	-	
Establishment of contact with the Central Authority and / or the competent authorities in the requested State to find out the kind of assistance such authorities could provide	96%	-	
Transmission of the request to the Central Authority or to the competent authorities in the requested State	94%	-	
Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	38%	Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	77%
Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	48%	Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	79%
Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	23%	Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	48%
Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	33%	Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	50%
Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	88%	Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	77%

<sup>1</sup> Annex I provides a summary at a glance of the responses received to Question 31 of the 1980 Questionnaire. See Prel. Doc. No 7 of June 2023 – Compilation of responses received to the January 2023 Questionnaire on the 1980 Child Abduction Convention, at pp. 213-219 for detailed lists of States' responses (including responses from specific jurisdictions) concerning the above specified services.

## Annex II Services provided by Central Authorities in the case of a request to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access under the 1996 Convention<sup>1</sup>

Assistance to individuals habitually resident in your State % of respondents providing		Request of assistance from another Central Authority on behalf of an individual residing abroad % of respondents providing	
None	3%	None	3%
Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the 1996 Convention	70%	Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the 1996 Convention	73%
Assistance in obtaining information on the relevant laws and procedures in the requested State	67%	Assistance in obtaining information on the relevant laws and procedures in the requested State	55%
Establishment of contact with the Central Authority and / or the competent authorities in the requested State to find out the kind of assistance such authorities could provide	76%	Establishment of contact with the Central Authority and / or the competent authorities in the requested State to find out the kind of assistance such authorities could provide	30%
Transmission of the request to the Central Authority or to the competent authorities in the requested State	70%	Transmission of the request to the Central Authority or to the competent authorities in the requested State	24%
Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	30%	Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	42%
Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	36%	Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	55%
Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	33%	Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	30%
Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	39%	Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	45%
Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	58%	Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	55%

<sup>1</sup> Annex II provides a summary at a glance of the responses received to Questions 19, 20(a) and 21(a) of the 1996 Questionnaire (2022) and Questions 28(a) and 29(a) of the 1996 Questionnaire (2016). See, respectively, Prel. Doc. No 6 A of June 2023 – Compilation of responses received to the October 2022 Questionnaire on the Practical Operation of the 1996 Child Protection Convention (responses from Contracting Parties (HCCH Members and non-Members)), at pp. 81-83 and 92-94 and [individual States' responses Prel. Doc. No 1 of December 2016](#) for detailed lists of States' responses (including responses from specific jurisdictions) concerning the above specified services.

**Annex III Services provided by Central Authorities in the case of access / contact applications (1980 Convention) and requests to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access (1996 Convention) – respondents providing services under both Conventions**

Assistance provided as requesting State % of respondents providing services under both Conventions		Assistance provided as requested State % of respondents providing services under both Conventions	
Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the Conventions	73%	Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the Conventions	69%
Assistance in obtaining information on the relevant laws and procedures in the requested State	69%	-	
Establishment of contact with the Central Authority and / or the competent authorities in the requested State to find out the kind of assistance such authorities could provide	77%	-	
Transmission of the request to the Central Authority or to the competent authorities in the requested State	69%	-	
Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	27%	Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	35%
Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	19%	Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	42%
Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	15%	Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	23%
Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	15%	Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	35%
Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	46%	Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	46%

### Annex IV Percentage of respondents where the Central Authority is the same for both Conventions (out of respondents offering the same services under the 1980 and 1996 Conventions)

Assistance provided as requesting State % of respondents providing services under both Conventions		Assistance provided as requested State % of respondents providing services under both Conventions	
Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the Conventions	89%	Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the Conventions	89%
Assistance in obtaining information on the relevant laws and procedures in the requested State	89%	-	
Establishment of contact with the Central Authority and / or the competent authorities in the requested State to find out the kind of assistance such authorities could provide	89%	-	
Transmission of the request to the Central Authority or to the competent authorities in the requested State	95%	-	
Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	100%	Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access	90%
Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	100%	Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice	91%
Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	100%	Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State	100%
Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	100%	Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance	100%
Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	100%	Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application	92%