

**QUESTIONNAIRE CONCERNING THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF
THE 1980 CONVENTION**

Wherever your replies to this Questionnaire make reference to domestic legislation, rules, guidance or case law relating to the practical operation of the 1980 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	El Salvador, C.A.
<i>For follow-up purposes</i>	
Name of contact person:	Emilia Guadalupe Portal Solís
Name of Authority / Office:	Procuraduría General de la República
Telephone number:	(503) 2231-9446
E-mail address:	emilia.portal@pgr.gob.sv

PART I: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS²

1. Recent developments in your State

1.1 Since the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission, have there been any significant developments in your State regarding the legislation or procedural rules applicable in cases of international child abduction. Where possible, please state the reason for the development in the legislation / rules, and, where possible, the results achieved in practice (e.g., reducing the time required to decide cases).

No

Yes, please specify:

Significant advances include:

A) The Law on Comprehensive Protection of Children and Adolescents.

B) Short judicial process.

C) Easy access to information through the website of the Attorney General's Office

[www@pgr.gob.sv]

D) Preparation of instructions for the application of the Convention.

E) Concentration of the judicial proceedings in the hands of Judges Specialized in Childhood and Adolescence

F) Inclusion of training on the application of the Convention in the Annual Plan of the Attorney General's Office.

G) Personnel specialized in childhood and adolescence.

H) Acquisition of a videoconference system.

I) National network that facilitates communication between the different Auxiliary Attorney Offices in order to know the status of the cases being processed.

J) Registration of precise statistics of cases related to the Convention.

1.2 Please provide a brief summary of any significant decisions concerning the interpretation and application of the 1980 Convention rendered since the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission by the relevant authorities³ in your State including in the context of the 20 November 1989 United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and relevant regional instruments.

Resolutions are framed within the agreements reached through conciliation.

1.3 Please provide a brief summary of any other significant developments in your State since the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission relating to international child abduction.

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

² This Part of the Questionnaire is intended to deal primarily with the developments in law and practice relating to international child abduction and international child protection which have occurred in your State since the Sixth Meeting of the Special Commission to review the operation of the *Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction* and the *Hague 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* (1-10 June 2011 and 25-31 January 2012) (hereinafter "the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission"). However, if there are important matters which you consider should be raised from *prior* to the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission, please provide such information here.

³ The term "relevant authorities" is used in this Questionnaire to refer to the judicial or administrative authorities with decision-making responsibility under the 1980 Convention. Whilst in the majority of States Parties such "authorities" will be courts (*i.e.*, judicial), in some States Parties administrative authorities remain responsible for decision-making in Convention cases.

The Central Authority of El Salvador, through the use of the Guide to Good Practice, has made the following significant changes:

- A) Free legal assistance is provided in both the administrative and judicial levels.
- (B) Within the framework of the Convention, a multidisciplinary team is available for the immediate handling of the cases.
- C) Use of teleconferences with the Central Authority of the United States of America.
- D) Video Conferences with Consuls of our country accredited in the United States of America.
- E) Receipt and submission of an application by email for review, as an act prior to initiating the respective process.
- F) Technical-legal advice to embassy personnel accredited in the country, on the application of the Convention.
- G) Dissemination in the media of the Convention by the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic.
- (H) Conducting workshops and training for the implementation of the Convention.

2. Issues of compliance

2.1 Are there any States Parties to the 1980 Convention with whom you are having particular challenges in achieving successful co-operation? Please specify the challenges you have encountered and, in particular, whether the problems appear to be systemic.

- No
 Yes, please specify:
[Please insert text here](#)

2.2 Are you aware of situations / circumstances in which there has been avoidance / evasion of the 1980 Convention?

- No
 Yes, please specify:
[Please insert text here](#)

PART II: THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE 1980 CONVENTION

3. The role and functions of Central Authorities designated under the 1980 Convention⁴

In general

3.1 Have any challenges arisen in practice in achieving effective communication or co-operation with other Central Authorities?

- No
 Yes, please specify:
[Please insert text here](#)

3.2 Have any of the duties of Central Authorities, as set out in **Article 7** of the 1980 Convention, raised any particular problems in practice either in your State, or in States Parties with whom you have co-operated?

- No
 Yes, please specify:
[Please insert text here](#)

3.3 Has your Central Authority encountered any challenges with the application of any of the 1980 Convention provisions? If so, please specify.

- No
 Yes, please specify:
[Please insert text here](#)

Legal aid and representation

3.4 Do the measures your Central Authority takes to provide or facilitate the provision of legal aid, legal advice and representation in return proceedings under the 1980 Convention (**Art. 7(2)-(g)**) result in delays in proceedings either in your own State, or, where cases originate in your State, in any of the requested States you have dealt with?

- No

⁴ See also Section 5 below on "Ensuring the safe return of children" which involves the role and functions of Central Authorities.

Yes, please specify:

The Central Authority of our country provides free legal assistance, so there is no delay for the assignment of a lawyer, who is able to act immediately. However, when the assistance of the requested countries is not gratuitous or is costly, this does cause a delay since it is necessary to select a lawyer whose fees are relatively low.

3.5 Are you aware of any other challenges in your State, or, where cases originate in your State, in any of the requested States you have dealt with, regarding the obtaining of legal aid, advice and / or representation for either left-behind parents or taking parents?⁵

No

Yes, please specify:

The fact that in other States legal assistance is not free causes difficulties because in most cases our users have scarce economic resources. They cannot therefore afford to pay for the attorney fees, running the risk to abandon the case.

Locating the child

3.6 Has your Central Authority encountered any challenges with locating children in cases involving the 1980 Convention, either as a requesting or requested State?

No

Yes, please specify the challenges encountered and what steps were taken or are considered to be taken to overcome these challenges:

[Please insert text here](#)

3.7 Has your Central Authority worked with any external agencies to discover the whereabouts of a child wrongfully removed to or retained within your State (e.g., the police, Interpol, private location services)?

No

Yes, please share any good practice on this matter:

Other States have collaborated with our Central Authority through INTERPOL to locate illicitly abducted children.

Information exchange, training and networking of Central Authorities

3.8 Has your Central Authority shared its expertise with another Central Authority or benefited from another Central Authority sharing its expertise with your Central Authority, in accordance with the Guide to Good Practice – Part I on Central Authority Practice?⁶

No

Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

3.9 Has your Central Authority organised or participated in any other networking initiatives between Central Authorities such as regional meetings via conference call or videoconference?

No

Yes, please specify:

Our Central Authority has effective communication and coordination with the Central Authority of the United States of America, through Teleconference.

Statistics⁷

⁵ See paras 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 of the "Conclusions and Recommendations of the Fifth Meeting of the Special Commission to review the operation of the *Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction* and the practical implementation of the *Hague 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* (30 October – 9 November 2006) (hereinafter referred to as the "[Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2006 Special Commission](#)") and paragraphs 32 to 34 of the [Conclusions and Recommendations of the Special Commission to review the operation of the Hague Convention of 19 October 1980 on Jurisdiction, Applicable law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children \(1-10 June 2011 and 25-31 January 2012\)](#) (hereinafter the "C&R of the 2011/2012 Special Commission") (available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Special Commission meetings").

⁶ Available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Guides to Good Practice". See, in particular, Chapter 6.5 on twinning arrangements.

⁷ See paras 1.1.16 to 1.1.21 of the Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2006 Special Commission (*supra*. note 5).

3.10 If your Central Authority does not submit statistics through the web-based INCASTAT database, please explain why.

[Our Central Authority sends data through INCASTAT](#)

Prompt handling of cases

3.11 Does your Central Authority have mechanisms in place to ensure the prompt handling of cases?

No

Yes, please specify:

[There are no specific mechanisms for lack of budget; however, all actions are carried out in order to expedite proceedings.](#)

3.12 If your Central Authority is experiencing delays in handling cases please specify the main reasons for these delays:

[Please insert text here](#)

4. **Court proceedings & promptness**

4.1 Has your State limited the number of judicial or administrative authorities who can hear return applications under the 1980 Convention (*i.e.*, concentration of jurisdiction)?⁸

Yes

No, please indicate if such arrangements are being contemplated:

[In El Salvador, the competence to hear minor abduction cases belongs to the Judges of childhood and adolescence, within the framework of the Short Process.](#)

4.2 Does your State have mechanisms in place to handle return decisions within six weeks (*e.g.*, production of summary evidence, limitation of appeals, swift enforcement)?

No

Yes, please explain:

[The short process lasts for twenty working days \(three weeks or so\). Therefore, once the return case is opened, according to the legal framework, the process should take no more than three weeks. According to the observed practice, the maximum time of proceedings has been around six weeks \(although it must be reiterated that the procedural mechanism forces it to be resolved in three weeks or twenty working days\).](#)

4.3 If your response to the previous question is No, does your State contemplate implementing mechanisms to meet the requirement of prompt return under the 1980 Convention (*e.g.*, procedures, bench-books, guidelines, protocols)?

No, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

4.4 If your State is experiencing delays in handling return decisions please specify the main reasons for these delays:

[Please insert text here](#)

4.5 Do your courts regularly order immediate protective measures when initiating the return procedure, so as to prevent a new removal and minimize the harm to the child (*e.g.*, prohibit removal of the child from the jurisdiction, retain documentation, grant provisional access rights to the left-behind parent)?

No, please explain:

[The few cases handled at the judicial level have not involved the need to dictate some type of protection measure, and the reason is that it is an agile, expeditious procedure.](#)

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

4.6 Do your courts make use of direct judicial communications to ensure prompt proceedings?

⁸ See, [The Judges' Newsletter](#) on International Child Protection – [Vol. XX / Summer-Autumn 2013](#) the special focus of which was "Concentration of jurisdiction under the *Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the civil aspects of International Child Abduction* and other international child protection instruments".

- Yes
 No, please explain:

There has been no need to do that. There have only been a few cases , and this resource has not been requested. We reiterate that perhaps the agility of the Short Process has not even made possible its invocation.

4.7 If your State has not designated a sitting judge to the International Hague Network of Judges does your State intend to do so in the near future?

- Yes
 No, please explain:

In the case of El Salvador, there are two named Judges: Lawyer María de Los Angeles Figueroa Meléndez, Principal, and Alex David Marroquín Martínez, Alternate.

4.8 Please comment upon any cases (whether your State was the requesting or requested State), in which the judge (or decision-maker) has, before determining an application for return, communicated with a judge or other authority in the requesting State regarding the issue of the child's safe return. What was the specific purpose of the communication? What was the outcome?

There have been no such cases.

5. **Ensuring the safe return of children**⁹

*Methods for ensuring the safe return of children*¹⁰

5.1 What measures has your Central Authority taken to ensure that the recommendations of the 2006 and 2011 / 2012 Special Commission meetings¹¹ regarding the safe return of children are implemented?

The Central Authority of our State, requests confirmation from the requesting state that the child has returned.

5.2 In particular, in a case where the safety of a child is in issue and where a return order has been made in your State, how does your Central Authority ensure that the appropriate child protection bodies in the *requesting* State are alerted so that they may act to protect the welfare of a child upon return (until the appropriate court in the requesting State has been effectively seised)?

So far, no case similar to the one presented has been brought to our attention. However, if there was to be one, the whole System of Integral Protection of Children and Adolescents would be activated for the protection of the child.

5.3 Where there are concerns in the requested State regarding possible risks for a child following a return, what conditions or requirements can the relevant authority in your State put in place to minimise or eliminate those concerns?

We have had experiences in which the concerns have been devaluated through research that is carried out through Social Work. This investigation includes:

Check if the place of residence of the father or mother is located in the risk area.

If the father or mother, as the case may be, has a family support network for the care of the child or adolescent at the time of his or her return.

Verify the conditions of life that are offered to the child or adolescent upon returning to their country of origin.

Use of the 1996 Convention to ensure a safe return

⁹ See **Art. 7(2) h)** of the 1980 Convention.

¹⁰ Where relevant, please make reference to the use of undertakings, mirror orders and safe harbour orders and other such measures in your State.

¹¹ See the [Conclusions and Recommendations](#) of the Special Commission of 2006 (*supra.* note 5) at paras 1.1.12 and 1.8.1 to 1.8.2 and 1.8.4 to 1.8.5 and the Appendix to the Conclusions and Recommendations and the Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission (*supra.* note 5).at paras 39-43.

5.4 If your State is not Party to the 1996 Convention, is consideration being given to the possible advantages of the 1996 Convention in providing a jurisdictional basis for urgent protective measures associated with return orders (**Arts 7 and 11**), in providing for their recognition by operation of law (**Art. 23**), and in communicating information relevant to the protection of the child (**Art. 34**)?

- No
 Yes, please explain:
 Please insert text here

Protection of primary carer

5.5 Are you aware of cases in your State where a primary carer taking parent, for reasons of personal security (e.g., domestic or family violence, intimidation, harassment, etc.) or others, has refused or has not been in a position to return with the child to the requesting State? How are such cases dealt with in your State? Please explain and provide case examples where possible.

To date there have been no cases where a primary care taker taking parent has refused to return the child even though there is a return order. If this was to happen, the System would be activated in order to order the location of the child.

5.6 In particular, would your authorities consider putting in place measures to protect the primary carer upon return in the requesting State as a mean to secure the safe return of the child? Please explain and provide case examples where possible.

The entire system of Comprehensive Protection of Children and Adolescents would be activated, and each institution would assume responsibility within its competences to respond to the needs that arise in each particular case.

Post-return information

5.7 In cases where measures are put in place in your State to ensure the safety of a child upon return, does your State (through the Central Authority, or otherwise) attempt to monitor the effectiveness of those measures upon the child's return? Would you support a recommendation that States Parties should cooperate to provide each other with follow-up information on such matters, insofar as is possible?

Yes, we are prepared to endorse any recommendations.

5.8 If your State is not Party to the 1996 Convention, is consideration being given to the possible advantages of the 1996 Convention in providing a jurisdictional basis for requesting a report on the situation of the child upon return to the State of habitual residence (**Art. 32-(a)**)?

- No
 Yes, please explain:
 Please insert text here

6. Voluntary agreements and mediation

6.1 How does your Central Authority (either directly or through any intermediary) take, or is it considering taking, appropriate steps under **Article 7-(c)** to secure the voluntary return of the child or to bring about an amicable resolution of the issues? Please explain:

The Central Authority of our country makes use of the conciliation procedure, in order to obtain immediate favorable results and in a strive to guarantee the parties their fundamental rights.

6.2 In what ways have you used the "Guide to Good Practice on Mediation"¹² for the purpose of implementing the 1980 Convention in your State? Please explain:

We have specific procedures and instructions that govern how the conciliation should be done.

¹² Available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Guides to Good Practice".

6.3 Has your State considered or is it in the process of considering the establishment of a Central Contact Point for international family mediation to facilitate access to information on available mediation services and related issues for cross-border family disputes involving children, or has this task been entrusted to the Central Authority?¹³

No, please explain:

Please insert text here

Yes, please explain:

We do not know whether a Central Mediation Contact Point is being considered, since cases related to the Convention are dealt with through the conciliation process.

7. Preventive measures

7.1 Has your State taken steps to advance the development of a travel form under the auspices of the International Civil Aviation Organisation?¹⁴

No

Yes, please describe:

Please insert text here

7.2 Regardless of whether the International Civil Aviation Organisation adds the development of a travel form to its work programme, would your State support the development of a non-mandatory model travel form under the auspices of the Hague Conference?

Yes

No, please explain:

Any initiative that leads to speed in the abduction proceedings and consequently in the return of the child should be adopted as a practice by the State.

8. The Guide to Good Practice under the 1980 Convention

8.1 In what ways have you used the Parts of the Guide to Good Practice¹⁵ to assist in implementing for the first time, or improving the practical operation of, the 1980 Convention in your State?

a. Part I on Central Authority Practice. Please explain:

Our State has used the Guide to Good Practice as a support to expedite the cases that are being carried out, since the Guide has been designed taking into account the experiences of other States.

b. Part II on Implementing Measures. Please explain:

In this respect, it should be noted:

-The existence of the Short Process without the possibility of cassation. This makes the case reach the Chamber of Children and Adolescents, and once the decision is signed, no challenge can be filed in another instance, unlike the case of constitutional processes (Habeas Corpus or Amparo)

-The design of the Short Process is simple, and must last a maximum of 20 business days. The decision must therefore be executed immediately, and there is no need to initiate a forced execution process.

-In addition, there is the possibility, in this logic, to request the intervention of the Police or the Attorney General's Office, when there is a refusal to comply with the order voluntarily.

c. Part III on Preventive Measures. Please explain:

Judges on their part did not need to use a specific mechanism to guarantee the return. The short process, in its structure, is very agile, expeditious and simple and in a period of three weeks provides the possibility of resolving the case.

¹³ As it has been encouraged in the Guide to Good Practice on Mediation, Chapter 4, on "Access to Mediation". par. 114-117. See also Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission (*supra*. note 5) at par. 61.

¹⁴ See the Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission (*supra*. note 5) at par. 92.

¹⁵ All Parts of the Guide to Good Practice under the 1980 Convention are available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Guides to Good Practice".

However, measures of protection are already implemented, among others, the following:

A) The Law on the Integral Protection of Children and Adolescents LEPINA prohibits the illicit transfer and retention of children and adolescents; even though such practice is based on the exercise of personal authority, custody and personal care, the visitation regime or the rules on authorization to leave the country. Consequently, the State will guarantee the eradication of this practice. (Article 43)

B) The effective application of the phases of the Short Process, which helps to decrease the time to get responses.

C) Article 44 of the Law on Comprehensive Protection of Children and Adolescents LEPINA, stipulates the need for authorization of both parents for the child or adolescent to leave the country. In case that such authorization was not given, it can be granted by the court (due to the existence of the conflict).

d. Part IV on Enforcement. Please explain:

The sentence pronounced establishes the period within which the return or delivery of the child must be executed to the person requesting it or responsible for receiving the child. As a general rule the delivery takes place immediately. In addition, the return order clearly states how the return operations should be carried out.

8.2 How have you ensured that the relevant authorities in your State have been made aware of, and have had access to, the Guide to Good Practice?

Please insert text here

8.3 Do you have any other comments about any Part of the Guide to Good Practice?

Please insert text here

9. **Publicity and debate concerning the 1980 Convention**

9.1 Has the 1980 Convention given rise to (a) any publicity (positive or negative) in your State, or (b) any debate or discussion in your national parliament or its equivalent?

No

Yes, please indicate the outcome of this debate or discussion, if any:

Please insert text here

9.2 By what methods does your State disseminate information to the public about the 1980 Convention?

Through the media, whether radio or television.

PART IV: TRANSFRONTIER ACCESS / CONTACT AND INTERNATIONAL FAMILY RELOCATION

10. Transfrontier access / contact¹⁶

10.1 Since the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission, have there been any significant developments in your State regarding Central Authority practices, legislation, procedural rules or case law applicable in cases of transfrontier contact / access?

No

Yes, please explain:

A) The Law on Comprehensive Protection of Children and Adolescents.

B) Short judicial proceedings.

C) Easy access to information through the website of the Attorney General's Office

[www@pgr.gob.sv]

D) Preparation of instructions for the application of the Convention.

E) Concentration of the judicial processes in the hands of the Judges Specialized in Childhood and Adolescence

F) Inclusion of training on the application of the Convention in the Annual Plan of the Attorney General's Office.

G) Personnel specialized in childhood and adolescence.

10.2 Please indicate any important developments in your State, since the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission, in the interpretation of **Article 21** of the 1980 Convention.

The important changes have taken place in the Right of Return of the child and the Law on Visitation, being the following:

A) Free legal assistance is provided in both the administrative and judicial levels.

(B) Within the framework of the Convention, a multidisciplinary team is available to give the cases immediate attention.

C) Use of teleconferences with the Central Authority of the United States of America.

D) Video Conferences with Consuls of our country accredited in the United States of America.

E) Receipt and submission of an application by email for review, as an act prior to initiating the respective proceeding.

F) Technical-legal advice to embassy personnel accredited in the country, on the application of the Convention.

G) Dissemination in the media of the Convention by the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic.

(H) Conducting workshops and training for the implementation of the Convention.

10.3 What problems have you experienced, if any, as regards co-operation with other States in respect of:

a. the granting or maintaining of access rights;

Please insert text here

b. the effective exercise of rights of access; and

Please insert text here

c. the restriction or termination of access rights.

?

Please provide case examples where possible.

There have been no problems, because of the maintenance of effective communication between the Central Authorities.

¹⁶ See the [Conclusions and Recommendations](#) of the 2006 Special Commission (*supra.* note 5) at paras 1.7.1 to 1.7.3.

10.4 In what ways have you used the “General Principles and Guide to Good Practice on Transfrontier Contact Concerning Children”¹⁷ to assist in transfrontier contact / access cases in your State? Can you suggest any further principles of good practice?

This situation has not materialized to date. However, in the event that this was to happen, conciliation would be applied as a way of solving the situation in a friendly way, in order to guarantee the rights of the child or adolescent.

11. International family relocation¹⁸

11.1 Since the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission, have there been any significant developments in your State regarding the legislation, procedural rules or case law applicable to international family relocation? Where possible, please explain these developments in the legislation, procedural rules or case law:

Please insert text here

PART V: NON-CONVENTION CASES AND NON-CONVENTION STATES

12. Non-Convention cases and non-Convention States

12.1 Are there any States that you would particularly like to see become a State Party to the 1980 Convention? If so, what steps would you suggest could be taken to promote the Convention and encourage ratification of, or accession to, the Convention in those States? Please explain:

Please insert text here

12.2 Are there any States which are not Parties to the 1980 Convention or not Members of the Hague Conference that you would like to see invited to the Special Commission meeting in 2017?

Please insert text here

*The “Malta Process”*¹⁹

12.2 In relation to the “Malta Process”:

a. Do you have any comment to make on the “Principles for the Establishment of Mediation Structures in the context of the Malta Process” and the accompanying Explanatory Memorandum?²⁰

Please insert text here

b. Have any steps been taken towards the implementation of the Malta Principles in your State and the designation of a Central Contact Point, in order to better address cross-border family disputes over children involving States that are not a Party to the 1980 and 1996 Conventions?

No

¹⁷ Available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under “Child Abduction Section” then “Guides to Good Practice”.

¹⁸ See the Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2006 Special Commission meeting at paras 1.7.4 to 1.7.5:

“1.7.4 The Special Commission concludes that parents, before they move with their children from one country to another, should be encouraged not to take unilateral action by unlawfully removing a child but to make appropriate arrangements for access and contact preferably by agreement, particularly where one parent intends to remain behind after the move.

1.7.5 The Special Commission encourages all attempts to seek to resolve differences among the legal systems so as to arrive as far as possible at a common approach and common standards as regards relocation.”

¹⁹ The “Malta Process” is a dialogue between certain States Parties to the 1980 and 1996 Conventions and certain States which are not Parties to either Convention, with a view to securing better protection for cross-border rights of contact of parents and their children and addressing the problems posed by international abduction between the States concerned. For further information see the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under “Child Abduction Section” then “Judicial Seminars on the International Protection of Children”.

²⁰ The Principles and Explanatory Memorandum were circulated to all Hague Conference Member States and all States participating in the Malta Process in November 2010. They are available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under “Child Abduction Section” then “Judicial Seminars on the International Protection of Children”.

Yes, please explain:
[Please insert text here](#)

- c. What is your view as to the future of the "Malta Process"?
[Please insert text here](#)

**PART VI: TRAINING AND EDUCATION AND
 THE TOOLS, SERVICES AND SUPPORT PROVIDED
 BY THE PERMANENT BUREAU**

13. Training and education

13.1 Can you give details of any training sessions / conferences organised in your State to support the effective functioning of the 1980 Convention, and the influence that such sessions / conferences have had?

[The Central Authority has implemented a permanent training program for the operational staff of the Office of the Attorney General of the Republic in order to strengthen knowledge of the Convention and facilitate its implementation.](#)

14. The tools, services and support provided by the Permanent Bureau

In general

14.1 Please comment or state your reflections on the specific tools, services and support provided by the Permanent Bureau to assist with the practical operation of the 1980 and 1996 Conventions, including:

- a. The Country Profile available under the Child Abduction Section.
[Please insert text here](#)
- b. INCADAT (the international child abduction database, available at < www.incadat.com >).
[Please insert text here](#)
- c. *The Judges' Newsletter* on International Child Protection - the publication of the Hague Conference on Private International Law which is available online for free;²¹
[Please insert text here](#)
- d. The specialised "Child Abduction Section" of the Hague Conference website (< www.hcch.net >);
[Please insert text here](#)
- e. INCASTAT (the database for the electronic collection and analysis of statistics on the 1980 Convention);²²
[The information is included in the INCASTAT database on the Online Platform.](#)
[However, in reviewing the data it is mentioned that El Salvador has not sent any data.](#)
- f. Providing technical assistance and training to States Parties regarding the practical operation of the 1980 and 1996 Conventions.²³ Such technical assistance and training may involve persons visiting the Permanent Bureau or, alternatively, may involve the Permanent Bureau organising, or providing assistance with organising, national and international judicial and other seminars and conferences concerning the Convention(s) and participating in such conferences;
[Please insert text here](#)
- g. Encouraging wider ratification of, or accession to, the Convention(s), including educating those unfamiliar with the Convention(s);²⁴

²¹ Available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" and "Judges' Newsletter on International Child Protection". For some volumes of *The Judges' Newsletter*, it is possible to download individual articles as required.

²² Further information is available via the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" then "INCASTAT".

²³ Such technical assistance may be provided to judges, Central Authority personnel and / or other professionals involved with the practical operation of the Convention(s).

²⁴ Which again may involve State delegates and others visiting the Permanent Bureau or, alternatively, may involve the Permanent Bureau organising, or providing assistance with organising, national and international judicial and other seminars and conferences concerning the Convention(s) and participating in such conferences.

Please insert text here

- h. Supporting communications between Central Authorities, including maintaining their contact details updated on the HCCH website;
Please insert text here
- i. Supporting communications among Hague Network Judges and between Hague Network Judges and Central Authorities, including maintaining a confidential database of up-to-date contact details of Hague Network Judges
Please insert text here

Other

14.2 What other measures or mechanisms would you recommend:

- a. To improve the monitoring of the operation of the Conventions;
Please insert text here
- b. To assist States in meeting their Convention obligations; and
Please insert text here
- c. To evaluate whether serious violations of Convention obligations have occurred?
We have no knowledge on this subject.

PART VII: PRIORITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER MATTERS

15. Views on priorities and recommendations for the Special Commission

15.1 Which matters does your State think ought to be accorded particular priority on the agenda for the Special Commission? Please provide a brief explanation supporting your response.

Exceptions should be addressed, since in our country, although the phenomenon of gangs exists, the other States base their refusal to proceed with the return of the child on the risk that they may run to become associated to these gangs. However, the phenomenon of gangs is not widespread throughout the national territory, so prior to ruling on return it is considered that enough elements should be collected in order to rule out that the place where the child will reside will not cause any risk .

Another important aspect is the measure taken by some States to demand Authority when the requesting party cannot personally attend the hearing, a situation that places him/her in a difficult position due to the costs of the Authorities. Likewise, the situation is also emblematic when he/she is required to obtain a visa in order to be able to be present at the hearing, but does not meet the requirements to obtain it or lacks the economic means to pay for its costs.

15.2 States are invited to make proposals concerning any particular recommendations they think ought to be made by the Special Commission.

Please insert text here

16. Any other matters

16.1 States are invited to comment on any other matters which they may wish to raise concerning the practical operation of the 1980 Convention.

Please insert text here