

<b>Title</b>	Compilation of responses to the Questionnaire in preparation of the Experts' Group meeting of 7 to 9 February 2022 on international transfers of maintenance funds
<b>Document</b>	Prel. Doc. No 19 of February 2022 – available in English only with responses showing in the language they were received
<b>Author</b>	PB
<b>Agenda Item</b>	TBD
<b>Mandate(s)</b>	C&D No 25 of CGAP 2020; C&R No 30 of CGAP 2019
<b>Objective</b>	To provide a compilation of the responses received to the November 2021 Questionnaire in preparation of the Experts' Group meeting of 7 to 9 February 2022 on international transfers of maintenance funds
<b>Action to be Taken</b>	For Decision <input type="checkbox"/> For Approval <input type="checkbox"/> For Discussion <input type="checkbox"/> For Action / Completion <input type="checkbox"/> For Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Annexes</b>	N/A
<b>Related Documents</b>	<a href="#">Prel. Doc. No 11 of November 2019</a> – Report of the Experts' Group on international transfers of maintenance funds <a href="#">Prel. Doc. No 17 of November 2021</a> – Questionnaire in preparation of the Experts' Group meeting of 7 to 9 February 2022 on international transfers of maintenance funds

# Compilation of responses to the Questionnaire in preparation of the Experts' Group meeting of 7 to 9 February 2022 on international transfers of maintenance funds

Last update: 3-2-2022

## States included in this compilation:

Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England & Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland), United States of America

## Name of contact person:

<b>Belgium</b>	Mélanie Vanwelkenhuysen
<b>Brazil</b>	Arnaldo José Alves Silveira
<b>Canada</b>	Tammy Brown
<b>Croatia</b>	Martina Tutić
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Markéta Kačerová Nováková
<b>Finland</b>	Anna-Lena Halttunen
<b>Germany</b>	Dr. Sarah Gerling-Stock
<b>Italy</b>	Giuseppe Vinciguerra
<b>Latvia</b>	Sintija Lavska
<b>Lithuania</b>	Sandra Šmulaitė
<b>Mexico</b>	Jorge F. Salcedo
<b>Norway</b>	Maren Stranger
<b>Portugal</b>	Miguel Vara
<b>Sweden</b>	Karin Honorato dos Santos CA / Lars Klint Swedish Enforcement Agency
<b>Switzerland</b>	Sandra John
<b>United Kingdom (England &amp; Wales)</b>	Denise Strachan
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Gary Quail
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	Angela Lindsay
<b>United States of America</b>	Anne Miller

## Name of Authority / Office:

<b>Belgium</b>	SPF JUSTICE
<b>Brazil</b>	Central Authority - Ministry of Justice and Public Security
<b>Canada</b>	British Columbia Family Maintenance Agency
<b>Croatia</b>	Ministry of Labour, Pension System, Family and Social Policy
<b>Czech Republic</b>	The Office for International Legal Protection of Children
<b>Finland</b>	Ministry of Justice
<b>Germany</b>	Bundesamt für Justiz / Federal Office of Justice
<b>Italy</b>	Italian Central Authority
<b>Latvia</b>	Administration of the Maintenance Guarantee Fund
<b>Lithuania</b>	State-guaranteed Legal Aid Service

<b>Mexico</b>	Procuraduría Federal de Protección de Niñas, Niños y Adolescentes del Sistema Nacional DIF
<b>Norway</b>	The Collection Agency of the Labour and Welfare Administration
<b>Portugal</b>	Directorate-General of the Administration of Justice
<b>Sweden</b>	Försäkringskassan (Swedish CA) / Kronofogden (Swedish Enforcement Agency)
<b>Switzerland</b>	Federal Office of Justice, Central Authority for International Maintenance Matters
<b>United Kingdom (England &amp; Wales)</b>	Maintenance Payments Business Centre
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	Scottish Government Central Authority and International Law Team
<b>United States of America</b>	Office of Child Support Enforcement

Telephone number:

<b>Belgium</b>	+32 2 542 71 18
<b>Brazil</b>	+55 61 2025 8908
<b>Canada</b>	250-220-4060
<b>Croatia</b>	+385 1 555 7103
<b>Czech Republic</b>	+420 542 215 522
<b>Finland</b>	+358 0295 16001
<b>Germany</b>	+49-228-99410-5916
<b>Italy</b>	0039 06 68188326/331/535
<b>Latvia</b>	+371 26386937
<b>Lithuania</b>	+370 700 00190
<b>Mexico</b>	5530032200 ext.4431
<b>Norway</b>	+47 941 87 196
<b>Portugal</b>	00351 217906428
<b>Sweden</b>	+46101169414/ +46 8 564 851 50
<b>Switzerland</b>	+41 58 463 12 29
<b>United Kingdom (England &amp; Wales)</b>	01284 829504
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	02890728819
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	+ 44 (131) 244 0460
<b>United States of America</b>	001-202-401-1467

E-mail address:

<b>Belgium</b>	aliments@just.fgov.be
<b>Brazil</b>	cooperacaocivil@mj.gov.br
<b>Canada</b>	tbrown@fmep.ag.gov.bc.ca
<b>Croatia</b>	pisarnica@mrosp.hr
<b>Czech Republic</b>	podatelna@umpod.cz
<b>Finland</b>	maintenance.ca.om@gov.fi
<b>Germany</b>	auslandsunterhalt@bfj.bund.de / Sarah.Gerling-Stock@bfj.bund.de
<b>Italy</b>	autoritacentrali.dgmc@giustizia.it

<b>Latvia</b>	sintija.lavska@ugf.gov.lv
<b>Lithuania</b>	s.smulaite@vgtpt.lt
<b>Mexico</b>	jorge.salcedo@dif.gob.mx
<b>Norway</b>	maren.stranger@skatteetaten.no
<b>Portugal</b>	miguel.a.vara@dgaj.mj.pt
<b>Sweden</b>	karin.honorato.dos.santos@forsakringskassan.se / kontakt@kronofogden.se
<b>Switzerland</b>	sandra.john@bj.admin.ch
<b>United Kingdom (England &amp; Wales)</b>	Denise.Strachan1@justice.gov.uk
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	reciprocalenforcement@courtsni.gov.uk
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	maintenanceenforcement@gov.scot
<b>United States of America</b>	anne.miller@acf.hhs.gov

9. For the purpose of the 7 to 10 February 2022 meeting of the EG, delegates / experts are invited to report on consideration given to and / or implementation of the following arrangements in their jurisdiction:

a. Developments in general regarding the international transfer of maintenance funds

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds.
<b>Brazil</b>	
<b>Canada</b>	<p>There have been no significant developments within Canada. Provinces with moderate international caseloads are currently sending and receiving international payments electronically via Swift transactions upon request from our international partners. Provinces and territories with modest international caseloads are not currently set up to send electronic payments and continue to use cheques.</p> <p>Il n'y a pas eu de faits nouveaux importants au Canada. Les provinces qui ont un volume modéré de dossiers internationaux envoient et reçoivent les transferts internationaux électroniquement en ayant recours au système SWIFT, sur demande de nos partenaires internationaux. Les provinces et les territoires dont la charge de travail est modeste ne sont actuellement pas organisés pour envoyer des paiements électroniques, et ils continuent d'utiliser les chèques.</p>
<b>Croatia</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Central Authority.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Our Office uses in majority electronic transfer of funds (mainly wire transfers), but the cheques are also used due to the fact, that some countries prefer them (e. g. USA) and do not accept electronic transfers.
<b>Finland</b>	N/A
<b>Germany</b>	<p>As already pointed out at the second meeting of the Experts' Group, the German Reserve Bank (Deutsche Bundesbank) will only be processing cheques from abroad until 31/12/2022.</p> <p>Therefore, the German Central Authority (Federal Office of Justice) cannot accept cheques from 2023 on.</p> <p>If the maintenance funds could be transferred via the system "United Postal Union" cannot be estimated at the moment.</p>
<b>Italy</b>	Continuous encouragement of electronic transfer's instruments
<b>Latvia</b>	N/A
<b>Lithuania</b>	There are no changes that we are aware of.
<b>Mexico</b>	The rights to maintenance in México include, substantially, the satisfaction of the needs for food and nutrition, housing, education, clothing, comprehensive medical

	<p>and preventive psychological health care, medical assistance and recreation. The federal laws and the laws of the federal entities will have to provide for the necessary procedures and legal counselling as well as for support measures to ensure compliance with the duty to ensure the rights to maintenance.</p> <p>In Mexico there is a lack of regulation regarding the international transfer of maintenance funds.</p>
<b>Norway</b>	There have been no big developments, but we are still working on eliminating checks, and on moving on to standard XML – ISO 20022 files.
<b>Portugal</b>	The Central Authority in Portugal doesn't handle the payments. It is up to the Portuguese courts to transfer the amounts directly to the creditors. Whenever possible, the transfer is done electronically, without the use of cheques.
<b>Sweden</b>	<p>Due to a change in the domestic enforcement code, it is now possible to apply for execution by e-mail. This is if you apply directly to the enforcement agency. It is no longer required that an application for execution is signed by the applicant or that the enforceable title (judgement/decision) is certified.</p> <p>The central authority with the Swedish enforcement agency has created an informal network to better understand the processes at each agency and to improve information to other states regarding the enforcement and payment processes in Sweden.</p>
<b>Switzerland</b>	<p>The current processing of international maintenance cases based on the conventions and agreements concluded by Switzerland is carried out in cooperation between the Central Authority at the federal level and the competent authorities in the cantons. In most cases, incoming and outgoing payments are made directly via the cantonal or local authorities and the parties concerned (and based on the respective terms and conditions of the individual banking relationships). Only within the framework of the transitional solutions with states which know cheque payments (Australia, USA, certain Canadian provinces) incoming payments to Switzerland are processed via the Central Authority. Therefore, the Central Authority does not have comprehensive knowledge of all the solutions used by the authorities in the cantons and in the individual cases.</p> <p>The Central Authority has not made fundamental changes in the payment processing last year. However, some of the proposals mentioned in the following paragraphs are discussed or already implemented, at least in individual cases.</p>
<b>United Kingdom (England &amp; Wales)</b>	The Maintenance Payments Business Centre (MPBC) now receives electronically monthly from New Zealand, Canada (British Columbia) and bundled payments monthly from Australia.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Creditors have been moved from cheque to electronic payment where this has been requested.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	No developments. The Scottish Central Authority does not transfer payments
<b>United States of America</b>	<p>The U.S. has made significant progress in its work to address this issue. We are planning a new integrated federal service (International Child Support Payment Service (ICSPS)) to manage international payments. We worked closely with a number of federal agencies to design the service to meet all federal banking and security regulations. The integrated service will leverage existing federal programs for the international transmission of payments through the Department of Treasury's International Payment Service (ITS). ITS is able to transmit payments to foreign authorities in any country, and their services are provided cost-free to federal agencies. We have set up dedicated bank accounts through the Department of Treasury to handle all international child support funds.</p> <p>Unfortunately, our recent solicitation was not successful, and we are now evaluating other options for delivering a centralized international payment processing solution to manage outgoing international payments for all U.S. states.</p>

The complexity of international banking regulations, foreign partner and state requirements, and the necessity of finding a cost-effective solution for a very small caseload present significant challenges for us, but this initiative continues to be a priority for OCSE while we are working hard to find a solution.

- b. Elimination of the use of cheques (see C&R 2019 No 1; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 11-14)  
Not being considered.

Croatia, Mexico, United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Croatia</b>	The electronic payment is used where this has been requested. Whenever possible, the transfer is done electronically, without the use of cheques.
<b>Mexico</b>	Nowadays the use of cheques is the way to maintenance funds
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	The elimination of cheques is currently not being considered at this time. There is still a demand from our creditors to have the option to be paid via cheque. Particularly in instances where the creditors do not have bank accounts and instead lodge their cheques to a Savings Account. (e.g. Post Office Account). Northern Ireland Central Authority are unable to pay directly into a Savings Account by way of electronic payment, so the option for creditors to receive payment via cheque in these instances is still required. Where creditors do request to be paid via electronic payment, this method of payment is being facilitated by the Northern Ireland Central Authority.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority does not process payments.

Is being considered.

Czech Republic, Germany, Norway, Sweden, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Czech Republic</b>	Our Office prefers to transfer the maintenance funds to the bank account and in majority does so. However, there are some Members, which still prefers cheques, so our Office use them as well.
<b>Germany</b>	The only countries cheques are still used with are Canada, South Africa, Australia, New Zealand and the USA. However, the US States Virginia, California and Ohio mostly make use of electronic transfers.  Following up on the discussions at the first meeting of the Experts' Group, Germany and the Canadian Province of Ontario entered into a first test of electronic payments. On 27/01/2020 the German CA received a test transfer made by Ontario in the amount of 1 CAD converted into the amount of 0.68 EUR. Obviously, no major bank fees (transfer and currency conversion) were deducted. Due to other priorities during the pandemic, the testing period has been interrupted. Germany would like to continue testing with Ontario.  Following up on the discussions at the second meeting of the Experts' Group, Germany and USA considered solutions for the elimination of cheques. While considering a federal solution in the long-term, OCSE recently encouraged US States to send child support payments by wire (SWIFT). The German CA is now in close contact with the US States Pennsylvania and Georgia in order to prepare first tests. However, other US States have stated that they are not able to send child support payments without the federal solution.

	Therefore, Germany would prefer a solution on the federal level. With all other countries Germany uses exclusively electronic payment systems.
<b>Norway</b>	We are still working on this, and we are no longer receiving checks from the UK, New Zealand, Sweden, Alberta, or British Columbia. We are still receiving some checks from 3 US states and Ontario (as well as checks sent to our US Lockbox, but these are transferred to our Norwegian bank account from the US). For outgoing payments, we are only sending checks to the US, and only in some cases.
<b>Sweden</b>	Ongoing discussions with our main bank regarding solutions on how to eliminate or minimize the use of cheques.
<b>United States of America</b>	Please see the information above. We are very grateful to our foreign child support partners for their willingness to continue to take checks from the U.S., while implementation of our new service is underway. Most states do not have available electronic alternatives to checks. The goal of our new federal service is to eliminate the use of checks.

Has already been implemented.

Belgium, Brazil, Canada, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England and Wales)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not use cheques in Belgium anymore.
<b>Brazil</b>	The use of cheques is not common at all in incoming requests, as payments originated from Brazil are usually made by electronic transfers. Although a few cheques have been received at our central authority in response to outgoing cases, they had to be sent back, as the central authority cannot intermediate payments. In some cases, the only solution was to have the cheques sent directly from the requested central authority to the applicant in Brazil. Overall, in Brazil, cheques are not used for transactions and it is highly uncommon to receive them by post, which would most certainly indicate that they came from abroad. Most of the local financial transactions are also electronic.
<b>Canada</b>	Provinces and territories with small international caseloads are not actively considering the elimination of cheques due to the cost and fees involved with sending electronic payments internationally. Most have responded that consideration would be given moving forward as their international caseloads increase. Provinces with moderate internationally caseloads are currently sending and/or receiving international funds via Swift transactions upon request from our international partners.  Les provinces et les territoires dont le volume de dossiers internationaux est faible n'envisagent pas activement l'élimination des chèques, en raison du coût et des frais liés à l'acheminement international de paiements électroniques. La plupart de ces provinces et territoires ont répondu qu'ils envisageraient l'élimination des chèques dans l'avenir si leur volume de dossiers augmentait. À l'heure actuelle, les provinces et les territoires dont le volume de dossiers internationaux est modéré envoient et reçoivent les transferts internationaux en ayant recours au système SWIFT, sur demande de nos partenaires internationaux.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Italy</b>	Deterring use of cheques, that indeed appears extremely rare. Italian CA invites in each proceeding both creditors and debtors to use electronic transfer's instruments, specifying the reasons of the request.
<b>Latvia</b>	Latvia does not use or accept cheques as a mean for maintenance payments as it is not possible to cash them (this service is not available in Latvia).

<b>Lithuania</b>	The check-cashing procedure in Lithuanian banks is not available.
<b>Portugal</b>	Portuguese courts transfer the funds electronically to the creditors, whenever possible.
<b>Switzerland</b>	However, interim solutions are still in place because of cheque payments from the USA and certain Canadian provinces.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	Canada's British Columbia wish to continue to receive cheques as we cannot send bulk payments due to the way our banking systems are set up. Receiving electronic payments individually would be very expensive. Electronic payments are something Ontario are working on but unable to provide a timeframe, so until then we can only send cheques. However, Australia now sends bundled bulk payments electronically with a remittance. New Zealand payments are by electronic transfer individually. We no longer send cheques to Norway and make payments electronically. British Columbia sends electronic payments individually.

- c. Solutions with regard to increased transparency and cost reduction of transfers and currency conversion (see C&R 2019 Nos 2 and 10; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 24-25)  
Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Lithuania, Portugal, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Brazil</b>	Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	The Central Authority is not directly involved in payments and has no contract with banks.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Lithuania</b>	The State-guaranteed Legal Aid Service is not directly involved in the money conversion and transfer process.
<b>Portugal</b>	Our courts are responsible to transfer the funds.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	Transfer of payments going out are charged to Her Majesty's Courts and Tribunals Service (HMCTS)/Ministry of Justice (MoJ); however, the recipient's bank may levy a charge when payment is received. Cheques we receive in are sent for conversion for which HMCTS/MoJ bears the cost. The bank we work with uses the Bank of England exchange rate for the day
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority will seek the amount requested in a Notice of Registration. This would not take into account currency conversion. There will be fluctuation in amounts actually paid to the creditor due to currency conversion. We do not charge a fee to any creditors for any currency conversion that may be required.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority is not involved in the process of currency conversion or transfer of payments. It is understood that the solicitor assigned to the case applies to the bank for a currency conversion certificate

Is being considered.

Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	<p>Most provinces that are sending Swift transactions are covering the costs charged by their bank and are able to provide the currency conversion details of the Swift Payment. Each province has negotiated their own banking arrangement with their financial institution therefore costs are inconsistent throughout the country. Due to lack of transparency with Swift transactions, intermediary banks may be used to transfer funds. Costs associated with these banks are unknown at the time payments are sent and are not covered by most provinces. One province has indicated that they will cover all costs, others have indicated they would consider covering the costs if they are known in advance.</p> <p>La plupart des provinces qui envoient des téléversements SWIFT couvrent les frais exigés par leur banque et sont en mesure de fournir les détails sur la conversion de change relativement au téléversement SWIFT. Chaque province a négocié ses propres modalités bancaires avec son institution financière, de sorte que les frais ne sont pas les mêmes partout au pays. En raison du manque de transparence entourant les téléversements SWIFT, des banques intermédiaires peuvent être utilisées pour virer des fonds. Les frais facturés par ces banques ne sont pas connus au moment où les paiements sont envoyés, et la plupart des provinces ne les couvrent pas. Une province a mentionné couvrir tous les frais, et d'autres ont souligné qu'elles envisageraient de le faire si ceux-ci étaient connus d'avance.</p>
<b>Czech Republic</b>	<p>Our Office as the state authority is obliged to comply with the national legal framework, also in order to ensure the transparency. We look into possibilities of having bank accounts with such terms, that the bank fees and exchange rates have a minimum negative impact on creditors. At the moment, our Office has the bank account at the private bank, so its exchange rates (and not the central national bank rates) are applied.</p>
<b>Germany</b>	<p>Regarding electronic payments with Virginia, California, Ohio and Ontario, apparently no major costs (around 1 %) arise as far as the German CA can compare the sent and the received amounts. Currently, the exchange rate used for the currency conversion of the amount transferred is not transmitted to the German CA. This is only possible for the Federal Treasury ("Bundeskasse", the holder of the bank account of the German CA). It could not be clarified so far whether it can also be given the opportunity to see the exchange rate used for currency conversion.</p>
<b>Italy</b>	<p>The Italian Ministry of Justice aims to arrange a general agreement with the national banks association on currency transfers and conversion costs</p>
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Norway</b>	<p>This is part of the framework agreement our bank must have with the Norwegian Government Agency for Financial Management (DFØ). They are now considering implementing the use of Swift GPI tracker. This will improve the traceability of payments, and thusly increase transparency. Transparency is an important part of the framework agreement.</p>
<b>Sweden</b>	<p>Ongoing discussions with our main bank regarding solutions on how to decrease currency conversion fees.</p>
<b>Switzerland</b>	<p>Some of the proposals are discussed or exist already in individual cases.</p>
<b>United States of America</b>	<p>Under our new service, no fees will be deducted from the payment. In addition, because ITS transmits large volumes of payments each day, the exchange rate that will be used to convert the payments before they are sent to other countries is very favorable.</p>

Has already been implemented.

Latvia

Please explain:

<b>Latvia</b>	Central national bank rates are used across the board on the day of conversion if the actual amount received by the creditor is unknown. Transaction costs are covered by the debtor.
---------------	---

- d. Solutions where creditors would not bear the costs related to the transfer of funds (see C&R 2019 No 2; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 26-29)  
Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Sweden, United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland), United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Brazil</b>	Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Central Authority.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Italy</b>	According to Italian law, these costs' burden is on the debtor; thus, each reduction of the amounts transferred implies an incomplete payment.
<b>Sweden</b>	Enforcement agency: Our creditors will bear the costs in general but fees in relation to conversions of system files etc will be considered our cost. CA: If a debtor pays voluntarily, we encourage the him/her to take responsibility for the costs connected to transfer of funds, while the creditor has to take responsibility for cost connected to the money received by his/her bank and costs for paying out the funds.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority do not charge creditors for transfer of funds electronically. The creditor would not incur such costs.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority is not involved in the transfer of maintenance payments.
<b>United States of America</b>	This is not necessary. Due to volume considerations, payments will initially be sent once per week to foreign authorities, but that can be changed as volumes increase.

Is being considered.

Canada, Mexico, Switzerland

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	Most provinces that are sending Swift transactions are covering the costs charged by their bank. Each province has negotiated their own banking arrangement with their financial institution, so costs are inconsistent throughout the country. Due to lack of transparency with Swift transactions, intermediary banks may be used to transfer funds. Costs associated with these banks are unknown at the time payments are sent and are not covered by most provinces. One province has
---------------	--

	<p>indicated that they will cover all costs, others have indicated they would consider covering the costs if they are known in advance.</p> <p>La plupart des provinces qui envoient des télévirements SWIFT couvrent les frais exigés par leur banque. Chaque province a négocié ses propres modalités bancaires avec son institution financière, de sorte que les frais ne sont pas les mêmes partout au pays. En raison du manque de transparence lié aux télévirements SWIFT, des banques intermédiaires peuvent être utilisées pour virer les fonds. Les frais facturés par ces banques ne sont pas connus au moment où les paiements sont envoyés, et la plupart des provinces ne les couvrent pas. Une province a mentionné qu'elle couvre tous les frais, et d'autres ont souligné qu'elles envisageraient de le faire si ceux-ci étaient connus d'avance.</p>
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Switzerland</b>	However, the Central Authority was not able to undertake further general developments in this area last year.

Has already been implemented.

Czech Republic, Germany, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom (England and Wales)

Please explain:

<b>Czech Republic</b>	<p>The clients of our Office do not bear any costs related to the transfer of the maintenance funds.</p> <p>Our Office bears/pays the bank fees from our budget.</p>
<b>Germany</b>	<p>Only partially. The German CA has an arrangement with the German Reserve Bank respectively the Federal Treasury to cover own transfer fees (see question f.).</p> <p>As regards third-party fees, the situation is as follows:</p> <p>Electronic payments</p> <p>At present, the German CA is not aware of any fees being charged in Germany if payments are forwarded to the recipients via the German CA (SEPA). The German Reserve Bank does not charge own fees to the German CA for transfers (see question e.).</p> <p>It is not certain whether extra fees are charged in the case of payments made directly to the creditor living in Germany (this may differ depending on the country the payment was sent from and/or the banks involved).</p> <p>Cheques</p> <p>Incoming cheques are credited to the bank account of the German CA (held by the Federal Treasury/Bundeskasse) for a fee of 2.00 EUR per check. Therefore, checks should be at least 5.00 USD. This fee is paid by the recipient because it is deducted by the bank from the amount transferred.</p> <p>Outgoing cheques are issued on behalf of the German CA via the German Reserve Bank (Bundesbank) by the latter's correspondence bank in the respective country. The currency conversion is done by the German Reserve Bank/Bundesbank. The transfer fees are paid by the recipient. In both cases, the fees are third-party fees. The German CA's house bank (German Reserve Bank/Deutsche Bundesbank) does not charge own fees for transfers (see also question e.).</p>
<b>Latvia</b>	According to the national law (Civil Procedure Law) the debtor bears the costs related to the execution of the court decision, including the costs related to the transfer of funds.
<b>Lithuania</b>	The debtor is responsible for the cost of the transfer. The funds are transferred directly to the creditor's account, and the State-guaranteed Legal Aid Service is not involved in this process.

<b>Norway</b>	We are responsible for the costs incurred by our bank in Norway. We have no control over the potential costs in the creditor's bank abroad.
<b>Portugal</b>	There are no transfer costs to the creditor.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	HMCTS/MoJ covers all charges for payments sent electronically. HMCTS/MoJ covers the cost of foreign cheques received which we send for conversion.

- e. Requested Central Authority arrangements with their bank to cover transfer fees or other arrangements to that effect (see C&R 2019 No 3; aide-mémoire 2021, para. 32)  
Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Brazil</b>	The Central Authority is not directly involved in payments and, thus, does not have a contract with a bank. Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	The Central Authority is not directly involved in payments.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Italy</b>	Italian AC has no its own bank account.
<b>Latvia</b>	Central Authority is not directly involved with the transfer of maintenance payments among the debtor and the creditor. The payments are made by the debtor himself (bearing the costs of the transfer) or the bailiff. In the latter case there are no costs of the transfer except for the costs of the execution procedure (related both to national and cross-border cases).
<b>Lithuania</b>	There are no arrangements.
<b>Portugal</b>	Our courts are responsible to transfer the funds.
<b>Sweden</b>	The Swedish Enforcement Authority is part of a national agreement with the banks via The Swedish National Debt Office (Riksgäldskontoret). In cases where CA in Sweden is the requested central authority a debtor either pays voluntarily direct to the creditor (or to the account given in the application) or through the Swedish enforcement authority. Therefore, the CA is not involved in the transfer of money when acting as the requested CA.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	This is not being considered.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority do not charge creditors for the transfer of funds electronically.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority does not communicate with banks as it does not process payments.

Is being considered.

Canada, Czech Republic, Mexico, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	As Canada does not have a centralized banking system for child support payments, each province and territory has negotiated their own banking agreements. Banks do not currently cover the costs of Swift transfer fees, however, most provinces are covering these costs.  Étant donné que le Canada n'a pas de système bancaire centralisé pour les paiements de pensions alimentaires pour enfants, chaque province et territoire a négocié ses propres modalités bancaires. À l'heure actuelle, les banques ne couvrent pas les frais de télévirement SWIFT. Cela dit, la plupart des provinces les couvrent.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	See answer to the question c.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Switzerland</b>	However, the Central Authority was not able to undertake further general developments in this area last year.
<b>United States of America</b>	Our service will be integrated with the Department of Treasury. All costs are covered by the federal government.

Has already been implemented.

Germany, Norway

Please explain:

Germany	With regard to the fees of the German CA's house bank (German Reserve Bank/Deutsche Bundesbank), such an arrangement already exists, whereby the bank does not charge own fees for transfers.
Norway	We cover all the costs incurred by the bank in Norway.

- f. Requesting Central Authority providing confirmation to the requested Central Authority that the amounts received are the same as the amounts sent and, where applicable, information on the reasons for any difference (see C&R 2019 No 3; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 15-17  
Not being considered.

Brazil, Croatia, Lithuania, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Brazil</b>	Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Central Authority.
<b>Lithuania</b>	All transfers are made directly to the creditor's account, and the State-guaranteed Legal Aid Service is not directly involved in the process.
<b>Norway</b>	Even if we can identify the costs, it is not likely that we would be able to do something about it.
<b>Portugal</b>	The transfer of funds are not processed by the Portuguese Central authority.
<b>Sweden</b>	Do not know if the banks are doing any reconciliation of the amounts CA: We do not send any regular confirmation the requested CA that we have received the amount paid. If arrears differ or if we have not received anything for a year, we ask for information. In that check of what arrears do we have in our

	system and what arrears do the enforcing agency in the requested state have it is possible to find differences. We do not receive any confirmations from other CAs either.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	MPBC only makes single payments and not bulk payments; we do not currently send confirmation of amounts sent.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority do not automatically advise reciprocating Central Authorities of payments received and paid out. Northern Ireland has no intention of implementing this practice.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority does not send or receive payments. However, if the creditor informs us that they have received less than the amount they are due to receive, we will contact the requested central authority to advise

Is being considered.

Canada, Italy, Mexico, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	Requested provinces have the ability to send payment information to the Requesting Authority. Confirmation of receipt is not required by all provinces but would be considered. One province has implemented this practice, but requires a confirmation receipt before sending additional payments.  Les provinces requises ont la capacité d'envoyer l'information sur les paiements à l'Autorité requérante. L'accusé de réception n'est pas exigé par toutes les provinces, mais cela pourrait être envisagé. Une province a adopté cette façon de faire, mais elle demande un accusé de réception avant l'envoi de paiements supplémentaires.
<b>Italy</b>	Italian CA is not involved in payments. Therefore, the only information about it may come from the parties or others CCAA, who are invited to advise.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Switzerland</b>	Exchange in this regard took place in individual cases.
<b>United States of America</b>	The ICSPS contractor will be responsible for the secure transmission of case and payment details to the foreign authority.

Has already been implemented.

Belgium, Czech Republic, Finland, Germany, Latvia

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do compare the table of arrears and amounts given/received with the other Central Authority involved.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Usually, our Office confirms the receipt of the first payment in the file. Afterwards, the current amount of debt and enforced due maintenance is regularly checked and communicated with the requested Central Authority. The difference between the amounts received and the amounts sent is in majority of cases caused by the exchange rate and currency conversion. If the maintenance is enforced through Central Authorities, it is preferable that the enforced amount are sent through the Central Authorities as well.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Germany</b>	In cases where debtors make electronic payments to the bank account of the German CA (held by the Federal Treasury/Bundeskasse) and the German CA

	forwards the payments to the recipients abroad, the recipients are informed in writing (by letter or email) of the first payment being made. In most cases, the recipients are asked to confirm receipt of the first payment by letter or email upon the transfer being made. Where recurring payments are in place, the caseworkers of the German CA request confirmation of payments by letter or email from the recipients every few months to ensure that these are in fact being received. Furthermore, the recipients and the other CA are informed that the relevant date for the currency conversion is the day the German CA receives the payment from the debtor. Discrepancies are clarified with the other Central Authority and the recipient.
<b>Latvia</b>	Currently the confirmation can be provided in the form of the updated statement of the arrears. If the requested Central Authority asks for the confirmation, the creditor is requested to submit the newest information regarding the amount of the payments received.

- g. Establishment of a centralised point (e.g., bank account, central bank) for international transfers dedicated to both incoming and outgoing transfer of funds (see C&R 2019 Nos 4 and 5; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 33-35)  
Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Sweden, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Brazil</b>	Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	
<b>Finland</b>	The maintenance cases are handled by the Central Authority (Ministry of Justice) and the Public Body. As the number of maintenance cases is quite low in Finland, it has not been considered to centralize the transfers. Debtors residing in Finland pays the creditor abroad either through the National Enforcement Authority or directly. Payments from debtor abroad goes directly to the Public Body.
<b>Italy</b>	Italian CA has no right neither possibility to collect money on behalf of the parties; also, has no bank account, nor staff able to manage payments and order money transfers.
<b>Latvia</b>	In our experience with maintenance funds disbursed and recovered by the public body, there will be situations when the debtor makes the payments to the creditor directly (not through the centralised point). That could lead to even more discrepancies and manual labor for balancing the arrears. Besides, establishment of a centralised point would demand extra resources that might not be commensurate with the gains.
<b>Lithuania</b>	The centralized point for international transfers is not established.
<b>Sweden</b>	For this to be a reality in Sweden, the Swedish central authority needs to reorganize, and take a bigger responsibility when it comes to outgoing payments. This would cost money to do and therefore it is not a priority at the moment.  Swedish Enforcement Authority have various bank accounts in different currencies

	and we have agreements with two main banks (one for outgoing payments and one for incoming payments).
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	We do not intend to set up additional bank accounts for international transfers.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority do not intend to set up any additional bank accounts solely for international transfers. A central account is already in operation dedicated to both incoming and outgoing transfer of funds for all international and non-international creditors.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority does not handle incoming and outgoing payments.

Is being considered.

Mexico, Portugal, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Portugal</b>	This solution is being considered.
<b>Switzerland</b>	As stated in a., the current processing of international maintenance cases based on the conventions and agreements concluded by Switzerland is carried out in cooperation between the Central Authority at the federal level and the competent authorities in the cantons. In most cases, incoming and outgoing payments are made directly via the cantonal or local authorities and the parties concerned (and based on the respective terms and conditions of the individual banking relationships). Only within the framework of the transitional solutions with states which know cheque payments (Australia, USA, certain Canadian provinces) incoming payments to Switzerland are processed via the Central Authority. The decentralised payment processing that already exists today is still preferred. A (certain) centralisation of payment processing would only be an issue if a (completely) centralized organisation with a Federal Central Authority were to be created in the future (e.g. when Switzerland joins the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance). However, the future organisation of the processing of maintenance cases has yet to be clarified.
<b>United States of America</b>	This is being implemented. Please see the description of the ICSPS above.

Has already been implemented.

Czech Republic, Germany, Norway

Please explain:

<b>Czech Republic</b>	Our Office has several bank accounts kept in different currency which are designated solely for international transfers of maintenance funds
<b>Germany</b>	Regarding electronic payments: Most of the payments to creditors in Germany are made by electronic transfer. The majority of those electronic payments go straight to the creditor. A much smaller number of payments is made to the German CA which then forwards the payment to the creditor. Where electronic payments are made by the debtor to the German CA, the Federal Treasury, holding the CA's banking account provides an electronic payment receipt. The electronically provided payment receipt is necessary for automatic processing of the payment.

	Regarding cheques: Incoming cheques are credited to the bank account of the German CA (held by the Federal Treasury/Bundeskasse) until 31/12/2022. Outgoing cheques are issued on behalf of the German CA via the German Reserve Bank/Bundesbank by the latter's correspondence bank in the respective country. In the USA this is JP Morgan Chase, New York Branch, in Canada it is the National Bank of Canada/Banque National du Canada.
<b>Norway</b>	We already have this in place. We have one bank account for incoming payments, and one bank account for outgoing payments.

- h. Provision of payment transfer services to any debtors transferring payments within the scope of the HCCH 2007 Child Support Convention (see C&R 2019 No 5; aide-mémoire 2021, para. 18)

Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Scotland), United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Brazil</b>	The Central Authority is not directly involved in payments and, thus, does not provide such services either to creditors or to debtors. All services available at the Central Authority are provided to both creditors and debtors, indistinctly. Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Italy</b>	Voluntary or compulsory payments instruments are selected, respectively, by debtors or Courts involved in enforcement procedures.
<b>Latvia</b>	Central Authority facilitates the collection and expeditious transfer of maintenance payments by providing the necessary information regarding the payments to the debtor. If the debtor is willing to pay voluntarily, it is doubtful that transfer services provided by the Central Authority would be more efficient and cost-effective than the tools available for the debtor right now. If the decision must be enforced, the collection and the transfer is provided by the bailiff.
<b>Lithuania</b>	There is no provision of payment transfer services by the State-guaranteed Legal Aid Service.
<b>Portugal</b>	
<b>Sweden</b>	n/a
<b>Switzerland</b>	This does not apply at the moment as Switzerland is not a member state of the Hague Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	Our systems work in GBP, any changes would require operational consultation.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority is not involved in transferring payments. Payments are made directly from the debtor to the creditor, as arranged by the solicitor assigned to the case

<b>United States of America</b>	This is not considered a priority. Our primary objective is to support state child support agencies in transitioning to electronic payments.
---------------------------------	--

Is being considered.

Czech Republic, Mexico, United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)

Please explain:

<b>Czech Republic</b>	The services are currently available to creditors that elect to use these services. To provide such services to any debtors requires cooperation of the creditors (e.g. power of attorney).
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority will seek to implement any processes to facilitate payments electronically within the scope of HCCH 2007 Child Support Convention.

Has already been implemented.

Canada, Germany, Norway

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	Each province and territory has provisions in place to accept payments from debtors. Once received payments will be transferred to the Requesting State.  Chaque province et territoire a des dispositions en place pour accepter les paiements des débiteurs. Une fois reçus, les fonds seront transférés à l'État requérant.
<b>Germany</b>	As mentioned above (question h.) the German CA provides the opportunity for any debtor to make electronic payments to the bank account of the German CA (Federal Treasury/Bundeskasse). The German CA forwards these payments to the creditors abroad.
<b>Norway</b>	All debtors and creditors can, at any given point, have the case through the Collection Agency and benefit from the payment services. However, if payments are not received, enforcement proceedings will be initiated against the debtor.

- i. Implementation of payment transfer monitoring systems (see C&R 2019 No 6; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 36-37)

Not being considered.

Belgium, Croatia, Finland, Lithuania, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Croatia</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Central Authority.
<b>Finland</b>	The Public Body monitors incoming payments. The Central Authority does not monitor payments as it does not handle them.
<b>Lithuania</b>	There are no systems for monitoring payment transfers, as funds are transferred directly to the creditor's account.
<b>Portugal</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Portuguese Central authority.
<b>Sweden</b>	Enforcement agency: We do not have any monitoring systems implemented apart from our online banking systems. CA: We monitor payments as requesting central authority. As requested, we do

	not monitor payments and we therefore trust that the creditor or the CA of the requesting state monitor what the arrears are.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	This is not required as the Scottish central authority does not process payments.

Is being considered.

Brazil, Italy, Mexico, Switzerland

Please explain:

<b>Brazil</b>	Although presently the Brazilian Central Authority is not directly involved in payments, as this is handled privately, we expect that in time iSupport will help obtaining and sharing this kind of information.
<b>Italy</b>	Only for voluntary payments, according to information granted by parties. In the enforcement procedures the payments of sums foreclosed on a regular base or in a single transfer are ordered by the Courts with a single decision.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Switzerland</b>	However, the Central Authority was not able to undertake further general developments in this area last year.

Has already been implemented.

Canada, Czech Republic, Germany, Latvia, Norway, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	Each province and territory has an internal system to monitor payments. Accounting statements can be sent to any Requesting Authority.  Chaque province et territoire dispose d'un système interne de suivi des paiements. Des relevés comptables peuvent être envoyés à toute Autorité requérante.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Our Office has its own monitoring system of payments.
<b>Germany</b>	As far as the payments are processed via the German CA, the monitoring of the payments is possible. That concerns many incoming cases (e.g. outgoing payments), because the debtor is asked to send his payments to the bank account of the German CA (Bundeskasse/Federal Treasury). Especially in outgoing cases mainly with EU member states (i.e. incoming payments) the payments cannot be monitored as the debtors / other Central Authorities / bailiffs regular pay directly (via SEPA) to the creditors in Germany. One exception in the group of incoming payments concerns cheques from the US/CAN which can be monitored.
<b>Latvia</b>	As long as the case is active, Central Authority (when acting as requesting Central Authority) keeps contact with the creditor regarding the amount of the payments so that the requested Central Authority could be informed when necessary. Internal systems for efficient payment accounting are in place but it depends on the information provided by the creditor. Central Authority compiles information on the amount due, payments received and outstanding debt.
<b>Norway</b>	We already have this. We monitor all incoming and outgoing payments.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	MPBC manages all financial transactions for England and Wales.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority maintains payment records for all creditors/Central Authorities. Communication by the way of a BACS remittance

	advise is issued to creditors/Central Authorities each time a payment is processed to enable the reconciliation of the amounts received by the creditor.
<b>United States of America</b>	State child support agencies have the primary responsibility for monitoring payments; however, the ICSPS will assist them by providing information about payments transferred through the service.

- j. Implementation of unique case references, known to both the requesting and requested State, attached to each transfer of funds (see C&R 2019 No 7; aide-mémoire 2021, para. 20)  
Not being considered.

Belgium, Croatia, Finland, Lithuania, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds.
<b>Croatia</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Central Authority.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Lithuania</b>	As the funds are transferred directly to the creditor's account, it is not possible to ensure that a unique case reference is added to each transfer.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	Due to the structure of our systems, it is not possible to attach a single unique reference number.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	This would not be applicable to the Scottish central authority as we do not transfer funds.

Is being considered.

Brazil, Canada, Czech Republic, Italy, Mexico, Norway, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Brazil</b>	Although presently the Brazilian Central Authority is not directly involved in payments, as this is handled privately, we expect that, in time, iSupport will help obtaining and sharing unique case references.
<b>Canada</b>	Each support case within Canada is assigned a unique case reference based on their provincial numerical perimeters. Most systems within Canada can also display the Requesting Authority's unique case number and include this information when sending payments. It is not the current practice to share one case number between the two Authorities but could be considered.  Chaque ordonnance alimentaire au Canada se voit attribuer un numéro de référence unique, conformément aux paramètres numériques provinciaux. La plupart des systèmes au Canada permettent également d'afficher le numéro unique assigné par l'Autorité requérante et incluent cette information lors de l'envoi des paiements. La pratique actuelle ne prévoit pas que le même numéro soit utilisé par les deux Autorités, mais cette avenue pourrait être envisagée.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Our Office participates on iSupport system discussions.
<b>Italy</b>	The Italian CA may require debtors or Courts to apply the unique case reference on requesting CA demand.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Norway</b>	The use of Swift GPI tracker is being considered, but this requires that the other bank is using it as well. We are also considering using the iSupport reference numbers when we start using iSupport.

<b>Switzerland</b>	The Central Authority is following the development of iSupport.
<b>United States of America</b>	This is part of the payment transfer process and is designed to meet the needs of the financial institutions and States involved in the process.

Has already been implemented.

Germany, Latvia, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)

Please explain:

<b>Germany</b>	Allocation and automatic procession of electronic payments is already possible if the payment reference number ("Kassenzeichen") is attached to the payment and remains unchanged throughout the transfer. In incoming cases (i.e. outgoing payments) it seems possible to exchange our case reference number for the iSupport ID. The iSupport ID should be compatible with banking reference conventions (e.g., no special characters).
<b>Latvia</b>	A unique case number of the execution case is provided by the bailiff for each transfer.
<b>Portugal</b>	Transfer of funds done by Portuguese courts have a unique case reference.
<b>Sweden</b>	The debtor's name is attached to the payment. If the applicant has attached a reference number to the application of enforcement, the reference number is also attached.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority attaches unique case references, known to both the requesting and requested State each time a transfer of funds is made. Each unique case reference links the transfer to an existing case.

- k. Implementation of currency conversion of payments done by the relevant authority in the requested State at the time of transfer (see C&R 2019 No 8; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 21-23)

Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Lithuania, United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds.
<b>Brazil</b>	Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	
<b>Lithuania</b>	The bank, not the Central Authority, is responsible for currency conversion of payments.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority does not process payments.

Is being considered.

Czech Republic, Italy, Mexico, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Czech Republic</b>	Unfortunately, the process of the cross-border maintenance enforcement causes that the creditor does not always receive the full amount, as per the maintenance decision. This is caused by the exchange rates and the fact, that the debtor fulfils with her/his obligation by paying the amount to the account of the requested Central Authority (outgoing cases). In case of the court enforcement, it is applied the exchange rate of the day when the deduction of debtor's income is done (incoming cases). In order to eliminate this unfavourable consequence, our Office invites the debtors to pay also the due amount caused by the exchange rates voluntarily.
<b>Italy</b>	Courts and debtors will be required to foreclose or pay, if possible, the amount corresponding to the sum due in foreign currency at the exchange rate of the day of transfer.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Sweden</b>	Ongoing discussions with our main bank regarding currency conversion.
<b>Switzerland</b>	However, the Central Authority was not able to undertake further general developments in this area last year.
<b>United States of America</b>	This is part of our design. Please see the description above.

Has already been implemented.

Canada, Finland, Germany, Latvia, Norway, Portugal, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	For provinces and territories sending cheques – currency conversion must be done by the Requesting Authority at time of deposit. Provinces sending Swift transactions have the currency conversion done at the time of the Swift transfer.  Dans le cas des provinces et territoires qui envoient des chèques, la conversion de change doit être faite par l’Autorité requérante au moment du dépôt. Dans le cas des provinces qui ont recours aux télévirements SWIFT, la conversion de change se fait au moment du télévirement SWIFT.
<b>Finland</b>	The National Enforcement Authority handles this when transferring payments to the creditors.
<b>Germany</b>	Where debtors make electronic payments via the German CA (Federal Treasury/Bundeskasse), the full payments are forwarded to the recipients. The relevant date for the currency conversion is the day the German CA receives the payment from the debtor.
<b>Latvia</b>	Central national bank rates are used across the board on the day of conversion if the actual amount received by the creditor is unknown.
<b>Norway</b>	In our agreement with the bank, it is stated that these conversions are made at the point of transfer from the bank to the creditor.
<b>Portugal</b>	
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	We pay out at the Bank of England rate at the time of conversion. The relevant authority/Bank advises us of the rate used when paying money in.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority currently converts the payments to the currency requested by the State at the time of transfer. Northern Ireland Central Authority incurs any conversion charge and does not pass the conversion charges onto the creditors.

- I. Implementation of bundled payments to reduce costs of transfers (see C&R 2019 No 11; aide-mémoire 2021, paras 38-40)  
Not being considered.

Belgium, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Germany, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (England and Wales), United Kingdom (Northern Ireland), United Kingdom (Scotland)

Please explain:

<b>Belgium</b>	We do not intervene in the international transfer of maintenance funds
<b>Brazil</b>	The Central Authority is not directly involved in payments. Initial contacts were made with the major State-owned bank in Brazil, Banco do Brasil S.A., also one of the largest local commercial banks and with several branches abroad. These contacts did not go very far. Recent changes in the management of the Central Authority indicate the need to bring the subject to the attention of the new Director for his or her appreciation. The fact that the Central Authority is not directly involved in payments makes it difficult to find a starting point for these measures.
<b>Croatia</b>	The transfer of funds is not processed by the Central Authority.
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Germany</b>	For outgoing payments bundled payments are not being considered so far due to the disadvantages mentioned below. Bundled payments may help reduce costs of transfer. However, the processing of bundled payments may involve time and cost intensive manual work for the receiving CA/body. For example, the processing of bundled payments from the USA would entail for the German CA that around 220,000 EUR per month needed to be divided up into about 560 different cases. At worst this work would have to be done manually delaying the payment and tying up resources.
<b>Italy</b>	Italian CA is not involved in payments.
<b>Latvia</b>	According to the national law (Law on Bailiffs) the funds recovered from a debtor and to be transferred to a creditor shall be transferred to a creditor within ten days from the day when they were paid in the deposit account of a sworn bailiff, if there are no objective reasons because of which the transfer of funds is to be deferred.
<b>Lithuania</b>	All transfers are made directly to the creditor's account, and the State-guaranteed Legal Aid Service is not directly involved in the transferring process.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Portugal</b>	
<b>Sweden</b>	Our internal systems do not support bunk payments.
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	MPBC is unable to make bundled payments out due to the structure of our systems.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	Northern Ireland Central Authority are legally bound by the Judge's direction to pay any monies received from the debtor onto the creditor immediately. We are therefore unable to withhold monies from the creditors for a period of time to enable 'bundled payments'.
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	We are unable to comment on this question as the Scottish central authority does not transfer funds.

Is being considered.

Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

<b>Switzerland</b>	This is already the practice in some cases.
<b>United States of America</b>	We will send bundled payments to foreign authorities. This is required in order to meet federal currency transfer regulations, as well as for cost and efficiency reasons.

Has already been implemented.

Canada, Czech Republic, Norway

Please explain:

<b>Canada</b>	Most provinces and territories are able to send bundled payments via Swift or cheque.  La plupart des provinces et des territoires sont en mesure d'envoyer des paiements groupés, par le système SWIFT ou par chèque.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Our Office sends enforced maintenance in some cases in bulk to the requesting Central Authorities, usually once or twice a month. If the creditor agrees, we can transfer more smaller payments after longer time together.
<b>Norway</b>	We do this daily, when possible. We can also receive bundled payments.

m. Any other developments including bilateral solutions put in place between States and ongoing trials between States:

<b>Belgium</b>	None
<b>Brazil</b>	
<b>Canada</b>	
<b>Croatia</b>	
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Payments between the Czech Republic and Slovakia are transferred twice a month (payments enforced in all cases together).
<b>Finland</b>	
<b>Germany</b>	
<b>Italy</b>	
<b>Latvia</b>	N/A
<b>Lithuania</b>	None.
<b>Mexico</b>	
<b>Norway</b>	
<b>Portugal</b>	Portuguese Central Authority receives the cheques that come from the USA, and processes the transfer of funds to the creditors, assuming the costs involved.
<b>Sweden</b>	
<b>Switzerland</b>	
<b>United Kingdom (England and Wales)</b>	Open to conversations with any other states to eliminate the use of cheques.
<b>United Kingdom (Northern Ireland)</b>	none
<b>United Kingdom (Scotland)</b>	The Scottish central authority is not involved in any bilateral solutions or trials as it does not process payments.
<b>United States of America</b>	

