

<b>Title</b>	<b>Conclusions and Recommendations from previous meetings of the Special Commission (2000, 2005, 2010 and 2015) on the practical operation of the 1993 Adoption Convention</b>
<b>Document</b>	<b>Info. Doc. No 1 of December 2019</b>
<b>Author</b>	PB
<b>Agenda item</b>	n.a.
<b>Mandate(s)</b>	C&R No 32 of the 2019 Council on General Affairs and Policy (CGAP) C&R No 32 of the 2018 CGAP Article 42 of the 1993 Adoption Convention Article 6 of the HCCH Statute
<b>Objective</b>	To present regrouped by topic the Conclusions and Recommendations approved by previous Special Commission meetings
<b>Action to be taken</b>	For Approval <input type="checkbox"/> For Decision <input type="checkbox"/> For Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Annexes</b>	n.a.
<b>Related documents</b>	n.a.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

<p>SCOPE ..... 3</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">1 Scope of the 1993 Adoption Convention and determination of the habitual residence ..... 3</p> <p>COOPERATION ..... 5</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">2 General ..... 5</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">3 Designation of Central Authorities, Other Authorities and Bodies under the Convention 6</p> <p>ADOPTION PROCEDURE..... 9</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">4 Subsidiarity ..... 9</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">5 Child ..... 11</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">6 Prospective Adoptive Parents..... 13</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">7 Article 17..... 15</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">8 Recognition and Effects of Adoption (Arts. 23 and 24) ..... 15</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">9 Avoiding Unnecessary Delays ..... 16</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">10 Nationality of the Child ..... 17</p> <p>POST ADOPTION MATTERS..... 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">11 General ..... 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">12 Post Adoption Reporting..... 18</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">13 Preservation of Information ..... 19</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">14 Search for Origins..... 19</p> <p>TYPES OF ADOPTION..... 19</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">15 Intrafamily / Relative Adoption..... 19</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">16 Openness in adoption ..... 20</p> <p>FINANCIAL ASPECTS AND ILLICIT PRACTICES ..... 21</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">17 Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption . 21</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">18 Illicit Practices in Intercountry Adoption ..... 23</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">19 Private and Independent Adoptions..... 25</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">20 Limits to ICA ..... 26</p>	<p>PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION AND COUNTRY / REGION SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS. 27</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">21 Evaluation of the operation of the Convention ..... 27</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">22 Mutual Support and Assistance in Applying the Safeguards of the Convention, including technical assistance (ICATAP)..... 28</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">23 Response to Disaster Situations ..... 29</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">24 Bilateral agreements (Art. 39(2)) ..... 30</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">25 Declaration by delegations from Africa ..... 31</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">26 Implementation of the Convention in Guatemala..... 31</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">27 Intercountry Adoption in Non-Convention States..... 33</p> <p>TOOLS AND GUIDES TO GOOD PRACTICE ..... 34</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">28 Statistics ..... 34</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">29 Country Profiles..... 34</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">30 Model Forms ..... 35</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">31 Guide to Good Practice No 1..... 36</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">32 Accreditation (Including Guide to Good Practice No 2)..... 38</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">33 Future Guides to Good Practice ..... 39</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">34 Use of Modern Technologies ..... 39</p> <p>OTHER MEASURES AND CONVENTIONS ..... 41</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">35 International placements outside the Scope of the Convention (including <i>Kafala</i>) ..... 41</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">36 International Surrogacy and Intercountry Adoption ..... 41</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">37 1996 Child Protection Convention ..... 42</p> <p style="padding-left: 20px;">38 1961 Apostille Convention ..... 42</p>
---	---

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
<b>SCOPE</b>					
1	<b>Scope of the 1993 Adoption Convention and determination of the habitual residence</b>			<p>11. The Special Commission emphasised that <b>all intercountry adoptions falling within the scope</b> of the Convention under Article 2(1), including in-family adoptions and adoptions by nationals of the State of origin, are <b>subject</b> to Convention procedures and safeguards.</p> <p>12. Where an adoption falling within the scope of the Convention has been <b>processed</b> in a Contracting State <b>as a non-Convention adoption</b>, the Central Authorities concerned are strongly recommended to co-operate in efforts to address the situation in a manner which respects Convention procedures and safeguards, and to prevent these situations from recurring.</p> <p>13. Where the habitual residence of the prospective adoptive parents is uncertain the concerned Central Authority should provide <b>advice on their particular situation</b> before they proceed with an adoption application.</p>	<p>22. In order to ensure that the Convention is applied to all adoptions falling within its scope, the SC recognised that there is a need to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) promote <b>consistent determinations</b>, in the light of the Convention’s objectives, of “habitual residence” in Contracting States, including developing a common understanding of the factors which might be considered when determining habitual residence;</li> <li>b) promote <b>education</b> of the relevant judicial and administrative <b>authorities or bodies</b> in Contracting States in relation to determinations of habitual residence and the scope of the Convention;</li> <li>c) <b>raise awareness</b> with the <b>public</b> of what qualifies as an intercountry adoption under the Convention.</li> </ul> <p>23. In cases where the habitual residence of the prospective adoptive parents is uncertain, the SC reaffirmed 2010 SC C&amp;R No 13</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>and further recommended that the concerned <b>Central Authority expeditiously consult with the Central Authorities</b> of any other relevant Contracting States before providing advice or communicating its decision to the prospective adoptive parents.</p> <p>24. The SC noted with concern reports of persons moving to, or moving children from, Contracting States in order to <b>undertake a domestic adoption</b> in another Contracting State in an effort to deliberately <b>circumvent</b> the Convention. The SC invited Contracting States, when considering prospective adoptive parents' applications to adopt domestically, to consider carefully the circumstances of the prospective adoptive parents' and / or the child's presence in that State.</p> <p>25. The SC welcomed Preliminary Document No 4 of April 2015 on "<b>Globalisation and international mobility: habitual residence and the scope of the 1993 Convention</b>" as providing useful further guidance on the scope of</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>the Convention and determinations of habitual residence. It recommended that the document be revised by the Permanent Bureau in light of: (1) the discussions at the SC meeting; and (2) any written comments submitted by Contracting States, Members of the Hague Conference, and States and organisations represented at the Special Commission. The SC further recommended that the finalised document be published subsequently on the website of the Hague Conference.</p>
<b>COOPERATION</b>					
2	General		<p>10. The Special Commission stresses the importance of <b>enhancing co-operation and exchange of information</b> between Central Authorities, public authorities, accredited bodies and any bodies and persons under Article 22(2), notably with a view to <b>promoting good practice</b> and to ensuring that <b>illegal and unethical</b> procedures prior to the adoption of a child be effectively and systematically <b>combated</b>.</p>	<p>7. States of origin and receiving States are encouraged to provide each other with a <b>full description of the manner in which they apply the safeguards under Articles 4 and 5 respectively</b>. This information should also be included in their Country Profile posted on the website of the Hague Conference. States are encouraged to update this information regularly.</p>	<p>26. The SC recognised the importance of the <b>continuation and expansion of co-operation and assistance between States</b> in relation to the implementation and operation of the Convention. It welcomed the positive results reported by States which have benefitted from such co-operation.</p> <p>27. The SC applauded the increased <b>horizontal co-operation</b> reported between States of origin,</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			<p>11. Contracting States are encouraged to undertake and participate in <b>regional and / or bilateral meetings</b> to exchange information and good practices.</p> <p>15. The Special Commission recommends that States actively <b>discourage direct contacts between prospective adoptive parents and authorities in the State of origin</b> until authorised to do so. Exceptionally, such contact at the appropriate time may be desirable, for example in the case of a child with special needs.</p>		<p>as well as regional and multilateral co-operation, to enhance the effective operation of the Convention.</p> <p>29. To support States considering becoming party to the Convention, the SC recommended that the Permanent Bureau develop <b>a tool to provide practical guidance</b> to assist them with their legal framework for adoption.</p>
3	<b>Designation of Central Authorities, Other Authorities and Bodies under the Convention</b>	<p>1. Each Contracting State should provide a <b>description</b> of the manner in which the various <b>responsibilities</b> and <b>tasks</b> under the Convention are <b>divided</b> between Central Authorities, public authorities and accredited bodies, so that the entities responsible to act under particular articles of the Convention are clearly identified, as well as the mechanisms by which they interact with one another. The Permanent Bureau should develop a <b>model chart</b> which would assist States in</p>	<p>3. The Special Commission reaffirms Recommendation No 2 of the Special Commission of November / December 2000, and underlines, in particular, the importance of designating Central Authorities without delay.</p>		<p>9. The SC recognised the importance of the role of <b>adoption accredited bodies</b> in the intercountry adoption process in many Contracting States, and the challenges that these bodies face in light of the changed landscape of intercountry adoption.</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>providing this information. The information should be furnished to the Permanent Bureau and published.</p> <p>2. The following recommendations are designed to <b>improve communication</b> under the Convention, as well as understanding of how the Convention operates in the different Contracting States:</p> <p>a) The <b>designation of the Central Authorities</b>, required by Article 13, as well as their contact details, should be <b>communicated</b> to the <b>Permanent Bureau</b> not later than the date of the entry into force of the Convention in that State.</p> <p>b) Such communication should, in accordance with Article 13 and paragraph 274 of the Explanatory Report on the Convention by G. Parra-Aranguren (Proceedings of the Seventeenth Session (1993), Tome II, Adoption – co-operation, page 591), give <b>notice of any other public authorities</b> (including their</p>			

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>contact details) which, under Article 8 or 9 <b>discharge</b> functions assigned to the Central Authorities.</p> <p>c) The <b>extent of the functions</b> of the Central Authorities and any such public authorities should be explained.</p> <p>d) The <b>designation of accredited bodies</b>, required by Article 13, as well as their contact details, should be <b>communicated</b> to the <b>Permanent Bureau</b> at the time of their accreditation.</p> <p>e) Where a <b>body</b> accredited in one Contracting State is, in accordance with Article 12, authorised to act in another Contracting State, such <b>authorisation</b> should be communicated to the Permanent Bureau by the competent authorities of both States without delay.</p> <p>f) The <b>extent of the functions</b> of accredited <b>bodies</b> should also be explained.</p> <p>g) All the <b>information</b> referred to above should be <b>kept up-to-date</b> and the Permanent Bureau informed promptly of any changes, including in</p>			



Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>particular any withdrawals of accreditation or authorisation to act.</p> <p><b>h) Designations</b>, in accordance with <b>Article 23</b>, of authorities competent to certify an adoption as having been made in accordance with the Convention should also be <b>kept up-to-date</b>.</p> <p>3. The need for <b>adequate resources</b> and <b>appropriately trained staff</b> in Central Authorities was accepted, as well as the importance of ensuring a reasonable level of <b>continuity</b> in their operations.</p>			
<b>ADOPTION PROCEDURE</b>					
<b>4</b>	<b>Subsidiarity</b>				<p>1. Twenty years after the entry into force of the Convention, the SC: [...]</p> <p>f) recognised the <b>increase in domestic adoption</b> as one of the positive factors impacting the changed landscape of intercountry adoption.</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>2. The SC reaffirmed the <b>importance</b> of subsidiarity<sup>1</sup> as a foundational principle of the Convention. It underlined that implementation of the subsidiarity principle is <b>central</b> to the success of the Convention, and to determining that an intercountry adoption takes place “in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights”.<sup>2</sup></p> <p>3. To further promote the principle of subsidiarity, States are encouraged to <b>strengthen</b> their <b>domestic child protection systems</b>, including the establishment and promotion of measures which support family <b>preservation</b> and reunification, as well as <b>in-country alternative permanent family care</b>, such as domestic adoption and other traditional forms of alternative care.</p> <p>4. The SC recognised that a lack of resources in some States remains one of the <b>most serious challenges</b></p>

<sup>1</sup> Preamble and Art. 4(1)(b) of the Convention.

<sup>2</sup> Art. 1(a) of the Convention.

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					to the implementation of the subsidiarity principle, and encouraged States to provide <b>support to other States</b> to improve their domestic child protection systems. Any such support should <b>not be offered or sought in a manner which compromises</b> the integrity of the intercountry adoption process, such as creating a dependency on income deriving from intercountry adoption.
5	Child	<p>12. The Special Commission agreed on the importance, from the point of view of the process of matching, and for the information of the adoptive parents and later the child himself or herself, of obtaining a <b>full and accurate medical report on the child</b>. The importance of maintaining <b>confidentiality</b> with respect to the medical report on the child, bearing in mind the right to respect for private life, was also emphasised.</p> <p>13. The idea of a rigid model form was not approved. However, it was accepted that the form for the <b>medical report</b> on the child which appears in</p>			<p>10. The SC recognised that an <b>increasing number</b> of children being adopted intercountry today have special needs and it is essential to address the resulting challenges.</p> <p>11. The SC recommended that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the <b>subsidiarity</b> principle of the Convention should be <b>equally applied</b> to children with special needs and, as a priority, measures should be promoted which support biological families in caring for children with such needs;</li> <li>b) children with special needs determined to be in need of alternative family care should be <b>evaluated on a systematic</b></li> </ul>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>Appendix B constitutes a useful aid in improving the quality of, and standardising, reports on the child drawn up in accordance with Article 16, paragraph 1, of the Convention.</p>			<p><b>and regular basis</b> to ensure that their legal, medical and psycho-social adoptability can be assessed and kept under regular review. The assessment of their psycho-social and medical adoptability is particularly important.</p> <p>12. In relation to children with special needs, the SC strongly emphasised the need for:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) an <b>individualised assessment</b> of the child’s specific needs which is particularly vital for the process of matching;</li> <li>b) <b>counselling</b> and <b>preparation</b> of the <b>child</b>, which should be adapted to his or her age, degree of maturity and needs;</li> <li>c) <b>specific selection</b>, mandatory <b>preparation</b> and <b>counselling</b> of prospective adoptive <b>parents</b>, including informing them of the post-adoption support available;</li> <li>d) <b>a full, accurate and up-to-date report</b> on the child and on the prospective adoptive parents. The report on the prospective adoptive parents should clearly identify “the characteristics of the children</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>for whom they would be qualified to care”, as well as the preparation and counselling they have undertaken;</p> <p>e) a <b>professionalised matching</b> process involving a multi-disciplinary group of professionals; and</p> <p>f) <b>professional assistance</b> to be provided to prospective adoptive parents <b>when deciding</b> on a child proposal, as well as in the <b>post</b>-adoption phase.</p> <p>13. The SC warmly <b>endorsed</b> the <b>work</b> of International Social Service in relation to children with special needs, including the possibility of using life books for such children.</p> <p>14. The SC recommended that <b>adoption accredited bodies</b> should acquire and / or have access to <b>professional expertise</b> on the intercountry adoption of children with special needs.</p>
6	<b>Prospective Adoptive Parents</b>	14. Emphasis was placed on the need for <b>thoroughness</b> and <b>objectivity</b> by authorities in the	2. The Special Commission recommends that the <b>Permanent Bureau</b> , in consultation with	8. States of origin may assist receiving States in establishing their criteria for the selection of	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>receiving country in the <b>assessment and preparation</b> of the prospective adopters, and in drawing up the report on the applicants in accordance with Article 15.</p>	<p>Contracting States and non-governmental organisations, <b>collect information</b> on issues including, inter alia, the <b>financial</b> aspects of intercountry adoption, <b>reports</b> on prospective adoptive parents, <b>preparation</b> of prospective adoptive parents, and <b>post-adoption reports</b>, with the view to the possible development of <b>future Parts of the Guide to Good Practice</b>.</p> <p>12. The Special Commission recognises the importance of States of origin <b>sending information</b> to receiving States on the <b>needs of children</b> to better identify prospective adoptive parents.</p> <p>13. The Special Commission recognises that as a matter of good practice, authorities in receiving States should <b>co-operate</b> with authorities in States of origin in order to <b>better understand</b> the <b>needs of children</b> in States of origin.</p>	<p>prospective adoptive parents by <b>providing information about the characteristics and needs of adoptable children</b>. This information will also contribute to the development of preparation materials on intercountry adoption directed to prospective adoptive parents, and to the management of their expectations.</p> <p>9. The Special Commission emphasised the need for <b>country specific preparation</b> and for prospective adoptive parents to have some <b>knowledge of the culture of the child</b> and his or her <b>language</b> in order to communicate with the child from the matching stage.</p> <p>10. The Special Commission recommended that the Permanent Bureau, in consultation with Contracting States and non-governmental organisations, <b>collect information on the selection, counselling and preparation of prospective</b> adoptive parents, with a view to the possible development of the <b>Guide to Good Practice No 3</b>. This may include a discussion on good</p>	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				practices in dealing with failed adoptions and the period of validity of the “home study” report.	
7	<b>Article 17</b>	<p>15. The <b>importance</b> within the adoption process of the requirements of <b>Article 17</b> were re-emphasised.</p> <p>16. In those States where agreements under Article 17 c) may be <b>given by bodies other than the Central Authority</b>, the bodies that may perform this function should be <b>specified</b>.</p>			
8	<b>Recognition and Effects of Adoption (Arts. 23 and 24)</b>	<p>17. Attention was drawn to the <b>importance</b> of the <b>certificate</b> of conformity provided for by Article 23 of the Convention. The body or <b>bodies</b> competent to <b>issue</b> such certificates should be <b>clearly identified</b> and the certificate should be <b>issued without delay</b> following the making of the adoption.</p> <p>18. Parents should be <b>provided with a certificate before they came to take the child/children</b>. The Central Authority in the <b>receiving State</b> should also be given a <b>copy</b> of the certificate.</p>		<p>15. The Special Commission noted with <b>concern</b> the high number of States that have <b>not designated a competent authority</b> for the purpose of issuing a certificate of conformity under Article 23.</p> <p>16. The Article 23 certificate is <b>essential to allow the automatic recognition</b> of adoptions made under the Convention and should be <b>issued promptly</b> where the requirements of the Convention have been met.</p> <p>17. Where a certificate under Article 23 is <b>incomplete or</b></p>	<p>36. In relation to Article 23 of the Convention, the SC emphasised the importance of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>clearly designating</b> the <b>authorities</b> competent to issue Article 23 certificates and keeping this information <b>updated</b>;</li> <li>b) <b>automatically issuing</b> such certificates following an adoption decision made in accordance with the Convention wherever possible;</li> <li>c) providing adoptive <b>parents</b> with the <b>original</b> of the Article 23 certificate without delay</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>19. The <b>importance</b> of the recommended “<b>Model Form</b> for the Certificate of Conformity of Inter-country Adoption” which was approved at the Special Commission of October 1994, and which appears in Annex C of the Report of that Special Commission, which was published in March 1995, was reemphasised.</p>		<p><b>defective</b>, States should co-operate to regularise the situation.</p> <p>18. The Special Commission underlined that <b>no additional procedure may be imposed</b> as a condition of recognition.</p>	<p>and, at the same time, sending a <b>copy</b> of the certificate to the <b>Central Authorities of both</b> Contracting States;</p> <p>d) using the “<b>Model Form</b> for the Certificate of Conformity of Inter-country Adoption” to promote consistent practice; and</p> <p>e) where an Article 23 certificate is <b>incomplete or defective</b>, co-operating to regularise the situation.</p> <p>37. The SC reminded Contracting States that <b>no additional procedure</b> may be imposed as a condition of recognition.</p>
9	<p><b>Avoiding Unnecessary Delays</b></p>		<p>14. The Special Commission reminds States Parties to the Convention of their obligations under Article 35 to act <b>expeditiously</b> in the process of adoption, and notes in particular the need to <b>avoid unnecessary delay in finding a permanent family for the child</b>.</p>		<p>5. The SC recalled that implementation of the principle of subsidiarity should not “unintentionally harm children by <b>delaying unduly a permanent solution</b> through intercountry adoption”.</p> <p>6. Recalling Article 35 of the Convention, the SC reminded Contracting States to do their utmost to <b>prevent unnecessary delays</b> at all stages of the</p>



Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>intercountry adoption process, while respecting the safeguards of the Convention. Wherever possible, the use of modern methods of communication is encouraged to facilitate expeditious action.</p> <p>7. The benefits of becoming a party to the <i>Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the Requirements of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (Apostille Convention)</i> were reaffirmed by the SC in order to avoid unnecessary delays in intercountry adoption.</p>
10	<b>Nationality of the Child</b>	20. Discussion in the Special Commission revealed a clear trend in favour of <b>accordng automatically</b> to the adopted child the nationality of the receiving State.	17. The Special Commission recommends that the child be accorded <b>automatically the nationality of one of the adoptive parents</b> or of the <b>receiving State</b> , without the need to rely on any action of the adoptive parents. Where this is not possible, the receiving States are encouraged to provide the necessary assistance to ensure the child obtains such citizenship. The policy of Contracting States regarding the nationality of the child should be	19. The Special Commission <b>reaffirmed</b> Recommendation No 17 of the Meeting of the Special Commission of September 2005.	20. Central Authorities should <b>co-operate</b> in the completion of any formalities necessary for the acquisition by the child of the nationality, where appropriate, either of the receiving State or of an adoptive parent.

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			guided by the overriding importance of <b>avoiding</b> a situation in which an adopted child is <b>stateless</b> .	21. The question of whether <b>nationality will be granted</b> to the child may, where appropriate, be a relevant factor when a State of origin is <b>considering co-operation with a particular receiving State</b> .	
<b>POST ADOPTION MATTERS</b>					
<b>11</b>	<b>General</b>				<p>18. The SC recognised that post-adoption services are <b>essential</b> and should take into account the <b>life-long nature of adoption</b>. States are encouraged to develop <b>specialised post-adoption services</b>, in addition to the general services already in place.</p> <p>19. The SC recognised that <b>appropriate evaluations, preparation, reports, matching</b> and post-adoption <b>support</b>, in relation to both the child and prospective adoptive parents, will <b>reduce the risk</b> of the breakdown of intercountry adoptions.</p>
<b>12</b>	<b>Post Adoption Reporting</b>		18. The Special Commission recommends to receiving States to <b>encourage compliance with post-adoption reporting</b> requirements of States of origin; a <b>model form</b> might be developed for this purpose. Similarly, the Special	27. The Special Commission <b>reaffirmed</b> Recommendation No 18 of the Meeting of the Special Commission of September 2005.	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			Commission recommends to States of origin to <b>limit the period</b> in which they require post-adoption reporting in recognition of the mutual confidence which provides the framework for co-operation under the Convention.		
13	Preservation of Information			28. It was recommended that receiving States and States of origin <b>preserve adoption records in perpetuity</b> . The record must contain the <b>information</b> referred to in <b>Article 16</b> and, to the extent possible, any <b>other information</b> or personal items relating to the child or his or her birth family.	
14	Search for Origins			29. It was recommended that receiving States and States of origin provide <b>different forms of assistance and counselling</b> for different <b>stages</b> of the child's development to adulthood, including preparation for origin searches and reunions of the adoptees with members of their biological families.	21. The SC recommended that the possibility of a child <b>searching</b> for his or her origins be <b>included</b> in the <b>counselling and preparation</b> of the prospective adoptive parents. When an adopted child or an adult adoptee undertakes such a search, professional support at all stages is recommended.
<b>TYPES OF ADOPTION</b>					
15	Intrafamily / Relative Adoption			<i>(See Conclusions and Recommendations Nos 11 &amp; 12 of 2010, Item 1 of this document)</i>	32. In relation to in-family adoption, the SC:

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) recalled that <b>in-family adoptions fall within the scope</b> of the Convention;</li> <li>b) recalled the need to respect the safeguards of the Convention, in particular to <b>counsel and prepare</b> the prospective adoptive parents;</li> <li>c) recognised that the <b>matching</b> process might be <b>adapted</b> to the specific features of in-family adoptions;</li> <li>d) recommended that the <b>motivations</b> of all parties should be <b>examined</b> to determine whether the <b>child is genuinely in need</b> of adoption;</li> <li>e) recognised that it is necessary to undertake an <b>individualised assessment of each child's</b> situation and it should not be automatically assumed that either an in-country or in-family placement is in a child's best interests.</li> </ul>
16	<b>Openness in adoption</b>				31. The SC noted that, where not prohibited by domestic legislation, and after professional matching, <b>contact</b> between the adoptee and biological family in intercountry adoption <b>may be beneficial</b> in some cases. In order to maximise

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					the benefits and minimise the risks of such contact, <b>professional support</b> should be offered to prepare the parties, as well as to assist them during and after contact. The adopted child's best interests should guide the nature of this contact, taking into account his or her wishes.
<b>FINANCIAL ASPECTS AND ILLICIT PRACTICES</b>					
17	<b>Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption</b>	<p>6. <b>Accreditation</b> requirements for agencies providing intercountry adoption services should include evidence of a <b>sound financial basis</b> and an effective internal system of financial control, as well as external <b>auditing</b>. Accredited bodies should be required to maintain <b>accounts</b>, to be submitted to the supervising authority, including an itemised statement of the average costs and charges associated with different categories of adoptions.</p> <p>7. Prospective adopters should be provided in advance with an <b>itemised list of the costs and expenses</b> likely to arise from the adoption process itself.</p>	<p>5. The Special Commission <b>reaffirms</b> Recommendations Nos 6 - 9 of the Special Commission of November / December 2000. <i>(See also Conclusion and Recommendation No 2 of 2005, Item 6 of this document)</i></p>	<p>4. The Special Commission recommended that the Permanent Bureau examine the feasibility of posting on the Hague Conference website <b>tables</b> indicating for each Contracting State the costs associated with intercountry adoption and the charges imposed on prospective adoptive parents (see table 1 and table 2 of Annex 9B of the draft Guide to Good Practice No 2).</p> <p>14. The Special Commission emphasised the need to establish, in all cases, a <b>clear separation</b> of intercountry adoption from contributions, donations and development aid.</p>	<p>41. The SC welcomed the tools developed thus far by the <b>Experts' Group on the Financial Aspects</b> of Intercountry Adoption (the Harmonised Terminology, the Note, the Summary List of Good Practices and the Tables on Costs) and recognised their practical value.</p> <p>42. The SC urged Contracting States to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- <b>complete</b> the <b>Tables on Costs</b> as soon as possible;</li> <li>- <b>publish</b> the Tables on the website of their Central Authority; and</li> <li>- provide the Permanent Bureau with the link for publication on the Hague Conference website.</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>Authorities and agencies in the receiving State and the State of origin 48 should <b>co-operate</b> in ensuring that this information is made available.</p> <p>8. <b>Information</b> concerning the costs and expenses and fees charged for the provision of intercountry adoption services by different agencies should be made available to the <b>public</b>.</p> <p>9. <b>Donations</b> by prospective adopters to bodies concerned in the adoption process <b>must not be sought, offered or made</b>.</p> <p>10. Receiving countries are <b>encouraged to support efforts in countries of origin to improve national child protection services</b>, including programmes for the prevention of abandonment. However, this support should <b>not be offered or sought</b> in a manner which <b>compromises</b> the integrity of the intercountry adoption process, or <b>creates a dependency</b> on income deriving from intercountry adoption. In addition, decisions concerning the placement of</p>			<p>In addition or alternatively, if a Contracting State so wishes, it may ask the Permanent Bureau to publish its Tables in full on the Hague Conference website.</p> <p>43. The SC recommended that the Experts' Group on the Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption continue its work in relation to the "<b>Draft Survey</b> for Adoptive Parents on the Financial Aspects of Intercountry Adoption".</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p>children for intercountry <b>adoption</b> should <b>not be influenced</b> by levels of payment or contribution. These should have no bearing on the possibility of a child being made available, nor on the age, health or any characteristic of the child to be adopted.</p>			
18	<p><b>Illicit Practices in Intercountry Adoption</b></p>			<p>1. <b>Concerned to prevent</b>, in the context of intercountry adoption, the <b>abduction, sale and traffic in children</b> and their illicit procurement, the Special Commission draws the attention of States to the following as essential features of a well regulated system:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) <b>effective application</b> of Hague Convention procedures and safeguards including, as far as practicable, in relation to non-Convention adoptions;</li> <li>b) <b>independent and transparent procedures</b> for determining <b>adoptability</b> and for making decisions on the placement of a child for adoption;</li> <li>c) strict adherence to the requirements of <b>free and informed consent</b> to adoption;</li> </ul>	<p>44. The SC welcomed the <b>frank and open dialogue</b> which took place on preventing and addressing illicit practices, and the sharing of good practices in this regard. It noted that <b>cooperation and coordination</b> between States is key to preventing illicit practices.</p> <p>45. The SC recommended that the <b>Working Group on Preventing and Addressing Illicit Practices</b> resume its work. It noted that the <b>United States of America</b> has offered to co-ordinate the work of the Group and invited States to notify the Permanent Bureau of their interest in joining the Group.</p> <p>46. Recalling 2010 SC C&amp;R Nos 22 and 23 and the fact that private and independent adoptions are not compatible with the</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				<p>d) strict <b>accreditation</b> and <b>authorisation of agencies</b>, and in accordance with criteria focussing on child protection;</p> <p>e) adequate <b>penalties</b> and effective prosecution, through the appropriate public authorities, to suppress illegal activities;</p> <p>f) properly <b>trained judges</b>, officials and other relevant actors;</p> <p>g) <b>prohibition</b> on <b>private</b> and <b>independent</b> adoptions;</p> <p>h) <b>clear separation</b> of intercountry <b>adoption</b> from <b>contributions, donations and development aid</b>;</p> <p>i) regulated, reasonable and transparent <b>fees and charges</b>;</p> <p>j) effective <b>co-operation</b> and communication between relevant authorities both nationally and internationally;</p> <p>k) implementation of other <b>relevant international instruments</b> to which States are parties;</p> <p>l) <b>public awareness</b> of the issues.</p> <p>2. The Special Commission acknowledged the generous</p>	<p>Convention, the SC encouraged Contracting States to move towards the <b>elimination</b> of <b>private</b> and <b>independent</b> adoptions.</p> <p>47. The SC recalled paragraph 20 above, and noted the relevance of the <b>1996 Hague Convention</b> to enhancing co-operation to protect children, including <b>trafficked</b> children.</p>



Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				<p>contribution of the Government of <b>Australia</b> for making possible the special day on the abduction, sale and traffic in children and their illicit procurement, which raised awareness of the nature and extent of the problem. An informal group co-ordinated by the Australian Central Authority with the participation of the Permanent Bureau will consider the development of more effective and practical forms of cooperation between States to prevent and address specific instances of abuse. The result of this work will be circulated by the Permanent Bureau for consideration by Contracting States.</p>	
19	Private and Independent Adoptions			<p>22. Adoptions which are <b>arranged directly between birth parents and adoptive parents</b> (i.e., private adoptions) are <b>not compatible</b> with the Convention.</p> <p>23. <b>Independent</b> adoptions, in which the adoptive parent is approved to adopt in the receiving State and, in the State of origin, <b>locates a child without the intervention of a Central Authority</b> or accredited <b>body</b> in</p>	<p><i>(See also Conclusion and Recommendation No 46 of 2015, Item 18 of this document)</i></p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				<p>the State of origin, are also <b>not compatible</b> with the Convention.</p> <p>24. It was strongly recommended that <b>training</b> be provided for judges and other authorities or persons exercising functions under the Convention. This training should address in particular the problems surrounding <b>private and independent adoptions</b>, as well as other possible ways in which the procedures and safeguards of the Convention are circumvented.</p>	
20	Limits to ICA				<p>8. States of origin are encouraged to <b>specify</b> through their Central Authority <b>any limits</b> in relation to the <b>number and type</b> of applications for intercountry adoption which they will accept, in light of the number and profile of intercountry adoptable children in the State. <b>Receiving States should respect any limits.</b> Moreover, even where no such limits have been specified, the number and type of applications sent to States of origin should be appropriate in view of the number and profile of intercountry adoptable children in that State.</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
<b>PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE CONVENTION AND COUNTRY / REGION SPECIFIC RECOMMENDATIONS</b>					
21	Evaluation of the operation of the Convention				<p>1. Twenty years after the entry into force of the Convention, the SC:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) affirmed the <b>continued relevance</b> and fundamental <b>importance</b> of the Convention and welcomed its <b>broad acceptance</b> as the international benchmark for intercountry adoption today;</li> <li>b) recognised the significant, <b>positive impact</b> which the Convention has had on laws and practices relating to intercountry adoption over the last 20 years, transforming an area that was previously largely unregulated into a regulated, rule-based system which strives “to ensure that intercountry adoptions are made in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights”<sup>2</sup>;</li> <li>c) acknowledged that the landscape of intercountry</li> </ul>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					adoption has changed over the past 20 years, and encouraged Contracting States to ensure that their laws and practices adequately respond to the current reality of intercountry adoption;
22	Mutual Support and Assistance in Applying the Safeguards of the Convention, including technical assistance (ICATAP)	<i>(See Conclusion and Recommendation No 10 of 2000, Item 17 of this document)</i>		<p>6. Receiving States are encouraged to consider <b>ways</b> in which to <b>assist</b> and <b>support States of origin</b> in the performance of their functions and in the application of safeguards under the Convention, including by means of capacity-building and other programmes.</p> <p>32. The Special Commission recognised the great value of the Intercountry Adoption Technical Assistance Programme (<b>ICATAP</b>), which has already provided technical assistance and training for several States.</p> <p>33. The Special Commission acknowledged the <b>limited resources</b> available to the Permanent Bureau to maintain ICATAP and urged all States to consider making financial and / or in-kind contributions to secure the continuity of the programme.</p>	<p>1. <b>Twenty years</b> after the entry into force of the Convention, the SC: [...] e) emphasised the great value of the Intercountry Adoption Technical Assistance Programme ("<b>ICATAP</b>") of the Hague Conference and the important support it has provided to States in the implementation and operation of the Convention; [...]</p> <p>28. Recalling the great value of <b>ICATAP</b> to the successful implementation and operation of the Convention, the SC urged States to continue to support the programme.</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				<p>34. Contributions of some States and international organisations, such as <b>UNICEF</b>, have been crucial to the success of ICATAP. In this regard, the <b>horizontal cooperation</b> between States of origin is particularly beneficial.</p> <p>35. The work undertaken to support the effective implementation of the Convention under the aegis of the <b>International Centre for Judicial Studies and Technical Assistance</b> should be regarded as essential for the proper functioning of the Convention.</p>	
23	Response to Disaster Situations			<p>38. The Special Commission recognised that, in a disaster situation, efforts to <b>reunite</b> a <b>displaced</b> child with his or her parents or family members must take priority. <b>Premature</b> and <b>unregulated</b> attempts to organise the <b>adoption</b> of such a child abroad should be <b>avoided</b> and resisted.</p> <p>39. <b>No new adoption applications</b> should be considered in the period after the disaster or before the</p>	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				<p>authorities in that State are in a position to apply the necessary safeguards.</p> <p>40. The Special Commission also recognised the need for a <b>common approach</b> on the part of Central Authorities in dealing with such situations and for Central Authorities to discuss and review actions taken in response to, and lessons learned from, disaster situations.</p>	
24	<b>Bilateral agreements (Art. 39(2))</b>				<p>33. The SC took note of the Study undertaken by Sweden entitled, "Commission Concerning <b>Bilateral Agreements</b> on Intercountry Adoption Report to the Government".</p> <p>34. The SC requested that the Permanent Bureau <b>monitor</b> the practice relating to agreements <b>concluded under Article 39(2)</b> of the Convention and other arrangements established <b>between Contracting States</b> on matters of procedure, co-operation or administration. To that effect, it encouraged Contracting States to send to the</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					Permanent Bureau examples of any such agreements or arrangements.
25	Declaration by delegations from Africa				50. The SC warmly welcomed the “ <b>Declaration on the need to develop a harmonised framework for the adoption of children in Africa</b> ” submitted by the delegations of Africa present at the SC meeting. The Declaration highlights the challenges that States in Africa face in relation to intercountry adoption, affirms the need for a harmonised framework for brainstorming, taking action, sharing experiences and conducting follow-up work on the adoption process in Africa and encourages the pursuit of work in this regard. It also emphasises the benefit that States in Africa have derived from the support of Contracting States to the Convention and other technical and financial partners.
26	Implementation of the Convention in Guatemala		22. The Special Commission: a) Recognises the initiative of the Government of Guatemala, which led to the <b>visit</b> of the Secretary General to		

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			<p>Guatemala from 31 May-3 June 2005;</p> <p>b) Takes note of the <b>Report</b> of the Secretary General of 15 June 2005, in particular the “action points”<sup>1</sup> (Work. Doc. No 8) on which a consensus emerged during this visit;</p> <p>c) Appreciates the presence at the Special Commission of a <b>high-level delegation</b> from Guatemala, including the Vice Minister of Foreign Affairs; the Procurador General de la Nación (the Central Authority under the Convention); Chairmen of three Parliamentary Committees, and others;</p> <p>d) Recognises the <b>efforts</b> being made by the Government of Guatemala towards the full implementation of the Convention;</p> <p>e) Urges Guatemala to <b>confirm</b>, as soon as possible, the legal <b>effect</b> of the <b>Convention</b> within its legal order consistent with Guatemala’s international obligations under the Convention;</p> <p>f) Having regard to the request for support made during the</p>		



Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			<p>Special Commission by the delegation of Guatemala, calls upon the States and international organisations represented at the Special Commission to <b>cooperate with the Government in its endeavours to fully implement the Convention.</b></p>		
27	<p><b>Intercountry Adoption in Non-Convention States</b></p>	<p>11. Recognising that the <b>Convention</b> of 1993 is founded on <b>universally accepted principles</b> and that States Parties are “<b>convinced</b> of the <b>necessity</b> to take <b>measures</b> to ensure that intercountry adoptions are made in the best interests of the child and with respect for his or her fundamental rights, and to prevent the abduction, the sale of, or traffic in children”, the Special Commission recommends that States Parties, as far as practicable, <b>apply the standards and safeguards</b> of the Convention to the arrangements for intercountry adoption which they make in respect of <b>non-Contracting States</b>. States Parties should also encourage such States without delay to take all necessary steps, possibly</p>	<p>19. The Special Commission <b>reaffirms</b> Recommendation No 11 of the Special Commission of November / December 2000.</p>	<p>36. The Special Commission <b>reiterated</b> the recommendation that Contracting States, in their relations with non-Contracting States, should apply as far as practicable the standards and safeguards of the Convention.</p> <p>37. For this purpose attention is drawn in particular to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Articles <b>4, 5 and 17</b>;</li> <li>b) the requirements of <b>Chapter III</b> of the Convention;</li> <li>c) the guarantees concerning <b>recognition</b>;</li> <li>d) the child’s right to <b>enter and reside</b> in the receiving State; and,</li> <li>e) the requirements concerning the suppression of <b>improper financial</b> or other gain.</li> </ul>	<p>1. Twenty years after the entry into force of the Convention, the SC: [...]</p> <p>d) <b>encouraged</b> non-Contracting States to consider <b>becoming party</b> to the Convention, bearing in mind the need for preparation prior to any ratification or accession; [...]</p> <p>35. The SC noted the risk that the multiplication of <b>bilateral agreements</b> with non-Contracting States could <b>deter</b> these non-Contracting States from <b>becoming party</b> to the Convention.</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		including the enactment of legislation and the creation of a Central Authority, so as to enable them to accede to or ratify the Convention.			
<b>TOOLS AND GUIDES TO GOOD PRACTICE</b>					
<b>28</b>	<b>Statistics</b>	21. The Special Commission recommended that the Permanent Bureau should prepare a <b>form for statistics</b> along the lines suggested, taking into account the matters raised during the debate.	9. The Special Commission welcomes the development of the <b>draft forms</b> for the gathering of general statistical information (Appendix 5 of Prel. Doc. No 2) and underlines the importance for States Parties to submit general statistics to the Permanent Bureau using these forms on an annual basis.	30. The Special Commission underlined the importance for States Parties of submitting <b>general statistics on an annual basis</b> to the Permanent Bureau using the forms contained in Preliminary Document No 5 of April 2010.  31. It was recommended that consultations should continue on options for the <b>future collection</b> of statistical data by the Permanent Bureau.	49. On an <b>annual basis</b> , Contracting States are urged to: a) <b>submit</b> their intercountry adoption <b>statistics</b> to the Permanent Bureau, using the forms on the website of the <b>Hague</b> Conference. The Permanent Bureau will continue to send an <b>annual reminder</b> to Contracting States in this regard
<b>29</b>	<b>Country Profiles</b>		8. To further the work commenced by the development of the <b>organigram</b> (Appendix 6 of Prel. Doc. No 2), the Special Commission invites the Permanent Bureau, to collect specific information from Contracting States, including, inter alia, <b>procedures, website</b>		48. All Contracting States that have not yet completed the <b>revised (2014) version of the Country Profile</b> (for receiving States and / or States of origin, as appropriate) are strongly encouraged to do so as soon as possible.  49. On an annual basis, Contracting States are urged to:

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			<p><b>addresses</b> and how the various <b>responsibilities</b> and tasks under the Convention are divided between Central Authorities, public authorities, accredited bodies and any bodies and persons under Article 22(2). This information should be made available on the <b>website</b> of the Hague Conference.</p>		<p>b) ensure that their <b>Country Profile</b> remains <b>up to date</b> and accurate and, where required, submit a revised version to the Permanent Bureau.</p> <p>The Permanent Bureau will continue to send an <b>annual reminder</b> to Contracting States in this regard.</p>
30	Model Forms	<p>5. The importance of the “Model Form for the Statement of <b>Consent</b>” which had been approved by the Special Commission of 1994, and which appears as Annex B of the Report of the Special Commission, which was published in March 1995, was re-emphasised.</p>	<p>6. The Special Commission reaffirms the usefulness of the <b>Model Form – Medical Report</b> on the Child and notes the usefulness, in particular in the case of very young children, of the supplement to this form as proposed in Working Document No 6, pp. 8-9.</p> <p>7. The Special Commission recommends that the Permanent Bureau, in consultation with Contracting States and non-governmental organisations, develop a <b>model form</b> for the <b>consent</b> of the child (Article 4(d)(3)) as well as model forms or protocols regarding the operation of Articles <b>15</b> and <b>16</b> of the Convention. <i>(See also Conclusion and Recommendation No 18 of 2005, Item 12 of this document)</i></p>		<p>15. The SC welcomed the work undertaken on the <b>draft model forms</b> contained at Annexes 1 to 4 of Preliminary Document No 5 as providing useful guidance in terms of the recommended content of the Article 15 and 16 reports, the post-adoption report and the statement of consent of the child to the intercountry adoption. It recommended that <b>work continue</b> and, to this end, invited Contracting States, Members of the Hague Conference, and States and organisations represented at the Special Commission to submit written comments on the current drafts. In light of the comments received, the Permanent Bureau will assess whether a <b>working group</b> should be established to finalise the work.</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>16. The SC invited the Permanent Bureau to develop model forms on:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) the agreements provided in accordance with <b>Article 17(c)</b>;</li> <li>b) the <b>certificate of conformity</b> which must be issued after the <b>conversion</b> of an adoption in accordance with Article 27.</li> </ul> <p>A <b>draft</b> of these model forms will also be submitted to those mentioned in paragraph 15 above for their written comments and, if a working group is established, the forms will be finalised by the working group if necessary.</p> <p>17. Where necessary to ensure consistency and coherence with any new model forms, the SC invited the Permanent Bureau to <b>update the existing model forms</b> in consultation with those mentioned in paragraph 15 above and, if necessary, the working group.</p>
31	<b>Guide to Good Practice No 1</b>		1. The Special Commission gives its <b>general endorsement</b> to the draft Guide to Good Practice dealing with Implementation of the 1993	5. The Special Commission underlined the <b>value</b> of the Guide to Good Practice No 1 entitled The Implementation and Operation of	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			<p>Convention prepared by the Permanent Bureau. It requests the Permanent Bureau, with the assistance of a group of experts appointed by the Special Commission, to <b>review</b> the draft in the light of comments made in the Special Commission on which there was consensus, and in particular by the addition of appropriate references to the situation of children with special needs. The revised text should then be circulated for their comments / approval to Contracting States, Member States of the Hague Conference and organisations represented at the Special Commission. Once there is a consensus, the Permanent Bureau will prepare the text for publication. The Permanent Bureau is authorised, in preparing the Guide to Good Practice for publication, to make changes of an editorial nature, to update where necessary any factual information contained in the Guide, to determine the presentation of the material in the Guide, provided that this does not involve any changes in substance or emphasis.</p>	<p>the 1993 Hague Intercountry Adoption Convention to existing and future Contracting States.</p>	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
32	<b>Accreditation (Including Guide to Good Practice No 2)</b>	<p>4. The following <b>principles</b> should apply to the process by which accreditation is granted under Article 10, to the supervision of accredited bodies provided for in Article 11 c), and to the process of authorisation provided for in Article 12.</p> <p>a) The <b>authority</b> or authorities competent to <b>grant</b> accreditation, to <b>supervise</b> accredited bodies or to give <b>authorisations</b> should be <b>designated</b> pursuant to clear legal authority and should have the <b>legal powers</b> and the personal and material <b>resources</b> necessary to carry out their responsibilities effectively.</p> <p>b) The legal powers should include the power to <b>conduct</b> any necessary <b>enquiries</b> and, in the case of a supervising authority, the power to <b>withdraw</b>, or recommend the withdrawal of, an accreditation or authorisation in accordance with law.</p> <p>c) The criteria of accreditation should be explicit and should be the outcome of a general</p>	<p>4. The Special Commission recommends that the Permanent Bureau should <b>continue</b> to gather <b>information</b> from different Contracting States regarding <b>accreditation</b> with the view to the development of a future Part of the <b>Guide to Good Practice</b> dealing with accreditation. The experience of non-governmental organisations in this field should be taken into account. Such information should include financial matters and should also be considered in the development of a set of model accreditation criteria.</p>	<p>3. The Special Commission gave its <b>general endorsement</b> to the draft Guide to Good Practice No 2 entitled Accreditation and Adoption Accredited Bodies: General Principles and Guide to Good Practice (hereinafter the draft Guide to Good Practice No 2) prepared by the Permanent Bureau. The Special Commission requested the Permanent Bureau to make <b>revisions</b> to the text, in particular Chapters 9 and 10, in the light of discussions within the Special Commission. This will include revision of the summaries of each chapter, some re-ordering of material (e.g., Page 1 of 6 Page 2 of 6 to avoid repetition), a check on correspondence between English and French texts as well as on the Spanish text, and the drawing up, on the basis of the text, of accreditation criteria. This work will be carried out in consultation with the Chair and Vice-Chairs of the Special Commission and the Working Group which assisted the Permanent Bureau in preparing the draft Guide. The revised text will be circulated to all Contracting States, Members of the Hague</p>	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
		<p><b>policy</b> on intercountry adoption.</p> <p>d) Accredited bodies should be required to <b>report annually</b> to the competent authority concerning in particular the activities for which they were accredited.</p> <p>e) Review or the <b>re-accreditation</b> of accredited bodies should be carried out periodically by the competent authority.</p>		<p>Conference and States and organisations represented at the Special Commission for their comments. The final version will then be prepared for publication by the Permanent Bureau.</p>	
33	Future Guides to Good Practice		<i>(See Conclusion and Recommendation No 2 of 2005, Item 6 of this document)</i>	<i>(See Conclusion and Recommendation No 10 of 2010, Item 6 of this document)</i>	
34	Use of Modern Technologies		<p>16. The Special Commission recommends the <b>use of flexible and efficient systems of communication</b> taking into account, where available, advances in technology.</p>		<p>38. The SC recognised that the use of modern technologies:</p> <p>a) has <b>improved</b> the intercountry adoption process, in particular by making communication easier amongst the various actors and making the process more expeditious. It recommended that Contracting States consider the possibility of <b>scanning and sending documents by e-mail</b>, transferring the paper documents by conventional</p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
					<p>methods thereafter if required;</p> <p>b) may be a helpful <b>tool</b> in the <b>matching</b> process (e.g., the use of short videos of children); and</p> <p>c) may <b>facilitate contact</b> between the prospective adoptive parents and the child after the matching, noting the need for appropriate support.</p> <p>39. The SC acknowledged the need to raise <b>awareness</b> of the <b>risks</b> associated with the use of modern technologies, including social media, and encouraged the training of professionals and the education of families.</p> <p>40. The SC expressed concern regarding the <b>disclosure</b> of sensitive personal <b>data</b> through the use of modern technologies, particularly concerning children. It recommended that Contracting States take appropriate measures to protect personal data and reminded them of Article 31 of the Convention in this regard.</p>



Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
<b>OTHER MEASURES AND CONVENTIONS</b>					
35	<b>International placements outside the Scope of the Convention (including Kafala)</b>	22. There was general agreement on the need to consider <b>how best to regulate</b> the different types of international <b>placement</b> falling <b>outside</b> the scope of the Convention. The value in this context of Article 33 of the Hague <b>Convention</b> of 19 October <b>1996</b> on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children was recognised.	21. The Special Commission recognises the need to consider how best to regulate the different types of international placement falling outside the scope of the Convention. The value in this context 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, in particular Article 33, was recognised. The Special Commission also recognised the reference to this Convention in the important Decision of the United Nations Committee on the Rights of the Child, 37th Session, <b>“Children without parental care”</b> , October 2004.	41. The Special Commission <b>reiterated</b> the value of the <b>1996</b> Convention on the International Protection of Children in the context of cross-border placement of children as well as other international child protection situations.	30. The SC recommended that <b>kafala</b> , as a child protection measure, be discussed at the next <b>SC</b> on the practical operation of the <b>1996</b> Hague Convention. The SC recommended that consideration be given to the inclusion of the subject on the agenda for the fourth <b>“Malta Judicial Conference on Cross-Frontier Family Law Issues”</b> (part of the <b>“Malta Process”</b> ).
36	<b>International Surrogacy and Intercountry Adoption</b>			25. The Special Commission noted that the <b>number</b> of international <b>surrogacy</b> arrangements is increasing rapidly. It expressed <b>concern</b> over the <b>uncertainty</b> surrounding the status of many of the children who are born as a result of these arrangements. It viewed as <b>inappropriate</b> the <b>use</b> of	

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
				<p>the Convention in cases of international surrogacy.</p> <p>26. The Special Commission recommended that the Hague Conference should carry out <b>further study</b> of the legal, especially private international law, issues surrounding international surrogacy.</p>	
37	1996 Child Protection Convention				<p>20. The SC encouraged States to <b>consider</b> ratification of, or accession to, the Hague <b>Convention</b> of 19 October <b>1996</b> on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the <b>Protection of Children</b> (hereinafter, “the 1996 Hague Convention”) in view of its relevance in enhancing co-operation to protect children in many different situations, including following the breakdown of intercountry adoptions.</p>
38	1961 Apostille Convention		<p>20. The Special Commission stresses the <b>usefulness</b> of linking the application of the Hague Adoption Convention of 1993 to the Hague Convention of 5 October <b>1961</b> Abolishing the</p>	<p>42. The Special Commission stressed the <b>usefulness</b> of linking the application of the Hague Adoption Convention of 1993 to the Hague Convention of 5 October 1961 Abolishing the</p>	<p><i>(See Conclusions and Recommendation No 7 of 2015, Item 9 of this document)</i></p>

Item	Topic	2000 Special Commission	2005 Special Commission	2010 Special Commission	2015 Special Commission
			<p>Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (the <b>Apostille Convention</b>). In the light of the high number of public documents included in a typical adoption procedure, the Special Commission recommends that States Parties to the Adoption Convention but not to the Apostille Convention, consider the possibility of becoming a party to the latter.</p>	<p>Requirement of Legalisation for Foreign Public Documents (the <b>Apostille Convention</b>). In the light of the high number of public documents included in a typical adoption procedure, the Special Commission recommended that States Parties to the Adoption Convention but not to the Apostille Convention <b>consider</b> the possibility of becoming a <b>party</b> to the latter.</p>	