

APOSTILLE

Prel. Doc. No 2
Doc. prélim. No 2
February / février 2017

(E/F)



**SYNOPSIS OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE OF APRIL 2016 RELATING TO
THE HAGUE CONVENTION OF 5 OCTOBER 1961 ABOLISHING THE REQUIREMENT
OF LEGALISATION FOR FOREIGN PUBLIC DOCUMENTS
(APOSTILLE CONVENTION)**

drawn up by the Permanent Bureau

* * *

**APERÇU DES RÉPONSES AU QUESTIONNAIRE D'AVRIL 2016 PORTANT SUR
LA CONVENTION DE LA HAYE DU 5 OCTOBRE 1961 SUPPRIMANT L'EXIGENCE
DE LA LÉGALISATION DES ACTES PUBLICS ÉTRANGERS
(CONVENTION APOSTILLE)**

établi par le Bureau Permanent

(Revised version as per February 2017 / version révisée en février 2017)

*Preliminary Document No 2 of September 2016
for the attention of the Special Commission of November 2016 on the
practical operation of the Apostille Convention*

*Document préliminaire No 2 de septembre 2016
à l'attention de la Commission spéciale de novembre 2016 sur le
fonctionnement pratique de la Convention Apostille*

Churchillplein 6b, 2517 JW The Hague - La Haye | The Netherlands - Pays-Bas
☎ +31 (70) 363 3303 📠 +31 (70) 360 4867 | secretariat@hcch.net | www.hcch.net

Asia Pacific Regional Office - Bureau régional Asie-Pacifique | S.A.R. of Hong Kong - R.A.S. de Hong Kong | ☎ +852 2858 9912
Latin American Regional Office - Bureau régional Amérique latine | Buenos Aires | Argentina – Argentine | ☎ +54 (11) 4310 8372

A first version of this document was prepared and published on the website of the Hague Conference on 22 September 2016. This current version is up to date as to 20 February 2017.

This document has not been translated. It is a compilation of the responses as they were received to make the responses more readily accessible to experts to the Special Commission. Therefore, the responses appear as they were received, in the language in which they were received. The Permanent Bureau has made some minor corrections to the text of responses for presentation purposes. The complete response of each Contracting Party is available on the "Apostille Section" of the Hague Conference website < www.hcch.net > under "Questionnaires & Responses".

In the interests of brevity responses to the following questions have not been compiled in this document:

- Other relevant instruments, internal laws or practices which facilitate or exempt the production of foreign public documents from legalisation or similar formality (Part B, Questions 1.1 a) and 1.3 a));
- Implementation legislation (Part B, Question 1.1 a));
- Public information on the operation of the Apostille Convention (Part B, Question 4.4 a));
- Published works on the Apostille Convention (Part B, Question 4.5 a));
- Full contact details of Competent Authorities (Part B, Question 5.1 b)).

Throughout this document numbers contained in square brackets ('[#]') refer to the number of relevant responses. Throughout this Questionnaire, the terms "State of origin" and "State of destination" are used as terms of art and are to be given the meaning ascribed to them in the Glossary of the Apostille Handbook.

* * *

Une première version de ce document a été établie et publiée sur le site web de la Conférence de La Haye le 22 septembre 2016. La version actuelle est une mise à jour au 20 février 2017.

Ce document n'a pas été traduit. Afin de rendre les réponses facilement accessibles aux experts de la Commission spéciale, celles-ci ont uniquement été compilées telles qu'elles ont été reçues et dans la langue dans laquelle elles ont été reçues. Le Bureau Permanent a apporté quelques corrections mineures au texte à des fins de présentation. Les réponses des Parties peuvent être consultées dans leur intégralité sur l'« Espace Apostille » du site web de la Conférence de La Haye (à l'adresse < www.hcch.net >, sous la rubrique « Questionnaires & Réponses »).

Par souci de concision, les réponses aux questions suivantes ne sont pas reprises dans le présent document :

- Autres instruments pertinents, lois ou pratiques internes qui facilitent la production d'actes publics étrangers ou la dispensent de légalisation ou de formalité similaire (partie B, questions 1.1 a) et 1.3 a)) ;
- Législation de transposition (partie B, question 1.1 a));
- Information du public concernant le fonctionnement de la Convention Apostille (partie B, question 4.4 a));
- Travaux publiés concernant la Convention Apostille (partie B, question 4.5 a));
- Coordonnées complètes des Autorités compétentes des États contractants (partie B, question 5.1 b)).

Dans ce document, les nombres entre crochets ('[#]') renvoient au nombre de réponses reçues. Dans le présent Questionnaire, les notions d'« État d'origine » et d'« État de destination » sont utilisées comme des termes génériques et doivent être interprétées en fonction du sens qui leur est conféré par le Glossaire du Manuel Apostille.

Table of contents

RESPONSES TO THE APOSTILLE QUESTIONNAIRE	IX
RÉPONSES AU QUESTIONNAIRE APOSTILLE	XI
PART A – QUESTIONS FOR NON-CONTRACTING PARTIES	13
Reasons for not being a Contracting Party.....	13
a) Why are you not party to the Apostille Convention?	13
Foreign direct investment.....	14
b) Are you aware that international organisations, such as the World Bank and the International Chamber of Commerce, have recognised the importance and efficacy of the Apostille Convention in the promotion and development of international trade and investment and have urged those that have not done so to join the Convention?	14
Studying the Apostille Convention.....	14
c) Are you currently studying the Apostille Convention, or do you envisage studying it, with a view to becoming a Contracting Party in the near future?	14
d) Are you taking the e-APP (electronic Apostille Program) into consideration, or do you envisage taking it into consideration, as part of this study?.....	15
Statistics	16
e) How many legalisations were performed in 2015 by the authorities in your jurisdiction?.....	16
Other Instruments.....	18
f) Is the production of foreign public documents in your jurisdiction exempted from / not subject to legalisation or similar formality, or otherwise facilitated, by virtue of:	18
The "Apostille Section" and publications	19
g) How useful is the information provided on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?	19
h) Are you aware of the publications of the Permanent Bureau the ABCs of Apostilles, the Brief Implementation Guide, and the Apostille Handbook, available on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?	20
i) Do you have any suggestions for future publications that could assist the promotion, implementation, or operation of the Apostille Convention?	20
Other	21
j) Are there any specific topics or practical issues that you would like to have discussed at the 2016 Special Commission?.....	21
PART B – QUESTIONS FOR CONTRACTING PARTIES	21
Section 1 – Joining the Apostille Convention	21
1.1 Changes to internal law	21
a) Was implementing legislation necessary to give the Apostille Convention force of law in your jurisdiction (including regulations relating to the establishment and functioning of Competent Authorities)?	21

1.2	Foreign direct investment	24
a)	Are you aware that international organisations, such as the World Bank and the International Chamber of Commerce, have recognised the importance and efficacy of the Apostille Convention in the promotion and development of international trade and investment and have urged those that have not done so to join the Convention?	24
1.3	Other relevant instruments, laws and practices	25
a)	Is the production of any types of foreign public documents in your jurisdiction exempted from / not subject to legalisation or similar formality, or otherwise facilitated, by virtue of:	25
Section 2 – Objections to accessions		27
2.1	Revisiting objections	28
a)	If you have objected to the accession of one (or more) Contracting Party(ies) under Article 12 of the Convention, have you revisited your position on this issue in the last five years, or do you intend to do so in the near future?	28
Section 3 – The Apostille Section and publications		29
3.1	Content of the Apostille Section	29
a)	How useful is the information provided on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?	29
b)	How often do staff of your Competent Authority(ies) consult the Apostille Handbook?	30
c)	Do you have any suggestions or comments concerning the publications of the Permanent Bureau, the ABCs of Apostilles, the Brief Implementation Guide, or the Apostille Handbook, available on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?	32
d)	Do you have any suggestions for future publications that could assist the promotion, implementation, or operation of the Apostille Convention?	33
Section 4 – Operation and statistics		34
4.1	General evaluation	35
a)	How do you rate the overall operation of the Apostille Convention?	35
b)	Have any persistent difficulties, issues or challenges in the operation of the Apostille Convention been encountered by your Competent Authority(ies)?	36
4.2	Statistics on issued Apostilles	39
a)	How many Apostilles were issued in your jurisdiction for each of the following years?	39
b)	Can any trend(s) be discerned from these statistics?	41
c)	What are the principal “States of destination” for Apostilles issued in your jurisdiction?	43
d)	How many e-Apostilles were issued in your jurisdiction for each of the following years?	45
e)	What are the principal “States of destination” for e-Apostilles issued in your jurisdiction?	46
f)	Please identify the three categories of public document that are most frequently requested to be apostilled in your jurisdiction. 46	

g)	Please mark with an "X" the categories of documents that are issued in your jurisdiction in electronic format (even if this is the case for only a few documents within that category) and for which an Apostille is issued (whether as an e-Apostille or in paper form)?	51
4.3	Legalisations	53
a)	How many legalisations were performed in 2015 by your Competent Authority(ies)?	53
4.4	Public information	56
a)	Is practical information (such as informational brochures or information provided on government websites) on the operation of the Apostille Convention made available to Apostille users?.....	56
4.5	Published works on the Apostille Convention	57
a)	Has the Apostille Convention been the subject of any articles, books or other works published in your jurisdiction?.....	57
Section 5 – Competent Authorities		58
5.1	Contact details	58
a)	How many Competent Authorities have you designated under the Apostille Convention?	58
b)	Are the contact details and practical information provided on the Apostille Section for your Competent Authority(ies) accurate and complete?	61
5.2	Training and support	62
a)	Have guidelines, desk instructions, or similar documentation been prepared to assist staff at Competent Authorities in the performance of their functions under the Apostille Convention? ..	62
b)	How often is training provided to staff at Competent Authorities?.....	62
Section 6 – Substantive scope of the Apostille Convention		64
6.1	Definition of "public document"	64
a)	Is the concept of a "public document" defined in your internal law?	64
b)	Have any difficulties been experienced with the characterisation of a document as a "public document" for the purposes of the Apostille Convention?	69
6.2	Exclusion of documents executed by diplomatic or consular agents	70
a)	Has the exclusion of "documents executed by diplomatic or consular agents" from the scope of the Apostille Convention given rise to any difficulties for your Competent Authority(ies), either as a "State of origin" or a "State of destination"?	70
6.3	Exclusion of administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations	72
a)	Has the exclusion of "administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations" from the scope of the Apostille Convention given rise to any difficulties for your Competent Authority(ies), either as a "State of origin" or a "State of destination"?	72
b)	Are Apostilles issued by your Competent Authority(ies) for any of the following documents?.....	74

6.4	Copies	80
a)	Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a simple copy of a public document (<i>i.e.</i> , may a simple copy of a public document be also regarded as a public document)?	80
b)	Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a certified copy of a public document?	82
6.5	Translations	84
a)	Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a simple translation of a public document?	84
b)	Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a certified translation?	86
6.6	Extradition documents.....	89
a)	Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to extradition documents?	89
6.7	Medical certificates	91
a)	Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to medical certificates?	91
6.8	Electronic documents and signatures.....	93
a)	Can public documents executed in electronic form be considered “public documents” under your internal law for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille?	93
b)	If a public document is executed in electronic form in your jurisdiction, how is an Apostille issued for that document?	95
c)	Can scanned copies of public documents that were executed in paper form be considered “public documents” under your internal law for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille?	97
d)	Are electronic signatures recognised as functionally equivalent of handwritten signatures?	99
Section 7 – Access to Apostille services.....		101
7.1	One-step vs. multi-step process	101
a)	Does a public document executed in your jurisdiction need to be somehow certified before the issuance of an Apostille?	101
b)	What certification process is involved?	102
c)	Why is certification required?	105
d)	Do you plan to make changes to the certification process?	108
7.2	Decentralisation of Apostille services	109
a)	Have you considered decentralising the Apostille services by establishing regional offices or by designating additional Competent Authorities?	109
7.3	Diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities	110
a)	Do you consider there to be any advantages or disadvantages with the practice of designating the diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities, in particular in light of Art. 1(3)(a) of the Convention?	110
b)	For which of the following documents do your diplomatic missions issue Apostilles?	113
c)	Have you experienced any practical difficulties with the designation of diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities?	114

d)	Please explain how, in practice, Apostille services are provided by the diplomatic missions	114
7.4	Apostille requests.....	114
a)	Ways of requesting an Apostille.	114
b)	Do your Competent Authorities enquire about the “State of destination” of the public document to be apostilled?	116
c)	How long does it take for an Apostille to be issued?	118
7.5	Fees	121
a)	Is a fee for issuing an Apostille imposed by your Competent Authority(ies)?	121
Section 8 – Issuance of Apostilles		123
8.1	Verification of public documents	123
a)	Do all of your Competent Authorities have access to a register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents, which the Competent Authority may consult before issuing an Apostille?..	123
b)	What is the form of the register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents?	126
c)	How is the register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents maintained and updated?	127
d)	Where the public document for which an Apostille is requested bears a signature, stamp or seal that does not match the sample in the register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents, how are such situations addressed by your Competent Authority(ies)?	128
8.2	The Apostille	132
a)	What stationery is used for the Apostille?.....	132
b)	Is a bilingual or trilingual Apostille Certificate used, or are there plans to introduce one?	134
c)	In your jurisdiction, is the Apostille Certificate used to authenticate the origin of public documents even when the Apostille Convention does not apply (e.g. using the Apostille Certificate for legalisations or other certifications)?	136
8.3	Completing the Apostille	137
a)	How are Apostilles filled in?.....	137
b)	In what language are the blanks of Apostilles usually filled in?	139
c)	How are Apostilles numbered?.....	141
d)	Where an item of the Apostille is not applicable (e.g. the underlying public document is not signed or does not bear a seal), is “not applicable” or “n/a” written in the relevant items by your Competent Authority(ies)?	143
e)	How is a paper Apostille signed?	144
f)	How is an e-Apostille signed?	146
g)	Does your internal law allow for a printout of an electronic document or an e-Apostille (both of which have been digitally signed) to be circulated?.....	146
8.4	Additional text.....	147

8.5	Affixing the Apostille	149
a)	Is the Apostille placed on the document itself or on a separate slip of paper (an <i>allonge</i>)?	149
b)	If a separate slip of paper is used (an <i>allonge</i>), how is it attached to the document?.....	153
c)	In the case of a one-page public document, where is the Apostille placed / <i>allonge</i> attached?	155
d)	In the case of a multi-page document, where is the Apostille placed / <i>allonge</i> attached?	156
e)	What technology is used by your Competent Authority(ies) to affix or logically associate the Apostille to the underlying public document?.....	158
f)	How does that technology ensure that the Apostille is not tampered with?	158
Section 9 – Register of Apostilles		159
9.1	Maintaining the register	159
a)	Are particulars of each Apostille issued recorded by your Competent Authority(ies) in a register?	159
b)	In what form is the register kept?	163
c)	How is the register maintained?.....	166
d)	For how long do Competent Authorities retain records of particulars in their register?	166
9.2	Checking the register	168
a)	How frequently is a request made to your Competent Authority(ies) to check the register of Apostilles?.....	168
b)	If an e-Register <i>is</i> kept by your Competent Authority(ies), do you have statistics on how frequently the e-Register is consulted? ..	169
Section 10 – The effect of Apostilles		170
10.1	Apostilles issued in your jurisdiction	170
a)	Has a paper Apostille or e Apostille issued by your Competent Authority(ies) ever been refused to be given effect by a recipient from another Contracting Party (<i>i.e.</i> , has the Apostille been rejected)?	170
b)	If an Apostille was rejected, what action did you take?	173
c)	Has an authority of another Contracting Party ever requested your Competent Authority(ies) to certify or confirm procedures for issuing Apostilles?.....	174
10.2	Foreign Apostilles produced in your jurisdiction.....	176
a)	On which of the following grounds has the effect of a foreign Apostille in fact been refused to be given by recipients in your jurisdiction?	176
b)	On which of the following grounds might the effect of a foreign Apostille possibly be refused to be given by recipients in your jurisdiction?	178
c)	Is any time limit applied with respect to the effect of foreign Apostilles and/or foreign public documents that are produced in your jurisdiction?	180
Section 11 – The e-APP.....		181
11.1	Implementation.....	181

a)	Has either component of the e-APP been implemented by your Competent Authority(ies)?	181
b)	Has the e-APP been studied by Competent Authorities?	182
c)	Have you contacted other Competent Authorities that already operate an e-APP component and asked for any relevant information or exchange of experience?	184
d)	For which of the following documents are e-Apostilles issued by your Competent Authority(ies)?	184
e)	Are there any issues (legal or otherwise) that may affect the implementation of the e-APP in your jurisdiction?	185
Section 12 – Other		186
12.1	Additional comments and information	186
a)	Additional space for one or more questions above	186
b)	Additional comments or information relating to the practical operation of the Apostille Convention	187
c)	Specific topics or practical issues that you would like to have discussed at the 2016 Special Commission	187

Responses to the Apostille Questionnaire

Responses [66]:	Other [8]
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Argentina 2. Armenia 3. Australia 4. Austria 5. Bahrain 6. Belarus 7. Belgium 8. Bosnia and Herzegovina 9. Bulgaria 10. Canada 11. Chile 12. China, People's Republic of 13. China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region¹ 14. China, Macao Special Administrative Region² 15. Colombia 16. Costa Rica 17. Croatia 18. Cyprus 19. Czech Republic 20. Denmark 21. Dominican Republic 22. Ecuador 23. Estonia 24. European Union³ 25. Finland 26. France 27. Georgia 28. Germany 29. Greece 30. Honduras 31. Hungary 32. Iran 33. Israel 34. Japan 35. Korea, The Republic of 36. Kosovo 37. Latvia 38. Lithuania 39. Luxembourg 40. Malaysia 41. Malta 42. Mauritius 43. Mexico 44. Monaco 45. Montenegro 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Canada 2. China, People's Republic of 3. European Union³ 4. Iran 5. Malaysia 6. Singapore 7. The Philippines 8. Viet Nam
	Contracting Parties [58] <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Argentina 2. Armenia 3. Australia 4. Austria 5. Bahrain 6. Belarus 7. Belgium 8. Bosnia and Herzegovina 9. Bulgaria 10. Chile 11. China, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region¹ 12. China, Macao Special Administrative Region² 13. Colombia 14. Costa Rica 15. Croatia 16. Cyprus 17. Czech Republic 18. Denmark 19. Dominican Republic 20. Ecuador 21. Estonia 22. Finland 23. France 24. Georgia 25. Germany 26. Greece 27. Honduras 28. Hungary 29. Israel 30. Japan 31. Korea, The Republic of 32. Kosovo 33. Latvia 34. Lithuania 35. Luxembourg

¹ Henceforth China (Hong Kong SAR).

² Henceforth China (Macao SAR).

³ Because of its length, the response of the [European Union](#) has not been compiled into this document. To view the full response, please refer to the [Apostille Section](#) of the Hague Conference website.

46. Namibia	36. Malta
47. New Zealand	37. Mauritius
48. Norway	38. Mexico
49. Peru	39. Monaco
50. The Philippines	40. Montenegro
51. Portugal	41. Namibia
52. Romania	42. New Zealand
53. Russian Federation	43. Norway
54. Serbia	44. Peru
55. Singapore	45. Portugal
56. Slovakia	46. Romania
57. Slovenia	47. Russian Federation
58. South Africa	48. Serbia
59. Sweden ⁴	49. Slovakia
60. Switzerland ⁵	50. Slovenia
61. Tajikistan	51. South Africa
62. Turkey	52. Sweden ⁴
63. United States of America	53. Switzerland ⁵
64. Uruguay	54. Tajikistan
65. Venezuela	55. Turkey
66. Viet Nam	56. United States of America
	57. Uruguay
	58. Venezuela

⁴ In its response, Sweden indicated that it was unable to answer the Questionnaire given its decentralised system of issuing Apostilles and the absence of any central source of information on the operation of the Convention.

⁵ A response was received from Switzerland, however, it objected to having its response published on the Hague Conference website.

Réponses au Questionnaire Apostille

Réponses [66]	Autres [8]
<div><div>1. Afrique du Sud</div><div>2. Allemagne</div><div>3. Argentine</div><div>4. Arménie</div><div>5. Australie</div><div>6. Autriche</div><div>7. Bahreïn</div><div>8. Belarus</div><div>9. Belgique</div><div>10. Bosnie-Herzégovine</div><div>11. Bulgarie</div><div>12. Canada</div><div>13. Chili</div><div>14. Chine, République populaire de</div><div>15. Chine, Région administrative spéciale de Hong Kong¹</div><div>16. Chine, Région administrative spéciale de Macao²</div><div>17. Chypre</div><div>18. Colombie</div><div>19. Corée, République de</div><div>20. Costa Rica</div><div>21. Croatie</div><div>22. Danemark</div><div>23. Estonie</div><div>24. Équateur</div><div>25. États-Unis d'Amérique</div><div>26. Finlande</div><div>27. France</div><div>28. Géorgie</div><div>29. Grèce</div><div>30. Honduras</div><div>31. Hongrie</div><div>32. Iran</div><div>33. Israël</div><div>34. Japon</div><div>35. Kosovo</div><div>36. Lettonie</div><div>37. Lituanie</div><div>38. Luxembourg</div><div>39. Malaisie</div><div>40. Malte</div><div>41. Maurice</div><div>42. Mexique</div><div>43. Monaco</div><div>44. Monténégro</div><div>45. Namibie</div><div>46. Norvège</div><div>47. Nouvelle-Zélande</div><div>48. Pérou</div><div>49. Philippines</div></div>	<div><div>1. Canada</div><div>2. Chine, République populaire de</div><div>3. Iran</div><div>4. Malaisie</div><div>5. Philippines</div><div>6. Singapour</div><div>7. Union européenne⁵</div><div>8. Viet Nam</div></div>
	<div>Parties [58]</div> <div><div>1. Afrique du Sud</div><div>2. Allemagne</div><div>3. Argentine</div><div>4. Arménie</div><div>5. Australie</div><div>6. Autriche</div><div>7. Bahreïn</div><div>8. Belarus</div><div>9. Belgique</div><div>10. Bosnie-Herzégovine</div><div>11. Bulgarie</div><div>12. Chili</div><div>13. Chine, Région administrative spéciale de Hong Kong¹</div><div>14. Chine, Région administrative spéciale de Macao ²</div><div>15. Chypre</div><div>16. Colombie</div><div>17. Corée, République de</div><div>18. Costa Rica</div><div>19. Croatie</div><div>20. Danemark</div><div>21. Estonie</div><div>22. Équateur</div><div>23. États-Unis d'Amérique</div><div>24. Finlande</div><div>25. France</div><div>26. Géorgie</div><div>27. Grèce</div><div>28. Honduras</div><div>29. Hongrie</div><div>30. Israël</div><div>31. Japon</div><div>32. Kosovo</div><div>33. Lettonie</div><div>34. Lituanie</div><div>35. Luxembourg</div><div>36. Malte</div><div>37. Maurice</div><div>38. Mexique</div></div>

¹ Ci-après China (Hong Kong SAR).

² Ci-après China (Macao SAR).

50. Portugal	39. Monaco
51. République dominicaine	40. Monténégro
52. République tchèque	41. Namibie
53. Roumanie	42. Norvège
54. Russie, Fédération de	43. Nouvelle-Zélande
55. Serbie	44. Pérou
56. Singapour	45. Portugal
57. Slovaquie	46. République dominicaine
58. Slovénie	47. République tchèque
59. Suède ³	48. Roumanie
60. Suisse ⁴	49. Russie, Fédération de
61. Tadjikistan	50. Serbie
62. Turquie	51. Slovaquie
63. Union européenne ⁵	52. Slovénie
64. Uruguay	53. Suède ³
65. Venezuela	54. Suisse ⁴
66. Viet Nam	55. Tadjikistan
	56. Turquie
	57. Uruguay
	58. Venezuela

³ La Suède a indiqué ne pas être en mesure de répondre au Questionnaire en raison de son système décentralisé d'émission d'Apostilles et en l'absence de source centrale d'informations sur le fonctionnement de la Convention.

⁴ La Suisse a répondu mais n'a pas souhaité que sa réponse soit publiée sur le site de la Conférence.

⁵ En raison de sa longueur, la réponse de l'[Union européenne](#) n'a pas été ajoutée au présent document. Pour accéder à cette réponse dans son intégralité, veuillez consulter l'[Espace Apostille](#) du site web de la Conférence de La Haye.

Questions & Replies	Contracting Parties
PART A – Questions for non-Contracting Parties	
Reasons for not being a Contracting Party	
a) Why are you not party to the Apostille Convention?	
<u>The internal law does not require foreign public documents to be legalised or subjected to a similar formality before having effect in your jurisdiction</u>	-
<u>There are legal obstacles in the internal legal system that prevent it from becoming a Party to the Convention</u>	-
<u>There are concerns about the loss of revenue currently generated by legalising documents.</u>	-
<u>Other specific issues:</u> <u>Viet Nam:</u> Viet Nam is concerned about the possibly increasing risk of fake documents being used in Viet Nam, as a result of lacking legalization procedure conducted by Vietnamese competent authorities.	[1] Viet Nam
<u>There is a lack of means or resources to properly implement the Apostille Convention</u>	-
<u>The question of becoming a Party to the Convention has never been examined in detail</u>	-
<u>Other:</u> <u>China:</u> The consular legalization system implemented in China currently is rather strict and standard, and is playing a positive role in maintaining credibility of foreign-related documents and promoting an effective circulation of those documents. China has no plan to join the Convention in the near future. However, China has also been aware of the role played by the Convention in simplifying the legalization of documents and promoting personnel exchanges between countries, and China would like to undertake more study on the Convention and China's relevant laws and regulations. <u>Iran:</u> Iran is going to be a state party in the near future. Presently the internal legal authorization is going on. <u>Malaysia:</u> Malaysia is in the process of acceding to the Apostille Convention. <u>The Philippines:</u> The Philippine's accession to the Apostille Convention is under process. The instrument of accession has already been signed by former President Benigno Simeon C. Aquino III on September 30, 2011 and is undergoing further legalities. <u>Singapore:</u> We are presently studying the Apostille Convention and considering the issue of becoming a	[5] China, Iran, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore

State Party.	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Viet Nam:</u> Viet Nam is aware of the benefits of becoming a member State to the Convention. However, we should carefully consider the possibility of joining the Convention, taking into account relevant legal, financial and technical conditions of Viet Nam.</p>	
Foreign direct investment	
b) Are you aware that international organisations, such as the World Bank and the International Chamber of Commerce, have recognised the importance and efficacy of the Apostille Convention in the promotion and development of international trade and investment and have urged those that have not done so to join the Convention?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Viet Nam:</u> Viet Nam is aware that the WB and ICC have recognised the importance and efficacy of the Apostille Convention in the promotion and development of international trade and investment. They have also suggested that non-member States consider joining the Convention in order to facilitate cross-border trade and foreign investment. However, Viet Nam needs more time to profoundly consider the advantages and disadvantages of becoming a member State to the Convention in order to make the most appropriate decision. In this effort, we are also studying carefully the recommendations by WB and ICC.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7] Canada, China, Iran, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	
Studying the Apostille Convention	
c) Are you currently studying the Apostille Convention, or do you envisage studying it, with a view to becoming a Contracting Party in the near future?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Canada:</u> The timetable and outcome of the study are not determined / Le calendrier et le résultat de l'examen ne sont pas connus.</p> <p><u>Iran:</u> Presently the internal legal authorization is going on. the case is under presidential office verification & ratification.</p> <p><u>Malaysia:</u> Malaysia is at the final stage of the accession process to the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>The Philippines:</u> Internal legal procedures are already underway. Accession is hoped to be effected within the year.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[6] Canada, Iran, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>

<u>Viet Nam</u> : Viet Nam has been studying experience of member State in joining and implementing the Convention. We have not worked out any specific timetable for accession.	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>China</u>: The consular legalization system implemented in China currently is rather strict and standard, and is playing a positive role in maintaining credibility of foreign-related documents and promoting an effective circulation of those documents. China has no plan to join the Convention in the near future. However, China has also been aware of the role played by the Convention in simplifying the legalization of documents and promoting personnel exchanges between countries, and China would like to undertake more study on the Convention and China's relevant laws and regulations.</p>	[1] China
<p><i>Only for those studying or envisage studying the Apostille Convention</i></p> <p>d) Are you taking the e-APP (electronic Apostille Program) into consideration, or do you envisage taking it into consideration, as part of this study?</p>	
<u>Yes – Which components?</u>	[1] Singapore
<u>Both components.</u>	[2] The Philippines, Singapore
<u>Only the e-Apostille component.</u>	-
<u>Only the e-Register component.</u>	[1] Canada
<u>No</u>	[2] Malaysia, Viet Nam
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>The Philippines</u>: A complete study of their full implementation is ongoing.</p> <p><u>Viet Nam</u>: Viet Nam is taking steps in building the e-Register component, which allows the online checking of legalization stamps issued by the competent Authorities of Viet Nam. The system is expected to be brought into practice in the near future.</p>	

Statistics

e) How many legalisations were performed in 2015 by the authorities in your jurisdiction?

Outgoing documents

Canada – Detailed Response to Part A, Question e) – Outgoing Documents

The Authentication Services Section of the Department of Global Affairs Canada authenticates signatures on a broad range of federal, provincial and territorial public documents. This service is not a requirement of Canadian law and is offered only in order to help bearers of Canadian public documents meet foreign requirements. Canadian provinces and territories offer authentication services for certain public documents executed in their respective jurisdictions. Some offer extensive authentication services while others offer more limited services or authenticate public documents only on occasional instances.

Canadian Jurisdiction	Approximate Number of Public Documents Authenticated in 2015
Federal	151,000 (including 20,000 Canadian public documents authenticated by Canadian missions abroad)
Alberta	8,600
British Colombia	9,245
Manitoba	1,785
New Brunswick	Data not available.
Newfoundland and Labrador	Data not available.
Northwest Territories	10
Nova Scotia	Data not available.
Nunavut	Data not available. Requests for authentication are infrequent and likely range from 0-10 per year.
Ontario	37,656
Prince Edward Island	7
Québec	6,000
Saskatchewan	864
Yukon	Data not available. Requests for authentication are infrequent.
Total	215,167

Canada

Canada – Réponse détaillée à la question e), Partie A – Documents à envoyer

La Section des services d'authentification du Ministère des Affaires mondiales Canada authentifie les signatures apposées à un large éventail d'actes publics fédéraux, provinciaux et territoriaux. La prestation de ce service n'est pas une obligation en vertu du droit canadien, mais vise à aider les porteurs d'actes publics canadiens à se conformer à certaines exigences d'autres pays. En outre les provinces et les territoires canadiens offrent, eux aussi, des services d'authentification pour certains types d'actes établis sur leur territoire. Certains fournissent des services d'authentification étendus alors que d'autres offrent un service plus limité et n'authentifient les actes publics que sur une base occasionnelle.

Juridiction canadienne	Nombre approximatif d'actes publics authentifiés en 2015
Fédérale	151,000 (y compris les 20 000 actes publics canadiens authentifier par les missions canadiennes à l'étranger)
Alberta	8,600
Colombie-Britannique	9,245
Manitoba	1,785
Nouveau-Brunswick	Données non-disponibles.
Terre-Neuve-et-Labrador	Données non-disponibles.
Territoires du Nord-Ouest	10
Nouvelle-Écosse	Données non-disponibles.
Nunavut	Données non-disponibles. Les demandes d'authentification sont rares et nombrent probablement de 0 – 10 par année.
Ontario	37,656
Île-du-Prince-Édouard	7
Québec	6,000
Saskatchewan	864
Yukon	Données non-disponibles. Les demandes d'authentification sont rares.
Total	215,167

590,000	China
208,117	Malaysia
839,638	The Philippines
N/A	Singapore
66,000	Viet Nam

Outgoing documents: 1,918,922 [5]	TOTAL
<u>Incoming documents</u>	
20,000	Canada
490,000	China
70,883	Malaysia
381,991	The Philippines
N/A	Singapore
No statistics	Viet Nam
Incoming documents: 962,874 [4]	TOTAL
Other Instruments	
<p>f) Is the production of foreign public documents in your jurisdiction exempted from / not subject to legalisation or similar formality, or otherwise facilitated, by virtue of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> any internal law or practice that has been introduced or is intended to be introduced? Or any bilateral, regional or global instrument to which you are party or to which you intend to become party. 	
<p><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Canada:</u> Canadian statutes do not require that foreign public documents that are produced in Canada be legalised. In some cases, public authorities before whom foreign public documents are produced have the discretion to determine the applicable authentication requirements. These authorities could require the bearers of foreign public documents to have them legalised. Canada is party to several bilateral treaties that exempt public documents from legalisation. In Quebec, Article 2822 of the Civil Code of Québec exempts foreign public documents from legalisation by providing that neither the quality nor the signature of a foreign officer issuing a document need be proved. The presumption of authenticity provided by article 2822 CCQ is rebuttable as prescribed by article 2825 CCQ. Private-sector organisations and individuals may require the bearers of foreign public documents to have them legalised, as no law prevents them from doing so (with the exception of Québec). While not a requirement under Canadian law, Canadian embassies and consulates legalise foreign public documents when requested to do so / Les lois au Canada n'exigent pas que les actes publics étrangers qui sont produits au Canada soient légalisés. Dans certains</p>	<p>[3] Canada, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>

<p>cas, les autorités publiques ont la discrétion de décider quelles exigences d'authentification elles imposeront pour la production d'actes publics étrangers. Ces autorités pourraient exiger que le porteur d'un acte public étranger le fasse légaliser. Le Canada est partie à plusieurs traités bilatéraux qui dispensent les actes publics des exigences de la légalisation. Au Québec, l'article 2822 du Code Civil du Québec ("CCQ"), dispense les actes publics étrangers de légalisation en prévoyant qu'il n'est pas nécessaire de prouver la qualité ou la signature d'un officier étranger duquel émane un tel acte. La présomption d'authenticité prévue à l'article 2822 CCQ est toutefois réfragable en vertu de l'article 2825 CCQ. Hormis au Québec, les particuliers et les organismes privés qui transigent au Canada peuvent exiger la légalisation d'actes publics étrangers produits devant eux puisque aucune loi ne les en empêche. Bien qu'il n'existe pas d'exigence de légalisation en droit canadien, les ambassades et les consulats canadiens légalisent les actes publics étrangers sur demande.</p> <p><u>Viet Nam</u>: According to Viet Nam's laws and regulations, some specific documents are exempted from legalisation based on the followed grounds: 1. Papers or documents delivered directly or via diplomatic channel between competent Vietnamese and foreign Agencies; 2. According to international treaties to which Viet Nam and the foreign countries concerned are parties, or on the reciprocity principle. Viet Nam has signed bilateral instruments which provide legalization exemption for some specific documents with other countries, such as Consular Agreements, Mutual Judicial Assistance Agreement.</p>	
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[4] China, Iran, Malaysia, the Philippines</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>The Philippines</u>: Foreign public documents still go through the legalisation process.</p> <p><u>Viet Nam</u>: In fact, the current legal framework of Viet Nam on legalisation exemption, to some extent, satisfy the objective of harmonizing trade facilitation and fraud documents prevention. We also consider signing bilateral agreements with foreign partners on a case by case basis, taking into account trade relations.</p>	

The "Apostille Section" and publications	
g) How useful is the information provided on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?	
<p><u>Very useful.</u></p>	<p>[4] Canada, Iran, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>
<p><u>Useful.</u></p>	<p>[3] China, Malaysia, the Philippines</p>

<u>Not useful.</u>	-
<u>The Apostille Section has not yet been consulted.</u>	-
<p><i>Comments or suggestions for improvement</i></p> <p><u>Malaysia:</u> To publish other Contracting States' legislation that implement Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>The Philippines:</u> www.hcch.net site cannot be reached at present.</p> <p><u>Viet Nam:</u> The current layout, design and contents in the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website are convenient and easy to follow. We have no suggestion for improvement.</p>	
h) Are you aware of the publications of the Permanent Bureau the ABCs of Apostilles, the Brief Implementation Guide, and the Apostille Handbook, available on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?	
<u>Yes</u>	<p>[7]</p> <p>Canada, China, Iran, Malaysia, the Philippines, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>
<u>Some of them:</u>	-
<u>No</u>	-

i) Do you have any suggestions for future publications that could assist the promotion, implementation, or operation of the Apostille Convention?	
<p><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Canada:</u> Canada suggests the publication of a document that examines the security features of the e-Apostille by country of issuance and that compares these security features with those of the paper Apostille. Canada notes that Preliminary Document No. 18, March 2007 examines security features of the e-Apostille and suggests that the document be updated to reflect current practices. Canada also suggests that a document discussing the interoperability of e-Apostille systems established by Contracting States be published. This document could discuss the establishment of information technology systems that could accept, recognize and verify e-Apostilles from all contracting states that use them / Le Canada suggère la publication d'un document qui examine les caractéristiques liées à la sécurité de l'e-Apostille selon le pays d'origine de l'e-Apostille et qui les compare aux caractéristiques liées à la sécurité de l'Apostille-papier. Le Canada reconnaît que le Document préliminaire No. 18 de mars 2007 examine les caractéristiques liées à la sécurité de l'e-Apostille et propose que ce document soit mis à jour à la lueur de la pratique actuelle. Le Canada suggère aussi la publication d'un document discutant l'interopérabilité des systèmes de l'e-</p>	<p>[4]</p> <p>Canada, Iran, Malaysia, the Philippines</p>

<p>Apostille établis par certains États contractants. Ce document pourrait discuter de la mise en œuvre de systèmes qui pourraient accepter, reconnaître et vérifier les e-Apostilles des États contractants qui les utilisent.</p> <p><u>Malaysia:</u> To provide information on fees imposed by Competent Authorities of Contracting States for the issuance of Apostille certificates.</p> <p><u>The Philippines:</u> Best practices in implementing the Apostille Convention.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[3] China, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Other</p>	
<p>j) Are there any specific topics or practical issues that you would like to have discussed at the 2016 Special Commission?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Canada:</u> Canada would be interested in a discussion on apostille requirements for documents issued by Chambers of Commerce that are not public entities. It would also be interested in learning how Contracting States address requests for apostilles from the bearers of such documents / Le Canada s'intéresse à une discussion sur les exigences d'apostille pour les actes dressés par les Chambre de commerce qui ne sont pas des entités publiques. Il s'intéresse aussi à en apprendre davantage sur la façon dont les États contractants traitent les demandes d'apostille faites par les porteurs de tels actes.</p> <p><u>The Philippines:</u> Technical issues on the implementation of the Apostille by a competent authority- Department of Foreign Affairs vis-a-vis its local and overseas posts.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[2] Canada, the Philippines</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[5] China, Iran, Malaysia, Singapore, Viet Nam</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Part B – Questions for Contracting Parties</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">Section 1 – Joining the Apostille Convention</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">1.1 Changes to internal law</p>	
<p>a) Was implementing legislation necessary to give the Apostille Convention force of law in your jurisdiction (including regulations relating to the establishment and functioning of Competent Authorities)?</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p>For more detailed information, see the individual responses.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[36]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[19]</p> <p>Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Namibia, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, South Africa, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Croatia:</u> The Convention is directly applicable in the Republic of Croatia, therefore no implementation legislation was necessary.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Circulaire (interne) relative à l'application de la convention de La Haye du 5 octobre 1961 supprimant l'exigence de la légalisation des actes publics étrangers du 12 décembre 2005, CIV 2005-19 D3/12-12-2005, NOR : JUSC0520960C: http://www.textes.justice.gouv.fr/art_pix/100-DACS-b.pdf.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> The Apostille Convention was ratified on 29 September 2006, and became effective on 14 July 2007 with respect to the Republic of Republic of Korea. Any implementing legislation was not necessary for its ratification or entry into force.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> Translation for Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No 186 "Regulation for Legalisation of Public Documents" (20.03.2012) has been made available http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/MK_Noteikumi/Cab_Reg_No_186_-_Legalisation_of_Public_Documents.doc. Translation for Cabinet of Ministers Regulation No.187</p>	

"Regulation Regarding the State Fee for Legalisation of Public Documents" (20.03.2012) has been made available [http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/MK_Noteikumi/Cab_Reg_No_187 - State Fee for the Legalisation of a Public Document.doc](http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/MK_Noteikumi/Cab_Reg_No_187_-_State_Fee_for_the_Legalisation_of_a_Public_Document.doc).

Monaco: Une seule autorité est compétente pour la délivrance d'apostilles: la Direction des Services Judiciaires.

Montenegro: These laws have not been translated in English. If necessary, the above mentioned laws will be translated and submitted afterwards.

Namibia: Namibia follows the monist approach to international law treaties.

Norway: The Apostille Convention was ratified by the Norwegian Government in 1983. No amendments to Norwegian law were necessary in this regard. The questions in this Questionnaire relating to the internal law have thus been answered on the basis on information collected from the various Competent Authorities, *i.e.* how the Competent Authorities have interpreted and applied the Apostille Convention. Please be advised that the Ministry of Justice- and Public Security is about to issue Guidelines to the Competent Authorities regarding the application of the Apostille Convention. These Guidelines will encompass many aspects entailed in the Apostille Handbook. If desirable we will submit a copy of the Guidelines when completed.

Romania: According to art. 2 of Government Ordinance no. 66/1999, as amended through art. V of Law no. 202/25.10.2010 on some measures for speeding up the judicial proceedings, the competent Romanian authorities in applying the Apostille stipulated by art. 3 para. 1 of the Convention are the following:

- district courts for the official documents stipulated under art. 1 letters a) and d),
- Public Notaries Chambers for the official documents stipulated under art. 1 letter c),
- Prefect's Offices for the official documents stipulated under art. 1 letter b).

As regards the public notary documents, the Order of the Minister of Justice no. 2922/2010 on amending and supplementing the Regulation for implementation of Law on Public Notaries and public notary activities no. 36/1995, approved through Order of the Minister of Justice no. 710/C/1995, with further amendments and supplements was issued in relationship to the Regulation on the methodology for applying the Apostille or the super-legalization by the Public Notaries Chambers on notarial acts, as approved by the Board of the National Union of Public Notaries through its Decision no. 349/17.12.2010, with further amendments. Currently, the activity of apostilization and super-legalization of notarial acts by the Public Notaries Chambers is undertaken in accordance with the following:

- Law on Public Notaries and public notary activities no. 36/1995, re-published,
- Regulation for implementation of Law on Public Notaries and public notary activities no. 36/1995, with further amendments and supplements,
- Regulation on the methodology for applying the Apostille or super-legalization of notarial acts by the Public Notaries Chambers, as approved by the Board of the Public Notaries Chambers through Decision no. 75/06.08.2013.

As regards the administrative documents, the Instructions of the Minister of Administration and Interior no. 82/2010, on the organization and implementation of apostilization activity for official administrative documents, were drafted in terms of judicial documents, the documentation of 2004 was made available to the courts by the specialised department within the Ministry of Justice (Directorate for International

Law and Judicial Cooperation). See <http://legislatie.just.ro; www.uniuneanotarilor.ro>.

Russian Federation: Federal Law No. 330-FZ of November 28, 2015 on Issuing Apostille on Russian Public Documents to be Taken Beyond the Territory of the Russian Federation, entered into force on May 27, 2016. This Law is the principal legal act that regulates issuing Apostilles. The Competent Authorities are designated by the Regulation of the Government of the Russian Federation No. 479 of May 30, 2016.

Slovakia: L'instrument d'adhésion après avoir approuvé par le parlement, a été déposé chez dépositaire le 6 juin 2001. La transposition de la convention n'a pas été nécessaire selon le droit slovaque. La convention est disponible au Journal officiel de la République slovaque sur le site <https://www.slov-lex.sk/pravne-predpisy/SK/ZZ/2002/213/20050901>.

Slovenia: The Act on Verification of Documents in International Traffic is going to be amended in the near future, but Articles of the currently valid legislation relevant for the implementation of the Convention (Articles 14 and 15), will most likely stay the same.

1.2 Foreign direct investment

a) Are you aware that international organisations, such as the World Bank and the International Chamber of Commerce, have recognised the importance and efficacy of the Apostille Convention in the promotion and development of international trade and investment and have urged those that have not done so to join the Convention?

Yes

[35]
Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Peru, Portugal, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America

No

[15]
Argentina, Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia, Croatia, Dominican Republic, France, Germany, Japan, Republic of Korea,

	Latvia, Malta, Norway, Turkey, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> In order to facilitate the process further we are planning to implement both components of the electronic e-Apostille program (e-register and e-app).</p> <p><u>Ecuador:</u> However, Ecuador is respectful of the sovereignty of States.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Yes, Kosovo Authorities have benefited greatly from IFC/WBG assistance as part of the Kosovo Investment Climate Project undertaken by IFC/WBG during 2015 and 2016. Kosovo's Competent Authorities have been assisted by IFC/WBG experts under the Kosovo Investment Climate Project, to develop and adopt the applicable legislation for enactment of the Law on Abolishing the Requirement for Legalization of Foreign Public Documents and the other relevant legislative documents that will regulate the process of implementation of the Apostille Convention. IFC/WBG has assisted and is assisting the Competent Authorities to develop tools for effective implementation of the Apostille Convention including the preparation for adoption of an Advanced category of e-Registry which is aimed to be released and implemented by first half of next year.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> The Lithuanian Chamber of Notaries was not aware.</p> <p><u>Malta:</u> We intend to inform the pertinent authorities with the contents of the apostille convention of which Malta is a member.</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> Montenegro is aware of the importance of the Apostille Convention recognised by the international organisations.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> While it is likely that the relevant New Zealand agency is aware of this Report, the National Office for the Hague Conference and the Central Authority were not aware of it.</p>	
1.3 Other relevant instruments, laws and practices	
<p>a) Is the production of any types of foreign public documents in your jurisdiction exempted from / not subject to legalisation or similar formality, or otherwise facilitated, by virtue of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any internal law or practice that has been introduced or is intended to be introduced? <p>or</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • any bilateral, regional or global instrument to which you are party or to which you intend to become party? 	
<p><u>Yes</u></p> <p>For more detailed information, see the individual responses.</p>	<p>[32]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia &</p>

	Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Uruguay
<u>No</u>	[21] Australia, Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Honduras, Malta, Mauritius, Namibia, Peru, Portugal, Serbia, South Africa, Turkey, United States of America, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> The Republic of Armenia is a party to the Minsk Convention on Legal Aid and Legal Relations in Civil, Family and Criminal Cases of 1993. In addition the Republic of Armenia has bilateral agreements with Bulgaria and Lithuania.</p> <p><u>Cyprus:</u> In practice, the Apostille Convention is preferred. In this respect, we requested the abrogation of the relevant provision in a number of bilateral conventions and application in lieu of the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>France:</u> La France est liée par de nombreuses conventions bilatérales et multilatérales de dispense de légalisation. De plus, au sein de l'Union européenne vient d'être adopté le règlement simplifiant la circulation des documents publics, qui devrait entrer en vigueur à compter du second semestre 2019 (qui concerne notamment les actes d'état civil, les actes notariés et les extraits de casier judiciaire).</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> Public documents issued in one of the member states of this Convention are accepted without legalisation in another member state.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> -EU Regulations / -Bilateral agreements with Albania, Algeria, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China, Croatia, Cyprus, Cuba, Czech Republic, Egypt, Finland, France, Greece, Italy, Iraq, Kosovo, Macedonia, Moldova, Mongolia, Montenegro, North Korea, Poland, Russia, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Syria, Tunisia, Turkey, Ukraine, Vietnam.</p>	

Kosovo: Republic of Kosovo, as one of the newest countries that have acceded to Hague Apostille Convention, prior to becoming State Party/Contracting State has applied legalisation procedures for all foreign public documents as it has not adopted or signed any bilateral or multilateral agreements for exempting the legalisation procedures.

Latvia: According to the statistics there are still cases, when the Latvian nationals are required to legalise public documents.

Lithuania: According to Art. 30 of the Consular Statute of the Republic of Lithuania documents issued by Embassies and Consulates accredited to Lithuania are exempted of the legalisation. According to provisions of bilateral agreements on Legal Assistance and Legal Relations in Civil, Family and Criminal cases with Belarus, Estonia, Latvia, Moldova, Russia and Ukraine all official documents are exempted of legalisation and certification by Apostille. According Art. 8 of the Convention on the issue of multilingual extracts from civil status records extracts are exempted of legalisation and certification by Apostille. Documents exempted of legalisation and certification by Apostille according to EU Law.

Monaco: Il s'agit notamment d'accords bilatéraux en matière d'entraide judiciaire qui contiennent des dispositions sur la dispense de légalisation.

New Zealand: Public documents that are admissible in evidence under Australian law, without proof of authenticity, are admissible in evidence in NZ to the same extent and for the same purpose without such proof (section 148 Evidence Act 2006). If Australian law does not require the document to be authenticated then it is admissible in NZ without such authentication. In practice this means that the NZ authority must apply the Australian rules of admissibility referred to in these provisions and to admit the documents when they would be admissible under Australian law.

Russian Federation: The Minsk Convention and Russia's bilateral MLA Treaties with a number of countries exempt certain types of public documents from all formalities including legalisation and Apostille.

Serbia: Exception is the issue of so called „Kosovo“, which is not a state, where Serbia objected to accession to the Convention on Apostille.

Slovenia: If an applicant specifically states that the State of destination requests an Apostille, we explain to the applicant that in accordance with bilateral instrument, public documents are exempted from legalisation, but on the applicant's request our authorities provide documents with Apostille.

Turkey: Turkey has bilateral agreements that provide rules for abolishing the requirement for full legalisation of foreign public documents.

Uruguay: Unilateral exemptions / Bilateral treaties / MERCOSUR.

United States of America: Foreign public documents are generally accepted without authentication. This is not owing to a specific law, regulation or practice but rather reflects a general absence of authentication requirements. Federal and state courts may require authentication in accordance with relevant Rules of Procedure when the authenticity of a particular document is in question.

Section 2 – Objections to accessions

2.1 Revisiting objections

Only for Contracting Parties that have objected to one or more accessions

a) If you have objected to the accession of one (or more) Contracting Party(ies) under Article 12 of the Convention, have you revisited your position on this issue in the last five years, or do you intend to do so in the near future?

Yes

Austria: Objection for Kosovo will be revisited within the next two years; objection for Kyrgyzstan and Uzbekistan was revisited in 2014.

Belgium: La Belgique a retiré son objection à l'adhésion de L'Albanie le 21 décembre 2015.

Greece: By Note of 17 December 2015 the Embassy of Greece informed the depositary that the Hellenic Republic withdrew the objection to the accession of Georgia to the Convention.

United States of America: The United States withdrew its objection to the accession of Liberia on May 20, 2015. The United States currently has no outstanding objection to any Contracting State to the Convention.

[7]

Austria, Belgium, Finland, Germany, Greece, Israel, United States of America

No

[17]

Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Venezuela

Comments:

Argentina: In April 2016, the Argentine Republic submitted a declaration to the Depositary informing that the provisions of the Apostille Convention will not apply to or bind Argentina in respect of Kosovo, on the grounds that Kosovo is not an independent State and, therefore, it does not meet the requirements set forth in Article 12 of the Apostille Convention.

Austria: Objections: Kosovo, Tajikistan, Burundi, Kyrgyzstan, Mongolia, Dominican Republic, Uzbekistan.

Dominican Republic: Dominican Republic did not present any objection.

France: Sans objet. La France n'a jamais utilisé le "vêto" prévu à l'article 12 de la Convention.

Germany: Si, à une date ultérieure, les conditions d'une acceptation de l'adhésion avaient changé (par exemple exclusion de falsification, exclusion de corruption, existence de services d'examen externes aux fins de la délivrance).

Israel: Israel objected to the accession of Kosovo to the convention in 2016.

Kosovo: Republic of Kosovo has no intention to present an objection to the accession of one or more contracting states to Apostille Convention, as a new country and one of the newest acceded countries to

<p>Convention shares and believes in values and benefits from instruments of Private International Law promulgated by HCCH and its opinions and decisions will not be subject of political motivations or interests.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: N/A</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Par suite des objections en vertu de l'article 12, la Convention n'entrera pas en vigueur entre le Kosovo et la Slovaquie. La raison des objections a été la non-reconnaissance du Kosovo de la part de Slovaquie. C'était la décision politique de notre gouvernement et probablement elle ne changera pas si tôt.</p>	
<p>Section 3 – The Apostille Section and publications</p>	
<p>3.1 Content of the Apostille Section</p>	
<p>a) How useful is the information provided on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?</p>	
<p><u>Very useful</u></p>	<p>[42]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><u>Useful</u></p>	<p>[14]</p> <p>Belarus, Denmark, Finland, Ecuador, France, Germany, Honduras, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Norway, Peru,</p>

	Serbia, Tajikistan, Turkey
<u>Not useful</u>	-
<p><i>Comments or suggestions for improvement:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> It serves as the main source of information.</p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Direct reference to the table of members is provided in public material published by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade to assist clients in understanding which countries will accept an Apostille certificate.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> Unification of Competent Authorities eligible to issue an Apostille.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> The Permanent Bureau should inform directly the State parties each time a State adheres to the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> The use of Apostille is applied differently in countries in particular whether to attach the original and the apostille together.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> The Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website is a most useful resource of information for all our authorities as well as for the people seeking information regarding legalisation of documents.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan:</u> Make Apostille Section available in Russian.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> U.S. state competent authorities note the usefulness of the Apostille Section, in particular the status table.</p>	
b) How often do staff of your Competent Authority(ies) consult the Apostille Handbook?	
<u>Daily</u>	[3] Costa Rica, Honduras, Romania
<u>Frequently</u>	[31] Austria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Israel, Kosovo, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa,

	Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>Seldom</u>	[24] Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Romania, Serbia, Turkey
<u>Never</u>	[1] Romania
<p><i>Comments or suggestions:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Information contained in the handbook is summarised for staff through internal policy guidelines.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Do not have a specific answer due to the cause that the Apostille Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Le Manuel est plus ou moins utilisé selon les cours d'appel concernées. De façon générale, il est utilisé en complément de la circulaire interne du 12 décembre 2005.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> Il n'est pas possible de faire une indication précise à cet égard, cependant il faut partir du principe que les autorités allemandes compétentes pour apostiller ne font quasiment aucun usage du Manuel en français ou en anglais. Le Manuel est actuellement traduit dans la langue allemande. Il y a donc lieu de supposer qu'à l'avenir les autorités allemandes compétentes pour apostiller se serviront fréquemment de la version allemande.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Handbook is very useful and valuable instrument especially for new authorities to guide and instruct them on how to deal with practical cases presented before competent authorities.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> Although it is not a publication that staff look at day to day, it is useful for Management.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> Whereas a few Competent Authorities consulted the Apostille Handbook frequently, about half of the Competent Authorities were unacquainted with the Apostille Handbook.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> Peru has an internal guide on apostille named "Manual de Apostilla". This document, mostly used regarding the apostille issues, is composed by four parties (objective, legal basis, scope and general dispositions).</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Almost 50% from the respondents "frequently"; Almost 50% from the respondents "seldom".</p>	

<p><u>United States of America:</u> U.S. state competent authorities relied on these publications in updating their own guidance and guides to good practice.</p>	
<p>c) Do you have any suggestions or comments concerning the publications of the Permanent Bureau, the ABCs of Apostilles, the Brief Implementation Guide, or the Apostille Handbook, available on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> Il est essentiel de publier aussi ces informations en espagnol.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Certaines cours d'appel trouvent le Manuel apostille complexe d'utilisation du fait des nombreux renvois qu'il comporte. Une clarification (sous forme de liste ou de tableau) des actes susceptibles d'être apostillés pourrait être suggérée, sous réserve d'un consensus des États contractants sur les documents concernés.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> It is essential to publish the Brief Implementation Guide in other languages such as Spanish.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> The ABCs brochure is a useful tool specifically designed to assist those who seek to benefit from the Apostille Convention. In order to promote awareness of its existence among potential users, we think it may be beneficial to distribute the brochure to bar associations in countries that are parties to the Apostille Convention and to publish it on relevant websites. The implementation guide deals with technical questions regarding the initial implementation of the Apostille Convention. However, it does not provide information on legal and practical issues that arise during the everyday use of the Convention. It may be useful to produce a short and concise brochure, similar to the Apostille ABC's brochure, which could include examples of problems encountered by states parties and best practices in resolving them. We have found the Apostille Convention handbook to be very useful. However, in order to make it more substantive, we believe it could also include examples of how the Special Commissions' recommendations have been addressed and implemented. The Permanent Bureau could consider producing a handbook, similar to the handbook on the Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters. Such a handbook can be relatively short, highlighting only key issues and problems associated with the implementation of the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> It would be helpful to set common requirements (recommendations) of certification by Apostille of copies and translations: According to internal law, notaries are authorised to authenticate copies of documents and signatures including copies of non-public documents and signatures of translators (including translations of non-public documents). These notarial deeds are notarial acts and are treated as official authentication. According to Art. 1 of Convention notarial acts are deemed to be public documents and may be certified by Apostille. As a result, such authentications of non-public documents may be certified by Apostille as notarial acts.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Ce guide est très utile et constitue un outil efficace pour faire connaître le système de la Convention.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> Those publications are extremely useful for the implementation of the Apostille Convention.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7] Costa Rica, France, Honduras, Israel, Lithuania, Monaco, Peru</p>
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[48]</p>

	<p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p>d) Do you have any suggestions for future publications that could assist the promotion, implementation, or operation of the Apostille Convention?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: German versions would be helpful.</p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: Petite brochure à destination des usagers.</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: It is important to divulgate the technology advances in e-apostille made by the Contracting States as in the case of Colombia that is using modern technologies, its service is on line and the apostilles are digitally signed.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Il serait également utile de mettre en place un réseau d'alerte interactif entre toutes les autorités chargées de l'Apostille susceptibles de signaler les cas et les risques potentiels de falsification de documents, et permettre d'éclaircir des doutes quant à l'authenticité des documents émis indépendamment du fait que le pays ou l'autorité soit inclus ou non dans un e-Register.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Une publication simplifiée et succincte à l'attention des usagers serait utile.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: The Convention Secretariat should consider publishing the information in different languages such as Spanish.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: See answer of 3.1(c).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[10]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Austria, Belgium, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Honduras, Israel, Lithuania, Mauritius, Slovakia</p>

<p><u>Lithuania:</u> Translation or verification of signature of translator may be certified by Apostille only if translation is affixed to a translated document and this document is public.</p> <p>The copy of document or authentication of the copy may be certified by Apostille only if the document is public.</p> <p><u>Mauritius:</u> We would need posters for information of the public.</p> <p><u>Slovakia:</u> Il serait très utile si les États contractants indiquaient obligatoirement les noms des autorités compétentes au dépositaire de la Convention dans la langue locale également. L'information dans les langues de la Conférence n'est pas suffisante, car elle ne correspond pas aux données figurant dans l'Apostille ou aux sceaux apposés sur les apostilles. En conséquence, les autorités auxquelles une apostille est présentée ne peuvent pas effectivement faire une comparaison entre les données indiquées sur l'Espace Apostille et les données sur l'Apostille. Par exemple selon les informations sur le site de la Conférence de La Haye pour Oman, c'est le Ministère des Affaires Etrangères (section consulaire) qui est l'autorité compétente, mais sur le tampon de ce ministère se trouvent le nom de l'autorité des Affaires Etrangères dans la langue arabe uniquement. Un officier qui vérifie l'Apostille n'est pas capable de juger, si les lettres arabes signifient « Le Ministère des Affaires Etrangères ».</p>	
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[45] Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>

Section 4 – Operation and statistics

4.1 General evaluation	
a) How do you rate the overall operation of the Apostille Convention?	
<u>Excellent</u>	[24] Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Kosovo, Latvia, Mauritius, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay
<u>Good</u>	[29] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, Slovakia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>Satisfactory</u>	[2] Peru, Turkey
<u>Unsatisfactory</u>	
<p><i>Comments or suggestions for improvement:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> There is still general misunderstanding concerning the legalisation of signatures and seals on education documents.</p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> Issuing operation is excellent, few misunderstandings with receiving authorities. Need more awareness sessions.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> Any public document should be Apostilled, with the exception of Criminal Records.</p>	

<p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Introduire un système uniforme d'apostille électronique.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> It is important for the Competent Authorities to include in the Hague Conference website a list of links of the contracting parties related to the verification of the apostille registry. That list could contribute in the process, reducing the time of consultations and improving the conviction of security about the authentication of the document.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Some courts ask, at national level, to have a handbook drafted for a unitary application of the Convention.</p>	
<p>b) Have any persistent difficulties, issues or challenges in the operation of the Apostille Convention been encountered by your Competent Authority(ies)?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> There is still general misunderstanding concerning the legalisation of signatures and seals on education documents.</p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> There is still a general misunderstanding concerning the legalisation of signatures and seals on power of attorney documents and education documents.</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> The rejection of the Colombian e-apostilles because they are digitally signed.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> Il existe toujours des problèmes avec l'interprétation faite par certains pays de l'exception prévue au point b) du paragraphe final de l'article 1: b) aux documents administratifs ayant trait directement à une opération commerciale ou douanière. En effet, certains pays continuent à interpréter cette exception comme une obligation de légaliser les documents puisqu'ils n'ont pas été inclus dans l'apostille, et non comme une dispense de toutes formalités.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> Sometimes problems arise when there is not a same interpretation of a public document between states (this concerns e.g. translations). Occasionally, there are misunderstandings when Apostille is required even for private documents (as it is not possible to issue an Apostille for a private document, applicants sometimes submit certified copies of a private document - usually established by a notary. The certified copy may be apostilled, however, in this case the Apostille refers only to the notarial certification). We also encountered problems with copies of ID cards and passports. Under the Czech law it is not possible to make certified copies of ID cards or passports and for a simple copy the Apostille cannot be issued. However, some states require copies of ID cards or passports with Apostilles.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> The Convention does not apply to administrative documents, such as commercial or customs operations. Application should consider all kinds of documents, with the exception of Criminal Records.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> See response for 3.1(c).</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Un État partie a refusé plusieurs fois une apostille en raison de sa forme.</p> <p><u>Mauritius:</u> We have just introduced fees for Apostille and we had to manage communication with the public.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Les difficultés rencontrées relèvent principalement de la pratique d'États destinataires qui exigent des formalités qui ne sont pas visées dans la Convention. Certaines difficultés proviennent également du format de certains documents à apostiller sur lesquels ne peuvent être apposés l'apostille ou une allonge et</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[15]</p> <p>Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Honduras, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Peru, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Venezuela</p>

du refus dans ces cas de certains États destinataires d'accepter des copies certifiées conformes. Ces derniers temps, il a été remarqué que des personnes demandent l'apposition de l'apostille sur un document non destiné à un État partie à la Convention. Lorsque l'Autorité centrale émet un refus en expliquant les motifs, la même demande est présentée mais avec un autre État de destination Partie à la Convention. Il est donc difficile de vérifier l'État de destination.

Peru: The verification of the authenticity of apostilles enacted by other contracting parties. For instance, the United States has different competent authorities, consequently there are different models of Apostille enacted in that country.

Romania: 5% ask for the clarification of terms such as "actes publics" (French) or as "public documents" (English) as they are found within the Convention.

Slovakia: Les informations pratiques sur l'« Espace Apostille » du site web de la HCCH sont très utiles. C'est dommage qu'elles ne soient pas disponibles pour toutes les personnes qui s'occupent de la Convention Apostille à cause de la barrière linguistique. Puis les demandeurs ne sont pas informés sur les nouveaux faits. Par exemple les clients de quelques Ambassades à Bratislava sont mal informés sur les Autorités compétentes slovaques actuelles.

Slovenia: As we were informed quite a few times in the last four years, some people had problems with foreign authorities accepting the Apostille that was printed out. Instead of verifying the e-Register, the foreign Authorities rejected documents and asked for additional official explanation from the Central Authority. People then turned to the Ministry of Justice of Slovenia that provided them with an explanation. Since the explanation had to be then translated into the language of the foreign authority, that caused additional costs for the people, although all the information regarding the use of e-Register and e-Apostille is available at the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website. There were also cases where applicants persistently asked for a legalisation (Apostille was not enough) due to the fact that the receiving authority only accepted documents with the stamp of their embassy and did not accept the Apostille.

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[37] Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Unknown</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[4] Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Ecuador, Romania</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Aucune difficulté liée aux dispositions de la convention elle-même n'a été recensée. Cependant, celle-ci est « victime de son succès », et les autorités de certains États continuent de demander une apostille sur certains actes alors même que des accords internationaux suppriment l'exigence de légalisation ou de formalité similaire.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> Some states require and take the original apostille leaving the owner without the original documents. If documents get lost the owner is left with nothing. this should change. there is also lack of trust among authorities.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> 90% from the respondents "No". 5% from the respondents "Unknown".</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Since all the necessary information is available at the Apostille Section, we suggest encouraging Authorities of the Contracting states to consult the relevant webpage and publications of the Hague Conference as well as contacting relevant Authority of the State concerned instead of rejecting the Apostille or asking people to provide them with additional explanation, especially since grounds for rejection are limited (see also para 291 <i>et seq.</i> of the Apostille HB and Q.13 of the ABCs of Apostilles).</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Since responding "yes" to this question in the 2012 questionnaire, there have been significantly fewer reports of problems with the acceptance of U.S. Apostilles.</p>	

4.2 Statistics on issued Apostilles

a) How many Apostilles were issued in your jurisdiction for each of the following years?

2012	2013	2014	2015	Contracting Party
254,500	233,000	248,130	256,500	Argentina
26,853	26,828	28,829	30,809	Armenia
45,260	48,027	50,477	53,982	Australia
16,496*	16,925*	17,916*	17,527*	Austria
0	0	1,947	3,661	Bahrain
49,124	51,746	49,517	48,815	Belgium
95,505*	119,420*	114,782*	117,994*	Bulgaria
26,616	28,751	32,645	37,221	China (Hong Kong SAR)
609	659	702	1,216	China (Macao SAR)
1,093,830	1,634,739	622,141	533,707	Colombia
59,373	63,881	69,471	76,913	Costa Rica
22,258	18,742	19,872	20,088	Croatia
441,864	474,829	412,092	452,730	Cyprus
25,310*	26,630*	28,661*	28,374*	Czech Republic
48,993	53,444	52,314	52,233	Denmark
206,766•	219,439•	222,959•	219,815•	Dominican Republic
96,452	84,674	81,889	87,012	Ecuador
7,610	7,357	6,453	7,058	Estonia
N/A	38,443	38,330	38,249	Finland
264,500**	265,317	242,183	228,211	France
28,530	34,791	40,556	43,603	Georgia
309,762	328,131	328,163	341,976	Germany
-	-	-	177,604*	Greece
27,470	42,617	49,180	57,909	Honduras
19,482*	20,374*	20,988*	22,499*	Hungary
216,596*	227,026*	186,162*	287,112*	Israel
65,762	70,075	79,750	90,729	Japan
77,024	91,255	96,077	100,103	Republic of Korea
-	-	-	13,757*	Kosovo
10,829	11,091	11,385	13,067	Latvia
13,021	14,488	15,207	16,165	Lithuania
47,500	50,000	58,000	55,000	Luxembourg

2012	2013	2014	2015	Contracting Party
17,995	20,773	24,814	27,923	Malta
24,954	26,944	25,485	27,888	Mauritius
218,000	228,500	245,000	255,900	Mexico
4,103	3,720	4,357	4,662	Monaco
-	-	-	309	Montenegro
-	-	-	2,000	Namibia
12,498	13,888	13,013	13,423	New Zealand
42,891	46,045	42,439	44,965	Norway
265,574	266,714	255,802	248,960	Peru
36,886	40,616	39,133	36,005	Portugal
229,524*	199,742*	195,691*	204,623*	Romania
15,183*	16,190*	54,270*	94,065*	Russian Federation
11,456***	12,370***	13,489***	14,527***	Serbia
20,221*	18,774*	19,101*	20,369*	Slovakia
12,674	13,501	11,969	11,978	Slovenia
12,875	16,619	19,486	18,767	South Africa
28,249	29,964	28,929	28,002	Turkey
-	57,960	50,239	48,394	Uruguay
-	-	44,362	210,333	Venezuela
4,550,978. [43]	5,315,019. [45]	4,314,357. [47]	4,844,732. [51]	TOTAL [51]

During this 4-year period, the Contracting Parties that issued the greatest number of Apostilles are (in order): Colombia, Cyprus, Germany, France and Peru.

* For a breakdown of these figures, see the individual responses.

• Figure include both Apostilles and legalisations.

** Estimation, compte tenu de l'absence de chiffres pour la CA de Paris en 2012, le nombre d'apostilles émises cette année-là a été évalué sur la base de la moyenne des 3 années suivantes.

*** These figures reflect only statistics provided by the court I Basic court in Belgrade. (competent also for II and III Basic court in such area). See also comments from Serbia below.

Unknown

Austria: unknown, how many Apostilles were issued by regional courts (Landesgerichte) and regional Governments (Landesregierungen).

Chile: The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.

Russian Federation: Full information is not available. The statistics for federal Competent Authorities is provided in a separate document.

United States of America: In 2012 the United States provided numbers based upon the response of 10 competent authorities. Given that this represents less than 20 percent of the U.S. competent authorities

[3]
Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile,
Russian Federation

that issue the majority of U.S. Apostilles any number provided would be incomplete and innacurate.	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> 16 regional courts are competent for the issuance of apostilles with regard to judicial and notarial documents; administrative documents are certified by the provincial Governor or the provincial Government in each of the 9 Austrian Provinces; the Austrian Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs is competent for the issuance of apostilles with regard to documents <i>e.g.</i> by the President, the President of the National Assembly, the Federal Government, a Federal Ministry or the Supreme Court.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Une légère diminution sur la période peut être constatée; à noter que dans le questionnaire apostille 2008, l'autorité centrale française avait recensé 385 000 apostilles pour l'année 2007.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Ministry of Justice (MoJ); Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Trade (MFAT); Hungarian National Chamber of Civil Law Notaries (HNCCLN).</p> <p><u>Japan:</u> The statistics are compiled by the fiscal year which starts in April and ends in March.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> The data in the table has been provided by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. Notaries are issuing Apostilles since 1 January 2016 only, therefore the statistical information is not available.</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> If necessary, statistics will be collected afterwards from the courts.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> The figures for the year 2014, 2013 and 2012 are not available at this moment.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> The above mentioned numbers for Apostilles issued are based on statistics provided by the Competent Authorities.</p> <p><u>Serbia:</u> MoJ has received statistics from 53 of 66 Basic courts so we can't provide you with totally accurate number. We can confirm the statistics for the largest court I Basic court in Belgrade (competent also for II and III Basic court in this area). Other courts have significantly lower figures.</p>	
b) Can any trend(s) be discerned from these statistics?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Argentina:</u> There is an increase in the number of Apostilles issued. The reason could be the accession of new countries of the Convention.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The number of issuances of Apostilles increases.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> A general trend of increase.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR):</u> The statistics shows an uptrend in the past few years.</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> There is a reduction in the amount of apostilles between 2013 and 2014, due to the restriction in remittances by Venezuela.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> Nous avons constaté que l'apostille a fortement contribué au développement des activités commerciales du pays, signataire entre autres de nombreux traités de libre échange, et aussi en raison de l'augmentation du nombre d'États partie à la Convention.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[32]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia,</p>

<p><u>Cyprus</u>: Steady flow.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Number of issued Apostilles is growing, probably due to the increase in international trade and migration.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: 1. studies Ecuadorians abroad due to scholarships granted by the government; 2. Documents required by the children of Ecuadorian migrants abroad.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Une tendance générale à la baisse se constate depuis 2013; sur 37 cours d'appel, seules les cours d'appel d'Outre-Mer ont vu le nombre d'apostilles augmenter.</p> <p>Il est difficile de cibler les raisons de cette baisse. L'on peut noter toutefois:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - une baisse du nombre d'adoptions internationales qui a un impact direct sur le nombre de demandes d'apostilles, - dans certaines cours d'appel, comme à Rennes, une meilleure application des textes de dispense de légalisation et d'apostille avec une augmentation importante du nombre des rejets (14% de demandes rejetées en 2015 à Rennes). <p><u>Georgia</u>: The number of Apostilles issued is increasing mainly because of the increase of request to certify by Apostille the translations.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Tendence croissante chaque année.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Each year there is a favourable increase, possibly due to the fact that more States have adhered to the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: Slight increase, possibly reasoned by a growing volume of migration of workers and developing cross-border economic relationships.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: The number of issued Apostilles are on the increase.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Kosovo, is not in a position to comment on this question as it has no previous statistics based on which may provide its opinion and the comparison with the previous legalisation process is not applicable for the purpose of this Questionnaire.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: The number is increasing, although at a slower rate.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Due to the free movement of persons and employment possibilities abroad the number of legalised documents increases every year.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: The trend of growth related to free movement of persons, especially students and labour mobility.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: Apostilles are on the increase year by year.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Une augmentation quasi constante de la délivrance du nombre d'apostilles peut être constatée.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: Trend of growth. Current statistics (on 30 August 2016): 283.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: There is an increase in applications as many people need apostilles to either study or emigrate abroad.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Croissance de immigration et d'émigration.</p>	<p>Slovenia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>
--	--

<p><u>Romania:</u> As regards public notary documents, a regular level of activity is maintained, even if the Law for adhesion of Romania to Convention no. 16 of the International Commission on Civil Status on the issue of multilingual extracts from civil status records, signed in Vienna on 8 September 1976, ratified through Law no. 65/2012, entered into force on 5 June 2013, for which the Government Decision no. 727/2013 for the approval of Methodological Rules for the application of Convention provisions was drafted. As regards judicial documents, some of the courts mentioned that a decrease/preservation of the same level of activity has been recorded, while other courts mentioned an increase by a maximum of 10%. The answer is no as regards the administrative documents.</p> <p><u>Slovakia:</u> Le nombre des Apostilles varie selon les années.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> We noticed a slight decrease of the number of issued Apostilles compared to previous years (2008-2011). Possible reasons could be that two bilateral treaties exempting documents from legalisation entered in force (one in 2010, other in 2015). Otherwise we notice that numbers of issued Apostilles remain approximately the same since people still migrate due to educational and work purposes.</p> <p><u>South Africa:</u> Steady increase in the processing of documents originating from South Africa, especially to countries which are signatory to the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>Venezuela:</u> There has been an increase of 50 % per year.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No/unknown</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[22] Armenia, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Israel, Luxembourg, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America</p>
<p>c) What are the principal “States of destination” for Apostilles issued in your jurisdiction?</p>	
<p>EU States</p>	<p>Armenia</p>
<p>Top 5 in 2015: Italy (16.3%), India (7.4%), Greece (7.2%), Netherlands (5.8%), Croatia (3.9%)</p>	<p>Australia</p>
<p>Regional Court of Vienna: Russia, Ukraine (mainly business papers concerning the foundation of companies) Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs: Russia (29%), Ukraine (12%), Kazakhstan (7%)</p>	<p>Austria</p>
<p>States of Europe, Kuwait, Canada etc</p>	<p>Bosnia and Herzegovina</p>
<p>Greece, UK, Austria, Germany, Turkey, Spain.</p>	<p>Bulgaria</p>
<p>The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. Nevertheless, legalized documents today are mainly used in countries such as Argentina, Peru, Colombia and Spain.</p>	<p>Chile</p>

Unknown.	China (Hong Kong SAR)
United States of America	China (Macao SAR)
Venezuela (16%), Spain (28.5%), Argentina (11%), Ecuador (8.18%), United States of America (6.48%)	Colombia
États-Unis d'Amérique (30%), Espagne (20%), France (10%), Mexique (10%), Colombie (15%), Nicaragua (15%)	Costa Rica
About 60 % of total Apostilles issued in the Republic of Croatia are for use in Germany, Austria and Italy	Croatia
Ministry of Foreign Affairs: Germany (40%), Greece (15%), Israel (10%) Ministry of Justice: Russian Federation, Germany, Italy, Ukraine	Czech Republic
Middle East countries, East Europe and South America	Denmark
USA/Spain/Italy	Dominican Republic
Europe: Spain, Italy, Germany; North America: United States; Latin America: Argentina, Mexico	Ecuador
Germany, Sweden, Finland	Estonia
Russian Federation, Spain, Germany, United States of America	Finland
Fédération de Russie, Israël, Espagne, Portugal, Colombie, Argentine, Mexique, Turquie, Brésil Aucune proportion nationale ne peut être fournie. Toutefois, pour certaines des cours d'appel les plus importantes, certains pourcentages peuvent être fournis: - Paris: sur 80 000 apostilles en 2015, 60% environ concernent la Russie et Israël; - Rennes (compétence spéciale liée à la présence du service central d'état civil et du casier judiciaire sur le ressort): sur 27 000 apostilles en 2015, 19,4% concernent l'Argentine, 15% la Russie, 14,1% Israël; - Lyon: sur 11 400 apostilles en 2015, 20,6% concernaient la Russie, 8% la Colombie, 8% l'Inde et 6,5% Israël - Bordeaux: sur 5 500 apostilles en 2015, 40% concernaient l'Amérique latine, 20% la Russie et 20% l'Espagne	France
Spain, Germany, Turkey, Italy, United States of America, Israel, Greece.	Georgia
Fédération de Russie, Ukraine, Kazakhstan, Turquie.	Germany
Germany (22%) Great Britain (11%), Bulgaria (9, 69%), Russia (6.11%) United States (4.87%) and France (4.87%). (The above percentages refer to the 152,586 documents and not to the total number of 177,604).	Greece
United States of America, Spain, El Salvador, Panamá, Costa Rica, Nicaragua.	Honduras
Germany - 31,8 %, Switzerland - 8,8 %, Slovakia - 6,1 %, Russia - 5,8 %, Ukraine - 4,1 %, Poland - 3,5 %, Belgium - 2,8 %, Netherlands - 2,6 %, Spain - 2,5 %, Turkey - 2,3 % (MoJ) Ukraine - 7,2 %, Germany 6,1 %, Russia 6,3 %, South Korea 6,1 %, United States of America 2,4%, Turkey 2,9 %, Kazakhstan 2,5 % (HNCCLN)	Hungary
Israel does not monitor the destination states of Apostilles issued.	Israel
United States of America, the Republic of Korea, the Republic of India.	Japan
France (10.9%), Russia (7.75%), Spain (7.54%), Germany (7.35%), US (6.65%).	Republic of Korea
Actually this information is not obtained from the applicants and the same can't be reported based on the assumptions. Beginning of 2017 the two competent Authorities will start using the unique applicant form which has a separate section/question for declaring the state of destination.	Kosovo

EU countries, Russia.	Latvia
Germany, Norway, UK, Netherlands.	Lithuania
DE 8% / ES 6.5 % / IT et PL 4 %.	Luxembourg
No statistics are kept.	Malta
We do not have a record on the destination of the document.	Mauritius
Spain	Mexico
Italie: 21,71 %, Russie: 12,14 %, Suisse: 5,66 %, Royaume-Uni de Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord: 5,13 %, Grèce: 4,27 %.	Monaco
Slovenia.	Montenegro
Germany, France, South Africa, Russia, Ukraine	Namibia
Republic of Korea, Netherlands, Russia, Spain, Italy, Australia, Germany.	New Zealand
1) Spain, 2) Russia, 3) Lithuania.	Norway
Spain, Argentina, Venezuela, and the United States Of America.	Peru
Espagne, Venezuela, Colombie, Ucrania, Roumanie.	Portugal
Administrative: Italy, Germany, Spain, Belgium, United Kingdom, Greece, France etc. Public Notary: Italy, Spain, Greece, Germany, United Kingdom etc. Judicial: Italy, Germany, Spain, Greece, United Kingdom, Switzerland, Israel, Belgium, France, Portugal, Netherlands, United States of America, Austria, Ireland, Russia, Cyprus, Hungary, Sweden, Finland, Argentina, Slovenia, South Africa, Mexico, Norway, Belarus, Turkey, Canada etc.	Romania
Cyprus, Germany, Italy, Spain, Switzerland, UK, US	Russian Federation
Italy, Germany.	Serbia
Serbia, Russian Federation, Ukraine.	Slovenia
Refer to the attached document that provides the complete details. Note: The statistics were taken for the year 2015.	South Africa
Czech Republic, Poland, Russian Federation, Republic of Kazakhstan, Republic of Turkey, Republic of Lithuania, Latvia	Tajikistan
Mexico.	United States of America
Spain – Argentina.	Uruguay
U.S.A, Panama, Spain, Colombia, Ecuador, Argentina	Venezuela

Only for Contracting Parties that issue e-Apostilles

d) How many e-Apostilles were issued in your jurisdiction for each of the following years?

2012	2013	2014	2015	Contracting Party
-	-	-	2	Austria
-	-	-	1	Bahrain
1,093,830	1,634,739	622,141	533,707	Colombia
472	770	1,191	1,216	New Zealand

N/A	N/A	N/A	2	Slovenia
0	0	0	0	United States of America
1,094,302. [3]	1,635,509. [3]	623,332. [3]	534,928. [6]	TOTAL [6]
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>[Note: Only Contracting Parties that issue e-Apostilles have been included]</i></p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> As of October 2015 district courts of Slovenia issue e-Apostille.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> While a number of U.S. state competent authorities have indicated the ability to issue e-Apostilles, there continues to be no demand from the public. Given ongoing developments in the field of electronic and remote notarization in the United States, it is possible that demand may be forthcoming.</p>				
Only for Contracting Parties that issue e-Apostilles				
e) What are the principal "States of destination" for e-Apostilles issued in your jurisdiction?				
Spain.				Austria
Germany.				Bahrain
The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile, but we expect the same countries of destination to where our legalized documents are used.				Chile
Venezuela, Spain, Argentina, Ecuador, United States of America.				Colombia
Republic of Korea, Netherlands, India, Russia, Spain, Australia, Germany, Italy.				New Zealand
Since there were only 2 e-Apostille issued in 2015 (October to December 2015), the two States of destination were Greece and Mexico.				Slovenia
Czech Republic, Poland, Russian Federation, Republic of Kazakhstan, Republic of Turkey, Republic of Lithuania, Latvia				Tajikistan
U.S.A, Panama, Spain, Colombia, Ecuador, Argentina				Venezuela
f) Please identify the three categories of public document that are most frequently requested to be apostillised in your jurisdiction.				

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
1		2	4	5	3	6										Argentina
1			2								3					Armenia
2	3		1													Australia
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>										Certificate of residence and free sales	Austria
1		2	3													Bahrain
2	3		1													Belarus
1			2						3							Belgium
1					3				2							Bosnia & Herzegovina
1 MFA	2 MFA	3 MFA														Bulgaria
			2 MJ			3 MJ					1 MJ					MFA: Ministry of Foreign Affairs MJ: Ministry of Justice
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											Chile
		2	1												Declaration signed by the Commissioner for Oaths (3)	China (Hong Kong SAR)
3			2												Verified true copy (1)	China (Macao SAR)
1					3						2					Colombia
1			2			3										Costa Rica
1			3			2										Croatia

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
		2	1	3												Cyprus
1 MFA					3 MFA						2 MFA					Czech Republic MFA: Ministry of Foreign Affairs MJ: Ministry of Justice
		3 MJ	2 MJ	1 MJ												
1					3	2										Dominican Republic
1	3	3	2	3	1	3	3	3	2	2	1	3	3	3		Ecuador
1		3			2											Estonia
1		3	2													Finland
1			3		2			2bis							Copies certifiées conformes à l'original faites par les mairies, les notaires ou les chambres de commerce	France
1			2						3							Georgia
1		6	2	7	4	3	14	5	8	11	13	9	10	12	Certificats de residence Certificats de domicile Avis d'imposition certificats pour produits pharmaceutiques	Germany

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
2					1						3					Greece
1					3						2					Honduras
2		1	3								3					Hungary
1 MFA											2 MFA					Israel MFA: Ministry of Foreing Affairs CA: Courts Administration
	3 CA				2 CA				1 CA							
2	3		1													Japan
2		1			3											Republic of Korea
1	3	8	6		4	2			7	9	5					Kosovo
3			2						1							Latvia
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>				<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>											Lithuania
		3		2											Attestation 27,56% (1)	Luxembourg
1		2	3													Malta
1				2	3											Mauritius
1					3						2					Mexico
3			1	2												Monaco
1	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	1	3	3	3	3	3		Montenegro
1		3		2												New Zealand
1					2					3						Namibia
1	3		2		3											Norway
1	2				3											Peru
3			1						2							Portugal

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
1	2	2	1	2	2			3	1	3	3			3	Documents that are drafted and issued by the Court Enforcement Officers (3) Legalised copies (2)	Romania
1			2								3				No detailed statistics are available for civil status documents and diplomas due to the fact that Apostilles on these documents are issued by regional authorities. The No. 1 position of civil status documents is therefore based on estimates.	Russian Federation
1					2						3					Serbia
1				2	3											Slovakia
2			1					3								Slovenia
1				3									2			South Africa
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>						<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					Tajikistan
					2	1			3		<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					Turkey
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>								<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>					Uruguay
2			1					3								United States of America
1	3	3	1	3	1	2	3	3	3	2	1	3	3	3	2 (Driver's license)	Venezuela

As with the previous meeting of the Special Commission, the categories of public documents for which Apostilles are most frequently requested are (in order): civil status documents, notarial authentications of signatures, and diplomas and other education documents

Comments:

Chile: The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. Nevertheless, the most frequent documents legalized today are the ones marked in the boxes.

Luxembourg: Acte notarié : 16,55% ; Arrêté : 0,54% ; Certificats : 0,33% ; Copie conforme: 9,35% ; Divers: 12,70% ; Document État

Civil: 0,80% ; Document judiciaire : 0,46% ; Extrait registre de commerce : 14,84% ; Facture: 0,07% ; Prise en charge : 0,23% ; Procuration sous seing privé: 13,38% ; Traduction: 3,20%.

g) Please mark with an "X" the categories of documents that are issued in your jurisdiction in electronic format (even if this is the case for only a few documents within that category) and for which an Apostille is issued (whether as an e-Apostille or in paper form)?

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
			x				x				x					Argentina
	x	x			x	x	x		x							Australia
x	x	x									x					Austria
													x			Belgium
x												x				Chile
											x					Colombia
x	x	x				x				x	x					Estonia
	x	x									x					Finland
				x												France

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
							x									Germany
x		x							x							Georgia
		x														Greece
		x														Israel
x	x	x			x	x	x				x	x	x			Republic of Korea
x																Kosovo
															Bills	Latvia
						x										Lithuania
		x														Luxembourg
		x														New Zealand
x	x	x	x	x	x	x				x	x					Peru
	x				x											Portugal
	x	x				x		x						x		Romania
x																Serbia
	x	x				x										Slovenia
													x			South Africa
						x					x					Turkey

Civil status docs	Other administrative documents	Extracts from commercial (or other) registers	Notarial authentications of signatures	Other notarial acts	Diplomas and other education documents	Court documents, including judgments	Patents or other docs intellectual property rights	Documents relating to adoptions	Translations	Medical or health certificates	Criminal records	Import or export licenses	Certificates of origin	Certificate of conformity	Other documents:	Contracting Party
			x	x		x					x					United States of America
										x	x					Venezuela

The categories of electronic public documents for which Apostilles are most frequently issued are (in order): Extracts from commercial (or other) registers, criminal records, court documents incl. judgments, other administrative documents, and civil status documents.

Comments:

Austria: For use abroad a wet signature is required in case of paper Apostille (Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs)

Chile: The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. Nevertheless, the most frequent documents issued in electronic format are marked in the boxes.

Colombia: Passport, Visa, disciplinary records, free sale certificate, Mandatory Sanitary Notification, certificate of nationality.

Venezuela: Since 2014, the Apostilles are electronic.

4.3 Legalisations

a) How many legalisations were performed in 2015 by your Competent Authority(ies)?

Outgoing documents	Incoming documents	Contracting Party
1,931	N/A	Armenia
53,309	4,578	Australia

Outgoing documents	Incoming documents	Contracting Party
15,957	50,763	Austria
86,005	-	Bahrain
55,651	0	Belgium
61,295	N/A	Bulgaria
300,000	200,000	Chile
No statistics	No statistics	China (Hong Kong SAR)
127,247	34,222	Colombia
10,734	12,000	Costa Rica
1,445	-	Croatia
Unknown	Unknown	Cyprus
10,800	600	Czech Republic
Unknown	Unknown	Denmark
Only Apostilles are issued	Only Apostilles are issued	Dominican Republic
23,126	-	Ecuador
1,000	1,000	Estonia
10,000	Approximately 2,000–3,000	Finland
125,000*	95,500*	France
8,254	Unknown	Georgia

Outgoing documents	Incoming documents	Contracting Party
183,625	36,303	Germany
Approx. 95,000*	Approx 114,544*	Greece
23,566	8,399	Honduras
6,755	8,112*	Hungary
15,210	14,487	Israel
122,130	0	Japan
189,735	552,233	Republic of Korea
135,506*		Kosovo
1,244	3,846	Latvia
2,065	500	Lithuania
9,700	-	Luxembourg
3,985	-	Malta
Approximately 6000/yearly	-	Mauritius
21,328	N/A	Mexico
Pas d'informations	Pas d'informations	Monaco
217*	-	Montenegro
Unknown	Unknow	Namibia
6,854	-	New Zealand
17,184	13,356	Norway

Outgoing documents	Incoming documents	Contracting Party
205,523**	205,523**	Peru
81,761	319,931	Portugal
20,268*	-	Romania
14,529	N/A	Russian Federation
9,443	Unknown	Serbia
3,614	37,821	Slovakia
4,673*	16,156*	Slovenia
25,067*	-	South Africa
16,560	-	Turkey
11,210	No registry	Uruguay
31,400	55	Venezuela
Approx. 2,155,906. [44]	Approx. 1,732,429. [23]	TOTAL [50]
<p>*For additional information, see the individual responses.</p> <p>** The Peruvian System does not identify the origin of the documents. In general, the system shows the total number of 205,523 legalisations.</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: See response to 4.2(a).</p>		
4.4 Public information		
<p>a) Is practical information (such as informational brochures or information provided on government websites) on the operation of the Apostille Convention made available to Apostille users?</p>		

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p>The practical information provided by the Contracting Parties has been included in the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference website.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[52]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[23]</p> <p>Belgium, Finland, Montenegro</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">4.5 Published works on the Apostille Convention</p>	
<p>a) Has the Apostille Convention been the subject of any articles, books or other works published in your jurisdiction?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p>For more detailed information, see the individual responses.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[15]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Costa Rica, Hungary, Israel, Namibia, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Uruguay</p>

<u>No</u>	[15] Bahrain, Belgium, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Norway, Venezuela
<u>Unknown</u>	[24] Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Peru, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Turkey

Section 5 – Competent Authorities

5.1 Contact details

a) How many Competent Authorities have you designated under the Apostille Convention?

Approximate number of Competent Authorities	Contracting Party
24*	Argentina
2	Armenia
1	Australia
80*	Austria
1	Bahrain
4	Belarus

Approximate number of Competent Authorities	Contracting Party
1	Belgium
48*	Bosnia and Herzegovina
3	Bulgaria
5	Chile
1	China (Hong Kong SAR)
1	Colombia
1	Costa Rica
22*	Croatia
1	Cyprus
2	Czech Republic
1	Denmark
1	Dominican Republic
1	Ecuador
Only notaries**	Estonia
9*	Finland
38*	France
3	Georgia
Approx. 180	Germany
Approx. 100	Greece

Approximate number of Competent Authorities	Contracting Party
1	Honduras
3	Hungary
2	Israel
1	Japan
2	Republic of Korea
2*	Kosovo
1	Latvia
281*	Lithuania
1	Luxembourg
1	Malta
2	Mauritius
33	Mexico
1	Monaco
15*	Montenegro
2	Namibia
1	New Zealand
17	Norway
1	Peru
6*	Portugal

Approximate number of Competent Authorities	Contracting Party
99*	Romania
Approx. 430*	Russian Federation
66*	Serbia
86*	Slovakia
12*	Slovenia
2	South Africa
27	Switzerland
2	Tajikistan
Approx. 138*	Turkey
1	Uruguay
170	United States of America
1	Venezuela
Approx. 1,937. [55]	TOTAL [56]
*For additional information, see the individual responses. ** No exact figure was provided.	
b) Are the contact details and practical information provided on the Apostille Section for your Competent Authority(ies) accurate and complete?	
See the full replies to the Questionnaire and / or the contact details provided in the " Competent Authorities " link available in the "Apostille Section" of the Hague Conference website.	

5.2 Training and support

a) Have guidelines, desk instructions, or similar documentation been prepared to assist staff at Competent Authorities in the performance of their functions under the Apostille Convention?

Yes

[32]
Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Israel, Honduras, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela

No

[22]
Argentina, Austria, Belarus, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Greece, Hungary, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Montenegro, Finland, Georgia, Monaco, Norway, Serbia, Turkey

b) How often is training provided to staff at Competent Authorities?

Regularly

[14]
Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, Costa Rica, Denmark, Estonia, Hungary, Latvia, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Slovakia, Uruguay

As required

[25]
Argentina, Bahrain, Bosnia &

	Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Georgia, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Namibia, Peru, Russian Federation, South Africa, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>Seldom</u>	[11] Armenia, Belaus, Croatia, Ecuador, Finland, France, Kosovo, Malta, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia
<u>Never</u>	[9] Austria, Colombia, Greece, Honduras, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Turkey
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> Annually, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs organizes courses on Consular Diplomacy, including topics on legalizations with Apostilles and implementation of the Hague Convention.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile, but we are training all our Competent Authorities on a regular basis.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> On-the-job training is provided to staff and they can seek direction from the Registrar, High Court whenever they have doubts.</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> In Colombia there is only one competent authority and that is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> Pas uniquement au personnel du Ministère mais aussi aux ordres professionnels (Avocats, Notaires, Comptables, autres institutions publiques (juges, greffiers, fonctionnaires du service de migration, santé publique, etc).</p> <p><u>Cyprus:</u> On the job training.</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> Training is provided to the new employees as well as to the permanent staff in case of changes in the legislation, practical operation or procedures.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> Questionnaire 5.2 a) et b): Inconnu; la pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> No formal training is organised to staff (MoJ, HNCCLN). Part of the regular training of consular officials focuses on legalisation issues in general, in this framework they are also informed about the</p>	

<p>Apostille Convention (MFAT).</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Till now only one training session with the assistance of IFC/WBG legal and regulatory expert has been organized prior to entrance into force of Apostille Convention and in addition a Study Visit to Austrian competent authorities has been organized with presence of key personnel of the two competent authorities with the support and organization of IFC/WBG.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: The consular trainings are organized by the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs twice a year. Within the framework of the planned abolishment of the legalisation requirement for the documents issued in the countries of the European Union, the European Economic Zone and the Swiss Confederation, presentations and briefings were organized by the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for the governmental institutions of Latvia (presentation is available only in Latvian).</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: Once a year for consular officers.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Constant feedback with the 33 competent authorities and organizing national's symposiums.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: We have new staff. The desk manual is also being rewritten and consolidated to make the information clearer and more assessable.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: Competent Authorities provide training to their staff, but there are no centralized training to the staff at the Competent Authorities.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The Ministry of Foreign Relations of Peru is the Competent Authority, and its staff is trained periodically.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Il y a de formation sur le Manuel de l'utilisateur de la base de donnés informatique.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: There is no special training on the national level provided for the staff at Competent Authorities, but there is a conference regarding legalisation of documents that is held at the District Court Ljubljana at least once a year and some designated authorities have prepared some guidelines and instructions for the staff.</p>	
<p>Section 6 – Substantive scope of the Apostille Convention</p>	
<p>6.1 Definition of “public document”</p>	
<p>a) Is the concept of a “public document” defined in your internal law?</p>	
<p><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: § 292 Zivilprozessordnung; § 47 Allgemeines Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz 1991.</p> <p><u>Bosnia & Herzegovina</u>: Law on the validity of public documents of BiH, Officiale gazette BiH 31/04</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: Civil Registration Act; National Education Act; Bulgarian Civil Service Act; Law for the Bulgarian Identification Documents.</p>	<p>[36]</p> <p>Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic,</p>

China (Macao SAR): In the Macao SAR, there are three types of written documents: authentic, authenticated and private documents, each with different legal value, in particular in terms of probative force. The Civil Code of Macao sets up the criteria to determine the types of documents and their legal value. It is complemented by some provisions of the Codes of Notary, Civil Register, Real Estate Register, and of Commercial Register, as well as by the law on the framework applicable to electronic documents and digital signatures (Law No. 5/2005, of 8 August). More specifically, in what refers the criteria to determine whether a written document is a document falling within the scope of the Convention, the main relevant provision of the Civil Code reads as follows (non-official translation):

Article 356

(Types of written documents)

1. The written documents can either be authentic or private.
2. The authentic documents are those issued in accordance with legal formalities by a public authority within the limits of its competence or within its scope of activity, by a notary or a public official that by law has the power to ensure the authenticity of the document*; all other documents are private.
3. The private documents shall be authenticated documents when confirmed by the parties in the presence of a notary under the terms prescribed by notarial law.

(*The expression used in the letter of the law is “dotado de fé pública”, which is difficult to translate into English - literally: public faith).

In relation to documents issued outside Macau, the rule is that of the traditional principle of locus regit actum, *i.e.*, the extrinsic validity of a foreign document is determined by the formalities prescribed by the law of the place where the document originates. Formalities are understood as being the requisites concerning solely the external form of the document.

This principle is also expressly established in the said Civil Code of Macau, which relevant Article reads as follows (non-official translation):

Article 358

(Documents issued outside Macao)

1. The authentic or private documents issued outside Macao in conformity with the law of the place where they were issued have the same legal value as documents of the same nature issued in Macao.
2. However, and unless otherwise provided for, when a court has serious doubts concerning the authenticity of a document or the authenticity of its recognition, the court shall freely appraise the legal value of the document.

Colombia: Ley 1564 de 2012 por medio de la cual se expide el Código General del Proceso y se dictan otras disposiciones. Artículo 243.

Costa Rica: L'acte administratif est celui fait par l'administration publique dans l'exercice de la fonction administrative, ce qui exclu les actes de gouvernement (art. 29 de la Loi Générale de l'Administration Publique et art. 27 de la Loi Régulatrice de la Juridiction Contentieuse Administrative)

Denmark, Ecuador, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela

Croatia: Civil Procedure Act, Art. 230.

Czech Republic: There is not one complex definition, slightly different definitions may be found in different laws (e.g. Civil Procedure Code, Administrative Code). In general, according to the Czech law, public documents are documents issued by courts or other public authorities, as well as local government bodies, within their powers and also documents declared public by special regulations (e.g. diplomas and other certificates of education, notarial acts, military acts, civil status documents, etc.)

Ecuador: Código Orgánico General de Procesos: Article 205. Public Document. It is authorized with the legal formalities. If notarized and incorporated in a protocol or public record, public deed will be called. public instruments issued data messages, granted, authorized or issued by and signed by the competent authority electronically shall also be considered.

Georgia: Decree of the President of Georgia N404 of 14 July 2009 on Approval of the Regulations of Document Apostillisation. The categories of documents subject to apostilization are defined.

Germany: Les actes publics sont des certifications émises par des autorités ou des personnes publiquement désignées à cet effet (notaires) relatives à des déclarations de tiers (article 415 Code de procédure civile), des déclarations et décisions provenant des autorités (article 417 Code de procédure civile) et des observations (article 418 Code de procédure civile).

Greece: Article 169 of Code Administrative Legal Process.

Public documents are documents which have been executed by a public organization.

Hungary: Section 195 of Law no. III of 1952 on the Code of Civil Procedure.

Israel: The Evidence Ordinance, 5731-1971, Article 29: "public document" means a document of one of the bodies enumerated hereunder, forming an act or record of an act (whether legislative, judicial or executive), or part of the official records, of that body and includes a document kept for record purposes, whether made officially or otherwise:

- (1) the State of Israel or the sovereign authority of any territory outside Israel;
- (2) a government department, a municipal authority, a court, a tribunal, another body having judicial or quasi-judicial powers, a notary or any other official body of Israel or of any territory outside Israel (any of these hereinafter referred to as an "official body");
- (3) a public official, an official of the sovereign authority of any territory outside Israel or an employee of an official body (any of these hereinafter referred to as an "officer").

Republic of Korea: 1. MOFA's Regulation #5 (28 Jun 2013), 2. the Criminal Act, and other relevant laws and regulations.

Kosovo: Article 1 of the Annex I) of the Law Nr. 05/L/093 <https://gzk.rks-gov.net/ActDocumentDetail.aspx?ActID=12663>

Latvia: Document Legalisation Law refers to the definition of public documents given in the Convention (can be accessed at:

http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/Likumi/Document_Legalisation_Law.pdf)

Lithuania: The concept of official document is defined in the Law on Documents and Archives of the Republic of Lithuania: <https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.1FEF229DA7C6/yxpTggxkDb> and Resolution No. 1079 (10 October 2006) of the Government of the Republic of Lithuania on Procedure of Legalisation and Certification (Apostille). The Law mentioned above sets that official document is document issued or received by state or local (municipality) authorities. In addition the above mentioned Resolution sets provision that official documents must be sealed by state or local (municipality) authority.

Mexico: A public document is defined as that issued by an authority or person acting in an official capacity in accordance with the powers vested in by Mexican law and which the State of origin. Third article of the *Acuerdo por el que se Establecen los Lineamientos Generales del Procedimiento de Apostilla de Documentos y Legalización de Firmas*, 15 de octubre 2013.
http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5317985&fecha=15/10/2013

Peru: According to article 43.1 of the Law N° 27444 - Law of General Administrative Procedures, public document is the valid document issued by public entities of Peru.

Portugal: Les lois qui attribuent compétence et pouvoirs aux autorités.

Romania: Law no. 36/1995 of public notaries and notarial activities specifies under art. 4 that "the act fulfilled by the Public Notary, bearing his/her seal and signature, purports public authority and exerts the evidentiary value stipulated by law".

Russian Federation: Article 5 of the Federal Law No. 330-FZ of November 28, 2015.

Serbia: Article 1 of the Regulation on ratification of the Convention abolishing the requirement of legalisation for foreign public documents, Official Gazette of the FPRY – International Treaties, No 10/1962 from 27/10/1962.

Slovakia: Art. 205 du Code de procédure civile litigieuse.

Slovenia: Article 224 of the Civil procedural law of the Republic of Slovenia stipulates that a document in physical and electronic form issued by a government body in the prescribed form and within the limits of its powers, or a document issued by a local government body or other statutory authority in the said form and manner (public document) shall prove the truth of what is certified or determined therein. Almost the same provision is in the General Administrative Procedure Act of the Republic of Slovenia in the Article 169.

Tajikistan: According to the Article 5 of the Law "On Obligatory Copy of Documents" dated from December 26, 2011, N°792, "Official documents - documents issued on behalf of the legislative, executive and judicial bodies, having legislative, regulatory, prescriptive or informative nature". According to Article 2 of the Law "On the right to access information" dated on June 18, 2008, # 411, "Official document - a document created by authority, organization or officials within its authority and certified in the established procedure."

Uruguay: Civil Code - Article 1574.

United States of America: Various state laws define public documents. See response to 2012 Questionnaire 6.1(a) and additional information supplied. [2012 response: California - CACode section 6252(3); Delaware - Title 29 Chapter 5, Subsection 502; Nebraska - NE Statute 84-712 through 84-

<p>712.9; Oregon - ORS Ch. 194; Washington St. - RCW 42.56.010]</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: Civil Code.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[17] Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Cyprus, Estonia, Finland, France, Japan, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, South Africa, Turkey</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Comments:</u></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: While the Procedure on Placing the Apostille does not expressly define the concept of a "public document" it states what official documents can be apostilled.</p> <p><u>Belarus</u>: According to Civil Code of the Republic of Belarus a public document is a document issued by a public body (art. 193).</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: There is no internal law expressly governing the legalisation of documents or defining a "public document".</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: For the purpose of the convention, Cyprus is guided by the categories listed in Art. 1.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: There is no certain regulation or definition in the legislation.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Sur le modèle de l'article premier de la convention, l'article 3 du décret n°2007-1205 du 10 août 2007 relatif aux attributions du ministre des affaires étrangères, des ambassadeurs et des chefs de poste consulaire en matière de légalisation d'actes fournit des exemples de documents pouvant être "considérés comme des actes publics" mais pas de définition stricto sensu de l'acte public lui-même.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Civil Proceedings Code. Article 270. Type of documents. 1. Documents could be public or private. 2. Public documents are the ones that are authorize by a judicial officer, by a notary or by a competent public authority, as long as law formalities are met.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: There are no internal laws which define the concept of a "public document" in relation to the application of the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>Mauritius</u>: The Convention abolishing the requirements of legislation for foreign public document Act of 1969 does not define the term as it renders the requirements of the Convention legal.</p>	
<p><u>Montenegro</u>: There is no concrete definition of a "public document".</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: Section 145 of the Evidence Act 2006 defines "public document". The definition sets out an inclusive list of documents that are "public documents". The list is not exhaustive and leaves scope of other documents to be considered "public documents".</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: The concept of "public documents" will be defined in the Guidelines which is about to be issued.</p>	

<p><u>Portugal</u>: La doctrine aussi indique quels sont les actes des autorités considérés publics.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Article 5 of the Federal Law No. 330-FZ defines the concept of a public document.</p>	
<p>b) Have any difficulties been experienced with the characterisation of a document as a “public document” for the purposes of the Apostille Convention?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Translations of public documents executed by sworn translators are not public documents under the Czech law. However, we were repeatedly asked to apostille them. Therefore, pursuant to a new practice, we apostille certified translations (translations executed by sworn translators) under the condition they are attached to a public document and the translation was previously certified by a Czech regional court (certifying that the sworn translator is duly recorded in the official list of Czech sworn translators). The Apostille then refers only to the court certification, not to the translator’s certification.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: For example some documents from the civil archives (not public archives), which are needed to certify the work experience and which have the meaning of public document.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: The translated documents from Sworn Translators. The applicable laws and other secondary legislative acts doesn't explicitly define the nature of the translated documents and these types/categories of documents are often presented for Apostillisation. Kosovo Authorities are in the process of regulating this matter with bilateral agreements with the Embassies of Republic of Italy and Kingdom of Belgium always referring to Articles/Points 195 to 197 of Apostille Handbook.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: See response to 3.1(c).</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Notaries' public documents.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Les certificats d’immatriculation de véhicules pour une vente de ces véhicules ou de permis de conduire pour l’achat de véhicules à l’étranger. Les États de destination exigent que ces documents soient apostillés. Il peut être considéré que ces documents administratifs n’ont pas directement trait à une opération commerciale mais l’autorité centrale monégasque s’est souvent interrogée à ce sujet.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: Court documents issued by private lawyers, Academic diplomas and degrees from private institutions.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: Competent Authorities have had difficulties determining whether certified translations of documents, <i>i.e.</i> translations executed by accredited translators, should be regarded as "public documents". The Ministry aims to clarify this issue in the Guidelines which is about to be issued.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The Competent Authority has problems when the user required to apostille commercial documents which are not public document according to the Apostille Convention.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Documents certifying graduation of studies issued by private educational institutions; documents of private companies; banking documents, fiscal registration certificates and VAT certificates issued by the Ministry of Public Finance - National Agency for Tax Administration, whose template and contents are regulated through Order no. 262/2007 for the approval of fiscal registration forms for taxpayers (75% from the respondents).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[15] Australia, Belarus, Czech Republic, Estonia, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Romania, Serbia</p>

<u>Serbia:</u> Difficulties are related to accepting electronic documents.	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[41]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Malta, Mauritius, Montenegro, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> We intend to broaden the scope of documents that can be apostilled.</p> <p><u>Belarus:</u> Sometimes internal act of a public body doesn't have to be stamped, but to issue apostille another public body may require a stamp.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. For that reason we still have not experienced any difficulties in this particular situation.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> En général non; exception: par exemple extraits du casier judiciaire.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Certains actes publics ne comportaient pas de signatures de l'autorité émettrice (casier judiciaire).</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> 25 % from the respondents "No".</p>	
6.2 Exclusion of documents executed by diplomatic or consular agents	
<p>a) Has the exclusion of "documents executed by diplomatic or consular agents" from the scope of the Apostille Convention given rise to any difficulties for your Competent Authority(ies), either as a "State of origin" or a "State of destination"?</p>	
<u>Yes</u>	[9]

<p><u>Armenia:</u> Some States require that the documents executed by the consular agents be apostilled.</p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Consular Officers are permitted to issue original Certificates of No Impediment to marriage, and certify copies of Australian Passports (which are issued from Australia). When executed overseas clients are often forced to send the documents back to Australia for legalisation, despite Australian consulates having authority to issue Apostilles abroad.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Criminal records.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> Regarding documents issued by foreign diplomatic or consular agents, whether in Israel or abroad, due to the aforementioned exclusion, it is many times difficult to receive an apostille on such documents, and there are issues with using such documents in Israel.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> Some countries require legalisation of consular certificates issued by Lithuanian consular officers.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Ministry of Internal Affairs stipulated that there are situations when issuance of the Apostille is demanded for such documents, including in countries that have ratified the London Convention (e.g., in Spain), but especially in those situations when the country where the document is to be used is not a signing party to the London Convention (European Convention on the Abolition of Legalisation of Documents executed by Diplomatic Agents or Consular Officers adopted in London on 7 June 1968).</p> <p><u>Slovakia:</u> Certaines ambassades étrangères à Bratislava dépassent ses pouvoirs dans la délivrance des documents.</p>	<p>Armenia, Australia, Austria, Honduras, Israel, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Slovakia</p>
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[45] Argentina, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> it would be helpful if documents retrieved from a central register would be apostilled by the competent diplomatic/consular missions.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. So for that reason we still have not experienced any difficulties in this particular situation.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Pas de difficulté constatée. Toutefois, certains usagers continuent de solliciter auprès de la cour d'appel de Rennes des apostilles d'actes d'état civil établis par les agents consulaires, du fait que le service central de l'état civil, situé sur ce ressort, est dépositaire des registres de l'état civil consulaire. L'exclusion prévue par la convention leur est alors rappelée.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> Occasionally our Consulates have authenticated an Apostilled document.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Not so far.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> Our diplomatic or consular agents are not permitted to issue apostilles. The issuing of apostilles falls within the mandate of the Ministry of Justice and the Registrar of the Supreme Court.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> We will attach Apostilles to certified copies of original documents that have been made by NZ consular agents overseas. This saves the applicant from having to return their original document to NZ.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> 50% from the respondents "No"; a few courts mentioned that sometimes there were requests on apostilization of copies or of legalised translations of such copies and this is the reason why, for the future, a decision should be taken in relationship to the possibility to apply the Apostille to the copies and/or legalised translations of documents executed by diplomatic agents or consular officers.</p> <p><u>Serbia:</u> If it was the opposite, obtaining apostille for the "documents executed by diplomatic or consular agents" would be a problem.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">6.3 Exclusion of administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations</p>	
<p>a) Has the exclusion of "administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations" from the scope of the Apostille Convention given rise to any difficulties for your Competent Authority(ies), either as a "State of origin" or a "State of destination"?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> In 2012 there was an inconvenience with Costa Rica, because for public tenders they required the mercantile documents with an apostille instead of legalization. Colombia brought this situation to the attention of the Contracting States in that year. The solution implemented by Colombia was to issue the apostilles in order to preserve National interests and avoid further problems with the mentioned country.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> Comme indiqué précédemment dans la réponse 4.1 b).</p> <p><u>France:</u> De façon générale, l'exclusion de l'article 1er in fine de la convention est interprétée de façon</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[10] Argentina, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Honduras, Luxembourg, Monaco, Peru, Romania, Tajikistan</p>

<p>souple par les autorités françaises, mais il existe des disparités dans les pratiques:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - à Paris (plus gros émetteur d'apostilles en France), l'apostille est refusée pour ces documents (renvoi au bureau des légalisations du MAEDI); - à Rennes, l'exclusion est souvent contournée en demandant soit une copie certifiée conforme du document, soit la légalisation de signature du signataire de l'entreprise (à une CCI par exemple). <p>Les entreprises arguent souvent que l'acte n'est pas directement lié à une opération commerciale mais qu'il s'agit d'un « enregistrement de produit » (not. pour les certificats d'origine).</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> As for the exclusion of administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations we have constant requests to Apostille such documents, which we understand that they do not require to be authenticated by its own nature, but when we explain this, customers insist on having their documents legalized by the Apostille, and by not doing so, discomforts them.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Certificats de vente libre.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Les certificats d'immatriculation de véhicules pour une vente de ces véhicules ou de permis de conduire pour l'achat de véhicules à l'étranger. Les États de destination exigent que ces documents soient apostillés. Il peut être considéré que ces documents administratifs n'ont pas directement trait à une opération commerciale mais l'autorité centrale monégasque s'est souvent interrogée à ce sujet.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> Peru does not apostille commercial documents excepts if the user express required that. However, some states used to provide apostilles on documents related to commercial operations. For instance, panama with commercial invoices or certificates of origin. The difficulty arises from the fact that there is no general criteria about how to deal with commercial documents.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[42]</p> <p>Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. For that reason we still have not experienced any difficulties in this particular situation.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> This situation might cause delay for companies, because they must have the appropriate documents superlegalised by the Embassy of the country of their destination.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Il existe un flou sur le statut des documents commerciaux. Cette exclusion apparait parfois plus comme une source de complexité que de simplification pour les acteurs économiques et les autorités délivrant les apostilles.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Not so far.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> It isn't a clear definition of "administrative documents dealing directly with commercial or customs operations".</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> Apostilles for such documents are regularly requested by foreign authorities. We issue these Apostilles when requested.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> 50% from the respondents "No"; There are frequent requests regarding application of the Apostille for copies and/or legalised translations of commercial invoices, import/export licences, waybills, sales records, weighing tickets etc.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan:</u> Tajikistan side has faced difficulties with Republic of Kazakhstan with regard to recognising of apostile issued in Tajikistan in certificates of residency. Earlier, Republic of Lithuania and Czech Republic in some cases demanded to stick e-apostille in documents.</p>	
b) Are Apostilles issued by your Competent Authority(ies) for any of the following documents?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Certificates of origin</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[26] Australia, Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;">Export licenses</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[20] Belgium, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic,</p>

	France, Germany, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Import licenses	[19] Belgium, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Germany, Latvia, Malta, Mexico, Namibia, Peru, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Health and safety certificates issued by the relevant government authorities or agencies	[37] Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Certificates of product registration	[25] Australia, Austria, Belgium, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg,

	Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Slovenia, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela
Certificates of conformity	[18] Austria, Belgium, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Peru, Slovakia, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela
End user certificates	[16] Australia, Belgium, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Denmark, France, Georgia, Honduras, Mexico, Namibia, Peru, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela
Commercial invoices	[13] Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, France, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, South Africa, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Where the document has been issued by a government authority or a government approved entity - in accordance with our free trade agreements and treaties.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Answer refers to Apostilles issued by Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.</p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> No.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The above mentioned documents can be certified on the basis of confirming the authenticity of the issuing authority as required by the interested party, excluding an Apostille.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Once the Convention enters into force, we shall not issue commercial invoices. With regard to the other documents we shall evaluate on a case by case situation, with the exception of health and safety certificates issued by government authorities, for which Law N°20711 from 2015, obliges to issue Apostilles.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> If the certificate is issued by an appointed government officer, we will issue an</p>	

<p>Apostille. Otherwise, we will only apostillise a notarial certificate attached to these other documents.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: Not in general.</p> <p><u>France</u>: 24 cours d'appel sur 37 délivrent des apostilles pour ces documents. Toutefois, il convient de préciser qu'à Paris (plus gros émetteur d'apostilles en France), l'apostille est refusée pour ces documents (renvoi au bureau des légalisations du MAEDI).</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: As far as the number of countries request certification by Apostille of these kind of documents, based on the interests of citizens such cases are interpreted narrowly.</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: No.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: The Israeli practice is to generally issue an Apostille on any document which has been duly signed by an authorized official of the State of Israel or any of its institutions, or signed by an employee of the state in her/his official capacity.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: Regardless of the categories above, Apostilles are issued for the documents executed by public authorities or authenticated by notaries public.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: According to internal law Apostille may be issued only for documents that are sealed by state authority.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Il y a un nombre important de demandes d'apostilles pour des factures commerciales qui sont utilisées en tant que justificatifs de domicile, par exemple lors de procédures administratives ou judiciaires à l'étranger. Il arrive qu'une apostille puisse être apposée sur ce type de documents si il est revêtu de la signature d'un notaire. Ainsi, seule la signature du notaire est attestée.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: No, apostilles are not issued for these documents.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: A few of the Competent Authorities have indicated that they issue Apostilles for the abovementioned documents when confirmed by the Notary Public.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: Peru can apostille several documents, but its final effectiveness will depend whether the States of destination accept them.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Public Notary Chambers apply the Apostille on copies and/or legalised translations of the following documents: certificates of origin; health certificates and health security certificates issued by the relevant authorities or agencies; certificates for product registration; certificates of conformity.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Apostilles are not issued for any of the abovementioned categories of documents.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Applicants bring a certified copy of these documents made by notary.</p>	
c) Are Apostilles issued for any of the following documents accepted by recipients in your jurisdiction?	
<p>Certificates of origin</p>	<p>[13] Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Georgia, Dominican Republic, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Namibia, Serbia,</p>

	Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Export licenses	[12] China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Namibia, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Import licenses	[12] China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Namibia, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Health and safety certificates issued by the relevant government authorities or agencies	[19] Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Georgia, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Certificates of products registration	[13] China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Georgia, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Mexico, Namibia, United States of America, Venezuela
Certificates of conformity	[10] China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Denmark, Georgia, Honduras, Republic of Korea,

	Mexico, Namibia, United States of America, Venezuela
End user certificates	[9] China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Georgia, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Namibia, United States of America, Venezuela
Commercial invoices	[8] Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Republic of Korea, Mexico, Namibia, United States of America, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> Not known, since this is not associated with our work.</p> <p><u>Australia:</u> We are not aware of entities within Australia requiring Apostilles on these categories of documents.</p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> No.</p> <p><u>Belgium:</u> Pas d'information à ce sujet.</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> We don't know if Colombian entities, who are in charge of those matters, accept those kind of documents.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The above mentioned documents can be certified on the basis of confirming the authenticity of the issuing authority as required by the interested party, excluding an Apostille.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Once the Convention enters into force, we shall not accept commercial invoices. With regard to the other documents we shall evaluate one case by case situation, with the exception of health and safety certificates issued by government authorities.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> It should be considered on a case-by-case basis.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> In most cases Apostilles issued for the documents are accepted.</p> <p><u>Estonia:</u> There is no information about the acceptance of the export and import licences, commercial invoices etc.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> Information unknown.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Sans objet, ni l'autorité centrale ni les parquets généraux n'étant informés des difficultés de réception en France des documents concernés.</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> The existence of Apostille certificate is not subject to refusal of accepting such documents.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> Pas de connaissance.</p>	

<p><u>Greece</u>: No.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Although we are not certain if Honduras' Entities who receive this kind of documents accept them, they should. Also, Honduras is willing and considers important to Apostillised such documents.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: We have no feedback from receiving authorities if they accept such foreign documents.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Israel accepts all Apostilled documents that meet the conditions of the Convention.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: It is up to each individual authority to decide whether or not to accept Apostilles issued for any of the documents above; thus no integrated information is available.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: Unknown.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: This depends on subject for approval from line ministry.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: Yes, Montenegro accepts apostilles issued for these documents.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: We have no information on how Apostilles issued overseas are used in New Zealand.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The Peruvian system does not provide detailed information about the origin of the documents. However, there is presumption that the list supra is admitted.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Si l'Apostille avait déjà été délivrée, nous accepterions les documents.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: We do not have any information about incoming documents of such nature.</p>	
<h3>6.4 Copies</h3>	
<p>a) Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a simple copy of a public document (<i>i.e.</i>, may a simple copy of a public document be also regarded as a public document)?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Australia</u>: The copy must be certified by a Notary Public or be a copy from an original electronic issued public document. The application of this rests in public policy not internal law.</p> <p><u>Bahrain</u>: Copy as original and should present the original during the request time.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Depuis le décret n° 2001-899 du 1er octobre 2001, abrogé et remplacé par le décret n°2015-1342 du 23 octobre 2015, la certification conforme à l'original de photocopies de documents délivrés par une administration ne peut plus être exigée par une autre administration, sauf doute sur la validité de la photocopie, auquel cas l'administration peut demander la présentation de l'original (article R.113-10 du code des relations entre le public et l'administration). Au vu de ces dispositions, la Chancellerie a confirmé aux parquets généraux par une note en date du 24 décembre 2008 que de simples photocopies peuvent recevoir une apostille, pourvu que cette photocopie permette de contrôler la véracité de la signature et/ou du sceau de l'autorité ayant délivré l'acte public original. Toutefois, l'article R113-10 alinéa 2 du code des relations entre le public et l'administration dispose que "l'administration continue à certifier conforme, à la demande du public, des copies demandées par des autorités étrangères". Bien entendu, ces copies certifiées conformes pourront faire l'objet d'une apostille.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Civil Proceedings Code Article 272 (1) and ((4).</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7] Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, Denmark, France, Honduras, Namibia</p>

<p><u>Namibia</u>: But only in certain cases. We mostly issue apostilles on copies if such public document is a national identity card or a passport.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: The apostille can be placed only on the copy certified by the notary.</p> <p><u>Belarus</u>: Apostille is issued for the documents that are certified by notary in order to certify the signature of the notary and not the contents of the public document.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: A copy of a public document may be regarded as a public document if it was certified by a registered notary in advance.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: Article 9 in the Apostille's Regulation N° 81 of Chile (http://apostilla.gob.cl/wp/wp-content/uploads/2016/02/Publicacion-Reglamento-Ley-20.711-2828.11.1529.pdf).</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: We have no means and no duty to verify the genuineness of a copy document.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: A simple copy of a public document is considered as a private document, not falling within the scope of the Convention.</p> <p><u>Croatia</u>: Simple copy cannot be considered as a public document. Therefore, the Apostille is issued only for the notarial or other certificate stating that the relevant document is a certified copy of a public document (according to Article 74 of the Public Notary Act).</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: A copy can only be regarded as a "public document" under the convention, provided that it bears an original signature.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Under the Czech law a simple copy of a public document is not regarded as a public document.</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: Only if the copy is certified by the issuing institution.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: The copy of the document must be stamped and signed certification in physical.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: There is no such regulation in the internal law.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: According to the Georgian legislation simple copy has no validity power.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Il ne s'agit pas d'un acte public.</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: The copy must be certified by the Public Authority that has executed the document which is then submitted accordingly to the Decentralized Administration or to the Region where upon the document is issued an Apostille. The Apostille certifies the signature of the document, not the certification. (But throughout the national territory the requirement of submitting original or certified copies of documents issued by public services and agencies covered by this regulation (such as legal persons governed by private law which are subject to a direct or indirect state control, public enterprises courts of all instances, etc) had been lifted. Public authorities are required to accept simple and readable copies of such documents. Respectively, all simple and readable copies of private documents, which have been certified by a lawyer, as well as all clear photocopies of original private documents that have been certified by services and agencies covered by the regulation, are also accepted.)</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[47]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>

<p><u>Israel:</u> Israel issues Apostilles only on original documents signed by the competent authority.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> The applicable laws do not recognise the copy as a public document thus the same is not accepted unless the same is notarized by a Public Notary.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> Only a copy of a document certified by a notary or institution that issued the document can be certified.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> A copy must be authenticated by notary.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Seule une copie certifiée conforme par un fonctionnaire ou notaire peut être légalisée.</p> <p><u>Mauritius:</u> We consider only original copies of public documents.</p> <p><u>Mexico:</u> The competent authorities are not obliged to issue an apostille in the case of a simple copy of a public document. Eighth article of the <i>Acuerdo por el que se Establecen los Lineamientos Generales del Procedimiento de Apostilla de Documentos y Legalización de Firmas</i> (15 de octubre 2013). http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5317985&fecha=15/10/2013</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> Simple copy is not a valid document.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> Photocopies without an original seal or signature are not accepted. They are not original documents, there is no signature or seal on them to verify, and there is a high risk that such documents could be fraudulent.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> The copy of a public document is valid when its authenticity is certified.</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> Seulment des copies certifiées.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> The simple copy is not assumed to be true to the original. The simple copy of an official document cannot be subjected to an Apostille as it does not represent an official document. Also, it can be easily forged.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> Simple copies of public documents are not regarded as public documents. Simple copies of public documents are not regarded as public documents.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> In Slovenia Apostilles are issued only on public documents and certified copies of such documents. Certified copies that are made by notary in accordance with the procedure, prescribed in Notarial Act, are considered as public documents (Article 60 of the Notarial Act) and by Administrative units in accordance with Generale Administrative Procedure Act.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan:</u> Only notary certified copy is considered as a official document.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Copies must be certified or notarized.</p> <p><u>Venezuela:</u> Venezuelan State - a single copy document is not considered for an Apostille, simple copies are certified.</p>	
b) Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a certified copy of a public document?	
<u>Yes – But an Apostille may be used for the certification <i>only</i>, not the copied document</u>	<p>[42] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium,</p>

	<p>Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, Venezuela</p>
<p><u>Yes – An Apostille may be issued either for the certification or for the copied public document</u></p> <p><u>Chile:</u> There are two types of public instruments in Chile: in one of them an Apostille may be issued for a copied public document; in the other case, an Apostille may be issued only for original certifications.</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> The Convention applies to any document translated by an official translator.</p> <p><u>France:</u> La copie certifiée conforme peut bien entendu être apostillée. Les autorités françaises n'ont pas donné d'instruction spécifique dans la note précitée du 24 décembre 2008, de sorte que tant l'apostille de la signature photocopiée que celle de la certification peuvent être envisagées. À ce jour, nous n'avons pas de visibilité sur les pratiques des cours d'appel en la matière.</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> If the copy of the document is certified by notary, the Apostille relates to the copied document; In case if the copy of the document is certified by the same authority that issued the original Page B-9 document, the Apostille might relate to the copied document as well as to the (administrative) certificate.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> Civil Proceedings Code Article 272 (1).</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Dans le premier cas, l'apostille visera le signataire de l'acte s'il s'agit bien d'un acte public. Dans l'autre cas, l'apostille portera sur l'autorité qui a certifié conforme l'acte.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> Our position depends on who has certified the document. If it has been certified by the issuing authority then we can issue an Apostille for the copied document itself. If it has been notarized by a Notary Public or other non-issuing authority then we would issue an Apostille verifying the notarial/other seal and signature only.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> An Apostille can also be issued for the certified copy of the official document.</p>	<p>[12]</p> <p>Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, France, Georgia, Honduras, Monaco, New Zealand, Romania, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><u>No – An Apostille may be issued neither for the certification nor for the copy</u></p>	<p>[4]</p> <p>Germany, Japan, Romania,</p>

	United States of America
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> The apostille certifies the signature and the seal of the notary and is placed on certain original documents, copies certified by the notary.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR):</u> In the Macao SAR, it is possible to issue an Apostille for a certified copy of a document. In such a case, the Apostille is merely a declaration that the authority responsible for the issuance of the certified copy is competent under the internal law of the relevant State to issue such a certification (<i>i.e.</i>, that the relevant document is a “true copy of the original”), and that the signature of that person(s) is authentic as well as he/she acted in his/her public capacity. An Apostille does not relate to the contents of the document and cannot affect its legal nature.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> La pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Greece:</u> See answer for 6.4(a) above.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Apostille may be issued for certified notarial copies (HNCCLN).</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Some U.S. state laws permit notaries public to certify true copies of documents, public or otherwise. Others do not.</p>	
6.5 Translations	
a) Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a simple translation of a public document?	
<p><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Mexico:</u> It is not a prerequisite for the competent authority to know and understand the content of a public document to proceed an apostille, provided that recorded in the same, that this was issued in Mexico. Fourteenth article of the <i>Acuerdo por el que se Establecen los Lineamientos Generales del Procedimiento de Apostilla de Documentos y Legalización de Firmas</i> (15 de octubre 2013). http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5317985&fecha=15/10/2013</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> Il n'y a pas des traducteurs certifiées</p>	<p>[5] Malta, Mexico, Portugal, South Africa, United States of America</p>
<p><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> The translation must be certified by an accredited interpreter or translator, unless performed by an Australian Notary Public.</p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> Translation must be certified first.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Translations in Chile are unofficial.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR):</u> A simple translation of a public document is considered as a private document, not falling within the scope of the Convention.</p>	<p>[50] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican</p>

<p><u>Colombia</u>: The translation must be performed by an official translator.</p> <p><u>Croatia</u>: The translation made by a sworn court interpreter (nominated as a sworn court interpreter by the President of County or Commercial court, after he passes the exam) can be certified as a public document.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: Apostille is issued on the public document, before being translated.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Under the Czech law a simple translation of a public document is not regarded as a public document.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: There is no such regulation in the internal law.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: 1. The public document must be apostillised; 2. The translation must contain the document and apostille translated; 3. Recognition signature notarized document translator.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Une traduction n'est pas un acte public.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Une traduction ne représente pas encore un acte public au sens de l'article 1 de la Convention. Si la signature du traducteur est authentifiée, cette authentification peut être assortie d'une apostille.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: The translation must be performed by the Official Translator from the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: According to Israeli law, only a Notary has the authority to legally certify a translation. Therefore, generally, any other translation will not receive an apostille.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Refer to answer b) of 6.1.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Only a translation of a document certified by a notary can be certified.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: A signature of translator must be authenticated by notary and the translation must be affixed to the document.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Seules les signatures des traducteurs assermentés peuvent être légalisées.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: Only to translations by authorized court interpreters.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The Convention applies to translations from official translators. Otherwise, it should be indicated at the top of the document the following phrase: "unofficial translation".</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: A simple translation of a document does not represent an official document, and no Apostille can be issued for such a document. If the translation is legalised (certified) by a public notary, then the Apostille can be applied.</p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: It is necessary to have translation from authorised/accredited court translator.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan</u>: Only notary certified translation.</p>	<p>Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: A translation of a public document may be considered as a public document if it was translated by a registered translation agency in advance.</p> <p><u>Denmark</u>: Only if the simple translation is certified by a notary.</p>	

<p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: Only if the original document is legalized and apostilled and the translator is certified.</p> <p><u>France</u>: La Chancellerie a rappelé dans la note aux parquets généraux du 24 décembre 2008 que "les traductions, qu'elles soient ou non faites par un traducteur assermenté ou inscrit sur une liste d'experts, ne sauraient, telles quelles, recevoir d'apostille, en ce qu'elles constituent l'interprétation d'un professionnel libéral, mais ne peuvent être assimilées à un acte public ni à une déclaration officielle."</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: There must be a sworn translation of the document. All public documents in Namibia are mostly in the English language.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: We require all documents to be either notarised by a Notary Public or certified by a government official.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: U.S. state practice varies.</p>	
<p>b) Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to a certified translation?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: It applies to translations certified by the notary.</p> <p><u>Australia</u>: Usually only applies to translations of public documents.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: The Ministry of Foreign Affairs keeps a list with certified translation agencies in regard to the Bulgarian Legislation.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: Only in one specific case: active extraditions.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: In certain cases, translations of documents follow a regime similar to notarial certifications (Articles 182 to 184 of the Code of Notary). The certification of a translation is considered to be a public document. The translator must be a notary or lawyer from Macao, a secretary from a commercial company (only in relation to documents pertaining to such a company) or a sworn translator. In this case, the Apostille authenticates the corresponding notarial act (<i>i.e.</i>, the 'certification' of the translation).</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: The Convention applies to any document translated by an official translator.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Par traducteur officiel inscrit sur le registre du Ministère des Relations Extérieures et des Cultes.</p> <p><u>Croatia</u>: The translation made by a sworn court interpreter (nominated as a sworn court interpreter by the President of County or Commercial court, after he passes the exam) can be certified as a public document.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Translations (simple or certified) are not public documents under the Czech law. However, we started to issue Apostilles for translations but technically the Apostille does not refer to the translation itself - or the translator's certification - but only to the previous certification of a Czech regional court which is certifying that the sworn translator is duly recorded in the official list of the Czech sworn translators.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: Under the Georgian legislation the translation made by administrative authority is considered a "public document" and is subject to apostillisation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[45]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>

Germany: (cf. 6.5 a)

Greece: The competent authorities accept the following: a. Translations from the Dept of Translations of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; b. Lawyer who verifies that the translation refers to the specific document. The verification must be placed on the Public document or on the translation; c. Graduate of the Dept of Foreign Languages, Translating and Interpreting of the Ionian University; d. Sworn translator from the Ministry of Foreign Affairs; e. Embassies and Consulates.

Israel: As mentioned above, in Israel, only Notaries have the authority to legally confirm the authenticity of translations. Therefore, if the translation has been certified by an Israeli Notary, an Apostille may be issued on the notarial certificate. It should be noted that any person can give an affidavit, in front of a Notary, in which that person certifies that he knows the two relevant languages and that he confirms the authenticity of the translation. This Notarial certificate of an affidavit may also receive an apostille. However, this document is not recognized by Israeli law as a certified translation.

Lithuania: Only if translation or signature of translator is authenticated by notary. There are no sworn translators in Lithuania.

Mexico: It is not a prerequisite for the competent authority to know and understand the content of a public document to proceed an apostille, provided that recorded in the same, that this was issued in Mexico. Fourteenth article of the *Acuerdo por el que se Establecen los Lineamientos Generales del Procedimiento de Apostilla de Documentos y Legalización de Firmas* (15 de octubre 2013).

http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5317985&fecha=15/10/2013

Montenegro: Translations by authorized court interpreters.

New Zealand: We require all documents to be either notarised by a Notary Public or certified by a government official. There is one government translation agency in New Zealand (and one private provider) and only their original translations are accepted. All others must be notarised.

Russian Federation: The Convention is considered to apply to a translation certified by a notary. A translation executed by any translator irrespective of his / her qualification needs to be certified by a notary in order to be regarded as a public document.

Serbia: It is necessary to have translation from authorised/accredited court translator.

Slovakia: Même si une traduction n'est pas considérée comme un acte public en Slovaquie, la Slovaquie a décidé d'appliquer la Convention aussi aux traductions certifiées, parce qu'elles sont produites par les traducteurs assermentés, et donc elles portent une signature et l'empreinte d'un cachet d'une personne en sa capacité formelle.

Slovenia: Only translation made by a court interpreter respectively the signature and the stamp of the court interpreter can be certified with an Apostille. Court interpreters are nominated by the Ministry of Justice after they pass a special exam and the Ministry of Justice is the only authority that can certify their signatures and stamps with an Apostille. The list of the court interpreters is published on the website:

<https://spvt.mp.gov.si/tolmaci.html>

Tajikistan: Notary certifies the signature of translator.

<p><u>United States of America:</u> If the certification is properly notarized.</p>	
<p><i>Only if the document to which the certified translation relates is a public document</i></p>	<p>[15] Australia, Austria, Bahrain, China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Monaco, Namibia, Peru</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Historic interpretation of Art. 1 of the Apostille Convention - annotation regarding government bill 458 of the Annexes of the stenographic protocols of the National Assembly XI GP 24th April 1967. Concerning the Apostille Convention: all translations are excluded.</p> <p><u>Cyprus:</u> Apostille is issued on the public document, before being translated.</p> <p><u>Ecuador:</u> 1. The public document must be apostilled; 2. The translation must contain the document and apostille translated; 3. Recognition signature notarized document translator.</p> <p><u>France:</u> La traduction, même réalisée par un expert (c'est-à-dire un expert assermenté), n'en est pas pour autant un acte public. En effet, la qualité d'expert ne confère pas à son titulaire celle d'autorité publique.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> The Convention applies to any public document translated by the Official Translator from the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Refer to answer b) of 6.1.</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> Il n'y a pas des traducteurs certifiées.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Only if the document translated by the sworn translator is an official document. The translation must bear the legalisation formula certifying the trueness of the translator's signature, executed by a public notary. The Apostille is issued only for legalised translations.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[10] Cyprus, Ecuador, France, Honduras, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Norway, Portugal, Romania</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Dominican Republic:</u> The original document that has been translated must be legalized or apostilled.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Il reste possible d'apostiller une traduction si elle comporte une déclaration officielle telle qu'une légalisation de signature en vertu de l'article L2122-30 du code général des collectivités territoriales (en vertu duquel "le maire, ou celui qui le remplace, est tenu de légaliser toute signature apposée en sa présence par l'un de ses administrés connu de lui, ou accompagné de deux témoins connus"). Toutefois, l'apostille ne visera que cette déclaration officielle de légalisation, elle ne pourra viser la signature du traducteur elle-même.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> Such translations may be made to public or non-public documents. Therefore, an Apostille on the Notarial certificate confirming the translation, does not refer to the authenticity of the translated</p>	

<p>document itself.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> A translation needs to be notarized by notary public offices only.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> The Convention is by some Competent Authorities considered to apply to a translation certified by a state-authorized translator. The Ministry aims to clarify this matter in the Guidelines which is to be issued.</p> <p><u>Venezuela:</u> The translation must be notarized and Notaries are not to benefit from the same, can process apostille.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">6.6 Extradition documents</p>	
<p>a) Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to extradition documents?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The Convention applies to third countries with which Bulgaria has no bilateral agreement on judicial matters.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Article 437 of the Penal Procedural Code (Law N° 19.696 from 2000). https://www.leychile.cl/Navegar?idNorma=176595</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> In general all extradition documents, i.e. letters rogatory, issued by the Danish Director of Public Prosecutions are legalized.</p> <p><u>Ecuador:</u> Reglamento a la Ley de Derechos Consulares.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> Si le document a été établi par une juridiction ou une autorité, il peut, en tant qu'acte public, également être apostillé.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> It applies officially through the General Secretary's Office.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> The Convention applies to such documents. However, in virtually every extradition case, the requirements for authentication of documents are covered by provisions of the relevant extradition treaty or agreement, which are applicable pursuant to Israel's extradition law. These agreements generally provide that an official seal of the requesting foreign authority will be sufficient authentication. Thus, the certification of public documents through an apostille would be extremely rare in extradition cases.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> In practice, the Convention has never been applied to extradition documents.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> According to bilateral or multilateral agreements on extradition and agreements on extradition of the EU with third countries.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Si signés par un fonctionnaire.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[33]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, Venezuela</p>

<p><u>Mexico</u>: All public documents concerning extradition matters are accepted.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: All extradition requests to and from Namibia should be authenticated.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: These are Court documents and would bear the seal and signature of the Court.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan</u>: It is falls under the public document.</p> <p><u>Uruguay</u>: Depending on the Instrument, and the states.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: There is no such general requirement but there may be different considerations in individual cases.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: There is no such regulation in the internal law.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: Since there are no internal laws relating to the Apostille Convention, the Convention may apply directly to any public documents as provided in article 1. Thus, Apostilles are issued for the documents executed by public authorities or authenticated by notaries public.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: The Law No. 04/L94 on International Legal cooperation in criminal matters doesn't foresee with any provision the application of Convention on extradition documents.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Latvia has concluded treaties on legal assistance in civil, family and criminal matters with Estonia, Lithuania, Russia, Belarus, Poland, Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Kyrgystan. According to treaties, documents sent by official institutions of above mentioned sides to each other are not require to be legalised. As from 24 November 2010, document legalisation requirements have been abolished regarding the documents issued in the countries of the European Union, the European Economic Zone and the Swiss Confederation. This abolishment implies that the documents issued in the said countries do not require additional authentication (certification with Apostille) in order to be used in Latvia. As from 31 October 2010, Latvia applies the Convention Abolishing the Legalisation of Documents Between the Member States of the European Communities (the Convention, May 25, 1987) which provides for a reciprocal exemption from the requirement of legalization. The Convention is applied to Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, and Italy.</p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: United States of America and United Kingdom request full legalisation for extradition documents.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Internal law does not prescribe Apostille/legalisation for extradition documentation, however there have been cases when the outgoing extradition documentation has been legalised/Apostilled on the request of the other State.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[17]</p> <p>Armenia, Belarus, China (Hong Kong SAR), Cyprus, Estonia, Georgia, Kosovo, Latvia, Monaco, Montenegro, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Belarus</u>: Yes, if the certified copy of the document need to be proved to the contents of the document.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: The relevant provisions under the specific legal basis apply (EAW, CoE Convention on Extradition,</p>	

<p>Bilateral Treaties).</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic:</u> Subject to: The countries that have presented objection to legal documents.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> Legalisation or apostille is not required in extradition procedures.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Une vingtaine de pays sollicitent que les demandes françaises soient revêtues de l'apostille: l'Afrique du sud, d'Antigue-et-Barbude, des Bahamas, de Belize, du Botswana, du Burundi, du Cap-Vert, du Costa Rica, de l'Equateur, de la Grenade, du Honduras, de la Dominique, du Lesotho, du Libéria, du Malawi, de la Namibie, du Panama, de Sainte-Lucie, de Saint-Vincent-et-les-Grenadines, de Saint-Thomas-et-l'Île-du-Prince, du Suriname, du Swaziland et de la Trinité-et-Tobago. Des éléments portés à notre connaissance, il ressort que le passage des demandes par les services apostille des différentes cours d'appel ne semble pas poser de problème (ceci, peut-être, dans la mesure où ces dossiers transitent en toute hypothèse, pour les pays concernés, par l'intermédiaire des Parquet généraux).</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> According to art. 172 para. 3 of Law no. 302/2004 republished on international judicial cooperation in criminal matters, documents attached to the mutual legal assistance request, certified by the requesting judicial authorities, are exempted from any other super-legalisation formalities.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> U.S. law provides that special authentication certificates are to be used for documents related to extradition: "Depositions, warrants, or other papers or copies thereof offered in evidence upon the hearing of any extradition case shall be received and admitted as evidence on such hearing for all the purposes of such hearing if they shall be properly and legally authenticated so as to entitle them to be received for similar purposes by the tribunals of the foreign country from which the accused party shall have escaped, and the certificate of the principal diplomatic or consular officer of the United States resident in such foreign country shall be proof that the same, so offered, are authenticated in the manner required." 18 USC 3190.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;">6.7 Medical certificates</p>	
<p>a) Under your internal law, is the Convention considered to apply to medical certificates?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Certificate issued by registered medical practitioners who are accredited by the Australian Medical Practitioners Authority.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Authorized by Law N° 20.711 from 2014, but with a previous official certification.</p> <p><u>Denmark:</u> Legalization of medical certificates for patients in treatment who need to travel is commonly used.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[43]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic,</p>

<p><u>Dominican Republic:</u> If it is certified by the Medical Association or the Health Ministry.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> There is no specific provision on that. In practice, Apostilles are issued for medical certificates.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> Si le document a été établi par une autorité publique, il peut également être assortie d'une apostille.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> As long as the medical certificates were signed by the Minutes Secretary or President from the "Colegio Médico de Honduras" or the General Secretary from the Health Secretariat.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Provided that the document in question is a public document.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> Only if the certificate has been certified by a competent official in the Ministry of Health.</p> <p><u>Japan:</u> Only certificates issued by public or red-cross hospitals.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> The Convention applies to documents issued by national institutes. Other ones need to be notarized.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Medical Certificates issued by public institutions, such as public health hospitals and consortiums of the doctors are considered being public documents and the the same are subject to Apostillisation or legalisation for non-contracting states.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> Latvia has concluded treaties on legal assistance in civil, family and criminal matters with Estonia, Lithuania, Russia, Belarus, Poland, Moldova, Ukraine, Uzbekistan and Kyrgystan. According to treaties, documents sent by official institutions of above mentioned sides to each other are not require to be legalised. As from 24 November 2010, document legalisation requirements have been abolished regarding the documents issued in the countries of the European Union, the European Economic Zone and the Swiss Confederation. This abolishment implies that the documents issued in the said countries do not require additional authentication (certification with Apostille) in order to be used in Latvia. As from 31 October 2010, Latvia applies the Convention Abolishing the Legalisation of Documents Between the Member States of the European Communities (the Convention, May 25, 1987) which provides for a reciprocal exemption from the requirement of legalization. The Convention is applied to Belgium, Denmark, France, Ireland, and Italy.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> If only medical certificates are authenticated by the Ministry of Health Care.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Si signés par un médecin-fonctionnaire (p.ex. médecin de contrôle).</p> <p><u>Mexico:</u> All public documents concerning medical certificates are accepted.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> All medical ceritificates issued by public hospitals can be authenticated</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> Medical documents issued by Private Practices require notarisation first.</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> La signature du médecin est vérifiée.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> Medical certificates are not specifically mentioned in the list of public documents (Article 5 of the Federal Law No. 330-FZ) and therefore the Convention may be considered to apply only</p>	<p>Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Lithuania, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, Venezuela</p>
---	--

<p>to medical certificates issued by government or municipal healthcare institutions.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan</u>: It is falls under the public document.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: This type of documents are only Apostillised if they are previously certified by the National Competent Authority.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: There is no such general requirement but there may be different considerations in individual cases.</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: The signature of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs attests it is the one made by a public servant who certified the signature of the Doctor.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: Competent Authorities require that such documents have to be confirmed by the Notary Public.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Medical certificates would be certified or notarized.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[8]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Armenia, Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Mauritius, Norway, Slovenia, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Belarus</u>: Yes, if the certified copy of the document need to be proved regardless to the contents of the document.</p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: L'apostille est apposée sur la certification de la compétence du médecin signataire du certificat médical</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: The Convention applies to medical documents, certified by the Ministry of Health of the Republik of Bulgaria.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: No information available.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Sans objet - la question n'a jamais été posée à l'autorité centrale à ce jour.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: According to internal law an Apostille may be issued for documents sealed by state or local (municipality) authority. Please note, that medical practioniers do not use a stamp with coat of arms of Lithuania (see question 8.3 d).</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: 90% responded yes and 5% no.</p>	
6.8 Electronic documents and signatures	
<p>a) Can public documents executed in electronic form be considered “public documents” under your internal law for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille?</p>	

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Australian court documents are often issued electronically, including through the Commonwealth Courts Portal. Australia maintains an electronic company register, Australian Taxation Office documents are often issued electronically through an Australian Government online portal to clients (www.MyGov.gov.au).</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> But only for the issuance of an e-Apostille.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Article 342 N°6, Civil Procedural Code (Law N° 1552 from 1902). http://www.leychile.cl/Navegar?idNorma=22740</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> If the e-document bears the signature of an appointed public officer and the e-document has the same legal effect of the paper document.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> Law No 227/2000 Coll., on electronic signature, states that electronic documents of public authorities signed by a qualified or secure electronic signature (based on a qualified certificate issued by an accredited certification-service-provider) have the same legal effects as public documents issued by these authorities.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> If paper copy of the document is prepared according to Electronic Documents Law.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> Yes. Some medical certificates are issued by public institutions in electronic forms.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> The Companies Office of the Ministry of Business, Innovation and Employment issues certain documents only in electronic form - Company Extracts and Certificates of Incorporation. The Intellectual Property Office of NZ also issues electronic certificates.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Documents in electronic form are also considered public documents when issued by the competent authority. (See also answer for 6.1 a).</p> <p><u>Tajikistan:</u> According to the Article 11 of the Law on electronic document "Electronic document on the machine carrier is equal to the document on paper and it has the same legal effect".</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[28]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Belarus:</u> Such a possibility is not regulated by national legislation.</p> <p><u>Estonia:</u> The Chamber of Notaries prepares the project of e-apostille, which enables to certify with apostille also the documents in electronic form.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> 1) According to internal law an Apostille may be issued only for documents that are sealed by state or local (municipality) authority. 2) Lithuania does not issue e-Apostilles so far.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> Documents executed in electronic form are presently not considered public documents for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille as their authenticity cannot be verified in accordance with the relevant regulations.</p> <p><u>Turkey:</u> The signature, seal and/or stamp are still required for Apostilles of the public document.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[15]</p> <p>Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Estonia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Lithuania, Monaco, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Turkey, Uruguay</p>

<p><u>Uruguay</u>: It has to be printed on paper support.</p>	
<p><u>Public documents are never executed in electronic form</u></p>	<p>[15] Armenia, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Honduras, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Serbia, Slovakia</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: e-Apostilles are currently issued by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs only.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: The Bulgarian Law on Electronic Documents and Digital Signature applies particularly in the field of Administrative Communication.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: La pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: This question is currently being discussed internally.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: According to internal law an e-document is considered an official document if it is issued by state or local (municipality) authority. Printout of such document may be certified by Apostille if it is sealed by the authority issued the document.</p> <p><u>Mauritius</u>: No apostilled documents concern public documents which are not in electronic format.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: No official documents are executed in an electronic form.</p>	
<p>b) If a public document is executed in electronic form in your jurisdiction, how is an Apostille issued for that document?</p>	
<p><u>An e-Apostille is issued</u></p>	<p>[4] Austria, Colombia, New Zealand, Slovenia</p>
<p><u>A paper Apostille is attached to the printout of the electronic public document</u></p> <p><u>Australia</u>: e-Apostilles are under active consideration by Australia. Australia has already implemented the first stage - an e-Register of Apostilles.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: Further study is required on the possibility of issuance of e-Apostilles.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: A paper Apostille cannot be attached to a simple printout of the electronic public document but it would be possible to issue an Apostille for a so-called converted document established by</p>	<p>[23] Argentina, Australia, Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania,</p>

<p>a notary. We have a process of a so-called authorized conversion of documents which is precisely regulated by the respective legislation (Law No 300/2008 Coll. on electronic acts and authorised conversion of documents). It enables full transformation of an electronic public document into a document in paper form (or vice-versa of a document in paper form into an electronic document). It also enables verification of the conformity of those documents and affixing of a verification clause. The verification clause contains significant information relating to the document itself (number of pages, information whether the original document contained some special security elements <i>e.g.</i> a seal or a watermark), information relating to eSignature and possible time stamp contained in a digital version of the document and also about the authority which accomplished the conversion. A converted document has the same legal effects as a certified copy of the document. The Apostille would refer to the signature and seal of the authority which accomplished the conversion and attached the verification clause, not to the underlying document.</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: When documents are executed from the General Electronic Commercial Registry they are authenticated from the website www.Businessportal.gr.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Kosovo Authorities are actively working that by end of next year are ready to enable the adoption in practice of the e-Apostilles.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Document must be prepared according to Electronic Documents Law.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: See comment 6.8 a). Lithuania does not issue e-Apostilles so far.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: We have not yet began the proces of issuing apostilles in electronic forms. We are still studying the possibility of issuing e-apostilles in future.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: Both are options, depending on what the customer requests.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: e-Apostilles has not been implemented, therefore currently only the paper Apostille is applicable.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: U.S. state competent authorities have reported no demand for e-Apostilles but some are prepared to issue. See response to 4.2(d).</p>	<p>Luxembourg, Namibia, New Zealand, Romania, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>Chile</u>: A paper Apostilled document may be attached or not to the printout.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: A paper Apostille is attached to the printout of the electronic public document that includes also a handwritten signature (for the purpose of the issuance of an Apostille).</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Honduras does not issues Apostilles in electronic form.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: The document must be confirmed by the Notary Public before an Apostille is issued. Alternatively the document can be reissued containing a wet signature and stamp.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: Peru has not had that kind of case yet.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Une apostille papier est apposé sur l'acte public, qui est en papier et signé</p> <p><u>Turkey</u>: The signature, seal and/or stamp are still required for Apostilles of the public document</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7] Chile, Finland, Honduras, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Turkey</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Answer refers to Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs only</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic:</u> We do not do it.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Les autorités désignées ne sont pas en mesure, à ce jour, de délivrer des apostilles électroniques, dès lors qu'elles ne disposent pas, en pratique, d'une signature électronique. L'autorité centrale et les autorités compétentes en matière d'apostille n'ont, à ce jour, pas été saisies de cette difficulté, qui pourrait concerner essentiellement les actes authentiques électroniques ou des actes émanant de la direction générale des finances publiques (impôts), qui sont les principaux émetteurs d'actes publics électroniques. Dans ce cas, il conviendrait, en l'absence de registre des signatures électroniques, de faire certifier (de façon matérialisée/manuscrite) la signature électronique (ie la validité du certificat de sécurité électronique) ; c'est cette certification qui serait alors apostillée.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> This question is currently being discussed internally.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Public document issued only in electronic form must be signed with a digital signature. Apostille for such document can be made only in electronic form (an e-Apostille is issued). At the request of the applicant a printout of such document can be made and a paper Apostille can be attached to the document.</p>	
<p>c) Can scanned copies of public documents that were executed in paper form be considered “public documents” under your internal law for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> Original Public document should be presented during the request.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Le même régime s'applique pour les copies numérisées que celui qui s'applique aux photocopies simples.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> Yes, only if such scanned copy is sealed by state or local authority that issued the original document.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Yes, if the copies are certified by a public notary, as true to the originals.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> A scanned copy of a public document may be considered a public document for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille provided that it is certified by a notary.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Scanned copy of a public document issued in paper form is made after a document was legalised. Such scanned copy (copy of a document with an Apostille) can circulate electronically and is considered to be a public document. If an applicant wants an Apostille also for a document in paper form, two separate legalisations of such document are made.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[9]</p> <p>Argentina, Bahrain, Colombia, France, Lithuania, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Belarus:</u> A copy of the document need to be certified.</p> <p><u>Bosnia & Herzegovina:</u> Question the authenticity of documents.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> If not printed and certified properly, the scanned copies of public documents cannot be</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[45]</p> <p>Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China</p>

<p>considered eligible.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: In our case, article 1 of Law N°20.711 from 2015, states that the Apostille doesn't grant public character to the document apostilled.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: Apostilles are not issued for simple scanned copies of documents.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: Scanned copies of public documents are considered as private documents, not falling within the scope of the Convention.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: Only true copies of public documents bearing original signature can be certified.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: The Chamber of Notaries prepares the project of e-apostille, which enables to certify with apostille also the documents in electronic form.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Honduras does not Apostilles on scanned copies of public documents.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Applicable practices and in the absence of the explicit norm/provision on the applicable laws doesn't recognise as a public document the scanned copies of public documents.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Il faut une signature ou un tampon en original.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: Copies of public documents must be notarised before being accepted for Apostille.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Copies of public documents presented for apostille must be certified in every case by the authority that issued under the Act. Ninth article of the Acuerdo por el que se Establecen los Lineamientos Generales del Procedimiento de Apostilla de Documentos y Legalización de Firmas (15 de octubre 2013). http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5317985&fecha=15/10/2013</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Des originaux sont demandés.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: We don't issue apostilles on scanned documents as there are prone to abuse and fraud.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: We do not accept simple photocopies or scans of documents as they are not original documents. There is no original signature or seal to verify and there is a high risk that such documents could be fraudulent.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The Apostille is made only on documents which has original sign from the public entity.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Seulment les copies certifiées.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Only if they are legalised according to the original, with the same value with the original document.</p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: Only certified copy which is signed by authorised person.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Pas pour le moment.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: Only if the said copies were firstly certified by a Public Notary.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: The documents must be original or certified copies.</p>	<p>(Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: No scanned copies.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: This question is currently being discussed internally.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Legal requirements vary among U.S. states.</p>	

d) Are electronic signatures recognised as functionally equivalent of handwritten signatures?

Yes

Australia: Usually documented in legislation.

Austria: § 18 (4) Allgemeines Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz 1991 (AVG), Federal Law Gazette BGBl. No. 51/1991 as amended, § 19 E-Government-Gesetz (E-GovG), Federal Law Gazette I No. 10/2004 as amended.

Belarus: Law on electronic documents and electronic signatures from 28 December 2009.

Bulgaria: If printed and stamped properly, the electronic signature is considered eligible.

Chile: Law N° 19.799, only for Advanced Electronic Signatures.

China (Hong Kong SAR): If under legislation, the e-signature is treated as a valid signature.

Colombia: Ley 527 de 1999 por medio de la cual se define y reglamenta el acceso y uso de los mensajes de datos, del comercio electrónico y de las firmas digitales, y se establecen las entidades de certificación y se dictan otras disposiciones. Artículo 28.

Czech Republic: But the signature needs to meet certain requirements (see response to question 6.8 a)).

Estonia: Link to the Digital Signature Act <https://www.riigiteataja.ee/en/eli/508072014007/consolide>

France: L'article 1316-4 du code civil (issu de la loi n°2000-230 du 13 mars 2000) dispose que « La signature nécessaire à la perfection d'un acte juridique identifie celui qui l'appose. Elle manifeste le consentement des parties aux obligations qui découlent de cet acte. Quand elle est apposée par un officier public, elle confère l'authenticité à l'acte. Lorsqu'elle est électronique, elle consiste en l'usage d'un procédé fiable d'identification garantissant son lien avec l'acte auquel elle s'attache. La fiabilité de ce procédé est présumée, jusqu'à preuve contraire, lorsque la signature électronique est créée, l'identité du signataire assurée et l'intégrité de l'acte garantie, dans des conditions fixées par décret en Conseil d'État » (voir décret n°2001-272 du 30 mars 2001). L'article 1317 alinéa 2 du code civil issu de la même loi prévoit que l'acte authentique "peut être dressé sur support électronique s'il est établi et conservé dans des conditions fixées par décret en conseil d'état". En application de ces dispositions et suite à la parution des décrets n° 2005-972 et n° 2005-973 du 10 août 2005, les officiers publics peuvent, depuis le 1er février 2006, dresser des actes publics électroniques. Néanmoins, toutes les autorités ne peuvent pas dresser d'actes publics électroniques; ainsi, à ce jour, un acte d'état civil ne peut être électronique en France.

Georgia: Law of Georgia on electronic signature and electronic document.

Germany: Dans certains Länder fédéraux il y a des bases juridiques en vertu de leurs lois relatives aux procédures administratives (Verwaltungsverfahrensgesetz).

Greece: L.3979/16-6-2011.

Honduras: Honduras recognises and attests the electronic signature of the public servant from the "Secretaría de Derechos Humanos, Justicia, Gobernación y Descentralización" who signed a public document.

[38]

Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, New Zealand, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, Slovakia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela

<p><u>Hungary</u>: Act CCXXII of 2015 on the General rules for electronic administration and trust services.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Electronic Signature Act, 5761-2001.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: By law.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: According to Electronic Documents Law.</p> <p>http://www.vvc.gov.lv/export/sites/default/docs/LRTA/Likumi/Electronic_Documents_Law.doc</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: The Law on Digital Signature of the Republic of Lithuania:</p> <p>https://www.e-tar.lt/portal/lt/legalAct/TAR.382345294FBF/TAIS_463802</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Ley de Firma Electrónica Avanzada (11 de enero de 2012).</p> <p>http://www.ordenjuridico.gob.mx/Documentos/Federal/pdf/wo67194.pdf</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: Generally, a signature cannot be denied legal effect solely because it is in electronic form. [Sections 5 and 8 of the Electronic Transactions Act 2002.]</p> <p>If there is a legal requirement for a signature, that legal requirement is met by means of an electronic signature if certain criteria are met. There are legal presumptions as to the reliability of an electronic signature. [Sections 22-24 of the Electronic Transactions Act 2002.]</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Decreto-Lei n.º 88/2009, de 9 de abril- regime jurídico dos documentos electrónicos e da assinatura digital; DL n.º 161/2012 de 31/12 (Altera o DL 88/2009 de 9/04 e republica-o)</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Law no. 45/2011 on the electronic signature.</p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: Law on electronic signature was adopted on 2004 (Official Gazette of RS, No 135/2004)</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Oui, mais pour le moment seulement dans un sens unilatéral (communication des personnes avec les autorités). Les autorités publiques ne délivrent pas de documents avec les signatures électroniques, alors des actes publics ne sont pas signés électroniquement. L'utilisation de la signature électronique est basée sur la loi 215/2002.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Electronic Commerce and Electronic Signature Act regulates that:</p> <p>http://www.pisrs.si/Pis.web/pregledPredpisa?id=ZAKO1973</p> <p>https://www.admin.ch/opc/fr/classifiedcompilation/20011277/200808010000/943.03.pdf</p> <p><u>Tajikistan</u>: According to the Article 11 of the Law on electronic document "An electronic document is recognized, if it is signed by electronic signature".</p> <p><u>Turkey</u>: Law on Electronic Signature, Article 5.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Federal legislation - 15 USC Chapter 96, U.S. state enactments of the Uniform Electronic Transactions Act and other state legislation.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: Based on the law on data messages and electronic signatures published in Official Gazette number 37076 dated December 13, 2000.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: Pending applicable legislation.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[16]</p> <p>Armenia, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao</p>

<p><u>Kosovo</u>: Article 6 and Chapters XII) & XIII) of the Law Nr. 04/L/-094 on the Information Society Services (http://www.kuvendikosoves.org/?cid=2,191,857) defines electronic signature as equivalent to handwritten signature. However the implementation in practice of this law is very slow due to non enforcement of certain Certification Service Providers and Supervisory Authorities.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: La législation interne a été modifiée mais les textes d'application permettant une application opérationnelle n'ont pas encore tous été édictés.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: Electronic signatures are legally recognized in Peru. However, Peru has not had that kind of cases yet.</p>	<p>SAR), Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Japan, Kosovo, Malta, Monaco, Norway, Peru, Russian Federation</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: Public documents issued electronically are signed by an electronic signature („Amtssignatur“).</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Cependant, à ce jour, ce type de document n'est pas objet d'apostille.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: See Q 8.b: for the purpose of the issuance of an Apostille a handwritten signature is, however, requested.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: L'original des signatures et des sceaux est requis.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: According to internal law e-signature has the same legal validity as handwritten signature.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: Subject to changes affected in time by local official institutions.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Though electronic signatures are recognised and practiced for certain purposes, they are not functionally equivalent to handwritten signatures for the purposes of the issuance of an Apostille as their authenticity cannot be verified in accordance with the relevant regulations.</p>	
Section 7 – Access to Apostille services	
7.1 One-step vs. multi-step process	
a) Does a public document executed in your jurisdiction need to be somehow certified before the issuance of an Apostille?	
<p style="text-align: center;">Certification is not required for any public document</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[29] Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Croatia, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Luxembourg,</p>

			Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey
Certification is required for some categories of public documents			[21] Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Mexico, Namibia, Peru, Romania, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
Certification is required for all categories of public documents			[7] Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Mauritius
Only for Contracting Parties that require certification			
b) What certification process is involved?			
Category of public document	Number of certifications	Certifying authority	Contracting Party
Notarised copies	1	Notary	Armenia
University degrees	1	Issuing Institution - not certification, rather content verification	Australia
Education documents	1	Ministry of Education or Science	Austria
Certificate of residence	1	Ministry of Finance	
Health certificate	1	Ministry of Health	
Traduction	2	2	Belgium
Diplôme	1	1	
Document délivré par une instance fédérale	1	1	
Powers of attorney, Declarations, Company documents	1	Notary	Bulgaria

Public documents	1	Authorized officials of the issuing authority	
Civil status	1	Municipality	
Diplomas	1	MoES	
Judicial Documents	1	MoJ	
Actes notariés	1	Directeur de la Direction Nationale du Notariat (DNN)	Costa Rica
Registre de l'État Civil	1	Directeur du Registre	
Registre National	1	Directeur du Registre	
Diplômes	1	Vice-Ministre de l'Education Nationale	
Certifications de libre vente de médicaments	1	Vice-Ministre de la Santé	
Documents issued by various Governmental Departments	1	Respective Ministries	Cyprus
Documents emanating from legal persons of public law	1	Court Registrar	
Civil status documents	1	Superior Register Office	Czech Republic
Taxation documents	1	General financial directorate	
Certified translations	1	Regional Courts	
Diplomas and other educational documents	1	Ministry of Education	
Medical or health certificates	1	Ministry of Health	
Acts of Civil Status	1	Central Electoral Board	Dominican Republic
Judicial acts	1	Attorney Generals Office	
Educational Documents	1	Ministry of Higher Education	
College degree	1	SENESCYT	Ecuador
Proceedings of the Civil Registry	1	Director	
Documents et actes des services administratifs de l'arrondissement (Kreis)	1	Service administratif compétent de l'arrondissement (Kreis)	Germany
Diplômes des universités et écoles supérieures	1	Université ou école supérieure d'émission	
Bulletins scolaires	1	Administration scolaire compétente	
Certificats médicaux	1	Conseil de l'Ordre des médecins ou Service d'hygiène et de la santé publique	

Brevets de maîtrise et certificats de fin d'apprentissage - avis d'imposition	1	Chambre d'industrie et de commerce (IHK) Trésors publics	
	1		Greece*
Birth Certificate	2	Competent Authority	Honduras
Criminal Records	2	Competent Authority	
Diplomas, Educational Documents	2	Competent Authority	
Medical Records	2	Competent Authority	
Adoption Certificate	2	Competent Authority	
Court documents	1	President or Deputy President of the court concerned	Hungary
Diplomas, other educational certificates	1	Office of Education	
Police protocols	1	Ministry of the Interior	
Health certificates	1	Health Registration and Training Center	
Notarial certificates	1	Legal Affairs Bureau	Japan
Health certificates		Ministry of Health of Latvia	Latvia
Medical certificates	1	Ministry of Health Care	Lithuania
Diplomas issued by accredited private educational bodies	1	Ministry of Education and Science	
Notarial Act	1	Judiciary	Mauritius
Marriage Certificate	1	Civil Status Office	
Certificate of Morality	1	Office of Director of Public Prosecutions	
Educational Certificate	1	Ministry of Education	
Education documents	1	1	Mexico
Notarial documents	1	1	
Civil Status Documents	1	1	
Court Documents	1	1	
National Identity Documents and Passports	1	The Ministry of Safety and Security	Namibia
Civil status documents	1	National register of identification and civil status (reniec)	Peru
Court documents including judgments	1	Superior Court of Justice of Lima	

Notarial acts and authentications	1	College of Notaries of Lima	
Diplomas and other education documents	1	Ministry of Education	
Judicial documents; court decisions; documents issued by the Trade Registry Office; documents issued by the court enforcement officer	1	Issuing court	Romania
Ministry of Internal Affairs: documents of study; qualification/health sector (qualifications, health status)	1	National Centre for Recognition and Validation of Diplomas; specialised structures subordinated to the Ministry of Labour, Social Protection and the Elderly; Ministry of Health/Department for Public Health	
Educational qualifications	1	DIRCO	South Africa
Medical certificates	1	DIRCO	
Export related documents	1	DIRCO	
Company related documents	1	DIRCO	
Transport	1	DIRCO	
Sentences	1	Supreme Court	Uruguay
Notarial titles	1	Supreme Court	
Documents inherent to university education	1	Ministry of Popular Power for University Education Science and Technology	Venezuela
Documents relating to civil registration	2	Notary Public, Principal Register	
Documents relating to basic education	1	Educational Zone corresponding state	
*No further information was provided by this Contracting Party			
Only for Contracting Parties that require certification			
c) Why is certification required?			
<u>Single Competent Authority but the signatures, seals and stamps of local officials and authorities are subject to a certification by a regional authority, whose certificate is in turn subject to an Apostille</u> <u>Japan:</u> An Apostille can be issued for the underlying document subject to a certification by a regional authority. <u>Peru:</u> In all the cases, the competent authority will require an additional and previous certification.			[6] Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Honduras, Japan, Peru, Venezuela
<u>Several Competent Authorities but the signatures, seals and stamps of local officials and authorities are nonetheless subject to a certification by a regional authority.</u>			[9] Austria, Bulgaria, Costa Rica,

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>whose certificate is in turn subject to an Apostille</u></p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> Seals, signatures and stamps of issuing authority confirm the authenticity of the document, subject to issuance of an Apostille.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Competent Authorities as per division of the document categories as specified above conduct the electronic check-out control by verification of the originality of registered seals used by public authorities and of registered signatures of public officials authorized to sign public documents and the typical symbols & elements of the public documents as archived for each category.</p> <p><u>Mexico:</u> Yes, the apostille can be issued for the underlying document.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Judicial documents must be certified in order to confirm their trueness with the original of the document kept by the judicial authority.</p>	<p>Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Kosovo, Mexico, Romania</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Special, multi-step procedure for the authentication of diplomas and other education documents that are issued in your jurisdiction and need to be produced abroad</u></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> For Australian university documents, the content of the document must be verified as a true and accurate record before the signatures/seals are legalised. This is to combat the promulgation of fraudulent tertiary awards. Most Australian universities now have online verification so this step is not required in most situations.</p> <p><u>Ecuador:</u> University degrees are public document at the time that the National Secretary of Higher Education, Science and Technology certifies SENESCYT.</p> <p><u>Greece:</u> The public authority that issues the diploma or copies of it certifies it.</p> <p>High school diplomas (7th, 8th and 9th grades) and Lyceums diplomas (10th, 11 and 12th grades) are authenticated by the Department of Secondary Education.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> Diplomas and educational documents (transcripts) must first be authenticated by the Education Secretariat before they can be issued and Apostille by the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Based on Administrative Instruction no. 26/2014 dated 21.07.2014, regarding the procedures for verifying the accuracy and authenticity of public documents, the following steps of procedures are undertaken by applicants and responsible authorities prior to documents are presented for the Apostillisation process before the Department of Consular Affairs:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A candidate shall submit an application for issuance of the specific document, at the institution of higher education; 2) The institution concerned, after approves the application, fills the form approved by Ministry of Education, Sports and Technology (MEST), upon request to the appropriate level of institutions of education; 3) Filled form is registered in registry books; date of document release is indicated; document is signed and stamped by the Dean, Secretary or authorized official of the respective education institution; 4) Verification of documents is done in university academic units and the Central University Administration. 	<p style="text-align: center;">[12]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Ecuador, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Kosovo, Mexico, Romania, South Africa, Uruguay</p>

<p>Submission of documents for signing and stamping the MEST:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Received documents at the Higher Education Department (HED), is made when the applicant has obtained the original documents as well as the completed forms signed and stamped by the authorized persons from academic units and central administration; 2) Invoice for payment is issued to applicant; all payment should be made through bank; 3) After payment applicants fill the complete dossier at registry office of MEST; 4) Registry office forwards the dossier to the Department of Higher Education (DHE) for verification procedure by the authorized verification officer; 5) After verification procedure is completed with no objections the same is presented for signature of the DAL Director; 6) After the signature by Director of DAL, the dossier is presented for obtaining stamp by the office of MEST Secretary; and 7) Finally dossier is delivered to applicant and copy to MEST archive. <p><u>Mexico:</u> Education documents are pre-authenticated by the competent official authority.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> The educational institution which issued the document of study issues a proof of authenticity for the documents of study. Later on, the School Inspectorate or the National Centre for Recognition and Validation of Diplomas (CNRED), based on the proof of authenticity, shall confirm the authenticity of the documents of study and, following the checks performed, they confirm the fact that the documents of study have been issued and executed in compliance with the legislation in force.</p> <p><u>South Africa:</u> Refer to the attached information sheets attached for further details.</p> <p><u>Uruguay:</u> For signature authentications.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> We do not have an electronic database of all seals and signatures of officials executing public documents which would allow us to certify their authenticity.</p> <p><u>Belgium:</u> chaque instance certifie pour son domaine de compétence.</p> <p><u>Greece:</u> The document is certified by the Public Authority that has issued the document. The document is not certified by an authority on a higher level.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> Generally one-step process is applied. In cases the Consular Department does not have at its disposal sample of a signature of the signing official or a sample of seal/stamp, such documents as registry documents, diplomas, documents on primary and secondary education, court judgements must be certified by the authority, who has issued the document (Registry Department of the Ministry of Justice, Department of Court of the Ministry of Justice, Ministry of Education and Science, State Social Insurance Agency, municipalities etc.) Mostly it applies for the documents issued in former USSR. Health Certificates at all times have to be certified by the Ministry of Health.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> There is no special procedure. According internal law official documents must be sealed. Private educational or medical accredited bodies are not authorised to authenticate documents by state or local</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[8] Armenia, Belgium, Greece, Israel, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, United States of America</p>

<p>municipality seal.</p> <p><u>Mauritius</u>: The certification ensures that the document is genuine.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Responses from U.S. states vary.</p>	
<p><i>Only for Contracting Parties that require certification</i></p> <p>d) Do you plan to make changes to the certification process?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: We plan to maintain an electronic database and introduce the e-register and and e-apostille systems.</p> <p><u>Australia</u>: The Australian Government Department of Education has now implemented a standard Australian Higher Education Graduation Statement with agreed template and standard information for all Higher Education entities in Australia. These documents will be able to be issued with an Apostille without any further certification as the Department of Education will also maintain a register of awards that can be verified by foreign entities.</p> <p><u>Austria</u>: In conjunction with amendment of the Federal Act of 31 May 1967 on the issuance of the Apostille according to the Hague Convention (BGBl. Nr. 28/1968).</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Il existe un projet de loi pour que certaines institutions publiques puissent appuyer le Ministère et délivrer elles-mêmes des apostilles concernant leurs propres documents.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: We are considering the possibility of increasing the number of Competent Authorities.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Ministry of Administration and Internal Affairs intends to improve its means for checking documents so that the procedure should be applied for all documents during a one-step process.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7]</p> <p>Armenia, Australia, Austria, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Romania</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: différents domaines de compétence.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: The National Assembly is the competent authority for the changes of the certification process.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Changer la pratique actuellement applicable présupposerait que l'autorité compétente pour la délivrance de l'apostille dispose, par exemple, des spécimen de signature et de sceau d'actualité de l'ensemble des doyens d'université, présidents des commissions d'examen et directeurs d'établissements scolaires. Vu le grand nombre de personnes disposant de la signature et leurs fréquents changements l'actualisation permanente de ce registre donnerait lieu à des charges administratives disproportionnées.</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: Unknown.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: The procedure has already been established.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Not for the moment as the Reform on Administration is in its embryonic stages and the Apostille Convention has been recently introduced.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Latvia already applies a one-step process (see Section 7.1.c).</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: One-step process of certification dominates.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[18]</p> <p>Belgium, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Ecuador, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Peru, Romania, South Africa, Uruguay</p>

<p><u>Mauritius</u>: The process works very well.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Legal regulations should be modified by various levels of government.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: No, as regards the documents issued by the Ministry of Education and Research. Certification for conformity of an original copy for a judicial document is executed during a one-step process.</p>	
<h2>7.2 Decentralisation of Apostille services</h2>	
<p>Only for Contracting Parties that have designated ONE Competent Authority</p> <p>a) Have you considered decentralising the Apostille services by establishing regional offices or by designating additional Competent Authorities?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Argentina</u>: Creation of regional registers with the capacity to certify as last step before the apostille. For educational certificates.</p> <p><u>Australia</u>: Australian missions overseas exercise authority through a delegation given by Australia's Competent Authority to issue apostilles at overseas missions. This has led to increased client satisfaction and deregulation savings for the Australian community. Previously all documents had to be mailed to Australia to have an Apostille issued.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. For that reason we have still not experienced this situation.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: C'est un projet à moyen terme.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: Apostille services are planned to be decentralized to the regional Civil Service Centers.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: The Ecuadorian State has nine zonal coordinations across the country, public institutions must maintain offices in all these coordinations in teste context the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and Human Mobility of Ecuador, has offices in nine zonal coordinations.</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: Regions, Decentralised Administration, Ministry of Justice.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: We're considering it, but only after an e-Apostille System is implemented in 2016.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: Gozo office, Embassies of Malta abroad.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: We will study the possibility of decentralising the apostille services to other regions of the country. Currently both central authorities responsible for issuing apostilles are located in the capital city-Windhoek.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The Competent Authority in Peru is the Ministry of Foreign Relations and there are nine regional offices which are competent for apostille services.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Ce sont le Ministère de la Justice et le Ministère de l'intérieur qui ont décentralisé les services d'Apostille. Le Ministère de la Justice a désigné 8 tribunaux régionaux pour certains actes publics et le Ministère de l'intérieur a désigné 72 administrations de district pour les actes d »état civil.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[15]</p> <p>Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Republic of Korea, Malta, Namibia, Peru, Slovakia, Uruguay, Venezuela</p>

<u>Venezuela</u> : The infrastructure utilization of the main registers are implemented at national level.	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: One Competent Authority has so far been sufficient to handle apostillisation requests, given the relatively small area of the HKSAR.</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: Colombia has online service over the world.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: The notary bureaus are in almost every city in Estonia.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: The procedure has already been established.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: According to State geographical characteristics.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Taille du pays et nombre de documents traités ne justifient pas une décentralisation.</p> <p><u>Mauritius</u>: We are a small island state and distance is not a problem.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: L'État ne prévoit pas de décentraliser le service des apostilles au moyen de l'établissement de bureaux régionaux en raison de la particularité géographique de l'État monégasque qui s'étend sur une surface d'environ 2 km² ; la Direction des Services Judiciaires reste la seule Autorité compétente pour délivrer les apostilles.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: But may look at the possibility of issuing from a Regional Office.</p> <p><u>Turkey</u>: Issuance of Apostille is already decentralised in Turkey. For instance, for administrative documents, this is the governorships in districts and for judicial documents the chief justice of the district.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[13]</p> <p>Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Honduras, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, New Zealand, Turkey</p>
7.3 Diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities	
a) Do you consider there to be any advantages or disadvantages with the practice of designating the diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities, in particular in light of Art. 1(3)(a) of the Convention?	
No.	Argentina
Not in particular.	Armenia
<p>Australia sees great advantages in permitting Apostilles to be issued at overseas missions. The policy only applies to original public documents, and usually relates to administrative documents (birth, death, marriage, divorce certificates) and diplomas.</p> <p>There are considerable savings for the community in not having to send documents to Australia for legalisation.</p>	Australia
<p>Advantages:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Better service for Austrian citizens and foreign nationals living in the host state. - Easier and faster access for applicants to documents retrieved from Austrian civil and citizen registers by the competent diplomatic and consular missions for the use in the host state. 	Austria

No.	Bahrain
Inconvénient : risque d'une perte de la qualité de l'expertise.	Belgium
No comment at this stage as further understanding of this practice is needed.	China (Hong Kong SAR)
The only competent authority in Colombia is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs. It is not convenient to delegate such functions to diplomatic missions having in consideration that the service is totally online.	Colombia
Cette pratique est avantageuse car le Costa Rica ne possède pas une représentation diplomatique dans tous les pays mais en raison de l'importance des relations commerciales avec les autres pays, il est important que les actes émis puissent être reconnus d'une manière sûre, simple, et efficace.	Costa Rica
N/A for the time being.	Denmark
No.	Estonia
La désignation des missions diplomatiques, à titre très subsidiaire, pourrait avoir un intérêt pour le cas - rare - des documents publics dressés par des autorités françaises établies à l'étranger. En effet, dans cette hypothèse, aucun parquet général n'est compétent en vertu de la déclaration de la France pour délivrer les apostilles (désignation des seules autorités sises sur le territoire français). Les intéressés peuvent contourner la difficulté en faisant certifier l'acte au consulat ; il prend alors la nature d'un acte consulaire dispensé d'apostille (le bureau des légalisations a reçu des demandes de légalisation concernant de tels actes). Une autre possibilité est de faire certifier l'acte par les autorités consulaires françaises de l'État dans lequel l'acte a été dressé ; dans ce cas, l'acte devient consulaire, donc dispensé d'apostille. Le cas s'est présenté récemment s'agissant d'une admission au baccalauréat signée par un président de jury établi dans un lycée français d'Amérique du sud; finalement, il a été suggéré de faire certifier la signature du président de jury par le rectorat dont dépend le lycée; cette certification sera apostillée par le parquet général compétent en vertu du lieu d'établissement du rectorat.	France
Advantages: Georgian citizens residing abroad can apply to the diplomatic missions instead of sending the documents to Georgia.	Georgia
Assuming that diplomatic missions of Contracting States, which have been designated as Competent Authorities, do issue Apostilles for public documents originating in their respective states and not for documents executed by diplomatic or consular agents, Germany does not consider Art. 1(3) (a) of the Convention to be applicable. Germany has no plans to designate diplomatic or consular missions as Competent Authorities. The German civil registration system does not allow German missions abroad to issue an Apostille, as verification of German public documents by the mission is not possible.	Germany
We have not designated diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities for the Apostille Convention.	Greece

The only competent authority in Honduras is the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation through its Authentication Department. It is not convenient to delegate such functions to diplomatic missions having in consideration that we only have few embassies and consulates worldwide.	Honduras
Currently, diplomatic and consular missions are not authorized to issue apostille certificates. The matter is under consideration.	Israel
No.	Japan
We are considering it favorably. The ICT technology in 1961 is different from today. In the Republic of Korea, remote authentication is available.	Republic of Korea
Will await to see more practices and upon strengthening of the diplomatic corpus this option might be considered within three to five years perspective.	Kosovo
Latvia does not consider such a possibility.	Latvia
Advantages: such certification (Apostille) is faster when a document and an applicant is abroad. Such practice is not in contradiction with Art. 1(3) (a) if the certified (Apostille) document is not executed by diplomatic mission.	Lithuania
Non.	Luxembourg
Although currently not in place, designating diplomatic missions as competent authorities have advantages that should be considered in the light of seriousness attached to the official legal documents.	Malta
We are a small island state and distance is not a problem.	Mauritius
Disadvantage, considering that these diplomatic missions are unable to adequately ensure that the signatures of the officials that issued the public documents are correct.	Mexico
Ministry of Justice analyzes the advantages and disadvantages of this solution in light of Art. 1 (3) (a) of the Convention.	Montenegro
We are studying the possibility of designating some of our diplomatic missions as competent authorities.	Namibia
We haven't looked into the pros or cons to date.	New Zealand
One advantage is that the people abroad will have the apostille in a direct way. However, if the diplomatic mission is the competent authority, then it will provide the apostille, regardless that the convention does not apply to documents executed by diplomatic agents, creating confusion in the apostille user. Moreover, at the present, it could be complicated to systematise the information from all the diplomatic missions over the world.	Peru

Jusqu'à aujourd'hui, il n'y a aucun problème.	Portugal
The answer depends on that which authority is competent authority in the respective state. If it is the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, who maintains or can provide specimen signatures of all public documents issuers, diplomatic missions could be authorized to issue apostille. Otherwise, if the competent authorities are courts, as it is case in the Republic of Serbia, diplomatic missions do not have the possibility to validate the signatures, and consequently, could not be designated as Competent Authorities.	Serbia
Nous considérons un désavantage cette pratique des états concernés.	Slovakia
No.	Uruguay
The United States recognizes that there are advantages to this practice regarding convenience to individuals needing to obtain Apostilles for foreign public documents who are already in the state where they need to present them. This would not appear to be in conflict with Art. 1(3)(a) of the Convention as long as diplomatic missions are not apostillizing documents executed by those same missions. The United States notes the practice of some states' diplomatic missions to issue vital records from extracts maintained in the state of origin of the document and recognizes that the need to have such documents apostillized may arise.	United States of America
Only for Contracting Parties that have designated diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities	
b) For which of the following documents do your diplomatic missions issue Apostilles?	
<u>Documents executed in your jurisdiction (i.e. that the consular or diplomatic agent represents), which are subsequently presented for apostillisation to the diplomatic mission</u>	[1] Australia
<u>Documents handled by consular or diplomatic agents but executed by another authority in your jurisdiction, which are reprinted or reissued by the diplomatic mission (i.e., the consular or diplomatic agent merely acts as an intermediary for a document that has been effectively issued in the jurisdiction (s)he represents)</u>	-
<u>Documents executed by consular or diplomatic agents that are not of a diplomatic or consular nature (e.g., civil status documents or notarial acts)</u>	[1] Austria
<u>Others</u> <u>Austria:</u> Documents that are retrieved and transmitted in electronic form from the Austrian civil register, containing civil and citizenship documents as well as the criminal records register.	[1] Austria
<u>Comments:</u> <u>Australia:</u> Australian diplomatic or consular staff do not execute civil status documents. These are only issued in Australia. <u>Austria:</u> e.g. birth certificates, marriage certificates, death certificates, proof of citizenship, certificate of	

exit from the State, criminal records.	
Only for Contracting Parties that have designated diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities	
c) Have you experienced any practical difficulties with the designation of diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities?	
<u>Yes</u> <u>Australia:</u> Certificates of No Impediment to Marriage are currently produced by Consular Officers however the certificates themselves are generated from Australia in a centrally managed database. Copies of Australian passports are issued by an officer of the Australian Passports Office, but this is drawn from the Centrally managed Australian passports database which is held in Australia. They issue these copies as authorised officers of the Passports Office, not as Consular or Diplomatic Officers.	[1] Australia
<u>No</u>	[1] Austria
<u>Comments:</u> <u>Austria:</u> 336 Apostilles were issued by Austrian diplomatic and consular missions in the year 2015.	
Only for Contracting Parties that have designated diplomatic missions as Competent Authorities	
d) Please explain how, in practice, Apostille services are provided by the diplomatic missions	
Physical documents presented at the Diplomatic mission. Australia maintains an up to date database of signatures and seals of Australian public officials. The database is accessible by Australian Consular or Diplomatic Officers who can compare the signatures and seals and the database also has sample public documents.	Australia
Documents are retrieved and transmitted in electronic form from the Austrian civil register, containing civil and citizenship documents as well as from the criminal records register. The document is signed by hand by an authorized officer of the diplomatic or consular mission. The Apostille is affixed in label form on the document itself or on an inseparably connected second page. The Apostille is signed by hand by an officer of the legalisation service of the mission.	Austria
7.4 Apostille requests	
a) Ways of requesting an Apostille.	
<u>In person</u>	[55] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica,

	Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>By post</u>	[33] Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, United States of America
<u>By e-mail</u>	[5] Austria, France, Germany, New Zealand, Slovenia
<u>Through a website</u>	[10] Australia, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Georgia, Germany, Latvia, Slovenia, Venezuela

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other:</u></p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> La demande doit être faite en personne mais il existe la possibilité de demander un rendez-vous par Internet pour la remise des documents. De plus, les documents apostillés peuvent être envoyés par courrier postal.</p> <p><u>Estonia:</u> Via embassy or consulate.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Via Hungarian embassies.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Through a related person who must present the notarized authorisation.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> Authorised person.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> Through telephone and facsimile.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Lawyer or empowered person, spouse, 1st or 2nd degree relative of the applicant, the representative of a legal person.</p> <p><u>South Africa:</u> Courier service.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[6] Costa Rica, Estonia, Hungary, Lithuania, Romania, South Africa</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Forms are available online through www.smartraveller.gov.au but it must be completed and then lodged either in person or by mail with the documents requiring legalisation.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> by email only in case of e-Apostille for an electronic document (only Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs)</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> https://tramites.cancilleria.gov.co/apostillalegalizacion/solicitud/inicio.aspx</p> <p><u>France:</u> Seule une cour d'appel indique accepter la saisine par l'intermédiaire d'un site web.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> MoJ: In person, by post, via embassies. MFAT: In person, via embassies. HNCCLN: In person, by post.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Il ne peut être fait autrement, sauf dans des cas tout à fait exceptionnels, car la personne doit signer le registre qui est en l'état un registre papier.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Apostille can be requested through a website only for electronic documents.</p>	
<p>b) Do your Competent Authorities enquire about the “State of destination” of the public document to be apostilled?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Always</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[44] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan,</p>

	<p>Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>Applicants specify the "State of destination" in the application form</i></p>	<p>[36] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Croatia, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>The "State of destination" is mentioned on the Apostille Certificate</i></p>	<p>[5] Croatia, France, Norway, Romania, United States of America</p>
<p><i>The enquiry is made orally and no record is kept</i></p>	<p>[18] Chile, Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Norway, Romania, Slovakia, Uruguay, United States of America</p>
<p><u>Occasionally</u> <u>Israel</u>: Only to determine whether the document requires an apostille or a regular legalization. Israel does</p>	<p>[2] Israel, Portugal</p>

<p>not keep a record of the destination states.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: L'État de destination n'est pas mentionné sur le certificat d'apostille depuis 2015.</p>	
<p><u>Never</u></p>	<p>[6] Belarus, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Denmark, Mauritius, Romania</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: Answer refers to applications at the Regional Court of Vienna and Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: The inquiry about the destination of the public document is made orally and it is recorded in the register of Apostilles.</p> <p><u>France</u>: La très grande majorité des cours d'appel (89,2%) demande que la destination soit précisée dans le formulaire; 56,8% des cours d'appel précisent cette destination dans le certificat apostille.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: The enquiry is made orally and record is kept.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: The By-law which will enforce the use of the application form which has a specific question/column on the destination of public document is anticipated to be approved by Government during the third quarter of this year and fifteen days after the promulgation of unique By-Law (Regulation) will enter into force and application by the competent authorities.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Il a été régulièrement constaté que des apostilles sont demandées pour des documents destinés à être présentés dans des États non parties à la Convention. Malgré les explications fournies, les personnes introduisent la même demande en indiquant le nom d'un État partie en vue d'obtenir l'apostille.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Very few respondents answered "No".</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Si l'information est demandée oralement, l'État de destination de l'acte public sera renvoyé au registre des Apostilles délivrées.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Practice varies among U.S. competent authorities. In order to provide good customer service and prevent fraud, the trend is towards inquiring about the state of destination. This is to ensure that the customer is obtaining the correct form of authentication and to prevent the potential for use of documents in support of domestic fraud. Practice varies among competent authorities, some include the state of destination in language "outside the box" while others indicate that the document is not intended for use within the United States. The Notary Public Administrators Section of the National Association of Secretaries of State adopted a resolution on July 20, 2010 adopting the latter as a best practice.</p>	
<p>c) How long does it take for an Apostille to be issued?</p>	
<p><u>In-person requests</u></p>	

<i>Less than one hour</i>	[25] Austria, Belgium, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Malta, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America
<i>Less than two hours</i>	[5] Estonia, Mexico, Romania, Slovakia, United States of America
<i>On the same day</i>	[15] Argentina, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Hungary, Kosovo, Lithuania, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America
<i>By the following working day</i>	[9] Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Mauritius, Romania, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>Within two to three working days</i>	[9] Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Honduras, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Namibia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America
<i>Within one working week</i>	[4] Lithuania, Russian Federation, Tajikistan, United States of America
<i>Other</i> <u>Austria</u> : Answer refers to average application at Regional Court of Vienna.	[10] Australia, Chile, China (Macao

<p><u>Australia:</u> Same day within Australia. Up to 2 business days at overseas missions.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> In most cases less than one hour, and only for large documents the situation may vary between the following working day or more.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR):</u> Generally, the Apostille will be issued within 2 working days after the application date. However, if there is no relevant signature in the register database or there are doubts about the authenticity of the document, the Apostille will be issued within 2 working days after the relevant authority makes confirmation for the relevant document.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> 4 jours ouvrables.</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> Maximum 8 working days. Expedited service is also available.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> MoJ, HNCCLN: less than one hour / MFAT: by the following working day, but the Apostille is issued on the same day if the applicant is not a Budapest resident.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> Within 2 working days.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> Usually on the same day, sometimes from 1 to 5 working days. (For requests in person or by authorised person).</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> 48 heures.</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> Ministry of Justice issues apostilles in less than one hour and courts on the same day.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> National Union of Public Notaries from Romania: On principle, the Apostille is issued during the same working day for the notarial acts, with the specification that the Regulation on the Methodology for applying the Apostille or the super-legalisation by the Public Notaries Chambers, the stipulated deadline is of 2 working days.</p> <p><u>South Africa:</u> The same-day service is applicable for 5 documents or less per customer.</p>	<p>SAR), Costa Rica, Georgia, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Monaco, South Africa</p>
<u>Other requests</u>	
<i>Less than one hour</i>	-
<i>Less than two hours</i>	-
<i>On the same day</i>	[7] Estonia, Finland, France, Malta, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America
<i>By the following working day</i>	[9] Armenia, Australia, Cyprus, France, Germany, Romania, Slovenia, South Africa, United States of America
<i>Within two to three working days</i>	[11] Armenia, China (Hong Kong

	SAR), Colombia, Greece, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Mexico, Namibia, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America
<i>Within one working week</i>	[7] Czech Republic, Denmark, Japan, New Zealand, Portugal, Russian Federation, Slovakia
<i>Other</i> <u>Belgium</u> : 10 jours ouvrables. <u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u> : Once payment is cleared, the application will be processed. <u>Costa Rica</u> : 4 jours ouvrables. <u>Hungary</u> : HNCCLN: by the following working day / MoJ: within one working week. <u>Republic of Korea</u> : 7 to 10 working days. <u>Latvia</u> : Within 2 working days. <u>Monaco</u> : 48 heures. <u>Portugal</u> : Dans les îles d' Azores, peut être plus d' une semaine, quand les conditions meteorologiques sont difficiles, pendant l'Hiver, ça dépend des transports. <u>South Africa</u> : This is applicable to courier items and documentation to be returned to the customer via the local postal services.	[9] Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Monaco, Portugal, South Africa
<i>Comments:</i> <u>Latvia</u> : For applicants from remote places of Latvia the documents are certified on the same day. <u>United States of America</u> : Responses from competent authorities vary.	
7.5 Fees	
a) Is a fee for issuing an Apostille imposed by your Competent Authority(ies)?	
<u>Yes</u> <u>Armenia</u> : 5,000 AMD. <u>Austria</u> : Regional Courts: 13,70 euros. Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs: 14,30 euros. Consular fee for issuance of Apostille by a diplomatic or consular mission abroad is 40 euros. <u>Belgium</u> : 20 euros. <u>Colombia</u> : 31.000 Colombian pesos. <u>Costa Rica</u> : C 625 (+ - 1 euro) payés en timbres.	[47] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia,

<p><u>Croatia</u>: 30, 50 or 60 Croation Kunas.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: 5.00 euros.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: 100 CZK (approx. 4 euros).</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: DOP \$620.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: 20 USD.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: 13 euros.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: 20 GEL.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: 10-130 euros.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: 150.00 LPS.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: 35 NIS.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: 10 euros.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: 14.23 euros.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: 10, 15 or 20 euros.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: 20 euros.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: 5 euros par apostille.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: 2 euros per page.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: \$32 for one Apostille and \$15 for each additional Apostille.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: \$9.7 USD.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Mais sont gratuit pour les personnes sans ressources matérielles.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: See comment below.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: 2,500 RUR.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: 10 euros.</p> <p><u>Uruguay</u>: \$ 392 (to 20th. June 2016).</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Issuing competent authorities impose fees ranging from \$1.00 to \$40.00. The average fee for an Apostille issued by U.S. state competent authorities is \$9.95.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: 0.4 U.T, in tax stamps.</p>	<p>Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[8] Chile, China (Macao SAR), France, Japan, Namibia, Norway, South Africa, Turkey</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: In addition to the regular processing of an Apostille request which costs 5,000 AMD we also offer an expedited service and impose an additional 8,000 dram expediting fee.</p>	

<p><u>Greece</u>: Only the Ministry of Justice, Transparency and Human Rights.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Although there is a fee for issuing an Apostille in a public document, there is an exception to this rule. Apostilles on official documents from State institutions, such as a Secretariat, are free of payment.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: Exemption from fees is also possible by operation of law or upon a grounded request (MoJ).</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Uniform tariff of 10.00 euros is charged for every certificate.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: We are still studying the possibility of charging a minimum fee for the issuance of apostilles.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: For the notarial acts, there is a single fee amounting to 35 lei + VAT (20%).</p> <p>For administrative documents, according to Emergency Ordinance no. 128/2000, the fee is of 3 LEI for registration of the application and 22 LEI for each Apostille requested by a natural person, respectively 44 LEI for each Apostille requested by a legal person or if the applicant is represented by a lawyer.</p> <p>For the judicial documents, the judicial stamp fee is of 10 LEI for each document that the Apostille is applied to (art. 22 letter a) of the Emergency Ordinance no. 80/2013) plus 10 LEI for the application.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Fees for the Ministry of Justice are regulated by the Administrative Fees Act (3,00 EUR for one Apostille), fees for district courts are regulated by the Court Fees Act (2,46 EUR or 5,00 EUR if a document is in foreign language).</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: 0.4 the amount of tax units canceled in tax stamps.</p>	
Section 8 – Issuance of Apostilles	
8.1 Verification of public documents	
<p>a) Do all of your Competent Authorities have access to a register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents, which the Competent Authority may consult before issuing an Apostille?</p> <p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Il n'y a qu'une seule autorité compétente à Monaco: la Direction des Services Judiciaires. Elle détient les spécimens de signatures, sceaux ou timbres des autorités et chefs de services de la fonction publique de Monaco habilités à délivrer des actes publics.</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">[46]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrian, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador,</p>

	<p>Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Turkey, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The Ministry of Justice maintains a database with samples of signatures and seals of notaries and judges. The Ministry of Foreign Affairs maintains a database with the samples of stamps and specimens of the officials from municipalities and registered translation agencies.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> There is a database containing the names of all state authorities and officials. In case of any uncertainty about the genuineness of a signature or a stamp it is always possible to contact the authority in question (by phone, skype, email etc.).</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Civil Registry Agency has developed and administers a platform where all signatures and seals of public officials and public authorities that are competent of issuing civil status and civil registry documents, are deposited and the check-out is done on real time.</p> <p>Department of Consular Affairs is in process of developing similar database/platform for all other issued public documents (it is anticipated that by beginning of 2017 the unique and centralised database is completed and becomes fully operational).</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> Latvian authorities can verify if the signature/ seal/ stamp is genuine by contacting the Consular Department of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.</p> <p>For the authentication of public documents which are issued in the European Union, European Economic Zone and Swiss Confederation, the competent institution of Latvia directly contact the competent authority of the relevant state.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> According to internal law the authorities issuing official documents must provide the competent authorities with samples of signatures and seals.</p> <p><u>Malta:</u> 1 authority only.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> We liaise with other ministries and government agencies to confirm the authenticity of all signatures on apostilles.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> The official document is presumed authentic until a statement of forgery is issued.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> Each Competent Authority has a separate register or database containing sample signatures and seals.</p>	<p>[11]</p> <p>Bulgaria, Finland, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Namibia, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Tajikistan, Uruguay</p>

Comments:

Armenia: We have a database containing the sample signatures and stamps of the notaries and heads of the civil registry district offices.

Australia: There is only one Competent Authority in Australia for the purpose of issuing Apostilles. All authorised officers have access to a global database.

Bahrain: There is only one competent Authority in Bahrain. All authorised officers have access to a signature/Stamps database.

France: 4 cours d'appel ne disposent pas de registre (sur 37 cours d'appel, alors qu'en 2008 16 CA n'avaient pas de registre). Toutefois, les principales cours d'appel émettrices d'apostilles disposent d'un registre. Dans certaines cours d'appel (petites ou moyennes), ce registre a été mis en place récemment.

Cours d'appel ne disposant pas d'un registre:

- Bastia (343 apostilles en 2015)
- Dijon (1900 apostilles en 2015)
- Papeete (146 apostilles en 2015)
- Saint-Pierre-et-Miquelon (16 apostilles en 2015).

Georgia: Each Competent Authority keeps the database containing the signatures and seals/stamps of the officials it is responsible to certify.

Greece: Not all competent authorities have access to a register or database. In which case they communicate with the public authority to verify the signature.

Honduras: Signatures' Registry File.

Hungary: Each Competent Authority has access to its own register of the sample stamps and signatures needed for the issuance of the Apostille.

Namibia: We however have sample signatures from all public educational institutions in the country.

Norway: The register is, however, not centralized.

Romania: The Ministry of Internal Affairs and the majority of courts answered "yes" in the sense that documents issued by the courts bear the legible signature of the president of the court and of the Head clerk; the documents issued by the Trade Registry Office bear the legible signature of the director; notarial documents bear the legible signature of the Public Notary and the round stamp. The National Union of Public Notaries from Romania mentioned that, for the notarial documents, there is a database including specimen signatures for all public notaries. As regards the administrative documents, the Ministry of Internal Affairs manages a register including the names and specimen signatures and corresponding specimen stamps for persons from within the relevant institutions at centralised level, who are designated by the management of such institutions to certify the signature and the position for the individual signing the document. Within each Prefect's Office there is a register including the names and specimen signatures and stamps corresponding to all persons from within the relevant institutions, at county level. Relevant institutions entail, as applicable: a) the issuing institution/authority/organization;

<p>b) another institution/authority/organization at central or local level which certifies the signature and the position for the individual signing the document. The list of relevant institutions at central level is drafted and updated by the Ministry of Internal Affairs (MAI) and is published on the MAI website. As regards judicial documents, the Courts of Appeal or the Ministry of Justice manage and approve the execution of the stamp imprint. Also, each official document bears the legible signature of the leader of the subordinated institution from the administrative point of view (e.g., documents issued by courts - the legible signature of the President of the court and of the Head clerk; documents issued by the Trade Registry office the legible signature of the director; documents issued by court enforcement officers - their legible signature), all next to the round imprint of the corresponding stamp.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> When a required sample is not available the relevant Competent Authority extends the application processing time in order to request the concerned agency to provide the sample.</p>	
<p>b) What is the form of the register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents?</p>	
<p><u>Electronic form</u></p>	<p>[13] Australia, Austria, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Israel, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Romania, Tajikistan, Uruguay</p>
<p><u>Paper form</u></p>	<p>[19] Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia,</p>
<p><u>Electronic and paper form</u></p>	<p>[29] Argentina, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Japan, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania,</p>

	Slovenia, South Africa, Turkey, United States of America, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> The updated list with the registered translation agencies can be found online at the web site of the MoFA.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Dans la majorité des cours d'appel (65.6%) le registre est papier; 15,6% des cours d'appel disposent d'un registre électronique (specimen de signature scannés); 18,8% des cours d'appel ont un registre pour partie papier, pour partie électronique.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> a pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> MoJ: paper form. / MFAT, HNCCLN: electronic and paper form.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> see response to 8.1(a).</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> As regards notarial acts, there is a professional folder that includes the specimen signatures for all Public Notaries.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> District courts have electronic form of the register, Ministry of Justice has both.</p> <p><u>South Africa:</u> The paper form is currently the back-up system.</p>	
c) How is the register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents maintained and updated?	
<p><u>Each Competent Authority maintains and updates its own register or database</u></p>	<p>[34]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Lithuania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America</p>
<p><u>Competent Authorities maintain and update a common register or database</u></p>	<p>[21]</p> <p>Belarus, Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao</p>

	SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Honduras, Japan, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> There is only one database managed by the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> There is only one Competent Authority in the HKSAR.</p> <p><u>Estonia:</u> The Chamber of Notaries maintains the database.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Il n'y a pas de registre central en France. De façon générale, les cours d'appel témoignent de la difficulté de tenir à jour ce registre. Toutefois, dans la plupart des cas, les spécimen de signatures des plus grosses administrations du ressort figurent dans les registres, soit parce qu'ils sont transmis spontanément par ces administrations, soit suite à des campagnes de recueil des signatures. Dans certaines cours d'appel, les signataires sont pré-enregistrés sur les trames d'apostilles (p. ex. à Paris).</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Refer to answer a) of 8.1.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> Competent authority collects samples to the special files.</p> <p><u>Namibia:</u> We refer the applicant to an institution that issued the document to verify the signature. upon verifying the signature by such an institution, a stamp is placed on the application form and signed by any official from such institution affirming the authenticity of the signature.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> N/A - New Zealand only has one Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>Slovakia:</u> En principe on utilise un formulaire.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Registers are updated/maintained promptly, every change (new signature or cancellation of a signature/stamp) is registered immediately.</p>	
<p>d) Where the public document for which an Apostille is requested bears a signature, stamp or seal that does not match the sample in the register or database containing sample signatures / stamps / seals of the officials / authorities that execute public documents, how are such situations addressed by your Competent Authority(ies)?</p>	
We contact the relevant officials/notaries to confirm that the underlying document was issued by them and refer the cases to law enforcement bodies in case a fraud is identified.	Armenia
Confirmation is obtained from the issuing authority to ensure the document is genuine and if so, a new specimen signature/seal is obtained and put into the database with the appropriate date range. Under Australia's Privacy Act 1988 legislation, consent is obtained before signatures/seals are loaded into the database.	Australia
If signature/seal/stamp are unknown a new sample is demanded before the apostille is issued.	Austria
The Competent Authority contacts the issuing authority to ensure the document is genuine and if so, new specimen signature and stamps are obtained and uploaded to the database.	Bahrain

A competent authority may contact a public body that has issued a public document to confirm the existence of such a document.	Belarus
Refus.	Belgium
If there is no sample in the register or database containing sample, signatures, stamps, seals of the officials, Competent Authority does not execute public documents.	Bosnia & Herzegovina
The Ministry of Justice refers the issue to the competent authorities (e.g. Police, Prosecutor's Office) The Ministry of Foreign Affairs suspends the process of legalization.	Bulgaria
Since the Convention has not yet entered into force, we have not experienced this situation. Nevertheless, this sort of aspect shall be verified between public authorities.	Chile
The relevant departments would be contacted to verify and confirm the same. Records will be updated. The notary concerned would be requested to file a fresh signature card.	China (Hong Kong SAR)
In case of doubt, the Macao SAR competent authority contacts directly the relevant authority/official in order to confirm the signature/stamp/seal's authenticity. After contacting the issuing authority, if there are reasons to suspect that the signature/stamp/seal is forged and/or tempered, it is mandatory to communicate it to the Public Procurator for investigation of the corresponding criminal offence (which is a public crime).	China (Macao SAR)
The document is rejected because of "inconsistency in signature" along with an explanation with the steps the citizen has to complete in order to fulfil the requirement. If the signature still has the inconsistency, the next step is to call the public servant who signed the document to ensure the issuance of the apostille.	Colombia
L'apostille est refusée. En cas de délit potentiel, l'information est transmise aux autorités judiciaires.	Costa Rica
The document will not be apostilled until the new stamp and signature is deposited.	Croatia
By direct communication with the respective department/body which is asked to confirm by returned fax the originality of the signature, seal or stamp.	Cyprus
Verification is made by telephone, e-mail or fax.	Czech Republic
The MFA asks for new signature.	Denmark
The Protocol is executed.	Dominican Republic
The notary bureau is contacting with the authority, which has executed the public document and controls the authenticity of the document. If the document is not authentic, the notary refuses to apostille the document.	Estonia
Généralement, l'autorité compétente effectue une demande de vérification auprès de l'administration concernée (si une fraude est avérée, le parquet général saisit le parquet du TGI concerné pour enquête). Il convient de préciser qu'à Paris (>80 000 apostilles en 2015), la vérification de la signature n'est pas systématique, faute de temps et de moyens du service.	France

The relevant authority is asked to verify the signature or stamp/seal and submit the matching signature/seal/stamp.	Georgia
Demande auprès de l'autorité d'émission, refus le cas échéant.	Germany
Communication with relative public authority.	Greece
If the public document to be Apostilled does not meet the standard law requirements, the document is rejected because of "inconsistency" along with an verbal explanation with the steps the person has to complete in order to fulfill the requirements.	Honduras
The Competent Authority contacts the issuing court or public body in order to verify the authenticity of the signature/stamp.	Hungary
In such cases the Competent Authority cannot issue an Apostille. The MFA contacts the relevant office of the official in order to look into the matter.	Israel
An inquiry will be made directly to the relevant authority/official that has the power to execute the public document in question in order to clarify whether or not the document was officially executed.	Japan
We seek confirmation from the offices issuing the documents, by fax and any other means.	Republic of Korea
Initiates the further verification and inspection procedures that are regulated with applicable secondary legislation and the process of issuing the Apostille Certificate is suspended until the verification/inspection procedure is completed and recommendation is issued.	Kosovo
The Consular Department requests for reassurance of the the signature of the signing official from the relevant state via diplomatic channels.	Latvia
Competent authority demands to update database of samples from authorities.	Lithuania
Vérification auprès de l'autorité ayant établi l'acte public.	Luxembourg
We contact the signatory to confirm the signature on the document and request that a new specimen signature form is submitted so that the records will be updated.	Malta
We call the responsible officers of those organisations to know whether the officer is authorised and ask for his/her specimen signature.	Mauritius
The competent authorities may perform administrative actions or criminal procedure other than the apostille, where there are indications that it is apocryphal or fraudulent documents, or if it is presumed that the same may be used illicitly. Tenth article of the Acuerdo por el que se Establecen los Lineamientos Generales del Procedimiento de Apostilla de Documentos y Legalización de Firmas (15 de octubre 2013). http://www.dof.gob.mx/nota_detalle.php?codigo=5317985&fecha=15/10/2013	Mexico
La personne en charge de la vérification contacte l'autorité signataire du document et lui demande de confirmer qu'elle a bien établi l'acte à apostiller.	Monaco
The Apostille will not be issued.	Montenegro
We refer the applicant to an institution that issued the document to verify the signature. upon verifying the signature by such an institution, a stamp is placed on the application form and signed by any official	Namibia

from such institution affirming the authenticity of the signature.	
We contact the relevant authority/person and ask them to confirm whether they issued/signed the document. We provide a copy of the document with our request. If their signature, stamp or seal has changed we request a new specimen for our files.	New Zealand
Apostille is not issued. The Competent Authority updates the register containing signatures / stamps if needed.	Norway
The Competent Authority contact with the public entity that enacted the public document in order to confirm the authenticity of it. If the document is adulterated or is fake, the competent authority start the internal proceeding in order to inform the situation to the law enforcement officer.	Peru
L'Autorité n'apostille pas le document.	Portugal
As regards the notarial documents, if there are any doubts regarding the signature, stamp or the seal applied by the Public Notary, the Public Notaries Chamber shall contact the public notary who executed the notarial act in order to confirm the authenticity of his/her signature/stamp and seal. Thus, the public notary who signed confirm the trueness of the document and in case the stamp or the seal do not match those included in the database, then the application of the Apostille shall be rejected. As regards the judicial documents, the document is rejected accompanied by a notice that mentions the reasons for the rejection or through a reasoned decision of the court in Chambers, which can be appealed in an administrative court of law. The notice is signed by the president of the court and by the clerk assigned to the Office for Application of the Apostille. In case of administrative documents, the Prefect's Office shall directly contact the issuing/relevant institution, as applicable, or through the Ministry of Internal Affairs.	Romania
In such situations the concerned Competent Authority shall refuse to issue an Apostille. However, the Ministry of Justice is not aware of any such instances having taken place in the last three years.	Russian Federation
L'Autorité compétente communique avec l'autorité délivrante par téléphone ou par e-mail pour vérifier la signature, le timbre et/ou le sceau et demande qu'un spécimen lui soit envoyé par télécopie.	Slovakia
If a signature, stamp or seal does not match, the competent authority makes an official inquiry with the authority/organisation/person that issued the document. If it is not the same/if it does not match, the Apostille is not issued.	Slovenia
An e-mail request is forwarded to the relevant authority that was responsible to issue the public document, in order to confirm the specimen signature and details such as the full names/rank etc. Once confirmed, then the DIRCO - Legalisation Section will proceed to legalise accordingly. If the authority indicated that the public document was fraudulently obtained, then the public document will be confiscated and returned to the authority for further investigation purposes. The customer will duly be informed accordingly.	South Africa
The Apostille would not be issued.	United States of America
If the signature resents the data and does not match those registered in the database, you contact the competent authority in order to verify its authenticity.	Venezuela

8.2 The Apostille

a) What stationery is used for the Apostille?

Standard paper

[32]

Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Kosovo, Latvia, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela

Paper with security features

Armenia: Hologram.

Austria: Dstamp with watermark.

Bulgaria: For documents, apostilled by the Ministry of Education and Science. The following stamps are also being placed: Bilingual round ink stamp with the name of the ministry with a corresponding number of the official stamp used, rectangular wet stamp with the names of the officer issuing the certificate, bilingual dry embossed seal with the name of the Ministry and the relevant number of the official stamp used.

China (Macao SAR): Watermarks.

Costa Rica: Hologrammes, filigrane, codes imprimés, réaction aux ultras-violets, et encre spéciale.

Ecuador: Watermarks, holograms, barcodes.

Estonia: Watermarks.

Kosovo: Competent Authorities have initiated a public bid for acquiring the certificates with watermarks features and the same is anticipated to start being used by end of this year.

Currently the two competent authorities use standard paper.

Lithuania: Watermarks and numbering.

New Zealand: A watermark (government crest).

Peru: Microprinting, intaglio system, security fibrils, watermarks, barcode and holograms.

[18]

Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Ecuador, Estonia, Georgia, Kosovo, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, United States of America

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Rubber stamp</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[15] Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Cyprus, Estonia, Greece, Israel, Kosovo, Mauritius, Norway, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Self-adhesive stickers</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[22] Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Germany, Israel, Kosovo, Latvia, Luxembourg, Republic of Korea, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Norway, Russian Federation, Slovakia</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> Electronic Apostille e-apostille. <u>Germany:</u> tampon. <u>Kosovo:</u> Rubber stamp is used actually while with the start of use of the paper with security features (watermark) will adopt simultaneously the self-adhesive sticker. <u>Lithuania:</u> Raised seal. <u>Malta:</u> Embossing on red wafer. <u>South Africa:</u> Dry seal; and printed on the Department's Note Verbale paper.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[6] Colombia, Germany, Lithuania, Malta, South Africa, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Red wafer seals are used to emboss the Apostille onto the document. In cases where the staff cannot place the document through a printer, a self adhesive plain white label is also used to print the Apostille certificate and place onto the document. <u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority. <u>China (Macao SAR):</u> The Apostille Certificate is reproduced on letterhead paper - with the symbol of the Macao SAR and the logo-type of the Macao SAR Competent Authority (the paper is manufactured by the Macao SAR Official Press, under a specific model), which is presented as an "allonge" to the apostilled document and attached to the end of the document by means of a small, special round metallic staple. At the interior of the junction between the document and the 'Apostille page', the seal of the Competent Authority is apposed.</p>	

<p><u>France</u>: La majorité des apostilles est apposée sur autocollant; vient ensuite le papier standard, et à titre résiduel le timbre. Certaines cours d'appel utilisent plusieurs supports.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Standard paper with a bar code.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: The majority of Apostilles issued by the MFA are issued on self-adhesive stickers, usually on the back side of the public document. Other Apostilles are issued with a rubber stamp.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: The Apostilles are issue on a special paper containing the Ministry of Justice's letterhead plus the seal.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Standard paper is used both by authorities that print out Apostilles filled in using computer software and authorities that practice filling in Apostilles by hand using rubber stamps.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
b) Is a bilingual or trilingual Apostille Certificate used, or are there plans to introduce one?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: Regional Court of Vienna: German/French. Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs: German/English.</p> <p><u>Bahrain</u>: Trilingual Apostille.</p> <p><u>Belarus</u>: French-Russian.</p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: français- néerlandais-allemand.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: In both Bulgarian and English languages.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: trilingual (Spanish, French and English).</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: English and Traditional Chinese.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: The applicant may request for a Chinese or Portuguese Apostille plus the relevant English translation.</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: Spanish, English, French.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Espagnol, français, anglais.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Czech/English.</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: Spanish/English.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: Finnish-Swedish, Finnish-English, Finnish-Swedish-English.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: Georgian and English.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Si tel est le cas, le plus souvent en anglais, en français, en allemand.</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: Greek and French.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: Hungarian and English, plus French is also used by MoJ and MFAT).</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Israel's Apostilles are issued in Hebrew and English.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Trilingual - Albanian and Serbian as official languages and English.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[34]</p> <p>Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America</p>

<p><u>Lithuania</u>: English-Lithuanian.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Spanish, French and English.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: English, French & Spanish.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: English and Spanish.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: le portugais, le français et l'anglais.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Nous utilisons la version bilingues dans la langues slovaque - anglais.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: District Courts use trilingual Apostille Certificate (Slovene, English and French), on the areas with minorities, Italian and Hungarian language is also used.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan</u>: Tajik, French and English.</p> <p><u>Turkey</u>: Turkish, English, French, German.</p> <p><u>Uruguay</u>: Spanish - English – French.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: The Notary Public Administrators Section of the National Association of Secretaries of State includes the model bilingual and trilingual Apostilles developed by the Permanent Bureau in its Handbook on Apostilles and Authentications. English/French/Spanish.</p>	
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[25] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Honduras, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: We are currently reviewing our processes and intend to introduce a bilingual or trilingual apostille.</p> <p><u>Australia</u>: Apostilles can be verified online and google translator can be used on the verification page.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: The apostille form is in English.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Seules deux parquets généraux utilisent des certificats bilingues (Papeete) ou trilingues (Bordeaux).</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Cela varie en fonction de l'autorité compétente pour apostiller. Pas toutes les autorités compétentes pour apostiller n'utilisent l'apostille multilingue.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: We are willing to take such a step as far as we get support.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: The practice of issuing Apostille in English is successful.</p>	

<p><u>Malta</u>: English only.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: We only use the official language of the state on all apostilles.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: Most Competent Authorities use an Apostille Certificate in English only. Some Competent Authorities use a bilingual Apostille Certificate in Norwegian and English.</p> <p>In the new Guidelines Competent Authorities will be advised to use a bilingual (Norwegian and English) or trilingual Apostille Certificate.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: For the moment, the State does not use more languages.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Most of the answers were "no". The official document is translated into the language of the country of destination, including the Apostille.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Though the option of issuing a bilingual or trilingual Apostille is provided by law, it is currently not practiced, as most of the staff of Competent Authorities are not trained to issue Apostilles in languages other than Russian.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Ministry of Justice uses only Apostille Certificate in Slovenian language, as provided by the second paragraph of the Article 4.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: We utilise the standard English issued Apostille.</p>	
<p>c) In your jurisdiction, is the Apostille Certificate used to authenticate the origin of public documents even when the Apostille Convention does not apply (e.g. using the Apostille Certificate for legalisations or other certifications)?</p>	
<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p>[2] Dominican Republic, Namibia</p>
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[51] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru,</p>

	Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Although, this is under active consideration.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> As required by the interested party, the Apostille is issued for legalisations of documents tend for third countries, which are not Party to the Convention.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Les autorités françaises refusent de délivrer une apostille lorsqu'une dispense est prévue. Toutefois, dans un souci de facilitation des démarches des usagers, il arrive que certaines apostilles soient délivrées "par complaisance" en connaissance des exigences de l'État de réception du document (par exemple, la cour d'appel de Colmar, frontalière avec l'Allemagne, évoque les apostilles exigées par les notaires allemands pour les dossiers de succession)</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> Israel has a similar but separate certificate for non-Apostille legalisations.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> We are looking into using the Apostille certificate or something similar.</p> <p><u>South Africa:</u> If the country of destination is not party to the Apostille Convention, then the DIRCO - Legalisation Section will issue and affix the relevant Certificate of Authentication.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Some U.S. competent authorities have adopted a uniform certificate corresponding the Model Apostille but that contains language "outside the box" noting that the certificate is not considered an Apostille when presented in a non-contracting state.</p>	
8.3 Completing the Apostille	
a) How are Apostilles filled in?	
<p><u>By hand</u></p>	<p>[17] Austria, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, France, Germany, Greece, Israel, Kosovo, Mauritius, Montenegro, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia</p>
<p><u>Using a type-writer</u></p>	<p>[2] Austria, Serbia</p>
<p><u>Using computer software</u></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> The Apostille register captures the data and then generates the certificate from information the</p>	<p>[46] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium,</p>

staff member inputs. The Apostille Register also generates the unique number for each Apostille certificate for verification under the e-Register.

Bulgaria: Computer Software "Lotus Notes" designed specially for the purpose of issuance of the Apostille.

Chile: Electronically.

China (Hong Kong SAR): Apostilles are generated from data in the computer system.

China (Macao SAR): Java (J2EE).

Costa Rica: Programme informatique du Ministère nommé "Sistema de autenticaciones".

Colombia: It's a software designed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs.

Czech Republic: Information about the underlying document is filled into the Apostille Certificate in MS Word.

Dominican Republic: Computerized System.

Ecuador: System ESIGEX.

Estonia: There is no pre-printed form of the apostille, the apostille form will be fulfilled and printed out from the infosystem to the security paper. We use the same apostille form as it is added to the Apostille Convention.

France: Winci CA (logiciel interne des cours d'appel françaises).

Georgia: A Common Computer software is developed by PSDA Software Development Team for the PSDA and Education Enhancement Center. Service Agency of MIA operates a Computer Software developed by Service Agency Software Development Team.

Greece: The Decentralised Administration of Attiki uses Data base Access-SQL.

Honduras: Software designed by the Secretariat of Foreign Affairs and International Cooperation.

Hungary: Microsoft Word, and software developed by the HNCCLN.

Israel: The majority of apostilles in Israel are issued by computer software. Others are issued by rubber stamp and handwriting.

Republic of Korea: e-Consul program.

Latvia: The short description of the document is entered into the electronic database - Document Legalisation System, and on Apostille 7 of 10 standard informational items are filled out by system and printed out.

Lithuania: Entering text for Apostille into the software, then printing the text on special Apostille blank

Luxembourg: Logiciel spécifiquement développé.

Malta: Legalisation software.

Mexico: Each competent authority has implemented its processes according to your needs.

Monaco: Traitement de texte.

Namibia: Microsoft word.

Bosnia & Herzegovina,
Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong
Kong SAR), China (Macao
SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica,
Czech Republic, Denmark,
Dominican Republic, Ecuador,
Estonia, Finland, France,
Georgia, Germany, Greece,
Honduras, Israel, Japan,
Republic of Korea, Latvia,
Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta,
Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, New
Zealand, Norway, Peru,
Portugal, Romania, Russian
Federation, Slovenia, South
Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay,
United States of America,
Venezuela

<p><u>New Zealand</u>: Internal software package.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: Microsoft Access and own-developed software.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The state uses a software to print the adhesive paper, the digital stamp and the serial number.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Ministry of Internal Affairs: centralised inter-operable system for keeping the records of Apostille issued by the Prefect's Offices for official administrative documents (SMIS code: 31493).</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Different ways of filling in Apostilles are practiced by different Competent Authorities depending on the number of apostilles issued (when the number is greater, computer software is the preferred mode while a limited number of apostilles is more practical to fill in by hand using the rubber stamp).</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Supreme Court of Slovenia developed a special software program for all the district courts for the purpose of e-Register and now for e-Apostille.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: Templates has been created on SharePoint, which is then amended on the computer accordingly.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: Software created by the Ministry of Popular Power for Foreign Affairs.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: Depending on the Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Les Apostilles sont davantage remplies à l'aide d'un logiciel qu'à la main (25 cours d'appel sur 37, dont les plus importantes).</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: On remplit l'apostille dans un programme électronique fait en Microsoft Access.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Each competent authority maintains its own computer process for the issuance of Apostilles.</p>	
<p>b) In what language are the blanks of Apostilles usually filled in?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>In one language</u></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: Armenian.</p> <p><u>Australia</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Austria</u>: German.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: Spanish.</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: Spanish.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Espagnol.</p> <p><u>Croatia</u>: In Croatian which is the official language for Croatian public authorities.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Czech.</p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: Spanish.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[46]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand,</p>

<p><u>Estonia</u> : English.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: Either Finnish or Swedish.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Français.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Seulement dans la langue officielle de l'Autorité compétente (langue autre que l'anglais ou le français).</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: Greek.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Spanish.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: Hungarian (MFAT).</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Albanian or Serbian depending on the nationality of the applicants.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Français.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Spanish.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Française.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: Montenegrin.</p> <p><u>Namibia</u>: English.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: En portugais.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Russian.</p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: Serbian.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Slovene.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Turkey</u>: Turkish.</p> <p><u>Uruguay</u>: Spanish.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: English.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: Español.</p>	<p>Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>In two languages</u></p> <p><u>Bulgaria</u>: In both Bulgarian and English Language.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: English and Traditional Chinese.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[13]</p> <p>Belarus, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao</p>

<p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: The applicant may request for a Chinese or Portuguese Apostille plus the relevant English translation.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: Finnish or Swedish + English.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: Georgian and English.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: dans la langue officielle de l'Autorité compétente et en anglais ou en français.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: Hungarian, English (MoJ. HNCCLN).</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Hebrew and English.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: Spanish and English.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: La langue slovaque et la langue anglaise.</p>	<p>SAR), Denmark, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Peru, Slovakia, Tajikistan</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>In three languages</u></p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: Français-néerlandais-allemand.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: Finnish, Swedish, English.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[2] Belgium, Finland</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>Bosnia & Herzegovina</u>: According to register of Competent Authority.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[1] Bosnia & Herzegovina</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: If the public officer stamped his Chinese name on the document and he has registered his Chinese name with us, the Apostille will include his Chinese name.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: la mention «attesté» est écrite en portugais, anglais et français.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: The official document is translated into the language of the country of destination, including the Apostille.</p>	
<p>c) How are Apostilles numbered?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Consecutively</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[46] Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New</p>

	Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Randomly</u></p> <p><u>Australia</u>: Internal computer system (CRM) generates a certificate number after the officer has included all details of the authorised signatory and public document.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: Alphanumeric.</p> <p><u>Colombia</u>: It's an algorithm.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: 15-digit number is generated electronically.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: From the lowest to the highest number with no end.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: In the MoJ the requests for Apostille legalisation are registered in the normal register of the issuing department (which covers other kinds of cases as well), and the case number generated by that system is the number indicated on the Apostille. If more than one document is requested to be furnished with Apostille with a single application, subnumbers are used to distinguish the documents but they only appear in the paper form file and not in the electronic register.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: numéro de série est une combinaison de la date d'émission et d'un numéro généré dans l'ordre.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The number is generated by the enaction of 22 digits, consisting of three letters (mre) and 19 numbers.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: In case of judicial documents, a number issued by the Lotus software, later on transcribed onto paper, in a register.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: An algorithm in the system assigns/provides unique code for every Apostille/legalisation that is made.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[11] Australia, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Colombia, Georgia, Honduras, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: Sequential-per year.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: The sequence is based on the species assigned in the nine coordinations.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: Every Apostille blank has an individual number.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: La numérotation d'enregistrement est annuelle. Ainsi, à chaque nouvelle année civile, elle repart à 1.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Apostilles are numbered randomly only at district courts that use a special software; Ministers of</p>	

<p>Justice of the Republic of Slovenia numbers Apostilles consecutively.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
<p>d) Where an item of the Apostille is not applicable (e.g. the underlying public document is not signed or does not bear a seal), is “not applicable” or “n/a” written in the relevant items by your Competent Authority(ies)?</p>	
<p><u>Yes</u></p>	<p>[15] Australia, Austria, Chile, Czech Republic, France, Georgia, Greece, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Romania, Portugal</p>
<p><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> Aucun espace ne reste en blanc. Tous les champs sont obligatoirement remplis.</p> <p><u>Croatia:</u> In such a case the Apostille would not be issued.</p> <p><u>Estonia:</u> If the public document is not correctly affirmed, the notary refuses to certify the document with apostille. If the document does not need to bear a seal, the notary marks the item with "-".</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> The document is rejected because of "inconsistency in signature or seal" along with a verbal explanation with the steps the person has to complete in order to fulfill the requirements.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> This document is returned and not processed further one for issuing the Apostille Certificate. If the official notes any fraudulent practice then the case is reported to respective inspection authorities.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg:</u> Seuls les documents ayant au moins une signature ou un tampon ou une signature électronique sont légalisés.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Si l'acte à apostiller est incomplet (absence de sceau ou signature), celui-ci est restitué. Aucun registre ne porte mention de cette restitution.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> Under such circumstances an Apostille is not issued.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> The document, including the observation, is returned to the apostille user.</p> <p><u>Slovakia:</u> Toutes les rubriques sont remplies.</p>	<p>[21] Belarus, Belgium, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Honduras, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Luxembourg, Monaco, Norway, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Uruguay, Venezuela</p>
<p><u>Such situations do not arise in practice</u></p>	<p>[19] Armenia, Bahrain, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Israel, Malta, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United</p>

	States of America
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> We place an Apostille only on documents executed by authorized officials and notaries.</p> <p><u>Australia:</u> On some occasions the field is left blank or it duplicates the name of the authority. It depends what type of underlying public document it is - some documents have both signatures and seals however the officer is only legalising one of the items.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> answer refers to e-Apostilles issued by the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> In case of absence of an item in the public document, it is not accepted for certification.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> De plus, nous pouvons ajouter d'autres informations comme le nom du bénéficiaire de l'apostille ou nombre de pages.</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic:</u> Information is given about the appropriate procedure.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Le problème se pose pour certains documents ne portant pas de signature, par exemple les extraits K-bis (extraits du registre du commerce et des sociétés) ou les casiers judiciaires.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> La pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Israel:</u> Israel issues a standard form of Apostille, and will usually not issue a certificate if the document is not signed or bears a seal.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> In the Republic of Korea, Most of electronically issued public documents are not signed, so we put a name or a title of the issuing officer rather than "N/A" or "not applicable." It is because most of underlying public documents (electronically issued) have security measures such as anti-copy protection, electric code for matching originals, barcode, etc.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> This is indicated by " - ".</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> Il y a la reference NA (non aplicable).</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> The document is to be returned, if it is incomplete.</p>	
Question 8.3 e) – For Apostilles issued in paper form	
e) How is a paper Apostille signed?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>By hand ("wet" signature)</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[45]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Estonia, Finland, France,</p>

	Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>By rubber stamp</u>	[12] Austria, Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Israel, Japan, Kosovo, Norway, Portugal, Romania
<u>By printer (e.g., a facsimile signature or PDF/JPEG image of the signature)</u>	[11] Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Ecuador, France, Greece, Peru, Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Mexico, Slovenia, United States of America
<u>By electronic signature</u> <u>Georgia</u> : The software automatically inserts pre-scanned signatures. <u>Romania</u> : For the administrative documents (Ministry of Internal Affairs). <u>United States of America</u> : Not in practice but many U.S. competent authorities have the capacity. <u>Venezuela</u> : Token.	[5] Bahrain, Georgia, Romania, Tajikistan, United States of America
<u>Other</u>	
<i>Comments:</i> <u>Belgium</u> : l'apostille est signée à l'aide d'un scan et ensuite paraphée par le fonctionnaire qui délivre. <u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u> : By scanned image of the handwritten signature since 2 October 2008. <u>France</u> : Les cours d'appel qui délivrent le plus grand nombre d'apostilles les signent via un logiciel ou un tampon (Paris, Rennes, Versailles, Aix-en-Provence, Douai, Bordeaux, Lyon). Toutefois, de nombreuses cours d'appel de taille moindre utilisent encore la signature manuscrite. <u>Georgia</u> : PSDA signs by printer, education and MIA - by hand.	

<p><u>Slovenia</u>: At the Ministry of Justice the paper Apostille is signed by hand, at district courts a paper. Apostille is signed with the PDF/JPEG image of the signature.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
Question 8.3 f) and g) – For Apostilles issued in electronic form (e-Apostilles)	
f) How is an e-Apostille signed?	
e-Apostille with underlying document is sent as one pdf-file to the signature server of the government	Austria
Signs using a digital certificate obtained from a commercial certificate authority.	Bahrain
Advances Electronic Signature	Chile
Firma electrónica avanzada PAdES- LTV (Advanced Electronic Signature Long Time Validation)	Colombia
No	Dominican Republic
Scanned and uploaded in the system ESIGEX	Ecuador
No e-APP	Greece
We use a commercial Certificate Authority - GlobalSign. Tokens are provided on which we store our digital signatures. We insert the token to apply the digital signature to the PDF Apostille certificate	New Zealand
Electronic signature is applied automatically, in accordance with the application/computer software/system, electronic signature SIGOV-CA; http://www.sigov-ca.si/	Slovenia
The responsible person for signing the Apostille, has an e-Token (digital certificate) assigned to him (her). The given digital certificate is linked to a copy of a signature of the given person in electronic format. When approving the documents of the applicant, this signature is applied to an Apostille.	Tajikistan
Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities	United States of America
Linus uses the operating system, played in java.	Venezuela
g) Does your internal law allow for a printout of an electronic document or an e-Apostille (both of which have been digitally signed) to be circulated?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: - printout of electronic document for the use in Austria is allowed and recognized by austrian authorities; - for use abroad a printout of an electronic document is generally insufficient.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: Article 12 of Law's Regulation N° 81 from 2015</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: We accept electronic documents, but do not have e-app.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: There is no prohibition on the printing of electronically issued documents.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: Once verified the validation code and the authenticity of the document and / or apostille.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[9]</p> <p>Argentina, Austria, Chile, Greece, Lithuania, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: e-apostilles can only be verified when received electronically</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[10]</p> <p>Austria, Bahrain, Bosnia &</p>

<p><u>Colombia</u>: If the e-apostille is printed, there wouldn't be any way to know for sure if it was issued by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of Colombia, bearing in mind that the digital signature loses all its security.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: The system does not allow printouts.</p> <p><u>Mexico</u>: Not allowed.</p>	<p>Herzegovina, Colombia, Ecuador, Hungary, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Romania</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Finland</u>: There are no specific provisions on e-Apostille.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: Unsure about how these documents are used within NZ</p>	
8.4 Additional text	
<u>Yes</u>	<p>[22] Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, France, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Mexico, New Zealand, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<i>Information relating to the limited effect of an Apostille (see Art. 3 of the Convention)</i>	<p>[15] Australia, Austria, Belgium, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Hungary, Mexico, New Zealand, Romania, South Africa, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<i>Information relating to the nature or content of the underlying public document</i>	<p>[10] Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Honduras, Mexico, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, United States of America</p>
<i>Information relating to the effect of Apostilles on certified copies</i>	<p>[3]</p>

	Costa Rica, Mexico, Serbia
<i>Information relating to the person who requested the Apostille</i>	[2] Costa Rica, Venezuela
<i>Information relating to the "State of destination"</i>	[2] France, United States of America
<i>Information relating to fees</i>	[6] Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Finland, Honduras, Hungary
<i>Information relating to the e-Register of the Competent Authority (e.g., the URL of the relevant website)</i>	[13] Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America
<i>Information relating to a digital signature</i>	[6] Austria, Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Slovenia
<i>Identification of a code to access the e-Register of Competent Authority</i>	[9] Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Mexico, Slovenia, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>Other</i> <u>Chile:</u> Name of the holder of the document. <u>France:</u> Nombre de pages.	[3] Chile, Ecuador, France
<u>No</u>	[30] Argentina, Armenia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Estonia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Uruguay

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> This additional information is contained in a separate disclaimer box printed next to the Apostille Certificate.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority (mostly Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs in case of e-Apostille).</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic:</u> 1-If it is going to be used in a non-member State, it must be taken to a consulate or embassy of the country in which the document will be used. 2- Verification code of 15 digits with letters and numbers. 3-Website of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs for verification.</p> <p><u>France:</u> A noter toutefois que la CA de Paris n'ajoute aucune mention supplémentaire.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> MFAT adds information on limited effect.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Mais il serait utile d'ajouter le nom de l'État de destination pour éviter que les demandeurs utilisent l'apostille à des fins autres que celles prévues par la Convention.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> The Ministry of Justice will soon pass a Directive to the Competent Authorities advising them to include information relating to the limited effect of an Apostille.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Most of the courts answered "No". The National Union of Public Notaries from Romania specified under the first checkbox from "Yes", that a seal is applied next to the Apostille seal, which stipulates that the Apostille certifies the authenticity of signature, the position of the person signing or, as applicable, the identity of the seal or of the stamp applied to the document. The Apostille does not certify the contents of the document. The second and the seventh checkbox were ticked by the Ministry of Internal Affairs.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
8.5 Affixing the Apostille	
<i>Questions 8.5 a) to d) – For Apostilles issued in paper form</i>	
a) Is the Apostille placed on the document itself or on a separate slip of paper (an allonge)?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The Apostille is placed on the document itself by:</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[37] Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia,</p>

	Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Turkey, United States of America
<i>Self-adhesive sticker</i>	[23] Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), Czech Republic, Denmark, France, Georgia, Germany, Israel, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Romania, Slovakia, United States of America
<i>Glue</i>	[3] Costa Rica, Cyprus, Germany
<i>Rubber stamp</i>	[12] Austria, Belarus, Croatia, France, Israel, Kosovo, Mauritius, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia
<i>Printing it on the underlying document</i>	[3] Australia, France, Greece
<i>Seals</i>	[6] Australia, Bosnia & Herzegovina, France, Greece, Namibia, Slovakia
<i>Staples</i>	[5] Greece, Honduras, Japan, Romania, United States of America
<i>Other</i> <u>Australia:</u> Embossed red wafer seals and wet ink stamps are also placed in the Apostille to ensure it is not copied or removed from the document.	[9] Australia, Belarus, Bulgaria, Costa Rica, Latvia, Mexico, Montenegro, Peru, Romania

<p><u>Belarus:</u> When there is enough space for the apostille stamp on the document.</p> <p><u>Bulgaria:</u> In case the Apostille cannot be placed on the document, a separate slip of paper is placed.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica:</u> L'apostille est apposée sur un page de moyen format collée au dos du document apostillé</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> Additional paper.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Actually in all public documents the Apostille certificate is placed in the back of the public document.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> If there is a limited space on a document, which does not allow to use self-adhesive sticker, Apostille is attached by grommets and ribbons.</p> <p><u>Mexico:</u> Adhesive tape.</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> Classic stamp.</p> <p><u>Peru:</u> If the document has no room to adhere the stickers, an extension of it is added to the document.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Certain courts apply it onto the signed page; only if there is not enough space on the document.</p>	
<p><u>The Apostille is placed on a separate slip of paper by</u></p>	<p>[31] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Lithuania, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America</p>
<p><i>Self-adhesive sticker</i></p>	<p>[8] Austria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Czech Republic, France, Luxembourg, Namibia, Norway</p>
<p><i>Glue</i></p>	<p>-</p>
<p><i>Rubber stamp</i></p>	<p>[10] Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Kosovo, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia</p>
<p><i>Printing it on the separate slip of paper</i></p>	<p>[20] Argentina, Armenia, Australia,</p>

	Bahrain, Belarus, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Finland, Honduras, Hungary, Lithuania, Namibia, New Zealand, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>Seals</i>	[8] Australia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Greece, Honduras, Namibia, Norway
<p><i>Other</i></p> <p><u>Australia</u>: Embossed red wafter seals, wet ink stamps and brass eyelets and ribbon are also used to attach the allonge to the document so that it remains tamper evident.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: As mentioned, the Apostille is reproduced on paper on a supplementary page (an "allonge" to the document), which is attached after the page with the signature by means of a small, special round metallic staple. At the interior of the junction between the document and the 'Apostille page', the seal of the Competent Authority is apposed.</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: The corners are bent, stapled and sealed on top and behind the joint.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: With the loop.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: If there is not enough space of the public document, the Apostille is placed on a separate slip of paper.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: tampon, en la cousant.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: Simplicity: production of printed blank is technologically simpler than a sticker. Security: special printed blank is more secure than Apostille stamp.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Allonge lorsque le format du document ne permet l'apposition de l'apostille sur le document lui-même.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: The certificate is then bound and sealed with green ribbon and a red seal. It also contains the Department's dry endorsed and wet stamps.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Ministry of Internal Affairs: following the application of the Apostille, a stamp bearing a coat of arms is also applied. Half of it is applied onto the Apostille, and the other half of the stamp is applied onto the document itself.</p> <p>For the judicial document, the Apostille is placed on the document or, if possible, also on the extension. It can also be stapled on the document.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Methods of affixation vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	<p>[11] Australia, China (Macao SAR), Dominican Republic, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Monaco, Romania, South Africa, United States of America</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Both methods are used, depending on the space available.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Practice varies from authority to authority - a separate slip of paper is generally only used if not enough space is left on the document itself.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> Separate paper is used when there is not enough place on the underlying document for an Apostille.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Le critère est celui de la place disponible sur le document à apostiller.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Cela dépend du format du document à apostiller.</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> The Apostille can be placed on a separate paper if there is no place for stamp on the document.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> National Union of Public Notaries from Romania: as a general rule, the Apostille is placed on the page where the seal and signature of the public notary lie, and the allonge is attached to the same sheet of paper, should the document not allow the direct application of the stamp.</p> <p>For judicial documents, the Apostille is placed on the document, or, if possible, also on the extension. It may be stapled on the document.</p> <p><u>Russian Federation:</u> The choice depends both on the mode of filling in the Apostille practiced by the Competent Authority as well as on the document in question. When a rubber stamp is used and the reverse side of the document is blank the Apostille may be stamped on that reverse side. However, this is not done when the Apostille is printed, in which case a separate sheet of paper is always attached to the document to avoid, inter alia, damaging the document while printing the Apostille.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> When there is enough space on the document the Apostille is placed on the document itself, if not, on an allonge. If it is printed out, it is placed on a separate slip of paper.</p>	
b) If a separate slip of paper is used (an <i>allonge</i>), how is it attached to the document?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Staples</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[28]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Macao SAR), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Kosovo, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Grommet</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[5]</p>

	Germany, Latvia, Norway, Romania, United States of America
<u>Ribbons</u>	[13] Australia, Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, France, Germany, Hungary, Latvia, New Zealand, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa
<u>Glue</u>	[7] China (Hong Kong SAR), Costa Rica, Cyprus, France, Germany, Malta, Romania
<u>Tape</u>	[4] Georgia, Germany, Monaco, Norway
<u>Other</u> <u>Australia:</u> Brass eyelets. <u>Bahrain:</u> Secure sticker. <u>Denmark:</u> Special stickers. <u>Finland:</u> Sticker. <u>France:</u> Pratiques variées selon les cours d'appel, sans qu'aucune ne soit vraiment majoritaire. <u>Greece:</u> Seals. <u>Montenegro:</u> In addition, on some documents the institution stamp can be placed on two linked papers of the document. <u>Namibia:</u> A separate paper is bound together with the document using a legal tape <u>Peru:</u> With glue labels and cold seals. <u>Portugal:</u> Timbre. <u>Slovakia:</u> Rubans liés par le sceau avec l'armoiries de l'État. <u>Slovenia:</u> If there is only one piece of paper, Apostille is attached to the document either using round sticker labels (at least three are used) that are stamped or attached with three colored ribbon; the remainder of the ribbon is then fixed with a round sticker label to the back (last page) of the documentation and the stamp is also put on the sticker. For documents with several pages, the Apostille is attached with ribbon.	[13] Australia, Bahrain, Denmark, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Montenegro, Namibia, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia
<i>Comments:</i>	
<u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority.	

<p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: If the document does not have sufficient space for the whole 'Apostille' label, part of the label will be glued to the document.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: It is stapled and then covered with self-adhesive sticker and stamped.</p> <p><u>Dominican Republic</u>: Seales on the bent area and behind it.</p> <p><u>Estonia</u>: With the loop.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: Cordelette du sceau et sceau plaqué</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: MoJ, HNCCLN: ribbon, sticker, stamp / MFAT: staples, sticker, stamp.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Si necessaire, avec rubans pour attacher plusieurs pages.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Staples + stamp on the front and on the back of the document that includes the staple. (Ministry of Internal Affairs, the National Union of Public Notaries from Romania and most of the courts).</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
<p>c) In the case of a one-page public document, where is the Apostille placed / <i>allonge</i> attached?</p>	
<p><u>The front of the document</u></p>	<p>[21] Armenia, Austria, Belgium, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovakia, South Africa, United States of America</p>
<p><u>The back of the document</u></p>	<p>[38] Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Peru, Romania, Russian</p>

	Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, Uruguay, Venezuela
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Where there is space available.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Always underneath the signature. If there is enough space on the front, if not on the back.</p> <p><u>Bahrain:</u> Separate slip of paper.</p> <p><u>Belgium:</u> Cela dépend de la place qu'il y a au recto.</p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> If there is space on the page, it will be the page containing the signature.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic:</u> If space allows it, the Apostille is placed on the front of document; if there is not enough place, Apostille is placed on the back of the document.</p> <p><u>France:</u> Pratiques variées selon les cours d'appel, sans qu'aucune ne soit vraiment majoritaire.</p> <p><u>Honduras:</u> An additional paper is attached to the Apostille.</p> <p><u>Lithuania:</u> It depends on the composition of the document. Usually on the side where is authentication (signature and seal).</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> Most Competent Authorities place the apostille in the front of the document when this is possible.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> National Union of Public Notaries from Romania: the Apostille is placed either on the front of the document, space permitting, or on the back of the document if the page is empty and has not been marked by the public notary as a "blank page". Also, it can be placed on the allonge, at the level of the seal and the signature of the public notary. As regards the judicial documents, the Apostille is placed below the signature or on the back of the page bearing the signature. If there is not enough space, the extension is applied (A4 format), following the page with the signature. Space permitting, it is applied either on the front of the page, or on the back of the page if the page is empty and has not been marked by the public notary as a "blank page" or on the allonge, at the same level with the seal and the signature of the public notary.</p>	
d) In the case of a multi-page document, where is the Apostille placed / allonge attached?	
<u>The first page of the document</u>	<p>[9]</p> <p>Armenia, Estonia, Finland, Germany, Namibia, New Zealand, Portugal, South Africa, United States of America</p>
<u>The last page of the document</u>	<p>[13]</p> <p>Argentina, Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Germany, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Mauritius, Montenegro,</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The page with the signature / seal / stamp</u></p>	<p>Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Venezuela [36] Australia, Austria, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Romania, Slovakia, Slovenia, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Other</u></p> <p><u>Australia</u>: Normally at the front of the package of documents, as close as possible to where the signature/seal appears.</p> <p><u>Bahrain</u>: Separate slip of paper.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: MFAT: the Apostille is attached to the page which bears the stamp/seal and signature.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: All pages are joined by an adhesive sticker at the top.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Usually Apostille is placed on the page with the signature/ seal/ stamp. If there is a limited space on the page with signature/ seal/ stamp, Apostille is placed on the last page of the document.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Au besoin sur une allonge apposée à la page où apparaissent la signature, le sceau et le timbre ou l'apostille est apposée à l'arrière de plusieurs pages qui sont préalablement cornées ou pliées en cascade avec un espacement régulier et un tampon.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[6] Australia, Germany, Latvia, Monaco, Norway, Uruguay</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>France</u>: Dans la mesure du possible, l'apostille est apposée sur la page comportant la signature / sceau / timbre, sauf en cas de manque de place, auquel cas elle est apposée sur la dernière page.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: cf. 8.5 c)</p> <p><u>Greece</u>: If the pages are numbered the Apostille is set on the last page.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Si possible, sinon sur une autre page ou une feuille séparée.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
<p>Question 8.5 e) and f) –For Apostilles issued in electronic form (e-Apostilles)</p>	

e) What technology is used by your Competent Authority(ies) to affix or logically associate the Apostille to the underlying public document?	
The underlying electronic public document and the e-Apostille are converted into one single pdf-file by using the software "pdf merge".	Austria
Secure sticker.	Bahrain
In the Apostille certificate, Chile introduces several boxes to better profile the document with the Apostille.	Chile
The colombian apostille is generated in this specific format PDF/A signed by an advanced electronic signature in PAdES- LTV (Advanced Electronic Signature Long Time Validation). Attached to the apostille is the PDF of the document, subject to the apostille keeping the electronic signature to the documents which its origin is also electronic with digital signature. For the rest of the documents which do not have digital signature the PDF includes a digitalisation made by the user.	Colombia
Adobe.	New Zealand
Document to be apostilled and an Apostille are combined in one pdf document that is then signed by a judge.	Slovenia
The Venezuelan apostille is generated in this specific format PDF/A signed by an advanced electronic signature.	Venezuela
f) How does that technology ensure that the Apostille is not tampered with?	
When the digital signature of the e-Apostille is verified, the underlying public document can be viewed as it was originally issued.	Austria
QR code is printed onto the secure sticker that contains public document info.	Bahrain
The automatic signature has two internal process, one is a xml file, and the other is pdf file. Both process are endowed of "Advances Electronic Signature" through Touken or HSM Sever. These characters prevent violating the apostille and provides the highest security standard.	Chile
The electronic signature allows: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Guarantees the identity and responsibility by the author of the document. - It assures the integrity of the document, it means the information cannot be modified - It includes a chronological stamp that allows to determine in real time, the signature of the document. - It allows to determine that the certificate was in effect when it was signed. - Guarantees also the integrity of the attached document. 	Colombia
If it is separated only half of the seal is shown in the joint.	Dominican Republic
GlobalSign created a digital certificate which also verifies our office authority to issue e-Apostilles. A digital embossed seal and signature are electronically added to an e-Apostille using a security feature SSL Certificate which locks the document in a PDF format so that it cannot be tampered with.	New Zealand
By using electronic signature - any eventual change of the document makes the electronic signature invalid. There is also the possibility to check e-Register for every Apostille issued by district courts.	Slovenia

For the security code verification presenting apostille to the citizen.	Venezuela
Section 9 – Register of Apostilles	
9.1 Maintaining the register	
a) Are particulars of each Apostille issued recorded by your Competent Authority(ies) in a register?	
<p><u>Yes - What information is recorded?</u></p>	<p>[55]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>The number and date of the Apostille (requirement of Art. 7(1))</i></p>	<p>[52]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech</p>

	<p>Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>The name and capacity of the person signing the document and/or the name of authority whose seal or stamp is affixed thereto (requirement of Art. 7(1))</i></p>	<p>[51] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America</p>
<p><i>The name and/or type of the underlying document</i></p>	<p>[41] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia,</p>

	Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>A description of the contents of the underlying document</i>	[18] Argentina, Austria, Belarus, China (Macao SAR), Czech Republic, France, Germany, Honduras, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Romania, Serbia, Tajikistan
<i>The name of the applicant</i>	[37] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Bulgaria, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>The “State of destination”</i>	[36] Argentina, Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Chile, Colombia,

	Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, New Zealand, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, South Africa, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America
<i>A copy of the Apostille</i>	[25] Australia, Bahrain, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Malta, Mexico, Montenegro, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, United States of America
<i>A copy of the underlying document</i>	[11] Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Montenegro, Romania, United States of America
<i>The fees of the Apostille</i>	[22] Argentina, Austria, Colombia, Czech Republic, Georgia, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, New Zealand, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan

<p><i>Other</i></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: Application receipt date, receiving employee, signature of the officer placing the apostille, person signing the apostille, apostille pick-up date and signature.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: A copy of the identity card of the applicant.</p> <p><u>Hungary</u>: Only the MFAT keeps a copy of the underlying document and the Apostille.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Number of receipt.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: DOB, phone numbers of the applicants.</p> <p><u>Romania</u>: Number of document that the Apostille was placed onto.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: La date de l'expédition ou de la réception.</p> <p><u>South Africa</u>: The specific reference number provided to each customer, therefore it is possible to confirm all information by verifying the specific process slip, which was issued (internal use/purposes).</p>	<p>[10]</p> <p>Armenia, China (Macao SAR), France, Greece, Israel, Republic of Korea, Romania, Slovakia, South Africa, United States of America</p>
<p><u>No</u></p>	
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: Depending on the Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>Georgia</u>: Concerning the copy of the Apostille: the copy of the printout of the apostille is not kept, though the copy of the information printed on the Apostille can be reached electronically any time.</p> <p><u>Germany</u>: La pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Israel has two competent authorities. The answer above refers to the MFA. The Courts Administration does not record the particulars of each Apostille issued.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: A copy of the Apostille is recorded only at district courts not at the Ministry of Justice.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
<p>b) In what form is the register kept?</p>	
<p><u>Electronic form, <i>not</i> publicly accessible online</u></p>	<p>[25]</p> <p>Argentina, Austria, China (Macao SAR), Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovenia, United States of America</p>
<p><u>Electronic form, publicly accessible online (an "e-Register") – with the following features:</u></p>	<p>[20]</p>

	Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>The URL for the relevant website is indicated in the Apostille</i>	[17] Australia, Austria, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>The register incorporates features to avoid "fishing expeditions" (i.e., attempts by users to collect information about an Apostille that he/she has not received)</i> <u>Costa Rica</u> : Il est nécessaire de rentrer un numéro inscrit sur l'apostille pour en vérifier l'authenticité. Une personne n'étant pas en possession d'un document apostillé, ne peut pas accéder à l'information. <u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u> : Reference Code and Verification Code	[13] Australia, Bahrain, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>The register allows users to view details about the Apostille (e.g., the entries against any of the 10 numbered standard informational items)</i> <u>New Zealand</u> : Apostille number, date of issue, name and capacity of person who signed the document	[10] Australia, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, New Zealand, Romania, Slovenia, Venezuela
<i>The register allows users to access the Apostille, or an image thereof</i>	[9] Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, Venezuela
<i>The register allows users to access the underlying document, or an image thereof</i>	[5] Austria, Colombia, Romania, Slovenia, Venezuela
<i>The register allows users to verify the signature on the Apostille</i>	[12] Australia, Austria, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica, Georgia, Romania, Slovenia, Uruguay, United States of

	America, Venezuela
<u>Paper form</u>	[24] Armenia, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Kosovo, Lithuania, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovakia, South Africa
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> depending on the Competent Authority (public e-Register Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs in case of e-Apostille only).</p> <p><u>France:</u> La plupart des cours d'appel tiennent un registre informatique (ce n'est pas un "e-Registre"). A noter toutefois que le registre de la CA de Paris est tenu sous forme papier.</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> In addition to the e-Register accessible publicly, the Agency has its own register not accessible publicly online.</p> <p><u>Greece:</u> The Decentralized Administration of Attica uses Electronic form.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Depending on the issuing authority. In the MoJ the register is electronic, however every case has a separate, paper form file in which the request form, containing all information listed under point a) above is kept. MFAT has an electronic register containing basic data of each case, supplemented by a paper based register which includes the request form together with a copy of the underlying document and the Apostille. HNCCLN has an electronic register supplemented by a paper based register containing the request form and the copy of the invoice. However, the copies of the documents and Apostille are not kept.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> The register should be in electronic format in 2017.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> National Union of Public Notaries from Romania and most of the courts have ticked "Paper form"; Ministry of Internal Affairs and a very low number of courts have ticked the first four checkboxes from the "Electronic form", respectively the last four checkboxes from the "Electronic form".</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> The Register of the Ministry of Justice is not publicly accessible, e-Register of district courts is.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.</p>	

c) How is the register maintained?	
<u>Each Competent Authority maintains its own register</u>	[32] Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Kosovo, Lithuania, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, United States of America
<u>Competent Authorities maintain a common register</u>	[21] Australia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Uruguay, Venezuela
d) For how long do Competent Authorities retain records of particulars in their register?	
<u>Less than one year</u>	
<u>Between one and five years</u>	[7] Armenia, Finland, Japan, Republic of Korea, Montenegro, Norway, Romania
<u>Between five and ten years</u>	[10] Austria, Bosnia & Herzegovina, France, Germany, Kosovo, Luxembourg, New Zealand, Norway, Romania, Turkey
<u>Ten years or more</u>	[17] Austria, Belarus, China (Hong

	Kong SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Greece, Hungary, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Venezuela
<u>Indefinitely</u>	[32] Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Latvia, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, South Africa, Uruguay
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Depending on the Competent Authority.</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> 4 years.</p> <p><u>France:</u> L'on note que lorsque le registre est informatisé, la conservation est généralement d'une durée illimitée.</p> <p><u>Germany:</u> La pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Hungary:</u> Depending on the issuing authority. HNCCLN: Indefinitely.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> Three years, according to the laws and regulations.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> The applicable Regulation No. 01/2015 on Unique marks for classification of documents and their time of preservation, through its Annex I) specifies that the public documents subject of legalisation and Apostillisation should be retained/preserved for ever/permanently by issuing authorities. (http://map.rks-gov.net/getattachment/138ffd8b-9cc1-4168-99a0-7e6fbe0fb1d7/RREGULLORJA-(MAP)-NR-01-2015-PER-SHENJAT-UNIKE-TE.aspx)</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> The period Competent Authorities retain records varies from one to ten years or more.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> As regards the courts, the applications must be kept over a 5 years period, however the registry itself must be kept on an indefinite term.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> District Courts retain records of the register indefinitely, Ministry of Justice retains it for ten years or more.</p>	

United States of America: Practices vary among U.S. competent authorities.	
9.2 Checking the register	
Only for Contracting Parties in which Competent Authorities keep a Register in paper or in electronic form BUT it is not publicly accessible online (i.e. not an e-Register)	
a) How frequently is a request made to your Competent Authority(ies) to check the register of Apostilles?	
<u>Never</u>	[13] China (Macao SAR), France, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Kosovo, Latvia, Malta, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Romania
<u>Once per year</u>	[10] Czech Republic, Denmark, Finland, Japan, Republic of Korea, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia
<u>Between 2 and 10 times per year</u>	[6] Argentina, Austria, Luxembourg, Romania, Serbia, South Africa
<u>Between 10 and 20 times per year</u>	[2] Cyprus, Lithuania
<u>More than 20 times per year</u> <u>Armenia</u> : 30	[4] Armenia, Norway, Romania, United States of America
<u>Unknown</u>	[9] Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Croatia, Ecuador, Estonia, Greece, Romania, Slovakia, Turkey
Comments: <u>Austria</u> : Regional Court of Vienna and Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs. <u>Finland</u> : Very seldom. <u>France</u> : Seules 6 cours d'appel (sur 37) ont indiqué avoir reçu de telles demandes:	

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - 1 cour d'appel 1 fois par an (Rennes) ; - 3 cours d'appel moins de 10 fois par an (dont Paris) ; - 2 cours d'appel plus de 10 fois par an. <p><u>Germany:</u> La pratique varie dans les différents Länder fédéraux.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> So far both Competent Authorities have not registered any request made for checking the register of issued Apostilles.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> Some Competent Authorities have had none or only a few such requests.</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> rarement il y a demandes pour verifier l'apostille.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> Certain courts have ticked "never" and "once per year". Public Notaries Union and certain courts ticked "Between 2 and 10 times per year". Certain courts mentioned that no request have been made over the past 8 years for the verification of any Apostille.</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> The information is valid for the Ministry of Justice.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> An approximate estimate is not available.</p>	
<p><i>Only for Contracting Parties in which Competent Authorities keep an e-Register</i></p> <p>b) If an e-Register is kept by your Competent Authority(ies), do you have statistics on how frequently the e-Register is consulted?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> 374 times in 2015.</p> <p><u>Colombia:</u> 2012: 172,780; 2013: 952,657; 2014: 226,259; 2015: 150,757.</p> <p><u>Romania:</u> On a daily basis (Ministry of Internal Affairs; certain courts).</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> - year 2013 - 288 unique visitors / - year 2014 - 228 unique visitors / - year 2015 - 1153 unique visitors / - year 2016 (jan. - june) - 4812 unique visitors.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[8]</p> <p>Bahrain, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Ecuador, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, Tajikistan</p>
<p><i>Has the implementation of an e-Register led to more Apostilles being checked against the register?</i></p>	
<p>Yes</p> <p><u>Slovenia:</u> Before the e-Register Apostilles at district courts were checked once or few times per year</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[3]</p> <p>Ecuador, Mexico, Slovenia</p>
<p>No</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">-</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[14]</p> <p>Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Kosovo, New Zealand, Romania, Russian Federation, United States of America</p>

<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Australia:</u> Google analytics can be used to determine how many times the URL is accessed by clients but there are generally no statistics on what type of enquirer it is conducting the search.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Answer refers to Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile, but our system will be electronic.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Not for the moment.</p> <p>With entrance into force of Regulation (By-Law) and adoption of the application form and release into operation of e-Register as indicated in above answers, the two Competent Authorities will be in position to extraculate the statistics.</p> <p><u>United States of America:</u> Statistics are currently unavailable but could be generated by the competent authorities that maintain e-Registers.</p>	
<p>Section 10 – The effect of Apostilles</p>	
<p>10.1 Apostilles issued in your jurisdiction</p>	
<p>a) Has a paper Apostille or e Apostille issued by your Competent Authority(ies) ever been refused to be given effect by a recipient from another Contracting Party (i.e., has the Apostille been rejected)?</p>	
<p><u>Yes, on what grounds:</u></p>	<p>[20] Argentina, Australia, Colombia, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Germany, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>The Apostille was not square-shaped</i></p>	<p>[3] Germany, Romania, United States of America</p>
<p><i>The Apostille did not have sides at least nine centimetres long</i></p>	<p>[3] France, Germany, United States of America</p>
<p><i>The Apostille did not have a border</i></p>	<p>[1] United States of America</p>
<p><i>The colour of the ink used to print the Apostille</i></p>	<p>[3] Australia, Colombia, France</p>

<i>The Apostille was signed other than by hand ("wet" signature)</i>	[4] Colombia, France, Romania, Slovenia
<i>The Apostille was not signed at all</i>	[2] France, Romania
<i>The Apostille was issued in electronic form (an e-Apostille)</i>	[1] Colombia
<i>The Apostille had expired</i>	[2] Colombia, France
<i>The manner in which the Apostille was numbered</i>	-
<i>The manner in which the Apostille was affixed to the underlying document</i> <u>Republic of Korea</u> : It looked so easy to affix. <u>Luxembourg</u> : Pas de tampon au coin du document. <u>Monaco</u> : Non utilisation de rubans. <u>United States of America</u> : Staples Apostilles have been rejected.	[4] Republic of Korea, Luxembourg, Monaco, United States of America
<i>The Apostille was physically detached from the underlying document</i>	[2] France, Romania
<i>The underlying document was not a public document under the law of the "State of destination"</i>	[1] Namibia
<i>The person that signed the underlying document no longer acts in the capacity certified in the Apostille</i>	-
<i>The Apostille did not certify the authenticity of the signature or the capacity in which the person signing the underlying document had acted, whether or not the document was signed (i.e., standard informational item No 2 and 3 are not filled in)</i>	[2] Argentina, Venezuela
<i>Other</i> <u>Australia</u> : India attempted to refuse an Australian Apostille because the ink of the stamp was not blue. The Netherlands advised clients that the Australian Apostille on a birth certificate was expired, rather than explain that the underlying document must be issued no later than 6 months before the Apostille is affixed. Chile has attempted to refuse two Apostilles in the last two months because the Apostille for the Australian Family Court did not state "N/a" under signature where a staff member was issuing the Apostille against the seal of the court. <u>Belarus</u> : The Apostille can be only rejected if it doesn't comply with the requirements stated in the Convention and doesn't correspond to the sample attached to the Convention.	[11] Australia, Belarus, Costa Rica, Finland, France, Latvia, Malta, Monaco, Montenegro, Norway, Portugal

<p><u>Costa Rica:</u> L'Espagne ne donne pas effet à l'apostille si celle-ci n'a pas été présentée, postérieurement à celle-ci, à l'Ambassade d'Espagne au Costa Rica et avant toute présentation du document en Espagne. Cette formalité s'appelle "Compulsar el documento apostillado".</p> <p><u>Finland:</u> Some countries have required the apostille to be translated into their own language.</p> <p><u>France:</u> En matière d'adoption, la Russie exige l'apposition du sceau entre les pages et refuse l'apostille lorsque l'une des pages du document a légèrement bougé; cet État exige l'apposition du sceau sur chaque angle des photos quand il y en a. Selon une cour d'appel, l'Argentine demande l'apposition de l'apostille sur l'original des diplômes, et rejette les apostilles sur copies certifiées conformes. Autres cas cités par les Autorités françaises: feuillets non cornés, rejet lié à la qualité du document traduit et non à l'apostille. La majorité des difficultés concernent les actes à destination de la Russie.</p> <p><u>Latvia:</u> As there is no such an institution as sworn translator in Latvia, the signature of a translator must be certified by notary. Nevertheless in some cases the certification of signature of the translator has been requested. The issue was solved with a relevant state.</p> <p><u>Malta:</u> The embossed print on the apostille was questioned by the Russian authorities.</p> <p><u>Monaco:</u> Le sceau ne dépasse pas le cadre de l'apostille, ce qui entraîne des risques de fraudes car la personne peut alors décoller l'apostille du document et la recoller sur un autre document.</p> <p><u>Montenegro:</u> Slovak Republic does not accept the apostille placed in the prescribed manner in cases where the public document was signed by the authorized person, which is in accordance with the regulations of Montenegro. They have objections to the signature of the authorized person.</p> <p><u>Norway:</u> To our knowledge there has only been a few such refusals.</p> <p><u>Portugal:</u> demandes sur l'acte public sous-jacent.</p>	
<p><u>No / unknown</u></p>	<p>[34] Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Kosovo, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Turkey, Uruguay</p>

<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments</i></p> <p><u>Australia</u>: In all cases above, the Australian Competent Authority referred clients to the Apostille handbook and advised them to go back to the authority in the receiving State to confirm the requirements.</p> <p><u>Austria</u>: Answer refers to the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.</p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: Ancienne apostille.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Both Competent Authorities had not registered any refusal/rejection of the issued Apostilles.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: Nothing recently.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The State has not reported any incident.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Rarement il y a des questions sur l'apostille des autorités de Portugal.</p>	
b) If an Apostille was rejected, what action did you take?	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The Apostille was reissued</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[8] Argentina, China (Macao SAR), Finland, France, Romania, Namibia, Norway, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The receiving authority was contacted</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[9] Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Latvia, Malta, Monaco, Norway, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The Competent Authority of the "State of destination" was contacted</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7] Colombia, Dominican Republic, Norway, Romania, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Diplomatic mission of the "State of destination" in your jurisdiction was contacted</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[9] Australia, Bahrain, Colombia, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Honduras, Peru, Tajikistan, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Diplomatic mission of your jurisdiction in the "State of destination" was contacted</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7] Bahrain, Colombia, Honduras, Republic of Korea, Mauritius, Tajikistan, United States of America</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>The Permanent Bureau was contacted</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[6]</p>

	Bahrain, Colombia, Germany, Honduras, Norway, United States of America
<u>No action taken</u>	[3] Belarus, Norway, Romania
<u>Other</u> <u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. <u>Costa Rica:</u> L'usager a dû revenir au Costa Rica pour que la formalité de "compulsar el documento apostillado" soit réalisée. <u>Czech Republic:</u> N/A. <u>France:</u> Délivrance d'une attestation de validité des apostilles par le magistrat, elle-même apostillée dans un cas. <u>Germany:</u> Emission d'une nouvelle apostille. <u>Lithuania:</u> Unknown. <u>Montenegro:</u> In case that we mentioned in the previous answer, the Party will ask for new document with a different signature on the public document. <u>Portugal:</u> Inconnu si il y a des apostilles rejetées. <u>Serbia:</u> We don't have information. <u>Slovenia:</u> The Competent Authority wrote a letter on a request of the applicant for the receiving authority and explained the existence of the E-register, the fact that district court judges do not sign the Apostille by hand/with the wet signature anymore and the manner of issuing Apostilles in Slovenia was explained as well as the fact that all of the information is available on the Apostille Section of the Hague Conference. <u>United States of America:</u> The U.S. Department of State assists in instances when Apostilles are rejected inappropriately.	[11] Bosnia & Herzegovina, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, France, Germany, Lithuania, Montenegro, Portugal, Serbia, Slovenia
c) Has an authority of another Contracting Party ever requested your Competent Authority(ies) to certify or confirm procedures for issuing Apostilles?	
<u>Yes</u> <u>Armenia:</u> We have been asked to provide info on our procedure for placing an apostille as well as the format we employ. <u>Australia:</u> Information is contained on www.smartraveller.gov.au so all other Competent Authorities or foreign missions are referred to that information. Australia's Competent Authority has also held briefings for foreign mission in Australia concerning the issuing of Apostilles at Australia's missions overseas and issued information by Third Person Note (also through the Permanent Bureau). <u>Colombia:</u> The Prosecution in Venezuela through the Colombian Consulate in Caracas requires the confirmation of Colombian apostilles in some cases.	[11] Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Colombia, Portugal, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela

<p><u>Portugal</u>: Rarement il y a des questions sur l'acte public sous-jacent.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: Few times we were requested by an authority from another Contracting State, mostly by the applicant going abroad, since the receiving authorities received to accept the Apostille that was printed out (was made without using rubber stamp). Instead of verifying the e-Register, the foreign Authorities rejected documents and asked for additional official explanation from the Central Authority. Applicants then turned to the Ministry of Justice of Slovenia that provided them with a letter where everything was explained.</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Competent authorities have reported requests from receiving authorities or foreign diplomatic missions to explain the process or to certify Apostilles. In these instances the U.S. Department of State assists by engaging directly with the inquiring entity.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[41] Austria, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria</u>: answer refers to the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.</p> <p><u>Chile</u>: The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Très rare - Seules deux cours d'appel ont eu une telle demande de la part de la Russie et de la Biélorussie, portant sur la mention "néant" inscrite sur les extraits de casier judiciaire, au lieu et place de la signature (NB: les extraits de casier judiciaire ne sont pas signés); une attestation de validité des apostilles a alors été délivrée.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Israel has been recently been approached by the Permanent Bureau in regards to a problem which arose with a possible denial of a competent authority for a request for Apostille certification, assumingly for use in another Contracting State. The Permanent Bureau was apparently informed of the issue by that</p>	

<p>Contracting State. It seems preferable that in such circumstances the Competent Authority in the Contracting State directly approach the Competent Authorities or National Organs of the other Contracting State, in order for the matter to be resolved expediently. This is especially important if matters pertaining to the procedure for issuing Apostille are in question. Israel does not see such practice as contravening C&R No. 27 of the 2012 SC.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: Unknown.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: C'était seulement les diplômes qui avaient été contrôlés comme ça parfois.</p> <p><u>Venezuela</u>: Code verification request validation of electronic apostille, should be manual with a detailed certification requirement in commit is issued.</p>	
10.2 Foreign Apostilles produced in your jurisdiction	
a) On which of the following grounds has the effect of a foreign Apostille in fact been refused to be given by recipients in your jurisdiction?	
<u>The Apostille was not square-shaped</u>	[1] Germany
<u>The Apostille did not have sides at least nine centimetres long</u>	[1] Germany
<u>The Apostille did not have a border</u>	-
<u>The colour of the ink used to print the Apostille</u>	-
<u>The Apostille was signed other than by hand ("wet" signature)</u>	[2] Bosnia & Herzegovina, Germany
<u>The Apostille was not signed at all</u>	[4] Czech Republic, Germany, Lithuania, Romania
<u>The Apostille was issued in electronic form (an e-Apostille)</u>	[1] Russian Federation
<u>The Apostille had expired</u>	[1] Lithuania
<u>The manner in which the Apostille was numbered</u>	-
<u>The manner in which the Apostille was affixed to the underlying document</u>	[1] Ecuador
<u>The Apostille was physically detached from the underlying document</u>	[6] Czech Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Germany Romania

<u>The underlying document was not a public document under your internal law</u>	[2] Germany, Romania
<u>The person that signed the underlying document no longer acts in the capacity certified in the Apostille</u>	[2] Bosnia & Herzegovina, Germany
<u>The Apostille does not certify the authenticity of the signature or the capacity in which the person signing the underlying document had acted, whether or not the document was signed (i.e., standard informational items n°2 and 3 are not filled in)</u>	[5] Argentina, Costa Rica, Estonia, Germany, Romania
<u>Other</u> <u>Belarus:</u> It doesn't comply with the requirements stated in the Convention. <u>Colombia:</u> The Apostille does not certify the authenticity of the signature or the capacity in which the person signing the underlying document had acted. <u>Finland:</u> The apostille was attached to an uncertified copy.	[4] Australia, Belarus, Colombia, Finland
<u>None of the above / unknown</u>	[32] Armenia, Australia, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Denmark, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Japan, Republic of Korea, Latvia, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, United States of America, Venezuela
<i>Comments:</i> <u>Armenia:</u> No such known cases. <u>Australia:</u> Australia's Competent Authority does not receive advice when an Apostille is refused, however, through delivery of Consular services, we are aware that some Australian Banks do not understand the effect of an Apostille and we are attempting to educate them so that Apostilles can be relied on where documents have been witnessed by foreign Notary Public (for example, Power of Attorney executed in a foreign state but issued by an Australian bank, witnessed by a foreign notary public). <u>Chile:</u> The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. <u>China (Hong Kong SAR):</u> No such experience. <u>China (Macao SAR):</u> It should be considered on a case by case basis.	

<p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Before rejection we would try to contact the authority which issued the Apostille to verify whether the Apostille was lawfully issued by the State of origin.</p> <p><u>France</u>: Sans objet, informations non disponibles pour les parquets généraux et l'autorité centrale.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: It is up to each individual authority concerned to decide whether or not to reject foreign Apostilles for any reason.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: N/A.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: À ce jour, aucun refus n' a été porté à la connaissance de l'Autorité centrale.</p> <p><u>New Zealand</u>: We do not collect information on the use of foreign Apostilles in New Zealand.</p> <p><u>Norway</u>: N/A.</p> <p><u>Peru</u>: The State has not reported any incident.</p> <p><u>Portugal</u>: Inconnu si les autres services publics ou privés on a refusé des effets des apostilles étrangers.</p>	
<p>b) On which of the following grounds might the effect of a foreign Apostille possibly be refused to be given by recipients in your jurisdiction?</p>	
<u>The Apostille was not square-shaped</u>	[2] Czech Republic, Germany
<u>The Apostille did not have sides at least nine centimetres long</u>	[3] Czech Republic, Germany, Uruguay
<u>The Apostille did not have a border</u>	[2] Bulgaria, Czech Republic
<u>The colour of the ink used to print the Apostille</u>	[1] Bulgaria
<u>The Apostille was signed other than by hand ("wet" signature)</u>	[4] Bulgaria, Germany, Romania, Russian Federation
<u>The Apostille was not signed at all</u>	[14] Armenia, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Denmark, Estonia, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Namibia, Romania, Russian Federation, United States of America
<u>The Apostille was issued in electronic form (an e-Apostille)</u>	-
<u>The Apostille had expired</u>	[3] Bulgaria, Czech Republic, Finland

<u>The manner in which the Apostille was numbered</u>	-
<u>The manner in which the Apostille was affixed to the underlying document</u>	-
<u>The Apostille was physically detached from the underlying document</u>	[9] Bulgaria, Ecuador, Finland, Germany, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Namibia, Romania, Russian Federation
<u>The underlying document was not a public document under your internal law</u>	[3] Belgium, Germany, Romania
<u>The person that signed the underlying document no longer acts in the capacity certified in the Apostille</u>	[1] Germany
<u>The Apostille does not certify the authenticity of the signature or the capacity in which the person signing the underlying document had acted, whether or not the document was signed (i.e., standard informational items n°2 and 3 are not filled in)</u>	[13] Armenia, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Costa Rica, Czech Republic, Denmark, Georgia, Germany, Republic of Korea, Russian Federation, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>Other</u> <u>Armenia:</u> Missing a seal. <u>Belarus:</u> It doesn't comply with the requirements stated in the Convention. <u>Bulgaria:</u> Any component of the Apostille that gives an impression of forgery or violating the integrity of the sticker. <u>Finland:</u> The form of the Apostille is manifestly different from the requirements of the Convention.	[5] Armenia, Bahrain, Belarus, Bulgaria, Finland
<u>None of the above / unknown</u>	[22] Bosnia & Herzegovina, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Germany, Honduras, Israel, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia
<u>Comments:</u> <u>China (Macao SAR):</u> It should be considered on a case by case basis. <u>France:</u> Sans objet, informations non disponibles pour les parquets généraux et l'autorité centrale.	

<p><u>Japan</u>: It is up to each individual authority concerned to decide whether or not to reject foreign Apostilles for any reason.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: À ce jour, aucun refus n' a été porté à la connaissance de l'Autorité centrale.</p>	
<p>c) Is any time limit applied with respect to the effect of foreign Apostilles and/or foreign public documents that are produced in your jurisdiction?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Belgium</u>: L'apostille reste toujours valable mais les actes d'état civil ne sont valables que 6 mois.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: 6 months</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[2] Belgium, Montenegro</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[46] Argentina, Armenia, Austria, Bahrain, Belarus, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Dominican Republic, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Georgia, Germany, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Monaco, Namibia, New Zealand, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovakia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Ecuador</u>: If the document has an expiration date, expires with the apostille.</p> <p><u>Japan</u>: It is up to each individual authority concerned to decide whether or not to reject foreign Apostilles for any reason.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea</u>: It depends on the authorities.</p> <p><u>Latvia</u>: Time limits can be on the effect for certain public documents (for example, certificates of marital status are valid for 6 months), not to Apostille itself.</p> <p><u>Montenegro</u>: Documents issued in Montenegro have 6 months time limit.</p>	

Section 11 – The e-APP

11.1 Implementation

a) Has either component of the e-APP been implemented by your Competent Authority(ies)?

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[19]</p> <p>Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Georgia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Romania, Slovenia, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p><i>The e-Apostille component</i></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[7]</p> <p>Austria, Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, New Zealand, Romania, Slovenia</p>
<p><i>The e-Register component</i></p> <p>Australia: https://orao.dfat.gov.au/pages/verifyapostille.aspx</p> <p>Austria: https://www.signaturpruefung.gv.at, https://www.signature-verification.gv.at</p> <p>Bulgaria: http://apostil.mjs.bg; http://apostille.mfa.bg; http://apostille.mon.bg</p> <p>Chile: https://consulta.apostilla.gob.cl</p> <p>China (Hong Kong SAR): https://e-services.judiciary.gov.hk/apoereg/?locale=en</p> <p>Colombia: www.cancilleria.gov.co/apostilla</p> <p>Costa Rica: http://www.rree.go.cr/index.php?sec=servicios%20al%20publico&cat=servicios%20de%20autenticacion&cont=726</p> <p>Dominican Republic: http://www.mirex.gob.do/servicios/apostille-legalizaciones</p> <p>Georgia: http://Apostille.cra.gov</p> <p>Malta: N/A.</p> <p>Mexico: http://dicoppu-portal.segob.gob.mx/registro/; http://187.141.34.91/Legalizacion/Apostillar.php; https://serviciosgg.jalisco.gob.mx/certificaciones/; http://www.bcs.gob.mx/anuencias/</p> <p>New Zealand: www.dia.govt.nz/apostille</p> <p>Peru: http://apostillaconsulta.rree.gob.pe/consulta/frmConsultaApostilla.aspx.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[21]</p> <p>Australia, Austria, Bahrain, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Costa Rica, Dominican Republic, Japan, Georgia, Mexico, New Zealand, Peru, Romania, Russian Federation, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Uruguay, United States of America</p>

<p><u>Romania</u>: Yes, for the administrative documents where the Ministry of Internal Affairs applies the Apostille; no, for the judicial documents where the courts apply the Apostille or for the notarial documents where the public notary chambers apply the Apostille.</p> <p><u>Slovenia</u>: https://evlozisce.sodisce.si/overitve</p> <p><u>Tajikistan</u>: http://www.apostille.tj</p> <p><u>Uruguay</u>: http://www.mrree.gub.uy/frontend/page?1,dgacv,consulta-publica-de-apostilla,O,es,0,</p> <p><u>United States of America</u>: Multiple U.S. competent authorities.</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[33]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mauritius, Monaco, Montenegro, Namibia, Norway, Peru, Portugal, Romania, Serbia, Slovakia, South Africa, Turkey</p>
<p><i>Only for Contracting Parties that have not implemented either component of the e-APP</i></p>	
<p>b) Has the e-APP been studied by Competent Authorities?</p>	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[19]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, China (Macao SAR), Cyprus, Czech Republic, Denmark, Ecuador, Estonia, Greece, Finland, France, Germany, Hungary, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Mauritius, Monaco, Slovakia, Turkey</p>
<p><i>And both components are being considered for implementation</i></p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: We are in the process of reviewing our procedures in order to introduce both components.</p> <p><u>Czech Republic</u>: Firstly the e-Register should be implemented and then the e-Apostille component might be implemented as well.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[10]</p> <p>Armenia, Czech Republic, Estonia, Finland, France, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Mauritius, Slovakia, Turkey</p>

<p><u>Estonia</u>: The Chamber of Notaries is preparing the project of e-apostille.</p> <p><u>Finland</u>: E-app issues are included in the large ongoing project concerning digitalization of the case management system of the competent authorities. E-app issues will be considered at a larger stage.</p> <p><u>Kosovo</u>: Refer to answer b) of 6.8.</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Nous sommes en train d'examiner la possibilité d'introduction d'un e-registre en tant que première composante. Possibilité d'e-apostille dans la phase suivante. Mais c'est possible que la situation changera après l'application du règlement de l'UE. visant à favoriser la libre circulation des citoyens et des entreprises en simplifiant l'acceptation de certains documents publics dans l'Union européenne.</p>	
<p><i>And only the e-Apostille component is being considered for implementation</i></p> <p><u>Denmark</u>: May be considered.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: For the Macao SAR, the implementation of the e-APP is being considered. However, further study/experience is necessary. In fact, the e-Government policy was launched in the Macao SAR in 2000 and still are in course. It is not deemed appropriate to separate the question of electronic Apostilles from all the rest.</p>	<p>[3] China (Macao SAR), Denmark Greece</p>
<p><i>And only the e-Register component is being considered for implementation</i></p>	<p>[1] Cyprus</p>
<p><i>But neither component is being considered for implementation</i></p>	<p>[2] Denmark, Germany</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p> <p><u>Serbia</u>: It will be studied in the future.</p> <p><u>Honduras</u>: Lack of observation.</p> <p><u>Israel</u>: Israel is interested in examining the possibility of using the e-app.</p>	<p>[9] Bulgaria, Honduras, Israel, Japan, Luxembourg, Montenegro, Norway, Serbia, South Africa</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>France</u>: La France a participé au projet "eApp pour l'Europe" avec le bureau permanent, l'Espagne, la Finlande et la République tchèque. Un atelier a été organisé à Paris en octobre 2011. Toutefois, le projet e-Apostille n'a pu voir le jour à cette époque. Une réflexion d'ensemble est actuellement engagée sur cette matière, qui devra également intégrer la perspective de l'entrée en vigueur courant 2019 du règlement européen sur la libre circulation des documents publics.</p> <p><u>Lithuania</u>: Lithuania is looking and discussing this information.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Défaut de ressources humaines.</p> <p><u>Malta</u>: N/A.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: la législation monégasque a évolué puisque le projet de loi sur le commerce et la preuve électroniques a été adopté sous la forme d'une loi intitulée loi sur l'économie numérique. Des dispositions de cette loi ont permis l'introduction en droit interne de la reconnaissance juridique de l'écrit et de la signature numériques. En revanche, des textes de mise en oeuvre de la loi doivent encore être établis.</p>	

Only for Contracting Parties that have implemented either component of the e-APP or are actively considering doing so

c) Have you contacted other Competent Authorities that already operate an e-APP component and asked for any relevant information or exchange of experience?

<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Armenia:</u> We have hosted an expert mission from Spain related to E-Apostille implementation and are now considering a study visit to further assist us in the introduction of the two components.</p> <p><u>Australia:</u> New Zealand.</p> <p><u>Austria:</u> New Zealand.</p> <p><u>Chile:</u> Colombia and Spain.</p> <p><u>Georgia:</u> A meeting was held in Tbilisi, Georgia which was attended by the representatives of Competent Authorities of Georgia, Great Britain and Austria. Experiences of these countries were exchanged.</p> <p><u>Republic of Korea:</u> We gathered relevant information.</p> <p><u>Turkey:</u> The law authorizes Turkish Post Corporation to implement e-apostille. It made contact with other postal administrations of other countries and asked about legislations on e-APP.</p> <p><u>Tajikistan:</u> Azerbaijan.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[8]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Armenia, Austria, Chile, Australia, Georgia, Republic of Korea, Tajikistan, Turkey</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>No</u></p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[14]</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Bahrain, Belgium, China (Hong Kong SAR), Colombia, Estonia, Finland, Greece, Kosovo, Mauritius, Monaco, Russian Federation, Slovenia, United States of America, Venezuela</p>
<p style="text-align: center;"><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>Austria:</u> Answer refers to Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.</p> <p><u>Kosovo:</u> Kosovo authorities are interested to realize a study visit to an country example; Moldavia or Latvia and learn from practical experiences, as reported above the competent authorities and Government have allocated initial funds to establish an Advanced Category of e-Register as a prelude for application of e-APP.</p> <p><u>Malta:</u> N/A.</p> <p><u>New Zealand:</u> Not recently.</p>	

Only for Contracting Parties that have implemented the e-Apostille component

d) For which of the following documents are e-Apostilles issued by your Competent Authority(ies)?

<u>Electronic public documents</u> <u>Austria:</u> Extracts from electronic databases maintained by Federal Ministries (e.g. birth certificates, marriage certificates, death certificates, extracts relating to civil status, proof of citizenship, criminal records, registration certificates, other extracts from public registers issued in electronic form).	[1] Austria
<u>Paper public documents that have been subsequently scanned</u>	[2] Romania, Tajikistan
<u>Both</u>	[6] Bahrain, Chile, Colombia, New Zealand, Slovenia, Venezuela
<i>Comments:</i> <u>Bahrain:</u> We are ready for both but until now we issue e-apostilles to a paper public document. <u>Malta:</u> N/A. <u>Romania:</u> Documents on paper that are have been subsequently scanned (documents where the Ministry of Internal Affairs applies the Apostille)	
e) Are there any issues (legal or otherwise) that may affect the implementation of the e-APP in your jurisdiction?	
<u>Yes</u> <u>Armenia:</u> The implementation of the e-APP will require designing a new legal instrument. <u>Austria:</u> For the full implementation of the e-Apostille the amendment of the Federal Act of 31 May 1967 on the issuance of the Apostille according to the Hague Convention (BGBl Nr. 28/1968) was initiated. <u>Czech Republic:</u> Money and lack of human resources (connected with effects of the financial crisis); the possibility of increasing the number of Competent Authorities. <u>Israel:</u> Limited resources, privacy issues. <u>Republic of Korea:</u> Personal information protection law, e-Government Law, e-Sign Law, e-Document & e-Commerce Law. <u>Kosovo:</u> As reported above Kosovo authorities needs further assistance by IFC/WBG or other competent bodies to meet the prerequisites of implementing the provisions of the Law on the Information Society Services related with e-signature and the creation of first certified service providers and nucleus of the supervisory authority. <u>Malta:</u> N/A. <u>Montenegro:</u> There is still no possibility to issue a public e-document. <u>Tajikistan:</u> The regulations on the terms and conditions of apostille in a official documents committed by state organs of the Republic of Tajikistan.	[10] Armenia, Austria, Czech Republic, Israel, Republic of Korea, Kosovo, Monaco, Montenegro, Tajikistan, Russian Federation
<u>No</u>	[14] Argentina, Belgium, Bulgaria, Chile, Colombia, Costa Rica,

	Estonia, Georgia, Mauritius, Portugal, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America, Venezuela
<u>Unknown</u>	[12] Australia, China (Macao SAR), Ecuador, Germany, Greece, Honduras, Hungary, Japan, Luxembourg, Norway, Slovakia, Slovenia
<p><i>Comments:</i></p> <p><u>China (Hong Kong SAR)</u>: Further study is required on the e-Apostille component.</p> <p><u>China (Macao SAR)</u>: Further study is required.</p> <p><u>Costa Rica</u>: Pas de problèmes juridiques mais des problèmes logistiques pour mettre en œuvre ce programme.</p> <p><u>Cyprus</u>: Special legislation is need for e-signature. Not a priority yet.</p> <p><u>Luxembourg</u>: Simply, there is no real solution now.</p> <p><u>Monaco</u>: Voir la réponse au point 11.1 b).</p> <p><u>Russian Federation</u>: Comprehensive legal framework needs to be put in place prior to implementing the e-APP.</p>	
Section 12 – Other	
12.1 Additional comments and information	
<i>Contracting Parties that have answered in the negative have not been included</i>	
a) Additional space for one or more questions above	
To answer question 5.2, we could not annex a video which is available on our web site (www.apostilla.gob.cl).	Chile
Remarque: sur 38 autorités désignées, 37 ont répondu au questionnaire. Pour plus de facilité de lectures, il est fait référence aux « cours d'appel » dans les réponses. Toutefois, ce sont les procureurs généraux près les cours d'appel qui sont l'autorité compétente; pour certaines collectivités d'outre-mer, il arrive que l'autorité désignée soit différente. Une liste à jour des autorités sera adressée d'ici la commission spéciale, avec, le cas échéant, une mise à jour de la déclaration faite au dépositaire.	France

See comment 3.1 c).	Lithuania
Question 5.1 b) - à corriger le tarif de l'apostille : 20.- €.	Luxembourg
b) Additional comments or information relating to the practical operation of the Apostille Convention	
As the competence to issue apostilles are shared in Austria's federal system (documents issued by courts or notary publics: Regional Courts; documents issued by administrative authorities: Regional Governments; documents issued by Ministries or Supreme Courts: Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs) we only were able to give partial impressions, mostly focused on the Regional Court of Vienna (Landesgericht für Zivilrechtssachen Wien) and of the Federal Ministry for Europe, Integration and Foreign Affairs.	Austria
The Convention has not yet entered into force in Chile. Once it does we will send the information requested in Annex A related to Competent Authorities.	Chile
J'ai mis en ligne la vidéo de présentation de l'apostille destinée à l'information des usagers à cette adresse: https://youtu.be/z5zEFz-liKE .	Costa Rica
At present education documents are apostilled by the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement of the Ministry of Education and Science of Georgia. After the relevant project is approved by the legislative authority of Georgia, education documents will be accepted and issued by the Public Service Development Agency, but the National Center for Educational Quality Enhancement will carry out all certification-related processes. The purpose of this change is that citizens all over Georgia will be able to submit applications at any territorial offices of the Agency instead of visiting the Center in Tbilisi.	Georgia
La mise en œuvre de l'e-APP est en cours.	Portugal
c) Specific topics or practical issues that you would like to have discussed at the 2016 Special Commission	
<p style="text-align: center;"><u>Yes</u></p> <p><u>Argentina</u>: Besides the topic of evolution of the Apostille, in order to obtain better benefits for users, also we should discuss the issue of false documents.</p> <p><u>Armenia</u>: We would like to discuss the possibilities regarding more prompt and efficient means of verifying the apostilles issued in the countries that do not use the e-APP.</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">[12]</p> <p>Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Colombia, Costa Rica, France, Honduras, Israel, Republic of Korea, Peru, Romania, Slovakia</p>

Australia: How Competent Authorities educate institutions in their State to accept apostilles issued abroad, eg Banking sector etc

Colombia: The rejection of the Colombian e-apostilles because they are digitally signed.

Costa Rica: Sur les points suivants:

1/ l'interprétation de l'article 1 en matière douanière

2/ le problème de la pratique espagnole de "Compulsar" les documents précédemment apostillés.

3/ la création d'un réseau d'alerte interactif entre toutes les autorités chargées de l'Apostille susceptibles de signaler les cas et les risques potentiels de falsification de documents, et permettre d'éclaircir des doutes quant à l'authenticité des documents émis indépendamment du fait que le pays ou l'autorité soit inclus ou non dans un e-Registre.

France: Exclusion de l'article 1er in fine relatif aux documents administratifs ayant trait directement à une opération commerciale ou douanière.

Honduras: To take into consideration to Apostillise all kind of documents. Special measures should be taken to avoid the practice of fraudulent public documents. A special manual or handbook should be given by the Permanent Bureau to fill out the questionnaire.

Israel: Israel proposes to discuss the following topics:

- Issuance by diplomatic or consular agents of Apostille to documents executed by Embassies and consulates or domestic authorities.
- Developing mechanism to ensure that complaints on implementation be sent to contracting states with full details (including contact details for the complaining competent authority) in order to best facilitate looking into the complaint.
- Facilitating direct contact between competent authorities in cases of issue arising from implementation.
- Ensuring that a contracting states do not cease to accept Apostilles from another contracting states without prior consultation with that contracting state or notification to the contracting state.
- Issuing "regular" Apostille to documents in electronic format (with electronic signatures).

Republic of Korea: Standard for e-APP system.

Peru: It should be convenient to sign agreements among States Parties; to commit to initiate policies which purpose is the "promotion web consultations about on apostilles". This promotion also will cover the issue of brochures as well as media participation promoting such information. Security of stamps: it is recommended that States implement certain security measures on the apostille label. For instances, many States use only a simple stamp which does not provide neither warranty nor security.

Romania:

1. Clarification on the placement of the Apostille on the judicial documents issued in criminal matters within certain procedures (transfer of convicted persons, extradition etc.) executed based on international courtesy and with a written assurance of reciprocity in relationship to South-American countries (which are not Contracting Parties to various UN Conventions in the field of international organized crime), which

<p>are signing parties to the Hague Convention of 1961.</p> <p>2. Clarification of the mandatory nature for the requirement to apply super-legalization (higher certification) to judicial documents issued in criminal and civil matters within some international judicial cooperation procedures executed based on international courtesy and with a written assurance of reciprocity in relationship to Arab countries (which are not Contracting Parties to the Hague Convention of 1961).</p> <p>3. Which is the content of the certification issued by translators for translations performed for courts/prosecutor's offices and in the case of translations performed for public notaries (when the translator's signature is to be certified), in the usual practice of the Contracting Parties?</p> <p><u>Slovakia</u>: Peut-être la réponse à la question No. 3.1.d.</p>	
<p><u>No</u></p>	<p>[32]</p> <p>Bahrain, Belgium, Bosnia & Herzegovina, Bulgaria, Chile, China (Hong Kong SAR), China (Macao SAR), Croatia, Cyprus, Ecuador, Estonia, Finland, Georgia, Germany, Hungary, Japan, Latvia, Lithuania, Malta, Mauritius, Mexico, Montenegro, Namibia, New Zealand, Norway, Russian Federation, Serbia, Slovenia, Tajikistan, Turkey, Uruguay, United States of America</p>