

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

*Wherever your replies to this Questionnaire make reference to domestic legislation, rules, guidance or case law relating to the practical operation of the 1980 Convention, **please provide a copy of the referenced documentation** in (a) the original language and, (b) wherever possible, accompanied by a translation into English and / or French.*

Name of State or territorial unit:¹	ROMANIA
<i>For follow-up purposes</i>	
Name of contact person:	DR. VIVIANA ONACA
Name of Authority / Office:	MINISTRY OF JUSTICE DIRECTORATE FOR INTERNATIONAL LAW AND JUDICIAL COOPERATION
Telephone number:	004.037.204.1077
E-mail address:	ddit@just.ro

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

PART I: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS²

1. Recent developments in your State

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

No

Yes, please specify:

Law no. 369/2004 on the application of the 1980 Hague Convention has been amended in 2014. The requesting party is no longer represented by the Romanian Central Authority. The applicant is represented in court by a lawyer (appointed by the Bucharest Bar – free of charge, or chosen and paid by the applicant). The timeframes have also been reduced (e.g. the court hearings are no longer than two weeks apart; if the return is ordered, the court appoints a time limit for complying with the obligation to return the child, which may not exceed two weeks from service of the judgement; the pronouncement of the judgement by the initial court may be postponed by up to 24 hours, and the judgement must be drawn up within 7 days of pronouncement etc.)

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

-

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

² This Part of the Questionnaire is intended to deal primarily with the developments in law and practice relating to international child abduction and international child protection which have occurred in your State since the Sixth Meeting of the Special Commission to review the operation of the *Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction* and the *Hague Convention of 19 October 1996 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children* (1-10 June 2011 and 25-31 January 2012) (hereinafter "the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission"). However, if there are important matters which you consider should be raised from *prior to* the 2011 / 2012 Special Commission, please provide such information here.

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

Not applicable

2. Issues of compliance

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

No

Yes, please specify:

There is no sufficient clarity in respect of the way the authorities from the Republic of Moldova handle the return applications. No country profile submitted on the Hague Conference website.

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

No

Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

PART II: THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE 1980 CONVENTION

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

In general

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

No

Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

No

Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

No

Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

Legal aid and representation

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

- No
 Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

- No
 Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

Locating the child

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

- No
 Yes, please specify the challenges encountered and what steps were taken or are considered to be taken to overcome these challenges:

[For incoming requests, the applicant should provide possible addresses where the child is supposed to live or contact persons who may have information on the location of the child. The authorities dealing with the localization of the child will not search the entire country, but will only verify the provided addresses.](#)

⁵ See paras 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 of the "Conclusions and Recommendations of the Fifth Meeting of the Special Commission to review the operation of the *Hague Convention of 25 October 1980 on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction* and the practical implementation of the *Hague Convention of 19 October 1996 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children* (30 October – 9 November 2006) (hereinafter referred to as the "[Conclusions and Recommendations of the 2006 Special Commission](#)") and paragraphs 32 to 34 of the [Conclusions and Recommendations of the Special Commission to review the operation of the Hague Convention of 19 October 1980 on Jurisdiction, Applicable Law, Recognition, Enforcement and Co-operation in Respect of Parental Responsibility and Measures for the Protection of Children \(1-10 June 2011 and 25-31 January 2012\)](#) (hereinafter the "C&R of the 2011/2012 Special Commission") (available on the Hague Conference website at < www.hcch.net > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Special Commission meetings").

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

No

Yes, please share any good practice on this matter:

The discovery of the whereabouts is done by the Police. In 2015, a protocol of collaboration has been signed between the Ministry of Justice and the Ministry of Internal Affairs.

Information exchange, training and networking of Central Authorities

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

No

Yes, please specify:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

No

Yes, please specify:

Statistics⁷

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

[Statistics for the year 2015 have been submitted on INCASTAT.](#)

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

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

Prompt handling of cases

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

- No
- Yes, please specify:

After designation by the Dean of the Bucharest Bar, the lawyer has 7 days to submit the return application to the court.

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

Heavy workload, understaffed

4. Court proceedings & promptness

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

- Yes
- No, please indicate if such arrangements are being contemplated:

Please insert text here

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

- No
- Yes, please explain:

Limitation to one appeal; short time limits for the drafting of the decision and for lodging the appeal.

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

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

No, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

[Heavy workload of the court's activity](#)

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

No, please explain:

[The removal of the child's travel document can be ordered only when there are grounds to fear that the minor could be removed from Romania in order to abscond from the return proceedings. The situation is exceptional.](#)

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

Yes

No, please explain:

[No available information. Nevertheless, the national law provides that the court may cooperate with the authorities of the State in which the child habitually resided, either directly or through the Romanian Central Authority.](#)

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

Yes

No, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

[No available information](#)

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

*Methods for ensuring the safe return of children*¹⁰

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

[Not applicable](#)

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

[Information is transmitted to the requesting Central Authority.](#)

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

[The information is transmitted to the Romanian child protection authority. If the case require, it can make the necessary arrangements for a protective measure, according to the national law covering measures on the protection of the child.](#)

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

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

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

Use of the 1996 Convention to ensure a safe return

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

No

Yes, please explain:

Please insert text here

Protection of primary carer

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

No concrete information available.

The Romanian Central Authority, upon transmission of the voluntary return letter, advises the primary carer taking parent that he/she needs to have a court order from the state of habitual residence, allowing the change of country of habitual residence. The reasons of personal security should mainly be addressed in the case covering the matters of parental responsibility in front of the competent court from the state of habitual residence.

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

Not applicable.

Post-return information

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

If safety concerns are raised by the requested Central Authority upon return of the child, the concerns are brought to the attention of the child protection authorities, who will

be able to monitor the situation. We would support a recommendation that States Parties should co-operate to provide each other with follow-up information on such matters, insofar as is possible.

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

No

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

6. **Voluntary agreements and mediation**

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

[After the whereabouts of the child are confirmed, the Romanian Central Authority sends a written invitation for voluntary return to the person retaining the child. He/she is also invited to come to an agreement with the left behind parent.](#)

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

[Information about mediation and contact details of the accredited body is provided to the person who retains the child.](#)

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

No, please explain:

[Mediation is available in Romania through private bodies.](#)

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

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

7. Preventive measures

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

No

Yes, please describe:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

Yes

No, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

8. The Guide to Good Practice under the 1980 Convention

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

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

[Part I has provided useful information during the works for the amendment of the national law concerning the application of the 1980 Hague Convention.](#)

b. Part II on Implementing Measures. Please explain:

[Idem above.](#)

c. Part III on Preventive Measures. Please explain:

[Idem above.](#)

d. Part IV on Enforcement. Please explain:

[Idem above.](#)

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

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

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

Not applicable

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

Not applicable

9. Publicity and debate concerning the 1980 Convention

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

No

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

There have been situations where incoming cases of child abduction have made headlines in the press, because one of the parents (or both) took the case to television/newspapers.

Following the petition of one abducting parent to a commission of the Romanian Parliament, the Romanian Central Authority has been invited for discussion on the matter. There has been no concrete outcome of the discussion, as the Romanian court is the only competent authority to decide upon a return application.

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

Forms available on the website of the Romanian Ministry of Justice. Leaflets provided to the courts and to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs concerning the child abduction.

**PART IV: TRANSFRONTIER ACCESS / CONTACT AND
INTERNATIONAL FAMILY RELOCATION**

10. Transfrontier access / contact¹⁶

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

No

Yes, please explain:

Law no. 369/2004 on the application of the 1980 Hague Convention has been amended in 2014. The requesting party is no longer represented by the Romanian Central Authority. The applicant is represented in court by a lawyer (appointed by the competent Bar – free of charge, or chosen and paid by the applicant).

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

No available data

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

a. the granting or maintaining of access rights;

Not applicable

b. the effective exercise of rights of access; and

Not applicable

c. the restriction or termination of access rights.

Not applicable

Please provide case examples where possible.

Not applicable

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

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

Not applicable

11. International family relocation¹⁸

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

The national law concerning the travel abroad of Romanian citizens has been amended multiple times. At this moment, the written approval of the other parent is not necessary when the child is travelling abroad unaccompanied by both of the parents, if there are documents that can prove the child travels to the state of domicile/residence.

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

12. Non-Convention cases and non-Convention States

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

Middle East states

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

Irak, Iran, Syria, Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emitares.

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

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

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

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

12.2 In relation to the "Malta Process":

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

[Not applicable](#)

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

No

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

- c. What is your view as to the future of the "Malta Process"?

-

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

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

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

13. Training and education

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

No training/conferences organized by the Romanian Central Authority since 2011.

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

In general

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

- a. The Country Profile available under the Child Abduction Section.
Not all countries have submitted their Country Profile.
- b. INCADAT (the international child abduction database, available at < www.incadat.com >).
Very useful for practitioners.
- c. *The Judges' Newsletter* on International Child Protection - the publication of the Hague Conference on Private International Law which is available online for free;²¹
Very useful.
- d. The specialised "Child Abduction Section" of the Hague Conference website (< www.hcch.net >);
Very useful
- e. INCASTAT (the database for the electronic collection and analysis of statistics on the 1980 Convention);²²
Not enough data to make a real analysis of the Convention's results.

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

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

- f. Providing technical assistance and training to States Parties regarding the practical operation of the 1980 and 1996 Conventions²³ Such technical assistance and training may involve persons visiting the Permanent Bureau or, alternatively, may involve the Permanent Bureau organising, or providing assistance with organising, national and international judicial and other seminars and conferences concerning the Convention(s) and participating in such conferences;

Useful, but it implies costs that are not always easy to support.

- g. Encouraging wider ratification of, or accession to, the Convention(s), including educating those unfamiliar with the Convention(s);²⁴

We support a wider ratification/accession.

- h. Supporting communications between Central Authorities, including maintaining their contact details updated on the HCCH website;

-

- i. Supporting communications among Hague Network Judges and between Hague Network Judges and Central Authorities, including maintaining a confidential database of up-to-date contact details of Hague Network Judges

-

Other

14.2 What other measures or mechanisms would you recommend:

- a. To improve the monitoring of the operation of the Conventions;
-
- b. To assist States in meeting their Convention obligations; and
-
- c. To evaluate whether serious violations of Convention obligations have occurred?

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

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

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

15. Views on priorities and recommendations for the Special Commission

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

-

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

-

16. Any other matters

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

-
