

---

## QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE USE OF IT IN THE OPERATION OF THE EVIDENCE CONVENTION

---

[NAME of STATE or territorial unit:]

the Republic of Turkey

1.1 To what extent is Your State in favour of the use of information technology to facilitate the operation of the Evidence Convention?

Somewhat in favour

1.1 To what extent is Your State in favour of the use of information technology to facilitate the operation of the Evidence Convention? - comment

1.2 Is the transmission by electronic means of requests for the taking of evidence possible under the internal law of Your State?

No

1.2 Is the transmission by electronic means of requests for the taking of evidence possible under the internal law of Your State? - comment

Please provide the specific provision/s:

1.3 Is the execution by electronic means of requests for the taking of evidence possible under the internal law of Your State?

No

1.3 Is the execution by electronic means of requests for the taking of evidence possible under the internal law of Your State? - comment

Please provide the specific provision/s:

1.4 Is Your State party to any bilateral or multilateral agreements, other than the Evidence Convention, which provide for the use of electronic means in the transmission or execution of requests for the taking of evidence?

No

1.4 Is Your State party to any bilateral or multilateral agreements, other than the Evidence Convention, which provide for the use of electronic means in the transmission or execution of requests for the taking of evidence? - comment

Please provide the specific provision/s:

1.5 Has Your State encountered any challenges regarding the use of information technology to facilitate the operation of the Evidence Convention?

No

[Internal law limitations]

No

[Judicial or administrative structures]

No

---

[Implementation challenges (e.g. lack of resources)]

No

[Costs]

No

[Selection of the appropriate technology]

No

[System interoperability / compatibility]

No

[Security concerns]

No

[Cooperation with other Contracting Parties]

No

[Other Challenges]

No

Please specify:

1.6 To what extent would Your State be in favour of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties for the operation of the Evidence Convention?

Neutral

Please explain your reasoning, if possible:

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Internal law limitations]

Yes

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Judicial or administrative structures]

Yes

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Implementation challenges (e.g. lack of resources)]

No

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Costs]

No

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Selection of the appropriate technology]

No

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [System interoperability / compatibility]

Yes

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Security concerns]

Yes

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Cooperation with other Contracting Parties]

No

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Evidence Convention? [Other challenges]

---

No

Please specify:

1.8 What is the status of the use of information technology in Your State for the transmission of Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

Not (yet) under consideration

1.9 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [E-mail (regular)]

No

1.9 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [E-mail (secured/encrypted)]

No

1.9 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Electronic transmission platform administered by a public/State authority]

No

1.9 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Electronic transmission platform administered by a private service provider]

No

1.9 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Electronic transmission using distributed ledger technology]

No

1.9 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention?

---

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Other]

No

Please provide details:

1.10 On average, approximately what percentage of Letters of Request transmitted electronically by other Contracting Parties does Your State accept?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

1.11 Since 2014, on average, approximately what percentage of Letters of Request received by Your State were transmitted electronically by authorities of other Contracting Parties?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [2014:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [most received from:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [2015:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [most received from:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [2016:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [most received from:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [2017:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [most received from:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [2018:]

If possible, please provide the number of Letters of Request transmitted electronically that were received per year, and the name(s) of the main Contracting Parties from which these were received: [most received from:]

1.12 If the Central Authority of Your State has received Letters of Request transmitted electronically under the Evidence

---

Convention, on average, approximately what percentage of these Letters of Request are subsequently forwarded electronically to the competent judicial authority for execution?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

If possible, please provide details as to how the documents establishing execution are forwarded:

1.13 What is the status of the implementation an electronic case management system in Your State for incoming and outgoing Letters of Request issued pursuant to the Evidence Convention?

Electronic case management system: A system that enables casework and related workflows to be followed and managed through electronic communication of information between the individuals concerned (incl. staff, as well as parties and their representatives in some cases).

Not (yet) under consideration

1.14 What type of electronic case management system does Your State use, or would consider using for incoming and outgoing Letters of Request issued pursuant to the Evidence Convention?

Electronic case management system: A system that enables casework and related workflows to be followed and managed through electronic communication of information between the individuals concerned (incl. staff, as well as parties and their representatives in some cases).

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT.

Other

Please provide details:

1.15 If Your State uses an electronic case management system for incoming and outgoing Letters of Request issued pursuant to the Evidence Convention, which of the following best describes the system?

Electronic case management system: A system that enables casework and related workflows to be followed and managed through electronic communication of information between the individuals concerned (incl. staff, as well as parties and their representatives in some cases).

Not applicable

1.15 If Your State uses an electronic case management system for incoming and outgoing Letters of Request issued pursuant to the Evidence Convention, which of the following best describes the system?

Electronic case management system: A system that enables casework and related workflows to be followed and managed through electronic communication of information between the individuals concerned (incl. staff, as well as parties and their representatives in some cases). - comment

1.16 In 2018, on average, approximately what percentage of Letters of Request received by Your State under the Evidence Convention were executed using information technology?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

1.17 When competent authorities of Your State execute Letters of Request transmitted electronically by another Contracting Party

---

under the Evidence Convention, on average, in approximately what percentage of such instances are documents establishing the execution of the Letter of Request returned electronically to the requested authority (Art. 13)?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

If possible, please provide details as to how the documents establishing execution are returned:

1.18 In 2018, what was the approximate percentage (on average) of Letters of Request received by Your State in which the use of information technology was requested in the taking of evidence under the Evidence Convention?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

If possible, please provide the following details: [Number of such requests:]

If possible, please provide the following details: [Main Contracting Parties from which such requests were received:]

Technology(ies) requested:

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Teleconferencing / audio-link]

No

Technology(ies) requested:

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Videoconferencing / video-link]

No

Technology(ies) requested:

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Electronic transmission of digital evidence]

No

Technology(ies) requested:

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Presenting physical evidence by electronic means]

No

Technology(ies) requested:

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate

---

the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Other]

No

Please provide details:

1.19 Please indicate whether Your State would accept Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention seeking the use of information technology in each of the following instances. [Teleconferencing / audio-link]

Not applicable

1.19 Please indicate whether Your State would accept Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention seeking the use of information technology in each of the following instances. [Videoconferencing / video-link]

Yes

1.19 Please indicate whether Your State would accept Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention seeking the use of information technology in each of the following instances. [Electronic transmission of digital evidence]

Unknown

1.19 Please indicate whether Your State would accept Letters of Request under the Evidence Convention seeking the use of information technology in each of the following instances. [Presenting physical evidence by electronic means]

Not applicable

Other (Please specify):

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Use of technology is prohibited by internal law]

No

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Use of technology is not provided for in internal law]

No

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in Your State]

No

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Use of technology is too resource-intensive]

No

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [The authority/ies lacks familiarity with the use of the requested technology]

No

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Unknown]

No

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Not applicable]

Yes

1.20 If Your State refuses requests from other Contracting Parties to use information technology in the taking of evidence in your territory, what is/are the main reason/s for such a refusal? [Other]

No

Please Specify:

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Teleconferencing /

---

audio-link]

No

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Videoconferencing / video-link]

Yes

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Electronic transmission of digital evidence]

No

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Presenting physical evidence by electronic means]

No

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Unknown]

No

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Not applicable]

No

1.21 If Your State uses information technology in the taking of evidence, what type of technology is used? [Other]

No

Please Specify:

If possible, please provide additional information, e.g. including the methods used, relevant security standards and acknowledgement of receipt mechanisms:

1.22 In 2018, what was, on average, the approximate percentage of Letters of Request sent by Your State in which the use of information technology was requested in the taking of evidence under the Evidence Convention?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

If possible, please provide the following details: [Number of such requests:]

If possible, please provide the following details: [Main Contracting Parties to which such requests were sent:]

Technology(ies) requested: [Teleconferencing / audio-link]

No

Technology(ies) requested: [Videoconferencing / video-link]

No

Technology(ies) requested: [Electronic transmission of digital evidence]

No

Technology(ies) requested: [Presenting physical evidence by electronic means]

No

Technology(ies) requested: [Other]

No

Please provide details:

1.23 If Letters of Request sent by Your State seeking the use of technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal? [Use of technology is prohibited by internal law]

No

1.23 If Letters of Request sent by Your State seeking the use of technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal? [Use of technology is not provided for in internal law]



---

No

1.23 If Letters of Request sent by Your State seeking the use of technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal? [Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in Your State]

No

1.23 If Letters of Request sent by Your State seeking the use of technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal? [Use of technology is too resource-intensive]

No

1.23 If Letters of Request sent by Your State seeking the use of technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal? [The authority/ies lacks familiarity with the use of the requested technology]

No

1.23 If Letters of Request sent by Your State seeking the use of technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal? [Other]

No

Please Specify:

1.24 In approximately what percentage of instances does Your State use information technology to facilitate the taking of evidence under Chapter II of the Convention?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

Please provide details (including the type of technology used):

General Satisfaction

2.1 How does Your State rate the general operation of the Evidence Convention?

Good

General Satisfaction

2.1 How does Your State rate the general operation of the Evidence Convention? - comment

Outside of the Evidence Convention

2.2 Outside the Evidence Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to obtain assistance in the taking of evidence located in the territory of Your State? [Procedure provided by internal law]

No

Outside of the Evidence Convention

2.2 Outside the Evidence Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to obtain assistance in the taking of evidence located in the territory of Your State? [Procedure provided by bilateral agreement(s)]

Yes

Outside of the Evidence Convention

2.2 Outside the Evidence Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to obtain assistance in the taking of evidence located in the territory of Your State? [Procedure provided by multilateral agreement(s)]

No

Outside of the Evidence Convention

---

2.2 Outside the Evidence Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to obtain assistance in the taking of evidence located in the territory of Your State? [Other procedure (such as consular channels)]

No

Please provide details (including full reference to the applicable legislation or caselaw):

Please provide details (including full reference to the applicable agreement/s):

Please provide details (including full reference to the applicable agreement):

Please provide details:

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

224

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2013][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

Germany, Austria, Romania

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

1606

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2013][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Germany, Netherlands, France

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

212

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2014][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

Germany, Austria, Romania

### 2.3 Statistical Data

---

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

1614

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2014][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Germany, Netherlands, USA

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

190

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2015][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

6

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2015][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

Germany, Austria, Switzerland

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

1443

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2015][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Germany, Netherlands, France

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

174

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2016][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

6

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2016][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

Germany, Austria, Romania

2.3 Statistical Data

---

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

1453

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2016][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Germany, Netherlands, Russia

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

159

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2017][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

6

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2017][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

Germany, Austria, Bulgaria

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2273

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2017][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Germany, Russia, Netherlands

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

167

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2018][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

6

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2018][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

Germany, Bulgaria, Austria

2.3 Statistical Data

---

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2018][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2015

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2018][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Evidence Convention - Chapter I [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Germany, Russia, France

2.3.2 Internal Law [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2013][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2013][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2014][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2014][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2015][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2015][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2015][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

---

2.3.2 Internal Law [2016][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2016][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2016][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2017][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2017][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2017][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2018][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2018][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2018][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2018][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.2 Internal Law [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

20

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2013][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

222

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2013][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

20

---

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2014][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

Azerbaijan, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Georgia

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

315

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2014][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus ,Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

23

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2015][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2015][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

Azerbaijan, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Georgia

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

263

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2015][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus ,Azerbaijan, Kazakhstan

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

17

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2016][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2016][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

Azerbaijan, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Georgia

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

247

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2016][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus ,Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

23

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2017][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2017][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

Azerbaijan, Georgia, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

484

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2017][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Turkmenistan, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Azerbaijan

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

36

---

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2018][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

4

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2018][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

Azerbaijan, Turkmenistan Georgia

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2018][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

569

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2018][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

5

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s) [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

Turkmenistan, Turkish Republic of Northern Cyprus, Azerbaijan

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution



---

(months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

---

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
1

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]  
Mongolia

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
23

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
5

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]  
United Arap Emirates, Afghanistan, Qatar

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
0

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
0

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
34

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
5

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]  
United Arap Emirates, Qatar, Afghanistan

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
0

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
0

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
10

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
5

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]  
United Arap Emirates, Qatar, Mongolia

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
0

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
0

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
20

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
5

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]  
United Arap Emirates, Qatar, Afghanistan

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
1

---

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
8

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]  
Tatarstan

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
17

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
5

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]  
United Arap Emirates, Qatar, Malaysia

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
2

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
6

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]  
Tatarstan

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
36

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
5

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]  
United Arap Emirates, Afghanistan, Qatar

3.1 Is Your State a Contracting Party to the Evidence Convention?

Yes

3.2 If Your State is a Contracting Party, are the contact details of the Central and competent Authority(ies) designated by Your State up to date on the Evidence Section of the HCCH website?

See Conclusion & Recommendation No 4 of the 2014 meeting of Special Commission.

No

Please provide the contact details below: [Central Authority/ies:]

Directorate General for Foreign Relations and EU Affairs, Ministry of Justice

Please provide the contact details below: [Address:]

Adalet Bakanl??? Ek Binas? Nam?k Kemal Mah. Milli Müdafaa Caddesi No:22 Çankaya / ANKARA Turkey

Please provide the contact details below: [Telephone:]

+90 (312) 414 80 51

Please provide the contact details below: [Fax:]

+90 (312) 219 4523

Please provide the contact details below: [E-mail:]

diabgm@adalet.gov.tr

Please provide the contact details below: [General website:]

<http://diabgm.adalet.gov.tr/>

Please provide the contact details below: [Contact person:]

Gökçen Türker, Nilgün Varer, Ferhat Eker

Please provide the contact details below: [Languages spoken by staff:]

Turkish, English

3.3 If Your State is a Contracting Party, is the practical information chart available on the Evidence Section of the HCCH website up to date?

---

See Conclusion & Recommendation No 4 of the 2014 meeting of Special Commission.

Yes

Please complete or provide the updates to the chart using the template available here.

3.4 If Your State is a Contracting Party, is the Country Profile in relation to the taking of evidence by video-link under the Evidence Convention up to date?

See Conclusion & Recommendation No 14 of the 2017 meeting of Council on General Affairs and Policy.

There is no Country Profile for Your State

Please complete or update the Country Profile available here.

```
[{ "title":"Video-link Country Profile","comment":"","size":"286.051","name":"video%20link%20anket%2027.11.2019.docx","filename":"fu_pvhr5jw7eiz3w6y","ext":"docx" }]
```