

**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	Croatia
For follow-up purposes	
Name of contact person:	Ms Jasna Palić Babić E-mail: Jasna.Palic.Babic@mdomsp.hr Phone: + 385 1 555 7125 Languages of communication: Croatian, English Ms Sunčica Lončar Email: Suncica.Loncar@mdomsp.hr Phone: + 385 1 555 7351
Name of Authority / Office:	Ministry for Demography, Family Youth and Social Policy
Telephone number:	+385 1 555 7111
E-mail address:	ministarstvo@mdomsp.hr

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:

[In the Republic of Croatia the drafting of implementing legislation regarding the Hague Abduction Convention is in progress.](#)

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.

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

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.

Taking into account the accession of the Republic of Croatia to the European Union and the entry into force of Brussels IIbis Regulation as from 2013 the tasks of CA are assigned to a special unit established within the Ministry.

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:

In exceptional cases, information relevant to the applicants are not provided in timely manner.

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

No

Yes, please specify:

In exceptional case, the national proceedings last very long and include various legal remedies against the return decision.

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:

In exceptional cases, information relevant to the applicants are not provided in timely manner.

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:

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

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

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

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:

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:

[Please insert text here](#)

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:

[Usually, the request for discovering the whereabouts of the child shall be transmitted to competent centres for social welfare who will take the necessary steps in order to discover the whereabouts of the child in cooperation with the police. Additionally, if there are no information regarding the whereabouts of the child, the Croatian CA can contact the Ministry of Interior in order to locate the child.](#)

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:

[As from 1 July 2013 as the date of the accession of the Republic of Croatia to the European Union, Croatian CA attends European Judicial Network meetings \(EJN\) and participates at bilateral meetings between CAs of EU Member States. Also, in order to share the expertise, Croatian CA has participated at additional visits and meetings with other CA's \(United States of America, France, Czech\).](#)

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:

[Croatian CA participated at several conferences on international and EU level discussing pending cases where necessary and exchanging experiences with other CAs.](#)

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").

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.

Statistics⁷

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

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:

When the Croatian CA receives an application under the 1980 Hague Convention the competent case-worker sends a confirmation of receipt and requires further information and documents where necessary whilst continuing with the handling of the case (locating the child, initiating of the proceeding) i.e. continuing the cooperation with competent centre for social welfare and court.

Although, the Croatia CA under Hague Abduction Convention is also the CA for certain other conventions in the field of protection of children (1996 Convention, 1993 Convention, 2007 Convention etc.) the case workers in charge of Hague Abduction Convention deal mostly with the applications for return of the child and applications for ensuring the effective exercise of access rights, both incoming and outgoing, in order to ensure the specialisation and prompt proceedings.

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

In the majority of cases delays in handling the cases are primarily depending on the lack of the documentation or the required translations or actions of the parties.

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:

Some arrangements are being contemplated regarding the Implementation Act of the Hague Abduction Convention 1980 which is in the drafting phase.

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:

Please insert text here

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:

Implementation Act of the Hague Abduction Convention is in the drafting stage.

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

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

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".

The main reasons for experiencing delays in handling the return decisions are non existing cooperation from the parents's side e.g. the respondent goes into hiding with the child after the decision of the return has been issued.

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:

Croatian courts can make provisional measures upon request of the interested parties

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:

Croatia does not have a designated sitting judge to the International Hague Network of Judges.

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?

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?

To ensure the safe return of children, there is a use of the provisional orders by the competent court and protective measures pursuant to Art. 11 (4) Brussels II bis Regulation.

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)?

The Croatian CA communicates with the CA of the requesting state.

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?

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.

The court may specify the conditions or requirements in cooperation with center for social welfare. In the context of the Brussels IIbis Regulation the court is obliged to ensure that adequate arrangements have been made.

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.

[In some cases, primary carer taking parent, states that one of the reasons for refusal of return of the child is domestic or family violence. Consideration of this objection is under competence of courts.](#)

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.

[The court would consider that adequate arrangements have been made to secure the protection of the child and/or primary carer taking parent after return to the requesting state.](#)

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?

[Croatian CA could not be involved in this process on the basis of 1980 Convention, after the return of the child. However, cooperation on the basis of Article 55 of the Brussels IIbis Regulation or on the basis of 1996 Convention would be applicable. ISS may be used if necessary in these cases. Therefore, recommendation regarding the follow-up information in the context of the 1980 Convention could not be supported.](#)

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:

Croatian CA contacts the competent centre for social welfare who will contact abducting parent in order to try to secure the voluntary return of a child allegedly wrongfully removed or retained in accordance with Article 3 of the Convention.

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:

Please insert text here

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:
Please insert text here
- Yes, please explain:
Please insert text here

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:
Guide to Good Practice Part I on Central Authority Practice has been used in the process of establishing and developing the CA proceedings with regard to the applications send under the 1980. It is available in Croatian language and it is used on a daily basis by the case workers. It is used in the process of drafting of implementing legislation.
- b. Part II on Implementing Measures. Please explain:
Guide to Good Practice Part II on Central Authority Practice has been used in the process of establishing and developing the CA proceedings with regard to the applications send under the 1980. Translation of the Guide to Good Practice Part II is available in Croatian language and published od the HCCH website. It is used on a daily basis by the case workers. It is used in the process of drafting of implementing legislation.
- c. Part III on Preventive Measures. Please explain:

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.

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".

It is used by the courts and case worker as well as in the process of drafting of implementing legislation.

- d. Part IV on Enforcement. Please explain:

It is used by the courts and case worker as well as in the process of drafting of implementing legislation.

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?

The available translation of Guide to Good Practice is published on the HCCH website. The link to the HCCH website is available at Croatian CA website.

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

Please insert text here

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:

In several individual incoming and outgoing cases the applicants addressed to the media (TV, newspapers etc.). Members of Croatian Parliament are addressed by the applicants.

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

Information about the 1980 Convention are made available to the general public on the website of CA, or by responses to the media questions of general nature regarding the purpose and operation of the Convention, media coverage of a different seminars and trainings on the operation of the Convention etc.

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

10. **Transfrontier access / contact**¹⁶

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:

Implementation Act of the Haque Abduction Convention is in the drafting stage.

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.

Please insert text here

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;

Please insert text here

- b. the effective exercise of rights of access; and

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

Please insert text here

- c. the restriction or termination of access rights.
Please insert text here

Please provide case examples where possible.

In the implementation of Article 21 of the 1980 Convention, different practices exist in different states. It seems that there are differences of interpretation of scope and the assistance that should be provided on the basis of Article 21.

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?

Please insert text here

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:

According to the Article 104 of the Croatian Family Act, parents equally, jointly and consensually make the decisions about the care of children. When parents do not live together permanently, they are obliged to create consensually the plan of the joint custody according to the Article 106 of the Croatian Family Act. According to the Article 105 of the Family Act, only one parent exercises the care for the child without the valid court decision regarding custody, if the other parent has passed away or is pronounced dead and the parents shared joint custody before that moment. Furthermore, the child shall be cared for by only one parent, fully, partially or in the way that this parent decides about the important issues regarding the child and is restricting the other parent in carrying out the care for child in that matter, only on the basis of the court decision which is made in the best interest of the child. The parent who is opposing the joint custody, and the joint plan for mutual custody or the agreement, is obliged to prove that the joint custody is not in favor of the child's wellbeing, otherwise the court may entrust independently the exercise of parental care to the other parent if it is considered that it is in the best interest of the child (legislation available through website). Article 96 of the Croatian Family Act says that the child's place of residence is the residence of his or her parents. Parents are obliged to determine the child's place of residence, and if the parents do not live together, the child may have a place of residence only with one parent. The right of a parent to determine a child's place of residence may be limited only by a court decision or by the need to obtain the consent of the center for social welfare. A child can not reside with a parent who does not exercise parental care on the child's personal rights or is deprived of the right to parental care.

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

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."

Convention and encourage ratification of, or accession to, the Convention in those States?
Please explain:

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?

[Please insert text here](#)

*The "Malta Process"*¹⁹

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

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"?

[Please insert text here](#)

<p>PART VI: TRAINING AND EDUCATION AND THE TOOLS, SERVICES AND SUPPORT PROVIDED BY THE PERMANENT BUREAU</p>
--

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?

[Af from 2013 at least two seminars/round tables/educations per year are being organised either by Croatian CA or by the other institution \(e.g. Law Faculty in Osijek, Law Faculty in Rijeka, Judicial Academy etc.\). Seminars are organised for judges, attorneys, lawyers from centers for social welfare, CA staff etc.](#)

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

In general

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".

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.
Country Profiles are valuable in better understanding of the functioning of the Convention in particular state. Country Profile for 1996 Convention would be very useful tool for better understanding of the functioning of the Convention.
- b. INCADAT (the international child abduction database, available at < www.incadat.com >).
INCADAT is a valuable source of case law on different questions regarding the implementation and interpretation of the Convention in different states.
- 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
The Judge's Newsletter on International Child Protection is useful especially for judges of the competent courts as well as for legislative purposes. More frequent issuing of the Newsletter would be beneficial.
- d. The specialised "Child Abduction Section" of the Hague Conference website (< www.hcch.net >);
The concentration of information and the possibility of quick access to the relevant information is extremely useful for CA and other authorities.
- e. INCASTAT (the database for the electronic collection and analysis of statistics on the 1980 Convention);²²
Useful tool for more in dept overview of functioning of the Convention.
- f. Providing technical assistance and training to States Parties regarding the practical operation of the 1980 and 1996 Conventions.²³ 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;
Very useful.
- g. Encouraging wider ratification of, or accession to, the Convention(s), including educating those unfamiliar with the Convention(s);²⁴
Please insert text here
- h. Supporting communications between Central Authorities, including maintaining their contact details updated on the HCCH website;
Contact details, if regularly updated and correct, are very useful for quick search of the relevant CA.
- 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
Please insert text here

Other

14.2 What other measures or mechanisms would you recommend:

- a. To improve the monitoring of the operation of the Conventions;

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".

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.

Please insert text here

- b. To assist States in meeting their Convention obligations; and
Tranings, progressive implementation of the Convention.
- c. To evaluate whether serious violations of Convention obligations have occurred?
Please insert text here

<p style="text-align: center;">PART VII: PRIORITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE SPECIAL COMMISSION AND ANY OTHER MATTERS</p>

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.

Please insert text here

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

Please insert text here

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.

Please insert text here