

**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.

<b>Name of State or territorial unit:</b> <sup>1</sup>	Republic of Moldova
<i>For follow-up purposes</i>	
Name of contact person:	Corneliu Tarus
Name of Authority / Office:	Ministry Of Health, Labour and Social Protection of the Republic of Moldova
Telephone number:	+373-22-26-93-57
E-mail address:	corneliu.tarus@mmpsf.gov.md igor.chisca@mmpsf.gov.md

**PART I: RECENT DEVELOPMENTS<sup>2</sup>**

**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:

On July, 7 2017 the art. 7 of the Law no. 140 of 14.06.2013 on the special protection of children at risk and children separated from their parents, was completed, so that a new attribution was added to the territorial guardianship authorities, according to which these authorities in cooperation with local guardian authorities, with other authorities and institutions that operates in the field of social assistance, education, healthcare as well as with the law enforcement bodies, take the necessary measures to ensure the implementation of the provisions of the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction adopted at The Hague on 25 October 1980".

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 authorities<sup>3</sup> 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.

None

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.

None

**2. Issues of compliance**

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

<sup>2</sup> 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.

<sup>3</sup> 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.

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:  
[Please insert text here](#)

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](#)

<b>PART II: THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE 1980 CONVENTION</b>
--

### **3. The role and functions of Central Authorities designated under the 1980 Convention**<sup>4</sup>

*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](#)

*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?<sup>5</sup>

- No  
 Yes, please specify:  
[In the cases of reuuests of children's returns to the Republic of Moldova, a large](#)

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

<sup>5</sup> 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").

number of applicants do not possess the financial resources in order to travel to the states where children are located for the purposes of their participation in the court hearings, as well as to pay the costs / tariffs of the state legal aid, even if those costs seem to be modest compared to the living standard of those states.

#### *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:  
[Please insert text here](#)

#### *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?<sup>6</sup>

- 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:  
[Please insert text here](#)

#### *Statistics<sup>7</sup>*

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

[The statistical data was submitted.](#)

#### *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:

[According to the legislation of the Republic of Moldova, all applications addressed to public authorities are to be examined within 30 working days, but those applications that do not require in depth studying and examination - without delay or within 15 working days from the date of registration. In case of applications received under the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention, the central authority examines them immediately.](#)

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

[Usually, delays are generated by the time needed to collect additional information or clarifications from different authorities in the country and abroad.](#)

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

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

#### 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)?<sup>8</sup>

Yes

No, please indicate if such arrangements are being contemplated:

[We intend to rise up the level of competence of hearing cases from primary courts to the courts of appeal.](#)

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:

[After elaboration and adoption of a special law for the implementation of the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention, the central authority will take the necessary measures to ensure the training for guardianship authorities, judges and bailiffs, and will also develop a series of instructions and tools to facilitate the implementation of the law.](#)

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

[At the moment, there is no national legal framework for the implementation of the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention](#)

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:

[At the moment, there is no national legal framework for the implementation of the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention](#)

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:

[At the moment, there is no national legal framework for the implementation of the provisions of the 1980 Hague Convention](#)

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 such cases](#)

---

<sup>8</sup> 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".

## 5. Ensuring the safe return of children<sup>9</sup>

### *Methods for ensuring the safe return of children*<sup>10</sup>

5.1 What measures has your Central Authority taken to ensure that the recommendations of the 2006 and 2011 / 2012 Special Commission meetings<sup>11</sup> regarding the safe return of children are implemented?

There are no specific legal provisions related to safe return of children

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)?

There are no specific legal provisions related to safe return of children

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?

There are no specific legal provisions related to safe return of children

### *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.

Until that moment, there have been no court decisions on the return of children in cases where the abduction took place because of violence against the parent who relocated the child, but several cases of this kind are at the stage of examination at the central authority. In one case, for example, the central authority received the request for the return of a child aged 2 months, relocated by the mother who breastfeeding him. Mother invoked her husband's violence and refused to return because of fear. The Central Authority of the Republic of Moldova in the communication with the Central Authority of the requesting state considered that at that time the return of the child without his mother is not possible because it is contrary to the best interest of the child.

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.

This will be taken into account in the process the development of national legal framework for the implementation of 1980 Hague Convention.

### *Post-return information*

<sup>9</sup> See **Art. 7(2) h)** of the 1980 Convention.

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

<sup>11</sup> 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.

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?

No, rather we will pass request for monitoring to the competent child protection authorities of state of return, without insisting on transmitting to us the results of the monitoring.

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:

Usually cases are solved amicably as a result of unofficial communication of specialists from the central authority with parents and the latter's awareness that the contact with the child protection and judiciary systems is not in the best interest of the child and, at the same time, their understanding of the fact that it will inevitably lead to a decision to the detriment of one of the parties, but both sides will spend significant material and emotional resources.

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

The mediation system in the Republic of Moldova, although legally regulated, is not developed.

---

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

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?<sup>13</sup>

No, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

Yes, please explain:

[After elaboration of national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention.](#)

## 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?<sup>14</sup>

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 Practice<sup>15</sup> 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:

[It will be used as the principal source of information in the process of elaboration of national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention.](#)

b. Part II on Implementing Measures. Please explain:

[It will be used as the principal source of information in the process of elaboration of national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention. .](#)

c. Part III on Preventive Measures. Please explain:

[It will be used as the principal source of information in the process of elaboration of national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention.](#)

d. Part IV on Enforcement. Please explain:

[It will be used as the principal source of information in the process of elaboration of national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention.](#)

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?

[At the moment, the main actor involved in the examination of applications under the 1980 Hague Convention is the central authority. After approving the national legal framework for implementation of the Convention, the central authority will take steps to harness the Guide to Good Practice in the process of training the territorial guardianship authorities, judges, bailiffs and other specialists.](#)

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

<sup>13</sup> 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.

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

<sup>15</sup> All Parts of the Guide to Good Practice under the 1980 Convention are available on the Hague Conference website at < [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Guides to Good Practice".

No

**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 has been a case of putting public pressure on the central authority from the side of the ex-ombudsman for children's rights, who, ignoring the principles and provisions of the Convention, tended to defend the interests of a Moldovan citizen (a mother) who abducted a child. Although in our society there still a stereotypical perception of the place and roles of parents in raising and educating children, this public confrontation has been an opportunity for the central authority to sensitized public opinion about the inevitable consequences of illegal decisions taken by parents regarding their children, as well as their responsibility towards the child, especially in the context of the amplitude of migration phenomenon in the Republic of Moldova.



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

Publication of data about abduction in various current reports, but also in the Periodic Report on the Implementation of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child), offering some Mass Media Interviews. Also the development of national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention is part of the National Action plan for the implementation of Child Protection Strategy 2014-2020.

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

### 10. Transfrontier access / contact<sup>16</sup>

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:  
[Please insert text here](#)

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.

[None](#)

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;  
[None](#)
- b. the effective exercise of rights of access; and  
[None](#)
- c. the restriction or termination of access rights.  
[None](#)

Please provide case examples where possible.  
[None](#)

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

[In most cases, requests for Contact Concerning Children come to the central authority regarding the violation of the respective right by the parent who lives with the child abroad, but there are several cases related to the restriction of parental access to the child \(all within the examination of return applications\). In these situations, the central authority intervened to the territorial guardianship authority with the request to facilitate the access to the child for parent who is abroad. As a result the problems were solved amicably, except for one case in which the territorial guardianship authority drew up an administrative act approving the schedule of meetings between the parent and the child.](#)

### 11. International family relocation<sup>18</sup>

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

<sup>17</sup> Available on the Hague Conference website at < [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) > under "Child Abduction Section" then "Guides to Good Practice".

<sup>18</sup> 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.

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:

International family relocation is a problem for the Republic of Moldova because of the large number of migrants and divorces (conditioned by migration). At the moment, there is no clear vision of a mechanism to ensure respect for the rights and interests of all parties affected by international family relocation.

Certainly, this topic will be given a special attention in the process of the elaboration national legal framework for the implementation of the 1980 Hague Convention.

## 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:

No

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?

No

*The "Malta Process"*<sup>19</sup>

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?<sup>20</sup>

No comments

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 Conventions?

No

Yes, please explain:

[Please insert text here](#)

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

No comments

## PART VI: TRAINING AND EDUCATION AND

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."

<sup>19</sup> 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".

<sup>20</sup> 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".

**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 such events has to places

**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.  
No comments
- b. INCADAT (the international child abduction database, available at < [www.incadat.com](http://www.incadat.com) >).  
No comments
- c. *The Judges' Newsletter* on International Child Protection - the publication of the Hague Conference on Private International Law which is available online for free;<sup>21</sup>  
No comments
- d. The specialised "Child Abduction Section" of the Hague Conference website (< [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) >);  
No comments
- e. INCASTAT (the database for the electronic collection and analysis of statistics on the 1980 Convention);<sup>22</sup>  
No comments
- f. Providing technical assistance and training to States Parties regarding the practical operation of the 1980 and 1996 Conventions.<sup>23</sup> 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;  
No comments
- g. Encouraging wider ratification of, or accession to, the Convention(s), including educating those unfamiliar with the Convention(s);<sup>24</sup>  
No comments
- h. Supporting communications between Central Authorities, including maintaining their contact details updated on the HCCH website;  
No comments
- 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  
No comments

<sup>21</sup> Available on the Hague Conference website at < [www.hcch.net](http://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.

<sup>22</sup> Further information is available via the Hague Conference website at < [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net) > under "Child Abduction Section" then "INCASTAT".

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

<sup>24</sup> 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.

*Other*

14.2 What other measures or mechanisms would you recommend:

- a. To improve the monitoring of the operation of the Conventions;  
No proposals
- b. To assist States in meeting their Convention obligations; and  
No proposals
- c. To evaluate whether serious violations of Convention obligations have occurred?  
No proposals

**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.

We thinking particular priority must be payd to art. 13 (b) of the 1980 Hague Convention.

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

No proposals

**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.

No proposals