

Title	Compilation of responses received to the August 2019 Questionnaire on the 2007 Child Support Convention
Document	Prel. Doc. No 4 of October 2020 (second revised version) – available in English only with responses in the language in which they were received
Author	PB
Agenda Item	TBD
Mandate(s)	C&R No 28 of the 2019 CGAP; C&D Nos 22-24 of the 2020 CGAP
Objective	To share responses received until 27 October 2020 from Members of HCCH to Prel. Doc. No 1 of August 2019
Action to be Taken	For Action <input type="checkbox"/> For Approval <input type="checkbox"/> For Decision <input type="checkbox"/> For Information <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
Annexes	N.A.
Related Documents	Prel. Doc. No 1 of August 2019 – Questionnaire on the practical operation of the <i>Convention of 23 November 2007 on the International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance</i>

**QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE *CONVENTION OF 23 NOVEMBER 2007
ON THE INTERNATIONAL RECOVERY OF CHILD SUPPORT AND OTHER FORMS OF FAMILY
MAINTENANCE***

Wherever your replies to this Questionnaire make reference to domestic legislation, rules, guidance or case law relating to the practical operation of the 2007 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:	
Argentina, Australia, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America	
Name of contact person:	
Argentina	Juan José Cerdeira (Dirección Nacional Asuntos Internacionales) Mariana Franco (Cooperación Internacional en materia civil)
Australia	Helen Foon
Austria	Robert Fucik, Angelo Rosenberg
Belarus	Anastasiya Kudyrko
Brazil	Lalisa Froeder Dittrich
Bulgaria	Kalina Kaludina
Canada	Manon Dostie and Andina van Isschot
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	JAVIERA VERDUGO
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Doctora Andrea León López Subdirectora de Adopciones Correo electrónico: andrea.leon@icbf.gov.co Andrea Carolina Mogollón Caballero Abogada – Autoridad Central Colombiana Correo electrónico: Andrea.mogollon@icbf.gov.co Andrés Julián Monsalve Monje Abogado – Autoridad Central Colombiana Correo electrónico: Andres.monsalve@icbf.gov.co Edid Viviana Abril Bolívar Abogada – Autoridad Central Colombiana Correo electrónico: Edid.abril@icbf.gov.co Manuela Beaudoin Valenzuela Abogada – Autoridad Central Correo electrónico: Manuela.beaudoin@icbf.gov.co Mariana García Jimeno Abogada – Autoridad Central Colombiana Correo electrónico: mariana.garcia@icbf.gov.co Miguel Angel Urrego García Abogado – Autoridad Central Colombiana Correo electrónico: miguel.urrego@icbf.gov.co Agrade
Croatia	Ms Jasna Palic Babic, Head of Service Ms Dina Šobot, Expert Associate
Cyprus	Dionysiou Troodia
Dominican Republic	Aly Peña
Finland	Tanja Niemi, Maija Leppä
France	Carine Viallon

Germany (CA)	
Germany (DIJUF)	Katharina Lohse/ Natalie Faetan
Hungary	dr. Czellecz Botond
Latvia	Legal Advisor Mrs Skrinda Inese
Lithuania	Vaida Pakalniškyte
Luxembourg	Monique Schmitz (avocat général)
Mexico	Luis Gabriel Ferrer Ortega
Netherlands	L. den Haan / N. Vels
Nicaragua	Johana Vanessa Flores Jiménez
Norway	Siri Risnes
Poland	Aneta Ludwiczak
Portugal	Paulo Gonçalves
Romania	Viviana Onaca
Slovenia	Vesna Lapanja
Sweden	Linda-Marie Danell
Switzerland	Sandra John
Ukraine	Tetiana Riabets
United Kingdom (England)	Mr Mark Stevens
United States of America	Anne Miller
Name of Authority / Office:	
Argentina	MINISTERIO DE JUSTICIA Y DERECHOS HUMANOS DIRECCION NACIONAL ASUNTOS INTERNACIONALES COOPERACION INTERNACIONAL EN MATERIA CIVIL (Transmitting and Receiving Agency to the Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance, New York, 1956)
Australia	Department of Human Services, Australia
Austria	Federal Ministry of Justice/Central Authority
Belarus	Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Belarus
Brazil	Ministry of Justice
Bulgaria	Ministry of Justice, "International Legal Child Support And Intercountry Adoptions" Directorate
Canada	N/A
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Corporación de Asistencia Judicial

Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Ministry for Demography, Family, Youth and Social Policy, Directorate for International Affairs and Programmes, Sector for International Cooperation, Service for International Cooperation in the field of Protection of Children and Coordination of Social Security Systems
Cyprus	Unit for International Legal Cooperation, Ministry of Justice and Public Order
Dominican Republic	National Council for Children and Adolescents (CONANI)
Finland	Ministry of Justice
France	Ministère de l'Europe et des Affaires étrangères Direction des français à l'étranger et de l'administration consulaire - Service des conventions, des affaires civiles et de l'entraide judiciaire Mission de la protection des droits des personnes - Bureau du recouvrement des créances alimentaires à l'étranger
Germany (CA)	Bundesamt für Justiz/ Federal Office of Justice (Central Authority)
Germany (DIJUF)	German Institute for Youth Human Services and Family Law
Hungary	Ministry of Justice Department of Private International Law
Latvia	The Administration of the Maintenance Guarantee Fund (Uzturedzēku garantiju fonda administrācija)
Lithuania	Mazeikiai division of the State Social Insurance Fund Board
Luxembourg	Procureur général d'Etat
Mexico	Consultoría Jurídica
Netherlands	LBIO
Nicaragua	Ministerio de la Familia, Adolescencia y Niñez
Norway	Directorate of Labour and Welfare
Poland	Requesting State - 45 Regional Courts, Requested State - The Ministry of Justice of Republic of Poland
Portugal	Central Authority of Portugal / Direção-Geral da Administração da Justiça - Divisão de Cooperação Judiciária Internacional
Romania	Ministry of Justice
Slovenia	Public Scholarship, Development, Disability and Maintenance Fund of the Republic of Slovenia
Sweden	Försäkringskassan(Swedish Social Insurance Agency)
Switzerland	Autorité centrale en matière de recouvrement international d'aliments
Ukraine	Ministry of Justice
United Kingdom (England)	Reciprocal Enforcements of Maintenance Orders (REMOs) Unit

United States of America	United States Central Authority for International Child Support Department of Health and Human Services, Office of Child Support Enforcement (OCSE)
Telephone number:	
Argentina	54 11 5300 4000 interno 76425, 78516
Australia	+61 3 623 61135
Austria	+43 (0)1 52152 0
Belarus	+375 17 200 86 87, +375 17 211 01 85
Brazil	55 61 2025-8933
Bulgaria	+ 359 2 9237 469
Canada	613-952-3724 / 613-954-4320
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	+562 29371435 // +569 92751311
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	38515557111
Cyprus	+35722805932 / 973/ 928
Dominican Republic	809-567-2233
Finland	+358 9 1606 7628
France	(33) 1 43 17 90 01
Germany (CA)	
Germany (DIJUF)	49-6221-9818-0
Hungary	+36 1 795 4990
Latvia	(+371)67830626
Lithuania	37044326659
Luxembourg	+352 47 59 81-393
Mexico	36865100 Ext. 5314 / 5306
Netherlands	010-2894890
Nicaragua	505 - 22781620 ext. 171
Norway	+47 95 77 14 06
Poland	222390470
Portugal	+351 217906345
Romania	40372041077

Slovenia	+386 1 4720 990
Sweden	010-112 04 58
Switzerland	+41 58 46 31229
Ukraine	+38 044 478 11 76
United Kingdom (England)	+44 (0) 20 3681 2727
United States of America	202-401-5722
E-mail address:	
Argentina	mfranco@jus.gob.ar jcerdeir@jus.gob.ar
Australia	helen.foon@humanservices.gov.au
Austria	team.z@bmj.gv.at
Belarus	kanc@minjust.by, omd@minjust.by
Brazil	cooperacaocivil@mj.gov.br
Bulgaria	mpzdm@justice.government.bg
Canada	Manon.Dostie@justice.gc.ca; Andina.vanisschot@justice.gc.ca
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	jverdugo@cajmetro.cl // internacionalcaj@gmail.com
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	ministarstvo@mdomsp.hr
Cyprus	tdionysiou@mjpo.gov.cy, registry@mjpo.gov.cy
Dominican Republic	ALY.PENA@CONANI.GOV.DO
Finland	maintenance.ca@om.fi
France	obligation.alimentaire@diplomatie.gouv.fr
Germany (CA)	auslandsunterhalt@bfj.bund.de
Germany (DIJUF)	csw@diujf.de
Hungary	nmfo@im.gov.hu
Latvia	maintenance@ugf.gov.lv
Lithuania	mazeikiai@sodra.lt
Luxembourg	parquet.general@justice.etat.lu
Mexico	dgcjuridica@sre.gob.mx
Netherlands	Ldenhaan@lbio.nl / Nvels@lbio.nl
Nicaragua	asuntosinternacionales@mifamilia.gob.ni

Norway	siri.risnes@nav.no
Poland	alimenty@ms.gov.pl
Portugal	paulo.j.goncalves@dgaj.mj.pt
Romania	ddit@just.ro, dreptintrenational@just.ro
Slovenia	jpsklad@jps-rs.si
Sweden	linda-marie.danell@forsakringskassan.se
Switzerland	Sandra.John@bj.admin.ch
Ukraine	mdcivil@minjust.gov.ua
United Kingdom (England)	Mark.Stevens@ospt.gov.uk
United States of America	ocseinternational@acf.hhs.gov

1. Statistics under the 2007 Convention

1.1. How many active cases is your Central Authority handling at this moment under the 2007 Convention?

Outgoing cases:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	No data
Belarus	51
Brazil	around 800
Bulgaria	0
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	18
Cyprus	1 CASE
Dominican Republic	The Dominican Republic does not have ongoing active cases. Nevertheless, is on the final stage of the instrument of ascension. Once the country finalizes its internal approval, Conani as a Central Authority, will handle any action or request on the matter.
Finland	Currently, there are 31 outgoing Hague 2007 cases pending in the Finnish Central Authority, including requests for specific measures.
France	45
Germany (CA)	722
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	20
Latvia	26 in process 6
Lithuania	61
Luxembourg	4

Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	30 cases (2018 - 2020)
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	20 cases for establishment and 180 cases for recognition and enforcement
Poland	134
Portugal	50
Romania	9
Slovenia	35
Sweden	1807
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	221
United Kingdom (England)	13
United States of America	OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Incoming cases:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	No data
Belarus	7
Brazil	around 400
Bulgaria	1
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	28
Cyprus	2 CASES
Dominican Republic	None.
Finland	There are currently 14 incoming Hague 2007 cases pending in the Finnish Central Authority, including requests for specific measures.
France	119
Germany (CA)	211
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	5
Latvia	3
Lithuania	8
Luxembourg	0
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	28 cases (2018-2020)
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.

Norway	73 cases (in addition to 22 from Finland and Sweden that will be handled under the Nordic convention)
Poland	144
Portugal	62
Romania	8
Slovenia	15
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	179
United Kingdom (England)	185
United States of America	OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

1.2. How many new cases (outgoing and incoming) were added to your caseload under the 2007 Convention each year during the last three years?

Last year:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	42
Belarus	2019: 35
Brazil	around 1400 new requests
Bulgaria	1
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	12
Cyprus	2018: 0 CASES
Dominican Republic	None.
Finland	18 (including requests for specific measures)
France	données non disponiblesi
Germany (CA)	outgoing: 356 incoming: 86
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	9
Latvia	7
Lithuania	2018:outgoing cases - 12 incoming cases - 5
Luxembourg	1
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	22
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	2018: About 200 incoming cases and about 50 outgoing cases

Poland	2018 - 236
Portugal	147
Romania	2
Slovenia	11
Sweden	74
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	146
United Kingdom (England)	244
United States of America	OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Prior year:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	32
Belarus	2018: 18
Brazil	around 1050
Bulgaria	3
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	20
Cyprus	2017: 3 CASES
Dominican Republic	None.
Finland	20 (including requests for specific measures)
France	données non disponibles
Germany (CA)	outgoing: 210 incoming: 89
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	9
Latvia	8
Lithuania	2017:outgoing cases - 11 incoming cases - 7
Luxembourg	0
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	25
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	2017: About 150 incoming cases and about 60 outgoing cases
Poland	2017 - 96
Portugal	24

Romania	4
Slovenia	14
Sweden	35
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	120
United Kingdom (England)	325
United States of America	OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Prior year:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	No data
Belarus	N/A
Brazil	The 2007 Hague Convention entered into force in Brazil in 2017.
Bulgaria	1
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	10
Cyprus	2016: 1 CASE
Dominican Republic	None.
Finland	6 (including requests for specific measures)
France	données non disponiblesi
Germany (CA)	outgoing: 4 incoming: 19
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	7
Latvia	0
Lithuania	2016:outgoing cases - 15 incoming cases - 0
Luxembourg	0
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	15
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	2016: About 150 incoming cases and about 20 outgoing cases
Poland	2016 - 82
Portugal	10
Romania	7
Slovenia	8
Sweden	3

Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	73
United Kingdom (England)	97
United States of America	OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data on Convention cases from the U.S. states, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify Convention cases.

Please specify the reference period for these statistics, *i.e.*, whether a calendar or fiscal year, and if the latter, the starting and ending dates:

Calendar year:

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Fiscal year:

United Kingdom (England)

starting:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	01/01/2020
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	
Cyprus	
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	01/01/2020
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	2018
Nicaragua	Please insert text here

Norway	
Poland	10.1
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	01.01.YYYY
Slovenia	101
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	01/04/2016-31/03/2017
United States of America	Please insert text here

ending:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	31/12/2020
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	
Cyprus	
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	31/12/2020
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	2020 (June)
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	
Poland	31.12
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	31.12.YYYY
Slovenia	3112
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here

United Kingdom (England)	01/04/2018-31/03/2019
United States of America	Please insert text here

1.3. How many requests for specific measures (Art. 7) has your Central Authority handled during the past 12 months?

Outgoing requests for specific measures:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	2
Belarus	5
Brazil	Around 80% of the requests
Bulgaria	0
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	1
Cyprus	0 CASES
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	18
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Since the beginning of 2019: 595 (2018: 436) [a statistical evaluation for the past 12 months is not possible with the German CAs system, statistics can only be provided as per calendar year]
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	3
Latvia	7
Lithuania	11
Luxembourg	2
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	155
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	In total about 145 requests during the last 12 months. Of these about 60 has been submitted by NAVI as transmitting agency.
Poland	15
Portugal	9
Romania	1
Slovenia	2
Sweden	81
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	28
United Kingdom (England)	7
United States of America	In its role as the U.S. Central Authority, OCSE has not made any outgoing requests for specific measures. OCSE has designated state IV-D child support agencies as public bodies to transmit and receive Convention applications, and process Convention cases. In that capacity, a state IV-D agency may also make

an outgoing request for specific measures. Based on anecdotal information from states, it appears that outgoing requests for specific measures are not frequent; the most common request is for address information.

Incoming requests for specific measures:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	no data
Belarus	5
Brazil	Around 50% of the requests
Bulgaria	0
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification.
Croatia	1
Cyprus	0 CASES
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	11
France	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Since the beginning of 2019: 54 (2018: 62)
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	4
Lithuania	4
Luxembourg	0
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	272
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	120 requests received in the last 12 months
Poland	61
Portugal	38
Romania	2
Slovenia	1
Sweden	6
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	40
United Kingdom (England)	89
United States of America	From November 2018 through October 2019, in its role as the U.S. Central Authority, OCSE received 420 parent locate requests from Convention countries. OCSE has designated state IV-D child support agencies as public bodies to transmit and receive Convention applications, and process Convention cases. In that capacity, a state IV-D agency may also make an outgoing request for specific measures. It appears that some states have received more than 100 requests for specific measures in the course of a year,

whereas other states have received none. The most common incoming requests relate to location of the debtor or assistance with service of process.

1.4. How many full-time employees (FTEs) are working in your Central Authority?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	approximately 2 FTE handling all maintenance cases (including European Maintenance Regulation, New York Convention and others)
Belarus	2
Brazil	7
Bulgaria	1 employee
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Currently the Central Authority of Colombia is conformed by six lawyers.
Croatia	Out of the total of 7 employees who are currently working in the Croatian Central Authority (4 lawyers, 2 social workers and 1 psychologist) 2 case workers - lawyers work exclusively on child support cases while 5 other employees (lawyers, social workers and psychologist) work on child support cases and other cases from the competence of Croatian Central Authority.
Cyprus	There are not any full time employees that deal exclusively with maintenance cases.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	There are currently approx. ten persons working in the Finnish Central Authority, which functions as a Central Authority for over 50 international instruments. Two persons are handling the maintenance cases under all instruments concerning that area. Furthermore, based on the national legislation, part of the duties related to recovery of maintenance under the EU regulation are handled by the Finnish Social Insurance Board (Kela). In Kela, there are currently three people working with international maintenance cases.
France	9 ETP
Germany (CA)	The German CA is not only responsible for cases under the Hague Convention of 2007, but also under all other international instruments regarding the recovery of cross border maintenance (as well as cases of formal reciprocity/bilateral agreements with Canada (except Québec & Nunavut) and South Africa and formerly also the United States until their ratification of the Hague Maintenance Convention). An allocation of the around 70 FTEs to the different instruments ist not possible. All incoming and outgoing cases are handled by the German CA from the beginning until they are closed. This includes not only communication with the parties and the requesting CA but also litigation of maintenance cases in court and enforcement of decisions as well as processing and supervising payments.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	9
Latvia	32
Lithuania	2
Luxembourg	2 (1 avocat général + 1 fonctionnaire)
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	4

Nicaragua	It is provided that when the Convention enters into force two public officials will be appointed to process applications.
Norway	In total 27 (CA: 22 and NAVI (transmitting agency): 5)
Poland	The Regional Courts -26, The Ministry of Justice of Republic of Poland - 4 and 2 part time
Portugal	9
Romania	2
Slovenia	2
Sweden	9 woorking with the 2007 Convention
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	3
United Kingdom (England)	21
United States of America	In OCSE, the Central Authority is staffed by approximately 1 federal FTE and 2 contractor FTE staff.

1.5. Please identify the countries that are your State's main partners in international child support cases under the 2007 Convention:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Turkey, United States of America, Bosnia-Herzegovina
Belarus	Germany, United States of America, United Kingdom
Brazil	Portugal, United States of America, United Kingdom, Spain, Italy
Bulgaria	We have not enough practice on the 2007 Convention.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, currently the Republic of Colombia is not a part of tis Convention, nevertheless, the country is taking actions for its ratification
Croatia	Norway, Bosnia and Herzegovina, USA.
Cyprus	USA , NORWAY, BELARUS
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Finland has the most 2007 Convention cases with the United States.
France	ETATS UNIS, TURQUIE, BRESIL, NORVEGE
Germany (CA)	USA
Germany (DIJUF)	USA, Norway, Turkey, Kasachstan, Ukraine, Brazil, Belarus, Bosnia-Herzegovina
Hungary	United States, Ukraine
Latvia	Norway and Ukraine
Lithuania	Norway
Luxembourg	Etats-Unis: 4 dossiers au cours des trois dernières années
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	No information
Nicaragua	Panama, Honduras, the United States of America, the European Union
Norway	Outgoing for establishment: USA Incoming for recognition and enforcement: Poland, Germany, Lithuania, Latvia, Austria.

	Outgoing for recognition and enforcement: UK and USA
Poland	Norway, Ukraine, USA ,Turkey
Portugal	Brazil, USA, Norway and Ukrain
Romania	NO, USA
Slovenia	Bosnia and Herzegovina, United States of America
Sweden	USA
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Germany, Italy, Portugal, Spain, Poland, Czech Republic, France, Slovak Republic, United States of America
United Kingdom (England)	Norway and USA.
United States of America	The Convention partners that generated the most international customer service inquiries to OCSE to date in 2019 are Germany, followed by the United Kingdom, Sweden, Poland, Ireland, and Brazil. U.S. states report that Germany, the United Kingdom, Poland, Sweden, France, Norway, Portugal and the Czech Republic are among states' main Convention partners.

2. Statistics under the 1956 Convention, regional instruments and bilateral arrangements*

2.1. How many active cases is your State handling at this moment under international instruments other than the 2007 Convention?

Outgoing cases:

Argentina	200 outgoing cases (maintenance creditor living in Argentina - maintenance debtor living in other contracting Parties)
Australia	There were 27,495 cases as at 30 June 2019 where the paying parent was in another jurisdiction and the payee was in Australia (see Child Support Program Information at data.gov.au). Most of these cases were under an international arrangement that Australia has with a reciprocating jurisdiction, but not all of these cases were transmitted to the reciprocating jurisdiction for enforcement.
Austria	
Belarus	Under the 1956 Convention there are 38 active cases.
Brazil	Around 400
Bulgaria	Bilateral treaties, 1.01.2013 - 27.11.2019 - 3
Canada	As of March 31, 2018 there were 720 outgoing international cases.
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	171
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, the sending Central Authority of the Republic de Colombia is the Consejo Superior de la Judicatura.
Croatia	Under 1956 Convention there are 117 active cases. The Ministry for Demography, Family, Youth and Social Policy took over responsibilities of Transmitting Agency under the 1956 Convention from Ministry of Finance as from August 2019. Under Council Regulation 4/2009 there are 378 active outgoing cases.
Cyprus	Under EU Regulation 4/2009: 23 1956 Convention: 0 Bilateral agreements: 0
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	In the Finnish Central Authority, there are currently 148 pending outgoing cases based on the 1956 Convention, regional instruments and bilateral

	arrangements. In addition to the cases pending in the Finnish Central Authority, the Social Insurance Institution (Kela) sends applications abroad to foreign Central Authorities based on the EU regulation and the Nordic Agreement. Their statistics are reported under question 2.2.
France	587
Germany (CA)	UN Convention: 588 EU Regulation: 1,406 formal reciprocity/ bilateral agreements: 23
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	531
Latvia	1134 active cases under the Council Regulation No 4/2009
Lithuania	721 cases by the Council Regulation No. 4/2009
Luxembourg	règlement (CE) n° 4/2009 du Conseil du 18 décembre 2008: 245
Mexico	2186 outgoing cases
Netherlands	Please insert text her
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	NAVI: 1151 (these are cases that we have sent under the Nordic Convention, the Hague Convention of 1973 and a bilateral agreement with Canada for recognition and enforcement and are still under enforcement) We have also sent a few cases to Ireland under the 1956 convention.
Poland	4660
Portugal	975
Romania	27
Slovenia	120
Sweden	665
Switzerland	1'199 - le 15.11.2019
Ukraine	71
United Kingdom (England)	1112
United States of America	The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Incoming cases:

Argentina	158 incoming cases (maintenance debtor living in Argentina - maintenance creditor living in other contracting Parties)
Australia	There were 12,695 cases as at 30 June 2019 where the payee was in another jurisdiction and the paying parent was in Australia (see Child Support Program Information at data.gov.au). Most of these cases were under an international arrangement that Australia has with a reciprocating jurisdiction, but not all of these cases involved requests from the reciprocating jurisdiction for enforcement.
Austria	Please insert text here

Belarus	The Central Authority does not have statistical data.
Brazil	Around 200
Bulgaria	Bilateral treaties, 1.01.2013 - 27.11.2019 - 26
Canada	As of March 31, 2018 there were 525 incoming international cases. The Canada totals for outgoing and incoming international cases include only the jurisdictions that report data to the Survey of Maintenance Enforcement Programs (Statistics Canada), including Nova Scotia, Alberta, Yukon, Northwest Territories, Prince Edward Island, New Brunswick, Saskatchewan, Newfoundland and Labrador, Nunavut and Saskatchewan.
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	60
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	As Intermediary Institution the ICBF through the Adoptions subdirection has 38 active requests.
Croatia	Under 1956 Convention there are 49 incoming cases. Under Council Regulation 4/2009 there are 125 incoming cases.
Cyprus	Under EU Regulation 4/2009: 76 1956 Convention: 0 Bilateral agreements: 6
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	In the Finnish Central Authority, there are currently 510 pending incoming cases based on the 1956 Convention, regional instruments and bilateral arrangements. It is also possible for the applicants to send their applications directly to the enforcement offices and courts. The Central Authority does not have statistical data of those cases.
France	1 600
Germany (CA)	UN Convention: 1,860 EU Regulation: 5,264 formal reciprocity/bilateral agreements: 40
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	260
Latvia	98 active cases under the Council Regulation No 4/2009
Lithuania	106 cases by the Council Regulation No. 4/2009
Luxembourg	règlement (CE) n° 4/2009 du Conseil du 18 décembre 2008: 29
Mexico	178 incoming cases
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	41 incoming cases for enforcement under the Nordic convention Several hundred cases for establishment, but these are generally not sent or handled under an international instrument. Norway always has jurisdiction to establish maintenance if one of the parties lives here. Consequently we do not have proper statistics for incoming cases for establishment.
Poland	949
Portugal	234
Romania	32
Slovenia	47

Sweden	80
Switzerland	1'554 - le 15.11.2019
Ukraine	162
United Kingdom (England)	8924
United States of America	The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

2.2. How many new cases (outgoing and incoming) were added to your caseload under international instruments other than the 2007 Convention each year during the last three years?

Last year:

Argentina	80
Australia	As at 30 June 2019 there were 40,190 international cases (where one parent/carer resided in Australia and the other parent/carer resided in another jurisdiction).
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	2019 (under the 1956 Convention): none
Brazil	
Bulgaria	3
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	67
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Republic of Colombia received 16 requests in 2019 as Intermediary Institution under the 1956 Convention.
Croatia	In 2018 there have been 8 new cases under 1956 Convention and 146 new cases under Council Regulation 4/2009.
Cyprus	2018 - EU Regulation 4/2009: 46 Bilaterals:0
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	There were about 150 new cases in the Finnish Central Authority in 2018. Due to a change in the case management system in 2018, it is not possible to get exact figures. In addition, the Finnish Social Insurance Institution (Kela) sent 69 outgoing applications directly to the Central Authorities of the requested states based on the EU regulation and the Nordic Agreement in 2018.
France	Données non disponibles
Germany (CA)	UN Convention: 99 (outgoing), 166 (incoming) EU Regulation: 311 (outgoing), 1,077 (incoming) formal reciprocity (South Africa + Canada (except Québec & Nunavut)): 3 (outgoing), 9 (incoming)
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	219

Latvia	incoming 76, outgoing 657 cases under the Council Regulation No 4/2009
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	149
Mexico	273 new cases in 2019 (outgoing and incoming)
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	2018: About 110 outgoing cases for enforcement and about 70 incoming cases for enforcement
Poland	2018 - 1567
Portugal	604
Romania	10
Slovenia	12
Sweden	740
Switzerland	594
Ukraine	24
United Kingdom (England)	2965
United States of America	The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Prior year:

Argentina	80
Australia	As at 30 June 2018 there were 42,306 international cases (where one parent/carer resided in Australia and the other parent/carer resided in another jurisdiction).
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	2018 (under the 1956 Convention): 7
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	1
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	74
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Republic of Colombia received 20 requests in 2018 as Intermediary Institution under the 1956 Convention.
Croatia	In 2017 there have been 9 new cases under 1956 Convention and 150 new cases under Council Regulation 4/2009.
Cyprus	2017 - EU Regulation 4/2009: 37 Bilaterals:0
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	There were 160 new cases in the Finnish Central Authority in 2017. In addition, the Finnish Social Insurance Institution (Kela) sent 155 new outgoing applications directly to the Central Authorities of the requested states based on the EU regulation and the Nordic agreement in 2017.

France	Données non disponibles
Germany (CA)	UN Convention: 94 (outgoing), 106 (incoming) EU Regulation: 321 (outgoing), 1,165 (incoming) formal reciprocity (South Africa + Canada (except Québec & Nunavut): 4 (outgoing), 9 (incoming)
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	286
Latvia	incoming 77, outgoing 152 cases under the Council Regulation No 4/2009
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	118
Mexico	296 new cases in 2018 (outgoing and incoming)
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	2017: About 190 outgoing cases for enforcement and about 90 incoming cases for enforcement
Poland	2017 - 2066
Portugal	514
Romania	4
Slovenia	13
Sweden	979
Switzerland	522
Ukraine	23
United Kingdom (England)	2994
United States of America	The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Prior year:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	No further data available.
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	2017 (under the 1956 Convention): 4
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	3
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	44
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Republic of Colombia received 9 requests in 2017 as Intermediary Institution under the 1956 Convention.
Croatia	In 2016 there have been 7 new cases under 1956 Convention and 120 new cases under Council Regulation 4/2009.
Cyprus	2016 - EU Regulation 4/2009: 26 Bilaterals: 1
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here

Finland	There were 145 new cases in the Finnish Central Authority in 2016. In addition, the Finnish Social Insurance Institution (Kela) sent 151 new outgoing applications directly to the Central Authorities of the requested states based on the EU regulation and the Nordic agreement in 2016.
France	Données non disponibles
Germany (CA)	UN Convention: 133 (outgoing), 130 (incoming) EU Regulation: 345 (outgoing), 1,167 (incoming) formal reciprocity (South Africa + Canada (except Québec & Nunavut)): 3 (outgoing), 8 (incoming)
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	309
Latvia	incoming 103, outgoing 279 cases under the Council Regulation No 4/2009
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	96
Mexico	335 new cases in 2017 (outgoing and incoming)
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	2016: About 160 outgoing cases for enforcement and about 100 incoming cases for enforcement
Poland	2016 - 1588
Portugal	461
Romania	9
Slovenia	3
Sweden	764
Switzerland	560
Ukraine	16
United Kingdom (England)	3277
United States of America	The United States is not party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments; the only international cases involving the U.S. Central Authority that we process outside of the Convention are pursuant to federal bilateral agreements. OCSE does not currently have authority to collect data from the U.S. states on cases under federal bilateral agreements, nor can we survey the states. We therefore lack such information. In general, the international caseload of individual U.S. states varies, and there is no federal requirement that state systems identify federal bilateral agreement cases.

Please specify the reference period for these statistics, *i.e.*, whether a calendar or fiscal year, and if the latter, the starting and ending dates:

Calendar year

Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Fiscal year

Australia, United Kingdom (England)

starting:

Argentina	01/01/2020
Australia	01/07/2020
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	01/01/2020
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	101
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	January 1st
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	
Poland	1.01
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	01.01.yyyy
Slovenia	11
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	1012017
United Kingdom (England)	01/04/2016-31/03/2017
United States of America	Please insert text here

ending:

Argentina	31/12/2020
Australia	30/06/2020
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	31/12/2020
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	3112
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	December 31st
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	
Poland	31.12
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	31.12.yyyy
Slovenia	3112
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	31122019
United Kingdom (England)	01/04/2019-31/03/2019
United States of America	Please insert text here

2.3. How many full-time employees (FTEs) are working in your Central Authority / Transmitting Agency / Receiving Agency under these other international instruments?

Argentina	There are 5 full time employees working in the Central Authority under the 1956 Convention. Additionally, there are provincial authorities working too in the 24 jurisdictions throughout Argentina.
Australia	106.4 This number has been calculated by bringing together the number of staff that work primarily on international cases and adding a proportion of FTE from teams that manage both domestic and international cases. This number is at the end of November 2019 and is subject to change dependant on workload fluctuations and priorities across service delivery.
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	2
Brazil	7
Bulgaria	Bilateral treaties - 1 employee - 1/2 of the full-time activity
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	3
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Currently the Central Authority of Colombia is conformed by six lawyers.
Croatia	Out of the total of 7 employees who are currently working in the Croatian Central Authority (4 lawyers, 2 social workers and 1 psychologist) 2 case workers - lawyers work exclusively on child support cases while 5 other employees (lawyers, social workers and psychologist) work on child support cases and other cases from the competence of Croatian Central Authority.
Cyprus	see 1.4
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	There are two employees handling maintenance cases in the Finnish Central Authority. In the Finnish Social Insurance Institution, there are three employees working with international maintenance cases.
France	9 ETP en tout ; la répartition ne se fait pas par instrument international.
Germany (CA)	see 1.4
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	9
Latvia	32
Lithuania	The same 2 employees, mentioned in 1.4 point of this questionnaire.
Luxembourg	2 (1 avocat général + 1 fonctionnaire)
Mexico	Six
Netherlands	1 team,
Nicaragua	Nicaragua is not a party to the 1956 Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance
Norway	Receiving agency: 1 FTE works with recognition under the Nordic convention. Transmitting agency: We use about two FTEs
Poland	The Regional Courts - 20 and 1 part time
Portugal	8
Romania	-
Slovenia	2
Sweden	31
Switzerland	A l'Autorité centrale (Office fédéral de la Justice): 4 ETP (répartis sur 7 personnes à temps partiel, dont 6 gestionnaires de dossier [ensemble 310% ETP] et 1 juriste [90% ETP]). Remarque: Les dossiers ne sont pas traités par l'Autorité centrale (Office fédéral de la Justice) mais par les autorités compétentes dans les 26 cantons.
Ukraine	3
United Kingdom (England)	21
United States of America	In OCSE, the Central Authority is staffed by approximately 1 federal FTE and 2 contractor FTE staff.

2.4. Please identify the countries that are your State's main partners in international child support cases under the 1956 Convention, regional instruments or bilateral arrangements:

Argentina	Chile, Spain, Brazil, Colombia, Mexico, Germany, Switzerland, France, Ecuador, Uruguay, Belgium, Netherlands, Romania, Israel, Italy.
-----------	---

Australia	The reciprocating jurisdictions with which Australia has the most cases are New Zealand (bilateral agreement), the United Kingdom (1956 Convention, 1973 Hague Convention and Commonwealth arrangements), the United States of America (bilateral agreement), the Philippines (1956 Convention) and Canada (Commonwealth arrangements).
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Under the 1956 Convention: Germany, under regional conventions and bilateral treaties: Russia, Ukraine, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland.
Brazil	Portugal, United States of America, Spain, Italy
Bulgaria	Bilateral treaties - Poland, Russia, Czech Republic, Ukraine, Belarus.
Canada	Some of Canadian provinces main reciprocating partners include the United States, United Kindom (Great Britain), Australia, and Germany. Quebec's main partners include the following ten U.S. states: California, Florida, Maine, Massachusetts, New Hampshire, New Jersey, New York, Oregon, Pennsylvania and Vermont.
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Argentina, Spain
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Spain and Chile.
Croatia	Under the 1956 Convention the main partner of the Republic of Croatia is Switzerland, Bosnia and Herzegovina and Serbia and under the Regulation 4/2009 the main partners of the Republic of Croatia are Germany, Slovakia, Slovenia, Poland, Sweden, Hungary.
Cyprus	1956 Convention: AUSTRALIA Bilaterals: UKRAINE, RUSSIA, BELARUS, SERBIA 4/2009 Regulation: most EU Countries
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Under the EU Maintenance Regulation the main partners are Estonia, the UK, Germany and Spain. Also, Finland has a lot of cooperation with the Nordic countries under the Nordic Agreement.
France	SUISSE, MAROC et ISRAEL pour la Convention de 1956 ; les dossiers bilatéraux sont suivis par le Ministère de la Justice, autorité centrale en application des accords concernés.
Germany (CA)	Switzerland (UN Convention) Poland, Austria (EU Regulation)
Germany (DIJUF)	EU (Maintenance Regulation), Switzerland (Lugano Convention), Canada, New-Zeeland, South Africa (reciprocity), Australia, Israel, Morocco, Tunesia, Argentina, Republic of North Macedonia (UN Convention 1956), Mexico, China, Japan, Republic of North-Macedonia, Algeria, Colombia (national law)
Hungary	Germany, United Kingdom, Austria, Romania, Slovak Republic, the Netherlands, Italy, Poland
Latvia	United Kindom, Germany, Ireland, Sweden
Lithuania	United Kingdom, Sweden, Ireland, Latvia, Germany
Luxembourg	Allemagne: 230 dossiers au cours des trois dernières années, Portugal: 45 dossiers au cours des trois dernières années, France: 28 dossiers au cours des trois dernières années
Mexico	Argentina, Colombia, Chile, Germany, Netherlands, Spain and United States.
Netherlands	Poland, Germa y and Belgium
Nicaragua	Nicaragua is not a party to the 1956 Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance

Norway	Sweden, Iceland, Finland and Denmark under the Nordic convention, and Australia under the Hague Convention of 1973.
Poland	The whole European Union, Switzerland, Norway, Belarus, Ukraine, USA
Portugal	Brazil (old cases), Germany, Switzerland, France, United Kingdom
Romania	Israel, Republic of Moldova, Switzerland, Turkey, Argentina, Brasil, New Zealand, Serbia, Ukraine, P.R. China, Morocco, Germany, Poland
Slovenia	Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia, Croatia, Switzerland, Australia
Sweden	No statistic is available.
Switzerland	Dossiers entrants: Allemagne, Portugal, Autriche, France, Pologne Dossiers sortants: Allemagne, France, Italie, USA, Autriche
Ukraine	Israel, Australia, Switzerland, Ireland
United Kingdom (England)	Austria, Poland and Sweden for the EU Maintenance Regulation 4/2009 Australia, Sweden and Ireland under 1956 Convention
United States of America	The U.S. is not a party to the 1956 Convention or regional instruments. The U.S. has a federal bilateral agreement with the following: Australia, El Salvador, Israel, Switzerland, and the Canadian provinces/territories of Alberta, British Columbia, Manitoba, New Brunswick, Newfoundland/Labrador, Northwest Territories, Nova Scotia, Nunavut, Ontario, Prince Edward island, Saskatchewan, and Yukon.

3. Operational issues

3.1. Are acknowledgments of receipt received within the required timeframe?

Always

No answers

Almost always

Austria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Half the time

Belarus, Croatia, Germany (CA), Hungary, Norway, United States of America

Rarely

Brazil, France, Portugal, United Kingdom (England)

Never

Bulgaria

3.2. Has your State encountered interpretation difficulties with regard to the term “residence” (Art. 9), which is broader than “habitual residence”?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Latvia, Germany (CA), Romania

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Le Bâtonnier a sollicité la rétractation d'une décision d'aide juridictionnelle au motif que la juridiction française n'était pas territorialement compétente, l'enfant pour qui la créance alimentaire étant demandée ayant sa résidence habituelle aux Etats Unis.
Germany (CA)	Difficulties arise in certain constellations, i.e. child abduction, (minor) creditor studying abroad for a limited period of time while the custodial parent stays in a different State (especially problematic when only one of those States is a member to the Hague Convention), creditor with two equal residences.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	As the Convention is not currently in force no interpretation difficulties have been encountered
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The creditors are RO students which are studying temporarily abroad. The RO debtors workers are working temporarily abroad. They have the domicile in RO, but the habitual residence abroad. The creditors prefer to send the application in the state where the debtor resides, via the RO CA, to avoid the translations, to avoid the contact with the foreign authorities from the requesting state.

Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

If yes, please describe, if relevant, the practices your State has developed to overcome these difficulties:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Le Conseil national des Barreaux a été saisi. Une note d'information a été publiée dans la newsletter de la conférence des Bâtonniers.
Germany (CA)	The Central Authority tries to communicate with the other Central Authority and the parties to the case to find the best solution depending on the individual circumstances.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	If the debtor has official registered address in Latvia but actually lives in Norway, no court orders or deeds are accepted in Norway in such situation if the court or administrative institution follows the Latvian laws
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	We asked the CA from the requested state not to dismiss the application and not to return the file, because the RO creditors sent the application via the RO CA.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here

Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

3.3. Has your State encountered problems with regard to applications made in the name of the child by a parent?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Romania, United States of America

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	In some States applications made in the name of the child by a parent are uncommon since domestic law provides that only the custodial parent is entitled to make an application . If there are indications as to a lack of power of representation (e.g. in cases of child abduction and conflicting custody decisions), the Central Authority might request documents that can be used to prove it in the proceedings.
Germany (DIJUF)	The problems were due to the collision of different legal cultures. In Germany the child is the creditor of the maintenance claim, and consequently it is the applicant/ party in court and administrative proceedings. During the minority of the child, the custodial parent acts for the child on its behalf (as legal representative) when it comes to make an application for child support (establishment, declaration of enforceability, enforcement). The custodial parent cannot apply for child support on his/ her own behalf. With one exception: in certain special court proceedings (i.e. divorce proceeding, maintenance proceeding after a separation but before a divorce) the custodial parent is applicant and party of the proceeding - but still not the creditor. qIn

	the states where the custodial parent is entitled to claim child maintenance (USA, UK, Italy), difficulties arose in explaining to the foreign authorities why the child himself was seeking the recognition and enforcement of the German support order (particularly in the US). Generally, the foreign authorities accept to process the child's application but consider in their proceedings the custodial parent to be the applicant. This pragmatic approach has no negative consequence for the creditor - as long as child and custodial parent agree and cooperate with each other, and as long as the non-custodial parent doesn't argue that the party of the maintenance title and the party of the recovery-proceeding differ. If he/ she does, this could lead to procedural issues in cases of court proceedings filed by the debtor against the enforcement measures. In cases of establishment of a support order, DIJuF adapts and prepares the application according to the law of the requested state. If, according to the law of this state, the custodial parent is entitled to claim child maintenance, the application is filed by the custodial parent notwithstanding the legal situation in Germany.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	As the Convention is not currently in force no problems have been encountered
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The child was de facto raised and residing by/with the grandmother. The grandmother pretended at phone that she is the mother. The grandmother signed the documents instead of the mother. After many years, the mother informed the RO CA that she was abroad and that the child did not leave with her. The CA cannot certify a person via the telephone or cannot verify the authenticity of the signature.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	In the U.S., a dependent child is not the creditor. Therefore most state child support systems create a case using the name of the applicant, which must be either the parent of the child or the public body; the dependent is identified as the person for whom maintenance is sought. It is problematic when a State sends an application where the child is the creditor/applicant and the name of the custodial parent is not provided. At least one state has also reported that occasionally a State will send a case where the parent is the applicant but, once the child emancipates, the State sends a second case where the child is the applicant and there is no indication that the two cases are related. This problem could be resolved with better communication between Central Authorities.

Do the problems concern lack of information in the relevant Country Profile?
Yes

Romania

No

Colombia (1956 New York Convention), France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Poland, United States of America

Do the problems concern lack of clarity in the relevant Forms?
Yes

Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Germany (CA), Romania

No

France, Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Poland, United States of America

3.4. Has your State encountered problems with regard to a public body acting in place of an individual to whom maintenance is owed or a public body to which reimbursement is owed for benefits provided in place of maintenance (Art. 36)?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Ukraine

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	A request for preliminary ruling is currently pending at the ECJ concerning the jurisdiction according to Art. 3 letter b) of Regulation (EC) 4/2009 (ECJ,

	<p>C 540/19). According to the Borrás/Degeling report, § 591 it was evident that public bodies would rarely, if ever, need to establish or modify a decision in a requested state" thus it may be assumed that the public bodies can rely on Art. 3 letter b) of Regulation (EC) Nr. 4/2009. If the ECJ nevertheless denies the applicability of said Article for public bodies, it might be desirable to grant public bodies their own right to apply for establishment of a decision through the Central Authorities. When public bodies apply for enforcement of a decision it would be helpful to provide a form attesting in accordance with Art. 36 (4) that the conditions are met (see. 7.5) especially outlining the legal grounds of the right to act in place of an individual to whom maintenance is owed or to seek reimbursement of benefits provided to the creditor in place of maintenance, the amount of benefits provided, the duration for which benefits are/were provided. These aspects are required in order to declare a decision that was made in favour of the child to be enforceable for the public body and therefore to finally enforce it in favour of the public body."</p>
Germany (DIJUF)	<p>One legal problem is the jurisdictional bases for the establishment of child maintenance orders after the payment of child maintenance advance by German public bodies. As the Convention does not contain any provisions concerning the international competence to deal with maintenance matters, the international competence is determined (from the German point of view) by the EU Maintenance Regulation. Currently the interpretation of Art. 3b) of the Regulation is not clear in regard to its application to public bodies and the possibility for them to file a maintenance proceeding at their seat in Germany. Where the local courts deny the applicability of Art. 3b), public bodies have no other choice than to apply for establishment of a maintenance order in the debtor's country of residence. In some cases, this makes the recovery of maintenance at least nonsensical from an economic point of view, if not impossible. One practical disadvantage with a legal consequence concerns the limited options for public bodies to make use of the assistance of the Central Authorities. According to the Convention (Art. 36: "for the purposes of applications for recognition and enforcement..."), public bodies can only be granted assistance in cases of recognition and enforcement, not in cases of establishment of a maintenance order. As a consequence, public bodies are not entitled to apply for specific measures in relation to an application for establishment of a maintenance order. It depends on the Central Authorities discretion whether or not it considers public bodies to be potential applicants for an application according to Chapter III of the Convention, and offer the service of specific measures. Where public bodies have the legal possibility to make use of the assistance of the Central Authorities or to file direct applications, problems can therefore occur in relation to the costs of proceedings. First of all, public bodies are faced with a lack of exemption from costs of proceeding. According to Art. 17 b) of the Convention, free legal assistance is automatically granted (it means without means and merits test) if free legal assistance has been granted in the state of origin but only under the same extent as provided by the law of the addressed state. From DIJuFs' experience (except in Austria under the Maintenance Regulation), German public bodies usually are not granted exemption from costs when they conduct proceedings abroad. Consequently, except in the states in which proceedings are free of costs (like Norway or Canada), public bodies hesitate to initiate steps against the maintenance debtor because, unlike the children who can have a personal interest in trying to recover their maintenance claim, public bodies only take measures when they are economically justified. A second considerable expense factor is the translation costs. According to German domestic law, applicants can namely apply for free legal assistance (more exactly: "exemption of reimbursement toward the Central Authority") if they fulfil</p>

	the requirements of free legal aid according to the German code of civil procedure. As public bodies do not meet these conditions, they have to bear the costs of translation. This expense factor can be considerable in cases of enforcement in countries like Turkey, Kasachstan, Albania, where the official language is not a very usual one. All mentioned points (lack of competence of obtaining a maintenance order in the state of origin and limited options of obtaining the assistance of the central authorities, costs of proceedings) make the recovery of transferred rights by German public bodies particularly difficult and discourage them regularly to start a proceeding.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	When are two creditors- the Public Body and the natural person (in act of enforcement the natural person receives payments which provided for the Public Body and that complicates the situation and puts the natural person as receiver of payments in double)
Lithuania	
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	We have no practice on the Convention as it is not in force. Therefore, no interpretation difficulties have been encountered.
Norway	We have had to explain many times that our office is the applicant, not the custodial parent, and that it is our office that has to sign the power of attorney. We have also had some problems with how the arrears statements are made when there is arrears owed to both the public body and the custodial parent.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	
Romania	The lawyer, the court and the baillif are wishing that this quality be explained in more detail. The lawyers are wishing this to be explained in detail before the application is lodged before the court, because the legal representative and the creditor must be specified in the civil action. The baillifs are counting the arrears and in order to avoid the double payment and they must know exactly: - the amount due to the public institution and the owner of the bank account for the money transfer (the public institution) - the amount paid by the debtor directly to the creditor, in the account of the creditor or the account of the custodial parent.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	
Ukraine	When applications come from Latvia, simultaneously in the applications for recognition and enforcement of the maintenance judgements there is a request for further recovery from a debtor of the sums paid by the Foundation of the guarantees to creditors. However, under the Ukrainian legislation this is possible only under the separate judgment.
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

3.5. Has your State encountered problems with regard to a person 21 years or older seeking to obtain legal aid for the recovery of maintenance arrears that accrued before the child turned 21?
No

Belarus, Brazil, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Romania, Slovenia

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	One case with Bosnia
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	The legislation does not provide unconditional free legal aid to a person 21 years or older. The person should lodge the application before reaching the age of 21 in order to benefit of free legal aid.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The authorities that have jurisdiction to know about the process since after 18 years olds in Colombia you are not considered a minor.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	There have been problems with regard to the scope of Art. 15 (1) because legal aid was refused to persons 21 years old or older, even though the application only concerned maintenance arrears that were accrued before the child had turned 21. A clearer wording of the provision might help to avoid these problems. Moreover, other Central Authorities even have denied the applicability of the Convention after that point taking the position that according to Art. 2 the convention is only applicable to creditors younger than 21 (even though only maintenance arrears that were accrued before the child had turned 21 were in question).
Germany (DIJUF)	In the USA it may happen that enforcement measures can no longer be taken after the 21st birthday of the maintenance creditor, even if maintenance arrears are still owed. From DIJUF experience it is not due to a special interpretation of the Convention but rather due to the fact that maintenance agencies do not receive Federal funding for children over 21. The compatibility of this practice with the requirements of the Convention could be discussed.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	As the Convention is not currently in force no problems have been encountered

Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The enforcement court applies the limitation period according to the enforcement law from the requested state even if according to the Romanian law the limitation/prescription (on the substantive law), the right to recovery of the child supports claims does not elapse or, if it started to elapse, it is suspended (the Civil Code, art. 2532). In this case, the major creditor could ask for the recovery of the maintenance claims (due by the debtor until he/ she reaches 18 years) 3 years after she became major. The enforcement court does not take into account that, according to the art. 56 para 3 from the 2007 Hague Convention, the State addressed shall not be bound under this Convention to enforce a decision or a maintenance agreement, in respect of payments falling due prior to the entry into force of the Convention between the State of origin and the State addressed, except for maintenance obligations arising from a parent-child relationship towards a person under the age of 21 years.
Slovenia	Because of the long time process of resolving the request by the receiving Central Authority, the maintenance creditor turns over 21 years and the Court in Bosnia and Herzegovina refused to file the file for enforcement, referring that the creditor turn over 21.
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

3.6. Does your State provide legal aid to public bodies acting on behalf of the applicant (child)? No

Belarus, Cyprus, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Ukraine, United States of America

If yes, please explain if this has involved difficulties:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	We have no practice under the 2007 Convention, but in cases under the 2009 EU Maintenance Regulation the National legal aid bureau provides legal aid to the children, represented by public bodies.
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	We have not face any difficulties yet.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	
France	Pas de difficultés rencontrées : la demande est faite au nom d'une créancière qui a mandaté un organisme publici
Germany (CA)	Public bodies can apply for legal aid under Art. 15.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	No difficulties
Lithuania	no difficulties
Luxembourg	Non, par exemple les Jugendämter" allemands présentent un "Antrag auf Beistandschaft" de la part de la mère de l'enfant"
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	Legal aid is not necessary in our administrative system.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Legal aid will be provided to the public body only when it is claiming reimbursement of maintenance payments. However, the public body must attest that in the State of origin fulfils the requirements to complete or partial legal aid or an exemption from taxation or costs.
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	In Ukraine all the applications under the Convention are supported by legal aid lawyers
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	It has not involved difficulties.

3.7. Is the caseload in your Central Authority divided by regions or other case characteristics in order to promote a specialisation of case workers?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Netherlands, Norway, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Caseload is divided geographically depending on where the alimony payer is located.
Croatia	In previous years the caseload has been divided by states in order to establish a specialisation of case workers. However, due to the turnover of the staff this is no longer the case.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Earlier the cases were divided by countries between the two employees handling the maintenance cases. The idea was to promote specialisation. However, as there are only two case workers in the Central Authority, it was considered better to divide the cases based on the first letter of the last name of the debtor, in order for both of the case workers to gain expertise and practice on different countries. This is the current practice.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	The German CA has two specialized subdivisions in which the cases are allocated to the different case workers by country/geographic regions. Additionally, a third subdivision is responsible for administrative issues and the processing of payments.
Germany (DIJUF)	Each caseworker is responsible for one of several states depending on his language skills. As DIJuF files direct applications as far as it is justified from a procedural or economic point of view, language skills are particularly important to ensure an effective communication with foreign authorities and are consequently playing a decisive role in the distribution of work.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	Some cases are divided based on the language skills of the caseworkers.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	By region
Switzerland	LA SUISSE, COMME ETAT MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 1956 (PAS MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 2007):

	<p>A l'Autorité centrale (Office fédéral de la Justice): Division par canton. Chaque gestionnaire est responsable pour certains cantons.</p> <p>Remarque: Les dossiers ne sont pas traités par l'Autorité centrale mais par les autorités compétentes dans les 26 cantons.</p>
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	
United States of America	In the United States, OCSE as the Central Authority has designated state IV-D agencies as public bodies to transmit and receive Convention applications, and process Convention cases. States vary with regard to how they organize their staff. Some state child support agencies specialize the assignment of cases based on the service needed, such as establishment or enforcement, intrastate or intergovernmental. Other state child support agencies assign cases based on the party's residential location or alphabetical breakdown of the party's surname.

3.8. Has your State encountered any other operational issues with respect to the processing of cases?

No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Romania, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Federal States within a country were not able to forward applications when residence changed
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Lack of response about the application by the other state
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	As the maintenance cases typically remain pending for many years, the number of active cases increases steadily. This makes the case handling and resourcing challenging.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	In order to ensure a swift handling of cases dedicated/specialized contacts would be desirable. The German CA has made good experiences with

	centralized/specialized authorities (also including courts), because this leads to a higher expertise of the authorities/persons involved in processing the cases, thereby facilitating the process. Status updates on a regular basis would be greatly appreciated, in order to be able to inform the applicant about the status of the case. Problems can occur in states with non unified legal systems, when the applicant moves to another federal state, since a transfer of cases from one state to the other often proves to be difficult. Some States are not able to forward payments to the creditor if the debtor makes voluntary payments, i.e. if a maintenance decision has not been established yet.
Germany (DIJUF)	DIJuF observed a considerable length of proceedings at the level of administrative assistance provided by certain requested Central Authorities. This problem is not necessarily due to any deficiencies of the Convention but to the national/internal states' organisation. Similar problems were identified in relation to the implementation of the 1956 UN Convention or the EU-Maintenance Regulation.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	The maintenance debt is only recovered from the year before the application is received in Norway, maintenance payments can only be made to one creditor, when the cas in relity there are two creditors the Public Body and the natural person and refuse to accept the court order and deed despite the Latvian laws if the debtor has address in Norway but the official address under the Population Register of Latvia is in Latvia
Lithuania	Currency conversion problem: Changes in the exchange rate change the amount of debt, but each country uses its own currency; maintenance debt is only recovered one year back (rule applies in Norway); maintenance payments can only be made to one creditor, when the cas in relity there are two creditors: the applicant and a public body (the rule applies in Norway)
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	Lack of response from some states. We have encountered problems with the recovery of maintenace arrears that occurred before the child turned 21 if we send the case after the child turned 21 years old. Also, we have had a case rejected because the decision was more than five yearss old at the time of transmittal.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	1. The enforcement is refused: - when the child support is determined n fraction/percentage by the RO courts and the amount of the salary of the debtor is known (obtained via letter ofrequest or obtained by the creditor directly from the local foreign fiscal authority based on the National Identification Code allocated to the foreigners) or - when the child support is determine by the RO courts in fraction/percentage from the minimum wage on economy from Romania or from the enforcement state where the debtor works. The minimum wages are also known and published on the Internet. Even if the creditor can calculate the amount due, the enforcement authorities refuse to enforce the RO order because the amount is not certain. The enforcement is refused when the child support is established in fraction/percentage and the amount of the salary of the debtor and the salary of the debtor is not known. As far as concerns the determination of the child

	<p>support in percentage by the RO courts, the purpose of this is to protect the creditors and the courts from successive applications to increase it if the debtor's material condition changes. This flexible solution allows the adjustment of the child support. The determination of the child support in percentage / fraction cannot be a ground to refuse the enforcement according to the 2007 Hague Convention. After the enforcement authorities ascertained that the child support cannot be recovered, very few enforcement courts determined by themselves the child support in a certain amount in a new decision. 2. A child was unlawful removed from the state of his habitual residence and the court from the place where the child was unlawful removed rendered a decision on the return of the child that was not enforced, a decision on the divorce and the ancillary issues (including the establishment of the child support in the charge of the debtor, which is the parent whose custody right was violated). The Human Rights Court from Strasbourg rendered an order on the violation of the art. 8 and art. 6 from the Human Rights Convention on the violation of the private life and access to justice. In the exequatur proceedings of the part of the order related to the child support, the public order is invoked by the debtor (the infringement of the rules on the competence, the return order that could not be executed, the order of the Human Rights Court). If the child is de facto raised by the parent that removed the child unlawful, the child support cannot be recovered. 3. The declaration of the enforcement (as part of the exequatur) is confused/assimilated with the authorisation for the enforcement (as part of the enforcement itself). In Romania the exequatur is rendered by the Tribunal (Tribunal) and the order rendered by the Tribunal can be appealed at the Appeal Court (Curtea de Apel) and later a second appeal can be filed at the High Court of Cassation ad Justice (Înalta Curte de Casație și Justiție). After the exequatur is final, the enforcement proceedings are initiated by a bailiff who requests for the authorisation for the enforcement at the First instance Court (Judecătorie). Also, for the foreign decisions for which the exequatur was suppressed the enforcement proceedings are initiated by a bailiff who requests for the authorisation for the enforcement at the First instance Court (Judecătorie). In practice, there is a confusion between exequatur and enforcement. The RO courts decline to each other the competence and the negative conflict is solved by a superior court. This determines delays in the proceedings.</p>
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	1) If the applications and supporting documents are received without translation into Ukrainian, we cannot process them properly because only the documents in the Ukrainian language (or accompanied with their translation into Ukrainian) may be referred to a court. 2) Some Central authorities of the Requested Parties do not make communications in English or French and only write letters in their official language - this makes problematic understanding of the aim and a content of the CA letters by our Central Authority.
United Kingdom (England)	When a case is closed and we have notified the State Authorities, transmittals requesting updates continue to be sent. Also, when a bilateral application has been submitted, which REMO has returned to resubmit under the Hague Convention, the foreign authorities keep requesting updates on the bilateral case, ignoring or overlooking the letters previously sent regarding submitting a new application.

United States of America	<p>In general, the experience of the United States is that the Convention is operating smoothly. However, the U.S. has experienced Convention countries sharing electronically sensitive case information such as personally identifiable information about parties and children without encrypting it to ensure its protection. This is a large concern because the U.S. has stringent data security provisions in law. When we provide sensitive case data in an encrypted manner, we want assurance that the information will remain protected.</p> <p>States have also identified the following issues:</p> <p>1) System limitations in monitoring performance and tracking applications for the Hague Convention due to the use of external forms outside of the state system of record as well as the lack of an identifier that can easily permit tracking of these cases.</p> <p>2) Retention of qualified staff to process international applications, due to their unique training and knowledge.</p> <p>3) Inconsistent communication between Central Authorities has caused delays in case processing, especially lack of timely responses to requests for case status of applications.</p> <p>4) Occasional delays or lack of cooperation by some States in providing Convention forms and payments records when requested by U.S. states due to unique state case processing requirements. This has occurred especially with pre-existing cases with Hague Convention countries when a U.S. state needs to take an action.</p>
--------------------------	--

4. Access to information

4.1. Has your State experienced difficulties in obtaining information required for processing cases under the Convention, as a result of restrictions on access to personal data held by the government or private institutions?

No

Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Brazil, Germany (DIJUF), Norway, Romania

As a requesting State, please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Somo states do not disclose the address of the debtor.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here

Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply, the Central Authority is the Consejo Superior de la Judicatura.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	
Germany (DIJUF)	Certain requested Central Authorities require applicants to provide information that most of them do not have before they start trying to locate the maintenance debtor. A good example could be Turkey, which requires applicants to provide the debtor's Turkish ID-Number, the complete name of the debtor's parents and the name of the local authority where he/ she is supposed to be registered.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	We don't always receive replies to our requests for specific measures.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The enforcement is refused when the child support is determined in fraction/percentage and the amount of the salary of the debtor is not known. The enforcement authorities mention that they have not access to the data base of the revenues of the debtor and they cannot calculate the amount. If the enforcement state, via its fiscal authorities, can calculate the taxes that debtor must pay, one cannot understand how the revenues of the debtor cannot be obtained by the enforcement authority and how the child support cannot be calculated. In RO, the bailiffs have access to the data base of the revenues of the persons (including the annual revenue) and the bailiffs calculate the amount due, the arrears and adjust it with the inflation rate. The CA of the enforcement authority does not accept to provide the revenue based on a request for specific measures formulated by the requesting CA.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	

Yes

Cyprus, Germany (CA), Norway, Romania

As a requested State, please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Access to information as to immovable property or bank accounts is excluded. Requests for such information can only be satisfied within criminal proceedings and in the context of a request for evidence respectively.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	When benefits are granted in place of maintenance in the requesting state, some countries are not able to provide the underlying approval decision for reasons of data protection, even though the decision may be necessary in order to prove to the courts in accordance with Art. 36 (4) that the conditions are met and the public body is thus entitled to apply for enforcement of a maintenance decision (that was rendered for the child receiving the benefits).
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	Requests are not always justified.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The debtor is registered with the domicile in Romania, but he is not living at that domicile, but to an another address without being registered or abroad.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

If yes

Please describe, if relevant, the practices your State has developed to overcome these difficulties:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Together with the Central Authority of the requesting State a solution was found by providing other proof.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	We correspond with the states in question.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

5. Enforcement issues

5.1. Has your State experienced difficulties in enforcing decisions that set the amount of maintenance obligations on the basis of a percentage of the salary of the debtor or of the requesting State's minimum wage?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Finland, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Switzerland, United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Usually in Argentina, the amount of maintenance obligations is set on the basis of a percentage of the salary of the debtor. And it is very difficult to determine which is the specific amount when the debtor lives and works abroad.
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	In principle, the Finnish enforcement authority requires precise amounts, in order to enforce a maintenance judgment. It is challenging for the enforcement authority to enforce a judgement where the enforceable amount is in percentage, if the requesting state/applicant is not able to provide the salaries of information regarding the minimum wage, out of which the percentage should be calculated. Sometimes it is difficult to get information on how to calculate the correct amount from the requesting state.
France	Les juridictions françaises refusent d'exéquaturer les décisions étrangères fixant la pension alimentaire en pourcentage d'un salaire moyen étranger (exemple du Brésil).
Germany (CA)	A decision can be enforced in Germany when it is sufficiently specific or can be specified with additional documents. This means that an obligation that is based on the state's minimum wage can be enforced if the exact amounts can be derived from corresponding official documents/tables. An obligation based on a percentage of the salary of the debtor causes uncertainties as to the possibility of enforcement. For example it can be unclear whether the decision refers to the gross or net income of the debtor. There are no official registers documenting that kind of information in Germany, making it difficult for the competent authorities or the enforcement bodies to determine the salary of the debtor. Similarly, an obligation based on a percentage of the income of the debtor (more regular than percentage of the salary) causes problems in enforcement, because it is already unclear which sources of income are included and the amount often cannot be determined for a lack of information.

Germany (DIJUF)	In cases of decisions submitted in order to obtain a declaration of enforceability in Germany, the question of enforceability of decisions that set the amount of maintenance on the basis of a percentage of the salary of the debtor is checked at the level of the exequatur proceeding. According to German jurisprudence, such foreign decisions cannot be declared enforceable in Germany for lack of definiteness (see for example OLG Köln, 27.06.2011, 16 W 3/11, JAmt 2012, p. 112, BGH 06.11.1985 , IV b ZR). In this case, the debtor has the right (and no other choice than) to apply for establishment of a new decision even if a enforcement order already exists (AG München, 21.08.2014, 514 F 2359/14, BeckRS 2014, 119052). Of course, it makes the recovery of maintenance more difficult for the creditor who has to conduct a new proceeding and apply for the new determination of the maintenance amount, instead of "simply" enforcing the existing decision. Furthermore, he/ she won't be able to obtain a new decision concerning the arrears accrued before the new proceeding was initiated.
Hungary	A number of Hungarian support orders specify a certain percentage of the debtor's income as payable amount. In outgoing cases this could not be considered in the enforcement procedure in the majority of states due to lack of legislation in this respect. This is only a problem for outgoing cases whereas in incoming cases the foreign order specifying percentage of the debtor's income can be enforced in Hungary.
Latvia	But it might be if the deed or order is noted on basis of percentage of the salary which is not the state noted wage, the indexation table as obliged enclosure is requested
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	25% of the incoming cases
Nicaragua	Not applicable. The Convention will enter into force for Nicaragua in April 2020.
Norway	Our system does not allow us to enforce such decisions.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	See 3.8. and 4
Slovenia	The problem is not to get information on the debtor's employment in foreign countries, as well as information on the debtor's salary.
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	En pratique, ces décisions ne peuvent pas être exécutées en Suisse.
Ukraine	
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	U.S. states are unable to enforce orders that are not stated as a sum certain; support must be set at a fixed amount.

If yes, please describe, if relevant, the practices your State has developed to overcome these difficulties:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here

Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Information from the Finnish tax authorities (yearly income information) has been used, in order to calculate the amount to be enforced. However, this is possible only if the debtor has had taxable income in Finland during the time the debt has accrued.
France	A ce jour, aucune solution n'a pu être trouvée pour contourner la difficulté ; les dossiers gérés avec le Brésil ne dépassent pas la phase amiable.
Germany (CA)	The difficulties are communicated to the requesting state and the applicant is asked to specify the amount owed and provide relevant documents that make it possible to specify the amount owed. For the purposes of cross border recovery of maintenance it may be helpful to establish a fixed amount or to provide for the possibility for the competent authority establishing the decision to specify the amount owed under domestic law.
Germany (DIJUF)	Within the scope of the EU Maintenance regulation, maintenance creditors can file an application for specification of the foreign decision with the competent German court if the finding of the decision is not specific enough and the enforcement authority therefore refused to enforce the decision (Art. § 34 AUG). A similar rule does not exist concerning decisions submitted for exequatur. - With the expectation of directly enforceable decisions, no solution was developed. The declaration of enforceability remains impossible.
Hungary	Hungarian orders of such kind include a minimum amount specified within the order which is usually enforced by the foreign authorities.
Latvia	the indexation table as obliged enclosure is requested
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	There is little we can do, except to alter the maintenance.
Poland	in the case of applications coming from Ukraine, the requested central authority is confronted with an unclear formulation of the amount of maintenance - there is no data from the foreign authority on how this amount should be calculated
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	As a Central Authority, our fund obtains this information from employers if the debtor was employed in the Republic of Slovenia or. through the other foreign Central Authorities, the countries where the debtor was employed.
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	LA SUISSE, COMME ETAT MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 1956 (PAS MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 2007):

	<p>Clarifier si le débiteur est disposé à signer une convention d'entretien pour un montant fixe (par mois) qui correspond à sa situation financière.</p> <p>Si le montant dans la décision est un pourcentage du salaire minimum du pays (par exemple du Brésil): Demander à l'Autorité centrale requérante de fournir des preuves (par exemple feuille officielle, base légale) indiquant le montant du salaire minimum.</p> <p>Autrement: Demander à l'Autorité centrale requérante de nous fournir une nouvelle décision indiquant un montant fixe par mois.</p>
Ukraine	
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	<p>U.S. state child support agencies report varying practices to overcome this difficulty. If it is a percentage of income order, some state agencies will work with the debtor and other income reporting sources to obtain an average monthly income for use in determining a specific amount to be enforced. The agency will then seek a hearing for the court to review the debtor's income and clarify the dollar amount to be used in enforcement of the order. The sum certain order is not considered a modification of the foreign order, but rather a clarification for purposes of identifying the appropriate conversion of a percentage of income. Other states determine the amount to be paid based on the debtor's salary at the time of accepting the order, or of taking judicial action. Adjustments will be made as required by the court. U.S. state agencies report difficulty in determining whether the foreign order is referring to gross or net salary. States have the most difficulty in enforcing percentage of income orders if the order contains references to undefined terms such as the country's minimum standard of living.</p>

5.2. Has your State experienced difficulties in enforcing orders where the debtor does not have his / her habitual residence in your State but does have property there?

Not applicable – we have not had any requests to enforce an order in this circumstance

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Hungary, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

No, we have been able to enforce orders in this circumstance.

Bulgaria, Germany (CA), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Portugal, Switzerland, United States of America

Please describe the processes used:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	We have no practice under the 2007 Convention, but according to the Bulgarian legislation the district court exercising jurisdiction over the place of enforcement is competent in this cases (i.e. when the debtor does not have his/her habitual residence in Bulgaria, but does have property here).
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here

Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	German law provides for jurisdiction of the national enforcement bodies whenever the debtor has property within the State (Section 828 Code of Civil Procedure (ZPO) in connection with Section 23 ZPO). It may, however, be necessary to serve the debtor in the other State using the relevant international instrument on the service of documents.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	
Latvia	Latvian bailiffs have rights to identify the debtor's property, seize them and sell in auction.
Lithuania	Lithuanian bailiffs have the right to certify the debtor's assets and sell them in auction. however, there is a problem with the proper presentation of information to the debtor
Luxembourg	saisie d'une assurance pension par huissier de justice
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	The proceeding is the same as any other enforcement case. The competent court in this case is where the property has place.
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	LA SUISSE, COMME ETAT MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 1956 (PAS MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 2007): Requérir le séquestre pour les sommes dues à titre d'aliments au tribunal du siège de l'employeur (saisie de salaire) et engager une poursuite. Pour des prétentions futures, demander un avis aux débiteurs. Le for est au siège suisse de l'employeur.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	A U.S. state may place a lien on a debtor's personal and real property that is located in the state.

Yes

Germany (DIJUF), Romania

Please specify the difficulties encountered:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here

Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	According to DIJUF's experience, applications are not handled by the Central Authority in the USA if the debtor has no residence in the US. In Turkey, one of DIJUF's applications for seizure of a Turkish bank account of a debtor residing in Germany, was processed by the Central Authority but not by the court of exequatur because no serviceable address in Turkey could be provided. The child's mother finally appointed a Turkish lawyer with the exequatur.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The case encountered was when the debtor resides in the enforcement state. In the requesting state, where the creditor resides, the debtor has a property. The enforcement authorities have difficulties having a direct contact and coordinate the enforcement and the amount recovered. They communicate via the CA.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

5.3. Can your State enforce the payment of interest (Art. 19)? Yes

Austria, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Belarus, Cyprus, Netherlands, Norway, Romania

Please explain why not:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	It is not possible to collect interest on arrears in Cyprus.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	If the decision contains a requirement to pay legal interest only specified amounts can be enforced (see 5.1), so the applicant would have to provide a detailed calculation of interest including the interest rate and the starting date for the mandatory interest. However, there are underlying questions for example concerning the applicable law that rules when and where fulfillment occurs (especially when payments are made via the Central Authority) that may cause difficulties calculating the interest. This may even lead to a risk of cost for the applicant which may not be covered by the legal aid granted according to Art. 14, 15.
Germany (DIJUF)	If the payment of interest has been ordered in the maintenance order, no problem occurs. If not, only the late payment interest (according to German law) can be enforced.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	the payment of interest must be specified in the judgment
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Our system can't calculate payment of interets
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Only through the bailiff's office, not through the CA, due to domestic law.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	No, only the adjustment with the rate of the inflation can be recovered. The payment of the interest can be recovered only if it is established by a separat order.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here

Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	MEBC (Her Majesty's Court and Tribunals Service Maintenance Enforcement Business Centres)- yes as a result of the single family court being created. The difficulties are in calculating the interest payments (the court accounts system does not allow this) for the administration team and so a schedule of arrears from the applicant is requested
United States of America	Please insert text here

6. Feedback on the use of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms

A. As the requesting State:

6.1. Are there specific problems that you want the Special Commission to address with regard to the content or completion of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms?

No

Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Yes

Brazil, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Poland, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	The forms are too extensive and redundant, specially Annex I.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	It would really useful to have the forms in and electronically fillable form available in the HCCH website.
France	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	In order to process the application of a child or public body some States need information on the custodial parent (i.e. name, date of birth). Currently this information is provided under "11. Other information" of the recommended application form given the fact that there is no designated place for this information in the forms.
Germany (DIJUF)	From DIJuF's experiences as a representative of applicants and trainer of public bodies (who are not familiar with the completion of forms in cross-

	border cases), the forms are very long and not intuitive, particularly for occasional users. Sometimes very little information, particularly concerning the debtor, is known and a number of questions cannot be answered. Nevertheless, the whole form has to be printed. This makes the form very confusing to read and constitutes an unnecessary wastage of paper. Dynamic forms like the EU one would be helpful. - Concerning child maintenance, the forms assume the custodial parent to be the applicant. However, according to most German orders, the child is the entitled party and applicant. This makes it sometimes difficult to complete the forms correctly. - Furthermore, according to German law, the ordered child maintenance amount is mostly expressed as a dynamic amount (e.g.: 100% of the maintenance basic rate). This kind of formulation is quite difficult to integrate into the forms as the applicant is expected to mention a fixed amount. - Unlike the EU-forms, the Hague application forms do not contain any possibility to indicate the contact details of the applicant's representative in the country of origin (lawyer, NGO).
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	there is a need to develop good practice in the use of forms, there is no form for Article 7.
Portugal	Recommended Forms should be mandatory. In certain ways they take Central Authorities work faster.
Romania	The RO CA needs a form for the arrears when the child support is determined in a certain ammount. Nevethless, this tabel could not be filled in when the child support is determine in fraction/percentage and the amount of the salary of the debtor is not known. In this case the RO CA needs to know if a request for specific measure can be filled in instead.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	The availability of translated HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms is an important discussion topic. For example, it would be very helpful if contracting States placed hyperlinks to translated versions of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms within their Country Profile. One U.S. state has also requested clarification about whether the Statement of Enforceability form must accompany only the most recent decision or all decisions submitted with the application.

6.2. Is it a requirement under the domestic law of your State that the 2007 Convention application forms be signed by the applicant?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, France, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The signature of the applicant legitimates the action in his or her behalf.
Croatia	According to the Article 71 Paragraph 5 of the Act on the General Administrative Procedure the submissions shall be signed by the applicant respectively a person authorised to represent the applicant.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Under the law of Law on Legal Force of Documents
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	pour des raisons de validité et de l'authenticité des documnets joints
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	The signature certifies that the applicant acts on his/her own behalf.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the obligation results from the rules of national law
Portugal	According to article 373 of the Civil Code, all documents must be signed, otherwise they will not be valid.
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here

United States of America	Please insert text here
--------------------------	-------------------------

6.3. If you have responded yes to Question 6.2., please specify what other documents are required in combination with an unsigned application form in order for it to be acceptable under your State's law:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	A power of attorney, in case a representative signs the application
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Besides the form, we request all documents that prove the existence of and alimony obligation (judicial decision, agreements, documents that prove kinship).
Croatia	Not applicable.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Procuration autorisant l'Autorité centrale à agir au nom du créancier.
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	no other
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	/
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	In addition to the form, the application must be accompanied by documents attesting the existence of the maintenance obligation (judgments, agreements, documents establishing parentage, among others).
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the application must be absolutely signed, if not by the applicant then by a representative (then a power of attorney is required)
Portugal	Any other document as an internal application form signed by the applicant
Romania	the documents required by the Convention, the documents mentioned in the recommended forms, other relevant documents (birth certificate, proofs of the revenues/employer of the debtor etc.)
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

6.4. Can your State's competent authorities complete an abstract or extract of the decision using the HCCH recommended form in lieu of a complete text of the decision?

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please explain under which circumstances:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	if the decision/agreement originates from Austrian court or authority
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	It depends on the requested state.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	The applicant must request directly from the Registrar of the Family Court that issued the decision, the filling in and sealing of such document, using the recommended relevant Form.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	It is possible. However, it has not been used in practice.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	In practice, the completion of the abstract does not seem to pose any difficulties to the competent authorities.
Germany (DIJUF)	In Germany, the court or public body which has issued the maintenance order is also competent to establish the abstract of a decision. Basically, the competent authority is supposed to complete the form and send it to the applicant. In practice, the local courts are not used to establishing this kind of documents and often need a long time to process the application. Furthermore, they do not always know which form is requested (EU form, Lugano Convention form...). DIJUF has solved the problem to some degree by preparing the forms so that the courts just need to add their seal and sign them.
Hungary	According to the national implementing legislation (Act No 67 of 2011) the court ex officio arranges the necessary forms to be filled in.
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here

Slovenia	Only if the requested Central Authority sent that kind request to us.
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	MEBC - We follow the processes as required by the Hague convention so the circumstances would be as per the treaties.
United States of America	The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, as the U.S. Central Authority, has issued guidance that a state child support agency, as well as the issuing tribunal, are competent authorities to complete an abstract or extract of a decision.

No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Dominican Republic, France, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Ukraine

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	We have no practice under the 2007 Convention, but the competent court could consider the issuance of an abstract or extract of the decision at the request of the applicant.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	We need the full text to know the extent of the obligation.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	
Dominican Republic	See answer in question 6.7
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Cf. profil FRANCE p. 16
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	The Lithuanian law provides neither rights nor obligations for the central authority to execute summaries or extracts of the judgment
Luxembourg	pour des raisons de sécurité juridique
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	the decision is being translated
Nicaragua	Complete text, to convey the full scope of the obligation.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	The forms are not available on the HCCH website.

Portugal	Portugal didn't declare to accept the use of an abstract or extract of the decision
Romania	the court/public notary delivers them both the order and the abstract
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Article 25 of the Convention prescribes providing of the full text of a judgement.
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

Is this covered in your State's Country Profile?

Yes

Latvia, Nicaragua, Portugal, Romania, Ukraine

No

Belarus, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Bulgaria, Netherlands, Slovenia, United Kingdom (England)

6.5. Who is the competent authority in your State to complete the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms?

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Federal Ministry of Justice (as Central Authority)
Belarus	The Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Belarus as the Central Authority and competent courts.
Brazil	The Judiciary and the Brazilian Central Authority (Ministry of Justice)
Bulgaria	The Central Authority and the competent court.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Instituto Colombiano de Bienestar Familiar is the Central Authority of the execution of several other Conventions, nevertheless, since 2007 Convention is not ratified it has not been assigned as the Central Authority for the execution of this Convention.
Croatia	Central Authority is competent to complete mandatory forms. The Central Authority has neither received nor completed recommended forms.
Cyprus	The Central Authority, i.e the Ministry of Justice and Public Order and the competent Family Court.
Dominican Republic	The Central Authority.
Finland	The Central Authority is competent to fill in the mandatory forms. The recommended forms can be filled in also by the Finnish Social Insurance Institution (Kela), applicants, courts or the social welfare boards in the municipalities, if the board has confirmed an agreement on maintenance between the parties.
France	Les juridictions

Germany (CA)	The mandatory forms are completed by the Central Authority, whereas the recommended forms are filled in by the applicant or the authority that made the decision.
Germany (DIJUF)	Application for recognition or recognition and enforcement (Annex A or B), application for establishment of a decision, application for modification of a decision: the applicant or applicant's representative - Abstract of decision: the authority or court which has issued the maintenance order - Statement of enforceability of a decision: the authority or court which has issued the maintenance order - Statement of proper notice: the authority (bailiff) or court which has arranged the service of documents - Status of application report: central authority - Financial circumstances form: the applicant or applicant's representative
Hungary	The competent court.
Latvia	The Administration of Maintenance Guarantee Fund (Uzturedzēku garantiju fonda administrācija)
Lithuania	Mazeikiai division of the State Social Insurance Fund Board
Luxembourg	question incompréhensible quant au mot renseigner""
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	The court
Nicaragua	Ministerio de la Familia, Adolescencia y Niñez (MIFAN), Central Authority
Norway	Requesting state: NAVI and NAV Family Benefits and Pensions
Poland	there is no competent authority
Portugal	Central Authority (mandatory forms) and creditor/applicant (some recommended forms)
Romania	the central authority (the mandatory form) the creditor and the court / notary (the recommended form)
Slovenia	Public Scholarship, Development, Disability and Maintenance Fund of the Republic of Slovenia
Sweden	Försäkringskassan
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Central Authority (Annex 1, Annex 2), courts (report on the enforcement of a judgment Art/.25(1) b)), report on proper notification Art. 25 (1) c))
United Kingdom (England)	The REMO unit (for England and Wales) completes the Mandatory Forms The Maintenance Enforcement Business Centres complete the Recommended Forms.
United States of America	The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement, as the U.S. Central Authority, has issued guidance that a state child support agency is the competent authority to complete the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms.

6.6. If the Central Authority or other competent authority in your State receives a handwritten form from an applicant, will it type the form in lieu of the applicant?

Yes

Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Ukraine, United States of America

No

Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Unless the requested state requires a typed form.
Bulgaria	If we receive a handwritten form from an applicant and there are any irregularities, we will return the form to the applicant.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Handwritten forms are accepted as long as these are legible.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	We have not had such cases, but in principle, if the text is readable, we would send the hand-written application to the requested state.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	DIJUF prepares applications for the applicants and, of course, types the applications. More generally, the German central local courts are supposed to assist applicants in preparing the application paperwork but we do not know to which extent the assistance is actually provided.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	We accept handwritten forms.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	As long as the handwritten is readable
Romania	The CA can translate the form in EN if the creditor/court presented them in RO language.
Slovenia	The form must be originally signed by the applicant
Sweden	If the information written is readable, it will not be typed in the form in lieu of the applicant.
Switzerland	LA SUISSE, COMME ETAT MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 1956 (PAS MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 2007): Les documents sont scannés.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	There is no requirement that a Hague form has to be typed up; No country has declared they would not accept handwritten applications.

United States of America	This will vary among U.S. states. Although many U.S. states will type the form based on the handwritten form received from the applicant, other states report that they will proceed with the original handwritten form.
--------------------------	--

6.7. Is it possible in your State to process non-certified documents for the purpose of recognition and enforcement (Art. 25)?

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Finland, Luxembourg, Norway, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, France, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	All requests for recognition and enforcement should be accompanied by original documents or their certified copies.
Brazil	
Bulgaria	For the purpose of recognition and enforcement, the courts in Bulgaria require all the documents to be presented in original or certified copies of the documents.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Does not apply since Colombia is not a part of the Convention.
Croatia	Central Authority acting as requesting authority requests original or certified copies of decisions for the purpose of recognition and enforcement.
Cyprus	Only certified and original documents are accepted by the Courts.
Dominican Republic	Law 544-14 on private international law establishes in its Article. 97, the requirements to which foreign public documents must be submitted and provides: The evidentiary force of foreign public documents is subject to the following requirements: 1) That in the granting or preparation of the document, the requirements established by law have been observed of the authority where they have been granted so that the document makes full trial evidence, 2) That the document contains the legalization or apostille and the other requirements necessary for its authenticity in the Dominican Republic " "
Finland	It is not stated in the national law that the Central Authority would need certified documents. However, if the receiving state needs certified documents, we will ask for them from the applicant.
France	En application du droit interne.
Germany (CA)	In practice, the Central Authority takes care to process only certified copies of decisions in order to avoid delays that might occur because the requested State might require them at a later point of time. This has not led to any problems.

Germany (DIJUF)	Enforcement clause has to be issued by an official authority (court, notary public).
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Orders and deeds should be signed by the person of authority of issuing authority
Lithuania	Judgments must be signed by a judge and stamped by the court
Luxembourg	il faut ventiler la réponse en fonction de la nature du document, par exemple il n'y a pas lieu de voir certifier un décompte des arriérés
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Section 557 of the Nicaragua Family Code sets forth the principle of prompt enforcement. There is no provision prohibiting the issuance of the documents mentioned in Article 25 of the Convention.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the documents must be properly certified.
Portugal	All requests must be accompanied by a certified document.
Romania	The order, the certificate of the service of the judicial documents must be presented in certified copy by the issuing court.
Slovenia	The court will reject request for recognition or the application for enforcement, if there are not certified documents.
Sweden	we require some verification that the documents are liable.
Switzerland	
Ukraine	The documents issued or filled by a court or other competent authority must be certified by a signature and a seal (stamp)/
United Kingdom (England)	
United States of America	Please insert text here

6.8. For applications other than those for recognition and enforcement, do requested States routinely require documents in addition to those listed in the available recommended forms?
No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United States of America

Yes

Austria, Brazil, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom (England)

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	power of attorney
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	There were cases in which certified translations were requested.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Cf. profil FRANCE p. 16 & 17.
Germany (CA)	If paternity needs to be established some States need a special statement by the child's mother concerning the alleged father (e.g. paternity affidavit)."
Germany (DIJUF)	Concerning applications for establishment of paternity in USA: paternity affidavit (from time to time) Concerning applications for recognition and enforcement: the "old" UIFSA forms (from time to time).
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	we need income
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	When we send cases for enforcement under Article 10 (1) b), some countries do require enforcement titles in addition to the court order/decision, but this is usually listed in the reservations/declarations made at time of ratification.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	birth certificate of the child (obtain a decision)
Romania	For the establishment of the filiation it is requested to present the birth certificate in original/certified copy.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Birth certificates and divorce dissolution documents.
United States of America	This will vary among U.S. states. Although requested States do not routinely require additional documents, some States require a Power of Attorney form or a statement to identify the need for legal assistance.

**If yes,
Only a few States have such requirements**

Austria, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Germany (CA), Norway, Portugal, Romania, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Many States have such requirements

No answers

B. As the requested State:

6.9. Are there specific problems that you would like the Special Commission to address with regard to the content or completion of the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms?

No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Sweden, Ukraine

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Germany (CA), Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	some States only provide Transmittal Form (Annex I) without Application Form
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	The forms are too extensive and redundant. It would be easier if the forms were less complex and if they had more relevant information, such as an e-mail of the debtor and information regarding the possibility of contacting this person electronically.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	It would be helpful if forms were completed electronically and printed because handwritten forms are not always legible and lead to a need for further inquiries and delays. In this respect dynamic forms could be helpful.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	
Norway	The applicant's and child's address and date of birth are often lacking. We need this information to be able to register the case.
Poland	there is a need to develop good practice in the use of forms, there is no form for Article 7.

Portugal	As referred at point 6.1, Recommended Forms should be mandatory as well as the arrears form used at iSupport, based at EJM arrears form
Romania	The online filling in of the recommended forms, a website with the national minimum wage and the inflation rate in each year and in each country in the 2007 Hague Contracting states
Slovenia	Regular monthly updates the HCCH website
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	In the U.S., a dependent child is not the creditor. Therefore, most state child support systems create a case using the name of the applicant, which must be either the parent of the child or the public body; the dependent is identified as the person for whom maintenance is sought. It is problematic when a State sends an application where the child is the creditor/applicant and the name of the custodial parent is not provided. We acknowledge that this is a system issue but would welcome if the forms always included the names of the child's parents.

6.10. Is it a requirement under the domestic law of your State that the 2007 Convention application forms be signed by the applicant?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Lithuania, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Latvia, Luxembourg, Poland, Portugal, Romania, United States of America

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	The form must be signed by the applicant, a representative or by the Central Authority.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	It is the requirement that proves the applicant's interest in the application and the authorization of its processing.
Croatia	According to the Article 71 Paragraph 5 of the Act on the General Administrative Procedure the submissions shall be signed by the applicant respectively a person authorized to represent the applicant.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here

Finland	Please insert text here
France	
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Under the law of Law on Legal Force of Documents
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	pour des raisons de validité et de l'authenticité des documnets joints
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the obligation results from the rules of national law
Portugal	see 6.2
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Although the Uniform Interstate Family Support Act (UIFSA), our domestic law implementing the 2007 Convention, does not require that a Convention application be signed by the applicant, a tribunal is only required to admit the document into evidence if it is signed under penalty of perjury. Also, one state has reported a State Supreme Court Rule requiring that all pleadings filed with the court must be signed by either an attorney or a litigant. Another state reported that where paternity is at issue, their state law requires a signed affidavit by the mother of the child.

6.11. If you have responded yes to Question 6.10, please specify what other documents are required in combination with an unsigned application form in order for it to be filed with a competent authority in your State?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	The form must be signed by the applicant, a representative or by the Central Authority.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	We just request the sing form.
Croatia	Not applicable. It is requested that application should be signed.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here

Finland	Please insert text here
France	Cf. profil FRANCE
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Power of attorney for enforcement measures
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	/
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the application must be absolutely signed, if not by the applicant then by a representative (then a power of attorney is required)
Portugal	see 6.3
Romania	the documents required by the Convention, the documents mentioned in the recommended forms, other relevant documents (birth certificate, proofs of the revenues/employer of the debtor etc.)
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	<p>The tribunal in some U.S. states may require a form, signed by the applicant, that the application and accompanying documents are submitted under penalty of perjury.</p> <p>In a contested paternity case, a tribunal in some U.S. states may require that the applicant sign an affidavit under penalty of perjury, or sworn under oath or before a notary.</p>

6.12. Do your State's competent authorities accept an abstract or extract of the decision under certain circumstances using the HCCH recommended form in lieu of a complete text of the decision?

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, United States of America

Please explain under which circumstances:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Although we do not need a translation of the decision, we need at least a certified copy
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	It is acceptable if the request is for the obtention of a new decision. For recognition and enforcement, the original decision is required.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	if this is sufficient for the court ordering the case
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Any circumstance
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	a court may accept an abstract, however it may further request a full text of a judgment.
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	A total of 46 U.S. states, territories, and the District of Columbia accept abstracts.

No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	We accept a complete text of the decision or a complete copy of the decision certified by the competent authority in the State of origin (Art. 25(3)a)).
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	We need the full text to know the extent of the obligation.
Croatia	It is necessary to provide the original or certified copies of decisions
Cyprus	Both the complete text of the decision as well as the abstract / extract in english / greek language are necessary and requested by the courts.
Dominican Republic	Law 544-14 on private international law establishes in its Article. 97, the requirements to which foreign public documents must be submitted and provides: The evidentiary force of foreign public documents is subject to the following requirements: 1) That in the granting or preparation of the document, the requirements established by law have been observed of the authority where they have been granted so that the document makes full trial evidence, 2) That the document contains the legalization or apostille and the other requirements necessary for its authenticity in the Dominican Republic ""
Finland	
France	Cf. profil FRANCE
Germany (CA)	This topic falls under the competence of the European Union and is not subject to Germany's discretion.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	In line with the internal law on recognition and enforcement of foreign judgements of any kind, the original decision shall be presented under the 2007 Child Support Convention, as well.
Latvia	The Latvian court issues an enforcement writ (izpildu raksts) under the Latvian laws which is not under the HCCH form
Lithuania	The court issues an enforcement order in accordance with the judgment issued. This Enforcement Order has a certified form in accordance with the legislation of the Republic of Lithuania. This form is not one of the recommended forms by HCCH
Luxembourg	pour des raisons de sécurité juridique
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	no experience with it
Nicaragua	The complete text is required in order to verify the scope of the document attesting the existence of the maintenance obligation.
Norway	We do not accept extracts.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Portugal didn't declare to accept the use of an abstract or extract of the decision
Romania	he court/public notary deliver them both the order and the abstract
Slovenia	So far, we have not yet filed an application for summary judgment or an application for enforcement under this document (abstract of extract of the decision)
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	The courts in England and Wales prefer to have sight of the text of the decision or order that has been made.
United States of America	A total of 8 U.S. states do not accept abstracts under their state law.

If no, please explain what could be done to facilitate the acceptance of an abstract or extract of a decision in your State:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	It would be necessary to pass new domestic legislation.
Bulgaria	It depends on the practice of the competent courts.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Finland has not specified this under article 57. However, it would be possible to ask the competent court if it could accept an abstract or extract of the decision in lieu of the complete text of the decision, if such documentation would be attached to the application. The court would make the decision on such acceptance.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	
Latvia	The Latvian Law notes that all HCCH documents should be recognised in the court and afterwards the enforcement writ should be issued
Lithuania	Recommended forms should become mandatory forms. It would be great to have a tool (as a tool for filling in forms under Regulation 4/2009) to fill in mandatory forms in all languages.
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	We have not experienced that a CA has sent us an abstract in lieu of the complete decision.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Make a declaration of acceptance
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	The Country profile (page 15) confirms it doesn't accept an abstract or extract of the decision in lieu of a complete text of the decision. This hasn't caused a difficulty for incoming applications to date as far as we are aware. Willing to discuss further via email or at possible Special Commision.

Is this covered in your State's Country Profile?**Yes**

Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Brazil, Finland, Lithuania, Poland, Slovenia

6.13. Is it possible in your State to process non-certified documents for the purpose of recognition and enforcement (Art. 25)?**Yes**

Brazil, Finland, Germany (CA), Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Germany (CA), Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Only original documents or their certified copies are accepted by the courts.
Brazil	If the documents were not sent through a Central Authority
Bulgaria	For the purpose of recognition and enforcement, the courts in Bulgaria require all the documents to be presented in original or certified copies of the documents.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	It is required that among the documents of the application there is a document that proves the existence of an alimony obligation. If the case is that this document was issued by a Colombian Authority we can arrange a copy.
Croatia	Central Authority acting as requested authority requests original or certified copies of decisions for the purpose of recognition and enforcement.
Cyprus	Only certified and original documents are accepted by the courts.
Dominican Republic	Law 544-14 on private international law establishes in its Article. 97, the requirements to which foreign public documents must be submitted and provides: The evidentiary force of foreign public documents is subject to the following requirements: 1) That in the granting or preparation of the document, the requirements established by law have been observed of the authority where they have been granted so that the document makes full trial

	evidence, 2) That the document contains the legalization or apostille and the other requirements necessary for its authenticity in the Dominican Republic ""
Finland	
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	German courts may require a certified copy of the decision to be declared enforceable, other documents may not need to be certified.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	In line with the internal law the authenticity of the documents is examined by the court/authority when deciding on recognition or enforcement.
Latvia	Orders and deeds should be signed by the person of authority of issuing authority
Lithuania	Judgments must be signed by a judge and stamped by the court
Luxembourg	il faut ventiler la réponse en fonction de la nature du document, par exemple il n'y a pas lieu de voir certifier un décompte des arriérés
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the obligation results from the rules of national law
Portugal	All requests must be accompanied by a certified document.
Romania	the order, the certificate of the service of the judicial documents must be presented in certified copy by the issuing court
Slovenia	In the proceedings, the court verifies the originality of the document - court decisions or court settlements.
Sweden	we require some verification that the documents are liable
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Only hard copies of the documents properly certified may be presented to a court or other competent authority
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

6.14. Can the recommended forms developed under the 2007 Convention be used for the purpose of a direct request (Art. 37) in your State?

Yes

Austria, Belarus, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Hungary, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal Romania, Slovenia

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	The forms CAN be used BUT: As formal requirements in court proceedings are not very strict, anyone could address the Austrian courts using such a form (but only the bilingual version including German language)

Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	It depends on the request. Usually, it would be necessary to present a petition and certified copies of the documents if the request is not transmitted through a Central Authority.
Bulgaria	It depends on the practice of the competent courts.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The applications must always be sent through the Central Authority.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	In order to initiate court proceedings, German procedural law requires applications to meet certain formal requirements, such as a concrete request, indication of evidence provided, a signature of the applicant. The use of the recommended forms for direct requests will therefore most likely lead to queries by the court. In cases that are filed via the Central Authorities the German CA is actively involved in court proceedings and takes care that the requirements are met by creating and filing applications in accordance with German procedural law.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Under Hungarian procedural law mandatory forms are introduced. Apart from those forms as additional documents, 2007 Hague Convention Forms may also be submitted.
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	goes through the CA
Nicaragua	Applications relative to the recovery abroad of maintenance must be transmitted through the Central Authority.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	First of all, all applications at Portuguese courts must be signed. For enforcements procedures must be used the internal mandatory form.
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	In the proceedings, the court verifies the originality of the document - court decisions or court settlements.
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

7. Possible additional forms – Is your State interested in the development of the possible following additional forms?

	Possible additional forms to be developed
7.1.	Calculation form for maintenance arrears / statement of arrears
No	France, Netherlands, Slovenia
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Croatia, Dominican Republic, Hungary
Priority Level - Med.	Austria, Brazil, Canada, Finland, Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Luxembourg, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Belarus, Bulgaria, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Germany (CA), Lithuania, Nicaragua, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland
7.2.	Scalable model form for decision
No	Austria, Belarus, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden
Yes	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Germany (DIJUF), Nicaragua, Poland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Lithuania, Nicaragua, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Med.	Cyprus, Germany (DIJUF), Poland, Ukraine
Priority Level - High	No answers
7.3.	Statements of enforceability with respect to authentic instruments as well as private agreements (Art. 30(3)(b))
No	Austria, Belarus, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Slovenia
Yes	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Croatia, Finland, Lithuania, Switzerland
Priority Level - Med.	Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Germany (CA), Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Brazil, Germany (DIJUF), Luxembourg, Norway, Romania
7.4.	Model form for Power of Attorney

No	Belarus, Canada, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Latvia
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Bulgaria, Germany (DIJUF), Lithuania, Switzerland, Ukraine, United States of America
Priority Level - Med.	Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Hungary, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Brazil, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Romania, Slovenia
7.5.	Form attesting that Art. 36 conditions are met
No	Belarus, France, Lithuania, Netherlands, Slovenia, United Kingdom (England)
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Argentina, Austria, Canada, Ukraine, United States of America
Priority Level - Med.	Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland
Priority Level - High	Bulgaria, Croatia, Romania
7.6.	Form for calculation of interest (with a table of interest or a link to a relevant website)
No	Austria, Belarus, Dominican Republic, France, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Ukraine
Yes	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), United States of America
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Germany (CA), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - High	Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Finland, Romania
7.7.	Dynamic forms (available on the HCCH website to be completed online, printed and sent by registered mail)
No	France, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Priority Level - Low	Luxembourg, Switzerland
Priority Level - Med.	Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Germany (CA), Lithuania, Nicaragua, Poland, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Brazil, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Latvia, Finland, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Netherlands, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia

	Possible dynamic mandatory (M) and recommended forms to be developed
7.7.1.	Transmittal form (M) under Art. 12(2)
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Germany (CA), Luxembourg, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Hungary, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.2.	Acknowledgement form (M) under Art. 12(3)
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Germany (CA), Luxembourg, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.3.	Application for Recognition or Recognition and Enforcement
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)

Priority Level - Med.	Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.4.	Abstract of a Decision
No	Belarus, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Bulgaria, Finland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Germany (CA), Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Cyprus, Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Lithuania, Poland, Romania
7.7.5.	Statement of Enforceability of a Decision
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Dominican Republic, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus, Hungary, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Canada, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Slovenia
7.7.6.	Statement of Proper Notice
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Norway, Slovenia
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Brazil, Bulgaria, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania
7.7.7.	Status of Application Report – Recognition or Recognition and Enforcement
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia

Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Portugal, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.8.	Application for Enforcement of a Decision Made or Recognised in the Requested State
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, France, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.9.	Status of Application Report – Enforcement of a Decision Made or Recognised in the Requested State
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Hungary, Norway, Romania
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Germany (CA), Lithuania, Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal
7.7.10.	Application for Establishment of a Decision
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Lithuania, Norway, Slovenia
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal,

	Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.11.	Status of Application Report – Establishment of a Decision
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Norway, Romania
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal
7.7.12.	Application for Modification of a Decision
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Norway, Slovenia
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Germany (CA), Luxembourg, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Lithuania, Sweden, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania
7.7.13.	Status of Application Report – Modification of a Decision
No	Chile (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Hungary, Norway, Romania
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus, Germany (CA), Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovenia, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Lithuania, Sweden, United States of America

Priority Level – High	Canada, Cyprus, Finland, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal
7.7.14.	Financial Circumstances Form
No	Luxembourg, Norway
Yes	Argentina, Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America
Priority Level - Low	Austria, Belarus, Netherlands, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England)
Priority Level - Med.	Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Lithuania, Romania, United States of America
Priority Level - High	Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Finland, Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia

7.8. Are there any other forms that your State would like to be developed?

No

Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Hungary, Poland, Romania, United States of America

Please specify the form and level of priority:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	A model form for a request for Specific Measures
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Form for specific measures
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Croatian Central Authority suggests that the additional recommended form be developed and available as dynamic form as well - request for specific measures, in accordance with Article 7 of the Convention in relation to Articles 6 (2)(b), (c), (g), (h), (i) and (j).
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Request for specific measures and reply form
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here

Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Request for specific measure is not covered by any specific form.
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	the form for Article 7
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	request for specific measures
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Art. 7 Request for Special Measures

Priority:
Low

No answers

Medium

Hungary

High

Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Finland, Poland, Romania, United States of America

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Forms for automatic indexation (art. 25(1) e))
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici

Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	reminder between the CA
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	A Status Request Form (that a requesting State could use to request an update)

Priority:
Low

No answers

Medium

Canada, United States of America

High

No answers

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Form for currency conversion
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here

Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	bank coordinates
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Request for Legal Aid

Priority:
Low

No answers

Medium

Canada, United States of America

High

No answers

8. Country Profile

8.1. Are there specific problems that you would like the Special Commission to address with regard to the content or completion of the Country Profile?

No

Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Brazil, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Norway, Romania, Slovenia, United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Information about the possibility of transmitting documentation electronically.
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	It is important that every participating country has filled in the Country Profile. It is a very useful tool.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	The country profiles for some states are still missing.
Germany (DIJUF)	Country profiles are not always complete and not always available in English (the English version of the French profile was filled out in French!) Concerning the specific measures, one very important question for applicants is to know the databases the Central Authorities have recourse to or which sources they use to comply with applications because if the request proceeded by the Central Authorities is not successful, they need to check which other possibilities to inquire are existing. Unfortunately, this question was very often not or very superficially answered in the country profiles. Furthermore, more accurate information on the competent authorities/courts and proceeding concerning direct applications for establishment of an order, recognition and enforcement would be also helpful. Until now, only a tick box (judicial or administrative) can be chosen. Amendments and/or completion with respect to those points would be very helpful.
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Some countries have not completed or updated their Country Profile. The information in the country profile is not always in compliance with the reservations/declarations made in connection with the ratification.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Description the proceedings (art. 10 para 1 d)) when the order cannot be recognised and enforced (the child support is determined in

	fraction/percentage, the debtor was not served the judicial documents and the order). In this case the creditor can ask the court from requested state to render a new decision. If the requested court is an exequatur court, not the competent court for the determination of the child support, the creditor must submit a new application. It is recommended or not for the creditors to fill in, from the beginning, together with the exequatur application , an application for the establishment of the child support
Slovenia	We do not have information on which e-mails addresses the updates for Country Profile should be sent. We also don't have any instructions for filling the data at Country Profile, if there is any.
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	There are several Convention countries that have not completed a Country Profile. We would like to see recommendations from the Special Commission encouraging States to complete their Country Profile. In the absence of a Profile, it would be helpful for the Permanent Bureau to provide access to the copies of the country's child support laws and procedures that Convention Article 57 requires a country to provide at the time of ratification or accession. Additionally there currently is no way to know when a State has updated its Country Profile. We would like a feature added that automatically generates a notice to other Contracting States any time a Country Profile is changed and identifies what section of the Profile was updated.

8.2. Is your State interested in extension of current Country Profile to cover spousal support (the current version of the Country Profile only covers children)?

No

Bulgaria, Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, United States of America

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Finland, France, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

If yes, please indicate a priority:

Low

Austria, Finland

Medium

Brazil, France, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

High

Canada, Croatia, Netherlands, Nicaragua

8.3. Are there other areas that your State would like to see added or modified in the Country Profile?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, France, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Sweden, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Ukraine, United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	With respect to applications of public bodies (Art. 36) information would be helpful on legal subrogation of maintenance claims or other legal consequences if benefits are provided.
Germany (DIJUF)	Indication of the national authorities responsible for the service of documents could be helpful (in case that maintenance creditors need to organize the cross border service of documents by themselves).
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Add a new point f. at 1. GENERAL INFORMATION", section "3. ESTABLISHMENT OF PARENTAGE", in regard to territorial competence (internal and international)"
Romania	The recognition and enforcement of the maintenance order established for partners, because RO not recognise this relation in the domestic law.
Slovenia	Forms are not available in the others languages's States that has sign this Convention
Sweden	Please insert text here

Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Maintenance by a daughter or a son of their parents.
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	U.S. states would like a section in the Country Profile where the country identifies the availability of bilingual forms, possibly including links to such forms. See also the U.S. response to 8.1.

9. Possible additional tools – Is your State interested in the development of the possible following additional tools?

9.1. Guide to Good Practice for Central Authorities on the implementation of the 2007 Convention (a guide as to how the Convention can be implemented in a State, with examples from States as to the way that Central Authority responsibilities are carried out)

No

Germany (CA), Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Yes

Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Latvia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If yes, please indicate a priority:

Low

Canada, Netherlands

Medium

Brazil, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Latvia, Poland

High

Argentina, Belarus, Bulgaria, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Nicaragua, Romania, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

9.2. Guidance for the completion of Mandatory and Recommended Forms under the 2007 Convention

No

Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine, United States of America

Yes

Argentina, Belarus, Bulgaria, Brazil, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA),

Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Sweden, United Kingdom (England)

If yes, please indicate a priority:
Low

Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Germany (CA), Sweden

Medium

Belarus, Bulgaria, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Portugal

High

Argentina, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, United Kingdom (England)

9.3. Standardised statistical report
No

Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Yes

Argentina, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Latvia, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If yes, please indicate a priority:
Low

Belarus, Dominican Republic, Latvia

Medium

Argentina, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Finland, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

High

Croatia, Romania

If yes, would it be helpful to develop a Prel. Doc. in advance of the Special Commission meeting to outline the possible statistics that should be included, the benefits of having that information, and a suggested timeline for collection?
Yes

Belarus, Brazil, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Nicaragua, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Latvia

9.4. Extension of current Country Profile to cover spousal support (the current version of the Country Profile only covers children)

No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Germany (CA), Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Yes

Argentina, Brazil, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Finland, France, Latvia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, Ukraine

If yes, please indicate a priority:

Low

Brazil, Finland

Medium

France, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Switzerland, Ukraine

High

Argentina, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Netherlands, Romania

10. Translation of documents and dissemination of information

10.1. Has the text of the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Cyprus, Lithuania

Yes

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United States of America

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

Austria, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Portugal, United States of America

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Nicaragua, Norway, Slovenia, Switzerland, Ukraine

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here

Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Russian: http://pravo.by/upload/docs/op/I00700105_1515186000.pdf
Brazil	Portuguese
Bulgaria	https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/BG/TXT/?qid=1574869959495&uri=CELEX:22011A0722(02)
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	The document is available on Croatian language under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:22011A0722(02)&from=HR
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	On the website
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Norwegian
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	The EU translated it RO language.
Slovenia	https://eur-lex.europa.eu/LexUriServ/LexUriServ.do?uri=OJ:L:2011:192:0051:0070:SL:PDF
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Il faudrait insérer le lien suivant sur votre site, qui donne accès aux traductions de la Convention de 2007 dans les langues de l'Union européenne (et donc y compris dans les langues nationales de la Suisse): https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/FR/TXT/?uri=celex:32011D0432
Ukraine	Ukrainian
United Kingdom (England)	PLEASE NOTE QUESTIONS UNDER PART 10 ARE NOT APPLICABLE AS WE ARE ALREADY AN OFFICIAL LANGUAGE.
United States of America	Please insert text here

10.2. Has the Explanatory Report on the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?
No

Belarus, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Norway, Poland, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), France, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal, Slovenia, United States of America

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

Austria, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, France, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, United States of America

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Nicaragua, Portugal

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Portuguese
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Portuguese

Romania	The EU translated it in RO language.
Slovenia	https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/719e6d10-9a83-11e6-9bca-01aa75ed71a1/language-sl
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

10.3. Does your State require the use of the HCCH Recommended Forms in your State's official language(s) (if not English or French)?

No – Go to Question 10.4.

Austria, Canada, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Norway

Yes

Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, France, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

If yes, have the HCCH Mandatory and Recommended Forms under the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Bulgaria, Croatia, Latvia, Slovenia, Sweden

If no, when will the translated forms be available? Are there steps that could be taken to facilitate the translation of forms into the official language(s) of your State?

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	We envisage to organise the translation of the forms in Bulgarian language.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Translations (recommended forms) coordinated or made under the PB or other authority would contribute to the availability of the relevant documents.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here

Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	les formulaires existent en langue française qui est une langue officielle du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Prevedni so samo obvezni obrazci Priloga I in Priloga II
Sweden	Most applications are in English
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

Yes

Belarus, Brazil, Croatia, France, Germany (CA), Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Ukraine

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

France, Nicaragua

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Belarus, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Germany (CA), Nicaragua, Portugal, Romania, Ukraine

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Russian: https://minjust.gov.by/directions/international_cooperation/icd-lev2-4/icd-lev3-5/
Brazil	Portuguese - https://www.justica.gov.br/sua-protecao/cooperacao-internacional/cooperacao-juridica-internacional-em-materia-civil/acordos-internacionais/prestacao-internacional-de-alimentos
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Spanish

Croatia	Translations of the mandatory forms are available in Croatian language as they are annexed to the Convention (Annex I - Transmittal form under Article 12(2) and Annex II Acknowledgement form under Article 12(3)) https://eur-lex.europa.eu/legal-content/HR/TXT/PDF/?uri=CELEX:22011A0722(02)&from=HR .
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	https://www.bundesjustizamt.de/DE/Themen/Buergerdienste/AU/HUUE2007/Formulare/Formulare_node.html
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	PNot applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Portuguese
Romania	The forms are enclosed in RO language.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Ukrainian
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

10.4. Has the Practical Handbook for Case Workers on the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Belarus, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, Norway, Romania, Ukraine

Yes

Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United States of America

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

Austria, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Switzerland, United States of America

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Brazil, Slovenia, Ukraine

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Portuguese
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	https://op.europa.eu/en/publication-detail/-/publication/7b733e6d-f74a-11e7-b8f5-01aa75ed71a1/language-sl/format-PDF
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	
Ukraine	Ukrainian
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

10.5. Has the Practical Handbook for Competent Authorities on the 2009 EU Maintenance Regulation, the 2007 Hague Child Support Convention and its Protocol (the Romanian project) been adapted and translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Belarus, Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Yes

Austria, Bulgaria, Canada, France, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, United States of America

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

Austria, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, United States of America

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Nicaragua

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here

Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

10.6. Has the Implementation Checklist for the 2007 Convention been translated into your State's official language(s)?

No

Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine

Yes

Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Dominican Republic, France, Nicaragua, United States of America

If yes, the document is available on the HCCH website.

Colombia (1956 New York Convention), France, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, United States of America

If yes, the document can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Nicaragua

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here

Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

10.7. What actions to raise public awareness on the international recovery of child support (e.g., information leaflets, institutional circulars, etc.) have been implemented in your State?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Information on the Ministry's website.
Brazil	Information on the website, publication of articles
Bulgaria	We publish information on the Ministry of justice website.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Convention has been widely publicized through the media.
Croatia	General information regarding the cross-border child support applications are made available on the web-site of the Croatian Central Authority.
Cyprus	Information is available to any interested party who communicates with the Central Authority. Further information will soon be available on the Ministry's website which is under revision.
Dominican Republic	None.
Finland	We provide general information on our Ministry's website: www.om.fi .
France	Une circulaire institutionnelle est en préparation
Germany (CA)	The Central Authority provides several brochures aimed at the general public, practioners, competent authorities, public bodies, moreover, it offers regular training sessions, conferences and workshops for different audiences.
Germany (DIJUF)	The Institute has implemented: - information for practitioners via the Network "child support worldwide" - and the Institute's law journal "Das Jugendamt" - training for German public bodies - participation in international projects like EPAPFR
Hungary	There is an information guide for citizens on the home page of the relevant government departemnt as well as practice guide for competent authorities

Latvia	information can be found in http://ugf.gov.lv and https://tm.gov.lv
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	site internet de l'administration judiciaire du Grand-Duché de Luxembourg + guichet.lu
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	The Convention has been widely featured in the media.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Website, TV programs
Portugal	Information leaflets; training of court staff; legal seminars with judges, prosecutors and lawyers, universities; conferences; development of new tools to help creditors
Romania	information leaflets, institutional circulars etc.
Slovenia	No actions made only posting the information on our website.
Sweden	Information on Försäkringskassans website
Switzerland	LA SUISSE, COMME ETAT MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 1956 (PAS MEMBRE DE LA CONVENTION DE 2007): Site Internet de l'Autorité centrale (pour la Convention de 1956, l'Accord bilatéral avec les Etats Unis ainsi que les Mémoires d'accord avec les Provinces canadiennes du Manitoba, du Saskatchewan, de la Colombie-Britannique et d' Alberta): https://www.bj.admin.ch/bj/fr/home/gesellschaft/alimente.html .
Ukraine	The Ministry of Justice of Ukraine by its Order of 15.09.2017 2904/5 has issued the Instructions for application in Ukraine of the Convention on International Recovery of Child Support and Other Forms of Family Maintenance.
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	The federal Office of Child Support Enforcement has developed training on the Convention for child support agencies, attorneys, and judges. Other resources included judicial bench cards and policy guidance documents.

Are such materials available on the HCCH website?

Yes

Netherlands, Romania, Switzerland

No

Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United States of America

If no, can the document be made available to the PB in pdf format or via hyperlink? Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Yes. Hyperlink: https://www.justica.gov.br/sua-protecao/cooperacao-internacional/cooperacao-juridica-internacional-em-materia-civil/acordos-

	internacionais/prestacao-internacional-de-alimentos https://www.justica.gov.br/sua-protecao/lavagem-de-dinheiro/institucional-2/publicacoes/cooperacao-em-pauta
Bulgaria	We publish information on the Ministry of justice website.
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Yes, it could be made available to the PB. However, this document only explains the internal regulation of the child support and family maintenance in Colombia.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Such documents can be sent as soon as the Ministry's website is finalised (see 10.7).
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	https://www.bundesjustizamt.de/DE/Themen/Buergerdienste/AU/Publikationen/Uebersicht_node.html
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	https://igazsagugyiinformaciok.kormany.hu/nemzetkozi-gyermekelviteli-es-tartasdiijal-kapcsolatos-ugyek
Latvia	In Latvia country profile
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Website LBIO
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Our Central authority can provide some materials (pdf and link)
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	(lien vers https://www.bj.admin.ch/bj/fr/home/gesellschaft/alimente.html)
Ukraine	yes, in Ukrainian only.
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	The documents are available through the international page of the OCSE website. The Permanent Bureau can post a hyperlink to that page: https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css/partners/international

11. Training and training material

11.1. Has training regarding the 2007 Convention taken place in your State for members of the Central Authority?

No

Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Ukraine

If no, what are the obstacles to such training?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Financial, lack of resources
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Canada has not yet ratified the Convention
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	No specific training on this Convention has taken place since the Republic of Colombia is not yet part of the 2007 Convention.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	No official training has been organized, due to the small amount of people handling the maintenance cases in the Finnish Central Authority. Currently the Finnish Central Authority is preparing a handbook for the employees in the Central Authority.
France	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	no such practice is applied, information is obtained through reading, research and collaboration
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	insufficient financial resources
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

Yes

Austria, Belarus, Croatia, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If yes, what type of training?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	CURRENT TEAM MEETINGS
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	There has been a study of the Convention and its applicability.
Croatia	In 2013 and 2014 the Croatian Central Authority organised the meeting with professors of private international law regarding the implementation of the EU Regulations and the Hague Conventions in the fields of the protection of children with the emphasis on the functions of the Central Authority. Additional training would be beneficial as well.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	
France	Une formation générale sur les obligations alimentaires, les procédures de recouvrement nationales et les instruments internationaux a été dispensée par un prestataires extérieur, magistrat honoraire.
Germany (CA)	Every caseworker receives an internal introductory training when he or she starts to work for the Federal Office of Justice in its function as the German Central Authority. We have created an internal handbook for the practical handling of cross border maintenance cases, including but not limited to the handling of cases under the 2007 Convention. Furthermore, all staff members have the possibility to receive further trainings in the course of time focusing on more specific topics.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Internal traning for caseworkers.
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	self organized
Nicaragua	Study of the Convention and its application
Norway	In-house training.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Internal training for Central Authority Staff
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici

Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Face-to-face training sessions and handouts.
United States of America	Central Authority staff have worked on the Convention for many years and developed and delivered training and resources to U.S. states. Training has included live presentations as well as webinars. In addition, there have been presentations about the Convention at almost every conference hosted by the national and regional child support associations in the United States.

11.2. Has training regarding the 2007 Convention taken place in your State for members of the relevant competent authority(ies)?

No

Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Slovenia

If no, what are the obstacles to such training?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	No specific training on this Convention has taken place since the Republic of Colombia is not yet part of the 2007 Convention.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Information is available on the internet as described above and specific questions may be addressed to the Central Authority at any time. The high number of competent authorities and respectively low number of cases makes unreasonable to hold specific training.
Latvia	no such practice is applied, information is obtained through reading, research and collaboration
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	insufficient financial resources
Portugal	Please insert text here

Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

Yes

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Croatia, Finland, Germany (CA), Norway, Portugal, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If yes, what type of training?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	WORKSHOPS
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Presentation in Seminars
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Educational seminar for employees of the centers for social welfare as a competent authorities have been organised by the Croatian Central Authority. Educational seminars for judges have been organised within the competence of the Ministry of Justice respectively Judicial Academy. However, the Croatian Central Authority participates on trainings or seminars organised for judges, by the state bodies or NGO's, when invited.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	The Central Authority has provided information material for the competent authorities for example on the courts' intranet pages. We have also provided information for the Finnish Social Insurance Institution.
France	VOIR 11.1
Germany (CA)	The German Central Authority holds regular conferences for judges and court clerks working at courts with a specialized jurisdiction for maintenance cases under the Hague Convention (and other international instruments) (24 courts of first instance, 24 courts of appeal). The participants discuss legal issues concerning inter alia the Hague Maintenance Convention, the EU Maintenance Regulation and the corresponding German implementing legislation as well as the most recent case law concerning the international recovery of maintenance. Practical issues are addressed in different workshops for incoming as well as outgoing cases. The conferences contribute to an enhanced network between practitioners at German courts and have proven to be an effective tool to foster and facilitate the application of the Hague Convention and ensure a swift handling of cases. Moreover, the German Central Authority trains staff of youth welfare offices nationwide, in

	their function as a legal adviser of the child as well as in their function as a public body claiming reimbursement of benefits provided in place of maintenance. Finally, the German Central Authority gives presentations and takes part in discussion panels in different national and international conferences for relevant stakeholders dealing with international family law cases, like lawyers, NGOs, judges and other legal practitioners.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	In-house training, as the CA is also the competent authority in Norway.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Since 2012, Central Authority provides training to court staff; legal seminars with judges, prosecutors and lawyers, universitie
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Seminars for regional authorities of the Ministry of Justice
United Kingdom (England)	Face-to-face and handouts
United States of America	OCSE has developed and presented webinar and in-person training for attorneys, judges, and other decision-makers; as well as developed judicial bench cards that are quick reference tools.

11.3. Has training regarding the 2007 Convention taken place in your State for caseworkers? No

Brazil, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Ukraine

If no, what are the obstacles to such training?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Financial, lack of resources
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	No specific training on this Convention has taken place since the Republic of Colombia is not yet part of the 2007 Convention.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here

Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	no such practice is applied, information is obtained through reading, research and collaboration
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	insufficient financial resources
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

Yes

Austria, Belarus, Croatia, Germany (CA), Hungary, Netherlands, Norway, Portugal, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If yes, what type of training?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	WORKSHOPS
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	In 2013 and 2014 the Croatian Central Authority organised the meeting with professors of private international law regarding the implementation of the EU Regulations and the Hague Conventions in the field of the protection of children with the emphasis on the functions of the Central Authority. Additional training would be beneficial as well.
Cyprus	Please insert text here

Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Voir 11.1
Germany (CA)	See under 11.1 and 1.4: caseworkers are members of the Central Authority and trained in that regard.
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please see 11.1
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Workshops, cases, presentations.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Theoretical and practical training, including iSupport
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Work shop
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Face-to-face training and handouts.
United States of America	OCSE has developed resources and delivered training for caseworkers in U.S. states. Training has included live presentations as well as webinars that include expanded trainer notes. In addition, there have been presentations about the Convention at almost every conference hosted by the national and regional child support associations in the United States. A number of state child support agencies have developed training for their caseworkers and have included Convention workshops at state child support conferences.

11.4. Have you developed training material regarding the 2007 Convention in your State?

No

Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, France, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine

Yes

Austria, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Latvia, Portugal, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If yes, the document(s) is available on the HCCH website.

No answers

If yes, the document(s) can be made available to the PB in pdf format or is available under the following hyperlink to be posted on the HCCH website.

Germany (CA)

Please specify the language(s):

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	We have provided the Finnish Social Insurance Institution (Kela) with information on how to process the outgoing 2007 Convention cases. We are also working on a handbook for the CA employees regarding child maintenance cases under all instruments.
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	The German Central Authority has developed training materials, including several brochures for youth welfare offices (acting as legal advisors or as a public body), that can be found on the website of the Central Authority: https://www.bundesjustizamt.de/DE/Themen/Buergerdienste/AU/Publikationen/Uebersicht_node.html
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	
United Kingdom (England)	
United States of America	The documents are available in English through the international page of the OCSE website. The

Permanent Bureau can post a hyperlink to that page:
<https://www.acf.hhs.gov/css/partners/international>

11.5. To assist with training, does your State favour having additional materials on the HCCH website?

No

Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Germany (CA), Hungary, Luxembourg, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Brazil, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Latvia, Netherlands, Ukraine, United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Powerpoints, Articles
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Translation into Croatian language of the Practical Handbook for competent authorities: The 2007 Hague Child Support Convention, the 2007 Hague Protocol on Applicable Law (Maintenance) and the 2009 European Union Maintenance Regulation as well as the translation into the Croatian language of the Explanatory Report (Borras and Degeling) on the 2007 Convention would be of assistance with the trainings and education.
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	It would be useful to have general training material available in the HCCH website, as well references to new literature and academic articles.
France	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	experience and practice work of Member States
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	all materials are welcome
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here

Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Information on the other State's practice and the main problems related to the Convention.
United Kingdom (England)	
United States of America	The HCCH website could feature training on how a State completes its Country Profile.

12. Joining the 2007 Convention

12.1. Is your State a Contracting Party to the 1956 New York Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance?

Yes

Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Brazil, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

No

Bulgaria, Canada, Dominican Republic, Latvia, Lithuania, Nicaragua, United States of America

12.2. Has your State joined the 2007 Convention?

Yes

Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Canada, Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Argentina, Australia, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Mexico, Switzerland

Please explain:

Argentina	At present, Argentina hasn't ratified the 2007 Convention. But it is in the parliamentary process. The Ejecutive branch has presented a bill to Congress for its approval.
Australia	Australia is assessing the benefits of ratifying the 2007 Convention and analysing the legislative changes that may be required to ensure Australia would be able to meet its obligations under the Convention if it were to ratify.
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here

Canada	Canada signed the 2007 Hague Child Support Convention on May 23, 2017. Work on towards ratification is ongoing.
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Republic of Colombia is currently carrying out the internal ratification procedure.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Internal consultations are underway to assess the feasibility of Mexico signing and ratifying the 2007 Convention in the future.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	La mise en oeuvre de la Convention de 2007 soulève des questions d'organisation et de répartition interne des compétences; affronter ces défis prend du temps, surtout dans un Etat fédéral.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

If no, what could be done to facilitate your State becoming a Party (e.g., the proposed Guide to Good Practice for Central Authorities on the implementation of the 2007 Convention)?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Not applicable
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here

Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	In particular, legislative modifications will be made to harmonize the national legal system with the provisions of the Convention. Likewise, internal processes are being carried out to modify the regulations of the Mexican authorities, in order to grant the necessary functions to act as the Central Authority of the Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Rien.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

If no, does your State have concerns regarding implementing the 2007 Convention?
No

Argentina, Australia, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Mexico

Yes

Switzerland

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here

Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Define the activities of the Central Authority, especially the obligation to guarantee legal advice to alimony applicants based on the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Le fait que la Convention de 2007 oblige les Autorités centrales à donner de l'aide au débiteur en vue d'une modification d'une décision risque de défavoriser le créancier; il y a un certain risque que toute demande présentée par un créancier sera contrée par une demande de modification.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

13. iSupport

13.1. Has your State implemented iSupport, or is it in the process of implementing iSupport? Yes

Brazil, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Latvia, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Portugal

No

Argentina, Australia, Belarus, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

If no, please respond as appropriate:

Argentina	Currently, it isn't implemented. However, the evaluation is being considered for the development of a pilot test.
Australia	Australia will continue to monitor the progress of iSupport. However, there are no current plans to implement the system.
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Canadian provinces and territories are not in the process of implementing iSupport. Three Canadian provinces provided comments in relation to this question. The province of British Columbia has indicated that iSupport is under consideration, but that implementation would not take place at this time. Saskatchewan said (implementation) not at this time. Québec has indicated that (while) the system is interesting it presents some difficulties notably with respect to protection of personal information, compability with existing systems, and associated costs.
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	The Republic of Colombia currently has a bill for the ratification of the 2007 Convention. The bill will be presented to the Congress in the second semester of 2020.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	The iSupport has not yet been implemented yet, as there has been a very limited number of applications so far.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	We have not yet implemented because of the IT requirements not yet been examined carfully. At present joining to the project is anticipated and a proposal has been submitted to the EU Commission for financing the implementation of e-Codex a prerequisite for the installation of the iSupport software
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	en l'absence de base légale, voire de modifications législatives instaurant la digitalisation au niveau des procédures nationales, tel par exemple la procédure de saisie sur salaire en vue du recouvrement forcé des aliments
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	The State of Nicaragua is in the process of support for the implementation of the Convention.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Poland is considering a possible future accession to iSupport
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici

Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	It's not considered cost effective or compatible with our internal electronic case management system.
United States of America	OCSE is in the process of developing an interface for iSupport.

13.1.1. For Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention: Does your State intend to implement iSupport?

Yes

Brazil, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, France, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Sweden, Ukraine, United States of America

If yes, when?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Yes, once the Convention is ratified.
Croatia	Depending on the increase of the number of the cases.
Cyprus	The soonest possible.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Finland is involved in the iSupport project and the latest testing of iSupport has been initiated in November 2019.
France	1er janvier 2020
Germany (CA)	Beginning of 2020
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Yes, Hungary made significant progress in implementing iSupport. As a preliminary step installation of e-Codex is being initiated. In order to use the available resources a project application for action grant has been made to EU Commission (CEF Telecom project).
Latvia	Depends on activities of other authority which responsibility is to implement it
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	un projet cadre JUPAL, dit "paperless justice" englobant entre autres la digitalisation des procédures est en cours, vu l'ampleur du projet, il n'est pas au point d'aboutir"
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	We don't no
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here

Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	We are investigating a possible implementation, but no time period is decided
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	The timing of U.S. implementation is dependent upon a number of factors, including development of our iSupport interface for states, testing with other iSupport countries, and the completion of our security review of iSupport.

If yes, please identify any assistance required:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Inter-institutional training, brochures and leaflets to publicize in different institutional media.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Assistance is required as to its implementation.
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Nous sommes en contact étroit avec M. PELLET qui doit effectuer prochainement une mission à Paris pour accompagner le passage à iSupporti
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	At this stage we are not requiring assistance and in general we are in contact with PB and iSupport staff and we have been receiving all necessary support so far.
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Inter-institutional training courses, preparation of leaflets and brochures and radio and TV broadcasting.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here

Sweden	-
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

No

Austria, Belarus, Mexico, Romania, Slovenia, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	
Austria	not for the time being
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	
Mexico	Not applicable. Mexico is not a State party to the 2007 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	
Slovenia	
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here

United Kingdom (England)	See 13.1 above
United States of America	Please insert text here

13.1.2. For Contracting Parties to the New York 1956 Convention which are not yet Parties to the 2007 Convention: Does your State intend to implement iSupport as it supports the New York 1956 Convention?

Yes

No answers

If yes, when?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Yes, once the Convention is ratified.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	
Switzerland	Nous sommes en train d'évaluer les possibilités d'iSupport; une réponse à la question n'est pas encore possible.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	It's not considered cost effective or compatible with our internal electronic case

	management system.
United States of America	Please insert text here

If yes, please identify any assistance required:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Please insert text here
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

No

Australia, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Mexico, Nicaragua

Please explain:

Argentina	Not yet. This is under evaluation.
Australia	Australia will continue to monitor the progress of iSupport. However, there are no current plans to implement the system
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	I do not know if my state plans to implement iSupport.
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Mexico was not aware that iSupport was available for instruments (or arrangements) other than the 2007 Convention. Further information is needed to determine feasibility of iSupport implementation for the 1956 Convention.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Nicaragua is not a party to the 1956 Convention on the Recovery Abroad of Maintenance
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

13.1.3. For non-Contracting Parties to the 2007 Convention which are Parties to bilateral agreements: Does your State intend to implement iSupport as it supports bilateral agreements?
Yes

No answers

If yes, when?

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Nous sommes en train d'évaluer les possibilités d'iSupport; une réponse à la question n'est pas encore possible.
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

If yes, please identify any assistance required:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here

Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Please insert text here
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	Please insert text here

No

Australia, Canada, Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Mexico, United Kingdom (England)

Please explain:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Australia and New Zealand have a bilateral agreement. Neither have implemented iSupport and other processes are in place for that agreement. Australia does have a bilateral agreement with the United States of America. However, there are no current plans to utilise iSupport for that agreement.
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here

Canada	Not at this time.
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	It will be evaluated once Colombia ratifies the 2007 Convention.
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Mexico	Mexico was not aware that iSupport was available for instruments (or arrangements) other than the 2007 Convention. Further information is needed to determine feasibility of iSupport implementation for bilateral arrangements.
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	This will be assessed once the Convention enters into force.
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	Please insert text here
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Veuillez saisir les informations demandées ici
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	It's not considered cost effective or compatible with our internal electronic case management system.
United States of America	Please insert text here

14. General

14.1. Are there any other issues or topics not covered in this Questionnaire that you would like to see the Special Commission address?

No

Austria, Belarus, Brazil, Bulgaria, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, France, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Poland, Slovenia, Sweden

Yes

Canada, Finland, Germany (CA), Germany (DIJUF), Hungary, Latvia, Norway, Portugal, Romania, Switzerland, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Please insert text here
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Direct requests, legal assistance
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Cooperation and best practices between the Central Authorities
France	Please insert text here
Germany (CA)	In order to facilitate the handling of cases, it is essential to have up to date contact details (full postal address, e mail address etc.) of other Central Authorities on the HCCH website. The application/interpretation of Art. 56 has led to problems with regard to the temporal applicability of the Convention because applications made via the Central Authority (a) instead of directly to court (b) could be treated differently, even though the application for enforcement itself could reach the court at the same time. To avoid that result, some German courts have interpreted Art. 56 b) to be applicable whenever an application is made to a court. A clarification that leads to a uniform handling of cases would be helpful.
Germany (DIJUF)	1. Costs of recovering maintenance In spite of the provisions made in Art. 15-17 of the Convention, the anticipated costs of recovering maintenance claims remain hard to estimate, given that the income and other financial circumstances of the maintenance debtor and thus the prospects of success of the intended measures often only become known in the course of the proceedings. Here, maintenance creditors are particularly reliant on an accurate estimate of costs, as they lack the financial means of subsistence – namely the maintenance – either entirely or partially. In the practice we observed that the costs covered by legal aid differ significantly from one Member State to the next. For example, the costs of translation are generally not covered and can, in disputed cases, become a genuine obstacle for the maintenance creditor. Moreover, despite the granting of legal aid, proceeding costs are repeatedly incurred, such as for instance hearing fees, fees for issuing extracts from decisions, chargeable inquiries by enforcement authorities to official agencies or the costs of special enforcement measures like enforced entry to a property. In some cases, the costs of expert reports, e.g. on foreign maintenance law are similarly not covered by legal aid. Furthermore it is very difficult for applicants to find professionals willing to assist on the basis of legal aid. The question of the costs of recovering maintenance is, however, also a key issue for public bodies. Payment of advance maintenance to children in need is associated with considerable financial expense for national treasuries. To that extent, recourse against maintenance debtors is intended to serve the purpose of reimbursement and not to result in additional cost or to be disproportionate. Public bodies do not enjoy any exemption from costs for conducting proceedings abroad. As soon

	<p>as the proceedings are not free of charge, the public bodies making the application must reckon with considerable court costs, solicitors' costs and/or enforcement costs, along with the costs of translation. Which costs are relevant generally depends on the stage in the proceedings at which recovery is sought. Most countries only grant advance payments for children if the maintenance creditor is already in possession of a maintenance order. Some others, though, may make advance payments of child maintenance irrespective of the existence of a maintenance order. This is the case in Germany and also in Latvia or Sweden. In the countries where the public body as the legal successor is required to establish a maintenance order, considerable costs must be reckoned with even at the level of obtaining a maintenance order. Assistance offered via Central Authorities pursuant to Chapter III of the Convention cannot be claimed in these circumstances, as Art. 36 of the Maintenance Regulation only relates to the procedure for declaration of enforceability and enforcement. Moreover, the determination of maintenance proceedings, in the absence of privileged place of jurisdiction, or in consideration of reservations made under Art. 20 (2), must be conducted abroad, and generally with a local solicitor being instructed to act. Under these arrangements not only the court and solicitor's costs, but also the costs of translation, add up to considerable sums, as the subrogation needs to be proven in the language of the court. As a consequence, it seems that it would serve the purpose of efficient implementation of maintenance, firstly to reduce the costs of recovering maintenance even further than already is the case, and secondly to better inform maintenance creditors regarding the anticipated costs, in order that a more accurate cost/benefit analysis can be conducted.</p> <p>2. Length of proceedings A further significant obstacle is the length of proceedings until maintenance obligations are enforced. Concerning the cooperation between central authorities, it seems that some of the Central Authorities lack the necessary financial and human resources to comply properly with the duty to provide assistance laid down in the Convention. This can lead to the loss of parts of the maintenance claim in cases where the domestic law of the state addressed states periods of limitation for the enforcement of arrears (Norway 1 year, France 5 years). On the level of national proceedings, it appears that problems arise only in exceptional cases when it comes to obtaining decisions on declarations of enforceability and enforcement. Things become significantly more problematic when debtors defend themselves against the initiated enforcement. Depending on the country of enforcement, this can lead to court proceedings lasting for years. The considerable length of proceedings until maintenance is enforced constitutes an unreasonable and one-sided burden on maintenance creditors. Admittedly, the maintenance debtor must be given the opportunity of defence against any claim that abuses the law. Since the claim, which is the subject of these proceedings, represents the direct financial livelihood of the creditor party and delays in the proceedings give the debtor party opportunity to remove assets from enforcement, it appears essential that maintenance issues are addressed with a wholly different urgency - by implementing deadlines in the Convention and perhaps even implementing consequences for the failure to act within the deadline.</p> <p>3. Difficulties related to the proceedings pursuant to Chapter III (cooperation between Central Authorities)</p> <p>3.1. Inactivity of some Central Authorities</p> <p>3.2. Support with extrajudicial negotiations It is our understanding that, with the exception of the Norwegian Central Authority, Central Authorities most of the time do not provide assistance in regard to the extrajudicial recovery of maintenance but immediately instigate formal steps. On the one hand, extrajudicial attempts</p>
--	--

	<p>at mediation in the country of enforcement can be considered a waste of time when applicants (like particularly some public bodies) only make an application for cross-border enforcement of maintenance once all efforts to find an extrajudicial solution have been exhausted. On the other hand, this often has the effect that voluntary payments are started, because the Central Authority of the country of enforcement is “taken more seriously” by the debtor than an authority based abroad. It is possible that express clarification would be desirable in the application form as to whether extrajudicial efforts are desirable or not helpful in this matter. Of course when national codes of procedure only permit enforcement if the debtor has received a request to pay via the extrajudicial route, possibly from the enforcement authority, the creditor won’t have any choice other than to accept the requirement of the national enforcement law.</p> <p>3.3. Representation of applicants interests Neither the Convention nor domestic law of the states addressed provide an instrument for Central Authorities to the benefit of the maintenance creditor in the event of difficulties arising during the proceeding (silence of the local authorities, an adverse decision by a local court or local enforcement authorities, objections by the maintenance debtor). As a rule, applicants must become active themselves in order to bring the proceedings forward.</p> <p>4. Defence proceedings by the maintenance debtor After enforcement measures have been initiated by the party entitled to maintenance, maintenance debtors often engage legal counsel in the country of enforcement to defend themselves against enforcement. They use the appeal procedures customary under their national law and introduce every conceivable objection against the enforcement measure itself, but equally against the claim for maintenance, without regard to whether the objections outlined constitute grounds for refusal of recognition and enforcement within the meaning of Art. 20, 22 of the Convention or grounds for modification within the meaning of Art. 18. The maintenance creditors thereby bear the disadvantages of conducting proceedings and providing evidence abroad. It is not uncommon to encounter incomprehension from the courts if reference is made to the fact that solely the reasons set out in Art. 22 of the Convention for refusing enforcement or recognition may be examined, but not, for example, the level of the claim for maintenance. Regarding this point, the Convention seems relatively clear. Therefore, it seems necessary that the national authorities make a considerable effort to provide information.</p> <p>5. Determining the serviceable address, the income and other financial circumstances of the debtor. One of the most common obstacles to enforcing maintenance is the difficulty of determining the serviceable address and the income and other financial circumstances of the maintenance debtor. It is true that the Convention has created a new option for assistance via the introduction of specific measures pursuant to Art. 7. However, it should be noted that the search for information often proves difficult. Applicants are often faced with the following problems: - The offer of assistance from the Central Authorities is often subject to strict data protection regulations. - The results of requesting information about the debtor’s financial circumstances often consist in the information whether or not the debtor owes assets/income. Because of data protection provisions, no information is provided as to the details of the existing assets or income and their seasability. - The option of requesting specific measures is open to public bodies solely for the purposes of enforcement, but not for obtaining a maintenance decision. Regarding this point, practice indicates a clear need for change, as state treasuries are spending considerable sums of money on combating child poverty through advance payments of child maintenance.</p>
--	---

Hungary	The transfer of maintenance funds is still problematic in some instances. Hungary implemented legislation for being able to receive maintenance funds in a central bank account to meet requirements of some contracting states.
Latvia	2007 Convention article 22(e)
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Please insert text here
Mexico	Please insert text here
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	We sometimes experience problems regarding differences in interpretation of the Convention. It would be helpful to have a network to discuss such issues and come to a consensus.
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Maintenance after 21 years old when there is already a pending case at the Central Authority. In Portugal, a new Law (2015) extended maintenance until the age of 25. If the Convention limited at the age of 21, what should a Central Authority do? Proceed with case under 2007 Convention or start a new case under 1956 New York Convention?
Romania	1) procedure on how to locate a person, obtaining the national identification number of a person 2) procedure on the investigation of the address of the debtor and the revenues and goods of the debtor, on one side, and proceedings on the interruption/suspension of the prescription of the enforcement for the child support for the creditor under 18 years, on the other side. If the debtor has no revenues or goods, some CA close the file and return the entire documentation. If the creditor wishes to recover the child support from abroad, the creditor he/she must formulate and send each year a request for specific measures and a new application. Other CA, on the contrary, if the debtor has no revenues or goods, they investigate ex officio every year the revenues and goods of the debtor until the creditor reaches 18 years/finishes her/his studies. Some CA do not close and return the file. The file is pending until the creditor reach 18 years / finish his/her studies. In case that the file is pending before the enforcement authority (bailiff), the bailiff ceases the enforcement due to the lack of the revenues / goods of the debtor, but also in order to recover his fee. In some cases the bailiffs issued a minute stating that the prescription is interrupted/suspended because the debtor was not located, the debtor has no revenues/goods.
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	- Si nécessaire en raison des travaux menés par le groupe d'experts: adresser la problématique du transfert de fonds (problématique des chèques etc.). - Cooperation effective des Autorités centrales dans les Etats membres: Sous la Convention de 1956, l'expérience pratique de notre autorité est que dans certains pays, on ne reçoit pas de réaction à des demandes, ou le cas échéant seulement après une très longue attente pouvant atteindre des années. La situation s'est-t-elle améliorée sous la Convention de 2007? Si ce n'est pas le cas: Quelles sont les raisons, quels sont les empêchements? - Execution forcée des obligations alimentaires: Sous la Convention de 1956, l'expérience pratique de notre autorité est que dans certains pays, il n'est

	<p>jamais procédé à l'exécution forcée des obligations alimentaires. Est-ce que cette situation s'est améliorée sous la Convention de 2007? Si ce n'est pas le cas: Quels sont les empêchements?</p> <p>- Demandes de modification par les débiteurs:</p> <p>A) Comment les Etats membres ont-ils résolu, tant au niveau pratique qu'au niveau organisationnel et du point de vue des compétences, les potentiels conflits d'intérêt si une demande de recouvrement présentée par un créancier est contrée par une demande de modification du titre par le débiteur? Est-ce la même autorité qui oeuvre tant pour le créancier que pour le débiteur, est-ce que ce sont des services différents?</p> <p>B) Est-ce que chaque demande d'un créancier pour l'exécution d'une décision est contrée par une demande de modification par le débiteur?</p> <p>C) Combien de demandes de modification ou de suspension d'exécution sont présentées par des débiteurs, en comparaison avec les demandes par les créanciers?</p>
Ukraine	<p>The practice of some States (for example, the USA) to send maintenance payments to Ukraine in the form of bank checks in spite the fact that every application under the Convention contains information of the bank account of a creditor. In Ukraine there are no any possibility to receive money under such checks. Another question - transmitting the maintenance payments to the bank account of the Central Authority of the requesting State. It is problematic because under the Ukrainian legislation in case of recovery of maintenance by the enforcement agent the money may only be transferred to the creditors account and not to the CA account, as some CA require (for example, Czech Republic, Netherlands).</p>
United Kingdom (England)	Please insert text here
United States of America	<p>To ensure the Convention is implemented as intended, it is essential that any country seeking to join the Convention must have in effect laws and procedures that provide for the compulsory establishment of parentage, when necessary, upon application for establishment of an order for support for a child born out-of-wedlock. Laws that only provide for establishment of parentage upon voluntary acknowledgment do not satisfy Convention requirements. Additionally, if a country categorically requires that an applicant establish parentage in the country where she resides prior to sending an Article 10 application to establish a support order, it is not complying with the Convention. Article 10 is clear that one of the applications available to a creditor in the requesting State is establishment of a decision in the requested State where there is no existing decision, including where necessary the establishment of parentage. While the U.S. believes that the Convention is clearly drafted and should not be susceptible to variable interpretation, it is essential that Contracting States adhere to this Convention requirement.</p> <p>We also recommend that the Special Commission discuss how best to encourage States to accept abstracts in lieu of the complete text of an order. Acceptance of an abstract would greatly reduce the costs of translation.</p>

14.2. Are there any areas where research and/or a Preliminary Document would be helpful?

No

Austria, Belarus, Bulgaria, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Finland, Germany (CA), Hungary, Latvia, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Mexico, Netherlands, Nicaragua, Norway, Poland, Portugal, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, Ukraine, United Kingdom (England)

Yes

Please specify:

Argentina	Please insert text here
Australia	Please insert text here
Austria	Please insert text here
Belarus	Please insert text here
Brazil	Transmission of payments
Bulgaria	Please insert text here
Canada	Please insert text here
Chile (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Colombia (1956 New York Convention)	Please insert text here
Croatia	Please insert text here
Cyprus	Please insert text here
Dominican Republic	Please insert text here
Finland	Please insert text here
France	Please insert text here
Germany (CA)	Please insert text here
Germany (DIJUF)	Please insert text here
Hungary	Please insert text here
Latvia	Please insert text here
Lithuania	Please insert text here
Luxembourg	Please insert text here
Mexico	Please insert text here
Netherlands	Please insert text here
Nicaragua	Please insert text here
Norway	Please insert text here
Poland	Please insert text here
Portugal	Please insert text here
Romania	1. the proceedings for the obtaining of : - the information on the (in) existence of the revenues/goods of the debtor - the information on the revenues/goods of the debtor and the domestic/international proceedings available (the proceedings for the judicial authorisation of the court, the 1970 Hague Convention inquest in futurum). 2.TheRO CA is confronted with the fact that debtors from abroad change frequently their address and the judgments on the modification (increasing) of the child support cannot be served to him by the RO Court based on the 1965 Hague Convention. The question is if the RO CA can ask the CA of the state where the debtor resides to facilitate the service of documents to the debtor based on the 6 para 2 j)m from the 2007 Hague Convention ?
Slovenia	Please insert text here
Sweden	Please insert text here
Switzerland	Est-ce que les Autorités centrales sont de l'avis que la coopération avec les autorités des autres pays et l'exécution forcée des obligations alimentaires s'est améliorée avec la Convention de 2007 en comparaison avec la

	Convention de 1956? Si ce n'est pas le cas, quelles sont les raisons, quels sont les empêchements? Qu'est-ce qui pourrait être fait pour encore améliorer la coopération?
Ukraine	Please insert text here
United Kingdom (England)	
United States of America	We recommend that the Permanent Bureau write a Preliminary Document on the current status of international payments and the work of the Experts Group. Transferring international child support payments remains the most challenging operational issue in international child support.

14.3. If your State is interested in attending a possible meeting of the Special Commission, would it be interested in attending, prior to the meeting, a half-day information session for new States Parties, States interested in becoming Party to the 2000 Convention or States that have not yet attended a meeting of a Special Commission to review the practical operation of a Convention?

Yes

Belarus, Brazil, Canada, Chile (1956 New York Convention), Colombia (1956 New York Convention), Croatia, Cyprus, Dominican Republic, Finland, Latvia, Mexico, Nicaragua, Poland, Romania, Slovenia, Sweden, United Kingdom (England), United States of America

No

Austria, Bulgaria, Germany (CA), Hungary, Lithuania, Luxembourg, Netherlands, Portugal, Switzerland, Ukraine