

<b>Título</b>	Resumen de respuestas al cuestionario de 2022 relativo al Convenio sobre Notificaciones
<b>Documento</b>	Doc. Prel. N.º 2 REV de junio de 2024
<b>Autor</b>	OP
<b>Punto de la Agenda</b>	V
<b>Mandatos</b>	CyD N.º 46 del CAGP de 2024 CyD N.º 39 del CAGP de 2023 CyD N.º 32 del CAGP de 2022 CyD N.º 36 del CAGP de 2021
<b>Objetivo</b>	Resumir las conclusiones del cuestionario de 2022 relativo al <i>Convenio de 15 de noviembre de 1965 sobre la Notificación o Traslado en el Extranjero de Documentos Judiciales y Extrajudiciales en Materia Civil o Comercial</i> (Convenio sobre Notificaciones)
<b>Acción requerida</b>	Decisión <input type="checkbox"/> Aprobación <input type="checkbox"/> Discusión <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Acción / finalización <input type="checkbox"/> A título informativo <input checked="" type="checkbox"/>
<b>Anexos</b>	Anexo: Compilación de respuestas (cuestionario para las Partes contratantes) - las respuestas fueron compiladas en el idioma en que se recibieron
<b>Documentos relacionados</b>	<a href="#">Doc. Prel. N.º 1 de diciembre de 2022</a> - Cuestionario sobre el <i>Convenio de 15 de noviembre de 1965 sobre la Notificación o Traslado en el Extranjero de Documentos Judiciales y Extrajudiciales en Materia Civil o Comercial</i> (Convenio sobre Notificaciones).

## Índice

I.	Introducción.....	1
II.	Comentarios generales.....	2
III.	Ámbito de aplicación del Convenio .....	3
IV.	Funcionamiento del Convenio .....	4
	A.    Vía principal de transmisión (art. 5).....	5
	B.    Vías de transmisión alternativas (arts. 8, 9 y 10).....	6
	1.    Utilización del Formulario Modelo.....	6
	2.    Agentes diplomáticos y consulares (art. 8).....	7
	3.    Vías diplomática y consular (art. 9).....	7
	4.    Vía postal (art. 10(a)).....	8
	5.    Funcionarios judiciales, ministeriales u otras personas competentes (art. 10(b)) .....	9
	6.    Persona interesada en un procedimiento judicial (art. 10(c)).....	9
	C.    Denegación del cumplimiento de la solicitud (art. 13) .....	10
V.	Uso de la tecnología.....	10
VI.	Información y estadísticas de las Partes contratantes .....	14
	A.    Solicitudes recibidas (vías principales de transmisión (art. 5)) .....	14
	B.    Solicitudes enviadas (vías principales de transmisión (art. 5)): .....	18
	C.    Estadísticas sobre las vías de transmisión alternativas .....	20
	D.    Denegación (art. 13):.....	20
	Annex: Compilation of Responses (questionnaire for Contracting Parties).....	23
I.	General Feedback.....	23
II.	Scope of the Convention.....	28
III.	Operation of the Convention.....	33
	A.    Main Channel of Transmission (Art. 5).....	42
	B.    Alternative Channels of Transmission (Arts 8, 9 & 10) .....	51
	C.    Refusal to Execute Request (Art. 13).....	68
IV.	Use of Information Technology.....	70

# Resumen de respuestas al cuestionario de 2022 relativo al Convenio sobre Notificaciones

## I. Introducción

- 1 De conformidad con el mandato otorgado por el Consejo de Asuntos Generales y Política (CAGP) en sus reuniones de 2021 y 2022,<sup>1</sup> en diciembre de 2022 la Oficina Permanente (OP) distribuyó dos cuestionarios sobre el funcionamiento práctico del *Convenio de 15 de noviembre de 1965 sobre la Notificación o Traslado en el Extranjero de Documentos Judiciales y Extrajudiciales en Materia Civil o Comercial* (Convenio sobre Notificaciones o Convenio). Uno de ellos estaba dirigido a las Partes contratantes del Convenio<sup>2</sup> y el otro a Partes no contratantes.
- 2 El cuestionario dirigido a las Partes contratantes abarcaba una serie de temas, entre ellos el ámbito de aplicación y el funcionamiento del Convenio, la utilización de las tecnologías de la información para transmitir y dar curso a las solicitudes de notificación o traslado en el extranjero, posibles cuestiones para debatir en la próxima reunión de la Comisión Especial (CE), y datos y estadísticas relativos al Convenio. La información recibida de las Partes contratantes en respuesta a este cuestionario servirá para preparar la agenda de la reunión de la CE. Las respuestas también se tuvieron en cuenta a los efectos de actualizar el *Manual Práctico sobre el Funcionamiento del Convenio sobre Notificaciones* (Manual Práctico). El cuestionario para las Partes no contratantes tenía como objetivo averiguar si estos Estados habían considerado, o estaban considerando, adherirse al Convenio sobre Notificaciones.
- 3 Los cuestionarios se distribuyeron a todos los Miembros de la HCCH y a las Partes contratantes del Convenio sobre Notificaciones, y la fecha límite para responder era el 31 de marzo de 2023. Ante la decisión del CAGP de posponer la reunión de la CE al ejercicio económico 2024-2025,<sup>3</sup> la OP amplió el plazo para la presentación de respuestas hasta el 9 de junio de 2023 y continuó aceptando respuestas después de esa fecha. Este resumen incluye todas las respuestas recibidas hasta el 30 de noviembre de 2023.
- 4 Cuando se distribuyeron los cuestionarios, el Convenio sobre Notificaciones contaba con 79 Partes contratantes.<sup>4</sup> La OP recibió en total 50 respuestas a los cuestionarios, 49<sup>5</sup> de ellas de 47 Partes contratantes.<sup>6</sup> Esto significa que, de las 79 Partes contratantes del Convenio, aproximadamente el 59% respondieron al cuestionario. Una Parte no contratante también respondió al cuestionario.<sup>7</sup>

---

1 CyD N.º 36 del CAGP de 2021; CyD N.º 32 del CAGP de 2022.

2 “Cuestionario relativo al *Convenio de 15 de noviembre de 1965 sobre la Notificación o Traslado en el Extranjero de Documentos Judiciales y Extrajudiciales en Materia Civil o Comercial* (Convenio sobre Notificaciones)” Doc. Prel. N.º 1 de diciembre de 2022 (en adelante, “Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones”).

3 CyD N.º 39 del CAGP de 2023. En su reunión de marzo de 2024, el CAGP confirmó que la reunión de la CE tendría lugar del 2 al 5 de julio de 2024 (CyD N.º 46 del CAGP de 2024).

4 Al momento de la publicación del presente Documento Preliminar, el Convenio sobre Notificaciones contaba con 84 Partes contratantes.

5 La Región Administrativa Especial (RAE) de Hong Kong y la RAE de Macao de la República Popular China (China) presentaron respuestas separadas al cuestionario, además de China (continental). Estas respuestas se contabilizaron y analizaron por separado a pesar de que todas ellas corresponden a la misma Parte contratante. Según proceda, se consideran respuestas individuales.

La Unión Europea (UE) también ha facilitado información complementaria sobre el derecho de la UE en materia de la notificación o traslado de documentos en el extranjero.

6 Albania, Andorra, Argentina, Armenia, Australia, Austria, Azerbaiyán, Brasil, Bulgaria, Alemania, Canadá, China, Chipre, Costa Rica, Croacia, Eslovaquia, Eslovenia, Estados Unidos de América, Estonia, Filipinas, Finlandia, Francia, Georgia, Hungría, Irlanda, India, Israel, Italia, Japón, Kazajstán, Letonia, Lituania, México, Montenegro, Nicaragua, Noruega, Polonia, Portugal, Reino Unido, República Checa, Rumania, San Marino, Serbia, Suecia, Suiza, Turquía y Viet Nam.

7 Singapur. Cabe señalar que al momento de responder al cuestionario para Partes no contratantes, Singapur aún no era Parte contratante. Sin embargo, se adhirió al Convenio el 16 de mayo de 2023, y el Convenio entró en vigor para Singapur el 1 de diciembre de 2023.

La OP está muy agradecida a los encuestados por el tiempo y el esfuerzo dedicados a responder los cuestionarios.

- 5 En el presente documento solo se resumen las respuestas de las Partes contratantes. Las respuestas recibidas de las Partes no contratantes se utilizarán para iniciativas de promoción y trabajo bilateral, por lo que no se han incluido en el análisis de este documento.
- 6 El resumen fue elaborado a partir de la información obtenida de las respuestas. Cuando estas no fueron claras, no fueron tenidas en cuenta. Del mismo modo, cuando los encuestados no respondieron a determinadas preguntas, la OP no tuvo en cuenta esas respuestas para el cálculo de los porcentajes. Con todo, el resumen no pretende ser concluyente ni exhaustivo; como se indica en varios casos, las respuestas de los Estados no siempre ofrecen una visión completa de su legislación y sus prácticas.
- 7 El anexo contiene una compilación de las respuestas de las Partes contratantes a cada una de las preguntas. Las respuestas de cada una de las Partes contratantes (en los casos en que autorizaron su publicación) se publicarán en la Sección Notificaciones del sitio web de la HCCH.<sup>8</sup>

## II. Comentarios generales

- 8 La mayoría de los encuestados calificaron el funcionamiento general del Convenio como “bueno” o “excelente”.<sup>9</sup> Dos de los 49 encuestados lo calificaron de “satisfactorio”, mientras que otros dos señalaron que “requiere mejoras”. En esas últimas dos respuestas señalaron que la utilización del Formulario Modelo plantea dificultades, por ejemplo, deficiencias en la dirección de la persona a la que haya de notificarse o trasladarse el documento o en la información requerida para efectuar la notificación o el traslado; incumplimiento de la obligación de presentar documentos en dos ejemplares y/o su traducción; no acusar recibo de las solicitudes transmitidas en virtud del Convenio por autoridades extranjeras, y dificultades de comunicación con las autoridades remitentes y las Autoridades Centrales.
- 9 En cuanto a la pregunta relativa a la facilidad de uso del Manual Práctico,<sup>10</sup> el 73% de los encuestados respondieron que era “buena”, el 16%, “excelente”, y el 6%, “satisfactoria”. En una proporción menor de respuestas (4%), se indicó que el Manual Práctico “requiere mejoras”.
- 10 Según las respuestas, el 70% de las Autoridades Centrales hacen un seguimiento de las solicitudes recibidas en el marco del Convenio sobre Notificaciones, mientras que el 9% no lo hace.<sup>11</sup> En el caso de las Autoridades Centrales que realizan un seguimiento de las solicitudes recibidas, la mayoría dispone de un registro o sistema electrónico de gestión de casos:

Electrónico, para solicitudes recibidas y enviadas	49%
Electrónico, solo para solicitudes recibidas	14%
Manual, para solicitudes recibidas y enviadas	14%

En el caso de los encuestados que seleccionaron “otros” para aportar más información sobre el sistema que utilizan para hacer seguimiento de las solicitudes recibidas, la mayoría describieron

<sup>8</sup> Las respuestas estarán disponibles en el sitio web de la HCCH, [www.hcch.net](http://www.hcch.net), en la sección “Notificaciones” y luego “Cuestionarios y respuestas”.

<sup>9</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 1.

<sup>10</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 2.

<sup>11</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 3.

un sistema de gestión de casos. Tres Estados federales señalaron la existencia de prácticas diferentes según el territorio.

- 11 Se preguntó a las Partes contratantes si su Autoridad Central hace un seguimiento de todas las solicitudes enviadas al extranjero.<sup>12</sup> Del 35% de los encuestados que respondieron que sí, el 69% utiliza un sistema electrónico para hacer un seguimiento, mientras que el 31% lo registra manualmente. Aproximadamente el 37% de los encuestados respondieron que no. La mayoría de los encuestados que respondieron “otros” señalaron que su Autoridad Central solo interviene en la tramitación de las solicitudes recibidas.
- 12 Según las respuestas, en 2022, el 37% de los encuestados dieron curso a las solicitudes recibidas en un plazo de 1 a 3 meses, el 45%, en un plazo de 3 a 6 meses, y el 7%, en un plazo de 6 a 12 meses. El 7% de los encuestados dieron curso a solicitudes en menos de un mes y el 4%, en un plazo de más de 12 meses.<sup>13</sup> Cabe destacar que 16 encuestados señalaron que los tiempos para dar curso a las solicitudes transmitidas por vía electrónica son significativa o moderadamente más rápidos que los de las transmitidas por correo postal.

### III. **Ámbito de aplicación del Convenio**

- 13 Aproximadamente el 59% de los encuestados no han tenido dificultades para interpretar el ámbito de aplicación del Convenio en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022.<sup>14</sup> El 26% indicaron que han tenido problemas en cuanto a la interpretación de “materia civil o comercial” (art. 1), y la mayoría de ellos consideran que existen dudas sobre si la materia administrativa queda comprendida en el ámbito de aplicación del Convenio. En el resto de las respuestas se indicaron otras dificultades, entre ellas el funcionamiento de los artículos 8 y 9 (vías diplomática y consular), la preparación del Formulario Modelo y la localización de la persona a la que haya de notificarse o trasladarse un documento.
- 14 El 78% de los encuestados indicaron que en su derecho interno no se definen los “documentos extrajudiciales” (art. 17), mientras que el 22% indicaron que este término sí se encuentra definido en su derecho interno.<sup>15</sup> Algunos Estados miembros de la Unión Europea (UE) se refirieron al concepto de “documentos extrajudiciales” del Reglamento de la UE de 2020 relativo a la notificación y traslado de documentos,<sup>16</sup> y a la interpretación dada por el Tribunal de Justicia de la Unión Europea (TJUE).<sup>17</sup>
- 15 Los tipos de documentos extrajudiciales que los encuestados transmiten con arreglo al Convenio sobre Notificaciones varían:<sup>18</sup>

- 
1. Documentos expedidos por notarios y agentes privados encargados de la ejecución

---

  2. Documentos otorgados por funcionarios públicos

---

  3. Decisiones dictadas por registros

---

<sup>12</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 4.

<sup>13</sup> En este cálculo se utilizaron los datos de 2022 por ser los más recientes de los que disponía la OP.

<sup>14</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 5.

<sup>15</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 6.

<sup>16</sup> Reglamento n.º 2020/1784 del Parlamento Europeo y del Consejo, de 25 de noviembre de 2020, relativo a la notificación y traslado en los Estados miembros de documentos judiciales y extrajudiciales en materia civil o mercantil (notificación y traslado de documentos) (versión refundida) (en lo sucesivo, “Reglamento relativo a la notificación y traslado de 2020”).

<sup>17</sup> TJUE, sentencia de 11 de noviembre de 2015, *Tecom Mican SL & José Arias Domínguez*, C-223/14.

<sup>18</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 7.

4.	Decisiones en el marco de procedimientos de mediación, arbitraje y administrativos
5.	Documentos de abogados, relativos a litigios o a la preparación de los mismos
6.	Requerimientos de pago
7.	Documentos relacionados con asuntos de derecho de familia, por ejemplo: decisiones de separación o divorcio y reclamaciones de alimentos para los hijos
8.	Documentos y solicitudes expedidos por autoridades en materia aduanera y fiscal

#### IV. Funcionamiento del Convenio

16 El 61% de los encuestados indicaron que, cuando reciben solicitudes de notificación o traslado como Estado requerido, prestan asistencia para localizar a la persona a la que haya de notificarse o trasladarse el documento en virtud del Convenio, mientras que el resto de los encuestados (39%) no prestan dicha asistencia.<sup>19</sup> Para prestar asistencia, la mayoría de los encuestados señalaron que su Autoridad Central puede recurrir a un amplio abanico de fuentes de información, entre ellas bases de datos gubernamentales y registros públicos o comerciales.

17 Se preguntó a las Partes contratantes cómo se transmiten los documentos para su notificación o traslado en el extranjero a otro Estado, a un funcionario del Estado o a una empresa de propiedad estatal.<sup>20</sup> Seis encuestados indicaron que el Convenio no se aplicaría en esos casos, mientras que 29 respondieron que el Convenio sí se aplicaría. El resto indicaron la utilización de la vía diplomática y/o la existencia de diferentes vías en función del destinatario.

18 Los 29 que respondieron que consideran que el Convenio se aplica a la notificación o traslado de documentos a otro Estado, a un funcionario del Estado o a una empresa de propiedad estatal, indicaron el uso de diferentes vías. Señalaron las siguientes:<sup>21</sup>

Vías principales (art. 5)	83%
Agentes diplomáticos o consulares (art. 8)	38%
Vía consular indirecta (art. 9(1))	3%
Vía diplomática indirecta (art. 9(2))	24%
Vía postal (art. 10(a)).	24%
Comunicación directa entre funcionarios judiciales (art. 10(b))	3%
Comunicación directa entre la persona interesada y los funcionarios judiciales (art. 10(c))	3%

19 Casi la totalidad de los encuestados (89%) realizan la notificación o traslado de documentos judiciales y extrajudiciales de la misma forma.<sup>22</sup> Uno de los encuestados indicó que la notificación

<sup>19</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 8.

<sup>20</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 9.

<sup>21</sup> Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>22</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 11.

o traslado de documentos judiciales la efectúa un agente o auxiliar judicial u otro notificador a instancia de la Corte Suprema de la jurisdicción requerida, mientras que los documentos extrajudiciales son remitidos por la Autoridad Central a un agente privado para que se encargue de la notificación.

#### A. Vía principal de transmisión (art. 5)

- 20 En cuanto a la pregunta sobre qué autoridades o personas son competentes para remitir una solicitud de notificación o traslado a una Autoridad Central extranjera, los encuestados indicaron las siguientes autoridades:<sup>23</sup>

Tribunales	59%
Fiscales	7%
Funcionarios a cargo de un registro	13%
Auxiliares judiciales ( <i>huissiers</i> )	13%
Notificadores judiciales ( <i>process servers</i> )	4%
Autoridades Centrales	65%
Otros	26%

De las respuestas se desprende que existe una gran diversidad de autoridades remitentes. Los encuestados que seleccionaron “otros”, para indicar otras autoridades, mencionaron distintas autoridades y personas competentes, por ejemplo: notarios, agentes encargados de la ejecución, abogados y otros organismos estatales.

- 21 Aunque el Convenio no lo exige, el 48% de los encuestados señalaron que las solicitudes enviadas al extranjero deben transmitirse a través de su Autoridad Central.<sup>24</sup> Las razones más citadas fueron la especialización y los conocimientos lingüísticos de la Autoridad Central. Algunos encuestados también consideran que su Autoridad Central es la más idónea para comprobar si la solicitud de notificación o traslado cumple los requisitos establecidos en el Convenio y el derecho del Estado requerido.
- 22 Cuando el solicitante no exige ninguna forma en particular de notificación, la forma principal/por defecto varía de un encuestado a otro:<sup>25</sup>

Simple entrega (aceptación voluntaria) (art. 5(2))	4%
Notificación personal	33%
Por correo	21%
Por citación judicial	19%
Por correo electrónico	0%

<sup>23</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 12. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>24</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 13.

<sup>25</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 14.

Por otros medios electrónicos	4%
Otros	19%

23 En el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022, el 47% de los encuestados recibieron alguna solicitud en la que se indicaba una forma de notificación en particular (art. 5.1.b)), mientras que el 32% declararon no haber recibido ninguna solicitud de una forma en particular, y el 21% indicaron que no sabían.<sup>26</sup>

24 Entre las formas de notificación solicitadas, las respuestas (desde la perspectiva de un Estado requerido) indican una preferencia por la notificación personal, seguida de la notificación por correo electrónico y por correo postal:<sup>27</sup>

Notificación personal	73%
Por correo postal	14%
Por citación judicial	9%
Por correo electrónico	18%
Por otros medios electrónicos	9%

25 Solo tres encuestados indicaron no poder dar curso a las solicitudes relativas a determinadas formas de notificación, bien por no disponer de recursos para efectuar la notificación personal, bien por no contar con procedimientos para notificar documentos por medios electrónicos, incluido el correo electrónico.<sup>28</sup>

26 Desde la perspectiva de los Estados requirentes, el 39% de los encuestados declararon no haber transmitido solicitudes con una forma de notificación específica, mientras que el 35% respondieron no saber si se había solicitado una forma específica.<sup>29</sup> En cambio, casi el 26% de los indicaron haber solicitado una forma específica en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022. Las respuestas muestran de nuevo una preferencia por la notificación personal, seguida de la citación judicial y por correo postal.<sup>30</sup>

27 El 58% indicaron haber dado curso a las solicitudes, mientras que el 42% respondieron que no sabían.<sup>31</sup> Por último, tres encuestados señalaron que existen costos asociados a la notificación personal y a la notificación efectuada por un agente judicial (*bailliff*).

## B. Vías de transmisión alternativas (arts. 8, 9 y 10)

### 1. Utilización del Formulario Modelo

28 En cuanto a la transmisión de una solicitud de notificación o traslado por vías alternativas casi el 40% de los encuestados respondieron que utilizan las secciones “Aviso” y “Elementos esenciales

<sup>26</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 15.

<sup>27</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 15.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>28</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 15.2.

<sup>29</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 16.

<sup>30</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 16.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>31</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 16.2.



del documento”.<sup>32</sup> El 24% de ellos indicaron que “siempre” utilizan el Formulario Modelo. El 44% de los encuestados respondieron que desconocen si el Formulario se utiliza para la notificación por vías alternativas. El 7% confirmaron que “nunca” utilizan el Formulario, y el 9% respondieron que no lo utilizan debido a haber formulado una objeción en relación con el uso de las vías alternativas.

- 29 Desde la perspectiva de los Estados de destino, el 54% de los encuestados indicaron que la sección “Certificado” del Formulario Modelo se utiliza para informar si los documentos han sido notificados.<sup>33</sup> De ellos, el 43% utilizan siempre el Formulario. El 24% respondieron no saber si se utiliza el Formulario, uno respondió que “nunca” se utiliza, y el 20%, que no lo utilizan debido a haber formulado una objeción en relación con el uso de las vías alternativas.

## 2. Agentes diplomáticos y consulares (art. 8)

- 30 Las respuestas muestran que, en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022, los agentes diplomáticos y consulares de casi la mitad de los encuestados (43%) han efectuado directamente la notificación o traslado de documentos judiciales o extrajudiciales a personas en el extranjero (art. 8.1).<sup>34</sup> El resto de las respuestas estuvieron divididas en partes iguales entre “no”, los agentes diplomáticos o consulares no han efectuado directamente la notificación o traslado a una persona en el extranjero (21%), y los que no saben (21%). Para el 15% de los encuestados, la vía diplomática y consular directa no es aplicable debido a una objeción.
- 31 Algunos encuestados (17%) indicaron que, en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022, las notificaciones por medio de agentes diplomáticos o consulares del Estado habían sido rechazadas por el destinatario.<sup>35</sup> En cambio, el 22% señalaron lo contrario. Sin embargo, en casi la mitad de los casos (46%), los encuestados respondieron que no disponen de información al respecto.

## 3. Vías diplomática y consular (art. 9)

- 32 Se preguntó a las Partes contratantes si habían utilizado las vías consular y diplomática para transmitir documentos en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022.<sup>36</sup> Las respuestas muestran que el número de encuestados que utilizan una o ambas vías es parejo:

---

<sup>32</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 17.

<sup>33</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 18.

<sup>34</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 19.

<sup>35</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 20.

<sup>36</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, preguntas 21-22.

Vía consular		Vía diplomática	
Sí	34%	Sí	32%
No	40%	No	36%
No sabe	23%	No sabe	30%
No aplicable	2%	No aplicable	2%

33 La razón más citada para recurrir a la vía diplomática fue la notificación o traslado de documentos a Estados o funcionarios públicos extranjeros. Algunos encuestados también mencionaron otras circunstancias excepcionales, como la suspensión de los servicios postales durante los conflictos entre la Federación de Rusia y Ucrania, y el brote de COVID-19.

#### 4. Vía postal (art. 10(a))

34 Veintidós encuestados formularon una objeción a la notificación o traslado por la vía postal en virtud del artículo 10(a) del Convenio.<sup>37</sup> A pesar de haber formulado una objeción en virtud del artículo 10(a), el 50% de los encuestados, en calidad de Estado de origen, siguen utilizando la vía postal para la notificación o traslado.<sup>38</sup> Sin embargo, uno de los encuestados señaló que, como Estado de destino, no acepta el uso de la vía postal cuando los documentos proceden de un Estado que ha formulado una objeción en virtud del artículo 10(a).<sup>39</sup>

35 Se preguntó a las Partes contratantes qué categorías reconocen como “vía postal”:<sup>40</sup>

Correo ordinario	50%
Correo certificado con acuse de recibo	54%
Mensajería privada, p. ej.: FedEx	33%
Correo electrónico	13%
Correo electrónico a través de una agencia postal estatal	0%
Otra	13%

36 Por lo que respecta a los encuestados que no han presentado una objeción en virtud del artículo 10(a), 7 consideran que la notificación o traslado por correo electrónico es análoga a la notificación o traslado por vía postal, mientras que 11 no opinan que así sea.<sup>41</sup>

37 Por último, el 38% de los encuestados indicaron que exigen que los documentos que vayan a notificarse o trasladarse por vía postal se traduzcan a una de sus lenguas oficiales.<sup>42</sup> En cambio, la mayoría de los encuestados (62%) no lo exige.

<sup>37</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 23.

<sup>38</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 23.1.

<sup>39</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 23.2.

<sup>40</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 23.3. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>41</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 23.4.

<sup>42</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 23.5.

## 5. Funcionarios judiciales, ministeriales u otras personas competentes (art. 10(b))

38 Más de la mitad de los encuestados (57%) han formulado una objeción al uso de las comunicaciones directas entre funcionarios judiciales, ministeriales u otras personas competentes en virtud del artículo 10(b).<sup>43</sup>

39 En el caso de los encuestados que no han formulado una objeción en virtud del artículo 10(b), los siguientes funcionarios son reconocidos como “funcionarios judiciales, ministeriales u otras personas competentes”:<sup>44</sup>

Abogados	64%
Auxiliares judiciales ( <i>bailiff</i> )	57%
Auxiliares judiciales ( <i>huissier</i> )	50%
Funcionarios judiciales	71%
Notarios	43%
Funcionarios del Poder Ejecutivo	14%
Notificadores judiciales ( <i>process server</i> )	43%
Otros	43%

40 Para el 53% de los encuestados, existen gastos asociados a la transmisión y notificación o traslado de documentos por esta vía.<sup>45</sup> Mientras que el 12% indicaron que no hay costos, el 35% respondieron que no saben.

## 6. Persona interesada en un procedimiento judicial (art. 10(c))

41 El 62% de los encuestados han formulado una objeción al uso de las comunicaciones directas entre una parte interesada y los funcionarios judiciales, ministeriales u otras personas competentes en virtud del artículo 10(c).<sup>46</sup>

42 En el caso de los encuestados que no han formulado una objeción en virtud del artículo 10(c), los siguientes funcionarios son reconocidos como “persona interesada en un procedimiento judicial”:<sup>47</sup>

Abogados	71%
Auxiliares judiciales ( <i>bailiff</i> )	50%
Auxiliares judiciales ( <i>huissier</i> )	57%
Funcionarios judiciales	64%

<sup>43</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 24.

<sup>44</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 24.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>45</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 24.3.

<sup>46</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 25.

<sup>47</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 25.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

Notarios	43%
Funcionarios del Poder Ejecutivo	14%
Otros	43%

43 Seis de los encuestados indicaron que existen gastos asociados a la transmisión y notificación o traslado de documentos por esta vía.<sup>48</sup> Solo dos encuestados indicaron que no hay gastos, y el resto respondieron que desconocían la respuesta o que habían formulado una objeción a la notificación en virtud del artículo 10(c).

### C. Denegación del cumplimiento de la solicitud (art. 13)

44 Las respuestas muestran que, en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022, solo un pequeño número de encuestados (19%) han denegado una solicitud de notificación o traslado por implicar un atentado “a su soberanía o a su seguridad”.<sup>49</sup> Según uno de los encuestados, algunos de los motivos por los que puede denegarse una solicitud en virtud del artículo 13 del Convenio son el embargo de fondos soberanos, las demandas relacionadas con actividades en tiempo de guerra, el embargo de activos soberanos, y no tener constancia de la notificación de un procedimiento cuando se pretende notificar o ejecutar una sentencia dictada en rebeldía. Otro encuestado también señaló que se habían denegado solicitudes de notificación o traslado en litigios en materia de patentes.

45 A pesar de ello, la mayoría de los encuestados (62%) respondieron que no han denegado solicitudes de notificación o traslado en el período de cinco años comprendido entre 2017 y 2022, mientras que el 19% respondieron que no lo saben. Estas cifras demuestran que el Convenio ha estado funcionando bien, y es poco frecuente que las Partes contratantes denieguen solicitudes de notificación o traslado en virtud del artículo 13.

### V. Uso de la tecnología

46 Las respuestas estuvieron divididas por igual en cuanto a si han tomado medidas (incluso a través de legislación) para permitir o aumentar el uso de la tecnología en el funcionamiento del Convenio.<sup>50</sup> Los encuestados comunicaron varios avances a este respecto, como el establecimiento de plataformas y sistemas en línea para la transmisión de solicitudes, para el pago de gastos y para la comunicación con autoridades extranjeras. Otro grupo de encuestados también señalaron mejoras con el uso del correo electrónico para la transmisión y recepción de solicitudes.

47 El 33% de los encuestados transmiten solicitudes por vía electrónica en el marco del Convenio.<sup>51</sup> En este contexto, las respuestas revelan una preferencia por el uso del correo electrónico, seguido de otros métodos de transmisión:<sup>52</sup>

Correo electrónico	69%
Correo electrónico (seguro/encryptado)	31%

<sup>48</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 25.3.

<sup>49</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 26.

<sup>50</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 28.

<sup>51</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 29.

<sup>52</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 29.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

Transmisión electrónica a través de una plataforma en línea administrada por el Gobierno	46%
Transmisión electrónica a través de una plataforma en línea administrada por un proveedor de servicios privado	15%
Transmisión electrónica mediante tecnología de registro distribuido (TRD)	0%
Otros	31%

48 Es de destacar que el 53% de los encuestados no aceptan solicitudes de notificación o traslado transmitidas electrónicamente en circunstancias en las que solo se presenta una copia electrónica.<sup>53</sup> Estos encuestados señalaron las siguientes razones por las que esto aún no es posible: la falta de políticas y procedimientos a nivel global para garantizar la identidad de la autoridad remitente; la integridad de los documentos; y el cumplimiento de las leyes de protección de datos. Algunos de estos encuestados también indicaron limitaciones de derecho interno.

49 Los encuestados que aceptan solicitudes de notificación o traslado transmitidas electrónicamente, en circunstancias en las que sólo se presenta una copia electrónica, indican el uso de diferentes métodos electrónicos de transmisión:<sup>54</sup>

Correo electrónico	81%
Correo electrónico (seguro/criptado)	43%
Transmisión electrónica a través de una plataforma en línea administrada por el Gobierno	24%
Transmisión electrónica a través de una plataforma en línea administrada por un proveedor de servicios privado	14%
Transmisión electrónica mediante tecnología de registro distribuido (TRD)	0%
Otros	14%

50 Se preguntó a las Partes contratantes si permiten la realización de la notificación o traslado por medios electrónicos.<sup>55</sup> El 67% de los encuestados respondió que sí. El método varía:

Correo electrónico	20%
Correo electrónico (seguro/criptado)	10%
Transmisión electrónica a través de una plataforma en línea administrada por el Gobierno	33%

<sup>53</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 30.

<sup>54</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 30.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>55</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 31. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

Transmisión electrónica a través de una plataforma en línea administrada por un proveedor de servicios privado	7%
Transmisión electrónica mediante tecnología de registro distribuido (TRD)	0%

Los encuestados que seleccionaron “otros” para aportar más información aclararon que la notificación por medios electrónicos puede permitirse en determinadas circunstancias y bajo ciertas condiciones, como el consentimiento de las partes y/o la autorización del juez competente.

- 51 Señalaron que las razones para rehusarse a dar curso a las solicitudes de notificación o traslado por medios electrónicos pueden ser:<sup>56</sup>

El derecho interno prohíbe el uso de la tecnología	7%
El derecho interno no contempla el uso de la tecnología	33%
No hay un sistema compatible con la tecnología requerida en su Estado	40%
Las autoridades no están familiarizadas con este tipo de tecnología	0%
Otros	33%

- 52 Por último, se pidió a las Partes contratantes que indicaran los posibles desafíos a los que se enfrentan en relación con el uso de las tecnologías de la información en el marco del Convenio sobre Notificaciones.<sup>57</sup> El 24% de los encuestados consideran que no plantea ningún desafío. En las respuestas en las que se indicaron desafíos, con frecuencia se mencionaron los siguientes: desafíos de implementación; problemas de interoperabilidad/compatibilidad entre sistemas; limitaciones de derecho interno y problemas de seguridad:

Limitaciones de derecho interno	50%
Estructuras judiciales o administrativas	29%
Desafíos en la implementación (p. ej., falta de recursos, falta de infraestructura)	74%
Costos	32%
Interoperabilidad/compatibilidad entre sistemas	53%
Problemas de seguridad	50%
Otros	12%

Entre los encuestados que seleccionaron “otros” para aportar más información, uno señaló problemas con la falta de reciprocidad por parte de las Partes contratantes del Convenio en

<sup>56</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 31.1. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

<sup>57</sup> Cuestionario de 2022 sobre Notificaciones, pregunta 32. Se podía seleccionar más de una opción para responder a esta pregunta.

relación con el uso de la tecnología y dificultades con la aceptación en el extranjero de las firmas electrónicas. Otro señaló problemas con la transmisión y recepción electrónicas de documentos voluminosos.

## VI. Información y estadísticas de las Partes contratantes

### A. Solicitudes recibidas (vías principales de transmisión (art. 5))

53 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado recibidas por la vía principal de transmisión (art. 5):<sup>58</sup>

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
Argentina	59	55	56	( <sup>59</sup> )	75	125	n. a.
Australia	-	-	270	375	465	426	( <sup>60</sup> )
Bélgica	144	127	157	107	203	262	n. a.
Bulgaria	231	216	240	153	204	180	n. a.
Brasil	-	-	46	315	579	623	n. a.
Canadá	2400	2500	2400	2100	2300	-	n. a.
China (continental)	1612	1782	1987	1335	2049	1571	n. a.
Croacia	-	4	15	18	29	32	n. a.
República Checa	66	86	116	77	110	124	n. a.
Estonia	7( <sup>61</sup> )	30	37	33	35	38	n. a.
Francia	903	964	897	701	989	1031	n. a.
Georgia	0	0	0	0	2	44	n. a.
Alemania	7335	6539	6871	6411	7622	5697	( <sup>62</sup> )
RAE de Hong Kong	538	586	565	435	522	421	n. a.
Hungría	135	202	179	134	118	124	n. a.
India	800	750	2000	600	650	1050	n. a.
Irlanda	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Israel	967	909	1083	818	896	754	n. a.
Japón	657	1257	1319	884	1079	1100	n. a.
Kazajstán	50	99	130	135	126	105	n. a.
Letonia	19	1	50	66	60	30	n. a.
Lituania	24	30	21	51	44	34	n. a.
México	534	631	506	408	448	410	n. a.
Montenegro	71	40	71	46	31	47	n. a.
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	7	10	n. a.
Filipinas	-	-	-	21	372	570	n. a.
Polonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Portugal	489	460	701	403	579	646	n. a.
Rumania	101	87	73	77	110	86	n. a.
Serbia	284	292	308	317	350	377	n. a.
Eslovenia	35	31	19	27	41	16	n. a.

<sup>58</sup> La información y las estadísticas que figuran en esta sección recogen únicamente las cifras indicadas por las Partes contratantes que autorizaron la publicación de sus respuestas en el sitio web de la HCCH.

<sup>59</sup> Argentina respondió que no se dispone de la información correspondiente a 2020 debido a la pandemia.

<sup>60</sup> Australia respondió que estas cifras son aproximadas y se refieren únicamente a las solicitudes recibidas por la Autoridad Central; no se recogen las solicitudes rechazadas ni las enviadas directamente a los estados y territorios australianos. Solo se ha facilitado información a partir de 2019, ya que la base de datos electrónica utilizada para registrar y gestionar las solicitudes recibidas por la Autoridad Central se puso en marcha en 2018.

<sup>61</sup> Estonia respondió que la información correspondiente a 2017 es solo parcial.

<sup>62</sup> Alemania respondió que, como observación preliminar, cabe decir que en Alemania no se llevan estadísticas oficiales sobre el número de solicitudes de notificación y traslado remitidas y recibidas. Las cifras indicadas se basan en información aportada voluntariamente por las Autoridades Centrales de los estados federados en los que se notificaron documentos de conformidad con el Convenio de La Haya sobre Notificaciones. Los datos de 2022 son solo parciales (en algunos de los estados federales aún no se dispone de datos).



<b>Eslovaquia</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Suecia</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	Aproximadamente 200-300 por año.
<b>Reino Unido <sup>(63)</sup></b>	19176 <sup>(64)</sup>	19135	11503	20580	15154	569 <sup>(65)</sup>	n. a.
<b>Estados Unidos de América</b>	7182	7857	8046	5835	8272	7323	n. a.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	143	267	333	303	286	301	n. a.
<b>TOTAL</b>	43962	44937	39999	42765	43807	24126	-

## 54 Tiempo (en meses) para dar curso a las solicitudes recibidas:

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
<b>Argentina</b>	-	-	-	-	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>Australia</b>	-	-	> 12	> 12	> 12	> 12	<sup>(66)</sup>
<b>Austria</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Bélgica</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Bulgaria</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>Brasil</b>	-	-	6-12	6-12	6-12	6-12	n. a.
<b>Canadá</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>China (continental)</b>	6-12	6-12	6-12	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>Croacia</b>	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>República Checa</b>	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>Estonia</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Francia</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Georgia</b>	-	-	-	-	3-6	1-3	n. a.
<b>Alemania</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>RAE de Hong Kong</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Hungría</b>	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>India</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>Irlanda</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Israel</b>	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>Japón</b>	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
<b>Kazajstán</b>	6-12	6-12	6-12	6-12	6-12	6-12	n. a.
<b>Letonia</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>Lituania</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>México</b>	3-6	3-6	3-6	6-12	6-12	3-6	n. a.
<b>Montenegro</b>	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
<b>Nicaragua</b>	<1	-	-	-	1-3	3-6	n. a.
<b>Filipinas</b>	-	-	-	1-3	1-3	<1	n. a.
<b>Polonia</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x

<sup>63</sup> Estas cifras incluyen las solicitudes de notificación y traslado recibidas en Irlanda del Norte y Escocia, además de Inglaterra y Gales.

<sup>64</sup> El Reino Unido respondió, en relación con Inglaterra y Gales, que no disponen de registros exactos para 2017 y 2018, pero que la media aproximada anual fue de 19.000.

<sup>65</sup> El Reino Unido respondió que no disponen de datos para Inglaterra, Gales e Irlanda del Norte.

<sup>66</sup> Australia respondió que estas cifras son aproximadas y se refieren únicamente a las solicitudes recibidas por la Autoridad Central; las solicitudes rechazadas no fueron incluidas; las solicitudes enviadas directamente a los estados y territorios australianos no se recogen. Solo se ha facilitado información a partir de 2019, ya que la base de datos electrónica utilizada para registrar y gestionar las solicitudes recibidas por la Autoridad Central se puso en marcha en 2018.

Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	( <sup>67</sup> )
Eslovenia	1-3	<1	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
Eslovaquia	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	n. a.
Suecia	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	3-6	n. a.
Reino Unido	1-3	1-3	1-3	1-3	3-6	3-6	n. a.
Estados Unidos de América	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	<1	n. a.
Viet Nam	3-6	3-6	6-12	6-12	6-12	3-6	n. a.

55 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado recibidas por vía electrónica:

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
Argentina	-	-	-	-	-	-	( <sup>68</sup> )
Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Bélgica	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Brasil	-	-	29	69	326	424	n. a.
China (continental)	0	0	36	270	439	821	n. a. ( <sup>69</sup> )
Croacia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
República Checa	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. ( <sup>70</sup> )
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Francia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. ( <sup>71</sup> )
Georgia	-	-	-	-	-	-	X ( <sup>72</sup> )
Alemania	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. ( <sup>73</sup> )
RAE de Hong Kong	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. ( <sup>74</sup> )
Hungría	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
India	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Israel	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Japón	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Kazajstán	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Letonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Lituania	-	-	-	-	-	-	n. a. ( <sup>75</sup> )
México	0	0	0	0	1	4	n. a.
Montenegro	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	-	-	x( <sup>76</sup> )

<sup>67</sup> Portugal respondió que muchas de las solicitudes son enviadas de vuelta directamente por la autoridad competente, sin intervención de la Autoridad Central.

<sup>68</sup> Según la respuesta de Argentina, la mayoría de las solicitudes se reciben por vía electrónica.

<sup>69</sup> China respondió que su único sistema funciona desde 2019.

<sup>70</sup> La República Checa respondió que no acepta solicitudes recibidas por vía electrónica, sino únicamente por correo ordinario (en papel).

<sup>71</sup> Francia respondió que su Autoridad Central no dispone de los medios técnicos necesarios para tramitar las solicitudes por vía electrónica. Por lo tanto, se invita a los solicitantes a enviar sus solicitudes por correo.

<sup>72</sup> Georgia respondió que su Autoridad Central no maneja este tipo de datos. Todas las solicitudes recibidas, tanto por correo electrónico como por correo postal, se integran en un sistema electrónico unificado.

<sup>73</sup> Alemania respondió que todavía no es posible enviar una carta rogatoria por vía electrónica. En el caso de las cartas rogatorias recibidas, se requiere una firma y un timbre o sello oficial. Todavía no existe una firma electrónica transfronteriza que permita identificar el origen y la autenticidad de la carta rogatoria a escala mundial.

<sup>74</sup> La RAE de Hong Kong respondió que, al no aceptarse la transmisión electrónica, no disponen de estadísticas al respecto.

<sup>75</sup> Lituania respondió que las solicitudes que recibe suelen presentarse en papel, pero que la Autoridad Central también acepta el formato electrónico. No dispone de un número exacto de solicitudes recibidas.

<sup>76</sup> Nicaragua respondió que, al 2023, ha recibido una diligencia por correo electrónico.

Filipinas	-	-	-	18	204	296	n. a.
Portugal	-	-	145	263	404	497	n. a.
Serbia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Eslovenia	-	-	-	-	-	-	n. a.
Eslovaquia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Suecia	-	-	-	-	-	-	Aproximadamente 10
Reino Unido	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Estados Unidos de América	0	2	1	886	952	1086	n. a.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>211</b>	<b>1506</b>	<b>2326</b>	<b>3128</b>	<b>-</b>

56 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado recibidas a las que se dio curso por medios electrónicos (independientemente de si luego se presentó una copia en papel de los documentos):

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Bélgica	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Brasil	-	-	29	69	326	424	n. a. <sup>(77)</sup>
China (continental)	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Croacia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
República Checa	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	n. a.
Francia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x <sup>(78)</sup>
Georgia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Alemania	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
RAE de Hong Kong	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Hungría	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
India	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Israel	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Japón	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Kazajstán	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. <sup>(79)</sup>
Letonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Lituania	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. <sup>(80)</sup>
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
México	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	-	5	n. a.
Filipinas	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Eslovenia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Eslovaquia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Suecia	-	-	-	-	-	-	n. a.
Reino Unido	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Estados Unidos de América	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.

<sup>77</sup> Según la respuesta de Brasil, el 100% en 2019-2022 respectivamente.

<sup>78</sup> Francia respondió que no tiene acceso a esa información porque la mayoría de las solicitudes de notificación y traslado no pasan por la Autoridad Central, sino que los *huissiers* son quienes les dan curso directamente.

<sup>79</sup> Kazajstán respondió que no se dio curso a ninguna de las solicitudes por vía electrónica.

<sup>80</sup> Lituania respondió que la Cámara de Oficiales Judiciales de Lituania no dio curso a ninguna solicitud por vía electrónica.

Viet Nam	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29</b>	<b>69</b>	<b>326</b>	<b>429</b>	<b>-</b>

## B. Solicitudes enviadas (vías principales de transmisión (art. 5)):

57 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado enviadas por la vía principal de transmisión (art. 5):

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
Argentina	151	111	111	0	75	125	n. a. <sup>(81)</sup>
Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Bulgaria	92	99	124	85	198	194	n. a.
Brasil	0	0	123	579	1096	1228	n. a.
Canadá	-	-	-	-	-	-	x <sup>(82)</sup>
China (continental)	955	486	1005	955	1117	814	n. a.
Croacia	-	1	20	13	32	47	n. a.
República Checa	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(83)</sup>
Estonia	4	14	13	5	18	17	n. a. <sup>(84)</sup>
Francia	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(85)</sup>
Georgia	-	-	-	-	-	2	n. a.
Alemania	7833	7725	7481	6976	6852	3329	n. a. <sup>(86)</sup>
RAE de Hong Kong	102	93	107	59	116	51	n. a.
Hungría	460	569	447	414	499	496	n. a.
India	500	450	600	300	350	400	n. a.
Israel	65	57	69	111	141	97	n. a.
Japón	234	178	187	202	269	247	n. a.
Kazajstán	5	10	16	15	24	18	n. a.
Letonia	117	16	13	19	14	17	n. a. <sup>(87)</sup>
Lituania	-	-	-	-	-	-	x <sup>(88)</sup>
Montenegro	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(89)</sup>
México	118	90	107	70	96	152	n. a.
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	4	3	n. a.
Filipinas	-	-	-	-	-	-	x

<sup>81</sup> Argentina respondió que no dispone de la información correspondiente a 2020 debido a la pandemia de COVID-19.

<sup>82</sup> Canadá respondió que no dispone de datos, ya que las solicitudes enviadas en virtud del artículo 5 suelen ser enviadas por miembros de los colegios de abogados de las provincias y territorios canadienses y por miembros de la *Chambre des notaires* de la provincia de Québec (únicamente para asuntos no contenciosos) que actúan en calidad de autoridades remitentes.

<sup>83</sup> La República Checa respondió que la mayoría de las solicitudes de notificación o traslado son remitidas (en papel) por las autoridades remitentes checas (los tribunales checos) directamente a la Autoridad Central del Estado en cuestión. No se dispone de información. No existe ninguna norma jurídica especial que obligue a los tribunales checos a llevar un registro de los casos en los que se aplicó el Convenio de La Haya.

<sup>84</sup> Según la respuesta de Estonia, en cuanto a 2017, los datos son parciales desde septiembre.

<sup>85</sup> Véase la respuesta de Francia (nota 78).

<sup>86</sup> Alemania respondió que, en algunos de los estados federales, aún no se dispone de datos correspondientes a 2022.

<sup>87</sup> Letonia respondió que, de 2018 a 2022, las solicitudes a Canadá se presentaron a través del Ministerio de Justicia.

<sup>88</sup> Lituania respondió que sus tribunales (en calidad de autoridades requirentes) gestionan los datos de los casos en su propio sistema de información (LITEKO). La generación estadística automatizada de este sistema funciona sobre la base de clasificaciones de categorías de casos y decisiones procesales de los tribunales. Por desgracia, no existe un código específico para los expedientes relacionados con el Convenio sobre Notificaciones. Por lo tanto, no es posible proporcionar datos precisos sobre las solicitudes remitidas al extranjero.

<sup>89</sup> Montenegro respondió que las solicitudes remitidas al extranjero no se transmiten a través del Ministerio de Justicia.

Portugal	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(90)</sup>
Rumania	195	279	256	258	280	277	n. a.
Serbia	300	299	315	328	355	413	n. a.
Eslovenia	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(91)</sup>
Eslovaquia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Suecia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Reino Unido	831	816	668	934	1007	684	n. a.
Estados Unidos de América	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Viet Nam	883	1326	1445	1137	1217	1446	n. a.
<b>TOTAL</b>	<b>12845</b>	<b>12619</b>	<b>13107</b>	<b>12460</b>	<b>13760</b>	<b>10057</b>	-

58 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado enviadas por medios electrónicos en el marco de la vía principal de transmisión (art. 5):

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
Argentina	-	-	-	-	-	-	<sup>(92)</sup>
Australia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Austria	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Bulgaria	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Brasil	0	0	47	288	487	572	n. a.
Canadá	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(93)</sup>
Croacia	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
República Checa	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. <sup>(94)</sup>
Estonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Francia	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(95)</sup>
Georgia	-	-	-	-	-	1	n. a.
Alemania	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. <sup>(96)</sup>
RAE de Hong Kong	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Hungría	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
India	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Israel	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a. <sup>(97)</sup>
Kazajstán	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Letonia	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Lituania	-	-	-	-	-	-	X <sup>(98)</sup>
México	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
Montenegro	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
Nicaragua	-	-	-	-	-	1	n. a.

<sup>90</sup> Portugal respondió que las solicitudes suelen ser enviadas directamente por las autoridades competentes a las Autoridades Centrales de los Estados requeridos.

<sup>91</sup> Eslovenia respondió que no dispone de datos, ya que las solicitudes las envían directamente los tribunales eslovenos a la Autoridad Central del Estado requerido.

<sup>92</sup> Argentina respondió que la mayoría de las solicitudes se envían por medios electrónicos.

<sup>93</sup> Véase la respuesta de Canadá (nota 82).

<sup>94</sup> La República Checa respondió que la mayoría de las solicitudes de notificación o traslado se dirigen a la Autoridad Central del Estado requerido solo en papel.

<sup>95</sup> Véase la respuesta de Francia (nota 78).

<sup>96</sup> Alemania respondió que, en el caso de las cartas rogatorias enviadas, el reglamento nacional alemán sobre asistencia judicial en materia civil (ZRHO) establece que deben ir firmadas por un juez y selladas con un sello oficial. Todavía no existe una firma electrónica transfronteriza que permita identificar el origen y la autenticidad de la carta rogatoria a escala mundial.

<sup>97</sup> Israel respondió que las solicitudes remitidas al extranjero se transmiten únicamente en papel.

<sup>98</sup> Véase la respuesta de Lituania (nota 88).

<b>Filipinas</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Eslovenia</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
<b>Eslovaquia</b>	0	0	0	0	0	0	n. a.
<b>Suecia</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Reino Unido</b>	0	0	0	0	5	1	n. a. <sup>(99)</sup>
<b>Estados Unidos de América</b>	-	-	-	-	-	-	x
<b>Viet Nam</b>	0	0	0	386	0	5	n. a.
<b>TOTAL</b>	0	0	47	674	492	580	-

### C. Estadísticas sobre las vías de transmisión alternativas

59 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado recibidas por vías de transmisión alternativas:

Encuestado	2017	2018	2019	2020	2021	2022	No sabe
<b>Bulgaria</b>	15	6	14	10	3	12	n. a.
<b>Rumania</b>	235	232	189	181	132	161	n. a.
<b>TOTAL</b>	250	238	203	191	135	173	-

### D. Denegación (art. 13):

60 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado recibidas del extranjero denegadas entre 2017 y 2022;

Encuestado	Respuesta
<b>Croacia</b>	“Muy pocas, cuando no se completan los formularios con los datos pertinentes”
<b>Kazajstán</b>	“2-3”
<b>Letonia</b>	“Entre una y tres solicitudes al año”
<b>E.E. U.U.</b>	“43 solicitudes recibidas. De las 43 solicitudes, 28 se presentaron en relación con casos nuevos, mientras que el resto de las denegaciones correspondían a casos ya conocidos”
<b>Lituania</b>	“7 (no se recibió ningún pago)”
<b>Israel</b>	1
<b>Australia</b>	“Aproximadamente 370 solicitudes entre enero de 2019 y diciembre de 2022. Cabe señalar que esta cifra incluye solicitudes que primero fueron denegadas, pero que luego se volvieron a presentar como una solicitud completamente nueva. Además, la cifra solo incluye las solicitudes recibidas por la Autoridad Central; no se incluyen las solicitudes enviadas directamente a los estados y territorios australianos. La información aportada corresponde a 2019 en adelante, ya que la base de datos electrónica utilizada para registrar y gestionar las solicitudes recibidas por la Autoridad Central se implementó en 2018.
<b>Filipinas</b>	“Hay trescientas noventa y dos (392) solicitudes que la Autoridad Central de Filipinas se negó a atender por falta de pago de la tasa administrativa exigida <i>Under Title III, Item 3 of A.O. No. 251-2020</i> : “Todas las solicitudes deben ir acompañadas del pago de cien

<sup>99</sup> El Reino Unido respondió para 2021 y 2022; todos casos con los Estados Unidos de América ya que solo aceptan por medios electrónicos.

	dólares estadounidenses (100,00 USD) en concepto de gastos de notificación por cada destinatario que deba ser notificado. xxx”
<b>México</b>	“1960”

61 Número de solicitudes de notificación o traslado enviadas al extranjero denegadas entre 2017 y 2022;

<b>Encuestado</b>	<b>Respuesta</b>
<b>Brasil</b>	“El Convenio está en vigor en Brasil recién desde mediados de 2019. Desde entonces, diecisiete solicitudes enviadas fueron denegadas por países que no aceptan solicitudes de naturaleza administrativa o fiscal. Además, muchas solicitudes no fueron enviadas porque se sabía que el país requerido no las aceptaría por estos motivos o porque estaban relacionadas con casos de corrupción.”
<b>Croacia</b>	“Muy pocas, cuando no se completan los formularios con los datos pertinentes”
<b>Kazajstán</b>	“alrededor de 5 solicitudes fueron denegadas”
<b>México</b>	“31”

## **ANEXOS**



## Annex: Compilation of Responses (questionnaire for Contracting Parties)

### I. General Feedback

(1) How does your State rate the general operation of the Service Convention?	
Argentina	Good
Australia	Satisfactory
Austria	Good
Belgium	Good
Brazil	Good
Bulgaria	Excellent
Canada	<p>Requires improvement – “Canadian central authorities have experienced difficulties corresponding with foreign forwarding authority to try to resolve issues such the absence of translations or of the required fee in requests for service. To facilitate resolving these, issues, forwarding authorities should include their email addresses in their requests for service. Also, see note below on the lack of access to the Handbook.</p> <p>Les autorités centrales canadiennes ont éprouvé des difficultés à correspondre avec les autorités expéditrices étrangères pour tenter de résoudre des problèmes tels que l'absence de traductions ou de frais dans les demandes de signification ou de notification. Pour faciliter la résolution de ces problèmes, les autorités expéditrices devraient inclure leur adresse électronique dans leurs demandes de signification ou de notification. Voir également la note ci-dessous sur le manque d'accès au Manuel”.</p>
China	Good
Croatia	Excellent
Czech Republic	Good
Estonia	Good
France	Bon
Georgia	Good
Germany	Good
Hong Kong SAR	Good
Hungary	Good
India	Excellent
Ireland	Good
Israel	Good
Japan	Good
Kazakhstan	Excellent
Latvia	Good
Lithuania	Good
Mexico	Excellent
Montenegro	Good
Nicaragua	Good
Norway	Good
Philippines	Good
Poland	Good
Portugal	Good
Romania	Good
Serbia	Excellent
Slovenia	Excellent
Slovakia	Excellent

<b>Sweden</b>	Satisfactory
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Requires improvement – “The comments from England and Wales are that: The most common problems with incoming requests are: • Not using Hague Model Form • Address incomplete/incorrect/out of date • Form handwritten and illegible • Defendant is a prisoner and prison number not provided • Two defendants for service on one request • Only one set of documents provided (two are required) • Translation not provided, without explanation • Incomplete summary of documents for service Problems experienced with outgoing requests include: • A substantial number (c 25%) of requested states do not acknowledge the request • Although the success rate in achieving service is high overall , there are a small number of countries, four in particular, where service either does not take place at all or takes a very long time, sometimes 1-2 years The Central Authorities of Scotland and Northern Ireland have rated the general operation of the Convention as satisfactory”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Good
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Good

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(2) How does your State rate the useability of the HCCH Practical Handbook on the Operation of the Service Convention?</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Satisfactory
<b>Australia</b>	Good
<b>Austria</b>	Good
<b>Belgium</b>	Good
<b>Brazil</b>	Excellent
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Excellent
<b>Canada</b>	Requires improvement – “The Handbook should be made available on HCCH.net for free. Access to the Handbook is a matter linked to access to justice. In Canada, members of the law societies of Canadian provinces and territories and members of the Chambre des notaires of the Province of Québec (for non-litigious matters only) are forwarding authorities. We cannot assume that these forwarding authorities who may serve documents abroad very infrequently, will purchase a Handbook. Often, service abroad involves family law matters and clients do not necessarily have the funds to help their legal counsel purchase a copy of the Handbook. As a result of the unavailability of the Handbook for free, the application of the Convention may be negatively impacted in these cases and this may have a negative impact on litigants. Le manuel devrait être disponible gratuitement sur le site HCCH.net. L'accès au Manuel est une question liée à l'accès à la justice. Au Canada, les membres des barreaux des provinces et territoires canadiens et les membres de la Chambre des notaires de la province de Québec (pour les affaires non contentieuses uniquement) sont des autorités expéditrices. Nous ne pouvons pas supposer que ces autorités expéditrices, qui ne signifient des documents à l'étranger que très rarement, achèteront un manuel. Souvent, les significations ou notifications à l'étranger concernent des affaires de droit de la famille et les clients n'ont pas nécessairement les moyens d'aider leur conseiller juridique à acheter un exemplaire du manuel. Le fait que le manuel ne soit pas disponible gratuitement peut avoir un impact négatif sur l'application de la Convention dans ces affaires, ce qui peut avoir des conséquences négatives pour les parties au litige”.

<b>China</b>	Good.
<b>Croatia</b>	Excellent
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Good
<b>Estonia</b>	Good
<b>France</b>	Bon
<b>Georgia</b>	Good
<b>Germany</b>	Good
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Good
<b>Hungary</b>	Good
<b>India</b>	Good
<b>Ireland</b>	Good
<b>Israel</b>	Excellent
<b>Japan</b>	Good
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Excellent
<b>Latvia</b>	Good
<b>Lithuania</b>	Good
<b>Mexico</b>	Excellent
<b>Montenegro</b>	Good
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Good
<b>Norway</b>	Good
<b>Philippines</b>	Good
<b>Poland</b>	Good
<b>Portugal</b>	Good
<b>Romania</b>	Good
<b>Serbia</b>	Good
<b>Slovenia</b>	Excellent
<b>Slovakia</b>	Good
<b>Sweden</b>	Satisfactory
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Good - "Northern Ireland rated the usability of the Practical Handbook as satisfactory".
<b>United States of America</b>	Good
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Good

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(3) Does your State's Central Authority have a manual or electronic case management register or system that is used to track incoming requests under the Service Convention?</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Australia</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming only
<b>Austria</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming only
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Canada</b>	Other - "Some Canadian Central Authorities have manual case management registers while others have electronic systems. Canadian Central Authorities only deal with incoming requests as they do not act as forwarding authorities. Certaines Autorités centrales canadiennes ont des registres manuels de gestion des dossiers, tandis que d'autres ont des systèmes électroniques. Les

	Autorités centrales canadiennes ne traitent que les demandes entrantes et n'agissent pas en tant qu'autorités expéditrices”.
<b>China</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Other – “The Czech Central Authority (Ministry of Justice) has got the electronic register of the incoming requests under the Service Convention. After the registration the incoming requests are forwarded to the competent Czech courts to be served”.
<b>Estonia</b>	Other - “Estonia is currently using an electronic system for registration of cases. Due to changes in EU Regulations, EU Commission is currently developing reference implementation software, which the Member States may choose to connect to the decentralised IT system”.
<b>France</b>	Oui - électronique pour les demandes reçues et envoyées
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes – manual for incoming and outgoing
<b>Germany</b>	Other – “There are no federal registers used throughout Germany; some of the Länder use case management registers, some of them electronic registers, some manual registers or other means to track incoming requests. As a remark to questions 3. and 4. as well as preliminary to questions concerning data and statistics it must be underlined that in Germany no official statistics are kept on the number of incoming and outgoing requests for service or on the time to process them. The judicial departments of the Länder, which designate the Central Authorities for their area of competence, have an informal overview, but are only able to provide limited information on content-related aspects of Letters of Request and the time required to process them. Some of the following information is based on their records. It is only of limited informative value. An answer to this question is also given by the European Union”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Yes – manual for incoming and outgoing
<b>Hungary</b>	Other – “The general electronic register system of the Ministry of Justice is used for cases relating to the Service Convention. This system stores basic data of the cases for identification purposes, therefore more detailed information is kept in the paper based files”.
<b>India</b>	Yes – manual for incoming and outgoing
<b>Ireland</b>	Other – “Using Excel spreadsheet – no specific case management system”.
<b>Israel</b>	Yes – manual for incoming and outgoing
<b>Japan</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Montenegro</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming only
<b>Norway</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming only
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes - manual for incoming and outgoing
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes - electronic for incoming and outgoing
<b>Sweden</b>	Other – “Not at the moment. See also response of the EU”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes – manual for incoming and outgoing

<b>United States of America</b>	Yes – electronic for incoming only
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Other – “The Ministry of Justice of Viet Nam uses Mutual Legal Assistance Request Management Software for both incoming and outgoing requests. However, this software mainly focuses on following up the work done by the Ministry of Justice. Thus, the input are based on requests or results of the requests received by the MOJ”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(4) If your State’s Central Authority has oversight for all outgoing requests, please indicate if there is a system used to track the progress of these.	
<b>Argentina</b>	No
<b>Australia</b>	Other – “The Australian Central Authority does not have oversight of outgoing requests”
<b>Austria</b>	No
<b>Belgium</b>	Other – “Nous n’avons pas de droit de regard sur les dossiers sortants”.
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes – electronic.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes – electronic.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Other – “Outgoing requests are usually transmitted directly from a judicial authority to the CA of the requested State. However, in some cases, the Letters of Request are transmitted via Central Authority or via diplomatic channels. In these cases, Letters of Request are registered by means of electronic case management. The CA maintains an electronic file service (a case management) in which incoming/outgoing requests for legal aid are registered. The case management enables to monitor the status of their processing”.
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes – electronic.
<b>France</b>	Oui - électronique
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes – manual
<b>Germany</b>	Other – “An answer to this question is also given by the European Union”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Yes – manual
<b>Hungary</b>	Other – “See response to question No. 3. All incoming and outgoing correspondence is registered in the case register electronically but the substance can only be known from the file”.
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	Other – “Using Excel spreadsheet – no specific case management system”.
<b>Israel</b>	Yes – manual
<b>Japan</b>	Yes – electronic
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes – electronic
<b>Latvia</b>	No
<b>Lithuania</b>	No
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Norway</b>	Other – “Unknown”.
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes - manual
<b>Poland</b>	No

<b>Portugal</b>	Other – “The requests sent through the central authority are overseen using our case Management System, but as general principle requests are sent directly without the intervention of the central authority”.
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes – electronic
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	Other – “Please see response of the EU”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes – manual
<b>United States of America</b>	Other – “The U.S. Central Authority does not have oversight for outgoing requests”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Other – “The Mutual Legal Assistance Request Management Software has some functions such as reminding and alerting when there is no reply for outgoing requests which were sent for a specific time (usually more than 6 months)”.

## II. Scope of the Convention

(5) In the previous five years, has your State experienced any difficulties in interpreting the scope of the Service Convention?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Other – “Articles 8 and 9 of the Service Convention”.
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “We do not have clear information about which countries would accept requests under the Convention related to administrative matters or related to administrative improbity”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “Receiving requests for service in Bulgaria of documents issued by customs and tax authorities of other Contracting States”.
<b>Canada</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “Yes, one Central Authority received several requests related to proceedings in taxation matters. Oui, une autorité centrale a reçu plusieurs demandes relatives à des procédures en matière fiscale”.
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “Some requesting authorities try to include in the material scope of the Service Convention also administrative or financial proceedings”.
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes, other – “Sometimes there have been problems when the person’s address is not known. We have been advised to the HCCH 1970 request before”.
<b>France</b>	Oui, concernant l’interprétation de l’expression « matière civile ou commerciale » (art. 1) – “S’il est unanimement admis que cette expression exclut la matière pénale, la question du droit public est plus problématique. En pratique, sauf exceptions, une définition large est adoptée afin de faciliter les procédures de notification des actes à l’étranger. Ainsi la notification d’un acte judiciaire dans le cadre d’une procédure pendante devant une juridiction judiciaire relève de la matière civile et commerciale quand bien-même l’administration est partie au litige”.
<b>Georgia</b>	No

<b>Germany</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “Distinction between private and public law matters; outgoing requests for service of interlocutory orders pursuant to the Act on Protection against violence according to Section 210 of the Act on Proceedings in Family Matters and in Matters of Non-contentious Jurisdiction (FamFG); Service of documents where split-recovery statutes will apply; in these cases parts of the amount a plaintiff would receive will be deposited into a general state fund”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “Requests sent by the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission were questionable for us, as its activity is not considered of civil nature in Hungary, nevertheless the requests were accomplished in the end”.
<b>India</b>	Yes, other – “Sometimes foreign authorities dont mention complete address of both of the parties (petitioner / respondent). The translated version of the requests is also not provided many times due to which the same are returned”.
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “Are personal status proceedings included within ‘civil and commercial matters’. Are administrative notices (such as fines, etc.) included”.
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes, other – “Use of language, for example, USA and UK in cases where the request is sent by our Country according to section c) of the Model form of the request, has been refused, although all rules were followed”.
<b>Lithuania</b>	No
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Philippines</b>	No
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	No
<b>Romania</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “[T]he exclusion of the administrative law”. Other – “[T]he exclusion of the administrative law; the exclusion of the acta de iuri imperii”.
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes, regarding the interpretation of “civil or commercial matters” (Art. 1) – “The 1965 Service Convention is not applicable on administrative matters (article 1 in the Convention). It can sometimes be difficult to distinguish administrative matters from civil and commercial matters. Administrative courts and authorities make several efforts to apply for service in administrative matters and there applications have been rejected”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(6) Is the concept of “extrajudicial documents” (Art. 17) defined in the internal law of your State?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes - “Article 726, of the CCP. The extrajudicial notification consists of a legal document that requires the payment of some debt, demanding the fulfillment of some non-compliance contract or cessation of an activity that is infringing the law”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	No
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes - “Within the EU, the concept of ‘extrajudicial documents’ within the meaning of the Service of Documents Regulation has been interpreted by the Court of Justice of the European Union in its judgment of 11 November 2015 in case C-223/14 Tecom Mican and Arias Domínguez encompassing not only documents drawn up or certified by a public authority or official but also private documents of which the formal transmission to an addressee residing abroad is necessary for the purposes of exercising, proving or safeguarding a right or a claim in civil or commercial law. Furthermore, according to Recital 8 of the Service of Documents Recast Regulation the term ‘extrajudicial documents’ should be understood to include documents that have been drawn up or certified by a public authority or official, and other documents of which the formal transmission to an addressee residing in another Member State is necessary for the purposes of exercising, proving or safeguarding a right or a claim in civil or commercial law. The term ‘extrajudicial documents’ should not be understood to include documents issued by administrative authorities for the purposes of administrative proceedings”.
<b>France</b>	Non, il n’existe pas de définition codifiée. “Pour la doctrine et la jurisprudence, l’acte extrajudiciaire est un acte signifié par un officier ministériel et produisant des effets juridiques en dehors de toute procédure judiciaire”.
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	No
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	“Concept not defined but referred to in Superior and Circuit Courts Rules - <a href="https://www.courts.ie/rules/service-documents-outside-jurisdiction-hague-convention">https://www.courts.ie/rules/service-documents-outside-jurisdiction-hague-convention</a> <a href="https://www.courts.ie/rules/service-eu-member-states-including-state-judicial-and-extra-judicial-documents-si-no-883-2004">https://www.courts.ie/rules/service-eu-member-states-including-state-judicial-and-extra-judicial-documents-si-no-883-2004</a> ”
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes - “[F]rom notaries, lawyers, bailiff”.
<b>Latvia</b>	No
<b>Lithuania</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes - “The domestic law of Nicaragua as such does not have a definition for extrajudicial documents but according to the general understanding of the legal terminology and the context of extrajudicial documents, it refers to those



	processes that are not linked to legal proceedings before courts or judicial processes”.
<b>Norway</b>	No
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes – “We refer to the relevant part of the European Union reply”.
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes – “Not in a Swedish national law. See also response of the EU”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No – “The concept of ‘extrajudicial documents’ is defined in the internal law of Northern Ireland”.
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(7) What types of extrajudicial documents are transmitted under the Service Convention by your State?	
<b>Argentina</b>	“Mediation, Arbitration Awards and Administrative Resolutions”.
<b>Australia</b>	“Under Australian law, the instances in which an extrajudicial document would need to be transmitted for service under the Convention are, in practice, very limited. Unfortunately, the Australian authorities do not have oversight of these instances”.
<b>Austria</b>	“None”.
<b>Brazil</b>	“All permitted by domestic law”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	“Documents issued by enforcements agents and notaries”.
<b>Canada</b>	“It is not possible to know if any extrajudicial documents have been transmitted for service abroad as forward authorities are private sector lawyers and Quebec notaries (for non-litigious matters only) and the government of Canada does not have access to their professional records. Il n'est pas possible de savoir si des actes extrajudiciaires ont été transmis pour signification ou notification à l'étranger, car les autorités expéditrices sont des avocat.es du secteur privé et des notaires du Québec (pour les affaires non contentieuses uniquement) et le gouvernement du Canada n'a pas accès à leurs dossiers professionnels”.
<b>China</b>	“China has not submitted any request for service of extrajudicial documents. However, we have received requests from other contracting parties for assistance in serving foreign extrajudicial documents such as notice of payment, lawyer’s letter, etc. After review, China has assisted in implementing the aforementioned request”.
<b>Croatia</b>	“Any document that is issued or verified by public authority and that is needed for realization, proving or preservation of rights in civil and commercial matters”.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	“There is not any internal definition of „extrajudicial documents“ in the Czech civil law; however, the Czech Courts shall take into account the concept of „extrajudicial documents“ within the meaning of the Service of Documents Regulation and the interpretation of this concept done by the Court of Justice of the European Union (judgement of 11 November 2015 in case C -223/14 Tecom Mican and Arias Domínguez)”.

<b>France</b>	“Sommmation de payer, contrat de bail, congé, protêt, commandement de saisie”.
<b>Georgia</b>	“Up to date, Central Authority of Georgia has not received requests concerning the service of extrajudicial documents”.
<b>Germany</b>	“Most requests for service of such documents concern notarial documents and administrative documents especially in child support cases”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	“We do not keep information on the types of extrajudicial documents, if any, that are transmitted under the Service Convention”.
<b>Hungary</b>	“Documents issued by civil law notaries (in succession cases), decisions on land registry offices on registration of in rem rights on immovable properties”.
<b>India</b>	“Documents/requests of authorities related to Customs, Indirect Taxation, Direct taxation, etc. are received and processed”.
<b>Ireland</b>	“No monitored in depth”.
<b>Israel</b>	“Unknown”
<b>Japan</b>	“A notarial deed prepared by a notary with regard to a claim for payment of a certain amount of money or any other fungible thing or a certain amount of securities, which contains a statement to the effect that the obligor will immediately accept compulsory execution is considered to be extrajudicial document”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	“All the documents we are requested”.
<b>Latvia</b>	“N/A”.
<b>Lithuania</b>	“Advance notice regarding claim of child support, an invoice, an eviction notice, etc. Note as regards concept of ‘extrajudicial documents’: according to EU Service Regulation 2020/1784, which applies directly within EU Member states, ‘the term ‘extrajudicial documents’ should be understood to include documents that have been drawn up or certified by a public authority or official, and other documents of which the formal transmission to an addressee residing in another Member State is necessary for the purposes of exercising, proving or safeguarding a right or a claim in civil or commercial law”.
<b>Montenegro</b>	“Competent authorities (notaries, public bailiffs and state bodies)”.
<b>Nicaragua</b>	“Our legislation in accordance with article 600 of the Code of Civil Procedure of Nicaragua, indicates the types of non-judicial (extrajudicial) documents which are the following "... 1-The public deed as long as it is the first testimony, and the second and third copies of the testimony issued with judicial authorization in accordance with the Notarial Law and with the knowledge of the persons to whom those who harm; 2- The authentic document issued by a competent public official, officials or employee, with the solemnities required by law; 3-The securities and other commercial documents that, having fulfilled the requirements established by the law, they are given executive force; 4- Arbitration awards, transactions and agreements signed between the parties arising from any of the alternative forms of conflict resolution; ...)”.
<b>Norway</b>	“The County Governor’s decision on separation and divorce - The Norwegian labour and Welfare services decisions on child support - Payment notices’ and orders for unpaid invoices”.
<b>Philippines</b>	“Title I, Item 5(g) of Administrative Order (A.O.) No. 251-2020 ( <i>Guidelines on the Implementation in the Philippines of the Hague Service Convention on the Service Abroad of Judicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters</i> ) dated 11 September 2020 defines “extrajudicial documents” as one referring to any private or public document not directly connected with pending or terminated lawsuits before courts. These shall include, but not limited to, demands for payment, notices to quit in connection with leaseholds, and protests in connection with bills of exchange ( <i>citing Report on the Work of the Special</i>

	<i>Commission on the Operation of the Convention of November 15, 1965 on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters)</i> ".
<b>Poland</b>	"Unknown – no statistics".
<b>Portugal</b>	"Extrajudicial documents are transmitted from public authorities, for example in succession procedures (by notaries)".
<b>Romania</b>	"Documents issued by the bailiff or public notaries".
<b>Serbia</b>	"Different types of submissions by participants in court proceedings".
<b>Slovakia</b>	"N/A"
<b>United Kingdom</b>	"None".
<b>United States of America</b>	"Most incoming requests are only for judicial documents; however, some of the requests for service of extrajudicial documents that have been transmitted are from attorneys, usually in connection with litigation or in anticipation or litigation, notices from foreign government agencies, or settlement demands from prosecutor's offices".

### III. Operation of the Convention

(8) As the requested State, does your State provide assistance to locate a person to be served under the Service Convention?	
<b>Argentina</b>	No
<b>Australia</b>	Yes – "The lack of formal address registration in Australia makes it difficult for authorities to provide assistance to locate a person. Generally, requesting authorities are advised to consult publicly available registers, such as the Australian Electoral Commission (for natural persons), and the Australian Business Register or the registers of the Australian Securities and Investments Commission Registers (for legal persons). Some jurisdictions are able to provide limited assistance, for example, where the addressee has moved, a bailiff or process server may make enquiries with the new resident or neighbours in relation to a forwarding address".
<b>Austria</b>	Yes
<b>Belgium</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes – "The Central Authority and other authorities have access to governmental databases to locate the persons to be served. The Superior Court of Justice also determines that water, electricity and telephone companies provide information. Judicial Officers call any phone number provided, try to fix incomplete addresses and talk to neighbours and other people that could help determining if the person lives in or around the provided address".
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes – "The Court may consult with the National Database "Population", the Commercial Register and Register of Non-profit Legal Entities".
<b>Canada</b>	Yes – "Some, but not all, Central Authorities will attempt to serve documents at more than one address, conduct internet searches or consult available government records to attempt to locate a person to be served under the Convention. Oui - Certaines Autorités centrales, mais pas toutes, tenteront de signifier des documents à plusieurs adresses, effectueront des recherches sur Internet ou consulteront les registres gouvernementaux disponibles pour tenter de localiser une personne devant être signifiée ou notifiée en vertu de la Convention".

<b>China</b>	Yes – “The court would try to locate the person to be served. It is therefore advisable that the requesting State provide contact information of the addressee whenever possible”.
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes – “Judges of the First instance Courts have possibility to use all tools prescribed by Croatian Civil procedure act. Under the provisions of mentioned Act obligation on determining or checking address by official duty is not prescribed, such obligation is prescribed in enforcement procedure that's process is initiated on authentic document”.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes – “The Czech competent courts provide some kind of assistance to requesting authorities to locate a person (an addressee) to be served – we mean the correcting or clarifying an incorrect address. For this purpose the Czech requested authorities need to know the date of birth and the last known address of the person to be served in the Czech Republic. However, the Service Convention shall not be abused for address searching”.
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes – “Referring to EU reply”.
<b>France</b>	Non – “[L]a France ne disposant pas d'autorité compétente pour procéder à la recherche d'adresse ou de registre de population. Les requérants sont invités à consulter des sites d'information (Service public, pages blanches, Infogreffe)”.
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	Yes – “In some cases assistance might be provided by getting information from the municipal registration office, or from a commercial register in cases the person to be served is a company”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes – “If the person of whom the procedural actions should be performed does not located at the address indicated in the documents, then the court executing the order independently takes measures to establish his place of residence”.
<b>Latvia</b>	No
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes – “To the extent possible and subject to functional capabilities, the Chamber of Judicial Officers may provide such assistance”.
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes – “The designated notifier strives for the notification to be positive, seeking other addresses in the systems at our disposal”.
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes – “Limited assistance only. For instance, if the sheriff or the process server can identify the new location of the intended party, the former may locate the latter in its new address, and serve the documents”.
<b>Poland</b>	Yes – “[I]f the address is incorrect and there is an opportunity to identify a new address”.
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes – “If the request is to executed under our national law, there is a possibility to locate the address of the person to be served. Although, a specific request for that purpose is recommended, otherwise, there is a strong possibility that such a service is not provided. The access to some databases depends on a decision from the judge”.
<b>Serbia</b>	No

<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes – “Courts have access to the population register and are authorised on their own initiative or if so requested by a requesting court to acquire information on addresses, when an address stated in a request for service is inaccurate or unknown”.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes – “We refer to the relevant part of the European Union reply. Furthermore, according to the information available to the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, the Slovak courts generally accept also requests when incomplete or incorrect address is listed, since Slovak courts are always taking steps to establish current address of addressee. On receipt of the request Slovak courts usually automatically check the current address of addressee in the Central Register of Inhabitants of the Slovak Republic, The Social Insurance Agency and in the register of prisoners. Further, according to the information available to the Ministry of Justice of the Slovak Republic, the Slovak courts also try to find the whereabouts of the addressee in cases when address in the request is not outdated (in situations when court tried to serve the documents to the address stated in the request, however service is not effective due to the fact that address of addressee has changed)”.
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes – “Firstly, there is a control whether the addressee can be identified in the National Population Register or not. Secondly, service will be proceeded at the registered address”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes – “The U.S. Central Authority delegated the ministerial act of service on private individuals and companies pursuant to the Convention to ABC Legal Services, a process server. All incoming requests for service under the Convention for private individuals and companies are transmitted to and executed by ABC Legal Services. ABC Legal will attempt to resolve issues with incomplete or incorrect addresses by finding the closest possible match to the address provided in the request. If, in the course of attempts to serve, it is discovered that the subject or entity can no longer be found at the requested address, ABC Legal provides a complimentary investigation to locate the subject. ABC Legal’s investigation department can use a name, previous address, and/or date of birth to conduct a search to find a new or updated address. If a valid new address is identified, ABC Legal will confirm with the foreign applicant whether a new attempt at service should be made for an additional fee”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes – “The Central Authority and competent authorities of Viet Nam provide assistance to locate a person to be served under the Service Convention when several following conditions are fulfilled: First, the forwarding authority has to provide a relatively sufficient address of the addressee. Usually, a sufficient address contains the house number, street, ward, district, city/ province. [To some areas, the information of quarter or group (subdivision of ward) is necessary]. A relatively sufficient address may lack some parts but at least must contain basic information of ward, district, city/ province. Please note that some provinces cannot verify the address within the service process even though the basic information is provided. Second, the forwarding authority should provide other information of the addressee to avoid identical names. Regarding individual addressee, further information may include ID or passport number, date of birth, names of relatives/ family members. Regarding legal entity, further information may include the name of legal representatives, tax number, register number... The phone number of relevant person might help. Insufficient address (contains only the name of district or province) is not qualified for service process, however, foreign authorities can request for taking of evidence to verify the address”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(9) As the requesting State, how would your State transmit a document for service upon another State, a State official, or a State-owned company?	
<b>Argentina</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Indirect consular channel (Art. 9(1)) (3) Indirect diplomatic channel (Art. 9(2))
<b>Australia</b>	Other – “In such a situation, diplomatic channels would likely be used, but the question of whether this use of diplomatic channels would be under the Hague Convention has not yet been considered”.
<b>Austria</b>	The Service Convention would not apply
<b>Brazil</b>	The Service Convention would not apply
<b>Bulgaria</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through indirect diplomatic channel (Art. 9(2))
<b>Canada</b>	Other – “The State would not necessarily be involved in transmitting the documents through the main channel, postal channels and direct communication between interested persons and judicial officers. Documents may be transmitted through any of the channels listed above if the rules of civil procedure applicable to the dispute allow the use of such channels. In some cases, requests sent through the main channel are rejected by the requested State and diplomatic channels are then used. L'État n'interviendrait pas nécessairement dans la transmission des actes par la voie principale, la voie postale et la communication directe entre les personnes intéressées et les huissiers de justice. Les documents peuvent être transmis par l'une des voies énumérées ci-dessus si les règles de procédure civile applicables au litige permettent l'utilisation de ces voies. Dans certains cas, les demandes adressées par la voie principale sont rejetées par l'État requis et la voie diplomatique est alors utilisée”.
<b>China</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Postal channel (Art. 10(a))
<b>Croatia</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Direct diplomatic and consular channel (Art. 8)
<b>Czech Republic</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Indirect diplomatic channel (Art. 9(2))
<b>Estonia</b>	The Service Convention would not apply
<b>France</b>	La Convention Notification s'appliquerait par : (1) Voie principale de transmission (art. 5) (2) Voies diplomatique et consulaire directes (art. 8)
<b>Georgia</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Postal channel (Art. 10(a))
<b>Germany</b>	Other – “Whether the Service Convention applies can remain open from the German perspective. This is because Germany also considers requests for service on Contracting States, on State officials or in some cases State-owned companies under the Hague Service Convention to be exceptional cases under the Convention in which at least diplomatic transmission is required. Indeed,

	Article 9(2) of the Hague Service Convention provides that documents may be transmitted through diplomatic channels for the purpose of service "if exceptional circumstances so require". In these cases it is for the defendant State to decide whether the request is handed to the Central Authority for execution or the respective Ministry of Foreign Affairs confirms acceptance of service by verbal note. German courts would use diplomatic channels for transmission and the request would be handed to the respective Ministry of Foreign Affairs by verbal note without using the model forms. The term "through the diplomatic channel" is interpreted by Germany as referring to transmissions of documents by the competent authorities of the forum State to the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the defendant State through the forum State's diplomatic or consular mission in the defendant State. Germany does not accept service to its diplomatic or consular missions".
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Other – "The forwarding authority of the Hong Kong Special Administrative Region of the People's Republic of China ("Hong Kong SAR, China") has not come across such a situation".
<b>Hungary</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Direct diplomatic and consular channel (Art. 8)
<b>India</b>	The Service Convention would not apply
<b>Ireland</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through Postal channel (Art. 10(a))
<b>Israel</b>	Other – "Service upon States and State Officials (sued in their official capacity) - by diplomatic channels. Service upon State-owned companies - through the Service Convention".
<b>Japan</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5).
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (2) Direct diplomatic and consular channel (Art. 9) (3) Direct communication between judicial officers (Art. 10(b))
<b>Latvia</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Direct diplomatic and consular channel (Art. 8) (3) Postal channel (Art. 10(a))
<b>Lithuania</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Indirect diplomatic channel (Art. 9(2))
<b>Mexico</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5)
<b>Montenegro</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5)
<b>Nicaragua</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5)
<b>Norway</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5)
<b>Philippines</b>	Other – "The Service Convention may apply. Service upon another State, a State official, or State-owned company should observe the proper diplomatic channels. In addition, in situations where there is a Treaty entered into between the Philippines and another State, the same may be preferred".
<b>Poland</b>	The Service Convention would apply: Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5)

<b>Portugal</b>	Other – “Diplomatic channel”.
<b>Romania</b>	Other – “Via diplomatic channel”.
<b>Serbia</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Direct diplomatic and consular channel (Art. 8)
<b>Slovenia</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmission (Art. 5) (2) Direct diplomatic and consular channel (Art. 8) (3) Indirect diplomatic channel (Art. 9(2)) (4) Postal channel (Art. 10(a))
<b>Slovakia</b>	The Service Convention would not apply
<b>Sweden</b>	Other – “Unknown”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Other
<b>United States of America</b>	The Service Convention would apply: (1) Through the Main channel of transmissions (Art. 5) (2) Indirect diplomatic channel (Art. 9(2)) (3) Postal channel (Art. 10(a))
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Other – “It depends. If there is no specific declaration of foreign country on their preferred channel, main channel of the Service Convention can be used in all circumstances. If foreign State is an addressee, indirect diplomatic channel may be used. Postal channel can also be exploited if available”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(10) As the requested State, how is a request for service on your State, State official or State-owned company executed?	
<b>Argentina</b>	“The articles 5 or 9 of the Service Convention are applied”.
<b>Australia</b>	“Such a request would ordinarily be transmitted either via diplomatic channels or to the Central Authority, before being forwarded to the relevant Australian authority for execution”.
<b>Austria</b>	“Via the diplomatic way”.
<b>Brazil</b>	“Through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	“When we receive such documents through diplomatic channels we submit the documents for service to the competent Bulgarian authorities on Art. 6”.
<b>Canada</b>	“For requests under Article 5 of the Convention, service would be executed as prescribed by that Article. Pour les demandes relevant de l'article 5 de la Convention, la signification ou la notification s'effectuera selon les modalités prévues par cet article”.
<b>China</b>	By state officials. “For requests for service made through the Hague Convention on Service, Chinese courts review them in accordance with the Convention and domestic law. If the request falls within the circumstances specified in Article 13 of the Convention, we refuse to assist in service”.
<b>Croatia</b>	“Through the provisions of the Convention”.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	“The requests for service on the Czech State, State official or State-owned company are executed according to the Service Convention as the standard requests addressed to any private subject”.
<b>Estonia</b>	“We will forward the request to the court. Court will try to service documents accordingly to Estonian Code of Civil Procedure”.
<b>France</b>	“Voie principale de transmission (art. 5)”.



<b>Georgia</b>	“The Central Authority – The Ministry of justice forwards the incoming requests for service to the competent court of first instance, which executes such requests in accordance with Chapter VIII of the Civil Procedure Code of Georgia (see: <a href="https://matsne.gov.ge/en/document/view/29962?publication=134">https://matsne.gov.ge/en/document/view/29962?publication=134</a> )”.
<b>Germany</b>	“A request is executed via diplomatic channels”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	“Hong Kong SAR, China has not received such request”.
<b>Hungary</b>	“Under the general rules of service of documents”.
<b>India</b>	By post
<b>Ireland</b>	Postal channel
<b>Israel</b>	“Documents addressed to the State of Israel, including its political subdivisions, agencies, authorities and instrumentalities, and to officials, or agents acting or who acted on behalf of the Government of Israel - service shall be effected, subject to the provisions of the Convention, through the Central Authority”.
<b>Japan</b>	“Main channel of transmission”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	“The requests come from the Ministry of External affairs to the Judicial Administration and also comes directly from the central organs of other countries”.
<b>Latvia</b>	“III. Document Delivery Procedures 7. For a legal entity, the document shall be delivered to its registered address. The document shall be serviced to the official or an employee of the legal entity. 8. For a natural person, the document shall be delivered to the address indicated by the submitter in the submission. 9. The document to be delivered to a natural person shall be serviced to the addressee personally. If the addressee cannot be met at the indicated address at the moment of the delivery of the document, the document shall be handed over to a family member or kinsman met at the respective address who has attained the legal age and residing together with the addressee (if the delivery of the document has been made to the address of the residence of the addressee) or to the administration of the workplace (if the delivery of the document has been made to the address of the workplace of the addressee) for servicing it to the addressee. The aforementioned person shall have the duty to service the document to the addressee. The warning to a debtor regarding voluntary sale at auction of immovable property through the court or undisputed enforcement of obligations or a court warning on enforcement of payment obligations envisaged in the Civil Procedure Law shall be serviced only to the addressee personally. 10. If in the process of the delivery of the document a sworn bailiff receives information that the addressee might be met in another address, a sworn bailiff shall inform the submitter about it by using the available means of communications (for example, telephone, electronic mail), and deliver the document to the respective address. 11. The addressee or the person indicated in paragraph 9 herein to whom the document has been handed over for servicing it to the addressee shall confirm the receipt of the document by putting the signature on a copy of the document. As from this moment, the document shall be considered as delivered. 12. If the addressee refuses to accept the document, a sworn bailiff shall inform the addressee about the type of the document and shall explain the consequences of the refusal that come into effect in accordance with paragraph 3 of these Regulations. As from this moment, the document shall be considered as delivered. 13. If the addressee cannot be met at the address indicated in the submission of the submitter and the document cannot be handed over to any of persons indicated in paragraphs 7 or 9 herein, a sworn bailiff shall leave a notice in a closed envelope in the post box of the addressee regarding the attempt to hand over the document to this person and invite the addressee to appear at the office of the sworn bailiff within seven days’ time to receive the

	document. <a href="https://lzeti.lv/media/documents/11789/2-03-01_MK_noteikumi_ENG.pdf">https://lzeti.lv/media/documents/11789/2-03-01_MK_noteikumi_ENG.pdf</a> ".
<b>Lithuania</b>	"No cases identified but, in general, the regular procedure applies: the Central Authority (MoJ) sends the documents to the Chamber of Judicial Officers of Lithuania which organises the service (appoints a judicial officer who serves the documents to the addressee)".
<b>Mexico</b>	"The Petition is sent to the Federal Judicial Council for processing".
<b>Montenegro</b>	"Requests for service are made through basic courts".
<b>Nicaragua</b>	"The document is received by the Secretariat of the Supreme Court of Justice (Central Authority of Nicaragua), It is verified whether the document has complied with the requirements that Nicaragua requires for the application of said agreement, then it is sent to the Court competent in the matter and territory to hear about said case. It is up to the court or tribunal to issue a resolution ordering the notification of the documents in reference. After the person has been notified, the documents that show whether the notification was positive or negative, the proceedings return to the Secretariat of the Supreme Court of Justice of Nicaragua (central authority), so that the response of compliance with the agreement can be sent through the Ministry. of Foreign Affairs, attaching the annexed form of the agreement, so that the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in turn sends the documents to the requesting State".
<b>Philippines</b>	"A request for service on the State, State official, or State-owned company should be coursed through the proper diplomatic channels. Should the circumstances warrants, the service may be executed through the Service Convention or request for judicial assistance (letters rogatory)".
<b>Poland</b>	"By the courts".
<b>Portugal</b>	"First, it should be highlighted that State jurisdictional immunity is subject to public international rules, which therefore affect if and how States are served. Portugal has signed the 1972 European Convention on State Immunity and has ratified the 2004 UN Convention on Jurisdictional Immunities of States and Their Property (the latter is not yet into force). Notwithstanding, Portuguese legal scholars and case-law consider that these circumstances should not be a reason to consider their content as irrelevant on the field of State immunity having regard that international custom is a formal source of law (article 8 (1) of the Portuguese Constitution and article 38 (1) of the Statute of the International Court of Justice). Consequently, a special consideration on the service of documents rules set forward on those conventions should be envisaged".
<b>Romania</b>	"Via diplomatic channel".
<b>Serbia</b>	"The request is executed through the competent court".
<b>Slovenia</b>	"In accordance with methods prescribed by our internal law (usually district courts serve documents as the Civil Procedure Code prescribes that they are competent for mutual legal assistance, if a process should be served to a person enjoying immunity, the service shall be effected through diplomatic channels, unless otherwise provided by an international agreement or the Civil Procedure Code of Slovenia)".
<b>Slovakia</b>	"Through diplomatic channels".
<b>Sweden</b>	"The documents will be served with The Cancellor of Justice by postal channel".
<b>United Kingdom</b>	"The Civil Procedure Rules for England and Wales provides the addresses to be used for service in any proceedings against the Crown, which includes Government Departments. The method of service is the same as those permitted for service on other persons or entities".

<p><b>United States of America</b></p>	<p>“Requests for service on the United States Government, which includes its officials (when named in an official capacity), departments, agencies, or instrumentalities, can be transmitted to the U.S. Central Authority under Article 5 of the Hague Service Convention or through diplomatic channels under customary international law. If the request for service complies with the requirements of the Hague Service Convention (if serving pursuant to the Convention) and customary international law requirements, service is executed by serving the appropriate United States Government office. While the United States does not object to Article 10 service by postal channels for private individuals or companies, service on the United States Government cannot be effected through Article 10. For more information, please see: <a href="https://www.justice.gov/civil/service-requests">https://www.justice.gov/civil/service-requests</a>”.</p>
<p><b>Viet Nam</b></p>	<p>“It depends. Requests for service of documents to the State or the Government of Viet Nam should be sent via diplomatic channel. Other requests to serve on State official or State-owned company can still be sent via main channels or other available alternative channels in Viet Nam. If the documents are served through competent authorities of Viet Nam (via main channel or diplomatic channels), the Vietnamese competent authority will use personal service or send the documents via mail. Please note that each request will be considered on a case by case basis”.</p>

\*\_\*\_\*

<p>(11) Does your State serve judicial and extrajudicial documents in the same way?</p>	
<p><b>Argentina</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Australia</b></p>	<p>No – “Service of judicial documents is effected by a Sheriff’s Officer, bailiff, or other process server, generally on the request of the Supreme Court of the requested jurisdiction or other relevant authority; Extrajudicial documents are received by the Central Authority and forwarded to a private service provider to arrange service”.</p>
<p><b>Austria</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Brazil</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Bulgaria</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Canada</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>China</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Croatia</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Czech Republic</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Estonia</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>France</b></p>	<p>Oui</p>
<p><b>Georgia</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Germany</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Hong Kong SAR</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Hungary</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>India</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Ireland</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Israel</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Japan</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Kazakhstan</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Latvia</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Lithuania</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>
<p><b>Mexico</b></p>	<p>Yes</p>

<b>Montenegro</b>	Yes
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No - “The extrajudicial documents are not processed by a court. That is why they are not notified in the same way but they are sent by the same means”.
<b>Norway</b>	Yes
<b>Philippines</b>	Unknown - “The Integrated Bar of the Philippines, the additional Central Authority designated to serve extrajudicial documents, has yet to issue its guidelines to establish the rules on said service”.
<b>Poland</b>	Yes
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Romania</b>	Yes
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes - “In Scotland the response is unknown”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

**A. Main Channel of Transmission (Art. 5)**

<b>(12) In your State, what are the authorities or who are the persons competent to forward a request for service to a foreign Central Authority?</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Australia</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Registrars (3) Process servers (4) Central Authority(ies) Other - “Any court official, or any other person or entity authorised by the rules of the relevant court”.
<b>Austria</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Belgium</b>	(1) Prosecutors (2) Registrars (3) Huissiers
<b>Brazil</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Registrars (3) Central Authority(ies).
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Canada</b>	Other - “Attorney General for Canada - Attorney General, Ministry of the Attorney General or Minister of Justice of a province or territory - Clerks of the courts and their deputies for a judicial or a court district. - Court Registrars (Saskatchewan) - Central Authority for Alberta - Deputy Minister of Justice, Northwest Territories - Huissiers and sheriffs - Local registrars - Members of the law societies of all provinces and territories - Members of the Board of Notaries of the Province of Québec (for non-litigious matters only) - Revenu Québec - Autorité centrale désignée de l’Alberta - Greffiers des cours et leurs adjoints d’un district judiciaire - Huissiers et les shérifs - Membres de la Chambre des notaires de la province de Québec (pour les matières non contentieuses seulement) - Membres des Barreaux des provinces et des territoires - Sous-ministre de la Justice des Territoires du Nord-Ouest - Procureur

	général, le Ministère du Procureur général ou le Ministre de la Justice d'une province ou d'un territoire - Procureur général du Canada - Registraires - Revenu Québec”.
<b>China</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies) “The Ministry of Justice and Beijing, Shanghai, Zhejiang, Jiangsu, Fujian, Jiangxi, Shandong, Guangdong, Guangxi, Hainan High People’s Courts”.
<b>Croatia</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Czech Republic</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies) Other - “Outgoing requests are usually transmitted directly from a judicial authority to the CA of the requested State. However, in some cases, the Letters of Request are transmitted via Central Authority or via diplomatic channels. In these cases, Letters of Request are registered by means of electronic case management. The CA maintains an electronic file service (a case management) in which incoming/outgoing requests for legal aid are registered. The case management enables to monitor the status of their processing”.
<b>Estonia</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>France</b>	(1) Greffiers (2) Huissiers
<b>Georgia</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Germany</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Other - “Requests from Hong Kong are forwarded to foreign Central Authorities by the Chief Secretary for Administration’s Office of Hong Kong, which is an “other authority” designated by the People’s Republic of China under Article 18”.
<b>Hungary</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>India</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Prosecutors (3) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Ireland</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Israel</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Japan</b>	Other - “[P]residing judge; authorized judge; commissioned judge”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Latvia</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Lithuania</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Mexico</b>	Courts / Tribunals
<b>Montenegro</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Huissiers Other - “Notaries and state bodies”.
<b>Nicaragua</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies)
<b>Norway</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Central Authority(ies) Other - “Forbrukerklageutvalget (The Consumer complaints Committee (unofficial translation) - Husleietvistutvalget (Rent Disputes Tribunal, for house tenants) - Parkeringsklagenemnda (an dispute resolution agency for

	sanctions or removal of vehicles) - County Social Welfare Boards - The enforcement officers - County Governors”.
<b>Philippines</b>	Courts / Tribunals Other – “Title I, Item 5(d) of A.O. No. 251-2020 defines “forwarding authority” as one referring to the authority or judicial officer of the Requesting State competent to forward the request for service. All justices and Clerks of Court of collegiate courts, and Judges of lower courts are designated as Forwarding Authorities in the Philippines”.
<b>Poland</b>	Courts / Tribunals
<b>Portugal</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Registrars (3) Huissiers (4) Central Authority(ies) Other – “Solicitors, Lawyers”.
<b>Romania</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>Serbia</b>	Courts / Tribunals
<b>Slovenia</b>	Courts / Tribunals
<b>Slovakia</b>	Courts / Tribunals Others - “[N]otaries (in inheritance proceedings and in proceedings seeking to reconstitute a lost or destroyed legal instrument, such as a title deed [konanie o umorení listiny])”.
<b>Sweden</b>	Courts / Tribunals Other – “Courts, enforcement agencies and other authorities serve documents in civil and commercial matters”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Central Authority(ies)
<b>United States of America</b>	(1) Courts / Tribunals (2) Prosecutors (3) Process servers Other – “The persons and entities within the United States competent to transmit service requests abroad pursuant to Article 5 of the Convention include any court official, any attorney, or any other person or entity authorized by the rules of the court. See Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Central Authority(ies)

\*\_\*\_\*

(13) Do outgoing requests for service have to be transmitted through your State’s Central Authority?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	No
<b>Belgium</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes – “The outgoing requests have to be transmitted through this Central Authority”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes – “The Central Authority examines if the documents meet the requirements”.
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	No – “Beijing, Shanghai, Zhejiang, Jiangsu, Fujian, Jiangxi, Shandong, Guangdong, Guangxi, Hainan High People’s Courts can also transmit requests to other State’s Central Authority”.
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes – “It is prescribed by internal law of the Republic of Croatia”.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	No

<b>Estonia</b>	Yes – “Under convention yes, in EU countries directly thanks to the regulation”.
<b>France</b>	No
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes – “According to the reservation N 9 made by Georgia, "For the purposes of: a) Article 2 of the Convention the Ministry of Justice of Georgia shall be designated as the Central Authority; b) Article 6 of the Convention the Courts of First Instance of Georgia are the authorities competent to complete the certificate; c) Article 9 of the Convention the Ministry of Justice of Georgia shall be designated as the authority competent to receive documents forwarded by consular channels." According to the reservation N 7 made by Georgia, "Georgia declares that the documents to be served in accordance with Article 9 of the Convention are forwarded to the Ministry of Justice of Georgia for the purposes of service to the parties". According the Article 2 of the Service Convention and reservations made Georgia, only State's Central Authority is authorized to transmit the outgoing requests for service”.
<b>Germany</b>	No
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes – “Specified knowledge on the application of the Convention and the necessary language qualifications is present at the Central Authority, but these cannot be guaranteed at all courts and other bodies dealing with civil cases”.
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes – “This is according to Israeli law”.
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes – “[I]t depends on law”.
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes – “In case of Article 8 of the Convention”.
<b>Lithuania</b>	No
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes – “Declaration made by the Mexican State”.
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes – “The secretariat of the Supreme Court of Justice (central authority), is the organ of communication with the other branches of the State as well as with the judicial officials (art. 171, Law 260 “Organic Law of the Judiciary”)”.
<b>Norway</b>	No
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	No
<b>Romania</b>	Yes – “Art 5 from the L A W NO. 189/2003 regarding international judicial assistance in civil and commercial cases”.
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	No
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes – “For Scotland the response is no: outgoing requests do not have to be submitted through the State’s Central Authority”.
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes – “Pursuant to Article 14 Law on Mutual Legal Assistance 2007, requests for mutual legal assistance in civil matters have to be sent via the Ministry of Justice – the Central Authority of Viet Nam. The MOJ will review the eligibility of the requests on the basis of national law, relevant treaties (if available) and specific requirements of foreign countries. It reduces the risk that foreign countries refuse requests from Viet Nam. The MOJ also helps the national

	competent authorities to follow up, communicate with, and remind foreign authorities to execute their requests”.
--	--

\*\_\*\_\*

(14) As the requested State, when no particular method is requested by the applicant, what is the primary / default method of service? (Art. 5(1)(a))	
<b>Argentina</b>	Court summons
<b>Australia</b>	Personal service
<b>Austria</b>	By post
<b>Belgium</b>	Other – “Le formulaire doit indiquer la forme de notification sollicitée”.
<b>Brazil</b>	By post
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Court summons
<b>Canada</b>	Personal service
<b>China</b>	(1) Personal service (2) By post
<b>Croatia</b>	Personal service
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Other – “If the documents shall be served by the way of the primary / default method of service (Art. 5(1)(a), the Czech Court chooses the appropriate method of service (by electronic means, by Court summon, via standard post) according to § 45 Czech Civil Procedural Code”.
<b>Estonia</b>	By other electronic means
<b>France</b>	Simple remise (acceptation volontaire) (art. 5(2))
<b>Georgia</b>	Court summons
<b>Germany</b>	By post
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Personal service
<b>Hungary</b>	By post
<b>India</b>	By post
<b>Ireland</b>	By post
<b>Israel</b>	By post
<b>Japan</b>	Other – “[D]elivery of the document by mail or by a court execution officer”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Court summons
<b>Latvia</b>	Personal service
<b>Lithuania</b>	Personal service
<b>Mexico</b>	Personal service
<b>Montenegro</b>	Informal delivery (voluntary acceptance) (Art. 5(2))
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Court summons
<b>Norway</b>	Other – “(a) Informal delivery (voluntary acceptance) (Art. 5(2)). (b) Personal service. (e) By e-mail. (f) By other electronic means”.
<b>Philippines</b>	Personal service
<b>Poland</b>	By post
<b>Portugal</b>	Personal service
<b>Romania</b>	Personal service
<b>Serbia</b>	Court summons
<b>Slovenia</b>	Other – “Article 89 of the Court Rules: (1) When a request by a foreign court to serve writings is not accompanied by a translation into the Slovenian language, even though required by international treaties or the European union regulations that the writings to be served must be written in the language of the requested country, then the court shall inform the party invited for the first time due to the serving of an act by a foreign court without a translation, that this court act shall be sent by post if the party does not appear in the court at



	the first invitation and the party shall therefore lose the opportunity to decline to accept this foreign court act, unless otherwise provided for by the law, an international treaty or a European Union regulation. (2) A party who appears in court in order to be served in person with a foreign court act without a translation, shall be informed by the court of the right to decline to accept it. (3) A court shall deliver a foreign writing under the regulations applicable for the deliveries of writings of domestic courts, unless differently requested in a request based on an international treaty, the law or a European union regulation”.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Other – “Art. 5(1)(a) - If the documents are in Slovak language (or with translation to Slovak language), Slovak courts serve the documents by post ‘Into own hands of addressee’ (personal service)”.
<b>Sweden</b>	Other – “Personal service by a Police process server (upon presentation of valid identification) and personal service by post (upon presentation of valid identification)”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Personal service – “In Scotland, post is the primary / default method of service”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Personal service
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Other – “Normally, the judicial official will bring the documents to the requested address to serve on the addressee personally. Less frequently used method is service by post. Other informal way is court summons to serve at the courthouse. During the pandemic, when personal service was impossible, the Vietnamese competent authority may execute the request by post or serve via the person in charge in each quarantine site”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(15) In the previous five years, as the requested State, has your State received a request with a particular method of service requested by the applicant? (Art. 5(1)(b))	
<b>Argentina</b>	No
<b>Australia</b>	Yes
<b>Austria</b>	Unknown
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	Yes
<b>China</b>	Yes
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	Unknown
<b>France</b>	Non
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Yes
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	Yes
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Japan</b>	Yes
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes

<b>Latvia</b>	Unknown
<b>Lithuania</b>	Unknown
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Norway</b>	Unknown
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes – “Request for Service through Publication by the Registrar of the High Court, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in the year 2021”.
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Romania</b>	Yes
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes – “In Northern Ireland the response is no”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes
<b>Viet Nam</b>	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(15.1) If yes, what method of service was requested?	
<b>Australia</b>	(1) By e-mail (2) By other electronic means Other - “Request for addressee to sign an acknowledgement of service from the State of Origin”.
<b>Belgium</b>	Personal service
<b>Brazil</b>	Personal service
<b>Canada</b>	(1) Personal service (2) By email
<b>China</b>	(1) Personal service (2) Court Summons Other – “According to the Chinese Civil Procedure Law, personal service or service by leaving the documents with the recipient is possible. But the Forwarding Party should clearly specify this under Option a) of the Request Form if it requires so”.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Personal service
<b>Germany</b>	Personal service
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Personal service
<b>Ireland</b>	Personal service
<b>Israel</b>	(1) Personal service (2) By email
<b>Japan</b>	By post Other – “[D]elivered by marshal”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Court summons
<b>Philippines</b>	“Request for Service through Publication by the Registrar of the High Court, Hong Kong Special Administrative Region in the year 2021”.
<b>Portugal</b>	Other – “Personal service with a document to be signed by the person to be served”.
<b>Romania</b>	Personal service

<b>Serbia</b>	Personal service
<b>Sweden</b>	Personal service
<b>United Kingdom</b>	(1) Personal service (2) By post (3) By e-mail
<b>United States of America</b>	(1) Personal service (2) By post

\*\_\*\_\*

(15.2) If yes, was the requested method of service able to be executed?	
<b>Australia</b>	Yes
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Canada</b>	No - "The request for service by email was not executed as there are no procedure in place for service by such method. La demande de signification par courriel n'a pas été exécutée car il n'y a pas de procédure en place pour la signification par une telle méthode".
<b>China</b>	Yes
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Unknown
<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	No - "No facilities or resources to effect personal service".
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Japan</b>	Yes
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Romania</b>	Yes
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Unknown
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

(16) In the previous five years, as the requesting State, has your State's forwarding authorities requested a particular method of service? (Art. 5(1)(b))	
<b>Argentina</b>	No
<b>Australia</b>	Unknown
<b>Austria</b>	Unknown
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	Unknown
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	Unknown
<b>France</b>	Inconnu
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	Yes

<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Yes
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Japan</b>	Unknown
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes
<b>Latvia</b>	Unknown
<b>Lithuania</b>	Unknown
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Norway</b>	Unknown
<b>Philippines</b>	No
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Romania</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	Unknown
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes – “In Northern Ireland, the response is no”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Unknown
<b>Viet Nam</b>	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(16.1) If yes, what particular method of service was requested?	
<b>Brazil</b>	Personal service
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Personal service
<b>Germany</b>	Personal service Other – “Substituted Service”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Other – “Publication on newspaper”.
<b>Israel</b>	Personal service Other – “By publishing in newspapers”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Court Summons
<b>Portugal</b>	Personal service
<b>Slovakia</b>	Other – “‘Into own hands of addressee’ (personal service) - special method required by national law (Act No 160/2015, the Contentious Civil Procedure Code)”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	(1) Personal service (2) By post (3) Court summons

\*\_\*\_\*

(16.2) If yes, was the requested method of service able to be executed?

Brazil	Yes
Czech Republic	Unknown
Germany	Unknown
Hong Kong SAR	Yes
Israel	Yes
Kazakhstan	Yes
Portugal	Yes
Slovakia	Yes
United Kingdom	Unknown

\*\_\*\_\*

(16.3) If yes, were there costs associated with this method of service?	
Brazil	No
Czech Republic	Unknown
Germany	Yes – “In some cases: bailiff costs when the document was served by a bailiff”.
Hong Kong SAR	Yes
Israel	No
Kazakhstan	No
Portugal	Yes – “Some States have costs associated to personal service”.
Slovakia	Yes – “Costs of personal service”.
United Kingdom	No

## B. Alternative Channels of Transmission (Arts 8, 9 & 10)

(17) As the State of origin, does your State use the “Warning” and “Summary” sections of the Model Form when transmitting a request through alternative channels?	
Argentina	Always
Australia	Unknown
Austria	Unknown
Brazil	Always
Bulgaria	Sometimes
Canada	Sometimes – “Use of the “Warning” and “Summary” sections of the Model Form is mandated by the rules of civil procedure applicable in some jurisdictions in Canada. L'utilisation des sections « Avertissement » et « Éléments essentiels de l'acte » du formulaire type est mandatée par les règles de procédure civile applicables dans certaines administrations au Canada”.
China	Always
Croatia	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
Czech Republic	Sometimes – “However, the Czech requesting authorities (Czech Courts) are instructed to use both sections of the Model Form”.
Estonia	Always
France	Jamais
Georgia	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
Germany	Sometimes – “‘Warning’ and ‘Summary’ Sections are not used when requests are transmitted according to Art. 8; When the request is delivered by post, Art. 10, courts use a German model form (ZRH 6) as determined by the German domestic Regulation on Judicial Assistance in Civil Matters (Zivilrechtshilfeordnung – ZRHO)”.

<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Unknown
<b>Hungary</b>	Unknown
<b>India</b>	Unknown
<b>Ireland</b>	Unknown
<b>Israel</b>	Sometimes
<b>Japan</b>	Never
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Always
<b>Latvia</b>	Unknown
<b>Lithuania</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
<b>Mexico</b>	Always
<b>Montenegro</b>	Unknown
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Always
<b>Norway</b>	Always
<b>Philippines</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels. "The Philippines made the following declaration/reservation/notification: (a) Pursuant to Article 8, the Philippines objects to service of judicial documents directly through diplomatic or consular agents upon persons in its territory, unless the document is served upon a national of the State in which the documents originate; and (b) the Philippines objects to the transmission channels under paragraphs a and c as provided for in Article 10 of the Convention".
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Sometimes – "The warning form is not always used".
<b>Serbia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovenia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovakia</b>	Unknown
<b>Sweden</b>	Unknown
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Always – "In Northern Ireland the response is not applicable. This is due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels".
<b>United States of America</b>	Unknown
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Never

\*\_\*\_\*

(18) As the State of destination, does your State use the "Certificate" section of the Model Form when informing whether documents have been served (in response to a request received through alternative channels)?

<b>Argentina</b>	Sometimes
<b>Australia</b>	Sometimes – "Usage differs between Australian jurisdictions, though in most cases the Certificate section is not used, as the requested jurisdiction either provides its own certificate or an equivalent proof of service, such as an affidavit".
<b>Austria</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Brazil</b>	Always
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Always
<b>Canada</b>	Always
<b>China</b>	Always
<b>Croatia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Always
<b>Estonia</b>	Always

<b>France</b>	Parfois – “Même si les attestations ne sont pas toujours complétées, des procès-verbaux sont annexés aux actes précisant les motifs de remise ou de non remise”.
<b>Georgia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
<b>Germany</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Unknown
<b>Hungary</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>India</b>	Always
<b>Ireland</b>	Unknown
<b>Israel</b>	Always
<b>Japan</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Always
<b>Latvia</b>	Always
<b>Lithuania</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
<b>Mexico</b>	Always
<b>Montenegro</b>	Unknown
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Always
<b>Norway</b>	Always
<b>Philippines</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Always
<b>Romania</b>	Sometimes – “The content of the warning and of the Summary is included in the judicial document”.
<b>Serbia</b>	Always
<b>Slovenia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovakia</b>	Unknown
<b>Sweden</b>	Always
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Always – “In Scotland it is unknown whether the “Certificate” section is used, and in Northern Ireland the response is not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Unknown
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Never

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(19) In the previous five years, have the diplomatic or consular agents of your State directly effected service of judicial or extrajudicial documents upon a person abroad? (Art. 8(1))</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	Unknown
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes
<b>Brazil</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	Yes – “Only to Chinese people”.
<b>Croatia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	Unknown
<b>France</b>	Oui
<b>Georgia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods

<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	Yes
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Unknown
<b>Latvia</b>	No
<b>Lithuania</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	Yes
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Norway</b>	Unknown
<b>Philippines</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Romania</b>	Unknown
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Unknown
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(20) In the previous five years, has service by diplomatic or consular agents of your State been rejected by the addressee? (Art. 8(1))</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	Unknown
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes – “Dans ce cas de figure l’Ambassade n’a aucun moyen de contraindre la notification. Les exploits sont alors retournés par celle-ci au SPF Affaires étrangères qui les retourne à son tour à l’huissier belge en mentionnant le motif de non-notification (refus par le destinataire)”.
<b>Brazil</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	Yes – “When rejected, diplomatic or consular agents of China will fill in certificates of non-service and send the certificates back to China”.
<b>Croatia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative channels
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Unknown
<b>Estonia</b>	Unknown
<b>France</b>	Inconnu
<b>Georgia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
<b>Germany</b>	Yes – “When the addressee rejected the documents, it was not possible to serve the documents according to Art. 8 of the Convention. A certificate of non-service was issued by the diplomatic or consular agent”.



<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Unknown
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	Yes – “Consular delivered documents, but addressee refused complaining the service is not forcible”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Unknown
<b>Latvia</b>	Unknown
<b>Lithuania</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	Unknown
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Norway</b>	Unknown
<b>Philippines</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Unknown
<b>Romania</b>	Unknown
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes – “Since the Article 8(1) provides that service of judicial documents upon persons abroad effected directly through diplomatic or consular agents service can only be made without application of any compulsion, the service is effected only when the addressee accepts document voluntarily”.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Unknown
<b>Sweden</b>	Unknown
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Unknown
<b>United States of America</b>	Unknown
<b>Viet Nam</b>	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(21) In the previous five years, has your State used consular channels to forward documents? (Art. 9(1))	
<b>Argentina</b>	No
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	Unknown
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes
<b>Brazil</b>	No
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	Unknown
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Unknown
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Oui
<b>Georgia</b>	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	No

Ireland	No
Israel	No
Japan	No
Kazakhstan	Unknown
Latvia	No
Lithuania	No
Mexico	No
Montenegro	Yes
Nicaragua	No
Norway	Unknown
Philippines	Yes
Poland	Unknown
Portugal	No
Romania	Yes
Serbia	Unknown
Slovenia	Yes
Slovakia	Yes
Sweden	Yes
United Kingdom	Unknown – “The response of ‘yes’ on the online questionnaire reflects the fact that Scotland has used consular channels to forward documents. This has not happened in Northern Ireland, and in England & Wales it is unknown”.
United States of America	No
Viet Nam	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

(22) In the previous five years, under exceptional circumstances, has your State used diplomatic channels to forward documents? (Art. 9(2))	
Argentina	Yes
Australia	Unknown
Austria	Unknown
Belgium	No
Brazil	No
Bulgaria	Yes – “Explicit request of the court for various reasons, for example, when serving of court’s notification to the debtor for an injunction by means of garnishment of especially large amounts or in case of service to the requested State, its diplomatic representation or State official”.
Canada	Unknown
China	No
Croatia	No
Czech Republic	Yes - “Letters of Request are usually transmitted directly from a judicial authority to the CA of the requested State. However, there are Contracted Parties that have not designated their CA, or that do not have a direct postal connection with the Czech Republic. In that case, the Letters of Request are transmitted via diplomatic channels”.
Estonia	Unknown
France	Non
Georgia	Not applicable, due to the objection made on the use of alternative methods
Germany	Yes – “See answer Q9”.
Hong Kong SAR	No

<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Unknown
<b>Latvia</b>	Unknown
<b>Lithuania</b>	No
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes – “Nicaragua’s diplomatic channel is through the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, and our domestic law, article 123 of Act No. 260 Organic Law on the Judiciary, states that: “When a foreign judge is commissioned for the practice of judicial proceedings, a commission shall be sent legalized through the Supreme Court of Justice and the Ministry of Foreign Affairs...” That is why diplomatic channels are always being pursued”.
<b>Norway</b>	Unknown
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown
<b>Portugal</b>	Unknown
<b>Romania</b>	Yes – “Service upon another State”.
<b>Serbia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovenia</b>	Unknown
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes – “Initially during the war in Ukraine, the postal service was suspended to Russia”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes – “Requests for service through diplomatic channels, traditionally under customary international law, have been transmitted for service on a foreign state. The process for outgoing requests for service on a foreign state is governed by 28 U.S.C. § 1608(a)”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes – “Diplomatic channel is used to serve documents on individuals or entities in other Member States when main channel and other channels are not available (e.g: during the pandemic). As stipulated above, if the addressee is a foreign State or Government, Viet Nam may consider sending the documents through diplomatic channel”.

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(23) Has your State (as the State of destination) objected to service under Article 10(a)?</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	Yes
<b>Belgium</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	Yes
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	No

France	Non
Georgia	No
Germany	Yes
Hong Kong SAR	No
Hungary	Yes
India	No
Ireland	No
Israel	No
Japan	Yes
Kazakhstan	No
Latvia	No
Lithuania	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Montenegro	Yes
Nicaragua	Yes
Norway	Yes
Philippines	Yes
Poland	Yes
Portugal	No
Romania	No
Serbia	No
Slovenia	Yes
Slovakia	Yes
Sweden	No
United Kingdom	No
United States of America	No
Viet Nam	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(23.1) If an objection has been made under Article 10(a), does your State continue to use postal channels for service as the State of origin, despite the objection?

Argentina	Unknown
Austria	Unknown
Brazil	No
Bulgaria	Unknown
China	Yes - "Post channels are used only when the State of destination does not object to service under Article 10(a)".
Croatia	No
Czech Republic	Yes
Germany	Yes
Hungary	Yes
Ireland	Yes
Japan	No
Lithuania	No
Mexico	No
Montenegro	No
Nicaragua	No
Norway	Yes

<b>Poland</b>	Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

(23.2) If no objection has been made, does your State, as the State of destination, accept the use of postal channels for service from other States of origin that have made an objection under Article 10(a)?

<b>Australia</b>	Yes
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes
<b>Canada</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	Unknown
<b>France</b>	Inconnu
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	Yes
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes
<b>Latvia</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Serbia</b>	Unknown
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

(23.3) If no objection has been made, which of the following categories does your State recognise as a “postal channel” under Article 10(a)?

<b>Australia</b>	(1) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (2) Private courier, such as FedEx Other – “Please note that Australia has also declared that service by post must be permitted in the jurisdiction where process is to be served”.
<b>Canada</b>	Other – “There is no specific rule applicable to judicial or extrajudicial documents served in Canada if they relate to proceedings taking place outside of Canada. Il n'y a pas de règle particulière applicable aux actes judiciaires ou extrajudiciaires signifiés ou notifiés au Canada s'ils se rapportent à des procédures se déroulant à l'extérieur du Canada”.
<b>Estonia</b>	(1) Regular post (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (3) E-mail (4) e-Post via State postal agency
<b>France</b>	(1) Courrier postal (2) Courrier recommandé (suivi), avec reçu
<b>Georgia</b>	Regular post
<b>India</b>	(1) Regular post (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt

<b>Ireland</b>	(1) Regular post – “[F]or limited companies”; (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt – “For natural persons”.
<b>Israel</b>	(1) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (2) Private courier, such as FedEx
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Regular post
<b>Latvia</b>	(1) Regular post (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (3) Private courier, such as FedEx (4) E-mail
<b>Portugal</b>	(1) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (2) Private courier, such as FedEx
<b>Romania</b>	Registered (tracked) post, with receipt
<b>Serbia</b>	Regular post
<b>Sweden</b>	(1) Regular post (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt
<b>United Kingdom</b>	(1) Regular post (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt
<b>United States of America</b>	(1) Regular post (2) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (3) Private courier, such as FedEx (4) E-mail
<b>Viet Nam</b>	(1) Registered (tracked) post, with receipt (2) Private courier, such as FedEx

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(23.4) If no objection has been made, more specifically, would your State consider service by e-mail to be analogous to service by postal channels under Art. 10(a)?</b>	
<b>Australia</b>	Unknown – “While the principle of functional equivalence is generally accepted in Australian law, this particular question has not yet been formally considered”.
<b>Canada</b>	Unknown – “There is no specific rule applicable to judicial or extrajudicial documents served in Canada if they relate to proceedings taking place outside of Canada. Il n'y a pas de règle particulière applicable aux actes judiciaires ou extrajudiciaires signifiés ou notifiés au Canada s'ils se rapportent à des procédures se déroulant à l'extérieur du Canada”.
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Non – “Le droit national n'autorise pas la signification ou la notification d'un acte par simple courrier électronique. La signification électronique est possible sous réserve de respecter plusieurs conditions (doit garantir la fiabilité de l'identification des parties, l'intégrité des documents, la sécurité des échanges, et doit comporter la mention du consentement du destinataire et la date et l'heure de la signification)”.
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes
<b>Portugal</b>	No

Romania	No
Serbia	No
Sweden	No
United Kingdom	No
United States of America	Yes
Viet Nam	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(23.5) If no objection has been made, does your State require the documents served to be translated into one of your State’s official languages?	
Australia	No
Canada	No
Estonia	“Cover letter must be in Estonian or English. The rest of the documents, it depends what language the recipient understands”.
France	Non
Georgia	Yes - “Georgia declares that the documents to be served on the territory of Georgia shall be written in the Georgian language or accompanied by a translation into the Georgian language duly certified according to the law of the requesting State”.
India	No
Ireland	No
Israel	Yes - “[T]ranslation in accordance with the information provided in the practical information page on the HCCH website”.
Kazakhstan	Yes - “[A]ll the incoming documents”.
Latvia	Yes - “All documents”
Portugal	No
Romania	No
Serbia	No
Sweden	No
United Kingdom	No
United States of America	No
Viet Nam	Yes - “As Viet Nam declared when acceding to the Service Convention, except for the documents to be served upon a national of a State in which the documents originate in accordance with ...paragraph a of Article 10 of the Convention, all documents to be served in Viet Nam must be either in the Vietnamese language or accompanied by a Vietnamese translation, in which case the signature of the translator must be duly verified or notarized”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(24) Has your State objected to service under Article 10(b)?	
Argentina	Yes
Australia	No
Austria	Yes
Belgium	No
Brazil	Yes
Bulgaria	Yes
Canada	No

<b>China</b>	Yes
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Non
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Japan</b>	Yes
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes
<b>Montenegro</b>	Yes
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes
<b>Norway</b>	Yes
<b>Philippines</b>	No – “The Philippines declared its objections only to Article 10, paragraphs (a) and (c) of the 1965 Hague Service Convention”.
<b>Poland</b>	Yes
<b>Portugal</b>	No
<b>Romania</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	No
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

<p>(24.1) If no objection has been made, which of the following categories does your State recognise as a “judicial officer, official or other competent person” under Article 10(b), either for sending or receiving?</p>	
<b>Australia</b>	<p>(1) Attorney or solicitor                  (2) Bailiff                  (3) Huissier                  (4) Court official                  (5) Notary                  (6) Process server                  Other – “Any court official, or any other person or entity authorised by the rules of the relevant court”.</p>
<b>Belgium</b>	<p>(1) Attorney or solicitor                  (2) Bailiff                  (3) Huissier                  (4) Court official</p>



	(5) Notary (6) Official of the executive branch (7) Process server
<b>Canada</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official (5) Notary (6) Process server Other – “Any competent adult. Tout adult ayant la capacité juridique”.
<b>France</b>	(1) Huissier (2) Fonctionnaire attaché au tribunal
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff Other – “Hong Kong SAR, China only accepts those entities designated as “forwarding authorities” by other Contracting States”.
<b>Ireland</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Court official
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Court official
<b>Portugal</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official (5) Notary
<b>Romania</b>	Other – “There is no special provision”.
<b>Serbia</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Court official (4) Notary
<b>Sweden</b>	Process server Other – “Authorised Serving Company”
<b>United Kingdom</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official (5) Process server “We would like to add that Scotland has a Messengers-at-Arms which are equivalent to hussiers. In Northern Ireland service can be by court bailiff”.
<b>United States of America</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Court official (3) Process server Other – “See Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or applicable U.S. state civil procedure rules for the competent parties in the United States who can effect service”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(24.2) If no objection has been made, how does this channel of transmission operate in practice?

<b>Australia</b>	“The Australian authorities do not have oversight of the practical operation of this channel of transmission”.
<b>Belgium</b>	“Les Officiers ministériels, fonctionnaires ou autres personnes compétents contactent directement un huissier en Belgique”.
<b>Canada</b>	“Individuals involved in judicial proceedings in Canada must ensure to follow to rules of civil procedure applicable to the service of documents abroad. Les personnes impliquées dans des procédures judiciaires au Canada doivent s'assurer de suivre les règles de procédure civile applicables à la signification ou notification à l'étranger”.
<b>France</b>	“La transmission est effectuée par un huissier sauf dans les cas où le greffe est compétent”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	“The practice of the Courts of the Hong Kong SAR, China is that whenever such requests are received, they will be forwarded to the Competent Authority for Hong Kong SAR, China (the Chief Secretary for Administration of Hong Kong SAR, China) for processing. Direct service through Government officials is not available in Hong Kong SAR, China. However, a private agent (usually a firm of solicitors) may be appointed directly to effect service. Such service can be effected directly without going through the Government or the Judiciary of Hong Kong SAR, China. The Judiciary of Hong Kong SAR, China does not seek reimbursement of the costs. The charges made by solicitors appointed to serve process by foreign judicial officers, officials or other competent persons are not regulated by the Government of Hong Kong SAR, China. They vary depending on the services required and time taken to execute the request. This channel of transmission operates in a similar manner as the main channel of transmission under Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention”.
<b>Ireland</b>	“Don't understand this question”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	“Initial consideration of the return must be written on each page, a completed form ‘certificate according to the model attached to the severity”.
<b>Portugal</b>	“Requests are sent directly between competent authorities. Central Authority can facilitate communication, if necessary”.
<b>Romania</b>	“Unknown”.
<b>Serbia</b>	“By directly deliver”.
<b>Sweden</b>	“The applicant may contact the Police process server/Serving Company directly”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	“It seems to operate satisfactorily, but we have no statistics on this”.
<b>United States of America</b>	“The United States has no objection to the informal delivery of such documents by members of diplomatic or consular missions in the United States, through the mail, or by private persons, if that would be effective under applicable law, provided no compulsion is used. See Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or applicable U.S. state civil procedure rules for the competent parties in the United States who can effect service and how service is effected”.

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(24.3)</b>	<b>If no objection has been made, are there costs associated with this channel of transmission?</b>
<b>Australia</b>	Unknown
<b>Canada</b>	Yes – “Nothing prevents individuals identified by Article 10(b) to charge fees to effect service abroad. Rien n'empêche les personnes identifiées par l'article (b), de facturer des frais pour effectuer une signification ou une notification à l'étranger”.

<b>France</b>	Oui – “Les frais de signification par huissier de justice à destination de l'étranger sont fixés à 48,36 €”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No - “As explained in Q24.2”.
<b>Ireland</b>	Unknown
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes – “[P]aid by the State”.
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes – “Personal Service may have costs associated. When a Bailiff is used for personal service there is a fee that needs to be paid”.
<b>Romania</b>	Unknown
<b>Serbia</b>	Unknown
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes – “At the moment approximately 100 Euros”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes – “Only if a process server is used. In England and Wales there are costs if a process server is used. In Scotland there are costs if service is by a Messenger-at-Arms. In Northern Ireland, there are costs if a process server is used”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes – “Private process servers charge a fee per request for service”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(25) Has your State objected to service under Article 10(c)?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	No
<b>Austria</b>	Yes
<b>Belgium</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	Yes
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Non
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Japan</b>	Yes
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes
<b>Montenegro</b>	Yes
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes
<b>Norway</b>	Yes
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes
<b>Poland</b>	Yes
<b>Portugal</b>	No

<b>Romania</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	No
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No – “In Northern Ireland there has been an objection to service under Article 10 (c)”.
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

(25.1) If no, which of the following categories does your State recognise as “any person interested in a judicial proceeding” under Article 10(c), either for sending or receiving?	
<b>Australia</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official (5) Notary Other – “Any court official, or any other person or entity authorised by the rules of the relevant court. In some circumstances this may include the parties to the proceedings (or their representatives)”.
<b>Canada</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official (5) Notary Other – “Any competent adult. Tout adult ayant la capacité juridique”.
<b>France</b>	(1) Huissier (2) Fonctionnaire attaché au tribunal Autre – “Agents du Ministère de l’Europe et des affaires étrangères pour les français de l’étranger”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Other – “Hong Kong SAR, China only accepts those entities designated as “forwarding authorities” by other Contracting States”.
<b>Ireland</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Court official
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Court official
<b>Portugal</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Notary
<b>Romania</b>	Other – “There is no special provision”.
<b>Serbia</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Court official (4) Notary
<b>Sweden</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official

	(5) Notary (6) Official of the Executive branch
<b>United Kingdom</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier “We would like to add that Scotland has a Messengers-at-Arms which are equivalent to huissiers”.
<b>United States of America</b>	(1) Attorney or solicitor (2) Bailiff (3) Huissier (4) Court official (5) Notary (6) Official of the executive branch Other – “See Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or applicable U.S. state civil procedure rules for the competent parties in the United States who can effect service”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(25.2) If no, how does this channel of transmission operate in practice?	
<b>Australia</b>	“The Australian authorities do not have oversight of the practical operation of this channel of transmission”.
<b>Belgium</b>	“Le requérant contacte directement un huissier en Belgique”.
<b>Canada</b>	“Individuals involved in judicial proceedings in Canada must ensure to follow to rules of civil procedure applicable to the service of documents abroad. Les personnes impliquées dans des procédures judiciaires au Canada doivent s'assurer de suivre les règles de procédure civile applicables à la signification et de notification d'actes à l'étranger”.
<b>France</b>	“Voie de transmission laissée à l'initiative du requérant”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	“This channel of transmission operates in a similar manner as the main channel of transmission under Articles 3 and 5 of the Convention”.
<b>Ireland</b>	“Don't understand this question”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	“A completed form ‘certificate according to the model attached to the severity’”.
<b>Portugal</b>	“Requests are sent directly between competent authorities. Central Authority can facilitate communication, if necessary”.
<b>Romania</b>	“Unknown”.
<b>Sweden</b>	“The applicant may directly take contact with the Police process server/Serving Company without involvement of the Central Authority”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	“It seems to operate satisfactorily, but we have no statistics on this”.
<b>United States of America</b>	“The United States has no objection to the informal delivery of such documents by members of diplomatic or consular missions in the United States, through the mail, or by private persons, if that would be effective under applicable law, provided no compulsion is used. See Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or applicable U.S. state civil procedure rules for the competent parties in the United States who can effect service and how service is effected”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(25.3) If no, are there costs associated with this channel of transmission?	
<b>Australia</b>	Unknown
<b>Canada</b>	Yes – “Fees may be charged for sending requests for service abroad.”

	Des frais peuvent être facturés pour l'envoi de demandes de signification ou de notification à l'étranger".
France	Inconnu
Hong Kong SAR	No
Ireland	Unknown
Kazakhstan	Yes – “[P]aid by the State”.
Portugal	Yes – “Personal Service may have costs associated”.
Romania	“Unknown”.
Serbia	Unknown
Sweden	Yes – “At the moment approximately 100 Euros”.
United Kingdom	No – “There are costs associated with this channel of transmission if it is in Scotland and a Messenger-at-Arms has been used”.
United States of America	Yes – “Private process servers charge a fee per request for service”.

### C. Refusal to Execute Request (Art. 13)

(26) In the previous five years, has your State refused a request for service on grounds of infringing “sovereignty or security”?	
Argentina	Yes
Australia	No
Austria	Yes – “Public liability”.
Belgium	Unknown
Brazil	No
Bulgaria	No
Canada	No
China	Yes
Croatia	No
Czech Republic	No
Estonia	Unknown
France	Non
Georgia	No
Germany	No
Hong Kong SAR	No
Hungary	No
India	No
Ireland	No
Israel	Yes – “Compliance with the request was deemed to infringe Israel's sovereignty”.
Japan	Yes
Kazakhstan	No
Latvia	Unknown
Lithuania	Unknown
Mexico	No
Montenegro	No
Nicaragua	No
Norway	Unknown
Philippines	No
Poland	Unknown
Portugal	No

<b>Romania</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	No
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Unknown – “This is ‘unknown’ in England & Wales and in Scotland, but the response is ‘no’ from Northern Ireland”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes – “In the past five years, the U.S. Central Authority has refused to execute 43 requests for service on the grounds of that the request infringed on the “sovereignty or security” of the United States. Common grounds for asserting an Article 13 rejection include, but are not limited to, garnishment of sovereign funds, claims relating to wartime activities, attachment of sovereign assets, and no record of service of the underlying proceeding when seeking to serve or enforce a default judgment. There are no U.S. court decisions to attach as U.S. courts do not review incoming service requests to make a determination of whether a request should be refused on the basis of Article 13”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	No

\*\_\*\_\*

(27) In the previous five years, has a request from your State been refused on grounds of infringing “sovereignty or security”?	
<b>Argentina</b>	No
<b>Australia</b>	Unknown
<b>Austria</b>	Unknown
<b>Brazil</b>	No
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	Unknown
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Unknown
<b>Estonia</b>	Unknown
<b>France</b>	Oui – “[C]oncernant une signification d’une mise en demeure de payer une taxe foncière en invoquant une atteinte à la souveraineté”
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	Yes – “Requests for service in patent dispute matters”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Unknown
<b>Lithuania</b>	Unknown
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	Unknown
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Norway</b>	Unknown
<b>Philippines</b>	No
<b>Poland</b>	Unknown

Portugal	Unknown
Romania	No
Serbia	No
Slovenia	No
Slovakia	No
Sweden	No
United Kingdom	Unknown – “In Northern Ireland the response is no, a request has not been refused on these grounds”.
United States of America	Unknown
Viet Nam	No

#### IV. Use of Information Technology

(28) Has your State taken any steps (including through legislation) to enable or increase the use of technology to facilitate the operation of the Service Convention, including in response to the COVID-19 pandemic?	
Argentina	Yes
Australia	Yes - “Increasing acceptance of requests received electronically; in urgent cases transmitting requests electronically between the Central Authority and relevant Australian jurisdiction; encouraging electronic means of communication with foreign authorities”.
Austria	Yes - “[W]here paper is not needed, electronic delivery is possible under certain conditions”.
Brazil	Yes - “We are able to receive requests through e-mail from any country that can do the same”.
Bulgaria	No
Canada	Yes - “Some jurisdictions have implemented online payment of the fees required for requests under Article 5 of the Convention. Certaines administrations permettent maintenant le paiement en ligne des frais exigés pour les demandes effectués en vertu de l'article 5 de la Convention”.
China	Yes - “We have established a system. <a href="https://www.hcch.net/en/states/authorities/details3/?aid=243">https://www.hcch.net/en/states/authorities/details3/?aid=243</a> ”.
Croatia	No
Czech Republic	Yes - “The COVID-19 pandemic has improved the communication of Central Authorities and established informal electronic communication (via e-mail)”.
Estonia	Yes
France	Oui - “La signification par voie électronique a été introduite en droit français par le décret n° 2012-366 du 15 mars 2012 venu modifier le Code de procédure civile, le décret n° 56-222 du 29 février 1956 pris pour l'application de l'ordonnance du 2 novembre 1945 relative au statut des huissiers de justice (remplacé depuis par le Décret n° 2021-1625 du 10 décembre 2021 relatif aux compétences des commissaires de justice) et le Code des procédures civiles d'exécution. L'initiative, qui s'inscrit dans le cadre du développement de la communication par voie électronique, rend pour la première fois la transmission des actes de procédure et des actes juridictionnels dématérialisés accessibles aux non-professionnels du droit”.
Georgia	Yes - “Electronic means of communication between the authorities of the State were improved. During the COVID-19 pandemic, forwarding authorities of Georgia transmitted requests electronically under the Service Convention”.



<b>Germany</b>	No
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes - "Since the Covid-19 pandemic, Israel's Central Authority accepts incoming requests via e-mail".
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Yes - "[W]e worked as usual, everyone worked from home and one was on duty in office".
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes - "At the time of Covid, the hearings of the court were primarily dealt with in video conference mode, similarly to prisons it was determined not to convoy, but all accused would be interrogated by video conference regime".
<b>Lithuania</b>	No
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes - "Fifth Section Article 1169 of the National Code of Civil Procedures".
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes - "Create an email only for the use of the convention".
<b>Norway</b>	Yes - "We have temporarily allowed electronic transmissions of request. This regulation will be repealed 1 July 2023".
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes - "Use of Official Philippines Judiciary Office 365 Accounts".
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes - "The use of video Conferencing or any other technological platform was extended".
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	"No, not yet. See also response of the EU".
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes - "ABC Legal Services, the U.S. Central Authority's designated process server for all incoming Convention requests for private individuals and companies, uses an online database and platform. The platform allows requesting authorities to upload their requests for service online, make the necessary payment, receive status and progress updates, communicate with staff, and obtain their proof of service. ABC Legal also accepts requests by email. The entire process of transmission of requests to ABC Legal, correspondence, and the transmission of the proof of service can now be done electronically".
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes - "The MOJ Viet Nam scanned the requests and sent via its official email address mlavietnam@moj.gov.vn or haguevietnam@moj.gov.vn and accepted the requests sent from the official email addresses of foreign Central authorities during the pandemic when postal service was not available. At present, the transmission of request via email is only applicable when postal service is unavailable or in other exceptional cases".

\*\_\*\_\*

(29) Do the forwarding authorities of your State transmit requests under the Service Convention electronically?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	Yes
<b>Austria</b>	Yes

<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	Yes
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	No
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Non
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>Germany</b>	No
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	No
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	No
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Norway</b>	No
<b>Philippines</b>	No – “While forwarding authorities do not transmit requests electronically, A.O. No. 251-2020 did not prohibit (or silent on) electronic service”.
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	No
<b>Slovakia</b>	No
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	Yes
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(29.1) If yes, what methods of transmission do the forwarding authorities of your State use?</b>	
<b>Argentina</b>	Email (regular)
<b>Australia</b>	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured / encrypted) (3) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government; (4) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by a private service provider Other - “Please note that while nothing legislatively precluding Australian jurisdictions from doing so, it is not yet common practice”.
<b>Brazil</b>	(1) Email (regular) (2) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government

<b>Canada</b>	<p>Other – “Our response to question 29 is "unknown" but this is not an option for response. The government of Canada does not have any record of outgoing requests since they are mostly made by members of the law societies of Canadian provinces and territories and members of the Chambre des notaires of the Province of Québec (for non-litigious matters only) in their capacity as forwarding authorities.</p> <p>Notre réponse à la question 29 est "inconnu" mais il ne s'agit pas d'une option de réponse. Le gouvernement du Canada n'a pas de données sur demandes sortantes puisqu'elles sont principalement faites par des membres des barreaux des provinces et territoires canadiens et des membres de la Chambre des notaires de la province de Québec (pour les affaires non contentieuses seulement) dans leur qualité d'autorités expéditrices”.</p>
<b>Estonia</b>	<p>(1) Email (regular)                  (2) Email (secured / encrypted)                  (3) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government</p>
<b>Georgia</b>	Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government
<b>Lithuania</b>	Email (regular)
<b>Sweden</b>	<p>(1) Email (regular)                  (2) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government</p>
<b>United States of America</b>	<p>(1) Email (regular)                  (2) Email (secured / encrypted)</p>
<b>Viet Nam</b>	<p>Email (regular)</p> <p>Other – “As required by the Central Authority of China, the MOJ Viet Nam sent requests to the Ministry of Justice of China via their online system (ilcc.online). We log in, fill the form online, then scan and upload documents to their system. We do not have any further detailed information of this system”.</p>

\*\_\*\_\*

(30) Does your State’s Central Authority accept requests under the Service Convention transmitted electronically in circumstances where only an electronic copy is provided (and where a paper copy is not subsequently provided)?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	Yes
<b>Austria</b>	No
<b>Belgium</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	No
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	Yes – “Requests have to be signed or stamped”.
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	No
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Non
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>Germany</b>	No
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	Yes
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes

Japan	No
Kazakhstan	No
Lithuania	Yes
Mexico	Yes
Montenegro	Yes
Nicaragua	Yes
Norway	No
Philippines	Yes
Poland	No
Portugal	Yes
Romania	No
Serbia	Yes
Slovenia	No
Slovakia	No
Sweden	No
United Kingdom	No
United States of America	Yes
Viet Nam	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

(30.1) If yes, what methods of transmission does your State accept?	
Argentina	Email (regular)
Australia	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured / encrypted) (3) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government (4) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by a private service provider Other - "Please note that not all jurisdictions in Australia will be able to accept electronic transmission of requests, so in some cases the Central Authority may need to assist. The Australian Central Authority will accept requests received electronically. To assist with execution, it is useful if the requesting authority provides written confirmation that it is sufficient to serve a copy of the document/s that have been transmitted electronically according to their internal law".
Brazil	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured / encrypted) (3) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government (4) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by a private service provider Other - "Brazil is able to accept many methods of electronic transmission, provided it was previously agreed upon in a bilateral, regional or multilateral initiative. For example, as soon as the "Protocolo de Medellín" is in force in Brazil, requests will also be exchanged using the Iber@ system".
China	Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government
Estonia	Email (regular)
Georgia	(1) Email (regular) (2) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by the government
Hungary	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured/encrypted)

<b>India</b>	Email (secured / encrypted)
<b>Israel</b>	Email (regular)
<b>Lithuania</b>	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured / encrypted)
<b>Mexico</b>	Other – “They are always received in physical or electronic form”.
<b>Montenegro</b>	Email (regular)
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Email (regular)
<b>Portugal</b>	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured/encrypted)
<b>Serbia</b>	Email (regular)
<b>United States of America</b>	(1) Email (regular) (2) Email (secured / encrypted) (3) Electronic transmission via online platform administered by a private service provider
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Email (regular)

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(30.2)</b>	If no, please provide further information about why this is not yet possible.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	“No legislative provisions”.
<b>Canada</b>	“It could become possible if policies and procedures were created for that purpose. Additional printing fees would have to be charged. Cela pourrait devenir possible si des politiques et des procédures étaient créées à cette fin. Des frais d'impression supplémentaires devront être facturés”.
<b>Czech Republic</b>	“There are internal law limitations to verify the sender of the request (the requesting authority) and integrity of documents”.
<b>France</b>	“Raisons technologiques et budgétaires mais la situation devrait prochainement évoluer, notamment en raison de l’obligation de transmission par voie électronique prévue par le Règlement européen signification 2020/1784 à compter du 1er janvier 2025”.
<b>Germany</b>	“The request for service must be signed and/or sealed. The technical requirements for transmission with a reliable examination of the origin and authenticity have yet to be fulfilled in this area on a global level. In addition to this, cross-border technical standards are not adequate in order to give legally secure evidence to the requesting party and the forwarding authority that the authentic request has been received and is being processed”.
<b>Ireland</b>	“Secure systems not yet developed”.
<b>Japan</b>	“Internal law limitation”.
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	“Use of technology is prohibited by internal law”.
<b>Norway</b>	“This is not yet possible due to the lack of a secure transmission channel and data protection (privacy) regulations”.
<b>Poland</b>	“Internal law limitations on electronic service”.
<b>Slovenia</b>	“Service of documents can be carried out via the e-Justice (e-Sodstvo) website, which is administered by the Supreme Court of the Republic of Slovenia, to users’ secure e-mail addresses. Electronic service is permitted in civil procedure and other civil judicial proceedings in which the rules of the Civil Procedure Act apply to electronic service of documents, e.g. in proceedings regarding commercial disputes, labour and social disputes, non-civil procedures, inheritance proceedings (it is not yet used in all such procedures) and land register procedures, and in insolvency proceedings and enforcement proceedings (electronic service is already used in all of these procedures).

	There are restrictions with regard to the groups into which users are classified. They are first divided into general groups: – users who do not have to provide proof of identity when using the e-Justice system (ordinary users), – users who access the e-Justice system using a username and password (registered users), and – users who access the e-Justice system using a username and password, and a qualified digital certificate (qualified users). Qualified users include: – in-house qualified users (judges and officers of the court who are authorised to carry out e-tasks in certain types of civil judicial proceedings), and – external qualified users (notaries, lawyers, executors, receivers, the State Attorney's Office, State Prosecutor's Office, real estate companies and municipal attorney's offices, i.e. entities that have the role of representative or judicial body in civil judicial proceedings, and users/parties, i.e. legal persons, natural persons or state and local authorities that have the role of party to the proceedings in civil judicial proceedings). National legislation does not yet provide the legal basis for execution of requests for mutual legal assistance with electronic means. In accordance with the Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast) the electronic cross-border transmission of documents through the decentralised IT system is possible (applicable from 01. 05. 2025)".
<b>Slovakia</b>	"It is possible only when the request and documents are signed electronically in accordance with REGULATION (EU) No 910/2014 OF THE EUROPEAN PARLIAMENT AND OF THE COUNCIL of 23 July 2014 on electronic identification and trust services for electronic transactions in the internal market and repealing Directive 1999/93/EC".
<b>Sweden</b>	"Because of judicial or administrative structures, lack of resources and infrastructure, cost and system interoperability, a reliable and legally secure reception cannot be guaranteed".
<b>United Kingdom</b>	"It seems to operate satisfactorily, but we have no statistics on this".

\*\_\*\_\*

(31) Does your State permit execution of service via electronic means?	
<b>Australia</b>	Other – "Some authorities may allow the execution of service requests via electronic means in specific circumstances and where it is authorised by the Court, however this is not yet common practice across Australian jurisdictions".
<b>Austria</b>	(1) By e-mail (secured / encrypted) (2) Via online platform administered by the government (3) Via online platform administered by a private service provider
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes (1) By e-mail (regular) (2) By e-mail (secured / encrypted) (3) Via online platform administered by the government (4) Via online platform administered by a private service provider
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes – Via online platform administered by the government
<b>Canada</b>	Other – "Canadian rules of civil procedure do not apply to the service of judicial documents in Canada in the context of foreign judicial procedures. While execution of service by electronic means in Canada in the context of foreign judicial procedures is not prohibited, there is no system in place at present for Canadian Central Authorities to execute service by such means.

	Les règles de procédure civile au Canada ne s'appliquent pas à la signification d'actes judiciaires au Canada dans le cadre de procédures judiciaires étrangères. Bien que l'exécution de la signification par voie électronique au Canada dans le cadre de procédures judiciaires étrangères ne soit pas interdite, il n'existe actuellement aucun système permettant aux Autorités centrales canadiennes d'exécuter la signification par de tels moyens”
<b>China</b>	Yes - (1) By e-mail (regular) (2) By e-mail (secured / encrypted) (3) Via online platform administered by the government “According to Article 90 of the Civil Procedure law of the People’s Republic of China, with to consent of the person on whom a litigation document is to be served, a people’s court may serve the litigation document by electronic means through which the receipt of the document can be confirmed. According to Article 10 of the Opinion on Further Strengthening Service Work in Civil Procedure, in strict compliance with the conditions prescribed by the civil procedure law and the judicial interpretation of the law regarding the use of electronic service, people’s courts may actively explore the effective ways of electronic service and the preservation of service proof. A court with necessary resources may establish a special electronic service platform. It may also carry out electronic service by way of litigation service platform, as well as serve documents through a special email address, a specific communication number or an information public account by cooperating with large portal websites and communication operators. According to Article 11 of the above Opinion, if the service is effected by fax or e-mail, the court shall record the sending and receiving fax numbers or e-mail addresses, sending time, as well as names of litigation documents served, and print the fax sending confirmation sheet or the web page for successful e-mail sending, saving it for future reference. According to Article 12 of the above Opinion, if the service is effected by SMS, wechat or other means, the court shall record the sending and receiving mobile phone numbers, the sending time, as well as names of the litigation documents served, and take photos of the contents delivered by SMS, wechat or other means, saving them for future reference”.
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes - Via online platform administered by the government
<b>Estonia</b>	Yes
<b>France</b>	Oui - Par transmission électronique via une plateforme en ligne administrée par un prestataire de services privé
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	Yes - “By secured electronic means (Section 173 of the German Code of Civil Procedure [Zivilprozessordnung - ZPO])”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes - Via online platform administered by the government
<b>India</b>	Yes - By e-mail (regular)
<b>Ireland</b>	Other - “Only where court order in place allowing service to specific e-mail address”.
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Other - “Unknown”.
<b>Lithuania</b>	No

<b>Mexico</b>	Yes
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes - By e-mail (regular)
<b>Norway</b>	Other – “This is only possible for the execution of service on the person, but not the transmission to/from other states”.
<b>Philippines</b>	No
<b>Poland</b>	Other – “Via online platform administered by the government only for professional attorneys when the document is without paper attachments”.
<b>Portugal</b>	No
<b>Romania</b>	No
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes - By e-mail (regular)
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes - Via online platform administered by the government
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes – Via online platform administered by the government
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes – “1. if the addressee agrees to be served at a specific email address and 2. if the addressee acknowledges receipt of service at the sam email address”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	Other – “See Rule 4 of the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure or applicable U.S. state civil procedure rules for the competent parties in the United States who can effect service and how service is effected. Service by electronic means may be allowed but typically only if the parties consent to service by email or a U.S. court grants permission in domestic litigation to serve by email. Service by email is not a form of service currently utilized by the U.S. Central Authority (and ABC Legal) under the Convention”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Other – “The execution of service via electronic means is possible but some conditions must be satisfied in accordance with Resolution no. 04/2016/NQ-HDTP dated 30/12/2016 guiding some provisions of the Civil Procedure Code no. 92/2015/QH13, Law on Administrative Procedure no. 93/2015/QH13 on sending, receiving the claims, documents and evidence as well as issuing, serving and notifying judicial documents via electronic means. At present, the Supreme Court has implemented 2 different options for registration of submitting and receiving the documents by electronic means through the Portal of The Supreme People’s Court: Option 1: Comprehensive package: (i) Submission of claims and tracking its process (ii) Registration of receiving judicial documents (iii) Receiving judicial documents Digital certificate is required to use this option and can be downloaded at <a href="http://nopdonkhoikien.toaan.gov.vn/download">http://nopdonkhoikien.toaan.gov.vn/download</a> Option 2: Partial package Receiving judicial document only. Registration at <a href="https://xacthuc.dichvucong.gov.vn">https://xacthuc.dichvucong.gov.vn</a> ”

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(31.1)</b>	<b>If no, what are your State’s reasons for refusing to execute the requests for service to be performed by using information technology?</b>
<b>Croatia</b>	Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in your State
<b>Georgia</b>	Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in your State
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	Use of technology is not provided for internal law
<b>Ireland</b>	Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in your State
<b>Israel</b>	Other – “According to Israeli law the first document to be served or the statement of claim cannot be transmitted electronically”.
<b>Japan</b>	Use of technology is not provided for internal law Other – “Under constructing the system for electronic transmission”.



<b>Kazakhstan</b>	Use of technology is prohibited by internal law
<b>Lithuania</b>	Other – “Electronic service is possible if the addressee has previously agreed to such method of service. In cases with a foreign element (incoming requests), it is generally not possible to obtain such prior consent. Therefore, even if the request and documents have been received electronically, the documents to be served shall be printed and served on paper”.
<b>Montenegro</b>	Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in your State
<b>Norway</b>	Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in your State
<b>Portugal</b>	Use of technology is not provided for internal law Other – “It is possible to use technology for service, but it is limited, at this time, to legal representatives of the parties (lawyers or solicitors) through a specific portal”.
<b>Romania</b>	Other – “It is not provided by the international law”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Use of technology is not provided for internal law

\*\_\*\_\*

(32) What challenges, if any, has your State faced regarding the use of information technology under the Service Convention?	
<b>Argentina</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) Security concerns
<b>Australia</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) Cost (4) Security concerns
<b>Austria</b>	None
<b>Brazil</b>	Other - “Lack of reciprocity from many of our partners, since many countries only accept paper requests. Also, many countries have difficulties accepting electronic signatures”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	(1) Judicial or administrative structures (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) System interoperability / compatibility
<b>Canada</b>	(1) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (2) Cost (3) System interoperability / compatibility (4) Security concerns
<b>China</b>	Internal law limitations – “This refers to the different domestic laws of different countries on whether hard copy must be served. As a result, information technology cannot be widely promoted under the Convention”.
<b>Croatia</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Judicial or administrative structures; Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) System interoperability / compatibility (4) Security concerns
<b>Czech Republic</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) System interoperability / compatibility Other – “There are internal law limitations to verify the sender of the request (the requesting authority) and integrity of documents”.
<b>Estonia</b>	(1) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure)

	(2) Costs (3) System interoperability / compatibility (4) Security concerns
<b>France</b>	(1) Difficultés de mise en œuvre (par ex., le manque de ressources, le manque d’infrastructures) (2) Coût
<b>Georgia</b>	None
<b>Germany</b>	Security concerns Other – “Media discontinuity as requests are received by post due to security reasons”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Judicial or administrative structures
<b>Hungary</b>	(1) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (2) Security concerns
<b>India</b>	None
<b>Ireland</b>	(1) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (2) Cost (3) System interoperability / compatibility (4) Security concerns
<b>Israel</b>	None
<b>Japan</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure)
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	None
<b>Latvia</b>	None
<b>Lithuania</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Judicial and administrative structures (3) System interoperability / compatibility (4) Security concerns
<b>Mexico</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Judicial or administrative structures (3) Implementation challenges (4) System interoperability/compatibility
<b>Montenegro</b>	Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure)
<b>Nicaragua</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure)
<b>Norway</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Judicial or administrative structures (3) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (4) Cost (5) System interoperability / compatibility (6) Security concerns
<b>Philippines</b>	Implementation challenges (e.g. lack of resources, lack of infrastructure)
<b>Poland</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Judicial or administrative structures; Implementation challenges (e.g. lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) System interoperability / compatibility (4) Security concerns
<b>Portugal</b>	Internal law limitations
<b>Romania</b>	None
<b>Serbia</b>	None
<b>Slovenia</b>	(1) Internal law limitations

	(2) Judicial or administrative structures (3) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (4) Cost (5) System interoperability / compatibility
<b>Slovakia</b>	(1) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (2) System interoperability / compatibility (3) Security concerns
<b>Sweden</b>	(1) Judicial or administrative structures (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) Cost (4) System interoperability / compatibility
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Internal law limitations
<b>United States of America</b>	Other – “Incoming requests for service under the Convention are too voluminous; too many documents are sent, making electronic transmission impossible”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	(1) Internal law limitations (2) Implementation challenges (e.g., lack of resources, lack of infrastructure) (3) Cost (4) System interoperability / compatibility (5) Security concerns

\*\_\*\_\*

(33) In your State’s opinion, what further work could the PB do on the use of information technology under the Service Convention?	
<b>Argentina</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Australia</b>	Other – “Australia agrees that additional guidance and information about the practical experience of Contracting Parties in this area would be useful, however in our view, this information would better be incorporated into the new edition of the Handbook than a standalone a Guide to Good Practice”.
<b>Austria</b>	Other – “Making electronic systems compatible”
<b>Brazil</b>	Other - “Stimulate all the countries to use electronic transmission, preferably by regular e-mail, as other initiatives that involve developing systems tend to take too long to develop and some are closed down shortly after they start being used and some don't even get to be used at all. If the development of a system becomes unavoidable, the same interface should be used for requests under all HCCH Conventions. Multiple systems should be avoided, but they may be acceptable if there is only one interface. Stimulate information exchange and confidence building among Members for the acceptance of electronic signatures. An idea would be to have an area on the website to disseminate information about each countries' valid electronic signatures”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Canada</b>	None
<b>China</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice – “It is recommended to collect widely the positions and legal provisions of various Contracting Parties regarding information technology, so that the requesting State can determine whether to submit the request electronically”.
<b>Croatia</b>	None
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Estonia</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>France</b>	Élaboration d’un Guide de bonnes pratiques

<b>Georgia</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Germany</b>	Other – “A similar project as I-support could be envisaged”.
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	None
<b>Hungary</b>	None
<b>India</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Ireland</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Israel</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Japan</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	None
<b>Latvia</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Lithuania</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Mexico</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Montenegro</b>	None
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Norway</b>	None
<b>Philippines</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Poland</b>	Other – “[C]reating an online forms to send to the authority or download a blank, editable PDF form”.
<b>Portugal</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Romania</b>	Other – “[T]he development of a Country Profile”.
<b>Serbia</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Slovenia</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice
<b>Slovakia</b>	None
<b>Sweden</b>	None
<b>United Kingdom</b>	None – “Here, England and Wales and Northern Ireland suggest the PB need not do further work, but Scotland has suggested the Development of a Guide to Good Practice”.
<b>United States of America</b>	Development of a Guide to Good Practice Other – “Further clarification from countries whether they allow service by email. Promoting the use of electronic means to transmit service requests and proofs of service”.
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Other – “Adding and updating the use of information technology under the Service Convention into the Handbook”.

\*\_\*\_\*

(34) In addition to the Service Convention, is your State a Party to any bilateral, regional, or multilateral agreements that provide rules for the service of documents abroad?

<b>Argentina</b>	Yes
<b>Australia</b>	Yes
<b>Austria</b>	Yes
<b>Belgium</b>	Yes
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes – “Within the EU, the matter is governed by the Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast). Articles 5 and 37(2) of it and its implementing Regulation oblige Member States to start using a decentralised IT system for transmission of requests and communication related to the service of documents at the latest by 1 May 2025”.
<b>Canada</b>	Yes

<b>China</b>	Yes
<b>Croatia</b>	Yes
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes
<b>Estonia</b>	No
<b>France</b>	Oui “- Convention de La Haye du 1er mars 1954 - Conventions bilatérales d'entraide judiciaire: Algérie (1962), Australie (1922), Bahamas (1922), Belgique (1956), Bénin (1975), Brésil (1996), Bulgarie (1989), Burkina Faso (1961), Cameroun (1974), Canada (1922 et Entente franco-québécoise du 9 septembre 1977), Chine (1987), Congo, Côte d'Ivoire (1961), Djibouti (1986), Égypte (1982), Émirats arabes unis (1991), Fédération de Russie (1936), Gabon (1963), Hongrie, Italie (1955), Lituanie (1928), Luxembourg (1870), Madagascar (1973), Mali (1962), Maroc (1957), Mauritanie (1961), Monaco (1949), Mongolie (1994), Niger (1977), Nouvelle-Zélande (1922), République centrafricaine (1965), République démocratique populaire lao (1956), République tchèque (1984), République-Unie de Tanzanie (1922), Roumanie (1974), Saint-Marin (1967), Sénégal (1974), Slovaquie (1984), Suisse (1913), Tchad (1976), Togo ( 1976), Tunisie (1972), Uruguay (1991), Vietnam (1999). - Règlement (UE) 2020/1784 du 25 novembre 2020 (refonte) relatif à la signification et à la notification dans les Etats membres des actes judiciaires et extrajudiciaires en matière civile ou commerciale, qui remplace le règlement (CE) n° 1393/2007 du Conseil”.
<b>Georgia</b>	Yes
<b>Germany</b>	Yes
<b>Hong Kong SAR</b>	No
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes
<b>India</b>	No
<b>Ireland</b>	No
<b>Israel</b>	Yes
<b>Japan</b>	No
<b>Kazakhstan</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes
<b>Mexico</b>	Yes
<b>Montenegro</b>	Yes
<b>Nicaragua</b>	Yes
<b>Norway</b>	Yes
<b>Philippines</b>	Yes – “For instance, Treaty on Mutual Legal Assistance in Criminal Matters”.
<b>Poland</b>	Yes – “Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters and bilateral conventions on judicial co-operation: Belarus, Bulgaria, People’s Republic of China, Czech Republic, Egypt, Estonia, Finland, France, Germany, Greece, Italy, Latvia, Lithuania, Russian Federation, Turkey and Ukraine”.
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes
<b>Serbia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes
<b>United Kingdom</b>	Yes

<b>United States of America</b>	Yes
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes

\*\_\*\_\*

<b>(34.1) Do any of these agreements provide for the use of electronic means (e.g., e-mail) to transmit or execute requests for service?</b>	
<b>Australia</b>	Yes – “Bilateral treaties with New Zealand, the Kingdom of Thailand, and the Republic Korea. Australia is also a party to a number of bilateral treaties between the UK and some European countries. These treaties were then extended to Australia due to its place in the Commonwealth of Nations. Although they do not expressly provide for the use of electronic means, there is also nothing to prohibit their use”.
<b>Belgium</b>	No
<b>Brazil</b>	Yes – “Many of the treaties are technology neutral and thus permit the electronic transmission of requests. Also, as soon as the "Protocolo de Medellín" is in force in Brazil, requests will also be exchanged electronically using the Iber@ system. An initiative of the COMJIB, the Protocol provides for the electronic transmission of mutual legal assistance requests in civil or criminal matters and is open to the accession of any other State”.
<b>Bulgaria</b>	Yes – “Within the EU, the matter is governed by the Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast). Articles 5 and 37(2) of it and its implementing Regulation oblige Member States to start using a decentralised IT system for transmission of requests and communication related to the service of documents at the latest by 1 May 2025”.
<b>Canada</b>	No
<b>China</b>	No
<b>Croatia</b>	No
<b>Czech Republic</b>	Yes – “Bilateral and multilateral Agreements/Conventions have been concluded many years ago and, therefore, they are technological neutral. However, in our opinion, they do not prohibit to use of electronic means. Within the EU, as regard the Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast) - see the coordinated answer of the EU”.
<b>France</b>	Oui – “Règlement (UE) 2020/1784 du 25 novembre 2020 relatif à la signification et à la notification dans les Etats membres des actes judiciaires et extrajudiciaires en matière civile ou commerciale (refonte)”.
<b>Georgia</b>	No
<b>Germany</b>	Yes – “1. Supplementary agreements to the Hague Convention of 17 July 1905 and/or of 1 March 1954 were concluded with: Norway (Berlin, 2 August 1909; Oslo, 17 June 1977); Switzerland (Berlin, 30 April 1910; and 24 December 1929 – in particular Article 18). 2. Bilateral conventions on judicial co-operation: United Kingdom (London, 20 March 1928 – Articles 2 to 7). United Kingdom (1928) which also applies to States other than the United Kingdom, e.g., Australia, the Bahamas, Canada, Malaysia and New Zealand; Greece (Athens, 11 May 1938 – Articles 1 to 6); Liechtenstein (17 February / 29 May 1958); Morocco (Rabat, 29 October 1985); Tunisia (Bonn, 19 July 1966), Turkey (Ankara, 28 May 1929 – Articles 9 to 17), United States of America (29

	October 1954). 3. Within the EU, the Regulation (EC) No 1393/2007 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 13 November 2007 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents), and repealing Council Regulation (EC) No 1348/2000 (Service of Documents Regulation) has been replaced by Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast) (Service of Documents Recast Regulation). Articles 5 and 37(2) of the Service of Documents Recast Regulation and its implementing Regulation oblige Member States to start using a decentralised IT system for transmission of requests and communication related to the service of documents at the latest by 1 May 2025. Only no. 3 provides for the use of electronic means. An answer to this question is also given by the European Union”.
<b>Hungary</b>	Yes – “Please see response of the European Union”.
<b>Israel</b>	No
<b>Latvia</b>	Yes – “The electronical means is not specified in these agreements, but it also is no prohibited to use electronical channels : Agreement of 3 February 1993 between the Republic of Latvia and the Russian Federation on legal assistance and legal relations in civil, family and criminal matters; Agreement of 14 April 1993 between the Republic of Moldova and the Republic of Latvia on legal assistance and legal relations in civil, family and criminal matters; Agreement of 21 February 1994 between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Belarus on legal assistance and legal relations in civil, family and criminal matters; Agreement of 23 May 1995 between the Republic of Latvia and Ukraine on legal assistance and legal relations in civil, family, labour and criminal matters; Agreement of 23 May 1996 between the Republic of Latvia and the Republic of Uzbekistan on legal assistance and legal relations in civil, family, labour and criminal matters; Agreement of 10 April 1997 between the Republic of Latvia and the Kyrgyz Republic on legal assistance and legal relations in civil, family and criminal matters”.
<b>Lithuania</b>	Yes – “EU Service Regulation 2020/1784”
<b>Mexico</b>	No
<b>Montenegro</b>	No
<b>Nicaragua</b>	No
<b>Norway</b>	No
<b>Poland</b>	No
<b>Portugal</b>	Yes – “Regulation 2020/1784”.
<b>Serbia</b>	No
<b>Slovenia</b>	Yes – “Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast)”.
<b>Slovakia</b>	Yes – “Regulation (EU) 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 November 2020 on the service in the Member States of judicial and extrajudicial documents in civil or commercial matters (service of documents) (recast). Furthermore, we refer to the relevant parts of the European Union reply, especially reply to question 3”.
<b>Sweden</b>	Yes – “Regulation EU No 2020/1784 of the European Parliament and of the Council of 25 Nobember on the service in the Member States of judicial and

	extrajudicial documents in civil and commercial matter will provide the use of electronic means from april 2025”.
<b>United Kingdom</b>	No
<b>United States of America</b>	No
<b>Viet Nam</b>	Yes – “Viet Nam has signed 18 bilateral Agreements on mutual legal assistance in civil matters with the following countries: Slovensko - Czech and Slovakia succeed (12 October 1982); Cuba (30 November 1984); Bulgaria (03 October 1986); Poland (22 March 1993); Lao PDR (06 July 1998 – newly signed on 11/1/2023 –not yet into force); Russia (25 August 1998); People's Republic of China (19 October 1998); France (24 February 1999); Ukraine (06 April 2000); Mongolia(17 April 2000); Belarus (14 September 2000); North Korea (3 May 2002); Chinese Taipei (12 April 2010); Kazakhstan (31 October 2011); Kingdom of Cambodia (21 January 2013); Hungary (10 September 2018), Thailand (16 November 2022 – not yet into force). E- service is provided in several Agreements such as MLA VN- Hungary (Art 10 para 5), MLA VN- Thailand ( Art 12 para 7), MLA VN- Laos (Art 14 para 6)”.

\*\_\*\_\*