

---

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

---

[NAME of STATE or territorial unit:]

United States of America

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

Strongly in favour

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

- comment

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

Yes

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

Please provide the specific provision/s:

The U.S. Central Authority, through its designated contractor ABC Legal, permits the electronic transmission of requests for service pursuant to the Hague Service Convention, subject to size and formatting limitations. For more information:

<https://www.abclegal.com/international-service-of-process/faq>.

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

No

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

Service within the scope of the Hague Service Convention is executed in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(2) by personal service only. For service outside the scope of the Hague Service Convention, execution of service by email depends on the state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located or where service is made.

Please provide the specific provision/s:

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

Oui

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

Please provide the specific provision/s:

The U.S. Central Authority, through its designated contractor ABC Legal, permits the electronic transmission of incoming requests for service pursuant to the Inter-American Convention on Letters Rogatory and Additional Protocol, subject to size and formatting limitations. For more information: <https://www.abclegal.com/international-service-of-process/faq>.

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

Yes

---

[Internal law limitations]

Yes

[Judicial or administrative structures]

Yes

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

Yes

[Costs]

Yes

[Selection of the appropriate technology]

No

[System interoperability / compatibility]

No

[Security concerns]

No

[Cooperation with other Contracting Parties]

Yes

[Other Challenges]

No

Please specify:

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

Somewhat in favour

Please explain your reasoning, if possible:

The U.S. Central Authority only receives and executes incoming requests for service pursuant to the Hague Service Convention. For outgoing requests, persons and entities within the United States competent to forward service requests pursuant to Article 3 include any court official, any attorney, or any other person or entity authorized by the rules of the court. Therefore, use of a common electronic platform would prove difficult for the United States as the platform would have to be accessible to all competent forwarding authorities.

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

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

Yes

1.7 What, if any, particular challenges does Your State envisage in relation to the possible use of a common electronic platform to

---

be used by all Contracting Parties in the operation of the Service Convention? [Security concerns]

Yes

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

Yes

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

No

Please specify:

1.8 What is the status of the use of information technology in Your State for the transmission of requests for service under the main channel (i.e. to the Central Authority, Art. 5(1)(a))?

Fully implemented and operational

1.9 What is the status of the use of information technology in Your State for the transmission of requests for service under the alternative channels (Art. 10)? [Art. 10(a)]

Unknown

1.9 What is the status of the use of information technology in Your State for the transmission of requests for service under the alternative channels (Art. 10)? [Art. 10(b)]

Unknown

1.9 What is the status of the use of information technology in Your State for the transmission of requests for service under the alternative channels (Art. 10)? [Art. 10(c)]

Unknown

1.10 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for requests for service under the main channel?

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

Yes

1.10 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for requests for service under the main channel?

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

Yes

1.10 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for requests for service under the main channel?

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

Yes

1.10 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for requests for service under the main channel?

---

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

Yes

1.10 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for requests for service under the main channel?

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

Yes

1.10 What type of electronic transmission does Your State use, or would consider using for requests for service under the main channel?

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

No

Please provide details:

1.11 On average, approximately what percentage of requests for service transmitted electronically by other Contracting Parties does Your State accept?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

75%

1.12 Since 2014, on average, approximately what percentage of requests for service received by Your State were transmitted electronically by forwarding authorities of other Contracting Parties?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

25%

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

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

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

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

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

94

---

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

France, Germany, China

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

724

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

France, Canada, Vietnam

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

909

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

France, Canada, Vietnam

1.13 If the Central Authority of Your State has received requests for service transmitted electronically under the Service Convention, on average, what percentage of the documents received are subsequently served electronically?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

If possible, please provide details as to how the documents are subsequently served:

1.14 What is the status of the implementation of an electronic case management system in Your State for incoming and outgoing requests for service issued pursuant to the Service Convention?

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

Fully implemented and operational

1.15 What type of electronic case management system does Your State use, or would consider using for incoming and outgoing requests for service issued pursuant to the Service Convention?

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

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

Case management system administered by a private service provider

Please provide details:

The case management system applies to incoming requests for service only. Applicants who transmit their request electronically through ABC Legal's website can access their request,

track its status, and download their proof of service and certificate. For more information:

<https://www.abcllegal.com/international-service-of-process/hague-service-convention> and

[https://secure.abcllegal.com/abc/order/enter\\_customer;jsessionid=3073002A0202A452299824913977AD1B](https://secure.abcllegal.com/abc/order/enter_customer;jsessionid=3073002A0202A452299824913977AD1B).

1.16 If Your State uses an electronic case management system for incoming and outgoing requests for service issued pursuant to

---

the Service Convention, which of the following best describes the system?

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

Fully electronic system (requests for service stored electronically, electronic display of the progress of the forwarded or received requests for service etc.)

1.16 If Your State uses an electronic case management system for incoming and outgoing requests for service issued pursuant to the Service Convention, which of the following best describes the system?

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

The case management system applies to incoming requests for service only. For more information:

<https://www.abcllegal.com/international-service-of-process/hague-service-convention> and

[https://secure.abcllegal.com/abc/order/enter\\_customer.jsessionid=3073002A0202A452299824913977AD1B](https://secure.abcllegal.com/abc/order/enter_customer.jsessionid=3073002A0202A452299824913977AD1B).

1.17 In 2018, on average, approximately what percentage of requests for service received by Your State under the Service Convention led to service being performed/effectuated using information technology?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

0%

1.18 When competent authorities of Your State execute requests for service transmitted electronically by another Contracting Party under the Service Convention, in approximately what percentage of instances is the certificate of service then returned electronically to the applicant (Art. 6)?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

100%

If possible, please provide details as to how the certificate of service establishing execution is returned:

If the request was uploaded electronically, the applicant is able to download the proof of service and the certificate of service from ABC Legal's website.

1.19 In 2018, what was the approximate percentage (on average) of requests received by Your State in which the foreign forwarding authority requested service be performed electronically under the Service Convention (Art. 5 (1) b)?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

Unknown

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

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

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

---

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Please provide details:

1.20 Please indicate whether Your State would accept requests of foreign forwarding authorities seeking service to be performed by each of the following methods (under (Art. 5 (1) b)?

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

---

of DLT. [Electronic service by private e-mail]

No

1.20 Please indicate whether Your State would accept requests of foreign forwarding authorities seeking service to be performed by each of the following methods (under (Art. 5 (1) b)?

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

No

1.20 Please indicate whether Your State would accept requests of foreign forwarding authorities seeking service to be performed by each of the following methods (under (Art. 5 (1) b)?

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

No

1.20 Please indicate whether Your State would accept requests of foreign forwarding authorities seeking service to be performed by each of the following methods (under (Art. 5 (1) b)?

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

No

1.20 Please indicate whether Your State would accept requests of foreign forwarding authorities seeking service to be performed by each of the following methods (under (Art. 5 (1) b)?

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

No

1.20 Please indicate whether Your State would accept requests of foreign forwarding authorities seeking service to be performed by each of the following methods (under (Art. 5 (1) b)?

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

No

Other (Please specify):

Service within the scope of the Hague Service Convention is executed in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(2) by personal service only.

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

No



---

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

No

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

No

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

No

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

No

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

Yes

Please Specify:

Service within the scope of the Hague Service Convention is executed in compliance with Federal Rule of Civil Procedure 4(e)(2) by personal service only. For service outside the scope of the Hague Service Convention, execution of service by email depends on the state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located or where service is made.

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

---

of DLT. [Service by electronic platform of a private provider]

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

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

No

1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used?

Distributed ledger technology (DLT): A database held by participants (or nodes) in a decentralised network, where transactions and records are processed, saved and replicated by each node independently and shared with the other nodes, seeking to validate the transaction by achieving consensus on its authenticity. Blockchain is perhaps one of the most well-known of the various forms of DLT. [Not applicable]

Yes

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

1.23 In 2018, what was, on average, the approximate percentage of requests sent by Your State in which your forwarding authority requested service be performed electronically under the Service Convention (Art. 5(1) b)?

(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)

Unknown

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

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

Technology(ies) requested:

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

---

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Technology(ies) requested:

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

No

Please provide details:

1.24 If requests for service sent by Your State seeking the use of information technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal?

---

[Use of technology is prohibited by internal law]

No

1.24 If requests for service sent by Your State seeking the use of information technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal?

[Use of technology is not provided for in internal law]

No

1.24 If requests for service sent by Your State seeking the use of information technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal?

[Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in Your State]

No

1.24 If requests for service sent by Your State seeking the use of information technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal?

[Use of technology is too resource-intensive]

No

1.24 If requests for service sent by Your State seeking the use of information technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal?

[The authority/ies lacks familiarity with the use of the requested technology]

No

1.24 If requests for service sent by Your State seeking the use of information technology have been refused by other Contracting Parties, what was/were the main reason/s given for such a refusal?

[Other]

No

Please Specify:

General Satisfaction

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

Good

General Satisfaction

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

Outside of the Service Convention

2.2 Outside the Service Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to perform service on someone located in the territory of Your State? [Procedure provided by internal law]

Yes

Outside of the Service Convention

2.2 Outside the Service Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to perform service on someone located in the territory of Your State? [Procedure provided by bilateral agreement(s)]

No

Outside of the Service Convention

---

2.2 Outside the Service Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to perform service on someone located in the territory of Your State? [Procedure provided by multilateral agreement(s)]

No

Outside of the Service Convention

2.2 Outside the Service Convention, what is the applicable procedure if an interested person from another jurisdiction wishes to perform service on someone located in the territory of Your State? [Other procedure (such as consular channels)]

No

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

For service outside the scope of the Hague Service Convention, execution of service by email depends on the state law for serving a summons in an action brought in courts of general jurisdiction in the state where the district court is located or where service is made.

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

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

Please provide details:

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

6394

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2013][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

21 days

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

France, Germany, China

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2013][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

### 2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

6828

### 2.3 Statistical Data

---

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2014][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

20 days

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

France, Germany, China

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2014][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

6409

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2015][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

25 days

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2015][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]

France, Germany, Poland

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2015][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

5548

2.3 Statistical Data

---

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2016][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
18 days

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2016][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]  
France, Germany, Turkey

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2016][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
6946

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2017][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
15 days

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2017][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]  
France, Germany, China

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2017][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
7509

2.3 Statistical Data

---

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2018][Incoming RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]  
20 days

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2018][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties]  
France, Germany, Vietnam

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2018][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2018][Outgoing RequestsAverage Timeframe for Execution (months)]

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1)) [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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



---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

---

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
591

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

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2013][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
55

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

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
631

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

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2014][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
59

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

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
584

---

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

28 days

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2015][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
74

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

6 months

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
660

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

21 days

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2016][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
153

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

6 months

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
740

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

22 days

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2017][Outgoing RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
153

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

6 months

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

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions) [2018][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
838

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

21 days

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

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

---

93

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
116

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]  
Austria, Jordan, South Africa

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2013][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
140

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Incoming RequestsTop 3 Forwarding States]  
Austria, South Africa, Thailand

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2014][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
97

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

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

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2015][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Incoming RequestsNumber (exact or average)]  
124

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

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

---

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2016][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

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

98

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

23 days

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

Austria, Jordan, Thailand

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2017][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

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

125

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

17 days

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

Austria, Jordan, Thailand

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

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

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels) [2018][Outgoing RequestsTop 3 Requested States]

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

Yes

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

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

Yes

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

Please provide the contact details below: [Address:]

Please provide the contact details below: [Telephone:]

Please provide the contact details below: [Fax:]

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

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

---

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

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

3.3 If Your State is a Contracting Party have the details of which authority(ies) are competent to forward requests for service under Article 3 been provided?

See Conclusion & Recommendation No 21 of the 2009 meeting of Special Commission.

Yes

Please specify the authorities competent to forward requests under Article 3 below:

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

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

Yes

Please provide the updates to the chart using the template available [here](#).