

QUESTIONNAIRE ON THE USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY IN THE OPERATION OF THE SERVICE CONVENTION

Objectives of the Questionnaire

As its March 2019 meeting, the Council on General Affairs and Policy of the HCCH mandated the Permanent Bureau (PB) to conduct work with respect to the development of an electronic system to support and improve the operation of both the *HCCH Convention of 15 November 1965 on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil or Commercial Matters* (Service Convention) and the *HCCH Convention of 18 March 1970 on the Taking of Evidence Abroad in Civil or Commercial Matters* (Evidence Convention).

This Questionnaire is being circulated with a view to preparing an update for the Council at its 2020 meeting. As mandated by Council in Conclusion & Recommendation No 40, the update will address the following issues: whether and how information technology would support and improve the operation of the Convention; current practices on the electronic transmission of requests under the Convention; legal and technological barriers to such transmission and how best to address these; and how a possible international system for electronic transmission would be financed.

The objective of this Questionnaire is therefore to collect information from Contracting Parties to the Service Convention relating to current laws and practices, as well as legal and technical challenges.

Instructions for completion

This Questionnaire is being sent to Central Authorities of Contracting Parties to the Service Convention, as well as National and Contact Organs of Members of the HCCH. For Members, National Organs are invited to coordinate with Central Authorities, if applicable. Central Authorities are also asked to coordinate as appropriate with other competent authorities. For Contracting Parties to the Convention which are not HCCH Members, Central Authorities are ultimately responsible for submitting the completed Questionnaire to the PB.

We kindly request that responses to this Questionnaire are completed at this link no later than **Friday 29 November 2019, 5.00 p.m. CET**.

This questionnaire is divided into three Parts:

Part 1 relates to the use of information technology under the Service Convention;

Part 2 relates to statistical information in relation to requests for service abroad under both the Convention and other methods/instruments;

Part 3 relates to the Practical Information provided on the HCCH website, including contact details for the relevant authorities under the Service Convention.

States are invited to complete as many Parts of the questionnaire as possible. Even where Your State is not a Contracting Party to the Convention, you are invited to complete as much of the questionnaire as possible (*e.g.* Part 2), with the data available.

For your information, where a question requires an answer that is an estimated percentage, please round your estimate down. Where a question requires specific data for a given year or category, please answer providing as much data as is available, even if incomplete.

In this questionnaire, reference is made to the following terms, as defined below:

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 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).

The PB intends to present information collected in these responses to the Questionnaire to the Council on General Affairs and Policy at its 2020 meeting. Information collected in these responses may also be posted on the HCCH website (www.hcch.net), except where expressly asked not to do so. **Please therefore clearly identify any responses which you do not want to be made publicly available.**

Thank you for your kind co-operation as the PB prepares for future work on the use of information technology under the Service Convention.

Please note:

- You can save your response to this Questionnaire at any time by pressing the “resume later” button on the bottom left-hand corner of your screen. You will be asked to create a name and password which you will then need to re-enter when you wish to resume your response.
- If you wish to return to a previous question when completing this Questionnaire, you should press the ‘previous’ button at the bottom of the page and not the back button in your web browser.

Identification for follow-up only

(this information will not be published on the HCCH website):

NAME of STATE or territorial unit: Canada
Name of contact person: Valérie Simard
Name of Authority / Office: Justice Canada
Telephone number: 613-957-1224
E-mail address: Please insert text here valerie.simard@justice.gc.ca

PART 1: USE OF INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY UNDER THE SERVICE CONVENTION

General	
1.1 To what extent is Your State in favour of the use of information technology to facilitate the operation of the Service Convention?	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Strongly in favour <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat in favour <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Neutral <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat against <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly against</p> <p>Comments: Canada is not against the use of information technology (IT) to facilitate the operation of the Service Convention but notes that the use of IT may have cost implications as further set out below.</p> <p>Le Canada n'est pas contre l'utilisation de la technologie de l'information (TI) pour faciliter l'application de la Convention Notification, mais il note que l'utilisation de la TI peut avoir des répercussions sur les coûts, comme il est expliqué ci-dessous.</p>
1.2 Is the transmission by electronic means of requests for service possible under the internal law of Your State?	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes Please provide the specific provision/s: <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Comments: There appears to be no legal limitation with respect to the transmission of requests under Article 3 from Canadian forwarding authorities to foreign Central Authorities (CAs). With respect to the transmission of requests from foreign forwarding authorities to Canadian Central Authorities, there may be practical limitations for the reception of such requests (e.g. the cost that may have to be borne by CAs to print the documents to be served). In addition, some Canadian CAs require prepayment under Article 12 in the form of a cheque. If requests were received electronically, they would have to set up a system to receive electronic payment.</p>

	<p>Il ne semble pas y avoir de limite légale en ce qui concerne la transmission des demandes en vertu de l'article 3 par les autorités expéditrices canadiennes aux Autorités centrales (AC) étrangères. En ce qui concerne la transmission des demandes des autorités expéditrices étrangères aux Autorités centrales canadiennes, il peut y avoir des limites pratiques à la réception de telles demandes (p. ex. le coût qui peut être assumé par les AC pour imprimer les documents à signifier). De plus, certaines AC canadiennes exigent un paiement anticipé sous forme de chèque en vertu de l'article 12. Si les demandes étaient reçues par voie électronique, il faudrait mettre en place un système pour recevoir les paiements électroniques.</p>
<p>1.3 Is the execution by electronic means of requests for service possible under the internal law of Your State?</p>	<p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes Please provide the specific provision/s: <input type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Comments: The service in Canada of foreign judicial documents through electronic means would not in itself be inconsistent with Canadian laws. However, it could give rise to subsequent difficulties with respect to the recognition and enforcement of an ensuing foreign judgment. Moreover, even if there is no legal impediment to serving these documents electronically, Canadian central authorities currently may not be in a position to certify such service under Article 6 of the Convention.</p> <p>La signification ou la notification au Canada d'actes judiciaires étrangers par voie électronique ne serait pas en soi incompatible avec les lois canadiennes. Toutefois, elles pourraient donner lieu à des difficultés ultérieures en ce qui concerne la reconnaissance et l'exécution d'un jugement étranger subséquent. De plus, même s'il n'existe aucun obstacle juridique à la signification ou à la notification de ces actes par voie électronique, les autorités centrales canadiennes pourraient actuellement ne pas être en mesure de certifier cette signification ou notification en vertu de l'article 6 de la Convention.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Yes Please provide the specific provision/s: <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No</p> <p>Comments:</p>
<p>1.5 Has Your State encountered any challenges regarding the use of information technology to facilitate</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> No <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes:</p>

<p>the operation of the Service Convention?</p> <p>(Please select all that apply)</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Internal law limitations <input type="checkbox"/> Judicial or administrative structures <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation challenges (e.g. lack of resources) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Costs <input type="checkbox"/> Selection of the appropriate technology <input type="checkbox"/> System interoperability / compatibility <input type="checkbox"/> Security concerns <input type="checkbox"/> Cooperation with other Contracting Parties <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other challenges <p>Please specify: Canadian governmental authorities are not typically involved in the transmission of documents abroad under the Convention. Where the Convention applies, requests for service are transmitted by a Canadian forwarding authority, usually a lawyer in private practice. We are not aware of any issues experienced by Canadian forwarding authorities with respect to the use of IT and the operation of the Convention. We are also not aware of their practice, if any, with respect to the use of IT to transmit requests to foreign Central Authorities.</p> <p>Please see our response to question 1.2 above with respect to cost implications for incoming requests and 1.3 with respect to the certification of the service under Article 6 of the Convention.</p> <p>Les autorités gouvernementales canadiennes ne participent généralement pas à la transmission d'actes judiciaires à l'étranger en vertu de la Convention. Lorsque la Convention s'applique, les demandes de signification sont transmises par une autorité expéditrice canadienne, habituellement un avocat du secteur privé. Nous n'avons connaissance d'aucun problème rencontré par les autorités expéditrices canadiennes en ce qui concerne l'utilisation des TI et le fonctionnement de la Convention. Nous ne connaissons pas non plus leur pratique, le cas échéant, en ce qui concerne l'utilisation des TI pour transmettre des demandes aux Autorités centrales étrangères.</p> <p>Veillez-vous reporter à notre réponse à la question 1.2 ci-dessus en ce qui concerne les incidences financières des demandes reçues et à la question 1.3 concernant la certification de signification en vertu de l'article 6 de la Convention.</p>
<p>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?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <input type="checkbox"/> Strongly in favour <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat in favour <input type="checkbox"/> Neutral

	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat against</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Strongly against</p> <p>Please explain your reasoning, if possible: Our opposition relates to the impact of operating such as system on the Hague Conference's budget and resources and on a shift of the Hague Conference's focus towards the operation of "systems" to the detriment of its legislative activities (by adding another system to those operated by the Conference in addition to iSupport and the possible development of a system to transfer support payments). In addition, we question whether such a system would be widely used.</p> <p>Notre opposition porte sur l'impact du fonctionnement d'un tel système sur le budget et les ressources de la Conférence de La Haye et sur un déplacement de l'attention de la Conférence de La Haye vers le fonctionnement de " systèmes " au détriment de ses activités législatives (en ajoutant un autre système à ceux gérés par la Conférence en plus de iSupport et le développement possible d'un système de transfert des pensions alimentaires). En outre, nous nous demandons si un tel système serait largement utilisé.</p>
<p>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?</p> <p>(Please select all that apply)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Internal law limitations</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Judicial or administrative structures</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Implementation challenges (e.g. lack of resources)</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Costs</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Selection of the appropriate technology</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> System interoperability / compatibility</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Security concerns</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Cooperation with other Contracting Parties</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other challenges</p> <p>Please specify: See also our response to question 1.6.</p> <p>The existence of a platform would not necessarily remove legal barriers that may be present in some Contracting Parties for the use of IT to transmit requests for service abroad or to execute foreign requests.</p> <p>The Convention does not contain any provision requiring the use of such a platform and it is unclear whether an eventual platform would be used by a sufficient number of Contracting Parties to justify the cost of its operation.</p> <p>The transmission of requests electronically would have cost implications for CAs (see response to question 1.2).</p>

The platform could raise issues with respect to the collection of costs (in states, such as Canada, that require the prepayment under Article 12).

Voir également notre réponse à la question 1.6.

L'existence d'une plate-forme n'éliminerait pas nécessairement les obstacles juridiques qui peuvent exister dans certaines Parties contractantes en ce qui concerne l'utilisation des TI pour transmettre des demandes de signification ou de notification à l'étranger ou pour exécuter des demandes étrangères.

La Convention ne contient aucune disposition exigeant l'utilisation d'une telle plate-forme et il n'est pas clair si une plate-forme serait utilisée par un nombre suffisant de Parties contractantes pour justifier le coût de son fonctionnement.

La transmission électronique des demandes aurait des répercussions financières pour les AC (voir la réponse à la question 1.2).

La plateforme pourrait soulever des problèmes en ce qui concerne la perception des coûts (dans les États, comme le Canada, qui exigent le paiement anticipé en vertu de l'article 12).

Service: Transmission of Requests

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))?

Canada does not have a national system for the transmission of requests under the main channel using information technology. We are not aware of the practice, if any, of Canadian forwarding authorities with respect to the use of IT to send requests to foreign Central Authorities. As noted elsewhere, Canadian forwarding authorities are generally lawyers in private practice.

Le Canada ne dispose pas d'un système national pour la transmission des demandes par la voie principale. Nous ne sommes pas au courant de la pratique, le cas échéant, des autorités expéditrices canadiennes en ce qui concerne l'utilisation de la TI pour envoyer des demandes aux Autorités centrales étrangères. Comme nous l'avons mentionné ailleurs, les autorités expéditrices canadiennes sont généralement des avocats en pratique privée.

- Fully implemented and operational
- Final stages of implementation
- Implementation in progress
- Under consideration
- Not (yet) under consideration

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)	Art. 10(b)	Art. 10(c)	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Fully implemented and operational
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Final stages of implementation
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Implementation in progress
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Under consideration
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not (yet) under consideration
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	Unknown
<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	Not applicable

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

- E-mail (regular)
 - E-mail (secured/encrypted)
 - Electronic transmission platform administered by a public/State authority
- Please provide details:

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.

Canadian Central Authorities are not currently considering the acceptance of electronic transmission for incoming requests under the main channel. Some Central Authorities have noted that they will accept corrected request forms by email after receiving a paper original.

It is not known if requests are transmitted electronically by Canadian forwarding authorities (please see our response to question 1.5 above).

Les Autorités centrales canadiennes n'envisagent pas actuellement d'accepter la transmission électronique des demandes reçues par le canal principal. Certaines Autorités centrales ont indiqué qu'elles accepteront les formulaires de demande corrigés par courrier électronique après réception d'un original papier.

On ne sait pas si les demandes sont transmises par voie électronique par les autorités expéditrices canadiennes (voir notre réponse à la question 1.5 ci-dessus).

- Electronic transmission platform administered by a private service provider
Please provide details:
- Electronic transmission using digital ledger technology
Please provide details:
- Other
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)

- 100%
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- 0%
- Unknown
- Not applicable

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?

- 100%
- 75%
- 50%
- 25%
- 0%

<p>(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>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:</p> <p>2014: ; most received from: 2015: ; most received from: 2016: ; most received from: 2017: ; most received from: 2018: ; most received from:</p>
<p>1.13 If the Central Authority of Your State has received requests for service <u>transmitted electronically</u> under the Service Convention, on average, what percentage of the documents received are subsequently <u>served electronically</u>?</p> <p>(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> 100% <input type="checkbox"/> 75% <input type="checkbox"/> 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 25% <input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>If possible, please provide details as to how the documents are subsequently served:</p>
<p>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?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Fully implemented and operational <input type="checkbox"/> Final stages of implementation <input type="checkbox"/> Implementation in progress <input type="checkbox"/> Under consideration <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not (yet) under consideration</p>
<p>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?</p> <p><i>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).</i></p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Case management system administered by a public/State authority Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Case management system administered by a private service provider Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Case management system using digital ledger technology Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Other Please provide details:</p>

<p>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.</p>	
<p>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?</p> <p>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).</p>	<p><input type="checkbox"/> Fully electronic system (requests for service stored electronically, electronic display of the progress of the forwarded or received requests for service etc.)</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Part of the procedure for issuance or execution of requests for service is done electronically</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> Electronic database of mainly paper requests and related procedures</p> <p><input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Additional comments: Some Canadian Central Authorities have indicated that they use electronic systems for record-keeping purposes. Certaines Autorités centrales canadiennes ont indiqué qu'elles utilisent des systèmes électroniques à des fins de tenue de dossiers.</p>

Service: Execution of Requests	
<p>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?</p> <p>(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> 100% <input type="checkbox"/> 75% <input type="checkbox"/> 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 25% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x 0% <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable </p>
<p>1.18 When competent authorities of Your State execute requests for service <u>transmitted electronically</u> by another Contracting Party under the Service Convention, in approximately what percentage of instances is the certificate of service then <u>returned electronically</u> to the applicant (Art. 6)?</p> <p>(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)</p> <p>Some Canadian Central Authorities have indicated that they transmit certificates of service electronically upon request.</p> <p>Certaines Autorités centrales canadiennes ont indiqué qu'elles transmettent les certificats de signification par voie électronique sur demande.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> 100% <input type="checkbox"/> 75% <input type="checkbox"/> 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 25% <input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable </p> <p>If possible, please provide details as to how the certificate of service establishing execution is returned:</p>
<p>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)?</p> <p>(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)</p> <p>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.</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> 100% <input type="checkbox"/> 75% <input type="checkbox"/> 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 25% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> x 0% <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable </p> <p>If possible, please provide the following details:</p> <p>Number of such requests:</p> <p>Main Contracting Parties from which such requests were received:</p> <p>Technology(ies) requested:</p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by private e-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by private social media account </p> <p>Please provide details:</p>

	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by public/State-administered email account Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Service by electronic platform of a private provider Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Service by electronic platform of a public/State authority Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Service using distributed ledger technology Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Other Please Specify:
<p>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)?)</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Few requests to serve documents electronically have been presented to Canadian Central Authorities. Generally, Canadian Central Authorities have indicated that they are not in a position to effect service electronically.</p> <p>Peu de demandes de signification électronique ont été présentées aux Autorités centrales canadiennes. En général, les Autorités centrales canadiennes ont indiqué qu'elles ne sont pas en mesure d'effectuer la signification par voie électronique.</p>	<p>Electronic service by private e-mail. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Electronic service by private social media account. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Electronic service by public/State-administered email account. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Service by electronic platform of a private provider. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Service by electronic platform of a public/State authority. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Service using distributed ledger technology. <input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> No <input type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable</p> <p>Other (Please specify): </p>
<p>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? (Please select all that apply)</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is prohibited by internal law <input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is not provided for in internal law <input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in Your State <input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is too resource-intensive

	<input type="checkbox"/> The authority/ies lacks familiarity with the use of the requested technology <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other Please Specify: Costs , policy preference , Coûts , préférence de politique générale
<p>1.22 If Your State performs service electronically, what type of information technology is used? (Please select all that apply)</p> <p>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.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by private e-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by private social media account <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by public/State-administered email account <input type="checkbox"/> Service by electronic platform of a private provider <input type="checkbox"/> Service by electronic platform of a public/State authority <input type="checkbox"/> Service using distributed ledger technology <input type="checkbox"/> Other <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <p>If possible, please provide additional information, e.g. including the methods used, relevant security standards and acknowledgement of receipt mechanisms:</p>
<p>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))?</p> <p>(Please round the estimated percentage down, if applicable)</p> <p>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.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> 100% <input type="checkbox"/> 75% <input type="checkbox"/> 50% <input type="checkbox"/> 25% <input type="checkbox"/> 0% <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Unknown <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable <p>If possible, please provide the following details:</p> <p>Number of such requests:</p> <p>Main Contracting Parties to which such requests were sent:</p> <p>Technology(ies) requested:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by private e-mail <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by private social media account Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Electronic service by public/State-administered email account Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Service by electronic platform of a private provider Please provide details:

	<input type="checkbox"/> Service by electronic platform of a public/State authority Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Service using distributed ledger technology Please provide details: <input type="checkbox"/> Other Please Specify:
<p>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?</p> <p>(Please select all that apply)</p> <p>It is not known if requests were transmitted electronically by Canadian forwarding authorities (please see our response to question 1.5 above). Consequently, it is also unknown whether such requests, if any, were refused.</p> <p>On ne sait pas si les demandes ont été transmises par voie électronique par les autorités expéditrices canadiennes (voir notre réponse à la question 1.5 ci-dessus). Par conséquent, on ne sait pas non plus si ces demandes, le cas échéant, ont été refusées.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is prohibited by internal law <input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is not provided for in internal law <input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is not possible as there is no compatible system in Your State <input type="checkbox"/> Use of technology is too resource-intensive <input type="checkbox"/> The authority/ies lacks familiarity with the use of the requested technology <input type="checkbox"/> Other Please Specify:

For internal use only

PART 2: STATISTICAL DATA AND OVERALL EFFICIENCY OF THE SERVICE CONVENTION

General Satisfaction	
<p>2.1 How does Your State rate the general operation of the Service Convention?</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Excellent <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Good <input type="checkbox"/> Satisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Somewhat unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Completely unsatisfactory <input type="checkbox"/> Not applicable Comments: </p>
Outside of the Service Convention	
<p>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?</p> <p>(Please select all that apply)</p>	<p> <input type="checkbox"/> Procedure provided by internal law Please provide details (including full reference to the applicable legislation or caselaw): </p> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Procedure provided by bilateral agreement(s) Please provide details (including full reference to the applicable agreement/s): To view the bilateral treaties regarding judicial cooperation in civil and commercial matters that are in force for Canada, please visit <u>http://www.accord-treaty.gc.ca/</u> under the headings "Bilateral" and "Judicial Co-operation (civil and commercial)". https://www.treaty-accord.gc.ca/text-texte.aspx?id=100690 </p> <p> <input type="checkbox"/> Procedure provided by multilateral agreement(s) Please provide details (including full reference to the applicable agreement): </p> <p> <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Other procedure (such as consular channels) Please provide details: Canadian law does not prohibit the service of foreign judicial documents by consular officers or private individuals, provided that no element of compulsion is used. </p> <p> Le droit canadien n'interdit pas la signification d'actes judiciaires étrangers par des fonctionnaires consulaires ou des </p>

	particuliers, à condition qu'aucun élément de contrainte ne soit utilisé.
--	---

For internal use only

2.3 Statistical Data

2.3.1 Service Convention (Main Channel, Art. 5(1))

	Incoming Requests Number (exact or average)	Incoming Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Incoming Requests Top 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties	Outgoing Requests Number (exact or average)	Outgoing Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Outgoing Requests Top 3 Requested States
2013				* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2014				* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2015				* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2016				* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2017				* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2018				* unknown	* unknown	* unknown

2.3.2 Internal Law

	Incoming Requests Number (exact or average)	Incoming Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Incoming Requests Top 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties	Outgoing Requests Number (exact or average)	Outgoing Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Outgoing Requests Top 3 Requested States
2013	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2014	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2015	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2016	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2017	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown
2018	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown	* unknown

2.3.3 Bilateral Agreement(s)

	Incoming Requests Number (exact or average)	Incoming Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Incoming Requests Top 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties	Outgoing Requests Number (exact or average)	Outgoing Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Outgoing Requests Top 3 Requested States
2013				N/A	N/A	N/A
2014				N/A	N/A	N/A
2015				N/A	N/A	N/A
2016				N/A	N/A	N/A
2017				N/A	N/A	N/A
2018				N/A	N/A	N/A

2.3.4 Multilateral Agreement(s) (Other than the HCCH Conventions)

	Incoming Requests Number (exact or average)	Incoming Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Incoming Requests Top 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties	Outgoing Requests Number (exact or average)	Outgoing Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Outgoing Requests Top 3 Requested States
2013	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2014	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2015	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2016	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2017	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A
2018	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A	N/A

2.3.5 Other Procedure (such as consular channels)

	Incoming Requests Number (exact or average)	Incoming Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Incoming Requests Top 3 Forwarding Contracting Parties	Outgoing Requests Number (exact or average)	Outgoing Requests Average Timeframe for Execution (months)	Outgoing Requests Top 3 Requested States
2013						
2014						
2015						
2016						
2017						
2018						

For internal use only

PART 3: PRACTICAL INFORMATION

Contact details (the contact details provided in this section will be published on the HCCH website)																	
<p>3.1 Is Your State a Contracting Party to the Service Convention?</p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No																
<p>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?</p> <p><i>See Conclusion and Recommendation No 4 of the 2014 meeting of Special Commission.</i></p> <p>Updates to contact details to follow.</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <p>Info on website is up-to-date</p> <p>Please provide the contact details below:</p> <table border="1" style="width: 100%; border-collapse: collapse;"> <tr> <td style="width: 70%;">Central Authority/ies:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Address:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Telephone:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Fax:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>E-mail:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>General website:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Contact person:</td> <td></td> </tr> <tr> <td>Languages spoken by staff:</td> <td></td> </tr> </table> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable	Central Authority/ies:		Address:		Telephone:		Fax:		E-mail:		General website:		Contact person:		Languages spoken by staff:	
Central Authority/ies:																	
Address:																	
Telephone:																	
Fax:																	
E-mail:																	
General website:																	
Contact person:																	
Languages spoken by staff:																	
<p>3.3 If Your State is a Contracting Party, have details of which authority(ies) are competent to forward requests for service under Article 3 been provided?</p> <p><i>See Conclusion and Recommendation No 21 of the 2009 meeting of Special Commission.</i></p>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <p>Please specify the authorities competent to forward requests under Article 3 below:</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable																
<p>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?</p> <p><i>See Conclusion and Recommendation No 4 of the 2014 meeting of Special Commission.</i></p> <p>Updates to practical information to follow</p>	<input type="checkbox"/> Yes <input type="checkbox"/> No <p>Please provide the updates to the chart using the template available here.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> There is no practical information chart for Your State <p>Please complete one using the template available here.</p> <input type="checkbox"/> Not Applicable																