

Questionnaire concerning the Practical Operation of the 1980 Child Abduction Convention

Wherever responses to this Questionnaire make reference to domestic legislation, rules, guidance or case law relating to the practical operation of the 1980 Convention, **please provide a copy of the referenced documentation** in (a) the original language and, (b) wherever possible, accompanied by a translation into English and / or French.

Name of State or territorial unit: ¹	Perú
<i>For follow-up purposes</i>	
Name of contact person:	
Name of Authority / Office:	
Telephone number:	
E-mail address:	
Date:	

PART I – PRACTICAL OPERATION OF THE 1980 CONVENTION

Recent developments in your State²

1. Since the 2017 SC, have there been any significant developments in your State regarding the **legislation** or **procedural rules** applicable in cases of international child abduction? Where possible, please state the reason for the development and the results achieved in practice.

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

They are in project

2. Following the Covid-19 pandemic,³ have there been any **improvements** that have remained in your State in the following areas, in particular in relation to the **use of information technology**, as a result of newly adopted procedures or practices applicable to child abduction cases? In each case, please describe the tools, guidelines or protocols put in place.

- a) Methods for accepting and processing return and access applications and their accompanying documentation;

At Central Authority level: Following the Covid 19 pandemic, within the framework of Law 31170 - Law that provides for the implementation of the digital parts desk, the Virtual Parts Desk was implemented by accessing the Link: <https://sgd.mimp.gob.pe/mpde>

Interviews with abducting parents are also conducted via Zoom, Google Meet and Whats App.

At the level of the judiciary: after the Covid 19 pandemic, we consider that there have been improvements in the processing of judicial processes, including international restitution processes, since we use applications such as:

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

² This Part of the Questionnaire is intended to deal primarily with the developments in law and practice relating to international child abduction which have occurred in your State since the Seventh Meeting of the Special Commission (SC) to review the operation of the 1980 Abduction Convention and the 1996 Child Protection Convention (held from 10 to 17 October 2017) ("2017 SC").

³ This question aims to gather information about good practices that were developed in those exceptional circumstances and that will continue to be applied regardless of the pandemic.

- Mesa de Partes Virtual (SINOE), it is possible to present claims, appeals and all types of procedural documents, from the place where the defendant is located;
- Consult information on the Magistrate hearing the case, on the scheduling of hearings, schedule an appointment with the Magistrate, under the application The Judge listens to you, schedule an appointment for the Table of Parties, through the platform indicated below.

- Conduct hearings using Google Meet, Zom and Whats App. This makes it easier for the parties to the proceedings to be heard from wherever they are; it is not necessary for them to come to Peru, as they can participate in the hearings from their place of residence. This makes effective the Principle of Procedural Immediacy that guarantees the direct relationship that must exist in these processes between the Judge and the parties and the Judge and the evidence.

- To carry out the generality of notifications to the parties and third parties by means of Electronic Notification. In these cases, it is no longer necessary to notify by physical letter, which generates delays, since in the case of notifications to persons domiciled abroad, International Letters Rogatory and/or Letters Rogatory are required, which generate expenses and delay the process, since the hearings had to be scheduled within a reasonable period of time until the return of the notification to the country of residence of the parties, if the Judge so ordered. Now, with electronic notification, this notification procedure is shortened and the process is made effective and speedy.

Electronic notification is regulated in Article 155-A of the Texto Único Ordenado de la Ley Organica del Poder Judicial which states: "Electronic notification is an alternative to notification by letter and it is compulsory in all contentious and non-contentious proceedings before the jurisdictional bodies of the Judiciary. (...)". Article 155-D of the above-mentioned Texto Unido Ordenado regulates: "The lawyers of the parties to the proceedings, whether or not they are public defenders, public prosecutors and public prosecutors must register in an electronic box, which is assigned by the Judiciary without exception. The Judiciary, through its Executive Council, is responsible for issuing the necessary provisions to implement and enable the assignment of electronic mailboxes of the Judiciary, as well as the rules for the processing of electronic notifications. The obligatory nature of assigning electronic boxes applies to appeals for cassation that are filed as of the entry into force of this Law and, as long as this obligation is not provided for, notification by writ of summons in accordance with the applicable provisions of the Code of Civil Procedure shall continue to apply. The provisions of the present Law shall not apply to those persons who litigate without captive defence by express provision of the law, unless they so request. "

<https://casillas.pj.gob.pe/sinoe/login.xhtml>

<https://www.gob.pe/institucion/pj/tema/contacto-con-poder-judicial>

<https://www.gob.pe/13971-solicitar-citas-para-mesa-de-partes-en-el-poder-judicial>

- b) Participation of the parties and the child (e.g., appearance in court proceedings, mediation);
At the level of the Judiciary, after the Covid-19 pandemic, we consider that there have been improvements to facilitate the participation of the parties and to listen to the children and/or adolescents involved in these judicial processes, since using the computer applications, Google Meet, Zom and Whats App, it is easier for the parties to the process to be heard from the place where they are, it is not necessary for them to come to Peru, since the hearings can participate from the place of their residence. With virtual hearings, the Principle of Procedural Immediacy becomes effective, which guarantees the direct relationship that should exist in these processes between the Judge and the parties and the Judge and the evidence.

c) Promoting mediation and other forms of amicable resolution;

At the level of the Judiciary, in Peru, mediation procedures are not customary, but rather conciliation procedures; in fact, international return proceedings are governed by the rules of the Single Procedure of the Code for Children and Adolescents, and in accordance with the provisions of Articles 171 and following of the said Code, the judge has the power to convene the parties ex officio to conciliate at a Single Hearing, or at any stage of the proceedings, when they so request. If there is an agreement and it does not harm the interests of the child and/or adolescent, he/she approves it, and the agreement has the effect of a sentence with the authority of res judicata. If there is no agreement, the process continues until the sentence is passed.

d) Making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access, including while pending return proceedings;

At the level of the Central Authority: steps have always been taken to ensure the effective exercise of rights of access, since the applications request the establishment of a provisional visiting regime in favour of the applicant parent who is abroad for the duration of the return proceedings.

At the level of the Judiciary, in Peru, by means of the precautionary measure of a Provisional Visitation Regime, the judge can order Visitation Regimes either in person or virtually for the parent who does not hold de facto custody of the child and/or adolescent; and even at a Single Hearing, the judge can also order such a Visitation Regime, considering that, in accordance with the provisions of Article 9. 3 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child which prescribes that "States Parties shall respect the right of the child who is separated from one or both parents to maintain personal relations and direct contact with both parents on a regular basis, except if it is contrary to the child's best interests".

e) Obtaining evidence by electronic means;

A nivel de la Autoridad Central: las solicitudes y sus respectivos medios probatorios de Restitución Internacional que presentan los residentes en territorio nacional, las remitimos de forma digital a la otra Autoridad Central requirente para que inicie las acciones pertinentes. Asimismo, recibimos de forma digital las solicitudes y sus respectivos medios probatorios remitidas por las diferentes Autoridades Centrales.

Following the Covid-19 pandemic, the Judiciary set up the Virtual Court Bureau (SINOE), where litigants can present their claims, responses to claims, lodge appeals and all types of pleadings, from wherever they are. In this way, they can offer and present, virtually, the means of evidence they deem appropriate, such as documents, witnesses, experts, statements of the parties, and even interviews of minors, which are carried out in the single hearing, through the applications Google Meet, Zom and Whats App, which facilitates that the parties to the process can be heard from the place where they are, it is not necessary that they come to Peru, since the hearings can participate from the place of their residence.

f) Ensuring the safe return of the child;

Ensuring the child's return is a matter of enforcement of judicial decisions, which according to our judicial system, the enforcement of judicial decisions is carried out at the request of the party, so it is the successful party in the process, in this case the plaintiff with the help of the Central Authority, who must carry out the process in order to ensure the safe return of the child and the judge, at his request, dictates

the relevant measures for the safe return of the child to his or her country of habitual residence.

- g) Cooperation between Central Authorities and other authorities;
It has always been applied, there is permanent co-ordination and communication with the central authorities of the other Hague Convention signatory countries, as well as with the liaison judge of the country and other countries.
- h) Providing information and guidance for parties involved in child abduction cases;
It has always been applied, there is permanent communication with users, through e-mails, personal interviews and meetings via Google Meet, Zom and WhatsApp.
- i) Other, please specify.
Please insert text here

3. Please provide the three most **significant decisions concerning the interpretation and application of the 1980 Convention** rendered since the 2017 SC by the relevant authorities⁴ in your State.

Case Name	Court Name	Court Level	Brief summary of the ruling
CASATION 215-2018-ANCASH dated 23.09.2019	TRANSITIONAL CIVIL CHAMBER OF THE SUPREME COURT OF JUSTICE OF THE REPUBLIC	COURT OF CASSATION	The Supreme Court of Justice of the Republic declared the appeal lodged by the plaintiff to be FOUNDED and, consequently, the Judgment of 25 September 2017, which CONFIRMED , which CONFIRMED Resolution No. 32 dated 19 June 2017, which declared the application filed by the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations in its capacity as Peruvian Central Authority for the fulfilment of obligations imposed on the Peruvian State by the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction to be UNFOUNDED , ORDERED the exceptional remand of the case file to the Superior Chamber in order for it to proceed to issue a new judgment, taking into account the considerations set out above. Whereas: "(...) Although it is true that the abduction creates a dramatic situation whose solution does not seem to satisfy anyone, it is no less true that what is sought is to provide a rapid solution that prevents the favouring of the person who broke the family unit. Along these lines, the return of minors cannot be confused with a custody process (although it is a tool for their protection) and therefore cannot lead to unnecessary delays, given that the only thing of interest is to determine whether or not the minor

⁴ The term “relevant authorities” is used in this Questionnaire to refer to the judicial or administrative authorities with decision-making responsibility under the 1980 Convention. Whilst in the majority of Contracting Parties such “authorities” will be courts (i.e., judicial), in some States Parties administrative authorities remain responsible for decision-making in Convention cases.

			<p>should be returned to the place where he or she had his or her habitual residence. This does not in any way mean that the child is left unprotected, but rather that the decision on custody, custody, parental authority or visiting arrangements must be settled in the country of origin (...) v. The evidentiary stage should be kept to a minimum and, in any event, should be carried out as quickly as possible because the aim of the Convention is to restore things to the state they were in before the abduction (...) (...).</p>
<p>EXP. N°: 16460-2016-0-1801-JR-FC-16. DECISION of 13.05.2019</p>	<p>FIRST FAMILY DIVISION OF THE SUPERIOR COURT OF JUSTICE OF LIMA - PERU</p>	<p>SECOND AND FINAL INSTANCE</p>	<p>The First Family Division of the Superior Court of Justice of Lima, REVOKED the Judgment appealed against, which declared the application filed by Desiré Patricia Campos Solgorre against Jaime Carlos Malliza Carrión, regarding the International Return of the minor Ilie Malliza Campos, to be UNFOUNDED; with the rest contained therein, which REFORMED it and declared it to be FOUNDED and consequently ordered the immediate return of the said minor to the United States of America. Whereas: "(...) That in the instant case it has been established (...) that the child Ilie Malliza Campos, aged nine years (to date), has as his "habitual residence" the United States of America, where he lived together with his parents Jaime Carlos Malliza Carrión and Desiré Patricia Campos Solgorre, where both married on 27 September 2014 (see Marriage Certificate fs. 18), both of them residing at 11 North French Avenue, Elmsford, New York; (...) that the plaintiffs have submitted to the American justice system, at the initiative of the present defendant, who filed a petition for custody of his minor child, in accordance with the agreement reached by the parties before the Family Court of the State of New York, County of Westchester, dated January 21, 2015, regarding the custody of the child Ilie Malliza in pages 24/26. (...) that it was the plaintiff who in good faith granted a temporary travel permit for the child to the defendant so that he could come to our country, having become aware of the delicate state of health of the child's father, from 20 August 2015 to</p>

		<p>6 November of the same year (page 29); however, far from returning the child on the agreed date and corroborated by the purchase of the return tickets, he has refused to comply with this agreement, turning this situation into an "unlawful retention", having even led to a rejection of the child's return to our country (page 29), and has refused to return the child on the agreed date. having even led to the child's rejection of his mother, as evidenced by his interview at the Single Hearing Session of 16 January 2017 (fs. 246/248), as well as not allowing the mother to communicate by telephone with her son, as evidenced by the e-mails of fs. 30, 32, 33 and 34, with which, the respondent would be in breach of the custody agreement signed with the respondent, as well as trying to dissociate the child's filial maternal relationship with his mother; (...).) Finally, it can be seen from the file that the unlawful retention of the child by the defendant took place on 6 November 2015, the date on which he should have returned him to the United States, in accordance with the agreement and the tickets purchased, the mother having filed the International Restitution claim through the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations on 24 August 2016, that is, within the period of one year referred to in Article 12 of the aforementioned Hague Convention, for which reason the immediate return of the said child is appropriate, bearing in mind that the child should have been returned to the United States of America on the date of the agreement and the tickets purchased, and that the mother had filed the claim for International Restitution through the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations on 24 August 2016, this is within the period of one year referred to in Article 12 of the aforementioned Hague Convention, and therefore the immediate return of the said child is appropriate, bearing in mind that the child is in the process of disassociating himself from his mother, as can be seen from the interview that the Court conducted with the child, at pages 246/248;</p>
--	--	--

			<p>Therefore, it is appropriate to uphold the grievances expressed by the plaintiff and revoke the appealed decision in all its aspects, especially if the letter submitted by the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations dated 27 December 2018, in which they inform "(...) we have learned that the defendant has taken cognizance of the fact that the child's mother is in the process of disengagement with the child's mother figure, as stated in the interview conducted by the Aquo on page 246/248.) we have learned that the respondent, Jaime Carlos Malliza Carrion, has been detained by the National Police since 20 December of this year, as a result of a police intervention for Illicit Drug Trafficking, in which more than 334 kilos of cocaine hydrochloride were seized...", which does not favour the integral development of the child under guardianship (...);</p>
<p>CASATION 2001-2016 AREQUIPA dated 15.10.2018</p>	<p>SALA CIVIL TRANSITORIA DE LA CORTE SUPREMA DE JUSTICIA DE LA REPUBLICA</p>	<p>COURT OF CASSATION</p>	<p>The Supreme Court of Justice of the Republic declared the appeal filed by Carlina Elsa Álvarez Zeballos to be UNFOUNDED and, consequently, did NOT CASE the judgement of 07 April 2016, issued by the Third Civil Chamber of the Superior Court of Justice of Arequipa, which CONFIRMED the appealed judgement of 23 October 2015, which declared the claim to be FOUNDED. Whereas: "(...) In the present case, the legal issue under debate consists of determining whether or not the High Court has complied with an adequate analysis of the evidence intended to prove that the minor is at risk at the plaintiff's side, thereby erroneously applying the Principle of the Best Interests of the Child (...) That, it must also be taken into account that the experiences a person receives during childhood will be the foundation of his or her adult life. Likewise, for the application of the Principle of the Best Interests of the Child, the paternalistic vision, which considers the minor as a subject of protection, must be set aside, but rather, care must be taken to provide him/her with the necessary conditions to progressively acquire greater autonomy and adult identity that will allow him/her to exercise his/her rights and duties by him/herself (...).</p>

		<p>That, for this type of conflict, international instruments such as the Hague Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (dated 25 October 1980) and the International Convention on the Rights of the Child (dated 20 November 1989). The first of these, in Article 13, provides for exceptions to the obligation to order the return of the child, which are: a) The parent who had custody rights had not exercised them effectively at the time of the wrongful removal or retention, or had consented to or accepted the removal; and, b) There would be grave physical or psychological danger to the child if return were ordered. (...) in the present case there is no doubt that at the time of the wrongful removal of the child, the child's habitual residence was in the city of Noordenveld - Province of Drenthe - The Netherlands, (...) That, as regards the danger to which the child would be exposed if the international return were to take place, it should be mentioned that, (...) it is of the utmost importance for the proper functioning of the child's family to be able to return the child to his or her place of habitual residence in Noordenveld - Province of Drenthe - The Netherlands, (...).) it is extremely important for the proper psychological development of the child, to have communication with both parents, because according to this, the child in his or her process of formation will develop skills that are important for adult life. (...) That, this Supreme Court does not consider that in the present case there is such a risk, but on the contrary, the Reviewing Chamber has carried out a correct analysis of all the evidence provided to the proceedings by both parties, creating the conviction that the alleged risk does not exist, since the appellant's mere allegation of the existence of danger is not sufficient, given that she has not provided any evidence to prove it. (...) this Supreme Court considers that there is no means of proof or evidence of the actual occurrence of the criminal offence denounced (sexual abuse), only the mother's allegation, with regard to the statement made by the minor, must also be analysed</p>
--	--	---

			<p>restrictively, as the conclusions reached by the psychological examinations carried out bear no relation to the complaint. For these reasons, this Supreme Court does not consider it justifiable to invoke the grounds of exception denounced solely on the basis of the mother's allegation. (...) That, in addition to this, it should be specified that, although it is true that the child is residing in Peru, having managed to adapt easily to our country since the date of his arrival, that is, approximately four years ago, this court does not consider that by virtue of the delay in the processing of the present case since its filing, it is possible to allege that the child has adapted to our country, It is not possible to allege that the child has completely adapted to his or her new home, which is why it would be acceptable for the child to remain in the country, but rather that for no reason can this Supreme Court protect an illegal situation that contravenes international treaties, which could become lawful by the mere passage of time, especially if the mother's actions endanger the proper development of the child. (...)"</p>
--	--	--	--

4. Please provide a brief summary of **any other significant developments** in your State since the 2017 SC.

From 2017 onwards there are no bills that have been submitted to Congress.

Issues of compliance

5. Has your State faced any particular **challenges with other Contracting Parties** to the 1980 Convention in achieving successful cooperation? Please specify the challenges that were encountered and, in particular, whether the problems appear to be systemic.

- No
- Yes

Please specify the challenges encountered:
Please insert text here

6. Are you aware of situations or circumstances in which there has been **avoidance or improper application** of the 1980 Convention as a whole or any of its provisions in particular?

- No
- Yes

Please specify:
In the Lima court, the 16th Family Court, which is competent to hear international return claims, processed the Malapi de Oyague case, Case N° 8933-2015-0-1801-JR-FC-16, which concluded with a well-founded judgment, and the child had to return to her country of origin; However, in its execution, the defendant filed a series of

Amparo actions, and in one of them, Case N° 3292-2018-0-1801-JR-CI-11, the Constitutional Court issued a precautionary measure ordering the suspension of the execution of the process, and as a result, the restitution of the minor to the plaintiff was not complied with, having exceeded 17 years of age to date.

Addressing delays and ensuring expeditious procedures

7. The 2017 SC encouraged States to review their procedures (including, where applicable, at the Central Authority, judicial, enforcement and mediation / other alternative dispute resolution - “ADR” phases)⁵ in order to identify possible sources of delay and implement the adjustments needed to secure shorter time frames consistent with Articles 2 and 11 of the Convention. Please indicate any identified sources of delay at the following phases:

Central Authority

- No
 Yes
 Procedure not yet revised

If the answer to the above is YES, please share any measures that have been implemented to address the delays:

Please insert text here

Judicial proceedings

- No
 Yes
 Procedure not yet revised

If the answer to the above is YES, please share any measures that have been implemented to address the delays:

In the Superior Court of Justice of Lima, the Family Chambers have established as a good practice, in the procedural act of receiving the files submitted on appeal, to send the files to the Public Prosecutor's Office for the Public Prosecutor's Opinion, and also to set a date for the hearing of the case. This implicitly sets a deadline for the Public Prosecutor's Office to issue its opinion before the date of the hearing of the case, thus avoiding delaying the process.

In compliance with the Hague Convention, the Peruvian Liaison Judge is taking steps to present the Executive Council of the Judiciary with proposals for compliance with the Convention, with a view to improving the system of administration of justice in international child abduction proceedings, and has therefore requested that three urgent measures be taken: 1.-Que cada Corte Superior de Justicia del País cuente con un solo Juez Especializado que conozca de estos procesos. Que al respecto es de señalar, que mediante Resolución Administrativa N° 032-2003-CE-PJ, de fecha 04 de abril del 2003 el consejo Ejecutivo del Poder Judicial dispuso que los Presidentes de las Cortes Superiores de Justicia dentro del ámbito de su competencia, designen los Juzgados de Familia, Civil o Mixto que deberán tener a su cargo las acciones que se presenten al amparo de la convención sobre Aspectos Civiles de la Sustracción de Menores. En merito a dicho mandato, el Presidente de la Corte Superior de Justicia de Lima, mediante Resolución Administrativa N° 182-2003-P-CSJL/PJ designó al 16° Juzgado de Familia como órgano competente para conocer dichas demandas; siendo que en otras Cortes de Lima, al parecer, no se dio cumplimiento a dicho mandato. Por lo que se ha solicitado mediante Oficio de fecha 19 de mayo del 2022, que el Consejo Ejecutivo del Poder Judicial

⁵ See C&R No 4 of the 2017 SC, “The Special Commission acknowledges that some States have made progress in reducing delays and encourages States to review their procedures (including, where applicable, at the Central Authority, judicial, enforcement and mediation / ADR phases) in order to identify possible sources of delay and implement the adjustments needed to secure shorter time frames consistent with Articles 2 and 11 of the Convention.”

disponga el cumplimiento de la citada Resolución Administrativa, con la finalidad de que se logre que cada Corte Superior de Justicia cuente con un solo Juez que conozca dichos procesos. Ello facilitara la capacitación permanente que se realice respecto a dicha materia. Por ejemplo, en la practica muchos magistrados confunden el proceso de sustracción internacional con los procesos de tenencia y custodia, siendo una de las razones de la dilación innecesaria de dichos procesos. También facilitará la coordinación de la Magistrada de enlace de dicho Convenio y ésta con los Magistrados de Enlace de los países signatarios del mismo. 2.Ongoing training for lawyers who defend in this area, including lawyers from the Central Authority of the Ministry of Women and Vulnerable Populations. Through free academic events in order to inform them of the scope of the aforementioned Convention, for example with regard to the difference with custody proceedings, as well as training with regard to the measures they can take to return a child if there are well-founded and accredited reasons for a wrongful removal or retention of a child in accordance with the terms of the Convention, such as in the case of requests for precautionary measures and early enforcement of judgments, procedural acts that do not require the decision issued to be consented to for its due execution. However, it achieves the aim of returning the child to his or her habitual residence without further delay and complies with the Convention. 3.That an administrative resolution be issued to ensure that the High and Supreme Courts, in the procedural act of sending the case files to the Public Prosecutor's Office for the prosecutor's report, in this type of proceedings, also set a date for the hearing of the case. This will prevent files from being sent to the Public Prosecutor's Office without a return date, which would also cause unnecessary delay. Co-ordination with the Central Authority, in order to send the cases that the Lima Court has, for example, in order to be aware of the pending cases in each process, be it in the processing and/or execution. Likewise, a legal specialist should be appointed to deal with the processing of these international restitution processes, so that he/she can deal with the cases and avoid procedural delays, identifying the files in a single colour.

Enforcement

- No
 Yes
 Procedure not yet revised

If the answer to the above is YES, please share any measures that have been implemented to address the delays:

The enforcement of court judgments is initiated at the request of the party, the central authority assists the plaintiff in the applications for enforcement of such judgments, and will depend on the willingness of the abducting parent to comply with the court decision, in case of non-compliance, at the request of the party, the judge makes the requirements for compliance, including coercive measures.

Mediation / ADR

- No
 Yes
 Procedure not yet revised

If the answer to the above is YES, please share any measures that have been implemented to address the delays:

Please insert text here

Court proceedings and promptness

8. Does your State have mechanisms in place to deal with return decisions within six weeks (e.g., production of summary evidence, limitation of appeals, swift enforcement)?
- No
 Yes
Please specify:
Please insert text here
9. If the response to question 8 above is “No”, does your State contemplate implementing mechanisms to meet the requirement of prompt return under the 1980 Convention (e.g., procedures, bench-books, guidelines, protocols)?
- No
Please specify:
Please insert text here
- Yes
Please specify:
Currently, there is the New Civil Procedure Code Project, which consists of a comprehensive review of the current Code to optimise the regulation of civil proceedings, thereby ensuring that users can access a better justice service. To this end, a working group was formed through Ministerial Resolution 0299-2016-JUS and made up of recognised specialists, who gave their proposals for improvement, in order to incorporate new institutions that respond to the demands of society, jurisprudential development and the contributions of comparative civil procedural legislation. The draft Code of Civil Procedure proposes to speed up proceedings, reduce the possibilities of annulment of procedural actions and guarantee that they do not lend themselves to delaying strategies. Similarly, the amendments to the enforcement regime aim to ensure that sentences are fully enforced. This would make access to justice for return and international access applicants faster, more predictable and more effective in protecting rights.
10. Do the courts in your State make use of direct judicial communications⁶ to ensure prompt proceedings?
- No
 Yes
Please specify:
In the Peruvian State, one of the principles of due process is the independence of the jurisdictional function, as regulated by paragraph 2 of Article 139 of the Political Constitution of the State, and therefore there is no direct communication between the Judges who hear these proceedings and the plaintiffs, even if they are represented by the Central Authority. However, there are permanent direct communications between the Central Authority and the Liaison Judge of the Peruvian Republic, regarding the follow-up and status of the proceedings they hear on the matter. ease insert text here
11. If your State has not designated a judge to the International Hague Network of Judges (IHNJ) does your State intend to do so in the near future?
- No
 Yes
Please specify:

⁶ For reference, see “Direct Judicial Communications - Emerging Guidance regarding the development of the International Hague Network of Judges and General Principles for Judicial Communications, including commonly accepted safeguards for Direct Judicial Communications in specific cases, within the context of the International Hague Network of Judges”.

The Peruvian State has appointed a liaison judge, who is Magistrate NANCY CORONEL AQUINO, Superior Family Judge of the Superior Court of Justice of Lima, Peru.

12. Please comment upon any cases (where your State was the requested State) in which the judge (or decision-maker) has, before determining an application for return, communicated with a judge or other authority in the requesting State regarding the issue of the child's safe return. What was the specific purpose of the communication? What was the outcome?

In the Peruvian State, it is never customary for a judge to communicate with the judge of another State regarding the safe return of the child, due to the independence of the jurisdictional function. However, there is permanent communication between the Peruvian Liaison Judge and other Liaison Judges in other countries regarding the safe return of the child, for example with the country of Argentina.

The role and functions of Central Authorities designated under the 1980 Convention

In general

13. Have any of the duties of Central Authorities, as set out in **Article 7** of the 1980 Convention, raised any particular problems in practice either in your State, or in Contracting Parties with which your State has cooperated?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

When applicants do not indicate the address where the child and/or adolescent could be found, it is complicated because Interpol Peru does not have among its functions the location of children or adolescents who have been transferred by one of their parents.

14. Has your Central Authority encountered any challenges with the application of **any of the 1980 Convention provisions**? If so, please specify.

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

When applicants do not indicate the domicile of the requested persons, especially when they are foreign migrants. insert text here

Legal aid and representation

15. Do the measures your Central Authority takes to provide or facilitate the provision of legal aid, legal advice and representation in return proceedings under the 1980 Convention (**Art. 7(2)(g)**) result in delays in proceedings either in your own State, or, where cases originate in your State, in any of the requested States that were dealt with?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

16. Are you aware of any other challenges in your State, or, where cases originate in your State, in any of the requested States your Central Authority has dealt with, regarding the **obtaining of legal aid, advice and / or representation for either left-behind parents or taking parents**?⁷

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

Locating the child

17. Has your Central Authority encountered any **challenges with locating children** in cases involving the 1980 Convention, either as a requesting or requested State?

- No
 Yes

Please specify the challenges encountered and what steps were taken or are considered to be taken to overcome these challenges:

Applicants will have to provide the address where the child is to be found because we do not have the support of Interpol.

Voluntary agreements and bringing about an amicable resolution of the issues

18. How does your Central Authority (either directly or through any intermediary) take, or is considering taking, appropriate steps under **Article 7(c)** to bring about an amicable resolution of the issues? Please explain:

Through an interview with the abducting parent, we inform them about the application received and the legal scope of the Hague Convention, in this framework the possibility of a voluntary return is raised.

19. In the case that your Central Authority offers mediation services, or other alternative dispute resolution methods to bring about an amicable resolution of the issues, has your Central Authority reviewed these procedures in the light of the framework of international child abduction cases (e.g., by providing trained, specialised mediators, including with cross-cultural competence and necessary language skills⁸)?

Please specify:

In our country, it is the judge who, within the process, promotes a conciliation hearing for the voluntary return of the child or adolescent.

20. Should the services mentioned in the question above not yet be provided, does your Central Authority intend to provide them in the future?

Please provide comments:

No

⁷ See paras 1.1.4 to 1.1.6 of the C&R of the Fifth Meeting of the SC to review the operation of the 1980 Child Abduction and the practical implementation of the 1996 Child Protection Convention (30 October – 9 November 2006) (2006 SC C&R) and paras 32 to 34 of the C&R of the Sixth Meeting of the SC to review the operation of 1980 and 1996 Conventions (1-10 June 2011 and 25-31 January 2012) (2012 SC C&R), available on the HCCH website at www.hcch.net under “Child Abduction Section” then “Special Commission meetings”.

⁸ For reference, please see the recommendation in the Guide to Good Practice on Mediation, item 3.2, paras 98-105, “Specific training for mediation in international child abduction cases”, available on the HCCH website at www.hcch.net under “Child Abduction Section” then “Guides to Good Practice”.

21. Has your State considered, or is it in the process of considering, the establishment of a central service for international family mediation to facilitate access to information on available mediation services and related issues for cross-border family disputes involving children?⁹

- No
Please explain:
For the reasons set out in paragraphs 19 and 20 above
- Yes
Please explain:
Please insert text here

Ensuring the safe return of children¹⁰

22. How does the competent authority in your State obtain information about the protective measures available in the requesting State when necessary to ensure the safe return of the child?

Please explain:
All information is obtained through the Central Authorities.

23. If requested as a safe return measure (e.g., in accordance with the 1996 Convention), would your Central Authority be in a position to provide, either directly or through intermediaries, a report on the situation of the child after a certain period of time after the return?

- No
 Yes
Please specify:
Please insert text here

Information exchange, training and networking of Central Authorities

24. Has your Central Authority shared experiences with other Central Authority(ies), for example by organising or participating in any networking initiatives such as regional meetings of Central Authorities, either in person or online?¹¹

- No
 Yes
Please specify:
We exchange information and have virtual working meetings with Central Authorities with whom we have more cases.

Case management and collection of statistical data on applications made under the Convention

25. Has your Central Authority developed any protocols or internal guidelines for the processing of incoming and outgoing cases?

- No
 Yes
Please specify and share the relevant instruments whenever possible:

⁹ As it has been encouraged in the Guide to Good Practice on Mediation, Chapter 4, on “Access to Mediation”. paras 114-117. See also 2011 / 2012 SC C&R at para. 61.

¹⁰ See Art. 7(2)(h) of the 1980 Convention.

¹¹ See, in particular, Chapter 6.5, on twinning arrangements, of the Guide to Good Practice – Part I – Central Authority Practice, available on the HCCH website at www.hcch.net (see path indicated in note 8).

Directive No. 006-2021-MIMP, Directive for the administrative handling of requests for return and international access under the Convention on the Civil Aspects of International Child Abduction (The Hague, 25 October 1980).

26. Does your Central Authority operate a case management system for processing and tracking incoming and outgoing cases?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Incoming or outgoing cases are followed up when warranted. Please insert text here

27. Does your State collect statistical data on the number of applications made per year under the 1980 Convention (e.g., number of incoming and / or outgoing cases)?¹²

- No
 Yes

In case this information is publicly made available, please share the links to the statistical reports:

We have a table showing incoming and outgoing cases by year.

Transfrontier access / contact¹³

28. Since the 2017 SC, have there been any significant developments in your State regarding Central Authority practices, legislation, procedural rules or case law applicable in cases of transfrontier access / contact?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

29. Has your Central Authority encountered any problems as regards cooperation with other States in making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

30. Has your State had any challenges, or have questions arisen, in making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact under **Article 21** when the application was *not* linked to an international child abduction situation?¹⁴

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

¹² In the Country Profile for the 1980 Child Abduction Convention, question No 23(e), States are asked to inform whether statistics related to applications under the Convention are publicly available. Please note that, at its meeting of 2021, according to Conclusion & Decision (C&D) No 19, the Council on General Affairs and Policy (CGAP) mandated the discontinuance of INCASTAT.

¹³ See C&R Nos 18-20 of the 2017 SC.

¹⁴ According to C&R No 18 of the 2017 SC, “The Special Commission agrees that an application to make arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access / contact under Article 21 can be presented to Central Authorities, independently of being linked or not, to an international child abduction situation.”

31. In the case of access / contact applications under **Article 21**, which of the following **services** are **provided by your Central Authority**?

Position	Services provided
A request of assistance to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access in another Contracting Party (as requesting State)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Assistance in obtaining information on the operation of the 1980 Convention <input type="checkbox"/> 2. Assistance in obtaining information on the relevant laws and procedures in the requested State <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Establishment of contact with the Central Authority and / or the competent authorities in the requested State to find out the kind of assistance such authorities could provide <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 4. Transmission of the request to the Central Authority or to the competent authorities in the requested State <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access <input type="checkbox"/> 6. Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services, where needed in the requested State <input type="checkbox"/> 8. Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 9. Provision of regular updates on the progress of the application <input type="checkbox"/> 10. Other, please specify: Please insert text here
A request of assistance to organise or secure effective exercise of rights of access in your State (as requested State)	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 1. Providing information on the operation of the 1980 Convention and / or the relevant laws and procedures in your State <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 2. Assistance in initiating judicial or administrative proceedings with a view to making arrangements for organising or securing the effective exercise of rights of access <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 3. Assistance in providing or facilitating the provision of legal aid and advice <input type="checkbox"/> 4. Assistance in obtaining private legal counsel or mediation services available in your State <input type="checkbox"/> 5. Referral to other governmental and / or non-governmental organisations for assistance <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> 6. Regular updates on the progress of the application <input type="checkbox"/> 7. Other, please specify: Please insert text here

32. Should your State also be a Contracting Party to the 1996 Convention, are you aware of any use being made of **provisions of the 1996 Convention**, including those under Chapter V, **in lieu of or in connection with an application under Article 21** of the 1980 Convention?

- No
- Yes

Please specify:
 Peru is not a party to this Convention

Special topics

Obtaining the views of a child in a child abduction case

33. When obtaining the views of a child in a child abduction proceeding in your State’s jurisdiction, what are the elements normally observed and reported by the person hearing the child (e.g., expert, judge, guardian *ad litem*? (E.g., the views of the child on the procedures, the views of the child on the subject of return, the maturity of the child, any perceived parental influence on the child’s statements)?

Please explain:

By listening to children, you can find out about their tastes, doubts, desires, needs, the problems they face or have faced, and everything related to their physical and mental state. It is also to give an appreciation of what they think; every child and adolescent has the right to be consulted in all matters that affect them, especially if we bear in mind articles 3 and 13 of the Convention on the Rights of the Child and the Code of Children and Adolescents.

34. Are there any procedures, guidelines or principles available in your State to guide the person (e.g, expert, judge, guardian *ad litem*) in seeking the views of the child in a child abduction case?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

In Peru, there is a Multidisciplinary Team in every court in the country, which, through psychological evaluations, allows us to know the opinions that the child may have, and even to know if we are dealing with a case of parental alienation. The Multidisciplinary Team issues its Psychological Report which is a means of proof in the international return process.

Article 15

35. As requesting State (outgoing applications), how often have judicial or administrative authorities in your State received requests for Article 15 decisions or determinations?

- Do not know
 Never
 Rarely
 Sometimes
 Very often
 Always

36. As requested State (incoming applications), how often have judicial or administrative authorities in your State requested Article 15 decisions or determinations?

- Do not know
 Never
 Rarely
 Sometimes
 Very often
 Always

37. Please indicate any good practices your State has developed to provide as complete as possible information in the return applications as required under Article 8 with a view to speed up proceedings?

Please indicate:

Advice is provided in the presentation of the application, which must include proof of the child's or adolescent's place of residence.

38. Considering C&R No 7 of the 2017 SC,¹⁵ what information do you suggest adding to the Country Profile for the 1980 Convention, either as requested State or requesting State in relation to Article 15?

¹⁵ See C&R No 7: "The Special Commission recommends amending the Country Profile for the 1980 Convention to include more detailed information on the Article 15 procedure. It is further recommended that an Information Document on the use of Article 15 be considered with, if necessary, the assistance of a small Working Group."

Please insert your suggestions:

In Peru the Central Authority has no jurisdiction to issue a decision or certification that the removal or retention of the child was wrongful.

Relationship with other international instruments on human rights

39. Has your State faced any challenges, or have questions arisen, in processing international child abduction cases where there was a **parallel refugee claim** lodged by the taking parent?

- No
 Yes

If possible, please share any relevant case law or materials that are relevant to this type of situation in your State or, alternatively, a summary of the situation in your State:

Please insert text here

- Do not know

40. Has the concept of the **best interest of the child** generated discussions in your State in relation to child abduction proceedings? If it is the case, please comment on any relevant challenges in relation to such discussions.

- No
 Yes

Please provide comments:

Please insert text here

Use of the 1996 Convention¹⁶

41. If your State is not Party to the 1996 Convention, is consideration being given to the possible advantages of the 1996 Convention (please comment where applicable below):

(a) providing a jurisdictional basis for urgent protective measures associated with return orders (**Arts 7 and 11**)

Please insert text here

(b) providing for the recognition of urgent protective measures by operation of law (**Art. 23**)

Please insert text here

(c) providing for the advance recognition of urgent protective measures (**Art. 24**)

Please insert text here

(d) communicating information relevant to the protection of the child (**Art. 34**)

Please insert text here

(e) making use of other relevant cooperation provisions (e.g., **Art. 32**)

¹⁶ For this part of the Questionnaire, the [Practical Handbook on the Operation of the 1996 Child Protection Convention](#) can provide helpful guidance, available on the HCCH website at [under "Child Protection Section"](#).

42. If your State is a Party to the 1996 Convention, does your State make use of the relevant cooperation provisions (e.g., Art. 32) to provide, if requested, either directly or through intermediaries, a report on the situation of the child after a certain period of time after the return?¹⁷

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

Primary carer and protective measures

43. Are you aware of any cases in your State where a primary carer taking parent, for reasons of personal security (e.g., domestic or family violence, intimidation, coercive control, harassment, etc.) or others, has refused or has not been in a position to return with the child to the requesting State? How are such cases dealt with in your State?

Please explain and provide case examples where possible:

Please insert text here

44. Would the authorities of your State consider putting in place measures to protect the primary carer upon return in the requesting State if they were requested as a means to secure the safe return of the child?

Please explain and provide case examples where possible:

Please insert text here

45. In cases where the return order was issued together with a protective measure to be implemented upon return, are you aware of any issues encountered by your State in relation to the enforcement of such protective measures?

- No
 Yes

Please explain and distinguish between such measures being recognised and enforced under the 1996 Convention:

Peru did not ratify the 1996 Convention

46. In cases where the return order was issued together with an undertaking given by either party to the competent authority of the requested State, are you aware of any issues encountered by your State in relation to the enforcement of such undertakings?

- No
 Yes

Please specify:

Please insert text here

47. If your State is a Contracting Party to the 1996 Convention, is Article 23 of that Convention being used or considered for the recognition and enforcement of undertakings given by either party while returning a child under the 1980 Convention?

¹⁷ See C&R No 40 of the 2017 SC: “The Special Commission notes that many Central Authorities may provide certain degrees of assistance (both when the 1980 Convention and / or the 1996 Convention apply), both to individuals within their own State and to foreign Central Authorities on behalf of an individual residing abroad. Requests for assistance may encompass such matters as: securing rights of access; the return of children (both when the 1980 Convention and / or the 1996 Convention apply); the protection of runaway children; reporting on the situation of a child residing abroad; post-return reports for children returned to their habitual residence; the recognition or non-recognition of a measure taken abroad (advanced recognition); and, the enforceability of a foreign measure of protection.” (Emphasis added.)

- No
 Yes
Please specify:
Please insert text here
 N/A

48. In cases where measures are ordered in your State to ensure the safety of a child upon return, does your State (through the Central Authority, competent Court or otherwise) attempt to monitor the effectiveness of those measures upon the child's return?

- No
 Yes
Please specify:
Please insert text here

International family relocation¹⁸

49. Has your State adopted specific procedures for international family relocation?

- Yes
Please describe such procedures, if possible:
Please insert text here
 No
Please describe how the authorities deal with international family relocation cases, if possible:
Please insert text here

Publicity and debate concerning the 1980 Convention

50. Considering any potential impact on its practical operation, has your State had any recent publicity (positive or negative) or has there been any debate or discussion in your national parliament or its equivalent about the 1980 Convention?

- No
 Yes
Please indicate the outcome of this debate or discussion, if any:
Please insert text here

51. By what methods does your State disseminate information to the public and raise awareness about the 1980 Convention?

Please explain:
Through the MIMP Web Portal
In addition to lectures to train the lawyers who will be defending the parties, interviews are given to Judges on radio stations so that the general listening public can learn about the processing of international restitution cases and their effect.

¹⁸ See the C&R of the 2006 SC at paras 1.7.4-1.7.5, C&R No 84 of the 2012 SC, and C&R No 21 of the 2017 SC, the latter of which says: "The Special Commission recalls the importance of securing effective access to procedures to the parties in international family relocation cases. In this regard, the Special Commission notes that: i) mediation services may assist the parties to solve these cases or prepare for outcomes; ii) the Washington Declaration of 25 March 2010 on Cross-border Family Relocation may be of interest to competent authorities, in particular in the absence of domestic rules on this matter. The Special Commission recommends joining the 1996 Convention."

PART II – TRAINING, EDUCATION AND POST-CONVENTION SERVICES

Training and education

52. Please provide below details of any training sessions / conferences organised in your State to support the effective functioning of the 1980 Convention, and the influence that such sessions / conferences have had:

Please provide details:

"Seminar on Private International Law: Peru before the Hague Conference".

<https://www.gob.pe/institucion/rree/noticias/643590-inauguracion-del-seminario-de-derecho-internacional-privado-peru-ante-la-conferencia-de-la-haya>

It should be noted that before the pandemic there were face-to-face training workshops for judges and prosecutors.

The tools, services and support provided by the PB

53. Please comment or state your reflections on the specific tools, services and support provided by the PB to assist with the practical operation of the 1980 (and 1996) Conventions, including:

- a. The Country Profile available under the Child Abduction Section, including the addition and / or revision of its questions.

Please insert text here

- b. INCADAT (the international child abduction database, available at www.incadat.com).

Please insert text here

- c. *The Judges' Newsletter* on International Child Protection - the HCCH publication which is available online for free;²⁰

Please insert text here

- d. The specialised "Child Abduction Section" of the HCCH website (www.hcch.net);

Please insert text here

- e. Providing technical assistance and training to Contracting Parties regarding the practical operation of the 1980 (and 1996) Conventions. Such technical assistance and training may involve persons visiting the PB or, alternatively, may involve the PB (including through its Regional Offices) organising, or providing assistance with organising, national and international judicial and other seminars and conferences concerning the Convention(s) and participating in such conferences;

Please insert text here

- f. Encouraging wider ratification of, or accession to, the 1980 (and 1996) Conventions, including educating those unfamiliar with the Convention(s);²¹

Please insert text here

²⁰ Available on the HCCH website at under "Child Abduction Section" and "Judges' Newsletter on International Child Protection". For some volumes of *The Judges' Newsletter*, it is possible to download individual articles as required.

²¹ Which again may involve State delegates and others visiting the PB or, alternatively, may involve the PB organising, or providing assistance with organising, national and international judicial and other seminars and conferences concerning the 1980 (and 1996) Conventions and participating in such conferences.

- g. Supporting communications between Central Authorities, including maintaining updated contact details on the HCCH website or intervening to facilitate contact in cases where obstacles arise.

Please insert text here

- h. Supporting communications among Hague Network Judges and between Hague Network Judges and Central Authorities, including maintaining a confidential database of up-to-date contact details of Hague Network Judges or intervening to facilitate contact in cases where obstacles arise.

Please insert text here

- i. Responding to specific questions raised by Central Authorities, Hague Network Judges or other operators regarding the practical operation or interpretation of the 1980 (and 1996) Conventions.

Please insert text here

Guides to Good Practice under the 1980 Convention

- 54. For any of the Guides to Good Practice²² which you may have used to assist in implementing for the first time, or improving the practical operation of, the 1980 Convention in your State please provide comments below:

- a. Part I on Central Authority Practice.

Please insert text here

- b. Part II on Implementing Measures.

Please insert text here

- c. Part III on Preventive Measures.

Please insert text here

- d. Part IV on Enforcement.

Please insert text here

- e. Part V on Mediation

Please insert text here

- f. Part VI on Article 13(1)(b)

Please insert text here

- g. Transfrontier Contact Concerning Children – General Principles and Guide to Good Practice

Please insert text here

- 55. How has your Central Authority ensured that the relevant authorities in your State have been made aware of, and have had access to the Guides to Good Practice?

²² All Parts of the Guide to Good Practice under the 1980 Convention are available on the HCCH website at www.hcch.net under “Child Abduction Section” then “Guides to Good Practice”.

It has been disseminated to judicial and prosecutorial authorities, providing the most important references for implementation within the international Return and Access process. The links are also referred to in the lawsuits.

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

No

57. In what ways have you used the *Practitioner's Tool: Cross-Border Recognition and Enforcement of Agreements Reached in the Course of Family Matters Involving Children*²³ to assist in improving the practical operation of the 1980 Convention in your State?

The Good Practice Guide is a very useful tool for compliance with the 1980 Hague Convention, as it illustrates solutions and how to act in the different situations that arise in international child abduction matters.

Other

58. What other measures or mechanisms would you recommend:

a. to improve the monitoring of the operation of the 1980 Convention;
Please insert text here

b. to assist States in meeting their Convention obligations; and
Please insert text here

c. to evaluate whether serious violations of Convention obligations have occurred?
Please insert text here

²³ The *Practitioner's Tool* is available at the HCCH website at www.hcch.net under "Child Abduction Section" then "Guides to Good Practice".

PART III – NON-CONVENTION STATES

59. Are there any States that you would particularly like to see become a Contracting Party to the 1980 Convention? If so, what steps would you suggest could be taken to promote the Convention and encourage ratification of, or accession to, the Convention in those States?

Please explain:

This depends on the sovereignty of each state.

60. Are there any States which are not Party to the 1980 Convention or not Members of the HCCH that you would like to see invited to the SC meeting in 2023?

Please indicate:

For the time being, no

The “Malta Process”²⁴

61. Do you have any suggestions of activities and projects that could be discussed in the context of the “Malta Process” and, in particular, in the event of a possible Fifth Malta Conference?

Please explain:

Please insert text here

²⁴ The “Malta Process” is a dialogue between certain Contracting Parties to the 1980 and 1996 Conventions and certain States which are not Parties to either Convention, with a view to securing better protection for cross-border rights of contact of parents and their children and addressing the problems posed by international abduction between the States concerned. For further information see the HCCH website at www.hcch.net under “Child Abduction Section” then “Judicial Seminars on the International Protection of Children”.

PART IV – PRIORITIES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR THE 2023 SC AND ANY OTHER MATTERS

Views on priorities and recommendations for the SC

62. Are there any particular issues that your State would like the SC meeting to discuss in relation to the 1980 Convention?

Please specify and list in order of priority if possible:

Coordination and capacity building among signatory countries on good practices among signatory countries. Please insert text here

63. Are there any proposals your State would like to make concerning any particular recommendation to be made by the SC?

Please specify:

Please insert text here

Bilateral meetings

64. Should your State be interested in having bilateral meetings during the SC meeting, please indicate, for the PB's planning purposes, an estimate of how many States with which it intends to meet:

Please insert number:

Please insert text here

Any other matters

65. States are invited to comment on any other matters which they may wish to raise at the 2023 SC meeting concerning the practical operation of the 1980 Convention.

Please provide comments:

Please insert text here