Hague Service Convention
Response of the United States of America

Prel. Doc.2 of July 2003
For the October Special Commission
Service/Evidence/Legalisation

Questionnaire Accompanying the Provisional Version of the new Handbook on the Operation of the Hague Convention of 15 November 1965 on the Service Abroad of Judicial and Extrajudicial Documents in Civil and Commercial Matters

**Questions Addressed to Non-Party States**

1. Not applicable.

2. Not applicable

**Central Authority**

3.1 The information as it appears on the Hague Conference website is accurate.

3.2 The language used by U.S. authorities is English.

3.3 A statistical breakdown of service requests, broken down by year and requesting state, is attached as an annex.

**Case Law And Reference Works**

4.1 Significant Court Rulings since 1992. The United States Supreme Court has made no ruling on the Hague Service Convention in recent years. An annex is under development addressing decisions made by lower courts in the United States. The annex will be provided to the Hague Conference to be made available to member States.

4.2 Bibliographic Reference works and articles since 1992. This annex is under development and will be provided to the Hague Conference to be made available to member States.

**Handbook**

5.1 It would be useful to practitioners to have a ready source of information as to the specific practices and limitations imposed by member states on service requests. The United States provides detailed information regarding formal service requests on the website of Process Forwarding International (PFI), the contractor that acts on behalf of the United States Central Authority in executing formal service requests. See

http://www.hagueservice.net/ A link to that website from the Hague Conference website could facilitate distributing information available at that location. We believe that given the liberal approach which the United States has taken with regard to its informal channels of service, little additional information is needed concerning service within the United States beyond what is provided on the Process Forwarding International website.

5.2 We would support a proposal to use the Hague Conference website to supplement the Handbook and provide updated country-by-country information relating to the Convention's operation. Specifically, we would consider it useful for the website to include, but not be limited to:

?? The name, address, telephone and fax numbers and email address of the foreign central authority;
?? Translation requirements;
?? Costs/fees;
?? Declarations and reservations
?? Dates when the Convention entered into force for the member state.

5.3 We would welcome hyperlinks to court cases and other materials on the operation of the Convention or guidance on where to find such materials.

5.4 We would suggest that updates to the handbook be done directly on the Hague Conference website, with listserve announcements to Central Authorities.

5.5 Information regarding formal service of process under the Convention can be found at the website maintained by Process Forwarding International. That website is http://www.hagueservice.net/. Information about service of process in other countries is available on the U.S. Department of State Consular website at http://travel.state.gov under the heading judicial assistance. See also the general U.S. Department of State website at http://www.state.gov under the heading Office of the Legal Adviser.

**Information Relating to Application of the Convention**

6.1 We are not aware of any significant decisional law regarding the scope of the Convention.

6.2 We are not aware of any significant decisional law regarding the phrase "in civil or commercial matters".

6.3 There is little controversy that the Hague Service Convention's procedures are generally considered mandatory and exclusive when litigants must make service outside of the United States. As addressed by the U.S. Supreme Court in Volkswagenverk A.G. v. Schlunk, 486 U.S. 694 (1988), however, there is a narrow exception where service can be made on persons or entities within the United States pursuant to procedures under specific local law. Although that law is binding on all state and federal courts within the

United States, and service under local rules may be utilized when available under applicable local law, most outgoing service of process requests continue to be made under the Hague Convention.

6.4 See preceding response.

6.5 We are unaware of any interpretational difficulties in the use of that terminology ("writ of summons").

7.1 The persons and entities within the United States competent to forward service requests pursuant to Article 3 include any court official, any attorney, or any other person or entity authorized by the rules of the court.

7.2 We believe that the law of the forum submitting the request should determine the question of the competence of the forwarding authority.

**Methods of Service Used by the Central Authority**

8.1 Formal Service

The United States Central Authority has outsourced to a private contractor, Process Forwarding International, the responsibility for making all formal service pursuant to Article 5(1). Under this contract, Process Forward International will execute all service requests using personal service. In the event personal service is impossible to effect, Process Forwarding International will serve such other method or methods as may be permitted under the law of the jurisdiction, including mail service, if authorized. In addition, Process Forwarding International is required to complete service of documents for return to the foreign requesting authority within six weeks of receipt.

Informal Service

Informal service is authorized within the United States in a variety ways: through members of diplomatic or consular missions in the United States, through the mails or by private persons if that would be effective under applicable law, provided no compulsion is used. The requesting authority would make arrangements for service using one of these informal means.

Special Request within Article 5(1)(b)

We are presently unaware of any "special requests" that would require service by a means other than those discussed above.

8.2 Although all formal requests for the service of documents made pursuant to Article 5(1), and submitted to Process Forwarding International, must be translated into English, along with a translation of the underlying documents, there is no similar requirement that service made through informal means such as mail, consular channels or privately

retained process services be translated. Some courts may rule, however, and typically only if challenged by the defendant, that service of documents not translated into English and made through these informal mechanisms may not provide the recipient with sufficient notice of the nature of the proceeding and an opportunity to respond, and, therefore, not be enforceable as a matter of due process.

8.3 As noted above, the Central Authority has attempted to improve its ability to make formal service of process pursuant to a Convention request by outsourcing to a private contractor, Process Forwarding International. We believe that this has greatly improved our ability to execute a service request in an efficient and timely fashion. In the past, requests for formal service made to the Central Authority would be forwarded to the U.S. Marshall Service for the federal judicial district where the service recipient resided. Given the heavy workloads in many large urban jurisdictions, there could be significant delays in having the Marshal Service complete service. Under the new contract with Process Forwarding International, all service must be made and the certificates of service returned within six weeks; in many cases service is completed even sooner. In contrast, prior to the outsourcing of service of process functions, a service request could take any where from six months to one year or longer to complete.

8.4 All requests for formal service under Article 5(1) must be sent directly to Process Forwarding International and are assessed a flat fee. That fee is:

| Year | Description | Fee US$ |
| --- | --- | --- |
| 2003 | Personal service or service by mail | $89.00 |
| 2004 | Personal service or service by mail | $91.00 |
| 2005 | Personal service or service by mail | $93.00 |
| 2006-2007 | Personal service or service by mail | $95.00 |

The United States notes, however, that there is no requirement under U.S. federal law that requests for judicial assistance be referred to the Department of State or the Department of Justice’s contractor for execution through Process Forwarding International. The United States has no objection to the informal delivery of such documents by members of diplomatic or consular missions in the United States, through the mails or by private persons if that would be effective under applicable law, provided no compulsion is used. The costs or fees associated with the use of privately contracted authorized persons to effect service, would be individually negotiated, and unknown to the United States Government.

9.1 We do not believe that requiring a translation of documents to be formally served is contrary to the spirit or letter of Article 5(3). Rather than making judicial assistance more cumbersome, we believe that it makes service easier to accomplish, and avoids unnecessary delays to the requesting authority should service be rejected by the recipient thereby requiring it to be returned to the requesting state for a translation and a renewed service request.

In addition, while the translation requirement for formal service imposed under Article 5 may create an additional burden on the requesting party, in many States, including the United States, it provides some degree of assurance that the recipient of the service of process is accorded full due process. Where the documents have not been translated sufficiently to enable the recipient to obtain a general understanding of the nature of the proceeding, courts could find that adequate notice and an opportunity to defend themselves was not accorded the recipient of the service, and any subsequent judgment could become unenforceable. For that reason, we believe that the translation requirement is fully consistent with the spirit of the convention, and the desire to ensure that fair and equitable justice is provided all litigants.

Because of the liberal view of the United States with regard to informal channels of service which do not impose a translation requirement, there are a plethora of alternative means that a requesting party can utilize if it wishes to avoid the translation requirement.

9.2 We do not believe that such a Recommendation would be helpful nor do we believe it could be easily implemented. In most circumstances it would be extremely difficult for our Central Authority, or its contractor, to obtain sufficient information to determine whether the addressee is fluent in the language of the document in order to waive the translation requirement. Even in a situation where a requesting authority provides information that suggests that a translation would not be necessary, such as an affidavit to that effect, reliance upon that information, if incorrect, could result in the service of process ultimately being found to be ineffective. Alternatively, if the recipient refuses to voluntarily accept the process because of its lack of translation, the request would be returned to the sending state to be translated and resubmitted, creating unnecessary substantial delays in effecting valid service.

9.3 See preceding response.

9.4 We believe that the criteria for determining the necessity and degree of translation that is required, is ultimately to be viewed under the standard of due process. That is, so long as the document or forms have been sufficiently translated into English to enable the recipient to understand the nature of the papers and the proceedings under which they have been issued, a less than complete translation may be acceptable. In many circumstances the summary of the document is quite cursory and, even if translated into English, may not provide adequate information to meet the minimum due process that a recipient of a service of process is entitled.

Again, because of the liberal use of alternative service channels for service in the United States which does not call for translation, parties wishing to avoid the inconvenience of a translation can do so readily. Service made under these informal vehicles, if voluntarily accepted without compulsion by the recipient, will generally be considered effective, unless expressly challenged subsequently by the recipient and under the factual circumstances presented, can be shown to have denied that party applicable due process.

9.5 There is no requirement for a translation to be legalized or bear an apostille.

10.1 At present, we have not developed sufficient information to provide a detailed analysis of the average time required for the performance of requests for service, although, under its contract, Process Forwarding International must complete service within six weeks. We understand that in many circumstances service has been completed in less than six weeks.

10.2 To the extent this question refers to formal requests coming from States to our Central Authority, we are unaware of any differences between the requesting States in our ability to make service.

To the extent this refers to outgoing service, we do not have any information.

10.3 This question asks how issues about timing might be improved. We believe that more direct communication between Central Authorities should be encouraged. This may help resolve questions and speed up the process. We encourage member States to communicate directly with Process Forwarding International. The website for PFI is http://www.hagueservice.net/.

11.1 We have no information regarding the transmittal of service requests under the Hague Service Convention made directly through consular and diplomatic channels. U.S. consular officers are prohibited by federal regulation from serving process abroad. Some U.S. bilateral consular conventions do include service of process as a consular function, and we are aware that foreign consuls in the United States have served documents. We do not have statistics on this practice.

11.2 We are unaware of any difficulties regarding mail service of process to recipients within the United States to the extent such service is permitted under the law of the jurisdiction where the recipient resides. However, with regard to outgoing requests there has been considerable question within the courts of the United States as to whether postal channels are authorized as a means for serving the initial summons and complaint to parties outside of the United States. This difficulty arises out of the use of the word "send" within Article 10(a). Some courts have ruled that the word "send" within that Article was intended to include "serve" and, accordingly, have held that the use of mail was effective in making service. Other courts, have noted that since the Convention generally use the term "serve", as a matter of treaty interpretation, its use of the word "send" in Article 10(a) must, therefore, have a different meaning. As a result, those courts have found that an initial summons cannot be served through postal channels, although subsequent papers in the proceeding may be so served once valid service has been made by other recognized means. The Department of State has communicated its view and the views of the 1989 Special Commission on this point, but it has never been considered by the U.S. Supreme Court.

In 2001, the U.S. Department of State conveyed to the Administrative Office of U.S. Courts guidance about countries that object to service by post channels. See the

Department website at http://www.state.gov, under Office of the Legal Adviser.

11.3 The United States does not have a system of transmission between huissiers. That said, we would have no objection to huissiers contacting Process Forwarding International directly. Attorneys in the United States are authorized to perform legal functions in the state to which they are admitted to the bar.

11.4 We have no difficulties with interested parties initiating service through mail service or through any person or official authorized by the rules of the United States courts.

12.1 The United States is quite flexible in interpreting what documents may be served under the Convention, and will accept judicial and extrajudicial documents for service, so long as the request emanates from a court, tribunal or even administrative body and relates to a judicatorial proceeding.

12.2 We have no information regarding this question.

13.1 We have no views on dual-dating systems, although typically United States courts will look to the actual date that a defendant has received the service of process as the operative date of service.

13.2 There is no distinction in the United States between service that is made domestically or that is effected abroad with regard to determining the date of that service.

14.1 The principal constraint as to the effectiveness of a foreign judgment is that the defendant against whom the judgment is to be enforced, has been accorded appropriate due process, including notice and an opportunity to respond. Where the service of process has been made under the Convention consistent with the domestic laws and court procedures, courts would typically consider the service effective. This does not preclude a judgment defendant from later challenging the judgment based upon some factual infirmity in the service not otherwise apparent to the court. Thus, for example, if the addressee accepts mail service of an untranslated pleading or document, a U.S. court could still find, if challenged, that the defendant had not been provided reasonable due process and deny enforcement of a resulting judgment. However, there are no reported cases of this happening, in fact. In addition, of course, other procedural or substantive infirmities may exist in the underlying action that might the judgment also unenforceable.

15.1 We do not have information regarding this question.

16.1 a) At the present time, the Central Authority is not willing to accept requests forwarded by fax or e-mail.

b) We have no information at the present time as to whether e-mail or fax has been used by parties in the United States to forward requests for service under the Convention.

16.2

As background, it might be noted that federal courts in the United States have begun to implement a comprehensive electronic system for the filing and serving of documents. It is anticipated that within the next several years, all federal trial courts, including bankruptcy courts and courts of appeals, will have implemented an electronic filing system, although the requirements may vary from court to court. We believe some state courts are considering electronic filing as well. Significantly, however, this system is only available after the case has been initiated with the service upon the defending party or parties of a paper copy of the summons and complaint made pursuant to existing applicable law. For that reason, even after such electronic filing systems have been fully implemented, it is unlikely that United States Courts would accept e-mail or fax service as effective, if expressly challenged by the recipient. In any event, nothing precludes a recipient of service of process within the United States through electronic channels from voluntarily accepting such service.

At least two states allow facsimile machines to play some role in service of process. See Montana Code Ann. 253501 ("Any summons, writ, or order in any civil action or proceeding and all other papers requiring service may be transmitted by telegraph or telephone for such service in any place"); Idaho R. Civ. P. 4 ("service may be transmitted by facsimile machine process or telegraph and the copy transmitted may be served or executed by the officer or person to whom sent, and returned in the same manner, and with the same force, effect, authority and liability as the original") . Until recently, Utah also allowed such service. See Utah R. Civ. P. 4 (providing for service by "telegraph or telephone" before recent amendments eliminated such service because it "could be ordered under [the rule] if appropriate"). The federal courts sitting in these states would also permit such service. See Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(e)(1).

The Federal Rules of Civil Procedure do not expressly allow service via fax or email. As noted in the Provisional Handbook, however, Fed.R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3) permits service abroad "by other means not prohibited by international agreement as may be directed by the court." The Handbook notes one case, *Rio Properties, Inc. v. Rio International Interlink*, which applied that provision to allow service via fax and email. The following cases have also followed that approach: *Ryan v. Brunswick Corp.*, 2002 WL 1628933 (W.D.N.Y. 2002) (Court issued order under Fed. R. Civ. P. 4(f)(3) allowing service of Taiwanese defendant via "regular mail, fax or email"); *Broadfoot v. Diaz*, 245 B.R. 713 (N.D. Ga. 713). Note that in each of these cases, prior permission from the court was required. Thus, a plaintiff could not utilize such means of service without first obtaining authorization from the court.

At least one state court also relied upon an analogous state law provision to authorize service by email. See *Hollow v. Hollow*, 747 N.Y.S. 2d 704(2002) (court authorized service on American in Saudi Arabia via his "last known email address as well as service by international registered air mail and international mail standard.").

We are aware that some U.S. courts have accepted such methods after due consideration of the circumstances of the case.

At present, there are no reliable means for establishing that e-mail or fax service has, in fact, been received and even if received at a destination, nor is there an effective way to prove the date when such service was made. Nevertheless, if a party accepts service of process through electronic channels and does not subsequently challenge the service, it is unlikely that a court in the United States on its own would find the service of process to be ineffective. Thus while there is no express prohibition against the use of such electronic service channels, its use would be subject to the considerable risk given that it can be easily challenged by a recipient party.

See Yvonne A. Tamayo, Are You Being Served?: E-Mail and (Due Service of Process, 51 S.C.L. Rev. 227 (2000); Frank Conley, Comment: Service With a Smiley: The Effect of E-Mail and Other Electronic Communication on Service of Process, 11 Temp. Int't & Comp. L.J. 407 (1997).

16.3

a) We do not typically utilize fax or e-mail to send the certificate of due performance of service. However, when it has become apparent that postal channels will not get a certificate returned to the requesting authority prior to a scheduled hearing, or upon specific request, faxed copies of the certificate can be provided; the original certificate will also be returned by mail.

b) There is insufficient developed case law to ascertain whether courts would accept e-mail or faxed certification of service. Without carefully considered safeguards and protocols, including, if necessary digital signatures, e-mail or fax may not provide sufficient self-authentication capabilities to be relied upon as evidence of service.

16.4 We will endeavor to research the question of U.S. and state law and case law on the subject of service by email or fax and will share the results of our inquiries with the Permanent Bureau to be shared with member States.

16.5

Because e-mail and fax generally are not currently recognized as effective for service of process (other than for subsequent papers in the context of an existing electronic filing system in a federal or state court) they are not subject to any existing security requirements. Within the context of a case pending in a jurisdiction in the United States that uses an electronic filing system for the filing of papers after the case has been initiated, the electronic service of any paper and the filing of such documents with the court must be made in accordance with the rigorous security and other technical and procedural protocols established under the particular court's procedures.

16.6

Such agreements would be privately negotiated and are therefore beyond our knowledge. Ordinarily, a domestic court would honor a consensual agreement regarding an agreed upon means for receipt of the service of documents.

17.1 We don't have any information that they are widely used. We have no objection to a discussion on this issue.

17.2 We have no objection to this, but are not familiar with the use of this information.

17.3 While such declaration is not viewed as necessary with regard to an incoming service request, we note that some States have questioned the competence of attorneys within the U.S. to forward service requests abroad. While many American attorneys attempt to avoid these difficulties by citing to the applicable law or court rules that authorize them to forward service, this suggestion would be welcome to the extent it facilitates the effectuating of outgoing service requests from these and other competent parties.

17.4 This appears to be a reasonable approach.

17.5 Yes, an electronic version that could be filled out on line would be a good alternative.

18.1 The United States follows a liberal policy with regard to the service of foreign judicial process within this country. It does not assert reciprocity with regard to the use of postal channels or other authorized formal and informal means for service.

18.2 See the preceding answer.

19.1 The United States is also a party to the Inter-American Convention on Letters Rogatory and the Additional Protocol to that Convention.

19.2 The provisions of the Inter-American Convention are not exclusive and, therefore, service between countries that are signatories to both agreements can be made under either. Some difficulties in obtaining compliance with the procedures established under the Hague Convention have arisen with a few countries that are signatories to both agreements, such as Mexico and other countries. Despite being signatories to the Hague Convention, courts within those countries have not recognized service of process requests under the Hague Articles, and instead, require that the protocols established under the Inter-American Convention be utilized in all cases.

L.C. On NO 42 (03) Additional Questions about Fees for Service

1. Does your State apply the principle of non-payment of fees, and if so, does this apply to all methods for service provided in Article 5? Does your State ever invoke Article 12(2) of the Convention?

A. The Central Authority of the United States has delegated its service of process responsibilities under the Hague Service Convention to a contractor, Process Forwarding International ("PFI"). Pursuant to the authority of Article 12 paragraph 2, a fee is assessed for service of process requests submitted to PFI acting on behalf of the Central Authority. This fee is also assessed on service requests from foreign entities that are not parties to the Hague Service Convention, except from countries party to the OAS Convention.

2. If your State requires from the applicant the payment or reimbursement of fees (in application of Article 12(2), please indicate.

A. The amount that the applicant has to pay for each method of service provided under Article 5 (including the informal delivery);
B. if the amounts are flat-rate or proportional (e.g., to the value of the litigation) costs;
C. if the amounts required are the same for all applicants or if they depend on the Requesting State, or any other criteria;
D. How the applied rates are determined, in particular whether they take into account the charge actually incurred by "the judicial officer or the competent person" to execute the service and/or take into account factors of a commercial nature.

A. The fee is for personal service or service by mail in any part of the United States and its territories. This fee represents the full charges assessed by the Central Authority's contractor, PFI. The contract with PFI to act on behalf of the Central Authority for service of process purposes was awarded on October 11, 2002, and followed the U.S. Government standard procedures for soliciting and evaluating bidders and awarding contracts. Those standard contracting procedures were developed to ensure that ultimately a contract is awarded to the bidder whose proposal provides the best value, considering both the price of the services being offered and the technical nature of the proposal itself.

The bids of all proposed contractors were rigorously evaluated on various factors including: price, their technical approach, and the experience and capabilities of the company, and its management team. Ultimately, PFI's proposal was determined to provide the best value in terms of price and the services being proposed, and an award was therefore made to the company. It is understood that PFI's fee includes all of its costs to perform this service, including insurance, processing and administrative costs, and all shipping costs incurred in transferring the papers to be personally served to appropriate process servers in the location of

the party being addressed. In light of the fact that the typical costs for private service of process within the United States for domestic litigation ranges from approximately $75.00 to $190.00, the fees being charged by PFI ($89.00) under its contract appear to be commercially competitive.

3. If your State does not object to the channel of transmission provided under Article 10 (b) of the Convention, please describe how the fees incurred in executing such a request for service are calculated and indicate the amount of the fees.

A. The United States does not object to the channel of transmission provided by Article 10(b) of the Convention. A fee will only be assessed to the extent the service of process made under that Article provision is submitted to PFI for execution.

4. In order to guarantee transparency and to enable any applicant before requesting service to know the fees which he or she may incur in the Requested State, the Permanent Bureau wishes, for each State Party to the Convention, to make information relating to the fees incurred for each method of service provided by the Convention available on the website for the Hague Conference. What are your views on this matter.

A. The United States has no objection to the publication of, and, in fact, has already widely disseminated information relating to the fees charged by PFI for effecting service on behalf of the Central Authority. Title 28 U.S.C. 1781 authorizes the State Department, and recognizes the inherent power of the federal courts to receive letters of request from foreign tribunals. Title 28 U.S.C. 1782 gives specific authority to the district courts to assist foreign tribunals and execute letters of request. The United States notes, however, that there is no requirement under U.S. federal law that requests for judicial assistance be referred to the Department of State or the Department of Justice's contractor for execution through PFI. The United States has no objection to the informal delivery of such documents by members of the diplomatic or consular missions in the United States, through the mails or by private persons if that would be effective under applicable law, provided no compulsion is used. The costs of fees associated with the use of privately contracted authorized persons to effect service, would be individually negotiated, and unknown to the United States.

October 2003

# HAGUE SERVICE CONVENTION

| Country | No. of Cases Received | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 * |
| Andorra | | | | 2 |
| Argentina | | | 1 | 2 |
| Australia | 1 | | | 3 |
| Austria | 19 | 15 | 48 | 16 |
| Azerbaijan | 1 | | | |
| Belarus | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 |
| Belgium | 253 | 222 | 308 | 310 |
| Bermuda | | 10 | | |
| Bolivia | 5 | | | 2 |
| Brazil | 98 | 159 | 345 | 78 |
| British Virgin Islands | | | 1 | |
| Bulgaria | 1 | 4 | 9 | 10 |
| Canada | 7 | 7 | 26 | 11 |
| China | 69 | 77 | 95 | 55 |
| Colombia | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
| Costa Rica | | | 1 | |
| Croatia | | 4 | 6 | 7 |
| Czech Republic | 33 | 28 | 30 | 15 |
| Denmark | 27 | 16 | 19 | 15 |
| Egypt | 123 | 80 | 137 | 39 |
| El Salvador | | 1 | | 1 |
| Estonia | 12 | 11 | 9 | 5 |
| Finland | 54 | 47 | 36 | 53 |
| France | 2598 | 2019 | 2925 | 1453 |
| Georgia | 1 | 1 | | |
| Germany | 1862 | 1133 | 1492 | 953 |
| Great Britain | 27 | 17 | 36 | 24 |
| Greece | 480 | 500 | 774 | 234 |
| Guatemala | 1 | 1 | | 2 |
| Guernsey | 1 | | | |
| Honduras | | | | 3 |
| Hong Kong | | 3 | | 15 |
| Hungary | | 3 | 1 | 1 |
| India | | | 1 | |
| Ireland | 6 | 4 | 6 | 11 |
| Israel | 8 | 10 | 17 | 147 |
| Italy | 361 | 218 | 369 | 197 |
| Japan (Okinawa) | 14 | 27 | 21 | 7 |
| Jersey | 1 | | | |
| Jordan | 46 | 26 | 36 | 17 |
| Kenya | | | 2 | |
| Kuwait | 28 | 28 | 45 | 11 |
| Latvia | 5 | 14 | 27 | 11 |

| Country | No. of Cases Received | | | |
| --- | --- | --- | --- | --- |
| | 2000 | 2001 | 2002 | 2003 * |
| Liechtenstein | 3 | 13 | | 5 |
| Lithuania | | 1 | 11 | 15 |
| Luxembourg | 26 | 20 | 22 | 12 |
| Malaysia | 12 | 1 | | |
| Martinique | | | | 1 |
| Mexico | 1 | 1 | | |
| Monacco | | | | 52 |
| Netherlands | 225 | 190 | 440 | 78 |
| Nicaragua | | | 510 | 81 |
| Norway | 65 | 305 | 384 | 285 |
| Panama | | | 1 | |
| Peru | 3 | 4 | 3 | |
| Poland | 253 | 222 | 277 | 102 |
| Portugal | 10 | 9 | 13 | 7 |
| Qatar | 2 | 1 | 5 | |
| Romania | 2 | | | |
| Russia | | | 5 | 6 |
| Scotland | | | | 4 |
| Singapore | | 6 | 6 | 2 |
| Slovakia | 1 | 3 | 4 | 12 |
| Slovenia | | | 4 | 3 |
| South Korea | 1 | | 1 | 29 |
| Spain | 104 | 108 | 131 | 52 |
| Sri Lanka | 11 | 13 | 8 | 15 |
| Sweden | 32 | 34 | 35 | 26 |
| Switzerland | 25 | 38 | 51 | 15 |
| Thailand | 1 | 37 | 11 | 129 |
| Tunisia | | 2 | 2 | 0 |
| Turkey | 198 | 163 | 206 | 26 |
| Ukraine | | | 3 | 4 |
| United Arab Emirates | 6 | 9 | 10 | 2 |
| Unknown Countries | 1 | | | |
| Uzbekistan | 1 | | 1 | |
| Vatican City | 2 | 1 | 1 | 3 |
| Venezuela | | 2 | | |
| Vietnam | | | 2 | |
| Yugoslavia | 2 | | 4 | 3 |
| **Totals** | 7132 | 5871 | 8977 | 4682 |

* Through October 1, 2003