



***Second Meeting of Government Experts***  
**Inter-American Program of Cooperation for the Prevention and Remedy of Cases of International Abduction of Children by one of their Parents**

***Palacio San Martín***  
***Buenos Aires, Republic of Argentina***  
***19, 20 and 21 September 2007***

(translation by the Permanent Bureau)

**REPORT OF ROUNDTABLE 1**  
**CONVENTIONS**

*(Moderator: Dr Ignacio Goicoechea)*

1. The experts urged the States which have not yet ratified the 1980 and 1989 Conventions on the international abduction of children to ratify them or to express their agreement to accession as soon as possible.
2. They reiterated the need for coordination and cooperation between competent authorities and/or Central Authorities in each State when acting in return applications.
3. Safe Return: they encouraged the competent authorities to coordinate and cooperate in adopting measures to secure the safe return of children once they have reached the requesting country and to inform the requesting judge of those measures.
4. Cooperation between actors: it was considered important to increase proper communication between all the bodies involved in the return process in order to resolve economic issues relating to the applicant parent.
5. States where the two international abduction Conventions are in force must appoint a Central Authority in each State. Where a State gives priority to the 1980 Hague Convention, it must make the declaration referred to in the Inter-American Convention, and the latter Convention shall otherwise prevail. They must inform the other States Parties of changes in the Central Authorities

6. It was suggested there should be technical cooperation at international level between States which have signed both Conventions, both at Central Authority and court level: for example, sharing experience and good practice, technical assistance and cooperation.
7. The experts analysed the issue of Articles 8 and 9 of the 1996 Convention, on the transfer of jurisdiction, concluding that there is no conflict with domestic law having regard to the fact that the transfer is not imposed by the Convention but is a power conferred on the court, provided its domestic law so permits and provided the court finds the decision to be in the best interests of the child.
8. The experts recommended that the Institute and the Hague Conference urge the States to look at the 1996 Convention, which appears to be complimentary to the 1980 and 1989 Conventions. The Preliminary Study presented at this meeting was suggested as the basis for that analysis.